

INFORMATION TO USERS

This manuscript has been reproduced from the microfilm master. UMI films the text directly from the original or copy submitted. Thus, some thesis and dissertation copies are in typewriter face, while others may be from any type of computer printer.

The quality of this reproduction is dependent upon the quality of the copy submitted. Broken or indistinct print, colored or poor quality illustrations and photographs, print bleedthrough, substandard margins, and improper alignment can adversely affect reproduction.

In the unlikely event that the author did not send UMI a complete manuscript and there are missing pages, these will be noted. Also, if unauthorized copyright material had to be removed, a note will indicate the deletion.

Oversize materials (e.g., maps, drawings, charts) are reproduced by sectioning the original, beginning at the upper left-hand corner and continuing from left to right in equal sections with small overlaps. Each original is also photographed in one exposure and is included in reduced form at the back of the book.

Photographs included in the original manuscript have been reproduced xerographically in this copy. Higher quality 6" x 9" black and white photographic prints are available for any photographs or illustrations appearing in this copy for an additional charge. Contact UMI directly to order.

U·M·I

University Microfilms International
A Bell & Howell Information Company
300 North Zeeb Road, Ann Arbor, MI 48106-1346 USA
313/761-4700 800/521-0600

Order Number 9204461

**It's deja vu all over again: The failure of educational reform in
Reagan's America**

Smith, Penelope Sue, Ed.D.

The University of North Carolina at Greensboro, 1991

Copyright ©1991 by Smith, Penelope Sue. All rights reserved.

U·M·I
300 N. Zeeb Rd.
Ann Arbor, MI 48106

IT'S DEJA VU ALL OVER AGAIN: THE FAILURE
OF EDUCATIONAL REFORM IN
REAGAN'S AMERICA

by

PENELOPE S. SMITH

A Dissertation Submitted to
the Faculty of the Graduate School at
The University of North Carolina at Greensboro
in Partial Fulfillment
of the Requirements for the Degree
Doctor of Education

Greensboro
1991

Approved by



Dissertation Advisor

APPROVAL PAGE

This dissertation has been approved by the following committee of the Faculty of the Graduate School at the University of North Carolina at Greensboro.

Dissertation
Advisor

Walter L. Ambaker

Committee Members

Joseph E. Bryson
C. M. Colville
James Runkel

February 18, 1991
Date of Acceptance by Committee

February 18, 1991
Date of Final Oral Examination

© 1991 by Penelope S. Smith

SMITH, PENELOPE SUE, Ed.D. *It's Deja Vu All Over Again: The Failure of Educational Reform in Reagan's America.* (1991) Directed by Dr. Dale Brubaker. 337 pp.

One constant in our history of the past century has been complaints about the quality of schooling students receive in K-12 public education institutions. The complaints themselves are remarkably similar, be they made in 1900 or in 1988, although the intensity of those complaints has increased significantly in recent years. The solutions designed to address them are likewise similar, although the disparity between what we hope those solutions will do and what actually happens has grown increasingly large.

Applying a theoretical framework derived from Thomas Kuhn's The Structure of Scientific Revolutions and sociology of knowledge research, the author demonstrates that the persistent resistance of educational problems to reform efforts is related to the characteristics of the institution itself. The current construct of schooling, based on an industrial, bureaucratic model, reflects most of the social expectations set for schools during the late nineteenth century. That construct or paradigm dictates the parameters within which discussions about the nature of schooling, the activities related to teaching and learning, and efforts at reform are conducted.

Given that current information age needs differ significantly from industrial age needs, school reforms which attempt to address the former through an institution designed for the latter have and are likely to continue to fail. The author reviews recent reform initiatives which conform to the paradigm, suggests why they have failed to ameliorate conditions in our schools, and introduces paradigm-challenging reforms which might meet with more success.

TABLE OF CONTENTS

	Page
APPROVAL PAGE	ii
CHAPTER	
I. All Hope Abandon, Ye Who Enter Here.	1
Footnotes.	10
II. If You Don't Know Where You're Going, Any Road Will Do.	13
Footnotes.	52
III. It's Deja Vu All Over Again.	63
Footnotes.	133
IV. The More Things Change, The More They Remain The Same.	155
Footnotes.	181
V. Brother, Can You Paradigm.	188
Footnotes.	229
VI. The Failure of Educational Reform In Reagan's America.	240
Footnotes.	252
VII. All That Is Solid Melts Into The Air.	254
Footnotes.	283
BIBLIOGRAPHY.	285

CHAPTER ONE

ALL HOPE ABANDON, YE WHO ENTER HERE

Dante, The Inferno

A review of statistics recorded in the 1989 Executive Educator supplement Education Vital Signs confirmed former Secretary of Education Cavazos's declaration that educational improvement was "stagnant." SAT scores declined slightly last year, although women and minorities experienced some gains. ACT scores increased slightly. The National Assessment of Educational Progress recorded minor gains in the three age levels it surveys, but the performance of seventeen year-olds continued to be disappointing. "Nearly half . . . do not have the skills required to perform tasks with decimals, fractions, and percents or to do basic geometry and algebra." "Sixty-one percent . . . still cannot understand, summarize, and explain relatively complicated information." In 1986 only seven percent could draw conclusions using detailed scientific knowledge. In writing "less than a third . . . [performed] adequately on persuasive and information tasks."¹ NAEP Director Archie Lapointe noted that "we find deficits in higher-order thinking skills, which mean that large proportions of American students do not appear to be adequately prepared for college work, career mobility, or thoughtful citizenship."²

A recent report of the International Association for the Evaluation of Educational Achievement found that of thirteen countries tested, the United States ranked eleventh in chemistry, ninth in physics, and last in biology.³ "Average Japanese 12th graders have a better command of mathematics than the top 5 percent of their American counterparts."⁴ Drop-out rates nationally are close to 25%; those rates often exceed

50% in some major cities. Each year we graduate 700,000 functionally illiterate students from our high schools.⁵

Depressing information? Of course it is. We have been through a decade of educational reform and our expectations are that something positive should have happened as a result of the time, money, and research, not to mention words, we have spent on correcting variations of those same deficiencies. The standards by which we judge our efforts, quantifiable measures of progress like achievement tests, attendance and drop-out rates, and greater participation in a rigorous course of study, do not reflect profound changes. So, are we to conclude that the initiatives were failures? Are we to assume that schools are beyond our collective abilities to reform, rehabilitate, restructure? Should we pack up our domestic education bags and subcontract such tasks to those nations which seem to be outperforming us, like Japan?

Or should we assume, as some educators probably do, that this, too, shall pass. The attention we now enjoy (tolerate) will move to another topic as the economic crisis passes; education and schooling as front-burner issues will return to somnolence until the next crisis occurs. We have been there before and nothing much happened; we shall come this way again, with little changed.

After all, education bashing is a relatively popular spectator sport in the United States. For instance, an author in the Ladies Home Journal, surely a magazine reflective of mass consciousness, wrote:

. . . imagine a more grossly stupid, a more genuinely asinine system tenaciously persisted in to the fearful detriment of over 17 million children and at a cost to you of over 403 million dollars each year . . . a system that not only is absolutely ineffective in its results, but is also actually harmful in that it throws every year 93 out of 100 children into the world of action absolutely unfitted for even the simplest tasks in life. Can you wonder that we have so many inefficient men and women; that in so many families there are so many failures, that our boys and girls can make so little that in the one case they are driven into the saloons from discouragements, and in the other, into the brothels to save themselves

from starving? Yet that is exactly what the public school system today is doing, and has been doing.⁶

However, as a careful reader might have noticed, that comes not from a recent issue of the magazine, but from one published in 1912. Nor was the Ladies Home Journal alone in its criticism. Samuel Orth, writing in the Atlantic Monthly three years earlier, was critical of the institution, and applauded the work of muckrakers in making public its many shortcomings.⁷ More than a half-century later Sloan Wilson, writing in a 1958 issue of Life magazine, concluded that "it is hard to deny that America's schools, which were supposed to reflect one of history's noblest dreams and to cultivate the nation's youthful minds, have degenerated into a system of coddling and entertaining the mediocre."⁸ Critics abound throughout the past century and the level and intensity of the critiques seem to come in waves, sometimes ebbing, sometimes charging full force toward the shore.

Waves, in fact, have been quite in vogue during the past decade of complaints, encouraged no doubt by the Bell Commission's use of the term "rising tide of mediocrity." Patricia Cross entitled a review of the early eighties reform literature "The Rising Tide of School Reform Reports."⁹ In 1987 the Education Commission of the States issued a concise pamphlet entitled The Next Wave: A Synopsis of Recent Education Reform Reports. Its authors noted that "the individual school is the focus of the second wave of reform."¹⁰ In 1989 Thomas Timar and David Kirp agreed that the next wave of reform must be at the school level, noting that prior initiatives have come from the state through legislated mandates.¹¹ In that same year Mary Hatwood Futrell, who as three term president of the National Education Association participated in many of the reform efforts of the 1980s, argued that there have been three waves of reform thus far and that we are poised on the fourth wave. The first involved the state response to A Nation

at Risk; the second was a reaction to the top-down initiatives of the states and a shift in emphasis to the individual school. The third wave was a result of a redirection of our emphasis to economic issues and an inclination to define the goals of schooling in economic utilitarian terms. The fourth wave, on which we are now perched, "envisions democratic, grassroots reform."¹² One is reminded of Alvin Toffler's The Third Wave. Toffler was convinced that humankind was poised to enter a technologically exciting information age on a giddy wave of progress.¹³ There seems an inevitability about the pace of these waves, as though there were no rational presence to direct them. They come with a force of nature, inevitable, relentless, mindless, albeit somewhat optimistic in nature.

But wave theories aside, schools have been the target for discussion, debate, and criticism from the right, the center, and the left for most of the last century. That criticism has assumed a strident tone during the past decade, partially because we have become tangibly infected with the virus of ignorance. We are entering an era in which international competition will demand more of our workers than they have heretofore been asked to deliver and it will make those demands when the workforce is decreasing and the people who comprise that workforce are changing. The presence of Sonys in the living room and Toyotas in the garage, the relative health of the yen and the relative malaise of the dollar, the rapidly escalating debt of the United States government and our deepening negative balance of trade, and the plethora of books about Theory Y and Theory Z management in a nation still dominated by Theory X managers have contributed to our sense of urgency. Television documentaries have related our educational tale of woe; editorials have found fault with the system, decried its products, and sought villains. Revisionists, like Joel Spring and Michael Katz, have argued that the educational system is a conspiracy of the wealthy to continue to enslave the poor. Conservatives, such as

Chester Finn, Diane Ravitch, and Allan Bloom, have argued for a return to the basics. Futurists like John Naisbitt have argued for the introduction of new basics.¹⁴

Only the most ostrich-like of our species in the United States could have failed to hear the call to educational arms in the eighties. We are, according to the National Commission on Excellence in Education, a "nation at risk."¹⁵ "If an unfriendly foreign power had attempted to impose on America the mediocre educational performance that exists today, we might well have viewed it as an act of war."¹⁶ The Task Force on Education for Economic Growth claims that "a real emergency is upon us."¹⁷ "Japan, West Germany and other relatively new industrial powers have challenged America's position on the leading edge of change and technical invention."¹⁸ The Paideia Group confidently asserts that the present "decline in the quality of public schooling is damaging the futures of . . . children."¹⁹ Ernest Boyer argues in The High School that "if we do not seize this special moment, we will fail the coming generation and the nation."²⁰ Robert Reich, a teacher of business and public policy at the John F. Kennedy School of Government, notes that our public schools are "inadequate to the task of preparing citizens for skill-intensive production."²¹ "At best, the current system . . . prepares young people for preexisting jobs in high-volume, standardized production."²² Vance Packard entitled his chapter on education in Our Endangered Children: Growing Up in a Changing World "Schools That Upset Children," clearly implying that they are neither a pleasant nor a productive place to be.²³ John Goodlad begins A Place Called School: Prospects for the Future on an equally somber note. "American schools are in trouble. In fact, the problems of schooling are of such crippling proportions that many schools may not survive. It is possible that our entire education system is nearing collapse."²⁴ Jim Hunt, a former Governor of North Carolina and chairman of the committee which prepared Action for Excellence for the Education Commission of the

States, has written that "a state can postpone some public needs, for a time, without dire consequences -- but not education; if we fail there, our failure may never be repaired."²⁵ Arthur Powell, Eleanor Farrar, and David Cohen found that most reform attention had been directed at the two extremes of the student population -- those who are gifted or those who are in trouble, either behaviorally or educationally. The majority of students, those clustered in the middle, have been allowed to drift through an unchallenging curriculum characterized by variety, rather than rigor. "Most Americans, and especially those most directly affected, do not seem bothered by a secondary education that lacks intellectual demand and intensity. Because they never wished for or expected anything else, they do not miss it."²⁶

The responses to the criticisms have been impressive in volume, if not in impact. During a two year span after the 1983 release of A Nation at Risk over 700 state laws and regulations were issued dictating what should be taught to whom in what manner for how long with what materials to achieve what competencies. Subsequently, study commissions reviewed and recommended changes in teacher education. A national certification board was established and hopes to have its first candidates sit for that certification in assessment centers to be opened in the early 1990s. Efforts to systematize educational data and to issue state report cards based on systematic collection of statistics are under way. President Bush convened a national conference of governors at Thomas Jefferson's university in Virginia to develop an action plan for a national education agenda. Politicians vie for titles as education congressmen or education governors; school promises still score points at the polls. The Secretary of Education will continue to issue an annual national report card, the infamous "Wall Chart" begun when William Bennett occupied that Cabinet position -- a ranking based in large part on student performance on the Scholastic Aptitude Test. When North Carolina

fell to last among the fifty states on the 1989 SAT results, the Department of Public Instruction immediately declared a crisis, appointed a prestigious and large task force on secondary education with a number of equally prestigious and large study committees to advise it, and promised to issue recommendations within a year. Those promises come even though North Carolina has actively pursued education reform for the previous eight years, annually adopting and implementing reforms from a number of other commissions.

In 1989 Donald Orlich wrote that:

Education reforms have been suggested by individuals, foundations, associations, governmental agencies, university boards of regents, state boards of education, and local school boards. Too frequently, however, the suggested reforms have been contradictory in nature, poorly implemented, and eventually abandoned.²⁷

Having been in public schools most of my life and actively involved as an education practitioner during the past decade, I concur. Like Dante attempting to plumb the inner circles of Hades, I sometimes feel that we should abandon hope of ever making sense out of the layers upon layers of statutes, regulations, and recommendations which cover the educational landscape in the United States. Yet it is precisely that coherence one seeks in "making sense" of something that I hope to achieve in the following chapters.

Most of what I shall argue is not new. I, too, believe that there is an overlapping pattern to our current reform movement -- a sequence of waves, perhaps, or at least a series of different dominant themes. Neither educational complaints nor reform movements are new. They have been a constant over the past century of schooling in America. Their current urgency is partially a result of our proximity to the complaints (we are alive now and the present always feels more real and intense than does the past), partially a result of the immediacy and power of the media, and partially a result of our frustration in being unable to come to terms with our inability to create instant,

significant, positive changes which ensure both equity and excellence, which achieve Garrison Keillor's mythical Lake Wobegone goal of having a time and place where "all the children are above average." Yet I believe we can approach our task of bringing to fruition educational change in more productive ways than we have in the past and it is an effort to define that approach that I offer as a way to bring coherence to educational rhetoric and reform initiated during the Reagan years.

Using Thomas Kuhn's basic argument in The Structure of Scientific Revolutions I shall demonstrate that the current paradigm of schooling was framed during the three decades prior to the first world war. That paradigm still exists, but the anomalies within the paradigm have begun to approach the critical mass point at which a paradigm leap is possible. Enduring, revolutionary change resides in the ability to distinguish anomalies and to restructure paradigms to resolve those anomalies more successfully. I shall argue that my model can help educators separate revolutionary wheat from rhetorical chaff. Specifically, I shall review the problem of modern K-12 school change by looking first at efforts from 1945 to 1980 in chapter two and during the 1980s in chapter three. I shall, in the fourth chapter, explore theories of change, looking for a way to make some sense of what has happened in our schools since the end of World War II. In the fourth chapter I suggest that Kuhn's theory of change seems a powerful tool for understanding our recent past, or at least the failures of our latest attempts at reform to make those changes we desire in our nation's schools. In the fifth chapter I define the current paradigm of schooling, one which was established nearly a century ago. In the sixth chapter I suggest the ways in which we have failed to challenge that paradigm as we search for the means to make our schools more effective, thereby bringing together the history found in chapters two, three, and five, using the theory found in chapter four. The failure to attempt significant challenges to the paradigm explains why we continue to

repeat our past, why we appear to return constantly to arguments we have already had about our schools and their operation. In my final chapter I suggest some implications of that explanation.

I do not intend this paper to be a summative explication of educational reform in Reagan's America. Rather, I intend it as a way to look at the events of the past decade. My task is to provide a theoretical loom on which to weave together disparate threads into some form of crude cloth, rather than a definitive description of those individual threads themselves. This is an interpretive, rather than explicative, paper.

I came to this topic seeking a resolution to my own doubts and concerns about reforms, reactions, and regulations which have been part of my professional life during the past ten years. I have had the good fortune to participate in reform groups, to sit on panels and boards engaged in change, and to watch how regulations move from public declarations of crisis to actual programs. Throughout the decade I have also worked in schools and watched the effects those initiatives have had on the lives of students, teachers, and administrators. My dissatisfaction with the pace, direction, and results of change led me to seek answers in the past. That attempt to find personal answers to personal doubts forms the foundation for this monograph.

CHAPTER ONE

FOOTNOTES

¹National School Boards Association, Education Vital Signs 5 (1989): 16-19 passim.

²Ibid., p. 18.

³Geoffrey Cowley, et. al., "Not Just For Nerds," Newsweek 115 (9 April 1990): 53.

⁴Ibid, p. 52.

⁵Education Vital Signs, p. 19; Dennis P. Doyle, Endangered Species: Children of Promise, a supplement of Businessweek (15 October 1989): E22.

⁶Reprinted in Ron Joekel, "President's Newsletter," Phi Delta Kappan Bulletin no. 3 (February 1986), p. 2.

⁷Samuel P. Orth, "Plain Facts About Public Schools," Atlantic Monthly 102 (February 1986): 289.

⁸Sloan Wilson, "It's Time to Close Our Carnival," Life 44 (24 April 1958): 36-37.

⁹K. Patricia Cross, "The Rising Tide of School Reform Reports," Phi Delta Kappan 66 (November 1984): 167.

¹⁰Joslyn Green, The Next Wave: A Synopsis of Recent Education Reform Reports (Denver, Colorado: Education Commission of the States, 1987).

¹¹Thomas B. Timar and David Kirp, "Education Reform in the 1980s: Lessons from the States," Phi Delta Kappan 70 (March 1989): 505-511.

¹²Mary Hatwood Futrell, "Mission Not Accomplished: Education Reform in Retrospect," Phi Delta Kappan 71 (September 1989): 9-14.

¹³Alvin Toffler, The Third Wave (New York: Bantam Books, 1981), note particularly pp. 349-361. An indication of the optimism conveyed by Toffler is contained on the first page of his introduction: "The Third Wave is just for those who think the human story, far from ending, has only just begun."

¹⁴Spring is one of the more prolific and articulate of the revisionists. See, for example, Joel Spring, The Sorting Machine: National Education Policy Since 1949 (New York: David McKay Company, Inc., 1976); Conflicts of Interest: The Politics of American Education (New York: Longman, 1988); and The American School: 1642-1985 (New York: Longman, 1968). Michael Katz is best known in education circles for Katz, The Irony of Early School Reform: Educational Innovation in Mid-Nineteenth Century Massachusetts (Boston: Beacon Press, 1968). Diane Ravitch penned a stinging rebuttal to the revisionist interpretation of schooling in The Revisionist Revised: A Critique of the Radical Attack on Schools (New York: Basic Books, 1978) to which the revisionists replied in Walter Feinberg, et. al., Revisionists Respond to Ravitch (Washington DC: National Academy of Education, 1980). Diane Ravitch and Chester Finn issued a call for a return to content in our curriculum when they collaborated on What Do Our 17-Year Olds Know?: A Report on the First National Assessment of History and Literature (New York: Harper & Row, 1987). Ravitch's own commentary on recent education trends prior to the Reagan administration can be found in The Troubled Crusade: American Education, 1945-80 (New York: Basic Books, 1983). With Finn and Robert Fancher she edited Against Mediocrity: The Humanities in America's Schools (New York: Holmes and Meier, 1984). Allan Bloom's The Closing of the American Mind (New York: Touchstone, 1987) became a bestseller as did S.D. Hirsch's Cultural Literacy: What Every American Needs to Know (New York: Houghton Mifflin, 1987). Both books lamented the lack of an American intellectual canon. John Naisbitt, best known as the author of Megatrends (New York: Warner Books, 1982), co-authored with Patricia Abardene Reinventing the Corporation (New York: Warner Books, 1985) in which he decries a return to "old" basics and advocates a new set of fundamentals.

¹⁵The National Commission on Excellence in Education, A Nation at Risk: The Imperative for Educational Reform (Washington DC: Government Printing Office, 1983).

¹⁶*Ibid.*, p. 5.

¹⁷Task Force on Education for Economic Growth, Action for Excellence: A Comprehensive Plan to Improve Our Nation's Schools (Denver: A.B. Hirschfield Press, 1983), p. 4.

¹⁸*Ibid.*, p. 13.

¹⁹Mortimer J. Adler, The Paideia Proposal: An Educational Manifesto (New York: Macmillan Publishing Co., Inc., 1982), p. xi.

²⁰Ernest L. Boyer, The High School: A Report on Secondary Education in America (New York: Harper & Row, Publishers, 1983), p. 1.

²¹Robert B. Reich, The New American Frontier (New York: Times Books, 1983), p. 213.

²²*Ibid.*, p. 214.

²³Vance Packard, Our Endangered Children: Growing Up in a Changing World (Boston: Little, Brown and Company, 1983), pp. 78-92.

²⁴John Goodlad, A Place Called School: Prospects for the Future (New York: McGraw-Hill Book Company, 1984), p. 1.

²⁵The North Carolina Commission on Education for Economic Growth, An Action Plan for North Carolina: Executive Summary (Raleigh: Office of the Governor, 1984), cover page.

²⁶Arthur G. Powell, Eleanor Farrar, and David K. Cohen, The Shopping Mall High School: Winners and Losers in the Educational Marketplace (New York: Houghton Mifflin, 1985); Arthur G. Powell, "Being Unspecial in the Shopping Mall High School," Phi Delta Kappan 67 (December 1985): 261.

²⁷Donald C. Orlich, "Education Reforms: Mistakes, Misconceptions, Miscues," Phi Delta Kappan 70 (March 1989): 513.

CHAPTER TWO

IF YOU DON'T KNOW WHERE YOU'RE GOING, ANY ROAD WILL DO

Lewis Carroll, Alice in Wonderland

The appearance of a seemingly endless number of blue ribbon panels and commissions in the wake of A Nation at Risk was not as unexpected as we, who lived the appearance of and prescriptions derived therefrom, might want to believe. Complaints about the quality of our schools have been commonplace following the distractions of the second world war. Precursors to the Reagan administration's discovery of crisis included the demise of the progressive education movement; the post-Sputnik initiatives, primarily in science and mathematics; the liberal critique of schools which culminated in, among other efforts, the open school alternative; the introduction of federal programs and regulations to ensure equity; the beginning of a neo-revisionist historical analysis which despaired of finding any excellence or equity in the public schools; and the inauguration of a variety of long-term research projects designed to examine candidly life in our nation's K-12 educational institutions.

Before we can look clearly at the reform efforts begun during and associated with Reagan's America, we must at least glance at the context in which those events are set. If they comprise the main course of the next chapter (and they do), then we need first to set the table and indulge in an appetizer or two. What happened in education from 1946 through 1980 would be repeated within a tighter chronological setting from 1980 onward. The kaleidoscope of education reform during the past decade contains the same glass pieces as that of the previous three decades; however, it spins at a faster pace.

Writing in 1947 in the New York Times Benjamin Fine declared that "America's public school system is confronted with the most serious crisis in its history."¹ A significant number of our teachers were uncertified, their average pay was lower than that of many marginally skilled blue collar workers, turn-over rates were high, morale suspect, and working conditions "deplorable."² Elizabeth Irwin, herself at one time a school teacher, had noted many of those same concerns in a 1946 issue of Collier's. Teachers were unable to contend with policy makers who treated them more like servants than professionals.³ Dorothy Thompson listed poor pay, inadequate training, discrepant standards based on socio-economic conditions and geography, the low status of teachers, and parental apathy as reasons for our post-war educational problems.⁴

Concerns about the conditions of K-12 schools were not the only educational issues broached as the country turned its attention from Europe and Japan back to domestic problems. We were still uncertain exactly what our schools should do, particularly our high schools. One set of educators advocated the life adjustment programs of the thirties and forties. Schools must do more for non-college bound students than they had ever done in the past. Conversely, the Harvard University Committee on the Objectives of a General Education in a Free Society argued in 1945 that all students needed to master a common core of knowledges and skills before their separate talents and aspirations took them in different directions.⁵ The demobilization of a vast number of disciplined young men eager to resume their civilian lives and to take advantage of new educational opportunities opened by the enactment of the G.I. Bill of Rights precipitated a debate on the role of university training in a modern society and the degree of formal schooling one might need or realistically be able to achieve therein.⁶ That debate had implications for public secondary schools. In 1947 The Commission on Civil Rights issued a report which recommended the end of legal

segregation, a recommendation later made real for the nation's schools by the Brown v. Board of Education decision.⁷ And there was a growing voice for a more active federal role in public schooling, a voice which united such politically unaligned individuals as Robert Taft and Harry Truman.⁸

Into a cauldron of social, political, and international changes wrought by demobilization, the establishment of the Iron Curtain, the fall of China, the splintering of the FDR Democratic coalition, and the likelihood that Jim Crow was gasping his last breaths came what Hollis Caswell, Dean of Teachers College, called "the great reappraisal."⁹ What became the focus of that reassessment was the set of ideas associated with the progressive education movement. Cremin wrote, in The Transformation of the School, that educational progressivism was an attempt to use the school as a means for social revitalization.

First it meant broadening the program and function of the school to include direct concern for health, vocation, and the quality of family and community life. Second, it meant applying in the classroom the pedagogical principles derived from new scientific research in psychology and the social sciences. Third, it meant tailoring instruction more and more to the different kinds and classes of children who were being brought within the purview of the school . . . Finally, Progressivism implied the radical faith that . . . everyone could share not only in the benefits of the new sciences but in the pursuit of the arts as well.¹⁰

Linked to the philosophy of Dewey and tamed by the 1981 Cardinal Principles of Secondary Education into a mainstream philosophy, progressivism became associated with the child-centered school. Helen Hay Heyl, a supervisor on the State University of New York campus at Albany, distinguished between traditional schools and those advocated by the progressives in a chart entitled "The Two Extremes." In traditional schools children are "sent" and "kept" a specific time before exploding "into freedom" at the end of the formal academic day. In progressive schools children "cannot get there early enough" and linger in the building after hours. Traditional schools are for

listening; progressive schools are for working. Children in traditional schools sit in seats arranged in rows. In progressive schools chairs are arranged around tables so students can work in groups. In traditional schools learning is teacher-directed and centered on memorization and recitation. In progressive schools students learn through experiences. Traditional schools stress obedience and discipline; progressive schools emphasize critical thinking and teach students to question. In traditional schools "mental discipline . . . will produce good citizens." In progressive schools good citizens are the products of "growth and understanding."¹¹

However, critics of progressive education were almost as vocal as advocates and were actively engaged in polemics from the beginning of the movement. For example, in 1934 William Bagley worried about the advisability of substituting activities for a sequenced course of study.¹² Even Dewey was concerned that progressive schools could become as dogmatic as traditional schools had become.¹³ Charles Beard, hardly a conservative, argued in 1937 that the primary mission of schools was to transmit knowledge, a mission which clashed somewhat with the less subject-oriented education favored by the progressives of his generation.¹⁴ In 1943 I.L. Kandel, a member of the Teachers College faculty, suggested that progressive education, like the well-known emperor, had no clothes. He concluded that the activity orientation of such institutions resulted in a sense of "rootlessness," rather than in inquiring minds.¹⁵

In 1945 Charles A. Prosser, long an advocate of vocational education, called for a conference to examine the needs of what today, at least to the proponents of a reform initiative called Tech Prep, we'd call the "neglected majority" -- that large group of students in the middle who are ill-served by traditional college-prep or vocational programs. According to Diane Ravitch that conference described these students as:

. . . coming from low-income homes with low cultural environments; as retarded in school; as making low scores on intelligence tests and achievement tests; as

less emotionally mature than other students, with lower grades and less interest in school work.¹⁶

What those young people needed was education which, through appropriate guidance and classroom instruction, promoted "citizenship, home and family life, use of leisure, health, the tools of learning, work experiences, and occupational adjustment."¹⁷ To critics reliance on a core curriculum which emphasized life adjustment was an acknowledgement that minimal academic standards were acceptable.¹⁸

As the fifties began those critics turned to the printed page to declare their dissatisfaction. Mortimer Smith, author of And Madly Teach, argued that progressive education was basically anti-intellectual.¹⁹ Bernard DeVoto, an historian, satirized the movement in a Harper's Magazine editorial.²⁰ A Roper poll, published in a 1950 issue of Life, showed that the American public was dissatisfied with the state of its schools.²¹ Albert Lynd, a local school board member, criticized "educationists" who promoted mastery of trivia, rather than the acquisition of knowledge.²² Robert Hutchins, dignified defender of a western canon, believed that progressive education generated a curriculum of essentially "dead facts," because "our mission here on earth is to change our environment, not to adjust ourselves to it."²³ One critic concluded that "we are offering . . . a slingshot education in a hydrogen-bomb age."²⁴

The educational pendulum swung from students to "stuff" in the early 1950s. The child-centered humanistic curriculum of the progressivisms, as well as the social reconstruction advocated by such educators as George Counts, collapsed before the onslaught of conservative defenders of "the basics," who asserted that only a return to a traditional curriculum could repair the damage of more than a decade of dangerous experimentation with frivolous electives. In an era of red-baiting and apparent loss of

control on the international stage, schooling needed to be made, quite literally, of sterner stuff.

In 1951 a series of articles in The Nation framed the debate in military terms, using language which paralleled an increasingly hot cold war.²⁵ Two years later Arthur Bestor published Educational Wastelands, one of the most effective indictments of experimental programs theretofore put into print.²⁶ Both he and Harold Albertz, author of Reorganizing the High School Curriculum, complained that teachers often lacked the education necessary to prepare students for the intellectual demands of the post-war world.²⁷ Patricia Graham accurately summarized that swing of the pendulum: in 1919 "progressive education meant all that was good in education; thirty-five years later all the ills in American education were blamed on it."²⁸ It was no accident that the Progressive Education Association ceased operation in 1955.

A cursory examination of a popular magazine for the years 1954 and 1955, a time when one might expect desegregation to be the major educational issue, suggests the depth of a generalized discontent with our nation's schools. The President of Kenyon University hoped that advanced classes would "raise the intellectual sights of the . . . secondary school in general, which has too long been tailored to the mediocre."²⁹ Oliver La Farge, a college teacher complaining about the quality of students sent to him from high schools, concluded "that a great many schools . . . fail to provide that most fundamental thing of all, an education."³⁰ The new three Rs in New York City's public schools in 1954 were "rowdyism, riot, and revolt."³¹ The Pittsburgh Teachers Association felt that they, too, were experiencing student discipline problems. They declared that "there is too much coddling of pupils and catering to parents," noting that in the previous school year 66 teachers "had been struck by pupils; 170 reported the theft of personal property; [and] 92 complained that parents had threatened them."³²

The NEA's Executive Secretary observed that "thousands of children go to school day after day in unsuitable and dangerous buildings, [and] are taught by underpaid and undertrained teachers on half-time shifts."³³ An advertisement in a September, 1954, issue of Time noted that "educators . . . are facing handicaps that experienced business men would consider extremely unsound: inadequate, understaffed plants, with outmoded facilities and poor working conditions."³⁴

In December, 1954, the editors of Time declared that within a decade America's schools would require a massive increase in spending simply to maintain services.³⁵ In that same issue was an article decrying "a retreat from solid learning." The percent of students studying second languages had dropped precipitously from figures in 1900, as had the percent of students taking advanced mathematics and science. John Francis Latimer of George Washington University complained that "we have gotten away from individual effort." "By permitting the high schools to become vocational bargain basements of education, we have insulted the student's intelligence and encouraged mediocrity by prescribing mediocre subject matter as an incentive for mediocre minds."³⁶ In 1955 members of the High School Teachers Association observed that they had been forced to lower their standards because of the limited ability of their students to read and their evident lack of ambition.³⁷ Although those complaints were overshadowed by reactions to mandated desegregation, they suggest that the tone of public debate was already contentious and likely to become more quarrelsome.

One year later a Presidential Commission on Education found that many Americans still wanted some of the frills decried by critics.³⁸ But any call for balance was upset by the 1957 launch of a Russian satellite, a technological slap in the national face of the United States. Sputnik provided a tangible link between national defense and schooling. If we were to win the space race against our Cold War adversaries we had to

convert our schools into effective training grounds for scientists, engineers, and mathematicians. Barbara Clowse, an historian and author of Brainpower for the Cold War, concluded that:

In a national crisis, part of the process of remedy involves fixing blame, finding who was responsible for the 'defeat' . . . Perhaps it was the Pentagon, bogged down in interservice rivalry and mismanagement . . . On the other hand, it could be a direct judgment on Eisenhower's Cold War priorities. Such indictments seemed more obvious than blaming schools and colleges for Russia entering the space age before America. Yet increasingly, leaders linked the Soviet exploits to American educational deficiencies.³⁹

The President of the United States, Dwight Eisenhower, asked local school boards to

. . .scrutinize your school's curriculum and standards. Then decide for yourselves whether they meet the stern demands of the era we are entering. As you do this . . . remember that when a Russian graduates from high school he has had five years of physics, four years of chemistry, one year of astronomy, five years of biology, ten years of mathematics through trigonometry, and five years of a foreign language.⁴⁰

The Vice-President echoed those sentiments. "There are too many soft subjects and not enough tough and challenging topics that develop the mind."⁴¹ Indeed, the comparison with Russia immediately after 1957 became almost as ubiquitous as the comparison of our schools with Japan in the mid-1980s.⁴²

Joining the national figures linking national security to educational success was Admiral H.G. Rickover, often touted as the father of our modern nuclear navy. He wanted a return to a classical, rigorous curriculum to ensure that we had the technical expertise necessary to remain a major global power.⁴³ In 1959 he published Education and Freedom which included among its chapters "Education Is Our First Line of Defense - - Make It Strong."⁴⁴ To cultivate the minds needed for that defense "nothing short of a complete reorganization of American education, preceded by a revolutionary reversal of educational aims" would be necessary.⁴⁵

In late 1957 Life magazine joined the national security debate with a four issue series entitled "Crisis in Education."⁴⁶ "The schools, " claimed Life's staff, "are in terrible shape. What has long been an ignored national problem, Sputnik has made a recognized crisis."⁴⁷ The Soviet educational system, went the argument, is superior to our own. We should, consequently, model our revisions on their successes. Contrasting the intellectual challenges presented to and accepted by Alexi, a "typical" Russian high schooler, and his American counterpart, Stephen, the latter was clearly at a disadvantage.⁴⁸ Richard Nixon concluded that our students needed to face the possibility of failure, to have more "backbone" and "competition," and to worry less about democracy in the operation of a school.⁴⁹

Formal responses were quick in coming. The Rockefeller Brothers Fund called for the expenditure of more resources on students identified as intellectually superior. Published as The Pursuit of Excellence, their study was co-sponsored by the Carnegie Foundation for the Advancement of Teaching, and reached a national audience when it was summarized in the Ladies Home Journal.⁵⁰ Simultaneously, a congressional committee opened public hearings in which dignitaries such as Rickover and James Killian, Eisenhower's science advisor, lamented the condition of our schools. Life magazine summarized their recommendations for changes, among which were: (1) raising secondary school standards; (2) eliminating trivial courses; (3) modernizing the teaching of science; (4) minimizing the duties teachers must perform which are unrelated to the process of teaching and learning; (5) raising teaching to the status of a profession; (6) identifying and enriching the education of our academically talented students; (7) removing barriers to teaching for qualified people who lack the appropriate credentials for that practice; and (8) attacking anti-intellectualism through a national campaign which demonstrates the value of intellectual attainments.⁵¹

In 1958 Congress passed the National Defense Education Act aimed primarily at improving our performance in science and mathematics.⁵² As Diane Ravitch notes, national security provided the vehicle which established "the legitimacy of . . . [a] federal role in supporting education."⁵³

Perhaps the most comprehensive study of the conditions of our secondary schools was made by James Conant, which culminated in 1959 with the publication of The American High School Today.⁵⁴ Conant acknowledged that the widespread influence of that book was partially fortuitous timing. "A wave of public criticism of the high schools which had started after Sputnik had reached its crest. School board members all over the country were anxious for specific answers."⁵⁵ Another reason for the book's success was its disinclination to fault educational professionals.

Sponsored by the Carnegie Corporation with additional support from the Educational Testing Service, Conant's study focused on the 1957-58 academic year. His report called for the elimination of small high schools and the establishment of comprehensive institutions capable of providing for the specialized needs of all students in a fiscally responsible manner. He advocated accelerated programs for gifted students, remedial programs for those youngsters with reading problems, and a specialized vocational course of study. The counseling program was intended to help students select an academic program which would culminate in the acquisition of marketable skills. All students were to take a common core curriculum, which included at least four years of English, three of social studies (with a special emphasis on a senior-year civics course), and one each of math and science. Tracking was an appropriate, even desirable, means of sorting students. Homerooms were to develop democratic values and skills, reinforced by their roles in establishing student councils.⁵⁶

Also in 1959 another group of school observers published recommendations for improving our educational institutions. The Case for Basic Education was sponsored by the Council for Basic Education which had been formed in 1956 partially as a means of popularizing Arthur Bestor's ideas.⁵⁷ James Koerner, editor of the book, believed that "only by the maintenance of high academic standards can the ideal of democratic education be realized."⁵⁸ Reflective of Mortimer Adler's 1980s Paideia Group, the Council declared that "schools exist to provide the essential skills of language, numbers, and orderly thought, and to transmit in a reasoned pattern the intellectual, moral, and aesthetic heritage of civilized man."⁵⁹ Teachers should be liberally educated and grounded in specific discipline studies.⁶⁰

The reform impetus also pushed for the introduction of a curriculum, particularly in math and science, which was less textbook-driven and more representative of what practitioners in those disciplines actually did. Like the trend in general criticisms of our schools which appeared after the second world war, there were intimations of change prior to the introduction of the national security argument which followed the launch of Sputnik.

The National Science Foundation, established in 1950, had been charged with, among other tasks, the improvement of science education in our nation's schools. In 1956 it was supporting a reappraisal of physical science instruction by the Physical Science Study Committee. Their project, from inception to the distribution of materials, study guides, and staff development opportunities, took five years and cost \$6 million. Led by Jerrold Zacharias, a physics professor at the Massachusetts Institute of Technology, the group received publicity in popular journals and at educational conferences. It did not, however, succeed in stimulating a revolution in either the content of or the way in which physics was taught to our high school students.⁶¹

The School Mathematics Study Group, established in 1958, fared somewhat better, at least in terms of popular distribution. Known as "the new math," the product of the study group was widely distributed during the early years of the 1960s. Designed by a committee headed by Edward Begle of Yale University and, like the physical science committee, funded by the National Science Foundation (NSF), the new curriculum sought to emphasize concepts over discrete facts, understandings over the compilation of disjointed information. Grounded in set theory, it established a scope and sequence reflective of the requirements necessary for entrance to college. Partially that was a result of its decision to focus on grades 7-12 and partially it was a result of the committee's expertise. Work on an elementary curriculum did not begin until 1960. A premise accepted by the group was that all students needed to be exposed to abstract mathematics. The committee believed in the idea of a non-differentiated curriculum, an idea being popularized by Bestor and the Council for Basic Education. By 1960-61 materials on the new math were available nationally and summer programs to train teachers were in place.⁶²

Other discipline areas were quick to follow the lead of the mathematicians and the physicists. For instance, in 1959 the American Institute of Biological Sciences began a review of life science curricula in K-12 schools, again with the financial backing of the NSF. The chemists initiated a review in 1960 and by 1963 had produced a textbook, a lab manual, audio-visual support materials, and an equipment package.⁶³ In that same year Francis Keppel, Kennedy's Commissioner of Education, declared (somewhat overconfidently, it seems) that "more time, talent, and money than ever before in history have been invested in pushing outward the frontiers of educational knowledge, and in the next decade or two we may expect even more significant achievements."⁶⁴

Additional support for these curricular ventures by higher education came from the 1958 National Defense Education Act and its provisions for summer institutes. Eisenhower's call for a national education initiative came formally in a January 27, 1958, speech to Congress. He proposed dramatic increases in NSF funding to hold special programs for science and math teachers, to support curriculum revision projects in those areas, to fund scholarships for students who were entering a career in science, to improve testing and guidance programs in secondary schools to identify talented youngsters likely to pursue technical careers, to purchase additional equipment for labs and to hire more teachers.⁶⁵ In hearings on the bill Gordon Allott, Senator from Colorado, declared that the status quo was no longer acceptable to the American people. "All you have to do is go out and talk with any one of tens of thousands of fathers and mothers to find that they are not happy with what is happening and nothing seems to be done about it."⁶⁶ Alexander Smith, senator from New Jersey, asserted that "we are in our present predicament because education in America had deteriorated in quality for lack of standards."⁶⁷ Detlev Bronk, a witness at the bill's hearings and chair of the National Science Board, agreed with the lack of standards argument. "Rather than have the elementary schools concerned with many of the things which should be the responsibility of the home and the parents and the church, I would like to see the schools giving emphasis to those fundamentals upon which all of the future education of man must depend."⁶⁸ M.H. Trytten, another witness, noted that "national survival depends upon the success or failure of our educational institutions to provide the intellectual, the scientific, the diplomatic leaders sorely needed to solve complex problems."⁶⁹ What today is sometimes called training in HOTS (higher order thinking skills) was then linked to condemnations of anti-intellectualism and resulted in admonitions to design new programs which "develop minds."

According to Diane Ravitch, the curriculum reformers shared a common perspective:

They hoped to replace current methods -- characterized by teacher-led 'telling' and student recitation -- with curriculum packages that used 'discovery,' 'inquiry,' and inductive reasoning as methods of learning . . . They hoped to end the traditional reliance on a single textbook by creating attractive multimedia packages that included films, 'hands-on' activities, and readings. They emphasized the importance of understanding a few central concepts in a discipline, rather than trying to 'cover' an entire field.⁷⁰

For all their good intentions and in spite of the introduction for the first time of significant financial support from the federal government, curriculum reformers failed to stimulate a revolution in content or methods in our schools.

Partially that was a result of the realities of the early and mid-1960s. The United States was plagued with domestic discontent and international failure. The struggle for civil rights culminated in a series of disturbing riots. Black power replaced civil disobedience; streets became the scenes of deadly confrontations between traditional forms of authority and a people seeking economic and social parity. Feminists, trained in the early civil rights movement, agitated for an equal rights amendment. Forces clashed on such disparate issues as abortion rights and affirmative action. A President was assassinated and a nation watched on television as his assassin was killed by an outraged citizen. Children were harassed simply for attending newly desegregated schools. Michael Harrington pricked our national conscience by revealing the extent to which poverty existed in the richest nation on earth. The Age of Aquarius transformed exotic and relatively rare fifties beatniks into mainstream Americans, as students began to demonstrate that they, too, suspected that a greater or at least a different form of freedom than that associated with the Ozzie and Harriet generation was their birthright. And our involvement in what was once an unknown country, Vietnam,

increased, displacing by the end of the decade domestic difficulties as the topic of newspaper headlines.

Partially that was a result of the failure of the design of those curricular reforms. Rather than build on the existing curriculum, the reformers sought to replace it. However, they failed to consider sufficiently the institutional resistance inherent in such major transformations. They failed to provide adequately for the retraining of the teachers who would have to use the new materials -- teachers who were comfortable with the status quo and who had been trained and rewarded for success with what was, rather than what might be. The innovators were primarily affiliated with colleges and the materials they developed were geared for the types of students they wanted to see in their classrooms. They failed to appreciate that the majority of the students in secondary schools would never set foot in those classrooms and, consequently, that their carefully crafted materials might be inappropriate for that audience. Also, because the innovators were primarily discipline-oriented scholars with a large measure of mistrust about what happened in colleges of education, they failed to include field-based educators on the study and revision committees. Consequently, what they created was sometimes generated in a rarified atmosphere divorced from the realities of K-12 schools. Finally, the financial independence of many of the development groups meant that they never interacted with nor understood the importance of involving the curriculum distribution network in their deliberations.⁷¹

Partially it was because what they developed lacked an equally innovative pedagogy. I was one of thousands of high school students identified in the early sixties as potential scientists or mathematicians. For eight weeks during the summer between my junior and senior years I attended an NSF science institute at the University of Iowa, spending roughly eight hours a day in lecture halls and labs investigating chemistry and

biology. On weekends and sometimes during the weekday evenings we were further introduced to the joys of the natural sciences through field trips and special lectures. Not only did I fail to find the content of my two courses unique (possibly a result of ignorance on my part -- I might not have had a sufficient knowledge base to make such distinctions, although I had been in accelerated science and math courses for my entire post-Sputnik secondary education career), but the methods used by my teachers (regular college professors and advanced graduate students) would have done justice to the most tradition-bound of traditional school adherents. What was new was the freedom of a college campus and the stimulation of same-age and same-interest students from across the nation, but I suspect the federal government did not see as a primary goal of the program the acquisition of the social skills that most of us came to see as the major benefits of our involvement.

Although domestic and foreign events shifted the spotlight from our nation's schools to other issues, all was not necessarily quiet within those schoolhouse doors. Emphasis in the sixties shifted from the calls for academic excellence which characterized most of the 1950s to calls for equity. Federal support in the Sputnik era was tied to national security issues; in the 1960s that support became a means of providing compensatory educational experiences to the educationally disadvantaged.

Beginning in the mid-1950s there appeared a growing body of literature which addressed the uneven academic achievement of poor and/or minority students. In 1964 the Office of Education sponsored a conference at the University of Chicago on the plight of those underachievers. Among the recommendations which came from that meeting were: (1) a call for providing meals, both breakfast and lunch, medical care, and clothing to whomever needed such essentials; (2) the creation of early learning experiences through the establishment of nursery schools and kindergartens for all

disadvantaged children; and (3) the development of individual learning plans for the first years of formal schooling to ensure that these children had opportunities to master gatekeeper skills before they progressed far in the educational system.⁷² The Johnson administration designed and had enacted legislation establishing Head Start classes throughout the nation. Title 1 of the 1965 Elementary and Secondary Education Act enlarged the scope of compensatory education and brought it into most communities in the nation. Under first Kennedy and then, more effectively, under Johnson the Department of Health, Education, and Welfare pushed the cause of desegregation. By the mid-1960s the federal courts were actively intervening in school systems reluctant to respond to Brown v. Board of Education.

In 1966 Equality of Educational Opportunity, funded partially by the Civil Rights Act of 1964, was published. Known eventually as the Coleman Report, named for its principal researcher and author, its central message, once simplified by the mass media, was that schools did not really make much of a difference in the lives of the students that they served. Students from advantaged homes did well; students from disadvantaged homes did poorly. Integrationists seized upon the Coleman findings to push their cause. Anti-compensatory education advocates also found the Coleman Report a supporting document in their efforts to remove the federal government from any such initiatives. Some scholars, motivated by what they perceived as racist and classist implications in the study, began what would eventually be known as the "effective schools" movement. They searched for and found institutions populated primarily with educationally disadvantaged students in which those youngsters were succeeding at rates comparable to students in advantaged schools.⁷³

But one of the most interesting reactions to the compensatory education debate came from a group of educators whom we might term romantic radicals. They faulted the

system for ignoring the unique needs of children in general and minority and/or poor children in particular. Idealists, often stimulated to enter education by the rhetoric of a Harrington or a Kennedy, sometimes disciples of Paulo Freire, they wanted to humanize the institutions they believed were dehumanizing both the adults and children who worked and studied within them. Two distinct groups emerged within that idealist collective. Scholars like Michael Katz used the power of academic research to rewrite the history of education in the United States; activist like John Holt and Jonathan Kozol sought to bring their message directly into classrooms and to popularize their efforts through mainstream publications. If the popularity of progressive ideas had shrunk in the 1950s, they were revived by the educational flower children of the 1960s and 1970s.

In 1960 A.S. Neill, the director of Summerhill, published an account of his school and attracted the attention of educators both in his native England and on the American side of the Atlantic. Benjamin Fine declared that it was the most "stimulating, exciting, and challenging" book on the education of children that he had encountered in the preceding twenty-five years.⁷⁴ To Neill "a school that makes active children sit at desks studying mostly useless subjects is a bad school."⁷⁵ He believed that children were "innately wise" and set about establishing an institution in which youngsters were given the freedom necessary to exercise that wisdom. At Summerhill, for example, classes were optional, examinations rare and then given for fun, and relationships between staff and student exceedingly informal.

Paul Goodman, in Compulsory Mis-education, agreed with many of Neill's ideas. "The compulsory system has become a universal trap, and it is no good. Very many of the young, both poor and middle class, might be better off if the system simply did not exist, even if they had no formal schooling at all."⁷⁶ Goodman declared that "the recent attacks

. . . by the Rickovers . . . have really been outrageous."⁷⁷ Indeed, it was the very thing which the Rickovers criticized, progressive education, which, if properly applied, would provide us with enlightenment. "The top-down dictated national plans and educational methods that are now the fad are quite irrelevant."⁷⁸ "We ought to spend more of our wealth on education . . . but it does not follow that the present system is the appropriate institution for the job."⁷⁹ "No single institution . . . can prepare everybody for an open future of a great society." "We should be experimenting with different kinds of school, no school at all, the real city as school, farm schools, practical apprenticeships, guided travel, work camps, little theatres and local newspapers, community service."⁸⁰ Goodman's cure for our current distress was equally radical:

My purpose is to get people at least to begin to think in another direction, to look for an organization of education less wasteful of human resources and social wealth than what we have. In reconstructing the present system, the right principles seem to me to be the following: To make it easier for youngsters to gravitate to what suits them, and to provide many points of quitting and return. To cut down the loss of student hours in parroting and forgetting, and the loss of teacher hours in talking to the deaf. To engage more directly in the work of society, and to have useful products to show instead of stacks of examination papers. To begin to decide what should be automated and what must not be automated, and to educate for a decent society in the foreseeable future.⁸¹

Goodman fervently believed that "the present system is not viable," and that it was leading the nation to an Orwellian 1984. "Change," he argued, "when it comes, will not be practical and orderly."⁸²

If Neill and Goodman set the stage, teachers like Jonathan Kozol, Herbert Kohl, James Herndon, and John Holt provided the scripts of life in our nation's inner-city classrooms. Kozol's bestseller, Death at an Early Age, winner of the 1967 National Book Award, became the prototype for the romantic critique of the minority classroom. Kozol, a Harvard graduate, took a job in an inner-city, segregated, Boston school and chronicled the prejudice and ineffective instructional methods he encountered. Fired for

introducing his students to a Langston Hughes poem against the wishes of those authorities who dictated the approved city curriculum, he concluded that to Boston's educational authorities "good" teachers "were dedicated to . . . the extension of their own personalities and the perpetuation of their own code of values in the hearts and minds of children." It would be, he argued, impossible to "get a good school" if it were staffed "by the veteran teachers of that sort."⁸³

Nearly a decade later Kozol penned The Night is Dark and I Am Far From Home in which he extended his critique of our public schools beyond his Boston experience.

U.S. education is by no means an inept, disordered misconstruction. It is an ice-cold and superb machine. It does the job . . . The problem is not that the public schools do not work well, but that they do.

The first goal and primary function of the U.S. public school is not to educate good people, but good citizens. It is the function which we call -- in enemy nations -- 'state indoctrination.' . . . In the U.S. . . . we employ more elegant expressions like 'the socializing function.'

The words are different. The function is the same: twelve years of mandatory self-dehumanization, self-debilitation, blood-lose.⁸⁴

Kozol calls for civil disobedience by teachers, acknowledging that the end of social indoctrination in schools will have widespread consequences in the structure and function of other institutions in our society.⁸⁵

Herbert Kohl, a classmate of Kozol's at Harvard, encountered similar experiences in a New York City classroom. His account of those experiences, 36 Children, summarized the disillusionment of a generation of young liberals.

There is no point in continuing to document each child's problems and pains. Enough has already been said. The thirty-six children are suffering from the diseases of our society. They are no special cases; there are too many hundreds of thousands like them, lost in indifferent, inferior schools, put on the streets or in prep schools with condescension or cynicism. When I think of my work as a teacher one of the children's favorite myths, that of Sisyphus, continually comes to mind . . . Without hope and without cynicism, I try to make myself available to my pupils. I believe neither that they will succeed nor that they will fail. I

know they will fight, falter, and rise again and again, and that if I have the strength I will be there to rejoice and cry with them, and to add my little weight to easing the burden of being alive in the United States today.⁸⁶

Although Kohl claimed to eschew cynicism, self-righteousness was in ready supply -- perhaps with some justification.

James Herndon, writing in the early 1970s, concluded that "the school's purpose is not teaching. The school's purpose is to separate sheep from goats."⁸⁷ It declares winners and losers by assigning grades.⁸⁸ Ultimately, it will refuse to educate the losers at all.⁸⁹ Like Kozol, he, too, was fired in the mid-1960s. He described his experiences in his first book, The Way It Spozeed To Be.

What went wrong? In the old days -- six years ago -- the kids got along with the system . . . The kids are different now . . . If more kids can't or won't go along with us, it is because we have more deprived kids. If virtually all the kids from 'lower-income' and 'minority' groups are in our own low-ability groups, we turn to the counselors, the social workers, the clinics. Them is deprived kids, goes the cry, and someone ought to do something about it.

Deprived of what? Of intelligence? . . . Naturally not. We have a list. They are deprived of ego strength, of realistic goal-orientation, of family stability, of secure peer relationships; they lack the serene middle-class faith in the future. Because of all that, they also lack self-control, cannot take risk failure, won't accept criticism, can't take two steps back to go one forward, have no study habits, no basic skills, don't respect school property . . .

You can add to this list, or you can find another. But what such a list adds up to is something simple: some kids can't take it as well as others.

Al right. Some can take it, and some can't. Those who cannot expose the point -- it's not any good for anyone.⁹⁰

John Holt agreed with Herndon. "Most children in school fail." Why? "They are afraid, bored, and confused." "They are afraid, above all, of failing." "They are bored because the things they are given and told to do in school are so trivial, so dull, and make such limited and narrow demands on the wide spectrum of their intelligence, capabilities, and talents." "Most of the torrent of words that pours over them in school makes little of no

sense."⁹¹ "School tends to be a dishonest as well as a nervous place."⁹² To Holt the curriculum in most schools presupposed that there existed a body of knowledge that everyone should know, that to be considered an educated person one needed to master that core curriculum, and it was the duty of the schools to ensure that such essential knowledge was taught to students. However, he believed such "ideas are absurd and harmful nonsense." "Schools should be a place where children learn what they most want to know, instead of what we think they ought to know."⁹³ Arthur Bestor was cringing behind a volume of the western canon when Holt declared that "learning is not everything, and certainly one piece of learning is as good as another."⁹⁴

In summarizing the liberal idealist argument, Holt writes that:

. . . what concerns me now is that so many people seem to be saying that our schools must stay the way they are, even if it means that children will learn less in them. Or, to put it a bit differently, our schools are the way they are for many reasons that have nothing whatever to do with children's learning.⁹⁵

If schools were to be places of true learning, they would accept the idea that such learning can, in the words of Holt, "arise out of the experience, interests, and concerns of the learner."⁹⁶ The organization, governance structure, curriculum, and pedagogy would differ dramatically. What we need to reform our schools, then, is "not the making of new curricula and high-powered and high-priced gadgets," but "to make the classroom into a very different place."⁹⁷

Ronald and Beatrice Gross, editors of Radical School Reform, agreed.

We have bungled badly in education. Not merely in the ways noted by most school critics: too little money for education, outdated curricula, poorly trained teachers. But in more fundamental ways. It isn't just that our schools fail to achieve their stated purposes, that they are not the exalted places their proponents proclaim. Rather, many are not even decent places for our children to be. They damage, they thwart, they stifle children's natural capacity to learn and grow healthily. To use Jonathan Kozol's frightening but necessary metaphor: they destroy the minds and hearts of our children.⁹⁸

To battle against such institutions Neil Postman and Charles Weingartner advised subversion. To them the real business of schools should be "to subvert attitudes, beliefs, and assumptions that foster chaos and uselessness."⁹⁹ The question of whose definitions of chaos and uselessness we should consider notwithstanding, their conclusion was that schools as presently constituted achieved little of real value. They even published a handbook for students who wanted to help in that subversion and join the coming revolution.¹⁰⁰

Ivan Illich went beyond the subversive transformation makers. He argued that we should eliminate schools altogether. They make "futile promises of salvation to the poor of the technological age."¹⁰¹ Students are taught "to confuse teaching with education, a diploma with competence, and fluency with the ability to say something new."¹⁰² "The contemporary crisis of education" should force us to "review the very idea of publicly prescribed learning" rather than the elements which comprise it.¹⁰³ Because "our present educational institutions are at the service of the teacher's goals," we fail to enable the learner, to help the student define himself or herself and contribute to the learning of others.¹⁰⁴ Schools, to Illich, were concerned with goals other than the intellectual growth of students and, consequently, should get out of the business of calling themselves schools.

Ravitch identifies four initiatives which are ideologically connected to the romantic radical critique of our nation's schools: the open school movement; the free school movement; the alternative school movement; and the deschooling or no school movement. They appeared to wax at the very time that enthusiasm for Great Society efforts began to wane.¹⁰⁵ Deschooling received attention in small journals, a few books, and scattered conferences, but, given the compulsory school laws in each state, was never effectively implemented. Illich remained on counterculture reading lists, a gadfly

with a faithful, albeit small, audience; he led no parades out the schoolhouse door. The free school movement enjoyed some successes, particularly in major urban areas and counterculture enclaves in metaphorical wildernesses. It was able to establish and sustain a formal network and newsletter and it eventually could claim a membership that numbered in 1972 approximately five hundred schools. However, the number of students served by those schools was relatively small.¹⁰⁶ Open schools enjoyed widespread popularity, becoming part of mainstream American education in the early 1970s as states encouraged the construction of new buildings with the open spaces demanded by the movement.¹⁰⁷ Ultimately, such institutions were seen by both staff and the community as less effective than egg-carton schools. Those critics welcomed the return of carpenters, who generally within five years of creating those open spaces began to construct walls to partition them into appropriate squares and rectangles for straight rows of desks. Alternative schools found a permanent niche in the American landscape, renamed, in several places, magnet schools. They became centers for specialized educational services or for students with discipline problems. Their "alternative-ness" was defined by the populations served or the services delivered, rather than by unique approaches to learning, to curriculum, to assessment, to schooling in general.¹⁰⁸

Support for the romantic radicals came from the universities through the research and publications of a number of revisionist, often Marxist, historians. By the late 1960s those historians argued that the most powerful lessons taught in schools were products of a hidden curriculum which reinforced attitudes and values associated with a capitalist, classist state. Schools were designed to maintain the status quo, to perpetuate inequities and class distinctions, to ensure the hegemony of America's business elite. Writers like Samuel Bowles, Herbert Gintis, Michael Katz, Paul Violas, and Joel Spring

all contributed to a reappraisal of the history of American education.¹⁰⁹ According to these scholars the student was seen by the state "primarily as a prospective worker." Consequently, public education became "a series of roads to be traveled and bridges to be traversed toward . . . a permanent place in the economic structure of corporate industry."¹¹⁰

The educational system, perhaps more than any other contemporary social institution, has become the laboratory in which competing solutions to the problems of personal liberation and social equality are tested and the arena in which social struggles are fought out. The school system is a monument to the capacity of the advanced corporate economy to accommodate and deflect thrusts away from its foundations. Yet at the same time, the educational system mirrors the growing contradictions of the larger society, most dramatically in the disappointing results of reform efforts.¹¹¹

In Kuhnian terms, the school is a paradigm microcosm. If we want to change the schools we will first have to change our society.

Michael Katz makes explicit the connection between the revisionists and the romantic critics by using Kozol to underscore his contention that the radical reform associated with free, open, or alternative schools "offers . . . little promise."¹¹² He fears that even if the free, open or alternative proponents were to take over the nation's educational systems and were they to do so without taking over other institutions which help define our culture, "they would have no more success than educational reformers of the past."¹¹³ Katz does offer four suggestions for reformers who want to precipitate changes: (1) have schools narrow their mission to teaching and learning cognitive "stuff" (they should get "out of the business of making attitudes"); (2) restructure the bureaucracy of schools, making them more people-sensitive places; (3) eliminate the compulsory attendance requirements while simultaneously making the structural changes necessary to permit easy entrance and exit to educational programs and places;

and (4) decentralize power or "power-down" in today's jargon, returning decision-making to teachers, students, parents, and the community.¹¹⁴

However specific Katz's recommendations might have been (or however contradictory), most revisionists despaired of achieving either excellence or equity in the schools. They sought not merely the school subversion of Postman and Weingartner's "soft revolution," but the next turn in the Marxian cycle from a capitalist to a classless society.

Charles Silberman authored what many consider a summation of the events of post-war American education in his 1970 publication Crisis in the Classroom: The Remaking of American Education. Begun initially as a study of the education of teachers, Silberman expanded his monograph to consider the institutions in which those teachers would work. Although many observers, Silberman noted, believed that the 1950s and 1960s boded well for educational change ("the decade which began in 1955, and through which we are still churning may ultimately come to be regarded as one of the major turning points in American education"), "nothing of the sort happened."¹¹⁵ Reviewing a 1960s Goodlad study, he agreed with Goodlad's findings: "Things are much the same as they had been twenty years ago, and in some respects not as good as they were forty years ago, when the last great school reform movement was at its peak."¹¹⁶ He concluded that a movement which began and continued in optimism and which accomplished little in actual changes in America's classrooms failed because its prime movers came from universities. Those reformers were associated with specific disciplines (math, biology, physics), had little previous involvement with K-12 schools or sometimes even the colleges of education on their own campuses, and were ignorant of the history of educational reform. Moreover, they tried to teacher-proof their efforts, viewing teachers as competent only to be technicians -- they saw them as part of the problem

and not part of the solution. Most damning to Silberman, they failed to address the reason for public education in the first place. They never fully answered the question: "What are schools for?"¹¹⁷ Silberman believed the result was a mindlessness which has characterized our thinking about schooling for nearly a century.

To be sure, teaching has its share of sadists and clods, of insecure and angry men and women who hate their students for their openness, their exuberance, their color or their affluence. But by and large, teachers, principals, and superintendents are decent, intelligent, and caring people who try to do their best by their lights. If they make a botch of it, and an uncomfortably large number do, it is because it simply never occurs to more than a handful to ask why they are doing what they are doing -- to think seriously or deeply about the purposes or consequences of education.

This mindlessness -- the failure or refusal to think seriously about educational purpose, the reluctance to question established practice -- is not the monopoly of the public school; it is diffused remarkably evenly throughout the entire educational system and indeed the entire society . . .

If mindlessness is the central problem, the solution must lie in infusing the various educating institutions with purpose, more important, with thought about purpose, and about the ways in which techniques, content, and organization fulfill or alter purpose.¹¹⁸

The search for a reflective practitioner was not a 1980s phenomenon.

In some respects Silberman's call to contemplation was an end to the sense of crisis which had characterized much of the debate of the previous two decades. Vietnam, continued violence in our cities, the assassinations of John Kennedy, Malcolm X, Martin Luther King, Jr., and Robert Kennedy, the elections of Richard Nixon and Spiro Agnew and the subsequent introduction of a conservative chill on domestic legislation, a dramatic escalation in the anti-war movement, the 1968 Democratic Convention in Chicago, George Wallace, Watergate, trouble first in Chilli and Argentina, then in Nicaragua and El Salvador, gasoline shortages, double digit inflation, Carter's malaise, the Iranian hostage crisis -- in the late 1960s and the 1970s they were all reasons to defer attention or a sense of crisis from schoolhouse doors. Also, demonstrations on

college campuses across the nation tended to shift the sights of reformers to those institutions and away from K-12 schools. So, although funding for education increased, the media spotlight focused elsewhere. Criticism would heat up once again when the College Board announced a significant decline in test scores, but that would come at mid-decade.

True, during that time the federal government gradually increased its involvement in our nation's K-12 schools, using regulatory legislation and compensatory education money to open doors which were once closed to national watchdogs. The Office for Civil Rights forced affirmative action plans on colleges by threatening to withhold federal grants; the Federal courts forced desegregation on school systems, first in the south, but eventually throughout the nation. The Bilingual Education Act of 1968 used the lure of money for innovative programs to introduce the idea of non-discrimination based on language. In 1970 Edith Green, congresswoman from Oregon, opened public hearings on sex discrimination in schools. Title IX of Public Law 92-318 was a tangible result of those deliberations. A decade of widening awareness of the rights owed physically, mentally, and emotionally handicapped individuals culminated in the passage of Public Law 94-142. Local education agencies, if they received public funds, could not discriminate on the basis of race, language, gender, or disabilities. Indeed, not only could they not discriminate, they now had affirmative action imperatives which must be met. As the federal government added accountability measures to the implementation of the programs it sponsored, schools were forced to adopt certain types of financial, pupil accounting, and measurable achievement standards that were national in nature and, consequently, more prone to bureaucratic inflexibility. Whereas the federal government had been a relative outsider

in public schools at the start of the Eisenhower administration, by the administration of Richard Nixon it was a featured player on the educational stage.¹¹⁹

Indeed, the Nixon administration began an extensive federal initiative which was designed to take the national government into the arena of educational innovation. The Experimental Schools Program or ESP was launched by a March, 1970, Presidential message to Congress. Established to take advantage of the potential for field research built upon the growing body of knowledge about effective practice, it provided money to local school systems which were willing to undertake "comprehensive" reforms. Programs were to target students in all grades, to include the curricular, organizational, and governance implications of proposed changes, and to involve the local community in the design and implementation of the project. The ESP hoped to fund 25 to 30 programs, submit them to careful analysis and evaluation, and provide the nation with a series of blueprints of educational practices which worked.¹²⁰ The project's developers hoped to resolve the difficulties of disassociated reforms, arguing that piecemeal change had failed and that only comprehensive change would produce results. Given the failure of ESP even to approach the goals set by those who administered the programs, Ravitch's conclusion that what they proved was the impossibility of holistic reform seems plausible.¹²¹

Although Robert Hutchins wrote in 1972 that "the great campaign against the American public school . . . [had] reached the stage of overkill," his conclusion that "it is impossible to believe that anything new can be added to the attacks already delivered" proved incorrect.¹²² There were a few significant final salvos fired in that decade. For example, the comprehensiveness of Conant's comprehensive high school came under fire. The National Commission on the Reform of Secondary Education, influenced by the arguments against compulsory schooling, urged that the mandatory attendance age be

lowered to 14, noting that a significant portion of our high school population gained nothing from their years in that institution.¹²³ James Coleman chaired a group which recommended specialized secondary schools.¹²⁴ In 1976 the National Panel on High School and Adolescent Education recommended the elimination of the comprehensive high school and a significant relaxation of the compulsory school requirements.¹²⁵ All three of those reports described the high school as a troubled place which isolated youngsters from the rest of society. That "decoupling" had precipitated attendance problems, vandalism, and a decline in academic achievement, particularly among urban poor and minority students.¹²⁶ We, as a nation, must reduce the social tasks that we had assigned our schools and recouple those institutions with other agencies or persons in the community. As the authors of The Education of Adolescents argued:

The panel concluded that we have drifted into excessive reliance on the high school as the instrument for 'educating' teenagers and preparing them to enter adulthood; that this burden must be reduced; and that we must examine anew what can be done to strengthen the educational role of the family, the church, the media, and other institutions that play a vital role in the education of our youth.¹²⁷

Simultaneously, however, the federal government was expanding the role schools must assume by requiring them to eliminate generations of prejudice and intolerance toward persons whose differences, be they racial, by gender, language-based, or the result of a handicapping condition, had kept them from equal participation in the American experience.

Simultaneously, too, there was a movement to define more precisely the minimum standards the nation desired its high school students to meet, thereby decoupling the very definition of mission from local school boards. The minimum competency test movement took root in the 1970s.¹²⁸ By 1978 33 states had passed or had pending legislation requiring successful completion of a standardized test as a

requirement for graduation.¹²⁹ In its search for single-answer solutions to complicated problems (it is, after all, much easier to focus on "the answer" than to seek a multitude of responses), politicians led the movement. Adding to the popularity of the competency test laws was the cost. It required far less money than alternative reforms, such as those aimed at reducing class size or dramatically increasing, thereby making competitive, teacher salaries. Using some of the same arguments applied to student competency testing, statehouses began to consider minimum test standards for teachers.

The teacher organizations continued to oppose the expanded use of standardized tests, often citing evidence of racial and gender bias. Arthur Wise, then with the RAND Corporation, concluded that "minimum competency testing will probably fail to improve education," but that it will almost certainly "contribute to the growing bureaucratization and centralization of American schools" -- interestingly one of the very things the various high school commissions were hoping to avoid.¹³⁰ Wise despaired of national initiatives to address successfully problems related to low student achievement, while maintaining that the national government could be instrumental in removing the inequalities in education which still characterized our nation's schools.¹³¹ James Mecklenburger, a research director with the National School Boards Association, called minimum competency testing "a bad penny," but acknowledged that "as a society we believe in the magical power of tests."¹³² Panaceas in American education often are associated with numbers.

If Johnny can't read, one of the places where we are quick to place the blame is at the feet of Johnny's teachers. By the end of the 1970s several reformers were looking seriously at the preservice preparation of those teachers and recommending changes. For instance, B. Othanel Smith, one of the authors of Design for a School of Pedagogy, concluded that "during the last 50 years, when knowledge was increasing by leaps and

bounds, the basic pedagogical program remained practically unchanged." The ways we prepared practitioners in the twenties and thirties could be found in preparation programs in the seventies.¹³³ Because colleges had failed to initiate necessary reforms, "state and federal governments are moving in response to public dissatisfaction with schools and teachers."¹³⁴ Smith called upon professional organizations to come together, determine a consensus on reforming preservice training, and work toward assisting policy makers to determine which changes should be legislated. One of the measures already under consideration was the expansion of those programs from four years of training to five. Robert Howsam, Dean of Education at the University of Houston, pointed out a paradox schools such as his faced when they considered the prospect of an additional year:

Teacher education is faced with a dilemma: If it cannot demonstrate effectiveness, it cannot be allowed a larger preparation time. If it cannot gain more time to develop and impart the professional culture, it cannot demonstrate that there is such a culture and that it can be imparted effectively.¹³⁵

Because "professionalism and bureaucratization are poor bedfellows," it might prove impossible to move in both those directions at the same time.¹³⁶ If the testing movement is carrying us toward the latter, the movement toward the former can never occur in spite of the good intentions of preparation program reformers, unless they are willing to move in a direction away from professionalization.

Another type of attack on teachers emerged late in the 1970s. Although always part of the general critique of our schools, it became a more visible and vocal component of the educational debate as individuals like Jerry Falwell attempted to form a coalition of conservatives to achieve politically a religiously fundamental social agenda. The comments of Barbara Morris, written only months before the election of the Moral Majority's choice for President, reflect their position.

She claimed that teachers, rather than failing to teach, actually teach some things too well. Schools promote humanism -- there is no God nor are there any absolutes, but there is sexual freedom and instruction in global understanding. "At one time schools supported and promoted traditional values, but today . . . students are encouraged to adopt only those values that suit them."¹³⁷ The educational system is "betraying the public trust" and, as a consequence, parents are deserting the system.¹³⁸ The 1960s and the 1970s were a time of growth for Christian academies, established initially to avoid integration, but increasingly defended as a means of avoiding the contamination of humanism which permeated the public alternative. One result of the establishment of conservative private schools was the expansion of support for an end to the financial monopoly of the public education and the indirect support of private institutions through tax credits or vouchers.¹³⁹ In a National Educator article Morris concluded that "the best thing that would happen to education in America would be the demise of government [read public] schools."¹⁴⁰

J. Charles Park reflected the fears of the other side. Because we are in the midst of rapid change, he argued, we can expect simplistic solutions to difficult problems and we can also "expect irrational rhetoric in the foreseeable future."¹⁴¹ He certainly ranked the voice of Ms. Morris among the irrational, as he did that of the senior senator from North Carolina. The accusations contained in a fund-raising letter sent over the Senator's signature were typical of the tactics used by the far right critics of schools. "Right now," Helms claimed, "your tax dollars are being used to pay for grade school courses that teach our children that cannibalism, wife swapping, and murder of infants and the elderly are acceptable behavior."¹⁴² Another fund-raising letter, sent by the Congressional Advisory Committee over the signature of its policy spokesperson Robert Grant, claimed that it would reveal "the truth about militant gays, liberal educators,

cruel atheists, and Godless politicians" who are part "of a master plan to destroy anything that is good and moral here in America."¹⁴³ And although progressive educators were in short supply and their theories hardly the stuff of most schools, the conservatives found them an inviting subject of condemnation.

Progressive education threatened to undermine church and home teaching of biblical Christianity and the principles on which America had been founded. It was materialistic, humanistic, atheistic, and socialistic; an ideology foreign to a nation whose motto was 'In God We Trust.'¹⁴⁴

Park concluded "that right-wing interests have found the public schools a convenient target for unifying ultra-conservative ideology and traditional morality for political gain."¹⁴⁵ Teachers, according to Park, will need to add courage to those attributes they carry to the educational wars.

Benedictions on the seventies were in evidence as the decade moved toward to end. Ben Brodinsky, editor of Edpress, selected ten events which captured the essence of the decade.¹⁴⁶ Five related to equity issues: The Serrano decision (school finance); Public Law 94-142; expanded rights for women and bilingual students; increased due process rights for all students; and the Bakke decision. One related to vocational education. Career education, introduced in 1971 by Nixon's Commissioner of Education, had been incorporated into the course of study in nearly 10,000 schools by mid-decade. Brodinsky claimed it was "always a concept in search of a definition," but it was also "the decade's moderate success story."¹⁴⁷ One involved demographics. The baby boomers had mostly moved through our schools and systems were having to deal with declining enrollments. Superintendents discovered that the management of decline was far more difficult than the management of expansion. Two related to student outcomes.

'Back to the basics' was the decade's best advertising slogan, a theme for mass media editorials and political oration, and an emotional topic for boards of education and PTA meetings.

The popular outcry was for more and better reading, writing, and arithmetic instruction. But at the movement's height, around mid-decade, demands arose for drill, recitation, more homework, stricter discipline, the teaching of patriotism, and an end to social promotions.¹⁴⁸

At the end of the decade the most tangible result of the 'return to the basics' argument was the proliferation of minimum competency tests. The decade began with the 1970 publication of achievement test results by the National Assessment of Educational Progress. The results were mixed, but provided fodder for critics. Five years later the College Board exploded a publicity bombshell with the announcement of a significant decline in scores, precipitating the convening of several blue ribbon panels to study the situation and suggest ways to halt the downward slide. The tenth event, certainly partly a response to the other nine, was the growing militancy of the two major teacher organizations, the National Education Association and the American Federation of Teachers. Both groups were increasingly willing to resort to collective bargaining, strikes, and direct political action to secure what they desired, while simultaneously and unintentionally alienating even more some of their most vocal critics.

Partially in response to those poor performances on tests Paul Woodring, whose voice was among those clamoring for reforms in the early 1950s, reactivated that voice and revisited the issue of school change in the late 1970s.¹⁴⁹ Using the most well-worn of contemporary reform metaphors, he noted that "criticism of the schools comes in waves" and he compared, somewhat erroneously perhaps, the late 1970s with the early 1950s as a period of crest.

Then, as now, there were charges that the quality of education had deteriorated, that discipline was being neglected, that children were not learning to read, and that there were too many 'frills' in the schools. Then, as now, the proposed remedy was a return to 'basic education.'¹⁵⁰

Two targets of criticism in the early fifties had disappeared: teacher colleges and progressive education theories (Woodring had obviously not read the Moral Majority literature). And he found reasons for some optimism: rural schools, particularly in the south, and those found in small towns were generally better. Urban schools remained troubled, but, according to Woodring, their blackboard jungle problems were a result of their jungle communities. He despaired of improvements in those schools unless there were improvements in the neighborhoods. The two general reforms that he suggested were to simplify the educational mission of the schools and to reempower parents with fundamental responsibilities in the social and cultural education of their children.

William Wirtz echoed some of Woodring's concerns:

There has been an unfortunate erosion of the traditions of thoughtful reading and careful writing, a distinct decline in skill . . . Beyond that there has been a relaxation of educational standards resulting in increased absenteeism, in questionable automatic promotions, in grade inflation, and in easier textbooks and related materials that seem designed to entertain rather than to educate. For one reason or another, as far as standards were concerned, our schools slacked off.¹⁵¹

Nor were Wirtz and Woodring the only commentators motivated to respond to those test scores.¹⁵² John Goodlad, conversely, thought there was more to consider in making determinations about educational quality:

It seems to my associates and me that how a student spends precious time in school and how he feels about what goes on there is of much greater significance than how he scores on a standardized test. But I am not at all sure that the American people are ready to put a rather straightforward criterion such as this ahead of the marks and scores we worship mindlessly in much the same way our supposedly more primitive ancestors worshipped the gods of thunder and fire.¹⁵³

But the gods of thunder and fire won that debate in the popular press and the political arenas.

Also writing at the end of the decade were practitioners like Ralph Lane, whose thoughts mirrored some of the romanticism one associates with a Kohl or a Kozol. He declared that classrooms were "absolutely the worst place to instruct most teen-agers." However, his solutions were far more modest than the radicals. He thought that judicious use of paraprofessionals and a reorganized school day in which caring teachers were allowed to interact more personally with students would resolve most of the problems.¹⁵⁴ It is doubtful that the radicals would have found large learning labs, one of Lane's suggestions, a particularly humanizing experience.

Bertrand Gross published Friendly Fascism: The New Face of Power in America in 1980 -- a book which quickly became popular with the far left critics of American society. He, more than the Ralph Lanes of the educational world, addressed the concerns of the romantics.

The entire education system . . . may be seen as a mammoth set of disciplined activities that -- irrespective of any specific indoctrination of knowledge or programming of skills -- can help produce docile, accepting personalities . . . By being given meaningless assignments and subjected to large-scale, uniform testing, students are trained in the acceptance of meaningless work, mindless rules and mind-numbing orders from superiors.¹⁵⁵

Few policy-makers were convinced by Gross's arguments. To them the United States was not then nor could it become a fascist nation.

The post-war period began with complaints about quality in our public schools and it ended with those same complaints, often made by many of the same critics. The calls for excellence accelerated after Sputnik and became more narrowly focused on disciplines which seemed particularly conducive to Cold War successes. However, as the impetus prompted by their enthusiastic introductions began to fade, caused partially by their failures to consider life in real classrooms and the attributes of real teachers, attention in the 1960s turned toward social issues as they related to schools.

Reflecting what was happening to our society outside classroom doors, that decade focused more on equity issues. Those concerns continued to hold a significant place on the stage of reform in the seventies. Stimulated by the idealism associated with Kennedy, writers like Harrington, and popularizers of an Age of Aquarius optimism, young teachers entered our inner cities as members of the Teacher Corps or as independent doers of good, only to confront conditions and people they could neither understand nor change. They recorded those confrontations in a literature of personal experiences which made few policy-maker converts, but which influenced some educators to establish alternative schools or free schools or open schools. They also became or stimulated activists within the teacher organizations to become more politically astute and to push for a broader educational agenda, one which was more child-centered than test score-oriented. The stories of individuals were reinforced by the theories of educational revisionists who told a new version of our school history, one less laudatory and more reflective of the actual experiences of the displaced and underrepresented.

Idealism and equity concerns gave way to a more somber mood in the seventies. Excellence once again became the motto of reformers, angered by the lack of discipline they observed in society and, by extension, in the schools, they sought to blame the chaos of riots, failed dreams, campus unrest, and disappointments abroad on our diminished will and declining intellect. Schools made good targets. And throughout the period the role of the federal government increased, from funding agent to supporter of innovative practices to watchdog to evaluator.

We behaved as the Cheshire Cat commanded. Lacking a clear sense of where we wanted to go (what was excellence? how did we define and provide for equity?), any road appeared to have an equal possibility of working. The one "modest success" of the seventies, according to one summation of the decade, was "always a concept in search of a

definition." Piecemeal changes, even those that worked, did not alter the big picture, did not challenge the system. Silberman's mindlessness remained with us as we entered the Reagan years.

CHAPTER TWO

FOOTNOTES

¹Quoted in Diane Ravitch, The Troubled Crusade: American Education, 1945-1980 (New York: Basic Books, Inc., 1983), p. 6. For an elaboration of Fine's critique, see Benjamin Fine, Our Children are Cheated: The Crisis in American Education (New York: Henry Holt, 1947).

²Ibid., p. 7.

³Elizabeth Irwin, "Why Teachers Quit School," Collier's 118 (24 August 1946): 20 and 38.

⁴Dorothy Thompson, "Our Schools Are in Danger," Ladies Home Journal 64 (March 1947): 11-12, 243. See also Dorothy Thompson, "Education and Civilization," Ladies Home Journal 64 (October 1947): 11.

⁵Committee on the Objectives of a General Education in a Free Society, General Education in a Free Society (Cambridge, Massachusetts: Harvard University Press, 1945). See, for example, p. 7.

⁶See, for example, Keith W. Olson, The G.I. Bill, the Veterans, and the Colleges (Lexington: University of Kentucky Press, 1974). The President of Fordham University anticipated the language of the 1980s critique of education in his own observations about university training in the immediate post-war years. He feared that the sudden entry of non-traditional college students would precipitate "tides of mediocrity." See "The Tides of Mediocrity," Time (23 February 1948): 52-54.

⁷Presidential Commission on Civil Rights, To Secure These Rights (New York: Simon and Schuster, 1947), pp. 20-78 passim.

⁸See, for instance, Ravitch, The Troubled Crusade, pp. 26-29 and 41-42.

⁹Hollis L. Caswell, "The Great Reappraisal of Public Education," Teachers College Record 54 (October 1952): 12-22.

¹⁰Lawrence A. Cremin, The Transformation of the Schools: Progressivism in American Education, 1876-1957 (New York: Alfred A. Knopf, 1961), p. 88.

¹¹Originally published in Journal of Education (7 November 1933), p. 602, the chart is reproduced in David Tyack, Robert Lowe, and Elisabeth Hansot, Public Schools

in Hard Times: The Great Depression and Recent Years (Cambridge, Massachusetts: Harvard University Press, 1984), p. 151.

¹²William C. Bagley, Education and Emergent Man: A Theory of Education with Particular Application to Public Education in the United States (New York: Thomas Nelson, 1934), p. 139

¹³Ravitch, The Troubled Crusade, p. 59.

¹⁴Beard's statement appeared in an NEA publication series which was printed in the late 1930s. See Educational Policies Commission, The Unique Function of Education in American Democracy (Washington, D.C.: National Education Association, 1937), pp. 77-78.

¹⁵I.L. Kandel, The Cult of Uncertainty (New York: Macmillan, 1943), pp. 14-15.

¹⁶Ravitch, The Troubled Crusade, p. 65.

¹⁷Ibid.

¹⁸See, for example, "Flapdoodle," Time 54 (19 September 1949): 64.

¹⁹Mortimer Smith, And Madly Teach: A Layman Looks at Public School Education (Chicago: Henry Regnery, 1949), pp. 21-24.

²⁰Bernard DeVoto, "Parable of the Lost Chance," Harper's Magazine 200 (January 1950): 42-45.

²¹"What the U.S. Thinks about Its Schools," Life 29 (16 October 1950): 11-18.

²²Albert Lynd, "Quakery in the Public Schools," Atlantic Monthly 185 (March 1950): 33-38 passim. Lynd later expanded this article into a book. See Quakery in the Public Schools (Boston: Little, Brown, 1953).

²³Robert Hutchins, The Conflict in Education in a Democratic Society (New York: Harper & Row, 1953), p. 42.

²⁴Blake Clark, "Denver Schools Connect Learning with Life," Reader's Digest 59 (February 1951): 92.

²⁵See, for example, Morris Mitchell, "Fever Spots in American Education," Nation 173 (27 October 1951): 344-347; Goodwin Watson, "Teachers and the 'Thing'," Nation 173 (3 November 1951): 371-374; Austin Burkhart, "Big Business and the Schools," Nation 173 (10 November 1951): 400-402; Jerome Nathanson, "The Foot in the Door," Nation 173 (17 November 1951): 423-425; and Theodore

Brameld, "Four Point Agenda for Education," Nation 173 (15 December 1951): 523-526.

²⁶Arthur Bestor, Educational Wastelands: The Retreat from Learning in Our Public Schools (Urbana: University of Illinois Press, 1953). The reaction of the education associations, particularly the increasingly vocal National Education Association, was not unlike its response in the 1980s to reports by such critics as William Bennett. See, for example, "The Voice," Time (19 July 1954): 46. For the place of Bestor's book in the context of the 1950s critique of education, see TheodoreSizer and Molly Schen, "Arthur Bestor's Educational Wastelands," History of Education Quarterly 27 (Summer 1987): 259-264.

²⁷Harold Albertz, Reorganizing the High School Curriculum (New York: Macmillan, 1953).

²⁸Patricia G. Graham, Progressive Education. From Acady to Academe: A History of the Progressive Education Association, 1919-1955 (New York: Teachers College Press, 1967), p. 145.

²⁹"Education," Time (4 January 1954): 38-39.

³⁰"The Last Rampart," Time (8 February 1954): 63.

³¹"The New Three Rs," Time (15 March 1954): 12.

³²"Education," Time (28 June 1954): 73.

³³"The Voice," Time (19 July 1954): 46.

³⁴American Seating Company advertisement, Time (6 September 1954): 64. The American Seating Company regularly ran advertisements urging community support for public schools. Reading like a 1950s equivalent of a public service announcement, they appeared weekly in the 1954 and 1955 editions of Time.

³⁵"Little Red Poorhouse," Time (13 December 1954): 41.

³⁶"Prescribed Mediocrity," Time (13 December 1954): 42.

³⁷"Report Card," Time (24 January 1955): 50.

³⁸"About Those 'Frills' in Schools," U.S. News and World Report (13 April 1956): 36-38.

³⁹Barbara B. Clowse, Brainpower for the Cold War (Westport, Connecticut: Greenwood Press, 1981), p. 13.

⁴⁰Dwight David Eisenhower, "Our Future Security," Vital Speeches 24 (1 December 1957): 100.

⁴¹Richard M. Nixon, "Our Urgent Need for Better Schools," Parents' Magazine 33 (March 1958): 35 and 72.

⁴²See, for example, "Report Card," Time (8 November 1954): 90 and "Schoolboys Point to U.S. Weakness," Life 44 (24 March 1958): 26-28.

⁴³H.G. Rickover, "A Size of What's Wrong with American Schools," U.S. News and World Report 43 (6 December 1957): 86-91. See, also, Joel Spring, The Sorting Machine: National Education Policy Since 1945 (New York: David McKay Company, 1976), p. 33.

⁴⁴H.G. Rickover, Education and Freedom (New York: E.P. Dutton, 1959).

⁴⁵Quoted in Douglas T. Miller and Marion Nowak, The Fifties: The Way We Really Were (Garden City, New York: Doubleday & Company, Inc., 1975), p. 256.

⁴⁶See Life (3 March 1958 - 21 April 1958) passim.

⁴⁷Life (24 March 1958): 25.

⁴⁸*ibid.*

⁴⁹Richard Nixon is quoted in School and Society 86 (1 March 1958): 104.

⁵⁰Rockefeller Brothers Fund, The Pursuit of Excellence (New York: Doubleday, 1958); "The Pursuit of Excellence in Education," Ladies Home Journal 75 (July 1958): 47 and 124.

⁵¹Life (7 April 1958): 89-96.

⁵²Miller and Nowak, The Fifties, p. 258.

⁵³Ravitch, The Troubled Crusade, p. 229.

⁵⁴James Bryant Conant, The American High School Today (New York: McGraw Hill, 1959). For a quick overview of his position, see James B. Conant, "A Hard Look at Our High Schools," Look 23 (3 February 1959): 27-32.

⁵⁵James Bryant Conant, My Several Lives: Memoirs of a Social Innovator (New York: Harper & Row, 1970), p. 621.

⁵⁶For a summary of Conant's program, see Spring, The Sorting Machine, pp. 37-51.

⁵⁷Ibid., pp. 25-26.

⁵⁸James D. Koerner, ed., The Case for Basic Education (Boston: Little, Brown, 1959), p. 1.

⁵⁹Miller and Nowak, The Fifties, p. 253.

⁶⁰See, for example, James Koerner, The Miseducation of American Teachers (Baltimore: Penguin Books, 1963).

⁶¹See, for example, Spring, The Sorting Machine, pp. 94-95 and 113-120 passim; Jerrold R. Zacharias and Stephen White, "The Requirements for Major Curriculum Revision," in New Curricula, ed Robert W. Heath (New York: Harper & Row, 1964), pp. 78-81; and Paul E. Marsh and Ross A Gortner, Federal Aid to Science Education: Two Program (Syracuse, New York: Syracuse University Press, 1963), pp. 15-58.

⁶²See, for instance, Spring, The Sorting Machine, pp. 120-127 passim; Max Beberman, "An Emerging Program of Secondary School Mathematics," in New Curricula, pp. 9-35; and William Wooten, SMSG: The Making of a Curriculum (New Haven, Connecticut: Yale University Press, 1965).

⁶³Spring, The Sorting Machine, p. 126.

⁶⁴Ronald Gross and Judith Murphy, ed., The Revolution in the Schools (New York: Harcourt, Brace & World, 1964), p. 1.

⁶⁵There were other recommendations in Eisenhower's address, including an increase in funds to study foreign languages and cultures as well as to expand the Office of Education to improve the collection of educational data. Congress also later added funding provisions in the areas of media and vocational education. See Spring, The Sorting Machine, pp. 96-102. For the text of Eisenhower's message, see Eisenhower, "Message from the President of the United States Transmitting Recommendations Relative to Our Educational System," in Science and Education for National Defense: Hearings Before the Committee on Labor and Public Welfare, United States Senate, Eighty-fifth Congress, Second Session (Washington, D.C.: Government Printing Office, 1958), pp. 195-196.

⁶⁶"Statement of William G. Carr, Executive Secretary, National Education Association," in Science and Education for National Defense, p. 481.

⁶⁷Ibid., p. 495; Spring, The Sorting Machine, p. 107.

⁶⁸"Statement of Doctor Detlev A. Bronk, President of the National Academy of Sciences and National Research Council," in Science and Education for National Defense, p. 6.

⁶⁹Spring, The Sorting Machine, p. 111.

⁷⁰Ravitch, The Troubled Crusade, p. 232.

⁷¹Ibid., p. 265.

⁷²Benjamin Bloom, Allison Davis, and Robert Hess, Compensatory Education for Cultural Deprivation (New York: Holt, Rhinehart & Winston, 1965), pp. 4-26 passim.

⁷³For an overview of the racial equality debate in the 1960s, see Ravitch, The Troubled Crusade, pp. 145-181.

⁷⁴Benjamin Fine, jacket comments for A.S. Neill, Summerhill: A Radical Approach to Child Rearing (New York: Hart Publishing Company, 1960).

⁷⁵Neill, Summerhill, p. 4.

⁷⁶Paul Goodman, Compulsory Mis-education and The Community of Scholars (New York: Vintage Books, 1962), p. 31.

⁷⁷Ibid., p. 41.

⁷⁸Ibid., p. 48.

⁷⁹Ibid., p. 101.

⁸⁰Ibid., p. 141.

⁸¹Ibid., p. 153.

⁸²Ibid., p. 154.

⁸³Jonathan Kozol, Death at an Early Age (New York: Bantam Books, 1968), p. 212.

⁸⁴Jonathan Kozol, The Night is Dark and I Am Far From Home (New York: Bantam Books, 1977), p. 1.

⁸⁵Ibid., p. 216.

⁸⁶Herbert Kohl, 36 Children (New York: New American Library, 1968), p. 224.

⁸⁷James Herndon, How To Survive in Your Native Land (New York: Bantam Books, 1972), p. 85.

⁸⁸Ibid., p. 82.

⁸⁹Ibid., p. 83.

⁹⁰James Herndon, The Way It Spozed to Be (New York: Bantam Books, 1969), p. 196.

⁹¹John Holt, How Children Fail (New York: Dell Publishing Company, 1970), pp. 15-16.

⁹²Ibid., p. 211.

⁹³Ibid., p. 216.

⁹⁴Ibid., p. 219.

⁹⁵John Holt, Freedom and Beyond (New York: Dell Publishing Company, 1972), p. 10.

⁹⁶John Holt, The Underachieving Schools (New York: Pitman Publishing Corporation, 1969), p. 3.

⁹⁷Ibid., p. 14.

⁹⁸"Introduction," in Ronald and Beatrice Gross, eds., Radical School Reform (New York: Simon and Schuster, 1969), p. 13.

⁹⁹Neil Postman and Charles Weingartner, Teaching as a Subversive Activity (New York: Dell Publishing Company, 1969), p. 15.

¹⁰⁰Neil Postman and Charles Weingartner, The Soft Revolution (New York: Dell Publishing Company, 1971).

¹⁰¹Ivan Illich, Deschooling Society (New York: Harper & Row, 1970), p. 15.

¹⁰²Ibid., p. 1.

¹⁰³Ibid., p. 94.

¹⁰⁴Ibid., p. 102. For additional information on the deschooling movement, see Alan Gartner, Colin Greer, and Frank Riessman, eds., After Deschooling. What? (New York: Harper & Row, Publishers, 1973).

¹⁰⁵Ravitch, The Troubled Crusade, p. 238. For a liberal critique of the radical school reform movement and its tenuous links to Dewey and progressivism, see Sidney Hook, Education and the Taming of Power (La Salle, Louisiana: Open Court Publishing Company, 1973). Hook believes that the radical reformers were not the intellectual

heirs of Dewey and to make that connection is to misread Dewey's message, something Hook believed many of Dewey's critics did regularly.

¹⁰⁶For an overview of the free school movement, see Allen Gnaubard, Free the Children: Radical Reform and the Free School Movement (New York: Pantheon Books, 1972) and Ann Swidler, Organization Without Authority: Dilemmas of Social Control in Free Schools (Cambridge, Massachusetts: Harvard University Press, 1979).

¹⁰⁷For an overview of the open school movement, see Ewald B. Nyquist and Gene R. Hawes, eds., Open Education: A Sourcebook for Parents and Teachers (New York: Bantam Books, 1972) and Bernard Spodek and Herbert J. Walberg, eds., Studies in Open Education (New York: Agathon Press, 1975).

¹⁰⁸See, for example, Gene I. Maeroff, "The Traditional School: Keep It Among the Alternatives," Phi Delta Kappan 54 (March 1973): 473-475; Rita M. Hymes and Franklin O. Bullock, "Alternative Schools: Answer to the Gifted Child's Boredom," The Gifted Child Quarterly 19 (1974): 340-345; Hunter O. Brooks and Paula R. Barker, "Alternative Schools in a Traditional Setting," Social Education (November 1973): 650-651; and the April, 1981, issue of Phi Delta Kappan which featured a number of articles on alternative schools.

¹⁰⁹See Michael Katz, Reconstructing American Education (Cambridge, Massachusetts: Harvard University Press, 1987) for a review of the revisionist argument. Diane Ravitch has penned an exceedingly critical appraisal of the revisionists in Ravitch, The Revisionists Revised: A Critique of the Radical Attack on the Schools (New York: Basic Books, 1978). A sampling of the current debate can be gleaned from Richard Attenbaugh, "'Our children are being trained like dogs and ponies': Schooling, Social Control, and the Working Class," History of Education Quarterly 19 (Summer 1981): 213-222; Donald R. Warren, ed., History, Education, and Public Policy (Berkeley, California: McCutchen Publishing Corporation, 1978); Russell Marks, "The Revisionist World View," History of Education Quarterly (Winter 1979): 507-514; Carl Kaestle, "Ideology and American Educational History," History of Education Quarterly 20 (Summer 1982): 123-137; Michael W. Apple, "Standing on the Shoulders of Bowles and Gintis: Class Formation and Capitalist Schools," History of Education Quarterly 28 (Summer 1988): 231-241; and Henry Giroux, "Theories of Reproduction and Resistance in the New Sociology of Education: A Critical Analysis," Harvard Educational Review 53 (August 1983): 257-293.

¹¹⁰Paul C. Violas, The Training of the Urban Working Class: A History of Twentieth Century American Education (Chicago: Rand McNally, 1978), p. 213.

¹¹¹Samuel Bowles and Herbert Gintis, Schooling in Capitalist America: Educational Reform and the Contradictions of Economic Life (New York: Basic Books, Inc., 1976), p. 5.

¹¹²Michael Katz, Class, Bureaucracy, & Schools: The Illusion of Educational Change in America, expanded ed. (New York: Praeger Publishers, 1975), p. 194.

¹¹³Ibid., p. 142.

¹¹⁴Ibid., pp. 140-146 passim.

¹¹⁵Robert H. Anderson, "Team Teaching in the Elementary and Secondary Schools," in Alfred de Grazia and David A. Sohn, eds., Revolution in Teaching: New Theory, Technology, and Curriculum (New York: Bantam Books, 1964), quoted in Charles E. Silberman, Crisis in the Classroom: The Remaking of American Education (New York: Vintage Books, 1971), p. 158.

¹¹⁶Silberman, Crisis in the Classroom, p. 159.

¹¹⁷Ibid., pp. 179-182 passim.

¹¹⁸Ibid., pp. 10-11.

¹¹⁹For more information on widening access to services in the public schools and the resultant implications thereof, see Ravitch, The Troubled Crusade, pp. 267-320.

¹²⁰For a review of several of the experimental school projects, see Robert E. Herriott and Neal Gross, eds., The Dynamics of Planned Educational Change: Case Studies and Analyses (Berkeley, California: McCutchen, 1979).

¹²¹Ravitch, The Troubled Crusade, p. 261. For a more comprehensive review of the inherent difficulties of national change programs, including some of the ESP projects, see Part II of J. Victor Baldrige and Terrence Deal, eds., The Dynamics of Organizational Change in Education (Berkeley, California: McCutchen, 1983), pp. 89-185.

¹²²Robert M. Hutchins, "The Great Anti-School Campaign," in The Great Ideas Today (Chicago: Encyclopedia Britannica, 1972), p. 155.

¹²³National Commission on the Reform of Secondary Education, The Reform of Secondary Education (New York: McGraw-Hill, 1973).

¹²⁴Panel on Youth of the President's Science Advisory Committee, Youth: Transition to Adulthood (Chicago: University of Chicago Press, 1974).

¹²⁵National Panel on High School and Adolescent Education, The Education of Adolescents (Washington, D.C.: U.S. Department of Health, Education, and Welfare, 1976).

¹²⁶For a Brief review and analysis of the conclusions of those reports, see Lawrence Cremin, Public Education (New York: Basic Books, Inc., 1976), pp. 63-69.

¹²⁷National Panel on High School and Adolescent Education, The Education of Adolescents, p. v.

¹²⁸See, for example, the May, 1978, issue of Phi Delta Kappan, which ran a series of articles on the minimum competency testing movement.

¹²⁹Chris Pipho, "Minimum Competency Testing in 1978: A Look at State Standards," Phi Delta Kappan 59 (May 1978): 585.

¹³⁰Arthur E. Wise, "Minimum Competency Testing: Another Case of Hyper-Rationalization," Phi Delta Kappan 59 (May 1978): 98.

¹³¹*Ibid.*

¹³²Jim Mecklenburger, "Minimum Competency Testing: The Bad Penny Again," Phi Delta Kappan 59 (May 1978): 697-698.

¹³³B. Othanel Smith, "Pedagogical Education: How About Reform?," Phi Delta Kappan 62 (October 1980): 89.

¹³⁴*Ibid.* For additional information on the teacher education debate, see Robert B. Howsam, et al., Educating a Profession (Washington, D.C.: American Association of Colleges for Teacher Education, 1976); Edgar H. Schein, Professional Education: Some New Directions (New York: McGraw-Hill, 1972); and David L. Clark and Gerald Marker, "The Institutionalization of Teacher Education," in Kevin Ryan, ed., Teacher Education: 74th Yearbook of the National Society for the Study of Education. Part II (Chicago: University of Chicago Press, 1975).

¹³⁵Robert B. Howsam, "The Workplace: Does It Hamper Professionalization of Pedagogy," Phi Delta Kappan 62 (October 1980): 94.

¹³⁶*Ibid.*, p. 95.

¹³⁷Barbara M. Morris, "The Real Issues in Education as Seen by a Journalist on the Far Right," Phi Delta Kappan 61 (May 1980): 613.

¹³⁸*Ibid.*, p. 615.

¹³⁹For a more sophisticated examination of the debate, see Evans Clinchy and Elisabeth Allen Cody, "If Not Public Choice, Then Private Escape," Phi Delta Kappan 60 (December 1978): 270-273; Daniel Patrick Moynihan, "The Case for Tuition Tax Credits," Phi Delta Kappan 60 (December 1978): 274-276; and Ernest F. Hollings, "The Case Against Tuition Tax Credits," Phi Delta Kappan 60 (December 1978): 277-279.

¹⁴⁰Barbara Morris, "Schools' End Best for U.S.," National Educator (July 1977): 1.

¹⁴¹J. Charles Park, "Preachers, Politics, and Public Education: A Review of Right-Wing Pressures Against Public Schooling in America," Phi Delta Kappan 61 (May 1980): 608.

¹⁴²Quoted in *ibid.*, this letter was dated 8 March 1976 and mailed with the sponsorship of the National Conservative Political Action Committee.

¹⁴³*Ibid.*, p. 609.

¹⁴⁴James C. Hefly, Textbooks on Trial (Wheaton, Illinois: Victor Books, 1976), p. 32.

¹⁴⁵*Ibid.*, p. 611.

¹⁴⁶Ben Brodinsky, "Something Happened: Education in the Seventies," Phi Delta Kappan 61 (December 1979): 238-241.

¹⁴⁷*Ibid.*, p. 240.

¹⁴⁸*Ibid.*, p. 239.

¹⁴⁹Paul Woodring, "A Second Open Letter to Teachers," Phi Delta Kappan 59 (April 1978): 515-516. Woodring's original "Open Letter" appeared in the July, 1952, issue of Harper's.

¹⁵⁰*Ibid.*, p. 515.

¹⁵¹Harold G. Shane, "The Academic Score Decline: Are Facts the Enemy of Truth?," Phi Delta Kappan 59 (October 1977): 84.

¹⁵²See, for example, Herbert Rudman, "The Standardized Test Flap," Phi Delta Kappan 59 (November 1977): 179-185; Vito Perrone, The Abuses of Standardized Testing (Bloomington, Indiana: PDK Educational Foundation, 1977); and W. James Popham, "The Standardized Test Flap Flop," Phi Delta Kappan 59 (March 1978): 470-471.

¹⁵³John Goodlad, "Can Our Schools Get Better?," Phi Delta Kappan 60 (January 1979): 343.

¹⁵⁴Ralph J. Kane, "The Mindless Box: The Case Against the American Classroom," Phi Delta Kappan 60 (March 1979): 502-503.

¹⁵⁵Bertram Gross, Friendly Fascism: The New Face of Power in America (Boston: South End Press, 1980), p. 277.

CHAPTER THREE

IT'S DEJA VU ALL OVER AGAIN

Yogi Berra

Ronald Reagan was swept into office with an overwhelming electoral college majority over the incumbent. The election reflected America's dissatisfaction with double digit inflation, national embarrassment over the hostage crisis in Iran, and President Carter's inability to provide persuasive leadership in a time of uncertainty. By almost all standards a good man, Carter campaigned in 1976 as an outsider who could make Washington politics decent, responsible, and responsive. During the four years of his term he remained an outsider and, consequently, was never able to function effectively as our chief executive. Conversely, Reagan, who also campaigned as someone independent of the Washington power structure, was able to work with the system to implement his agenda. A conservative who wanted to limit the power of the federal government to intervene in domestic issues, he owed his victory partially to a coalition of fundamentalists who hoped he would enact their social program -- a return to those mythical "good old days" when, at least in schools, everyone learned, everyone behaved, everyone had a role and knew how to follow the script, and at least most people accepted the values of a traditional, albeit secularized, Christianity.

Reagan pledged to reduce the newly created Department of Education (one of Carter's last acts) to a commission or a public foundation, to return prayer to the classroom, and to work toward the establishment of tuition tax credits or a voucher alternative to the public schools. Disliked by the National Education Association and the American Federation of Teachers for his positions on domestic and foreign issues as well

as his positions on various education matters (admittedly, the AFT and Reagan did initially agree on the fate of the Department of Education), Reagan found that he could easily operate without them.

Although one might not have been able to guess the precise bearings of the new administration's education ship of state, most commentators could make some fairly accurate rough estimates. Equity would take a back seat to excellence. If there were to be a national call for anything, it would have a decided return to basics and individual responsibility tone. In 1981 it seemed entirely possible, given Reagan's agenda and personal interests, that the new President would permit the states to assume leadership in that arena, except for a few specific, value-laden issues like school prayer.

Of course, the President and his advisors did not lack for possible reform recommendations. There had been and there were at the time of his election a number of educators and scholars engaged in studies about the state of our schools. A. Harry Passow, looking at the efforts of the early and mid-1970s, concluded in 1976 that:

The education profession and general citizenry have never faced such a plethora of commission and panel reports as they do presently. Their number alone might be sufficient basis for immobilizing those individuals who would like to change the . . . schools.¹

Commenting from the perspective of 1984 he decided that he might have spoken "too soon," since the early 1980s reports outnumbered "those of the 1970s by better than two to one."² However, that moves us too far ahead of our educational march to recommendation overload. In 1981 Reagan and his thirteenth man, Terrel Bell, the newly appointed Secretary of Education, had file cabinets full of education reviews and evaluations to inform their educational decisions regarding the relative value of equity and excellence as well as the shades of possibilities between those two polar extremes.

Carter's Commission for a National Agenda for the Eighties designed an education program that sought to make "equality, competence, and excellence" the "essential items" for future consideration.³ Sounding the hyperbolic crisis theme of past decades, Raymond Reisler, a senior staff member of the commission, wrote that:

The current crisis of confidence in public schooling is more widespread, persistent, and intense than at any previous point in history -- is precisely the time to reaffirm the legacy and potential of public education. A renewed commitment to excellence in public education for children of all abilities is fundamental to the American idea of a just society. Temporary confusion of purpose and disappointment with lowered scores on standardized tests are not sufficient cause to permit the permanent weakening of this mainstay of a pluralistic democracy.⁴

The commission contended that the role of the federal government in the coming decade is to continue the promotion of equality of opportunity and the provision of compensatory education funds to facilitate the attainment of such equity.⁵ We need to focus on teaching logical thought, while ensuring mastery of the basics. However, the "back to basics" movement must not be made at the expense of such disciplines as the arts or foreign languages. Mastery, rather than seat time, should be the criteria for promotion. Teacher training should be improved; teacher salaries should be made sufficiently competitive that many of our brightest students will be attracted into the profession. A "new spirit of collaboration is needed" to link the various stakeholders in public schooling together. We need to consider expanding beyond the four walls of the school building to ensure appropriate, real-life experiences for our secondary students.⁶

Writing in early 1981 Joseph Milner, chair of the Wake Forest University Department of Education, predicted that the coming decade would be characterized by retrenchment. Although he was specifically addressing the secondary school English curriculum, his conclusions applied to other disciplines as well.

As a reaction to the looseness and experimentation of the Seventies, we shall see more emphasis on teacher accountability, widespread competency testing, diminished federal funding, and increased emphasis on staff development under full control of superintendents' staffs. A revised and tightened curriculum will exclude minicourses and disavow the currently prevalent psycho-social services ethos. We shall also see . . . a general turn toward cultural monism rather than today's ethnic pluralism.⁷

Teaching will become a conserving activity, rather than possess the subversive tinge that it had assumed during the sixties and parts of the seventies.

Robert D. Barr, an Indiana University educator, believed that the 1980s boded well for at least one reform associated with an earlier decade. Alternative schools offered ways to reform schooling (it's easier to open a new school, than to change an old one), to reduce behavior problems, to contribute to desegregation efforts, and to foster the back-to-basics movement. Believing that "alternative schools have come of age," Barr felt that it was "quite likely that public education will . . . move away from a single, monolithic educational system for all students and toward a diverse system of educational alternatives."⁸

In some respects both men were correct. At the end of the eighties we had certainly implemented several reform initiatives which more tightly structured schooling in America, creating institutions with programs of study which were even more similar than they had once been. The cultural literacy movement proposed an American canon with which to measure the educational attainments of our children. Yet parental choice and the restructuring movement, both of which gained momentum near the end of the decade, bespoke a centrifugal rather than centripetal direction for change.

James Coleman, one of the authors of Public and Private Schools, which was circulating in draft form in 1980, noted that private school students had higher educational aspirations than their public school counterparts and that they outperformed them on standardized measures of academic achievement. He suggested that

those differences occurred in part because of our violation of several basic tenets of the early traditions of American public schooling. Attendance tied to residential areas has made, particularly in certain urban areas, schools "segregative and exclusionary." Local control had eroded and as local boards and superintendents lost some of their authority, schools became less responsive to parents and the communities they served. The courts, by expanding the civil rights of students, had undermined the principle of in loco parentis. Combined with those changes was the increasing size of schools and school districts and the concomitant increases in bureaucracy. Schools had become impersonal institutions. "The organization of American education is harmful to [the] quality of education."⁹ His solution, one adopted by the Reaganites and pushed with increasing zeal in the coming years, was the implementation of tuition tax credits or voucher systems.¹⁰

Robert Ebel called for the "comprehensive monitoring of pupil achievement" to resolve our school woes.

Educators ought to be definite and clear about what they are trying to do; that what they ought to be trying to do, in the main, is to facilitate the cognitive development of their pupils; and that they ought to provide credible evidence of how well they have succeeded in doing that job.¹¹

Each school system should publish the results of student achievement on an annual basis. Ebel's 1982 ideas were to find tangible form later in the decade as accountability systems tied to student performance became a fundamental tenet of those reformers who sought to build our changed schools on a foundation of academic excellence. They advocated a standard course of study, expanded state testing programs, and the alignment of that testing program with the prescribed course of study. Local education agencies would be rated on yearly report cards; they, in turn, could measure the effectiveness of particular schools, departments, and teachers.

Gary Fenstermacher took exception to Ebel's argument that test scores would improve schooling. He noted that American businessmen had lost ground to the Japanese precisely because they had been preoccupied with immediate returns, with annual bottom line profits, that they had ignored the temporary sacrifices necessary to attain long-range goals. If test results were to serve as indicators of progress toward specific goals, perhaps we should, Fenstermacher wrote, spend some time considering those goals toward which we wish to make strides. If we design the tests to measure the wrong goals, we have designed a system which will effectively ensure the attainment of things which could be harmful -- our journey toward that type of excellence would be ill-spent. He also criticized Ebel for the arrogance of presuming that there existed one best way "for all teachers, all schools, all social conditions."¹² Fenstermacher and Ebel represent, at the start of the decade, two sides of what would become an on-going argument throughout the 1980s -- the role of the "sticks" of testing in pursuit of the "carrot" of excellence.

David Tyack and Elisabeth Hansot summarized sections of their book Managers of Virtue in an April, 1982, article in Phi Delta Kappan. They claimed that a significant part of our current educational dilemma is a lack of coherence. As a result our school systems were "faddish in . . . particulars and resistant to change in . . . basic mode of operation."¹³ Like Fenstermacher, they believed that we must decide what goals we should be pursuing. Anticipating another major theme of reformers later in the decade, Tyack and Hansot noted that "centralization of decisions about instruction has had ambiguous results." When reforms had been imposed top-down or had been designed as teacher-proof innovations, the efforts "rarely worked."¹⁴ Citing Arthur Wise's 1979 study Legislated Learning, they agreed that at least curricular and instructional reforms need to be made at home, in the district, or, even better, at the individual school level.¹⁵

G.T. Sewall was one of the first school critics to launch a "return to the canon" argument. While a fellow at the National Humanities Center in North Carolina's Research Triangle Park, he penned a defense of the "essentialist" position. Formed in 1938 by William Bagley of Columbia University, that position was designed to respond to the excesses in progressive education then being made in the name of John Dewey. Bagley worried that the "stuff" of education was being sacrificed to concern about students. We should get out of the business of worrying about how students felt and what they thought and begin to worry about the rigor of the thoughts themselves. We needed to ensure those thoughts were focused on a challenging academic program. Sewall sought to bring Bagley's argument into the 1980s.

Advocates of basic education are congregating -- and being heeded -- in new corridors. In organizations as diverse (and 'liberal') as the American Federation of Teachers, the Brookings Institution, Teachers College of Columbia University, the New Republic, the Rockefeller Foundation, and the National Endowment for the Humanities, numerous men and women of intelligence and power have concluded . . . that schools do make a difference, that they are reformable, and that long-ignored or maligned Essentialist principles hold part of the key to authentic school improvement.¹⁶

If that group could push through an essentialist agenda "they would also provide a continuing mega-vitamin program for the social anemia that . . . schools can combat [now] only through nonacademic programs and therapeutic intervention."¹⁷ To cure both our academic and our emotional ills, Sewall proposed a seven step plan: (1) schools should stress academics; (2) they should be orderly; (3) they should set standards and require that students meet those standards before advancing; (4) the community should "recant . . . permissive values"; (5) all adults should "require young people to work as hard and to behave as virtuously as they themselves do"; (6) districts should provide alternative programs and schools; and (7) "educational leaders should reaffirm some traditional practices and values" to provide models for the community.¹⁸

Hendrik Gideonese, an active participant in the redesign of standards for national accreditation undertaken by the National Council for the Accreditation of Teacher Education (NCATE), declared that "a revolution" was required in the preservice training of teachers before schools could be fixed.¹⁹ Asserting that to cover adequately the expanding knowledge base would take at least six years of post-secondary training, he dismissed the four year system as "attempting to accomplish the impossible." If we were to begin to train teachers well, schools must be redesigned to accommodate those highly skilled practitioners. They "must be transformed into a setting for professional employment" and "be composed of hierarchically structured teams of teachers."²⁰ Citing the significant improvements made in medical schools at the end of the nineteenth century, subsequently accelerated by the publication of the Flexner study, as a precedent for the type of change which might occur, Gideonese implied that we lack only the will to move in the direction of dramatic reform. Gideonese anticipated the interest in practitioner training which led to the formation of the Holmes Group and on-going attempts to establish a recognized national certification board.

Hans Weiler believed that the problems of our schools, the decline in prestige they had suffered "during the past decade or so," were not unique to public education. "They reflect a broader problem . . . a general erosion of confidence in public authority."²¹ Surprisingly, he concluded that:

Even if SAT scores rose and vandals started behaving themselves, the overall public assessment of public education would be very unlikely to improve . . . It is just not conceivable that, at a time when cynicism about public authority is at an all time high . . . an institution so central and so fundamentally political as education could bounce back to new heights -- or even modest elevations -- of public confidence.²²

If Weiler is correct, then any effort to reform schools would not dent appreciably our perception of their failures to meet our expectations.

Michael Kirst of Stanford University, conversely, represents the no-funds/no-frills formula for making schools better. To be successful with a 1980s educational initiative, reforms must: "(1) create structural and organizational additions; (2) be easily monitored; (3) have constituencies with a stake in maintaining them; and (4) be low cost."²³ Specifically, he suggested better use of time, elimination of programs that do not improve skills or expand a student's store of knowledge, reconsideration of tracking, additional homework, revised staff development for teachers, increased salaries in areas of shortages, improved preparation and critical evaluation of principals, and alternative schools.

Outlined, then, by 1981 were the various positions that would dominate deliberations and debate about schooling for the rest of the decade. Already the canon keepers had come readily out of their ideological closets and, bandwagoning the "back to basics" theme, they began to fashion a curriculum which advocated a common core preparation founded on the literature and history of western civilization. Alternative schools, the one romantic reform to survive the seventies, were soon to be renamed schools of choice or magnet schools and seen as a means to privatize, wholly or partially, the public schools. The politics and economics of retrenchment fit well with a growing suspicion of authority and institutions. Talk became increasingly tough: more hours, more days, more effort, more expectations, more homework, more accountability. Schools were to teach students and we would be able to judge how well they succeeded by accumulating test data and analyzing and comparing scores, state by state, school by school, and teacher by teacher. Teachers would be better trained and, to hold their toes over a metaphorical fire, we would find tough administrators, able to lead rather than merely to manage their faculties. As for issues related to equity, the backseat would suffice. We would return to neighborhood schools and community commitment. By

November, 1982, no fewer than 29 studies on improving our nation's high schools, whose programs seemed most subject to critical attack, were represented at the Wingspread Conference on Studies of the American High School.²⁴

Certainly there was no lack of advice for the new President. Indeed, he entered office with a 132 page summary of recommendations from the Heritage Foundation to supplement a decade of report writing and commission meeting. The religious right was not reluctant to add its voice to education agenda-making. But even after a year in office, the only policy which seemed to apply to the federal role in education was "cut the programs and/or the costs." George Kaplan found the administration "remarkably unconcerned about education at any grade or jurisdictional level -- even for service in the armed forces," which was certainly one area in the budget on which Ronald Reagan was willing to spend money. "There is no guiding philosophy, only a wistful desire to return children to the little red schoolhouse on the village green."²⁵ Other than "some vague sloganeering about excellence, freedom, and choice which had surfaced "haphazardly," no coherent vision had been attempted.²⁶ Jack Schuster of the Higher Education Management Institute believed that in 1982 "national-level education policy. . . [was] being decentralized at a rapid rate." As a result we can expect a "further decline of education as a national or societal priority."²⁷ Three trends emerged when the President proposed his first budget: "deregulation, consolidation of programs, and cutbacks in educational spending."²⁸ Ed Meese, a Reagan confidant, declared that the Department of Education was a "ridiculous bureaucratic joke."²⁹ The President's initial instruction to Terrel Bell was "to look at the appropriate role of the federal government in education, if there is one, and to report back."³⁰ The implication was that none existed; Bell was to preside over the extinction of his job.

As a result of the obvious preferences of the Reagan administration to diminish the federal presence in education, some observers suspected that any new initiatives would have to come from the states. In 1981 Bell himself stated that "in the future, educators will turn to the statehouse to solve their problems."³¹ But the one role those statehouses could not fill was the one best suited to the bully pulpit of the White House. In 1983 that bully pulpit potential was made real, somewhat unintentionally, with the publication of a national report on education by a federal agency.

In April of that year the National Commission on Excellence in Education handed to Ronald Reagan A Nation at Risk: The Imperative for Educational Reform, an event which attracted immediate and sustained media attention. Chester Finn dismissed the report as "a splendid codification of what I've regarded as conventional wisdom of the past five years."³² Harold Stowe, a former United States Commissioner of Education, was even less complimentary. "I think American education has a cold. Most people think it has the flu. It certainly does not have the pneumonia that the commission suggested."³³ The 1983 national Teacher of the Year, LeRoy Hay, said that "the recommendations are responsive to what used to be."³⁴ Dennis Gray of the Council for Basic Education concluded that:

. . .there's this orgy of overindulgence. And tomorrow we're going to have a terrible headache because the problems aren't going to be solved. In order for the revival spirit to take hold, it's got to be incorporated into people's thinking in a way that it's not yet. A fundamental turn-around must be more rational, more programmatic, and more courageous.³⁵

But Time magazine's writers observed that "despite some reservations about over simplification, many educators were pleased."³⁶

Created in 1981 the Commission began its work to address "the widespread public perception that something is seriously remiss in our educational system."³⁷

Short, filled with the written equivalent of the ten second sound bite, the report surveyed the current signs of danger and suggested ways to turn away from the brink of educational disaster. "Our nation is at risk." "Our once unchallenged preeminence in commerce, industry, science, and technological innovation is being overtaken by competitors throughout the world." Not only was our number one ranking in almost everything thrown into doubt, but our national security was once again (remember Sputnik) in jeopardy. "We . . . dismantled essential support systems," which had allowed us to respond to the Russian challenge in 1957. We committed "an act of . . . unilateral educational disarmament."³⁸ Echoing the tough talk of the New Right, the report accused us of losing sight of "high expectations" and the need for "disciplined effort."³⁹ As we enter an information age, we must enter armed with knowledge and skills if we are to among that age's victors.

How did we know, other than a sagging economy and a worsening balance of trade with Japan, that we were in trouble? A Nation at Risk cited thirteen indicators most of which, relying on standardized test data, suggested we were becoming a nation of partial illiterates as our children graduated from our public schools without the knowledge necessary for success.

Each generation of Americans has outstripped its parents in education, in literacy, and in economic attainment. For the first time in the history of our country, the educational skills of one generation will not surpass, will not equal, will not even approach, those of their parents.⁴⁰

"More and more young people emerge from high school ready neither for college nor for work."⁴¹ The solution is to create a "learning Society," defined by the commission as one committed "to a set of values and to a system of education that affords all members the opportunity to stretch their minds to full capacity."⁴² As tempting as it might be to consider the contradictions which characterized the rhetoric of the report (many

educators, for example, would argue that the "opportunity" already existed -- it was the "taking advantage thereof" which seemed the problem), those contradictions did not blunt its ability to make headlines.

We have, commission members found, a number of tools with which to rebuild our tottering institutions: for instance, the abilities of our children; the ideal of a free, public education; the ideology of the American dream; some excellent teachers; the "ingenuity of our policymakers, scientists, State and local educators and scholars in formulating solutions once problems are better understood."⁴³ And the commissioners proved helpful in delineating those problems. Our curriculum at the high school level is "cafeteria style . . . in which the appetizers and desserts can easily be mistaken for the main courses." High schoolers do little homework, receive inflated grades, read simplistic textbooks, and take fewer challenging courses than do students in other industrialized nations. They spend far less time on schoolwork or in the classroom than those other youngsters. And the individuals teaching them are disproportionately drawn from the lower quartile of graduating high school and college students, take a preservice preparation program light on content and heavy on methods, are poorly paid, and, if trained in the sciences or mathematics, rarely elect to remain in the classroom.⁴⁴

To remedy the problem and, one suspects, as a guide to the ingenious policymakers, the commission made five recommendations, with several implementation suggestions appended to each. The high school should adopt a rigorous, required program of study in what was termed "the new basics." Actually only computer science was new, but the number of years of each "basic" might have been new to some students in some states (4 years of English, 3 of math, 3 of science, and 3 of social studies, in addition to 1/2 of computer programming; 2 years of a foreign language were recommended). To its credit the commission did try to suggest in its implementation bullets some specifics

for those years of study (it wasn't "any" three years of math) and to suggest that the K-8 schools would need to build a better foundation for rising high schoolers.

The second recommendation concerned standards and expectations. They should be high and they should be measurable. By implication they endorsed the implementation of gatekeeper testing. They also recommended improvements in textbooks and instructional technology. The third recommendation addressed time. We should use what we have better and we should have more of everything -- a longer day, a lengthened year, and more homework.

Teachers were the subject of the fourth recommendation. We should require more of individuals who offer themselves as candidates for teaching and we should teach them to be teachers better than we now do. We should increase salaries, expand the work year to eleven months, design career ladders, and find ways to convince scientists and mathematicians that teaching can be a rewarding profession.

Finally, the commission recommended that we provide the leadership and funding such reforms will require. We needed effective principals. We needed state and local politicians as well as school boards willing to find fiscal resources. The federal government has a role to play in protecting civil rights, in research, data collection, analysis and distribution, and in assisting to remedy areas of teacher shortfall. But it should do so with a "minimum of administrative burden and intrusiveness." It also had the task of promoting "the national interest in education," in serving as a bully pulpit.⁴⁵

Two months later, in June, 1983, the Task Force on Education for Economic Growth, a panel formed by the Education Commission of the States, issued Action for Excellence: A Comprehensive Plan to Improve Our Nation's Schools. Like the Bell Commission document, Action for Excellence reflected a mood of crisis. The report was "put forth with an unusual sense of urgency."⁴⁶ The immediate improvement of

education "can legitimately be called crucial to our national survival."⁴⁷ There is "a real emergency . . . upon us . . . we must act now."⁴⁸ Because the international marketplace had been transformed by technological advances and global competition, more students needed to attain significantly higher levels of skills. Clearly tying the mission of schooling to economic prosperity, the task force proposed eight recommendations to improve the academic performance of our students. They included: (1) the development and implementation of state plans for improving K-12 education; (2) creation of broader partnerships to achieve that improvement; (3) generation of the resources necessary; (4) enhancement of the teaching profession; (5) establishment of more rigorous requirements for all students; (6) initiation of quality assurance programs to monitor school, teacher, and student performances; (7) improvement in school leadership; and (8) extension of better services to populations unserved or underserved in our present schools.⁴⁹

The report explored specific reasons for alarm: our students perform poorly on standardized tests; proportionately they enroll in increasingly fewer courses in science and mathematics; colleges have had to expand their remedial programs significantly during the past decade; other nations outperform us on international measures of achievement, attend more hours and days of school, and take a more challenging course of study; our teachers are in short supply in technical areas, poorly paid, and inadequately prepared; administrative trivia detracts principals from monitoring the instructional program; and some administrators are poorly prepared to meet the challenges of our public schools. But our greatest problem "is our absence of clear, compelling and widely agreed-upon goals for improving performance." "Back to basics" initiatives were dismissed as "too often . . . motivated by nostalgia rather than a realistic concern for the future."⁵⁰

To sum up: we have expected too little of our schools over the past two decades, in terms of quality -- and we have gotten too little. The result is that our schools are not doing an adequate job of education for today's requirements in the workplace, much less tomorrow's. If we are serious about economic growth in America -- about improving productivity, about recapturing competitiveness in our basic industries and maintaining it in our new industries; about guaranteeing to our children a decent standard of living and a rewarding quality of life, then we must get serious about improving education. And we must start now.⁵¹

The commission report included several specific responses clustered around eight recommendations.

Governors should appoint state commissions to draft state action plans. They should forge alliances to ensure broad-based support for those plans, including "especially business leaders."⁵² Yet each state should also budget additional resources to support improvement and the federal government should not reduce its fiscal support. We should better recruit, train, and pay teachers than we have in the past. We should create career options which keep teachers in classrooms, but distinguish among them and reward those whose performances are more effective. Staff development should be made more applicable to those classroom performances. Schools should establish "firm and demanding requirements concerning discipline, attendance, homework, grades and other essentials of effective schooling," "strengthen the curriculum," and "increase both the duration and the intensity of academic learning time."⁵³ To assess how well our efforts are doing, we should institute a testing program which measures progress on a regular basis, establishes benchmarks for promotion, and requires remediation for students who have not reached those benchmarks. We should also have regular evaluation of teachers and tie those evaluations to some form of rewards. Our colleges should set higher entrance requirements, thereby indicating that they, too, had increased their expectations of students. Principals must be given more responsibility for the management of their schools and in return must be held more accountable for the results

obtained therein. To ensure that we meet the needs of those students we are currently not serving well, we should find ways to increase participation rates of females and minorities in the sciences and mathematics, enhance opportunities of academically gifted students, reduce drop-out rates, better serve handicapped populations, and equalize funding formulas.⁵⁴

After a conclusion expressing optimism in our potential to improve our schools and confidence in our nation's youth, the Hunt Commission, so-named for its chair, the then governor of North Carolina, summarized the competencies students should master before graduation. They were similar to the Bell Commission's "New Basics."

Less than a year later both Hunt and Bell reviewed the receptions their reports had received. Bell claimed that 1984 was "a turning point in American education." Schools were "on the rebound after 20 years of nearly unbroken decline." Each state had education reform commissions at work. Nearly all of them were raising graduation standards. Twenty were contemplating adding time to the school day or the school year. Thirteen were in the midst of drafting a master teacher plan. A sizeable majority were studying teacher preservice training. Such activities were signs of "a magnificent renaissance in American education" and Nation at Risk "appears to have been the firebrand that ignited the national campaign for . . . improvement."⁵⁵ The federal agenda, Reagan's agenda, summarized by Bell, centered on avoiding federal "intrusion" in the schools, consolidating programs into block grants, establishing goals (e.g., by 1989 the drop-out rate for all states will be no more than 10%), advocating the adoption of tuition tax credits and/or vouchers, pushing for a "prayer in school" constitutional amendment, recognizing excellence, and working to facilitate the improvement of discipline. Essentially, the administration would provide the cheerleaders and some traditional, value-laden cheers, but the action on the field was the responsibility of

other governments. Local and state authorities were charged with ensuring that measurable improvements happened and with securing the funds necessary for those improvements.

Jim Hunt's recapitulation was less sanguine about the changes which had occurred and certainly implied that what was happening was not the result of federal efforts. He was, however, equally optimistic about the future. The challenge before us was great.

We Americans want to insure that we can continue to compete in the world economy. We want our economic productivity increased, our technological capability enhanced, and our standing in the world restored. Our quality of life and the future of our children depend on our ability to pursue this new ethic of educational excellence.⁵⁶

Action for Excellence contained the "blueprint for reform" which will produce "the renewal of a commitment to excellence in education."⁵⁷ Be it a "new ethic" or a "renewed commitment," that excellence, Hunt asserted, would come only through state initiatives -- a position one would expect from a governor leading a commission appointed by the governors. Hunt included in his review specific criticisms of the part being played by the Reagan administration in the reform movement. The national commitment "has been conspicuously absent" and, if that absence were to continue, "the cause of improving education will fail."⁵⁸ So, although the states were the field players, they could blame ultimate failure, if it happened, on the lack of cheerleading enthusiasm from Washington.

Ernest Boyer agreed that the 1983 reports made an impact, if only because they pushed education into the national spotlight. But they failed, he wrote, to consider the special difficulties which confront the educationally disadvantaged child, our most troubled schools, and societal changes in general. America had a youth problem, not

merely a school problem.⁵⁹ Louis Rubin concluded that "the reform reports . . . suggest ends, but not means, ignoring important considerations such as cost, the absence of consensus, and the everyday impediments schools face."⁶⁰ He worried that the urgent call to action the major reports demanded might result in unanticipated, negative results. Allen and Eleanor Odden found that most "state education reform programs and recommendations . . . emphasize the hardware of education excellence -- stiffer requirements, higher standards, and more time."⁶¹ They also found that there was remarkable similarity in the programs being enacted or considered.⁶² Murphy, Mesa, and Hallinger challenged the states to assume the role of catalyst and become active players in educational change by establishing standards for curriculum and a testing system which ensured that the state approved curriculum was taught.⁶³ Conversely, John Prash argued that decentralization was the route to successful reform.⁶⁴ Chester Finn, who would later support a national curriculum, in 1984 supported Prash, noting that "uniform standards would damage the schools that are most effective."⁶⁵ Robert Block, superintendent of a Minnesota school system in 1983, called A Nation at Risk "a foul shot at American education," claimed it suggested nothing new, and that it left him "with an old, deep-seated anger that won't go away."⁶⁶ Harold Howe, United States Commissioner of Education during the Ford Administration, noted that the reports "pay very little attention . . . to the noncognitive elements of schooling -- those practices that build student morale and motivation and that ultimately make possible more demanding cognitive work."⁶⁷ Speaking for teachers, Harry Chandler concluded that the Bell Commission report was "a mass of opinion pretending to be fact."⁶⁸ He predicted that the United States will, as a result, "rush headlong into ill-conceived but widely-advertised innovations that will hang like millstones from the curriculum long after the Commission and its report have been forgotten."⁶⁹ "Bell and President Reagan claim a

turnaround in education standards because of A Nation at Risk," writes Anne Lewis, "but most educators and the media view the report as an executive summary of the reasons that changes already were taking place."⁷⁰

Anger at the ways Reagan's government was involved in educational issues, often at odds with the declarations of concern found in A Nation at Risk, also found a place in the literature. Generally that anger focused on the prominence of the conservative social agenda (prayer and parental choice) in actual proposals before Congress and the lack of legislative proposals that would provide schools with actual resources. For example, the 1984 budget plan included reductions in compensatory education, women's equity programs, vocational education, adult education, bilingual education, Indian education, and assistance for college-bound students.⁷¹ John Hanrahan and Julie Kosterlitz detailed the bureaucratic incursions of the New Right advocates in the Department of Education -- men and women who blamed the public schools for the godlessness they found in modern education. The staff was reduced, funding cut, specific programs perceived as un-American (bilingual education, for example) targeted for elimination or significant reductions, leadership positions filled by individuals unfriendly to public education, and communications dominated by articles advocating the elimination of a federal role in our nation's schools rather than with information fostering improvements.⁷²

The rationale for change in those reports also received criticism. Meg Greenfield of Newsweek wondered if we really generated "the educational values that count" when we "stress only . . . external, comparative advantages." The new "champions of education" apparently view it "as a disagreeable thing" and, as a consequence, they provide remedies founded on a "joyless, driven concept of the meaning of learning." Greenfield believed that "schooling needs to be saved from these 'friends'."⁷³ Howe agreed. "I still have a nagging concern about the emphasis of the reports on materialistic motives as a basic

platform for educational reform."⁷⁴ Ira Winn wrote that "we must stop thinking of education as a commodity."⁷⁵

Boyer, who believed our problem with students extended beyond the four walls of the school, wondered "how our current push for excellence . . . relates to the urgent, deeply disturbing issues our students will confront."⁷⁶ "Students were hardly mentioned in A Nation at Risk."⁷⁷ The emphasis on excellence, wrote James Albrecht, "will only hasten the disenfranchisement of the inarticulate, those whose children are already unsuccessful and demoralized in our schools."⁷⁸ Thomas Toch, author of "The Dark Side of the Excellence Movement," concluded that:

The lesson of recent experiments with performance-based promotion seems clear. If the U.S. fails to insure that the excellence movement reaches every student, the current calls for school reform may do nothing more than widen the gulf between the educational haves and the have-nots, leaving those citizens who lack adequate training increasingly less able to manage in an increasingly complicated world.⁷⁹

Allan Glatthorn, in a satirical piece entitled "Nine Proposals to Improve Our Health Care System" -- a piece which implied the limitations of the education reforms by applying them to medicine, noted that "we've become much too soft on poorly disciplined sick people. If a sick person won't take the medicine prescribed, he or she should be forbidden to see the doctor again."⁸⁰ In the fittingly named "High School Reform: Stuffing the Turkeys," Ira Winn suggested that a school which viewed students as "young gobblers" that we must consciously stuff would become "an empty and boring ritual . . . for . . . students."⁸¹ Evans Clinchy addressed another student-oriented problem in "Yes, but What about Irving Engleman?" As we move toward a standardized and discipline-driven school, the Irving Englemans, the students with eccentric rather than "normal" gifts, will be forced to attend classes which remained stale and unsatisfying, learning far less than they were able and retreating from education as soon as possible.⁸²

Although most of the initial reactions were to the Bell Commission's report and, less often, to the Hunt Report, there were several other national commissions which issued somewhat similar sets of recommendations between 1982 and 1984. The College Entrance Examination Board, responding to the evident decline in and disproportionate performance by different populations on the Scholastic Aptitude Test, issued Academic Preparation for College: What Students Need to Know and Be Able to Do in May, 1983.⁸³ Called "The Green Book," Academic Preparation provided an action agenda for high schools.⁸⁴ In addition to suggesting its own version of competencies and skills, the College Board spent some time explaining the skills required for competent studying and, like both the Hunt and Bell reports, explicitly mentioned the need to be computer literate. Adrienne Bailey, a member of the College Board and consequently not a necessarily objective commentator, concluded that the Green Book suggested "a true union of subjects and competencies," which will require "rethinking and rearranging the secondary school curriculum." The report emphasized "doing well, not just doing time." It specifically included the arts among those basics students must encounter before college. Noting that education must be a continuum, the Board urged better articulation between secondary schools and colleges. To support efforts to implement its suggestions, the Board established the Educational Equality Project which spent the decade of the eighties attempting to forge collaborative links.⁸⁵

Also issued in 1983 was the Report of the Twentieth Century Fund Task Force on Federal Elementary and Secondary Education Policy.⁸⁶ Believing that the schools have been asked to assume so many tasks that they have been diverted from their primary purposes, the report's authors suggested "a common curricular 'spine'" for all students. It advocated an active role for the federal government, including the establishment of a national Masters Teacher Program, support for encouraging the expansion of our pool of

science and math teachers, continued compensatory education programs, inclusion of an "impact aid program" for districts with disproportionately high numbers of immigrants and impoverished populations, and several quality control measures linked to data gathering and analysis. Academically it urged mastery of a second language for all students.⁸⁷

Among other entries in the reform sweepstakes were the Business-Higher Education Forum's America's Competitive Challenge: The Need for a National Response and Excellence: Your Guide to Action Now, issued by the National School Public Relations Association.⁸⁸ There were sufficient reports out by 1983 that the Education Commission of the States issued A Summary of Major Reports on Education and the Northeast Regional Exchange commissioned Education Under Study: An Analysis of Recent Major Reports on Education.⁸⁹ The Forum of Educational Organization Leaders, a group of association leaders which had been meeting informally and regularly since 1974, felt motivated by the flurry of activity to issue its first formal position paper. Included among its recommendations were: (1) higher pay for teachers; (2) career ladder options; (3) financial incentives to attract top students into the profession; (4) guarantees of safe schools; (5) standard, rigorous minimum requirements for graduation; (6) study of the current use of school time prior to increasing present practices; (7) regular expectations for homework at both elementary and secondary levels; (8) the use of standardized tests only as part of a spectrum of factors in determining promotion, retention, or program acceptance decisions; (9) an expanded role for the federal government in financing education; (10) use of teacher testing for new candidates only and not in isolation in making employment decisions; and (11) increased expectations for both teachers and students.⁹⁰ The Forum warned against quick fixes and noted that "neither tests, tax credits, tuition vouchers, nor prayer will

make our schools sufficiently great."⁹¹ By 1985 a reform observer could purchase an anthology specifically addressing the proliferation of recommendations, complete with brief biographies of the major players on the change stage.⁹²

Numerous critics challenged the data used to support the arguments of the various national commissions. For example, Lawrence Stedman and Marshall Smith analyzed four of the reports (A Nation at Risk, Action for Excellence, Academic Preparation for College, and Making the Grade) and found their use of data dated, flawed, or applied simplistically to draw false conclusions.⁹³ Joel Spring observed that:

The decision of business not to invest in new plants and equipment in the 1970s and instead to reap short-term profits is partly responsible for the present technological crisis. The failure of the public schools did not cause the problem (emphasis in the original).⁹⁴

Paul Peterson of the Brookings Institute pointed out that the major reports tended to exaggerate problems through the "selective use of evidence and a profusion of strong rhetoric."⁹⁵

One might have expected relatively general, similar, somewhat unimaginative statements from the types of national commissions that garnered the majority of public attention in 1983. The groups were generally composed of individuals, often not directly connected to education or at least to K-12 public schools, who met periodically, came with personal agendas related to political and/or economic concerns, considered staff prepared or commissioned background reports, and approved statements which evolved from consensus-building discussions. They lacked expertise in teaching and learning, except that which comes from being educated in schools themselves. They also lacked an historical perspective; few reports suggested that anyone had researched the patterns of reform initiatives throughout the past century of schooling in America. How else can one explain the remarkable willingness to propose arguments once argued,

reforms once tried, as though they were new? But they were not the only men and women engaged in studying schools during this period. James Albrecht recognized correctly their potential power in muting the potential influence of those other groups.

The fascination of the public and the media with A Nation at Risk has created another problem; it has blunted and obscured the carefully researched, thoughtful, and imaginative reports of Ernest Boyer, John Goodlad, and TheodoreSizer.⁹⁶

Unlike the national commissions, the efforts of Boyer, Goodlad, and Sizer had taken place over many years, were built on a substantial body of knowledge gathered directly in schools, and represented a different approach to educational change.

The Carnegie Foundation for the Advancement of Teaching was one of the most active national organizations in underwriting educational reform efforts during the 1980s. Currently associated with the move to establish a national certification process, at the beginning of the decade it made a commitment to fund a comprehensive review of America's public high schools. Using a data base gathered partially from an intensive investigation of fifteen schools, the 28 members of its advisory panel received and debated the observations and proposals which were subsequently published in 1983.⁹⁷ The resultant book, High School: A Report on Secondary Education in America, was written by Ernest Boyer, a former United States Commissioner of Education and, in 1980, the president of the Carnegie Foundation.⁹⁸

Dennis Williams, education staff writer for Newsweek, found the book "far more optimistic than earlier task force reports."⁹⁹ Barbara Presseisen concluded that High School was "the most comprehensive of the reform studies" which she reviewed, a conclusion she might have modified had she included Goodlad's work among those reports.¹⁰⁰ Critical of the bureaucratic rigidity of modern schools, "the development of

the profession of teaching for the success of the individual teacher" formed the centerpiece of the changes Boyer suggested.¹⁰¹

Boyer's trust in the potential of improved instruction to make schools better is obvious in comments he made about the work that went into writing High School. For example, in a critique of other reports, he noted that "additional academic requirements . . . keep [students] . . . busy, but unless those courses are more inspiring than most now taught they would continue to bore and perhaps limit students in the long run."¹⁰² "All the talk about excellence is superficial unless we acknowledge that good teaching is the very heart of good schools."¹⁰³

Education is a human enterprise. Renewal must take place in the heads and hearts of people. And while we tighten the procedures, we also must find ways to give more participation and more empowerment to those who do the work. Our top priorities should focus on those who meet with children and, especially, on the working conditions of teachers.¹⁰⁴

That sanguine hope in the promise of education and educators distinguished Boyer's books from those of some of his colleagues.

Like other national reports, High School assumes that the role of education is pivotal in determining the future of the United States.

The success or failure of the American high school will determine the quality of our democracy, the strength of our economy, the security of our defense, and the promise of our ideals. The time has come for America to stand behind its belief in public education.¹⁰⁵

To accomplish that purpose, Boyer suggests twelve strategies. We must clarify our goals and precisely define our shared vision for high schools. The mastery of English must be at the center of all programs of study. That focus must be complemented by a core curriculum for all students, including a required senior year independent project. All students must study that same core curriculum; tracking must be eliminated. Only in

the last two years of the high school curriculum will students explore elective options which provide appropriate transition experiences either to the world of work or to further education. All students must fulfill the requirements of a "new" Carnegie unit in service. The working conditions of teachers must be dramatically improved, as must their preservice training. Teacher preparation programs should be expanded to five years. Instruction must be more varied and less textbook driven than was then common practice. Although technology can enhance educational practice, we must ensure that its entrance into our classrooms was accompanied by both planning and appropriate training of staff members expected to use it. All high schools should become more flexible. Principals must be effective leaders for high schools to work. They need to be better trained, allowed greater autonomy, and given more control over budget and personnel decisions. Connections between the high school and other community resources must be strengthened, as must connections to feeder schools. Finally, the public must demonstrate its commitment to schools and change through active involvement in programs and willing assistance in securing necessary financial resources.¹⁰⁶

Boyer believed that we were witnessing "the best opportunity" we will have this century to make significant improvements in our schools. We must "seize this special moment."¹⁰⁷ And we must seize that moment with the teachers who are already in our nation's classrooms. "Teachers must be viewed as part of the solution, not the problem."¹⁰⁸ "We cannot expect students to shine unless we brighten the prospects for teachers."¹⁰⁹

John Goodlad's work, part of which informed Boyer's High School, was published in 1984. It represented eight years of inquiry which included interviews with over 1,000 teachers, 8,000 parents, and 17,000 students and looked at all levels of schooling. Dennis Williams concluded that the scope of the study qualified it as the most

extensive piece of research ever done on our public schools. Goodlad "provides compelling evidence that what we have will not do, and that only a thorough revolution can bring the reality of the school closer to the ideal."¹¹⁰ He recognized that the Bell Commission proposals were more likely to attract the attention of policymakers than his efforts, so he cautioned those men and women to move slowly.

It is becoming clear to teachers and principals that we are in the midst of a struggle for ideas. I've been advising policymakers to be very cautious about implementing reforms, like a longer school day or a longer school year, because I am not convinced that the ideas that were the most visible in 1983 are going to be those that propel the reform movement in 1986.¹¹¹

Like Boyer, Goodlad believed that "the individual school is the key unit for change."¹¹² Lasting improvement will come school by school, not state regulation by state regulation.

Goodlad, in A Place Called School, suggested two sets of recommendations: for the short term we can and must improve our existing schools, but for the long term changes we need we will have to change profoundly those existing institutions. The state should articulate a clear set of goals for public education systems, goals which are both comprehensive and consistent. That meant a re-examination of the plethora of regulations and requirements which defined the duties of schools and the creation of a new synthesis of purpose. That re-examination should, once goals are set, permit local units and schools considerable latitude in meeting those goals. Decentralization would mean greater involvement by teachers in local decisions, particularly those made at the school level about curriculum and instruction. Principals should be judged not as managers of programs, but as leaders of people. Lengthened school years should be for the purpose of planning and program design, not for additional contact time with students. Internal staffing patterns within schools should be adjusted to provide additional planning time for teachers while students were in attendance.

The curriculum must be balanced, have a common core which reflects the connectedness rather than the distinctiveness of the various disciplines and include an emphasis on communication skills. Tracking needed to end. We should establish research and development centers which specialize in curriculum design, teaching, and evaluation and which will be able to communicate its findings effectively to teachers in the field. Teaching practice must be expanded; skilled practitioners should have opportunities for advancement which permits them to remain in the classroom. We need to articulate the programs of elementary, middle and high schools more effectively than we now do. We need to pay more attention to the training and selection of principals. We need to experiment with optional staffing patterns in elementary schools and eliminate the potential problems of large high schools by breaking them into smaller schools within school units. Goodlad believed that those recommendations were interconnected and needed to be done in concert, rather than in isolation. Moreover, he saw them as "guiding principles" or illustrative directions, rather than prescribed specific measures.¹¹³

To carry us toward twenty-first century schools Goodlad wrote that we must respond to four conditions defining societal changes: (1) the existence of "a youth culture powerfully preoccupied with itself and . . . much less shaped by home, church, and school than once was the case"; (2) "the stunningly swift advance of technology"; (3) "better understanding and engineering of the relationships between education and work and between schools and the workplace"; and (4) the need for a significantly more highly educated society.¹¹⁴ Among the responses he suggested was a restructuring of our educational system, kindergarten through university. We needed to begin state supported education earlier and to have increased options for those later years. Students would enter a twelve year sequence of formal study at age four and at age sixteen be

prepared for an additional four years of specialized opportunities. Units within the common twelve year sequence would be nongraded and short. Students would be in smaller groups, housed together in communities within a larger school. Peer teaching would be common. The curriculum would include a continuum along which students would progress at speeds which matched their intellectual development, rather than their ages. Collaborative educational efforts were essential after the student reached 16 years of age. Goodlad, adopting the expanded definition of education one associates with Bernard Bailyn and Lawrence Cremin, believed that other agencies must begin to accept some responsibility for "developing the knowledge, values, skills, and habits" of our nation's young people.¹¹⁵ At the turn of the last century families realized that they no longer could provide most of the educational experiences their children would require for success in the workplace and they asked the schools to assume that task. As we approach the turn of this century we need to consider the possibility that the requirements for the workplace in the next century can no longer be met within the schools. We need an educational ecosystem, a learning society to prepare for the next era.

In commenting about his projections, Goodlad noted that "our experiment in schooling is unfinished."¹¹⁶ A Place Called School not only reviewed where we were, but set our current location within the context of that on-going experiment. Noting that we have asked our schools to assume "a broad role" and have "placed them at the heart of its [national] well-being," Goodlad, as well as Boyer, entitled chapters "We Want It All."¹¹⁷ Our expectations "are both idealistic and grandiose."¹¹⁸ We want equity. We want excellence. We want good citizens. We want economic prosperity. To come closer to those ideals, we must change those schools. We must continue and simultaneously redesign the experiment.

TheodoreSizer headed the high school study co-sponsored by the National Association of Secondary Schools Principals and the Commission on Educational Issues of the National Association of Independent Schools. Out of that five year project came three books: Horace's Compromise: The Dilemma of the American High School by Sizer; The Shopping Mall High School: Winners and Losers in the Educational Marketplace by Arthur Powell, Eleanor Farrar, and David Cohen; and The Last Little Citadel: American High Schools Since 1940 by Robert Hampel.¹¹⁹ Like the Goodlad study, Sizer's group looked intensively at fifteen schools to provide the data which formed the basis for subsequent recommendations. The editors of Newsweek entitled their review of Sizer's book "A Call for Radical Reform." Dennis Williams noted that Sizer believed "that reform should proceed cautiously" precisely because of the need for significant transformations. Unfortunately, Sizer also believed that "the mood is not right for large-scale movement toward improving the schools."¹²⁰ Barbara Presseisin found Horace's Compromise "a sobering view of education."¹²¹ If Boyer were at the optimistic end of the hopeful spectrum, Sizer was nearer the opposite pole.

How, then, could we improve our schools? Sizer argued that change must come "slowly," "carefully," and "all at once."¹²²

The most powerful spurs for students' learning -- their motivation, the adaption of programs to their styles of learning, the expectations for each of them -- are humanistic, not mechanistic or programmatic; they are subtle and changeable. School reform, especially high school reform, is thus inevitably complicated, not only because school structures are intricate, but because of the rich variety of individual talents in each school . . . many today fail to see and respect this inevitable complexity, even if it is readily apparent. They confuse standardization with standards, and in the process sap the morale of the ablest teachers and principals who well know that children have to be schooled flexibly, even individually. We trivialize the process of learning by oversimplifying it; and by the oversimplification represented by mandated standardized practice we lessen the potential of leaders . . . Sound policy . . . is patient and respectful of the reality that enduring change in education is likely to be slow a-coming.¹²³

The remedies that he suggested were dramatically different from those which formed the national agenda of the Bell Commission.

The teacher is central to learning, butSizer argued that the conditions of teaching and the lack of will on the part of some teachers to inspire their students limited effectiveness. So, change must liberate the teacher to do his or her job. The bureaucracy which characterized the institution must be dismantled. Like Goodlad and Boyer, Sizer wanted schooling decentralized. We needed less specialization. Teachers needed fewer students. The curriculum needed simplification. There should be no tracking system which inhibits the learning of any child. The program of study should be integrated units taken by students able to master them, rather than by students who are a particular age or grade. Assessments should be performance-based. Essentially, Sizer stressed the idea that less is more. "Inspiration, hunger: these are the qualities that drive good schools." To achieve them "the best we educational planners can do is to create the most likely conditions for them to flourish, and then get out of the way."¹²⁴

Attempting to actualize the ideas of the Study of High Schools coalition, Sizer called for a focus on nine principles. Schools must have a clear focus. The goals of the school should be simple -- disciplines, credit hours, and a march through six period schools days must give way to an integrated curriculum. Goals should be universal, but the delivery of services should be student specific. Schools should have the autonomy necessary to personalize instruction. To facilitate that personalization, student contacts at any one time should be no more than eighty per teacher. The metaphor for a student must change from the student as raw material to be worked upon by a teacher to student as worker. Diplomas were to be awarded for mastery, not seat time. Schools must set high expectations. Teachers must perceive themselves as generalists with multiple responsibilities, rather than narrow specialists. To increase the financial resources

available to schools, we must abandon some of the custodial and ancillary functions schools now perform.¹²⁵

The work of Boyer, Goodlad, andSizer addressed somewhat different problems than did those of the more political documents of 1983. Rather than dwelling on the decline in test scores and on our relative academic anemia compared to other nations, they examined our nation's schools and found them essentially inimical to thinking. They were unlikely places in which to promote the intellectual growth and well-being of either the students or the adults housed therein. Nor were the most generally proposed reforms likely to alter that situation. As Sizer stated:

It is doubly ironic that these educational reforms, supposedly based on a belief in the power of the mind, are in fact profoundly anti-intellectual and anti-scholarly. John Goodlad's seven-year study A Place Called School was published at the same time as many of these reports, but it's as if his work doesn't exist; it's as if certain common-sense notions about how schools are organized -- that students, for example, can't engage their minds very well in 35-minute snippets of time, or that smaller classes allow for more individual attention -- play no role whatsoever in many of the state reforms.¹²⁶

One reason they failed to find the same remedies is that the two groups failed to concentrate on the same types of problems.

For Boyer, Goodlad, and Sizer the problems of schools included: excessive and vague goals; low productivity; little incentive for students to elect demanding academic work; shopping mall organization and cafeteria programs of study; fragmentation of the school day, student tasks, and the curriculum ("the high school scene is as colorful and feverish as it is inimical to the reflection that inescapably accompanies learning to use one's mind"); segregation often reflective of socio-economic status; poor linkages to the world beyond its doors; and a staff of teachers with limited professional mobility, poor working conditions, and uncompetitive salaries -- teachers who were frequently patronized and often undermined by policy makers. The "first step in our search for

better schools" should be to eliminate the "regularities of school-keeping."¹²⁷

Conversely, the earlier reports argued for more of those same regularities.

Those three scholars were not the only individuals writing about the intellectual wasteland of our nation's high schools from a school culture perspective. Conservative Gerald Grant's examination of a high school in Syracuse, New York, The World We Created at Hamilton High: 1953-1987, revealed the cluster of discipline, academic, and social problems we have come to associate with inner-city schools. Grant's school had become a rigid bureaucracy in which people got what they sought from their years in residence and then got out.¹²⁸ David Owen went underground at the beginning of the decade and re-experienced secondary schools from the perspective of an informed adult masquerading as an adolescent. Life in that school reflected the values and realities, albeit from the other side of the desk, as that of Sizer's Horace.¹²⁹ Philip Cusick addressed the difficulties of providing meaningful experiences for all students, both those who want to be in a high school and those who do not want to be there.¹³⁰ Linda McNeil explored the various compromises worked out between adults and students within high schools, finding them similar to Horace's compromises and the "treaties" explored by Powell, Farrar, and Cohen.¹³¹ Herbert Kliebard, in a review of several books on the American high school, concluded that:

The critical problem in reforming this state of affairs . . . is that the high school as shopping mall works. It works only marginally well educationally speaking . . . but it is surprisingly successful politically. The culmination of a hundred years of experiment with mass spending education, apparently, is to avoid the issue of what constitutes a good education for youth in favor of 'everything-goes.'¹³²

Arthur Powell came to somewhat the same conclusion:

Most Americans, and especially those most directly affected, do not seem bothered by a secondary education that lacks intellectual demand and intensity. Because they never wished for or expected anything else, they do not miss it.¹³³

And, partially because policy-makers did not know what an intellectually stimulating environment was and because they did understand what existed, "more of" what existed became the easiest reforms to consider. Partially because they clung to several beliefs about what should work in schools, they were willing to support other ideas which were contrary to the setting which Boyer, Goodlad, andSizer believed must be created to foster excellence in the midst of equity.

Willis Hawley, Dean of the George Peabody College for Teachers, wrote that many of the national reports had "an Alice in Wonderland quality to them."¹³⁴ Reforms built on narrow or misguided definitions of problems, analysis of which avoided a critical assessment of school culture, led to misconceptions which tainted policies. Among the misconceptions or myths upon which such errant reforms were built were: (1) bussing fails to promote desegregation or learning; (2) gifted students are neglected if we focus on helping low-achievers; (3) tracking and pull-out programs help students served thereby gain positive self-images; (4) retaining students promotes future achievement; (5) vocational education is important to long term job prospects; (6) prescribed curriculum will change what teachers do in the classroom; (7) most parents are unhappy with the schools their children attend; (8) merit pay is an important tool in private industry and, consequently, applicable to school situations; and (9) more time is a cost-effective way to improve test scores.¹³⁵ Hawley, too, thought the answer to many of the problems which one found in our nation's schools could be remedied by restructuring rather than retooling.

Sarah Lawrence Lightfoot, author of perhaps the most literary of the secondary school studies of the eighties, found that there were some commonalities in high schools which were successful. Although The Good High School: Portraits of Character and Culture is as much a treatise on research methodology as a survey of educational

institutions, it does suggest that schools which work have certain common characteristics. Like Boyer, Goodlad, and Sizer, Lightfoot found most high schools uneasy places.

Today's high schools . . . seem furthest away from . . . [an] idealized past. They appear grotesque in their permissiveness and impending chaos. The large, unruly adolescents appear threatening, and their swiftly changing, faddish preoccupations are baffling to their parents' conservative eyes . . . They are seen as scary and incomprehensible, or dull and boring.¹³⁶

But good ones had a clear idea of what they are and what they wished to accomplish. There was almost an ideological fervor in such schools. Leaders were the "public persona of the institutions."¹³⁷ In good schools there seemed to be a redefinition of leadership which "includes softer images that are based on nurturance . . . on a subtle integration of personal qualities traditionally attached to male and female images."¹³⁸ Teachers were central to the mission of the school and there were obvious efforts to ensure their needs were met. They "were not expected to be superhuman, neither were they regarded as people of meager talent and low status."¹³⁹ They tended to be resourceful, innovative, more autonomous than one might anticipate in most schools, and perceived as the variable upon which goodness ultimately depended. Students were seen as individuals who must be engaged personally. Teachers ensured that they worked closely with the young people for whom they were responsible and they perceived the edges of that responsibility to extend beyond the four walls of their classroom. Students were expected to perform well; they were objects of care rather than abuse. Good schools were orderly and safe places in which students perceived that they had a stake and a consequent responsibility to preserve such order.

Lightfoot's analysis of goodness corresponds somewhat to the correlates associated with the effective schools movement. And, she acknowledged that connection.¹⁴⁰ In the

mid-1960s a group of studies were conducted attempting to determine which school resources contributed to student achievement. The initial reports suggested that achievement was related to conditions outside the reach of the school.¹⁴¹ That stimulated a number of scholars to attempt to find schools that worked, and, indeed, they did find examples in which students performed better than anticipated. By the late 1970s a body of literature existed describing the characteristics of such schools -- schools which appeared to attain both equity and excellence.¹⁴²

Initial characteristics, those drawn from the 1970s studies, suggested five factors contributed to effectiveness: strong leadership, high expectations, clear goals, schoolwide staff development, and student monitoring. During the early 1980s the literature was further synthesized by Ron Edmonds, who designed the five correlates which currently guide the movement's school improvement efforts.¹⁴³ Safe and orderly environment replaced the staff development component, and greater specificity was added to the other four correlates. In 1985 the United States Office of Education funded two research and development centers to support continued investigation of school effectiveness. The result of that funding was a proliferation of studies refining definitions and suggesting their applicability to the process of making schools better places for learning for all. Colleagues of Edmonds, such as Larry Lezotte, have become national consultants on the local implementation of the effective school model and a network of schools, systems, and states employing that model has been established, as has a regular journal.¹⁴⁴

Boyer, Goodlad, and Sizer all also sponsored programs to apply the recommendations they suggested or at least to explore the possibility of building school improvement on careful attention to alterations in the school environment -- in those regularities of school-keeping. The Carnegie Foundation underwrote two programs to

strengthen leadership at the building level and provided direct grants to individual schools as part of a renewal initiative.¹⁴⁵ Goodlad established a school improvement network which has motivated some regional accrediting bodies, including the Southern Association of Colleges and Schools, to provide site-based renewal options.¹⁴⁶Sizer established the Essential Schools Coalition dedicated to finding ways to achieve more by down-sizing curriculum, classes, and organizations.

Ernest Boyer and Ted Sizer had served together on a panel which, in 1982, examined modern schooling, found it wanting, and made public its observations a year before A Nation at Risk was printed. The Paideia Group, chaired by Mortimer Adler, anticipated the cultural limitations argument which came after the Bell and Hunt Commissions issued their recommendations. It published three books, authored by Adler, established a national network of schools interested in implementing some of the ideas advanced by the group, began publication of a regular newsletter, and created a national center now located at the University of North Carolina at Chapel Hill. Their first publication, The Paideia Proposal: An Educational Manifesto, outlined the role of schooling, the elements that must be present therein, and some implications of those elements for the structure, operation, and staffing of schools.¹⁴⁷ Paideia Problems and Possibilities responded to the questions which arose from the proposal itself.¹⁴⁸ The Paideia Program: An Educational Syllabus provided a possible course of study, with appended book lists, which could satisfy the requirements of "paideia" schooling.¹⁴⁹

Arguing that we must have "an educationally classless society," the Paideia Group concluded that we must end multiple track education. All children can learn and there were specific skills that all children must master. "There are no unteachable children. There are only schools and teachers and parents who fail to teach them."¹⁵⁰ Schooling was preparation for education, not a substitute for it. It must provide students with not

only the intellectual foundation for continued learning, but it must also provide the stimulation necessary to motivate them to continue their education.

The Group proposed three generic types of learning to which all students should be exposed: the "acquisition of organized knowledge"; the "development of intellectual skills"; and an "enlarged understanding of ideas and values."¹⁵¹ The first is to be acquired by traditional didactic instruction, assisted by texts and technology. The second comes from coaching and supervised practice. The third is the product of Socratic questioning or seminars. The size, duration, and types of classes vary according to what type of learning is involved. It was the recommendations related to the third column that ultimately received the most attention.¹⁵²

Although not intended to be an elitist, exclusively intellectual program, the Paideia proposal attracted a decidedly liberal arts contingent of supporters. The panel recommended twelve years of physical education, several years of a "wide variety of manual activities," and the introduction of all students to "the wide range of human work."¹⁵³ It recommended better preservice training for teachers. It called for better educational leadership and more autonomy for principals. It stressed the need for active, rather than passive, learning experiences for students. But what most readers remembered were seminars, Socrates, and hints of the Great Books. Probably part of that public emphasis was the connection between the Paideia Group and Adler, one of the leading proponents of a great books approach to education and a vocal advocate of the value of a broad, humanistic, liberal education.¹⁵⁴

Adler's seminars became associated with an informal group of education critics we might call defenders of the canon. Diane Ravitch set the stage for those defenders in The Schools We Deserve, published in 1985. For most of this decade, curriculum "has been dominated by a species of social efficiency . . . that judges curricular offerings by

their utility and that insists on a close fit between what students study and what roles they are likely to assume as adults."¹⁵⁵ As a result curriculum is subject to the fads and fashions of a changing workplace. Until we have a commitment to a comprehensive education which transcends the vagaries of the marketplace, we will continue to wander in a curricular wasteland.

If we believed that it was important to have a highly literate public, to have a public capable of understanding history and politics and economics, to have citizens who are knowledgeable about science and technology, to have a society in which the powers of verbal communication are developed systematically and intentionally, then we would know what we wanted of our schools.¹⁵⁶

Because we do not believe that with sufficient verve, "we get the schools we deserve, which accurately reflect our own confusion about the value of education."¹⁵⁷ Ravitch, like Adler, believed that schools need to perceive their primary role in terms independent of vocations.

William Bennett, a man who believed himself to be above such confusion, designed in 1986 a curriculum to prepare students for the intellectual rigors of a technologically sophisticated world. At the time James Madison High School: A Curriculum for American Students was published Bennett was Secretary of Education.¹⁵⁸ He had previously been the Director of the National Center for the Humanities, so he came to his role of education advocate with intellectual credentials in place. The nature of his proposed curriculum was linked to A Nation at Risk and it contained the implication that there existed "one better, if not best, curriculum." That curriculum was skewed toward the study of western civilization. Using the language of the canonists (we want our students to have "a common moral and intellectual discipline," "a common language of ideas"), he made no apologies for a retreat from cultural diversity.¹⁵⁹

But Mr. Bennett's high school did not place the canonist arguments in the public limelight. Attention from the media and the education establishment came with the unexpected appearance on the best seller lists of two books: Allan Bloom's The Closing of the American Mind and E.D. Hirsch's Cultural Literacy: What Every American Needs to Know.¹⁶⁰

Bloom's book addresses problems in our universities, but the implications of those problems are important in deciding what to do with our K-12 schools. Like our high schools, "the university now offers no distinctive visage to the young person."¹⁶¹ Because there is a democracy of disciplines, because no knowledge can claim enduring importance as part of a liberal education, there is intellectual anarchy. "There is no vision, nor is there a set of competing visions, of what an educated human being is."¹⁶² As a result everyone retreats to a specialty with occasional, unguided forays into the broad range of electives which litter course catalogues. The secondary school version thereof is tracking and the cafeteria curriculum. Because we lack that common core, because we lack a consensus on what to value in an education, we face an intellectual crisis which, Bloom argues, is actually a crisis of civilization.

Less intellectual in its approach and tied more closely to the need for articulation between high schools and universities is Ernest Boyer's College: The Undergraduate Experience in America, another effort sponsored by the Carnegie Foundation. Although not strictly a canonist in the sense of Bloom, Hirsch, or Adler, Boyer did find the college curriculum fragmented. There is a "confusion over goals." Colleges are "searching for meaning in a world where diversity, not commonality, is the guiding vision."¹⁶³ Boyer recommended that universities re-establish a common core curriculum, one which integrated specialities and which addressed the search for meaning one associates with the humanities.

The 1980s was the decade in which Trivial Pursuits and Jeopardy became popular pastimes. The search for the minutiae of our past encounters with extraneous facts became a parlor game for scholastic extroverts. Perhaps that popularity explains somewhat the reception Hirsch received when he published Cultural Literacy.

Cultural literacy is "the basic information needed to thrive in the modern world." It "constitutes the only sure avenue of opportunity for disadvantaged children, the only reliable way of combating the social determinism that now condemns them to remain in the same social and educational condition as their parents."¹⁶⁴ To be literate is not merely to read and write with a modicum of skill, but to bring to that process the context of a civilization, to bring a shared body of knowledge. That literacy required that we eliminate the fragmentation which characterized K-12 education in the United States.

The counterreform of the 1980s seems bent upon a return to a more traditional curriculum. This welcome course correction demonstrates the underlying good sense of the American people, who have launched a grassroots movement to advance that reform. But the movement is being greeted unenthusiastically by many educators.¹⁶⁵

In spite of the evident lack of enthusiasm by some professionals, many of the corollaries of the adoption of a cultural core curriculum, such as the revision of current textbooks or the greater integration of subject areas in early grades, have received a positive reception. For example, by 1990 "whole language instruction" had become a code term for the adoption of a more holistic approach to education with an emphasis on literature rather than basals for reading instruction.

The popularity of Cultural Literacy spawned a vast merchandizing campaign. Dictionaries keyed to terms, names, and events that reflected such literacy began to appear on bookstore shelves. Eager trivia seekers could purchase tests of cultural literacy. Hirsch became a speaker in demand for both professional conferences and

television talk shows. And books such as Diane Ravitch and Chester Finn's What Do Our 17-Year-Olds Know? became lunchtime conversation topics. After nearly 200 pages spent analyzing the results of the first National Assessment of History and Literature, the authors penned several recommendations to address our current "generation at risk."¹⁶⁶ We must "teach history in context," removing it from its current role as an incidental part of social studies or a subject to be taught topically. We must spend more time teaching history, begin earlier, and ensure that all students have at least two years of world history in addition to the years spent studying our national culture. Chronology and geography are important aspects of history and should be incorporated therein. We should spend more time teaching literature, teach it earlier, and insist that it comprise the majority of textbooks used for reading instruction. All students need to be exposed to literature, primary sources (letters, documents), and biographies. To ensure that the core subjects of cultural literacy receive appropriate attention, we must lengthen schedules, calendars, or student work assignments (more homework, for example) to provide a place for it within the school day. There should be alternative routes to the classroom for individuals who possess expertise in literature or history, but who lack the appropriate teaching credentials to gain access to positions in our public schools. Colleges must support these efforts by insisting that students who apply for admission possess a high degree of competence in literature and history and that students in teacher preparation programs exhibit a high level of competence before graduation.¹⁶⁷

Even the federal government climbed aboard the Hirsch-Ravitch bandwagon. The National Endowment for the Humanities issued two reports on the topic: To Reclaim a Legacy (1984) and American Memory (1987).¹⁶⁸ The former addressed the humanities as they related to universities; the latter considered the place of the humanities in K-12 schools, and included both Hirsch and Ravitch on its advisory panel.

American Memory contained three basic recommendations: more time should be given to history, literature, and foreign language studies; textbooks should be better; and teachers must become more knowledgeable about the subjects they teach.

The canonists were not the only education reformers to place some emphasis on the improvement of the preservice training of teachers. One can persuasively argue that if the 1982-84 national studies constituted the first wave of a comprehensive reform movement, that the second wave involved the education of educators.

Initial attention to teachers took the form of quick fixes -- ways to compel adults in classrooms to become more effective. The assumption was that teachers did less than they could do to motivate their charges to learn. Consequently, reformers paid attention to proposals designed to dangle sticks or carrots before the eyes of practitioners. They inaugurated career development or career ladder programs. Sometimes those programs were piloted in school districts, like the Charlotte-Mecklenburg Plan in North Carolina; sometimes they involved statewide initiatives, like the Tennessee plan.¹⁶⁹ Sometimes policy-makers sought answers in evaluation systems.¹⁷⁰ Sometimes they designed multi-faceted incentive programs, like the bonus point system used in Jefferson County, Kentucky, to encourage professional retraining.¹⁷¹ Sometimes they tried relicensing existing teachers through education programs keyed to areas of scarcity.¹⁷² Sometimes they instituted tests for teachers.¹⁷³ Almost always they attempted to raise salaries.

But even as they applied short-term solutions, reformers knew that there were long-term problems for which those answers were inadequate. Although incentive programs were relatively easy to draft, there were some inherent problems with implementation and results.¹⁷⁴ There was a supply-demand problem. Minority teachers were increasingly difficult to find. Teachers in certain specialty areas either never used their teaching credentials or left the profession after only a few years in the

classroom. Certain geographic areas had difficulty attracting good candidates.¹⁷⁵ Teacher shortages sometimes led to practitioners being assigned to classes outside their fields.¹⁷⁶ Once we attracted appropriately credentialed teachers, we had difficulty retaining many of the brightest ones.¹⁷⁷ Partially their departure was the result of the low status attached to the profession.¹⁷⁸ Partially the conditions under which teachers were asked to work convinced them to seek employment elsewhere.¹⁷⁹

Those concerns led to an examination of teacher education itself and, in turn, that examination led to a call not only for the reform of preservice training but also of the schools in which those individuals, once trained, would work. As early as 1981 a report on the need for improved teacher training was circulating.¹⁸⁰ It stated that we need to raise our expectations for candidates to teacher training. Upon exit from preparation programs those candidates should be able to demonstrate a high level of competency, which included not merely performance in the program proper, but also on a standardized exit test. The program of study itself must be made more rigorous. We needed to develop better linkages between schools of education and other schools on campus. Special attention should be given to preparing students to enter areas of shortages. The education of teachers did not conclude with the completion of an undergraduate program. There should be rigorous requirements for continuing education programs to maintain certification.¹⁸¹ State policymakers began to consider ways in which their efforts could incorporate measures designed to provide future educators with programs which prepared them to meet the twin demands of equity and excellence in our nation's K-12 classrooms.

A typical example of state involvement is North Carolina, which in 1985 appointed a task force to review and make recommendations on teacher education. Serving as staff director of that task force was Donald Stedman, who had been a member

of the 1981 Task Force on Higher Education and the Schools, whose report was one of the first publications to suggest changes in teacher education. After a year of study, supported by a variety of commissioned papers and complementary research conducted by the Public School Forum of North Carolina, it issued its report, The Education of North Carolina's Teachers, which provided the basis for reform legislation in the 1987 session and for several sessions thereafter.¹⁸² That Task Force recommended a comprehensive reform of preservice programs, the implementation of a quality assurance model to strengthen and monitor those programs, establishment of a Professional Practices Board, required accreditation by NCATE for all teacher certification schools, coordination of continuing education plans, incentives to attract bright students -- including a model teaching fellows program and continued support for the Center for the Advancement of Teaching, and revitalization of the professional staffs of schools of education. The recommendations reflected those considered by most states. By 1988 a sufficient number of initiatives were in place that the American Council on Education issued a review of them.¹⁸³

Teacher educators themselves began to propose changes from within. David Berliner felt the clamor for reform and the proliferation of proposed alterations were sufficiently widespread that opportunities to incorporate the growing knowledge base of the profession in programs undergoing rapid change might be lost.¹⁸⁴ David Clark believed that the present system was so inadequate that rapid and a radical reformation was imperative.¹⁸⁵ Reginald Damerell, in a muckraking attack worthy of Ida Tarbell and Lincoln Steffens, claimed that teacher colleges ruined education in the United States.¹⁸⁶ Robert Barr advocated adoption of a "warranty assurance" plan used in Oregon as one way to require quality programs.¹⁸⁷

In 1985 the National Commission for Excellence in Teacher Education issued its findings in A Call for Change in Teacher Education.¹⁸⁸ Those finds were not unexpected. Admission standards should be raised. The federal government and the states should design a national campaign to attract candidates of quality to teaching. Special programs should be established to recruit minority educators. Programs must be rigorous and include a one year, post-graduate, paid internship. Certification and program approval standards should continue to be the responsibility of the states, but a national certification program should be explored. Policymakers must help secure the resources necessary to finance such changes. They must expand support in research and development. A National Academy for Teacher Education should be established, although the report authors were silent on the identity of the sponsoring agency. Adequate salaries, working conditions, and career opportunities must be made more attractive than those currently existing if we hoped to attract and retain brighter candidates to the profession.¹⁸⁹ The American Association of State Colleges and Universities highlighted existing programs which were effective in attracting good candidates and preparing them well, thereby establishing a higher education variation of the effective schools correlates.¹⁹⁰ The Association of American Colleges prepared their own version of effective programs in 1989.¹⁹¹

But the two reports which attracted the most attention were known as the Holmes Report and the Carnegie Report.¹⁹² Both were published in 1986. Both called for significant changes in teacher preparation and for simultaneous changes in the conditions of teaching.

The Carnegie Report included recommendations for establishing a national certification board, for designing fifth year Master of Teaching programs, for eliminating traditional undergraduate programs, and for substantial increases in the

salaries of teachers. We needed to raise admissions standards, recruit highly skilled candidates, and restructure the profession. Teachers needed greater autonomy, more voice in the design and implementation of curriculum as well as other school-based decisions, and opportunities for collegial experiences with their peers. Support staff must free teachers from tasks which inhibit their abilities to perform professional responsibilities. Comprehensive in scope, A Nation Prepared: Teachers for the 21st-Century linked teacher education to the culture of the schools in which those teachers would practice and both to the current problems of educating young people. To change the preparation of teachers we must simultaneously change their work environments.

Why is this so? Because the current structure and organization of schooling not only make extraordinary inefficient use of those able teachers we are lucky enough to attract to and retain in the schools, but they also create a host of disincentives that drive many of the best teachers out of the schools.¹⁹³

The Carnegie Foundation did not underwrite a task force for the sake of generating rhetoric-filled paper only. It acknowledged that the cost of its proposals was high, but it also announced that it would provide the initial funding for the National Board for Professional Teaching Standards as an indication of its commitment to change.¹⁹⁴

In January, 1986, Lee Schulman and Gary Sykes prepared for the Carnegie Task Force a draft proposal for such a national board.¹⁹⁵ When the report of that task force was finished a call for the board was included in its recommendations. In the press release which accompanied the distribution of A Nation Prepared, the links between the certification effort of 1986 and the Flexner Report of 1910 were made explicit.¹⁹⁶ By 1987 the Board was functional, with 63 members serving during its initial stages and with a variety of assessment models being designed under Board commissions. James Hunt, the chair of the Education Commission of the States task force on education, was named the National Board chair.

The Holmes Group has yet to attract the media attention garnered by the Carnegie Task Force. Partially that lack of publicity is a result of Carnegie funding and the continuing publicity associated with the establishment of a national certification process. Partially that lack of attention is a result of reaction from peers, many of whom perceive the Holmes Group as hostile to small teacher preparation programs.¹⁹⁷ The group, composed initially of education deans, set five goals: (1) to provide a more intellectually rigorous preparation program; (2) to distinguish among teachers in terms of knowledge, skill, commitment, education, certification, and work; (3) to elevate entrance standards to the profession; (4) to establish a network of schools within the group; and (5) to work toward reforming the environments in which teachers work.¹⁹⁸ Like the Carnegie report, Tomorrow's Teachers called for a fifth year of education for prospective teachers.

Reaction to the recommendations was mixed. Some states already had reform efforts underway. By the end of 1986 most of them were looking at the imposition of additional requirements on schools of education through regulations attached either to the program approval process or the licensure process. The National Council for Accreditation of Teacher Education completed its own redesign of standards -- a process which had begun early in the decade and was culminating when Carnegie and Holmes were initiating their meetings.¹⁹⁹ By 1986 that redesign was being piloted and promised a modicum of quality assurance, if only to those institutions which sought national accreditation. Some educators were unimpressed by the results of the reports. Frances Keppel, a former United States Commissioner of Education, regretted that neither the Holmes nor the Carnegie Group had looked at the need for a pro-active federal role in teacher educational.²⁰⁰ Edward Nusser worried that the reports would result in programs which delayed field experiences until late in a candidate's education.²⁰¹ Ted

Sizer, however, saw the reports as supporting his call for radically restructuring K-12 schools.²⁰² Louis Harris found that teachers were divided, both in their reactions to reforms in general and to suggested changes in their work environment.²⁰³

The redesign of the work environment was an issue which had been a secondary recommendation in earlier reports, a primary recommendation in major reports addressing teacher education issues, and became the focal point of reform recommendations in the latter years of the Reagan era.

Teachers, or at least the organizations which represented them on the national and state political stage, helped to refocus legislative attention to workplace issues. They had consistently advocated improving the status, compensation, and working conditions of educators. Basically organized as unions, the National Education Association, the American Federation of Teachers, and a few smaller groups can claim nearly 90% of all public school teachers as members.²⁰⁴ Like other unions, even like the NEA affiliates that are labeled "professional organizations" in non-bargaining states, the NEA and the AFT were concerned during most of the post-war era with bread and butter issues. However, they, too, detected the changing political winds of the late 1970s and early 1980s. Although their initial reactions to the early reform initiatives were somewhat different particularly with respect to merit pay, both organizations quickly mobilized local and state members to address other issues raised by the reports.²⁰⁵

The ways in which these issues were addressed predictably varied. The NEA, an unwieldy bureaucracy at best, reflected the sharp divisions within its ranks by adopting relatively conservative positions, at least with respect to education issues. In 1984 it made public its response to A Nation at Risk and Action for Excellence when the NEA Blue Ribbon Task Force on Educational Excellence issued An Open Letter to America on Schools, Students, and Tomorrow.²⁰⁶

Borrowing the language of Boyer, Goodlad, andSizer, the report declared that "our nation's schools must be totally restructured if they are to meet the needs of our students and our rapidly changing society."²⁰⁷ Formal education should begin earlier. It should be supplemented with "numerous off-campus learning opportunities."²⁰⁸ Expectations must and will increase. Teachers must interact with fewer students in a collegial setting in which the hierarchical structure that we now associated with schools did not exist. Mastery, not a passing grade, must become the goal of students and teachers. Schools would be organized to enhance flexibility, granting teachers more autonomy to meet individual needs. Districts must set and enforce strict standards of discipline as well as provide the services necessary to assist troubled youngsters to develop the skills required to function in classrooms. Salaries must be comparable to those in other professions. The Open Letter was long on rhetoric and somewhat short on specifics. A few of the issues it raised, such as the emphasis on behavior management, reflected distinctly teacher-oriented concerns. Some issues reflected the union tradition which had been built since 1945, such as the assertion that better educational quality could become part of a bargaining agreement.

But the NEA did not rest on its national report as a response to the prospect of legislated reform. Almost every state affiliate convened a blue ribbon panel and authored a report. Arizona's report, entitled A Call to Excellence, demanded higher standards, increased support systems, lower class sizes, better recruitment and retention of able teachers, and increased funding.²⁰⁹ Delaware's The Challenge for Educational Excellence called for strengthening the curriculum, providing specific requirements for graduation, tying extra-curricular participation to academic performance, expanding the state's kindergarten program, requiring greater teacher involvement in school decisions, reducing class size, establishing and enforcing discipline codes, eliminating

unnecessary classroom interruptions, limiting non-instructional duties for teachers, and raising salaries. In all the Delaware State Education Association suggested 119 recommendations in only 22 pages.²¹⁰ Idaho's NEA affiliate issued A Vision of Excellence in January, 1984. It recommended better preservice training, better staff development, an evaluation system formative in nature, better compensation, a comprehensive education program available to all students, more autonomy for teachers and more voice in decisions which relate to classroom practice, higher standards and minimum standards for advancement, and enhanced relations between the home and school.²¹¹ Ohio's Achieving Excellence in Education, Washington's Reducing the Risk: Educational Renewal for Washington's Future, Alaska's Profile for Excellence, and Colorado's The Profession Speaks reflected in title and content the same concerns and remarkably similar remedies.²¹² The operant words were "better" and "more," comparative modifiers removed from the present only by degree.

The NEA also addressed issues related to preservice training. Its 1982 report, Excellence in Our Schools: Teacher Education, was a recapitulation of general practice considered good and reflected their active involvement in the National Council for Accreditation of Teacher Education (NCATE).²¹³ Its response to the problems associated with preparation programs after the publication of the Holmes and Carnegie Reports was more colorful, more amenable to catchy quotations for the afternoon newspapers, and conscious of the links between preservice and conditions in schools. Teachers for Tomorrow had a decidedly late wave reform character. For example, "the school building" should be "the fundamental unit of education renewal." "Teachers should become better involved in all matters that affect the quality of instruction." "Collegiality" is "crucial to effective schools."²¹⁴ "Schools need to be evaluated as

learning environments because the way a school is organized and supported can decisively affect teacher performance."²¹⁵

And following the successes of the AFT to move toward actual restructuring, rather than paper wishes, the NEA began to support programs which reflected initiatives it had recommended. It established a Mastery in Learning pilot project and network, followed by a Team Approach to Better Schools (TABS) program. In 1990 it created the Center for Innovation to monitor those programs and its Learning Lab project, which sought to identify one school district per state to serve as a lighthouse system for innovative, teacher-led efforts.²¹⁶ By providing some seed money, human resources, and opportunities for collaborative training, the NEA is hoping to attract the visibility that Al Shanker has given the American Federation of Teachers.

The AFT, long linked to the mainstream union movement, remained more conservative on social issues than the NEA of the 1970s. At the same time it became more responsive to the shifting tides of educational reform waves.

The message communicated by the AFT leadership was that the:

... goals of the excellence movement were sound (indeed, virtually identical to the AFT's own objectives), that the entry of powerful new participants into the education policy debate was welcome, and that educators should at least be willing to engage in serious conversation with anyone who wished to improve the schools and had ideas and resources for doing so.²¹⁷

The method used by the American Federation of Teachers was the contract. In Dade County, Florida, in Rochester, New York, and in Boston, Massachusetts, the AFT placed reform issues on the table and negotiated them into the language of the bargaining agreement. Negotiations transcended the bread and butter issues which had characterized collective bargaining in the 1960s and 1970s. In addition to salary and some working

conditions complaints, language on restructuring and curricular issues were written to forge collaborative efforts to improve schools.²¹⁸

Shanker himself became a frequent conference speaker. He published in major journals. He served on national panels. He became an insistent voice for the need to change dramatically our schools. "Desperate measures already abound."²¹⁹ "Developing the capacity for self-renewal in public education will be neither simple nor painless, but we have no choice about changing."²²⁰ "The question is not whether there will be changes. The question is whether changes will be done to us by others or led by us."²²¹ "We in public education will either change the schools, or public education will be changed for us. Public education will either improve or be destroyed."²²²

The two major teacher organizations were not the only professional associations which sought to be one with the education change-makers. What we should teach and who should make those decisions resulted in a debate among curriculum specialists. Linda McNeil identified three factors fueling that debate:

These forces include the increasing power of testing and of standardized models of accountability to determine curriculum; the pressure of 'cultural literacy'; and the school restructuring movement, which can have the effect of subordinating the curriculum to organizational factors in the school.²²³

Two additional elements contributed to the arguments specialty areas advanced for a place in the K-12 course of study: (1) the power of science, mathematics, and technology to attract funding and, consequently, opportunities for constant revision of curriculum options, and (2) attempts by the traditional "have-nots" of the standard curriculum, such as the arts, to assert their "new basics" credentials. So, although standardized testing tends to ensure the place of communication and computational skills and cultural literacy provides history and literature with the aura of legitimacy, the

various specialty associations, those linked with specific disciplines sought to establish their credentials, through the development of redesign task force reports.

Equity and Excellence: Compatible Goals is typical of research projects which contained curriculum implications which led to recommended changes either in the discipline proper or in the schools. Completed in 1984, it surveyed exemplary science and mathematics programs which facilitated increased access and success of females and minorities. Among the characteristics of those programs and, by implication, the characteristics that all schools should strive to emulate were: a high, consistent academic orientation rather than either enrichment or remediation; competent and skilled teachers; hands-on opportunities; integrated programs rather than narrow, discipline-specific courses; and co-operation from higher education.²²⁴ Also typical was the American Chemical Society's What Drives Chemistry Curricula?. That short report (10 pages) concluded with 28 specific recommendations. Among them were: support for improved working conditions for science teachers, continuing education opportunities, better preservice education, new curricular materials, emphasis on laboratory-based instruction and assessments rather than multiple choice standardized tests, and improved uses of technology in the classroom.²²⁵

Mathematics, perhaps because of the ease with which we can measure it, received considerable attention during the post-Sputnik era of curriculum activities and that attention returned in the 1980s. John Paulos attached the state of mathematics education to the E.D. Hirsch star when he penned Innumeracy: Mathematical Illiteracy and Its Consequences.²²⁶ In 1987 The Mathematics Report Card reviewed four national assessments taken over a span of thirteen years. Its authors concluded that our students knew less math, took fewer advanced math classes, did less homework, and could solve problems requiring multiple steps less well than could youngsters from other

industrialized countries. The report concluded that "the absence of innovative instructional approaches is cause for concern," as is the infrequent use of typical mathematical tools, like calculators, in the classroom. "Overemphasis on basic skills may leave students unprepared for more advanced skills."²²⁷ In 1989 the National Council of Teachers of Mathematics produced Curriculum and Evaluation Standards for School Mathematics, which called for "dramatic changes . . . in the way mathematics is taught."²²⁸ In that same year the National Research Council issued Everybody Counts: A Report to the Nation on the Future of Mathematics Education. The Council recommended national mathematics standards. "Teacher professionalism must be strengthened."²²⁹ Standardized tests should be aligned to the new standards. Students should study math every year that they are in school. Homework should be routine. Additional resources should be available. Business and industry should refrain from "steal[ing] teachers by hiring them away" from classrooms. Governments should reward exemplary programs.²³⁰

An indication of the attention received by mathematics and the sciences was the plethora of reports which specifically addressed those program areas. For example, within a seven year span the following task force products were published: A Report on the Crisis in Mathematics and Science Education: What Can Be Done Now?; Education in the Sciences: A Developing Crisis; Tomorrow: The Report of the Task Force for the Study of Chemistry Education; Recommendations on the Mathematical Preparation of Teachers; New Goals for Mathematical Science Education; Stories of Excellence: Ten Case Studies from a Study of Exemplary Mathematics Programs; And Gladly Teach: A Ford Foundation Report on Urban Mathematics Collaboratives; The Secondary School Mathematics Curriculum; School Mathematics in the 1990s; Teachers; The Underachieving Curriculum; Assessing U.S. School Mathematics from an International

Perspective; Priorities of School Mathematics; Educating Americans for the 21st Century; Educating Scientists and Engineers. Grade School to Grade School; School Mathematics: Options for the 1990s; Teaching Teachers. Teaching Students: Reflections on Mathematical Education; and Developments in School Mathematics Education Around the World.²³¹ By the end of the decade so many projects had been underwritten that a book devoted exclusively to a review of reform efforts in those specialty areas was available.²³²

The Educational Testing Service supported efforts by specialty groups somewhat indirectly by preparing a series of discipline-specific report cards for the Department of Education.²³³ The National Endowment for the Humanities published Toward Civilization: A Report on Arts Education in 1988 which found that the "condition of arts education is no worse now than it has been."²³⁴ That was the good news; the bad news was that its condition had always been mediocre. The National Endowment proposed remedying the situation by requiring that 15% of all instruction time in grades K-8 be devoted to the study of some aspect of the arts and that all high school students complete at least two units in the arts before being allowed to graduate. The Fall, 1988, issue of The Educational Forum was devoted to the need for dance education.²³⁵ Specialists complained of the trivialization of the social studies program and demanded curricular changes.²³⁶ Vocational education teachers complained of being considered practitioners of a periphery subject area and wanted more time in the curriculum. A national commission argued for "an expanded and stronger role for vocational education within the secondary school" and there were widespread efforts to include required vocational components within the middle school curriculum.²³⁷

In addition to the efforts of specialists to make educational changes, advocates of particular organizational divisions also issued critiques and recommendations. William

Bennett's First Lessons: A Report on Elementary Education in America was one example of those efforts.²³⁸ So, too, was Bennett's What Works: Research about Teaching and Learning, which served as a companion volume for First Lessons.²³⁹ No group is capable of the evangelical fervor of middle school proponents. The National Association of Secondary School Principals produced both a theoretical position paper, Developing a Mission Statement for the Middle Level School, and a set of recommendations, An Agenda for Excellence at the Middle Level.²⁴⁰ And the Carnegie Foundation sponsored the study which led to Turning Points: Preparing American Youth for the 21st Century, which spawned a number of similar state reports by middle school leagues.²⁴¹

But the profession did not run the educational reform engine in the 1980s. The teachers of teachers, classroom practitioners, unions, and specialty groups were the subjects of state deliberations, rather than the initiators of such deliberations. The statehouses controlled the education reform agenda. Although A Nation at Risk received more publicity than any other early report, it was Jim Hunt's Action for Excellence that framed the skeleton of the education agendas pushed by the nation's governors.

By 1984 newspapers were regularly reporting state legislation drafted and passed as a response to the reports of the national commissions. The Columbus, Ohio, Dispatch, for example, noted that as of August 7, 1984, 46 states had or were in the process of designing comprehensive education improvement plans, 13 states had merit pay or career ladder efforts underway, 44 states had introduced stiffer graduation requirements, and 39 states had begun curriculum reform efforts.²⁴² The Wichita, Kansas, Eagle-Beacon declared "good" the efforts by the state's governor to remain "willing to lead education reform."²⁴³ The Massachusetts chief state school officer claimed that positive changes had occurred as "a response to state pressure on local officials."²⁴⁴ The Indianapolis News announced that by 1984 there existed "50

laboratories seeking different solutions and remedies to the complicated problems facing education."²⁴⁵ Those laboratories turned to legislation to set the parameters of their experiments.

For example, California's Senate Bill 813, passed in 1984, was described as "the most comprehensive reform legislation in the recent history of United States education."²⁴⁶ The law identified course requirements for specific subjects, set requirements for college entry, established student achievement standards and required staff development. It increased high school graduation requirements, lengthened the school day and year, established tighter discipline procedures, provided an incentive program for teachers, made dismissal of poorly performing teachers easier, and provided new money for public schools. Given that California has sometimes led other states in finding reform directions, the expansion of state control into areas once considered the province of local boards of education was significant. Bill Honig, state superintendent in California, noted that passage of S.B. 813 came as a result of the help of educators, a bi-partisan coalition of community leaders, and "strong legislative and gubernatorial sponsorship."²⁴⁷ Honig recognized that significant changes were necessary to prevent even more drastic alternatives.

The risks of undertaking reforms . . . are great, but the risk of doing nothing is greater. For if we fail to improve the performance of our schools, we invite voucher plans as alternative methods of educating our young. Public schools have always been the backbone of our democracy. I would hate for our generation of educators to be the one that lost its nerve, forgot its roots, and presided over the demise of public education. That would be a calamity from which the nation might never recover.²⁴⁸

Both the sense of urgency and the depth of change required to alter the course of our nation's schools were not unique to Honig or California.

Paul Berman, in a review of Minnesota's 1985 comprehensive education reform legislation, identified six general "structural flaws" in the American education system. Comprehensive high schools "are asked to do too much and are over-regulated." Students are tracked. Teachers are so overburdened that they "cannot spend enough time with each student." Principals have only limited authority. Superintendents "find it difficult to run their districts efficiently." Parents lack ways to hold schools accountable for the education of their children.²⁴⁹ To resolve these difficulties the state legislature passed reforms known collectively as the Minnesota Plan, included in which was a provision for ten demonstration sites which would develop restructured schools.

Burnes and Lindner concluded that the 1983 attention to schooling represented a "small window of opportunity" for educational reform. But if states did not move quickly to begin, implement, and demonstrate positive results from such change efforts then they would once again be shut.²⁵⁰ Anderson and Odden believed that state support for reform initiatives was crucial. Surveying previous efforts, they discovered that states could apply significant pressure for changes through testing programs. They also concluded that projects which had the support of the governor and the legislature tended to expand. Moreover, the state was in the best position to find sufficient funds to support major school improvement attempts.²⁵¹ Salganik also found that state testing programs were catalysts to improvement efforts in local districts.²⁵² Farrar and Flakus-Mosqueda found that a number of states had adopted significant school improvement policies, although the degree of money available to make those policies realities varied.²⁵³ Fuhrman, Huddlen, and Armstrong summarized what by 1986 was a decided trend in public education. "Today state governments are making -- and state agencies are carrying out -- policy in areas that used to be handled solely by local school boards." They are doing that even though "evidence that increasing the number of regulations and

procedures often increased bureaucratization rather than school effectiveness, and despite evidence that school improvement is best accomplished at the building level." Yet they seem to be achieving positive results.²⁵⁴ Kirst, on the other hand, warned that we should not rush to judgment in evaluating new state reform efforts. He also suggested that part of our analysis of results should include an analysis of degree of implementation of the external state-required reforms.²⁵⁵

Before the first spate of state reforms had a chance to change schools, the governors sought to sustain the momentum generated by Action for Excellence by publishing the 1986 equivalent of that report. Entitled Time for Results: The Governors' 1991 Report on Education, it contained the recommendations of seven task forces. Those separate panels, led and filled by governors, dealt with teaching, leadership, parental involvement and choice, readiness, technology, facilities, and college quality. Each task force issued a summary of current state efforts at reform, a set of recommendations, obstacles which must be overcome, ways to measure results, and sources consulted in formulating the recommendations. A total of 65 different suggestions were listed, many with sub-sections of additional specific recommendations. The report committed the National Governors Association to reporting annually, between 1986 and 1991, on its progress toward implementing its agenda.

On teaching the task force advocated supporting the creation of a national certification board, adopting state reforms which professionalized the workplace, improving teacher education, implementing comprehensive recruitment plans, ending emergency teaching certificates, recognizing outstanding teachers, developing sustained funding programs, finding times and places in which educators can be heard, and setting up state-operated technical intervention programs.²⁵⁶ To improve school leadership the governors recommended revising the selection, certification, evaluation, and

education of administrators. New reward systems for administrators should be tied to school effectiveness. And, one of the more interesting suggestions, we should "be patient and remain committed," an implicit acknowledgement that change was not an overnight phenomenon.²⁵⁷ Several recommendations addressed ways to increase parental participation. One called for expanded opportunities for parental choice.²⁵⁸ To promote readiness to learn, the task force called for extra help in basic skills for students with deficiencies, employment of effective schools practices, provision of a challenging curriculum for everyone, early intervention programs, kindergarten for everyone, pre-K programs for disadvantaged youngsters, developmentally appropriate instructional practices in lower grades, rewards for schools which are able to help parents serve as their child's first teachers, reduction of class sizes, and provision for alternative schools for high-school drop-outs.²⁵⁹ To encourage the use of technology, all districts should develop written plans for that use, require teachers to be technologically sophisticated, establish continuous up-grading of staff skills, and help create consortiums. The national government should establish a technology institute modeled after the National Science Foundation.²⁶⁰ Districts should make more efficient use of buildings, including adaptation of year-round calendars. They are responsible for providing adequate, safe environments for student learning.²⁶¹ And colleges must reemphasize quality undergraduate education programs.²⁶²

Joe Nathan, reviewing the report for the November, 1986, Phi Delta Kappan, which also featured summaries of the work of the seven task forces by their chairs, claimed that it provided "historic opportunities for the nation's educators."²⁶³ Nathan saw the report as a partial response to concerns raised during the first wave of reform. He noted that "the governors are willing to provide greater discretion to educators" as long as those educators "are ready to take responsibility for outcomes."²⁶⁴ Lamar

Alexander, in reviewing the efforts of the National Governors' Association in preparing the report, observed that the governors had decided to increase their involvement because "without their leadership, most of what needs to be done won't get done."²⁶⁵ Lamenting that many of the earlier reform efforts resulted in conflicts with practitioners, he hoped that Time for Results could forge "a new compact" with the profession.²⁶⁶

At the 1987 annual meeting the governors reviewed programs inaugurated during the year following the release of Time for Results.²⁶⁷ In 1988 that review focused on the depth of change necessary to meet the demands of the future. To respond to new challenges, argued the report's author, "will require a fundamental restructuring of schools." That restructuring will require shifting "decision-making authority and responsibility to the school site." States "must significantly strengthen their efforts to set educational goals and assess performance, to stimulate local diversity and experimentation, and to provide rewards and sanctions linked to school performance."²⁶⁸ The 1989 report looked at successful restructuring efforts in "pioneering districts." It identified the implications of those programs for states.

State leadership in restructuring education requires aligning restructuring with the goals and language of state mandates about curriculum, special programs, and accountability. If state curricular goals emphasize basic skills and factual knowledge instead of problem solving and conceptual skills, there will be little room for schools to change what they do. If state programs are regulated in ways that result in fragmented, compliance driven services for students, districts and schools will not have the flexibility to adapt these extra resources in ways that strengthen the entire educational program for targeted students.²⁶⁹

The shift in emphasis found in Time for Results meant that Nation at Risk and even Action for Excellence regulations could ultimately inhibit, rather than enhance, school improvement efforts.

Arthur Wise, looking backward on nearly a decade of legislated reform, also had some reservations about directions and results. "No common vision . . . has guided reform." "We must distinguish between the rhetoric of reform . . . and its reality."²⁷⁰

Two conflicting trends are evident in the last decade. The first, stemming from a long-term distrust of boards of education and educators, is the continuing effort by the states to consolidate control over local school districts and local educators. The second, an assertion of power by educators and some policy makers, is a return to the classical conservative view that educational decisions, like other political and economic decisions, are best made closest to the people to be served. Advancing the trend toward state control are most so-called "education governors" and legislators, some Reagan Administration "conservatives," and others who champion the incorporation of dubious schemes of scientific management into state education policy. Advancing the trend toward client control are some elected officials, teacher organizations, parents, and others who believe that the cognitive and affective needs and interests of school children are not standardized.²⁷¹

Wise concluded that the decade represented a trend toward state control. Thomas Timar and David Kirp, in a similar review, concluded that "the states had generated more rules and regulations about all aspects of education" from 1983 through 1988 "than in the previous 20 years."²⁷² And those previous 20 years had not been uneventful in terms of education activities. Yet for all of those efforts "achieving meaningful school reform is an art that few state policy makers have mastered."²⁷³

But it is not an art they undertook to master without help. A Nation at Risk linked our economic difficulties to our educational problems. It was a linkage supported by business and industry, who became enthusiastic advocates for educational reform. One of the most obvious aspects of that involvement was the comparison begun early in the decade of America's schools with those of Japan, often set within the context of recent American economic failures and Japanese economic successes. That latter comparison focused on differences in the ways Americans and Japanese ran their businesses, which led to looking at ways to incorporate those differences in schools. Kirst, for instance,

noted in 1981 that "the Japanese education system is much better equipped than its U.S. counterpart to produce workers . . . that the economy of the future will require."²⁷⁴ And "we ignore the future economic impact of Japan upon the U.S. at our peril."²⁷⁵ The popularity of Theory Z, a description of the co-operative participatory management style found in Japan, quickly generated attention from educators as they sought to apply its lessons to classrooms and schools.²⁷⁶ Paul George's Theory Z School: Beyond Effectiveness is but one example of those efforts.²⁷⁷

In 1985 the Research and Policy Committee of the Committee for Economic Development (CED) published Investing in Our Children: Business and the Public Schools.²⁷⁸ The committee included senior managers from such major companies as Conoco, Exxon, Proctor & Gamble, McGraw-Hill, General Electric, Aetna, and Dow Chemical. They identified the skills and attitudes that students needed for success in the workplace, offered suggestions on those strategies which would "have the greatest payoff for students and for society," recommended steps to improve teaching and education administration, and proposed new ways that businesses and schools could become partners.²⁷⁹ Calling for the implementation of "ten imperatives" for schools, they concluded that only "bottom-up efforts would be successful."²⁸⁰

Among their specific recommendations were: curriculum reform that stressed communication skills; introduction of higher achievement standards in high schools; continuation of state-sponsored standardized testing programs to monitor that achievement; more involvement by families and businesses in schools; deemphasis on vocational education programs which focus on particular job skills at the expense of competence in academic areas; emphasis on early childhood education; increased salaries for teachers and performance-based bonuses; introduction of career ladders; employment of paraprofessionals to assume non-teaching duties educators now perform;

more autonomy and accountability for individual schools; and increased selectivity and training in preservice programs.²⁸¹ The authors of Investing in Our Children urged businessmen to become more active participants in their local schools, including aggressively seeking positions on school boards.²⁸² As Denis Doyle and Marsha Levine, who served as the principle authors for the CED report, concluded, "today's high-tech firms are not served by old organizational forms . . . [nor] are the needs of today's schools."²⁸³

During the years since the CED report major businesses and industries have begun to reach out to schools, as have their smaller counterparts on the local level. Adopt-a-School programs, mentorships, and projects directed at addressing the educational needs of students most likely to drop out of schools and, consequently, least likely to have the requisite skills for employment in the information age workplace appeared throughout the country.²⁸⁴ Some businesses piloted summer internships for teachers, providing them with a salaried introduction to the requirements of modern offices and factories.²⁸⁵ Commentators addressed the lessons even colleges of education could learn from new business practices.²⁸⁶ Other companies designed collaborative programs which featured the free use of their products, such as Apple Computer pilot projects, produced rewards for effective teachers, such as the annual meeting of state teachers of the year sponsored by Burger King or the Reader's Digest program, or established grants to support innovative practices, such as the recently established efforts by R.J. Reynolds-Nabisco and Coca-Cola.

But such efforts did not stem the tide of gloomy comparisons with Japan or other economic competitors. Merry White, using the martial spirit favored by A Nation at Risk, described a nation "mobilized for schooling" in her 1987 publication The Japanese Educational Challenge: A Commitment to Children.²⁸⁷ David Kearns, chief executive

officer of Xerox, and Denis Doyle looked at that challenge and demanded that "we have a new view of public education" in Winning the Brain Race: A Bold Plan to Make Our Schools Competitive.²⁸⁸ They began with the statement that "public education in this country is in crisis," a phrase reflective of the Bell Commission's 1983 declaration of war. However, between 1983 and 1988 there had been many attempts to address that crisis, apparently, in the eyes of Kearns and Doyle, to little avail.²⁸⁹ Kearns declared that failure the result of educators setting the reform agenda. "The new agenda . . . will be driven by competition and market disciplines."²⁹⁰ It must encompass choice programs and restructuring that will leave schools autonomous and open throughout the year. Performance-based salaries will be part of a compensation package for teachers, whose entry into the profession must now focus on academic preparation rather than pedagogy. Rigorous academic standards will be required for all students and youngsters must maintain a "C" average in all subjects to be eligible to participate in extra-curricular activities. All schools will incorporate a focused emphasis on democratic values in the basics of the 1990s.

Those themes were echoed in a special BusinessWeek edition entitled Endangered Species: Children of Promise also authored by Doyle.

Business is involved in education in countless ways . . . for only one reason: the bottom line. No longer are philanthropy and altruism the issues; they are important, but not primary. Business is interested today because long-term profitability depends on it. Education is the source of economic growth and prosperity; it is the foundation of our ability to compete in a changing world economy. Without an educated work force America will be left behind.

Understandably, the pace of education reform and restructuring across the nation has been uneven; examples of significant change and improvement are to be found in many communities. Taken together, however, they have been lamentably slow in coming. By any measure, we still lag far behind the competition. Most European schools are superior, and Japanese schools are far superior, to American schools.²⁹¹

The solution, according to Doyle, is "a call to action" on the part of the business community. It must assume leadership of reform and restructuring, because "no one else will."²⁹²

Fortune magazine devoted a special issue in the spring of 1990 to education, stressing the economic importance of schools, a persistent theme in the commentaries of businesses and industries.²⁹³ Many states established task forces to study their schools from the perspective of the workplace and to prepare educational recommendations. For example, in 1990 in North Carolina the Governor's Commission on Workforce Preparedness issued The Skills Crisis in the Workplace: A Strategic Response for Economic Development. That group recommended elimination of all general track courses in high schools, increased graduation requirements, a shift in the compulsory school exit age from 16 to 18, the connection of satisfactory school performance to eligibility for a driver's license and a work permit, enhanced leadership participation in education by businesses and industries, expanded and more effective community college programs, expanded and more effective adult literacy programs, and the establishment of a permanent commission on workforce preparedness.²⁹⁴ Marvin Cetron and Owen Davies, authors of the best-seller American Renaissance: Our Life at the Turn of the Century, entitled their chapter on American schools "A Nation of Dunces?." They, too, stressed the economic importance of restructured schools.²⁹⁵

Like the later efforts of the National Governors Association, businesses emphasized redesigning our educational system in significant ways. Participatory management, teacher empowerment, and site-based decision-making became fundamental vocabulary for third wave reformers. Patricia Cross called teachers "the linchpins of education reform."²⁹⁶ Reforms made without considering their needs, without providing them with a degree of autonomy, would fail, just as hierarchical,

bureaucratic, regulation-bound industries had given way to Japanese competitors. Jack Frymier concluded that attracting and training the best and the brightest students for careers in education might prove insufficient, if the work stations to which we sent them continued as they currently were. Frymier argued that we must empower teachers, rather than "create conditions of work that blunt their enthusiasm and stifle their creativity."²⁹⁷ In 1988 Gene Maeroff published The Empowerment of Teachers: Overcoming the Crisis of Confidence.²⁹⁸ Maeroff, like Cross and Frymier, believed that we must re-establish an element of trust in our practitioners and give them "the power to do their job as well as they can."²⁹⁹ Linda McNeil observed that:

Good teaching can't be engineered into existence. But an engineering approach to schooling can crowd out good teaching. Instead of holding up a variety of models for practice and learning from their strength, these reforms continue our historically flawed search for "one best way" to run our schools. These reforms take a cynical view of teachers' ability to contribute constructively to schooling; they choose to make the content, the assessment of students, and the decisions about pedagogy all teacher-proof, so that a standardized model will become the norm.³⁰⁰

The push for autonomy for teachers extended, in the literature, to a call for more autonomy for administrators.³⁰¹ Paradoxically, although business advocated a bottom-up, restructured approach to change, it also clearly demonstrated that it mistrusted educators and believed it must assume the leadership role.

By the end of the decade the number of books and early reports on the revitalization potential of restructuring was growing exponentially. Joyce, Hersch, and McKibbin's The Structure of School Improvement introduced the concept of redefining schooling in the same year that A Nation at Risk was published.³⁰² Roland Barth's Improving Schools from Within presented the case for unlocking the human potential already residing within buildings, empowering teachers, administrators, and parents with responsibility for and control over resources to create change.³⁰³ In 1988 the

National Association of State Boards of Education issued Today's Children, Tomorrow's Survival: A Call to Restructure Schools.³⁰⁴ Anne Lewis, writing on behalf of the American Association of School Administrators, presented a comprehensive review of restructuring in 1989, noting that a coherent consensus on precisely what was meant by that term had yet to appear.³⁰⁵ Walberg and Lane edited a series of articles for the Curriculum Council of the National Association of Secondary School Principals, all of which advocated restructured settings, curricula, or methods of teaching and learning.³⁰⁶ By 1991 one could find a how to do it manual on empowering schools.³⁰⁷

We began this chapter with reformers calling for a new spirit of collaboration to begin the decade of the eighties; we end with the business community advocating new partnerships. We began with a need for higher academic standards, better trained teachers, and continued efforts to help the educationally disadvantaged. Nearly ten years later we had those same needs.

The 1980s did not find new problems to explore in the nation's schools. It quantified old ones, and dressed them in the rhetoric of alarm. Nor did new solutions emerge, although by the end of the decade it was obvious that remedies would have to address structural issues. We were, at least in our language, moving away from remodeling the current organization to considering ways to redefine it. But often what actually became policy was internally contradictory, inadequately funded, and rarely sustained over a sufficient number of years to assess adequately its impact on student learning. Schools received considerable attention in Reagan's America, but they did not seem much better at the end of the decade than they were at the beginning. To explore why they remained resistant to changes we must first explore the phenomenon of change itself.

CHAPTER THREE

FOOTNOTES

¹A. Harry Passow, Secondary Education Reform: Retrospect and Prospect (New York: Teachers College, Columbia University Press, 1976), p. 52.

²A. Harry Passow, "Tackling the Reform Reports of the 1980s," Phi Delta Kappan 65 (June 1984): 682.

³Raymond F. Reisler, "An Education Agenda for the Eighties," Phi Delta Kappan 62 (February 1981): 413.

⁴Ibid.

⁵Ibid., p. 414.

⁶Ibid., pp. 413-414, 435 passim.

⁷Joseph O. Milner, "English in the Eighties: A Global Projection," Phi Delta Kappan 62 (February 1981): 415.

⁸Robert D. Barr, "Alternatives for the Eighties: A Second Decade of Development," Phi Delta Kappan 62 (April 1981): 571.

⁹James S. Coleman, "Quality and Equality in American Education: Public and Catholic Schools," Phi Delta Kappan 63 (November 1981): 163.

¹⁰See, for example, James S. Coleman, "Public Schools, Private Schools, and the Public Interest," The Public Interest (Summer 1981): 19-30.

¹¹Robert Ebel, "Three Radical Proposals for Strengthening Education," Phi Delta Kappan 63 (February 1982): 375.

¹²Gary D. Fenstermacher, "Three Nonradical Proposals for Strengthening Ebel's Argument," Phi Delta Kappan 63 (February 1982): 380.

¹³David Tyack and Elisabeth Hansot, "Hard Times, Hard Choices: The Case for Coherence in Public School Leadership," Phi Delta Kappan 63 (April 1982): 511. For an expanded view of the evaluation of school leadership, see Tyack and Hansot, Managers of Virtue (New York: Basic Books, 1982). They elaborate the argument about the difficulty of making certain decisions in David Tyack, Robert Lowe, and Elisabeth Hansot,

Public Schools in Hard Times: The Great Depression and Recent Years (Cambridge, Massachusetts: Harvard University Press, 1984).

¹⁴Tyack and Hansot, "Hard Times, Hard Choices," p. 514.

¹⁵Arthur Wise, Legislated Learning: The Bureaucratization of the American Classroom (Berkeley, California: University of California Press, 1979).

¹⁶G.T. Sewall, "Against Anomie and Amnesia: What Basic Education Means in the Eighties," Phi Delta Kappan 63 (May 1982): 604. For an expanded version of that argument, see Sewall, Necessary Lessons: Decline and Renewal in American Schools (New York: The Free Press, 1983).

¹⁷Sewall, "Against Anomie," p. 606.

¹⁸Ibid., pp. 605-606 passim.

¹⁹Hendrik D. Gideonse, "The Necessary Revolution in Teacher Education," Phi Delta Kappan 64 (September 1982): 15.

²⁰Ibid., p. 17.

²¹Hans N. Weiler, "Education, Public Confidence, and the Legitimacy of the Modern State: Do We Have a Crisis?," Phi Delta Kappan 64 (September 1982): 10.

²²Ibid., p. 14. Weiler uses data gathered by the Gallup Poll of the Public's Attitudes Toward the Public Schools and the National Opinion Research Center to support his crisis of confidence argument.

²³Michael W. Kirst, "How to Improve Schools: Without Spending More Money," Phi Delta Kappan 64 (September 1982): 6-7.

²⁴Passow, "Tackling the Reform Reports," p. 74.

²⁵George R. Kaplan, "Some Cranky Fulminations on Reagan and Education," Phi Delta Kappan 63 (May 1982): 590.

²⁶Ibid., p. 593.

²⁷Jack H. Schuster, "Out of the Frying Pan: The Politics of Education in a New Era," Phi Delta Kappan 63 (May 1982): 583.

²⁸Ibid., p. 586.

²⁹Ibid., p. 587.

17. ³⁰Chester E. Finn, Jr., "Toward a New Consensus," Change (September 1981):

³¹Schuster, "Out of the Frying Pan," p. 589.

³²Ellie McGrath, "To Stem 'A Tide of Mediocrity'," Time (9 May 1983): 63.

³³*ibid.*

³⁴*ibid.*

³⁵Dennis Williams, et. al., "Can the Schools Be Saved?," Newsweek (9 May 1983): 58.

³⁶McGrath, "To Stem 'A Tide'," p. 62.

³⁷National Commission on Excellence in Education, A Nation at Risk: The Imperative for Educational Reform (Washington, D.C.: Government Printing Office, 1983), p. 1.

³⁸*ibid.*, p. 5.

³⁹*ibid.*, p. 6.

⁴⁰*ibid.*, p. 11.

⁴¹*ibid.*, p. 12.

⁴²*ibid.*, p. 13.

⁴³*ibid.*, p. 15.

⁴⁴*ibid.*, pp. 18-23 *passim*.

⁴⁵*ibid.*, pp. 24-33 *passim*. Actually the report concluded with an admonition that "America can do it" and notes to parents and to students. Both of those "notes" were unctuous in tone and contributed little to the report except possibly a sense of satisfaction for erstwhile preachers. See *ibid.*, pp. 33-36.

⁴⁶Task Force on Education for Economic Growth, Action for Excellence: A Comprehensive Plan to Improve Our Nation's Schools (Denver, Colorado: Education Commission of the States, 1983), p. 3.

⁴⁷*ibid.*

⁴⁸*ibid.*, p. 4.

⁴⁹Ibid., pp. 10-11.

⁵⁰Ibid., p. 31.

⁵¹Ibid., p. 32.

⁵²Ibid., p. 35.

⁵³Ibid., p. 38.

⁵⁴Ibid., pp. 34-41 passim.

⁵⁵Terrel Bell, "American Education at a Crossroads," Phi Delta Kappan 65 (April 1984): 531.

⁵⁶James B. Hunt, Jr., "Education for Economic Growth: A Critical Investment," Phi Delta Kappan 65 (April 1984): 539.

⁵⁷Ibid.

⁵⁸Ibid., p. 541.

⁵⁹Ernest L. Boyer, "Reflections on the Great Debate of '83," Phi Delta Kappan 65 (April 1984): see particularly 527-529.

⁶⁰Louis Rubin, "Formulating Education Policy in the Aftermath of the Report," Educational Leadership 42 (October 1984): 9.

⁶¹Allan Odden and Eleanor Odden, "Education Reform, School Improvement, and State Policy," Educational Leadership 42 (October 1984): 17.

⁶²See also Allan Odden, Education Finance in the States: 1984 (Denver, Colorado: Education Commission of the States, 1984).

⁶³Joseph Murphy, Richard P. Mesa, and Phillip Hallinger, "a Stronger State Role in School Reform," Educational Leadership 42 (October 1984): note particularly 23-26. Daniel P. Resnik and Lauren B. Resnick also advocated an active role for states. See Resnick and Resnick, "Improving Educational Standards in American Schools," Phi Delta Kappan 65 (November 1983): 180.

⁶⁴John C. Prash, "Reversing the Trend Toward Centralization," Educational Leadership 42 (October 1984): 27-29 passim.

⁶⁵Chester E. Finn, Jr., "Toward Strategic Independence: Nine Commandments for Enhancing School Effectiveness," Phi Delta Kappan 65 (April 1984): 519.

⁶⁶Robert Block, "We Already Know Our Problems Out Here in the Field," Phi Delta Kappan 65 (November 1983): 183.

⁶⁷Harold Howe, "Education Moves to Center Stage: An Overview of Recent Reports," Phi Delta Kappan 65 (November 1983): 171.

⁶⁸Harry N. Chandler, "Just Between Us Teachers," Phi Delta Kappan 65 (November 1983): 183.

⁶⁹*Ibid.*, p. 184.

⁷⁰Anne Lewis, "Presidents Don't Make Education Policy," Educational Leadership 42 (October 1984): 37.

⁷¹David L. Clark, Terry A. Astuto, and Paula M. Rooney, "The Changing Structure of Federal Education Policy in the 1980s," Phi Delta Kappan 65 (November 1983): 191.

⁷²John Hanrahan and Julie Kosterlitz, "Schools for Scandal," Common Cause 9 (September/October 1983): 17-25.

⁷³Meg Greenfield, Newsweek (16 May 1983):

⁷⁴Howe, "Education Moves to Center Stage," p. 172.

⁷⁵Ira Winn, "High School Reform: Stuffing the Turkeys," Phi Delta Kappan 65 (November 1983): 185.

⁷⁶Boyer, "Reflections," p. 530.

⁷⁷*Ibid.*, p. 529.

⁷⁸James E. Albrecht, "A Nation at Risk: Another View," Phi Delta Kappan 65 (June 1984): 685.

⁷⁹Thomas Toch, "The Dark Side of the Excellence Movement," Phi Delta Kappan 66 (November 1984): 176.

⁸⁰Allan A. Glatthorn, "Nine Proposals to Improve Our Health Care System," Phi Delta Kappan 65 (November 1983): 187.

⁸¹Winn, "High School Reform," p. 185.

⁸²Evans Clinchy, "Yes, But What About Irving Engleman?," Phi Delta Kappan 65 (April 1984): 542-545.

⁸³College Entrance Examination Board, Academic Preparation for College: What Students Need to Know and Be Able to Do (New York: College Board, 1983).

⁸⁴It was tempting in the early and mid-1980s to identify the various reports by the distinctive colors of their covers. In the case of Academic Preparation, the authors actually used the "green book" reference. The Bell Commission's report became known as the "blue book"; the Hunt Commission's contribution was called the "red book."

⁸⁵Adrienne Y. Bailey, "The Educational EQuality Project: Focus on Results," Phi Delta Kappan 65 (September 1983): 22-25. The two capital letters in EQuality represented the twin goals of the project: excellence and quality.

⁸⁶Twentieth Century Fund, Report of the Twentieth Century Fund Task Force on Federal and Secondary Education Policy (New York: Twentieth Century Fund, 1983). Some editions of this report carried the title by which it was commonly known: Making the Grade.

⁸⁷In addition to the report proper, see Patricia A. Graham, "The Twentieth Century Fund Task Force Report on Federal Elementary and Secondary Education Policy," Phi Delta Kappan 65 (September 1983): 19-21.

⁸⁸Business-Higher Education Forum, America's Competitive Challenge: The Need for a National Response (Washington, D.C.: Business-Higher Education Forum, 1983); National School Public Relations Association, Excellence: Your Guide to Action Now (Arlington, Virginia: National School Public Relations Association, 1983).

⁸⁹Education Commission of the States, A Summary of Major Reports on Education (Denver, Colorado: Education Commission of the States, 1983); Lynn Griesemer and Cornelius Butler, Education Under Study: An Analysis of Recent Major Reports on Education (Chelmsford, Massachusetts: Regional Exchange, Inc., 1984). The Northeast Regional Exchange analysis is reprinted in Beatrice and Ronald Gross, eds., The Great School Debate: Which Way for American Education? (New York: Touchstone Books, 1985).

⁹⁰Forum of Educational Organization Leaders, Educational Reform: A Response from Educational Leaders: Recommendations of the Forum of Educational Organization Leaders (Washington, D.C.: Institute for Educational Leadership, 1983). The executive summary of the Forum's report is printed in Gross, The Great School Debate, pp. 106-108. Members included the presidents and executive directors of the American Association of Colleges for Teacher-Education, American Association of School Administrators, American Federation of Teachers, Council of Chief State School Officers, Education Commission of the States, National Association of Elementary School Principals, National Association of Secondary School Principals, National Association of State Boards of Education, National Congress of Parents and Teachers, National Education Association, and National School Boards Association. Dennis Gray published a sharp attack of the report in Gray, "The Emperors Have No Clothes: Leaders Respond to Education Reports," Basic Education (December 1983).

⁹¹Forum of Educational Leaders, Educational Reform, printed in Gross, The Great School Debate, p. 108.

⁹²Gross, The Great School Debate.

⁹³Lawrence Stedman and Marshall Smith, "Recent Reform Proposals for American Education," Contemporary Education Review 2 (Fall 1983): 85-104.

⁹⁴Joel Spring, "Education and the Sony War," Phi Delta Kappan 65 (April 1984): 535.

⁹⁵Paul Peterson, "Did the Education Commissions Say Anything?," The Brookings Review (Winter 1983): 9.

⁹⁶Albrecht, "A Nation at Risk," p. 684.

⁹⁷A summary of the portraits of thirteen of those fifteen schools can be found in Vito Perrone, et. al., Portraits of High Schools: A Supplement to High School: A Report on Secondary Education in American (Lawrenceville, New Jersey: The Carnegie Foundation for the Advancement of Teaching, 1985).

⁹⁸Ernest Boyer, High School: A Report on Secondary Education in America (New York: Harper & Row, Publishers, 1983).

⁹⁹Dennis Williams, et. al., "R_x for High Schools," Newsweek (26 September 1983): 97.

¹⁰⁰Barbara Z. Presseisen, Unlearned Lessons: Current and Past Reforms for School Improvement (Philadelphia: The Falmer Press, 1985), p. 67. The reports she reviewed included: A Nation at Risk, Action for Excellence, The Paideia Proposal, Academic Preparation for College, Making the Grade, Educating Americans for the 21st Century, Horace's Compromise, and High School.

¹⁰¹Ibid.

¹⁰²Williams, "R_x for High Schools," p. 97.

¹⁰³Ernest Boyer, quoted in Dennis Williams, et. al., "Can the Schools Be Saved?," Newsweek (9 May 1983): 54.

¹⁰⁴Ernest L. Boyer, "In the Aftermath of Excellence," Educational Leadership 42 (March 1985): 11.

¹⁰⁵Boyer, High School, p. 297.

¹⁰⁶Ibid., pp. 301-311 passim.

¹⁰⁷Ibid., p. 1.

¹⁰⁸Ibid., p. 155.

¹⁰⁹Ibid., p. 185.

¹¹⁰Dennis Williams and Diane McDonald, "How to Reform the Schools," Newsweek (1 August 1983): 75.

¹¹¹Nelson Quinby, "Improving the Place Called School: A Conversation with John Goodlad," Educational Leadership 42 (March 1985): 16.

¹¹²Ibid. See also John I. Goodlad, A Place Called School: Prospects for the Future (New York: McGraw-Hill, 1984), p. xvi.

¹¹³Goodlad, A Place Called School, pp. 271-320 passim.

¹¹⁴Ibid., pp. 321-322.

¹¹⁵Ibid., pp. 323-361 passim.

¹¹⁶John I. Goodlad, "The Great American School Experiment," Phi Delta Kappan 67 (December 1985): 271.

¹¹⁷Ibid., p. 33.

¹¹⁸Ibid., p. 34.

¹¹⁹Theodore R.Sizer, Horace's Compromise: The Dilemma of the American High School (Boston: Houghton Mifflin Company, 1984); Arthur G. Powell, Eleanor Farrar, and David K. Cohen, The Shopping Mall High School: Winners and Losers in the Educational Marketplace (Boston: Houghton Mifflin Company, 1985); and Robert L. Hampel, The Last Little Citadel: American High Schools Since 1940 (Boston: Houghton Mifflin Company, 1986).

¹²⁰Dennis Williams, "A Call for Radical Reform," Newsweek (27 February 1984): 74.

¹²¹Presseisen, Unlearned Lessons, p. 75.

¹²²Theodore Sizer, "Common Sense," Educational Leadership 42 (March 1985): 21.

¹²³Ibid., p. 22.

¹²⁴Sizer, Horace's Compromise, p. 221.

¹²⁵Ibid., pp. 225-227 passim.

¹²⁶Mark D. Danner, "Forum: How Not to Fix Schools -- Grading the Educational Reformers," Harper's 272 (February 1986): 45. Both Sizer and Boyer were members of the forum's panel.

¹²⁷Theodore R. Sizer, "High School Reform: The Need for Engineering," Phi Delta Kappan 64 (June 1983): 680-681.

¹²⁸Gerald Grant, The World We Created at Hamilton High, 1953-1987 (Cambridge, Massachusetts: Harvard University Press, 1988).

¹²⁹David Owen, High School: Undercover with the Class of '80 (New York: The Viking Press, 1981).

¹³⁰Paul A. Cusick, The Egalitarian Ideal and the American High School: Studies of Three Schools (New York: Longman's, 1983).

¹³¹Linda M. McNeil, Contradictions of Control (Boston: Routledge and Kegan Paul, 1985).

¹³²Herbert Kliebard, "Compromise and Diversity in the American High School," History of Education Quarterly 27 (Spring 1987): 95-96.

¹³³Arthur G. Powell, "Being Unspecial in the Shopping Mall High School," Phi Delta Kappan 67 (December 1985): 261.

¹³⁴Willis D. Hawley, "False Premises, False Promises: The Mythical Character of Public Discourse about Education," Phi Delta Kappan 67 (November 1985): 183.

¹³⁵Ibid., pp. 184-185.

¹³⁶Sara Lawrence Lightfoot, The Good High School: Portraits of Character and Culture (New York: Basic Books, Inc., 1983), p. 315.

¹³⁷Ibid., p. 323.

¹³⁸Ibid., p. 222.

¹³⁹Ibid., p. 335.

¹⁴⁰See, for example, *ibid.*, p. 323.

¹⁴¹See for example, C.S. Jencks, et.al., Inequality: A Reassessment of the Effect of Family and Schooling in American (New York: Basic Books, 1972).

¹⁴²See, for example, W.B. Brookover, et.al., School Social Systems and Student Achievement: Schools Can Make a Difference (New York: Praeger, 1979).

¹⁴³See, for example, Ronald R. Edmonds, "Effective Schools for the Urban Poor," Educational Leadership 37 (1979): 15-27; "Some Schools Work and More Can," Social Policy 9 (1979): 28-32; "Making Public Schools Effective," Social Policy 12 (1981): 56-60; and "Program of School Improvement: An Overview," Educational Leadership 40 (December 1982): 4-11.

¹⁴⁴For an extensive review of the effective schools literature and the Lezotte process for implementing that model in a school district, see Kent Peterson and Lydia McCue, The North Carolina School Improvement Project: Resource Notebook (Madison, Wisconsin: National Center for Effective Schools, 1990).

¹⁴⁵Boyer, "In the Aftermath," p. 13.

¹⁴⁶North Carolina has nearly two dozen schools, including several in the Piedmont, participating in this renewal option to regional accreditation. See also John I. Goodlad, ed., The Ecology of School Renewal: Eighty-Sixth Yearbook of the National Society for the Study of Education (Chicago: University of Chicago Press, 1987).

¹⁴⁷Mortimer Adler, The Paideia Proposal: An Educational Manifesto (New York: MacMillan Publishing Company, 1982).

¹⁴⁸Mortimer Adler, Paideia Problems and Possibilities (New York: MacMillan Publishing Company, 1983).

¹⁴⁹Mortimer Adler, The Paideia Program: An Educational Syllabus (New York: MacMillan Publishing Company, 1984).

¹⁵⁰Adler, The Paideia Proposal, p. 5.

¹⁵¹Ibid., p. 8.

¹⁵²The Paideia Group's basic curriculum divisions are summarized on a chart entitled "Columns of Learning." See *ibid.*, p. 23.

¹⁵³Ibid., p. 33.

¹⁵⁴See, for example, Mortimer Adler, Reforming Education: The Opening of the American Mind, ed. Geraldine Van Doren (New York: MacMillan Publishing Company, 1988).

¹⁵⁵Diane Ravitch, The Schools We Deserve: Reflections of the Educational Crisis of Our Times (New York: Basic Books, Inc., 1985), p. 74.

¹⁵⁶Ibid., p. 57.

157Ibid.

158William J. Bennett, James Madison High School: A Curriculum for American Students (Washington, D.C.: United States Department of Education, 1987).

159Ibid., p. 4.

160Allan Bloom, The Closing of the American Mind (New York: Simon & Schuster, Inc., 1987); E.D. Hirsch, Jr., Cultural Literacy: What Every American Needs to Know (Boston: Houghton Mifflin Company, 1987).

161Bloom, Closing of the American Mind, p. 337.

162Ibid.

163Ernest Boyer, College: The Undergraduate Experience in America (New York: Harper & Row, Publishers, 1987), p. 3.

164Hirsch, Cultural Literacy, p. xiii.

165Ibid., p. 125.

166Diane Ravitch and Chester E. Finn, Jr., What Do Our 17-Year-Olds Know? A Report on the First National Assessment of History and Literature (New York: Harper & Row, 1987).

167Ibid., pp. 205-247 passim.

168William Bennett, To Reclaim a Legacy (Washington, D.C.: Government Printing Office, 1984); Lynne V. Cheney, American Memory (Washington, D.C.: Government Printing Office, 1987).

169Phillip C. Schlechty, et.al., "The Charlotte-Mecklenburg Teacher Career Development Program," Educational Leadership 42 (December 1984/January 1985): 4-8; Russell I. French, "Dispelling the Myth about Tennessee's Career Ladder Program," Educational Leadership 42 (December 1984/January 1985): 9-13.

170Arthur Wise and Linda Darling-Hammond, "Teacher Evaluation and Teacher Professionalism," Educational Leadership 42 (December 1984/January 1985): 28-33; Fenwick W. English, "Still Searching for Excellence," Educational Leadership (December 1984/January 1985): 34-35.

171Phillip C. Schlechty and Donald W. Ingwerson, "A Proposed Incentive System for Jefferson County Teachers," Phi Delta Kappan 68 (April 1987): 585-590.

¹⁷²Bruce S. Cooper, "Retooling Teachers: The New York Experience," Phi Delta Kappan 68 (April 1987): 606-609.

¹⁷³Gregory R. Anrig, "Teacher Education and Teacher Testing: The Rush to Mandate," Phi Delta Kappan 67 (February 1986): 447-451.

¹⁷⁴Note, for example, Cresap, McCormick and Paget, Teacher Incentives: A Tool for Effective Management (Reston, Virginia: National Association of Secondary School Principals, 1987), particularly the bibliography; Fenwick English, "We Need the Ghostbusters: A Response to Jerome Freiberg," Educational Leadership 42 (December 1984/January 1985): 22-25; Association for Supervision and Curriculum Development Task Force on Merit Pay, Incentives for Excellence in America's Schools (Alexandria, Virginia: ASCD, 1985); National Education Association, Merit Pay: Promises and Facts (Washington, D.C.: NEA, 1984); Committee on Education and Labor, United States House of Representatives, Merit Pay Task Force Report (Washington, D.C.: Government Printing Office, 1983); and Elaine Say and Leslie Miller, "The Second Mile Plan: Incentive Pay for Houston Teachers," Phi Delta Kappan 64 (December 1982): 270-271.

¹⁷⁵Patricia A. Graham, "Black Teachers: A Drastically Scarce Resource," Phi Delta Kappan 68 (April 1987): 598-605; Southern Education Foundation, Teacher Supply and Quality in the South: A Search for Strategies and Solutions (Atlanta, Georgia: Southern Education Foundation, 1986); Willis D. Hawley, "Toward a Comprehensive Strategy for Addressing the Teacher Shortage," Phi Delta Kappan 67 (June 1986): 712-718; Linda Darling-Hammond, Beyond the Commission Reports: The Coming Crisis in Education (Santa Monica, California: Rand Corporation, 1984); and Margaret Foreman, Minority Educators: Are They an Endangered Species? (Raleigh: North Carolina Association of Educators, 1986).

¹⁷⁶Robert A. Roth, "Emergency Certificates, Misassignment of Teachers, and Other 'Dirty Little Secrets'," Phi Delta Kappan 67 (June 1986): 725-727; Virginia Robinson, Making Do in the Classroom: A Report on the Misassignment of Teachers (Washington, D.C.: Council for Basic Education, 1985).

¹⁷⁷Phillip C. Schlechty and Victor S. Vance, "Institutional Responses to the Quality/Quantity Issue in Teacher Training," Phi Delta Kappan 65 (October 1983): 94-101.

¹⁷⁸Gary Sykes, "Contradictions, Ironies, and Promises Unfulfilled: A Contemporary Account of the Status of Teaching," Phi Delta Kappan 65 (October 1983): 87-93.

¹⁷⁹Educational Research Service, Educator Opinion Poll: Reporting the Opinions, Status, and Experiences of American Public School Educators (Arlington, Virginia: Educational Research Service, 1986).

¹⁸⁰Task Force on Higher Education and the Schools, The Need for Quality (Atlanta, Georgia: Southern Regional Education Board, 1981). That organization maintained its interest in teacher education throughout the decade. See, for example, Eva Galambos, Teacher Preparation: The Anatomy of a College Degree (Atlanta, Georgia: Southern Regional Education Board, 1985); Commission for Quality Education, Access to Quality: Undergraduate Education (Atlanta, Georgia: Southern Regional Education Board, 1985); and Commission for Quality Education, Improving Teacher Education: An Agenda for Higher Education and the School (Atlanta, Georgia: Southern Regional Education Board, 1985).

¹⁸¹See, for example, California Commission on the Teaching Profession, Who Will Teach Our Children? (Sacramento, California: Commission on the Teaching Profession, 1985). An overview of state programs was published in 1988. American Association of Colleges for Teacher Education, Teacher Education Policy in the United States: A 50-State Survey of Legislative and Administrative Actions (Washington, D.C.: State Issues Clearinghouse, 1988).

¹⁸²Task Force on the Preparation of Teachers, The Education of North Carolina's Teachers: A Report to the 1987 North Carolina General Assembly (Chapel Hill: Board of Governors of the University of North Carolina, 1986). See also Public School Forum of North Carolina, Who Will Teach Our Children? (Raleigh: Public School Forum, 1986).

¹⁸³Engin Inel Holmstrom, Recent Changes in Teacher Education Programs (Washington, D.C.: American Council on Education, 1985). See also Gene Hall, "Policies, Practices, and Research in Teacher Education: Beyond the Looking Glass," R&DCTE Review 3 (Spring/Summer 1985): 1-2, 10.

¹⁸⁴David C. Berliner, "Making the Right Changes in Preservice Teacher Education," Phi Delta Kappan 66 (October 1984): 94-96.

¹⁸⁵David L. Clark, "Better Teachers for the Year 2000: A Proposal for the Structural Reform of Teacher Education," Phi Delta Kappan 66 (October 1984): 117.

¹⁸⁶Reginald G. Damerell, Education's Smoking Gun (New York: Frundlich Books, 1985).

¹⁸⁷Robert D. Barr, "New Ideas for Teacher Education," Phi Delta Kappan 66 (October 1984): 127-130.

¹⁸⁸National Commission for Excellence in Teacher Education, A Call for Change in Teacher Education (Washington, D.C.: American Association of Colleges for Teacher Education, 1985).

¹⁸⁹*Ibid.*, pp. 8-29 *passim*.

¹⁹⁰American Association of State Colleges and Universities, Showcase for Excellence: Developing Models to Enhance the Teaching Profession (Washington, D.C.: American Association of State Colleges and Universities, 1985).

¹⁹¹Joseph Johnson, et.al., Those Who Can: Undergraduate Programs to Prepare Arts and Science Majors for Teaching (Washington, D.C.: Association of American Colleges, 1989).

¹⁹²The Holmes Group, Tomorrow's Teachers: A Report of the Holmes Group (East Lansing, Michigan: The Holmes Group, Inc., 1986); Task Force on Teaching as a Profession, A Nation Prepared: Teachers for the 21st-Century (New York: Carnegie Forum on Education and the Economy, 1986).

¹⁹³Marc Tucker and David Mandel, "The Carnegie Report -- A Call for Redesigning the Schools," Phi Delta Kappan 68 (September 1986): 24.

¹⁹⁴Task Force on Teaching, A Nation Prepared, p. 111.

¹⁹⁵Lee Schulman and Gary Sykes, "A National Board for Teaching? In Search of a Bold Standard," report prepared for the Task Force on Teaching as a Profession, January 1986. (Typewritten.)

¹⁹⁶"Landmark Report Calling for Revolutionary Changes in Schools, Teaching Profession," Carnegie Forum on Education and the Economy, 12 May 1986. (Typewritten Press Release.)

¹⁹⁷See, for example, Lynn Olson, "Reaction to Holmes Report: Plaudits, Skepticism, and Muted 'Sour Grapes'," Education Week (23 April 1986): 1, 12-15.

¹⁹⁸The Holmes Report, Tomorrow's Teachers, p. 4.

¹⁹⁹Donna Gollnick and Richard Kunkel, "The Reform of National Accreditation," Phi Delta Kappan 68 (December 1986): 310-314.

²⁰⁰Francis Keppel, "A Field Guide to the Land of Teachers," Phi Delta Kappan 68 (September 1986): 18-23.

²⁰¹Edward Nussel, "What the Holmes Group Doesn't Say," Phi Delta Kappan 68 (September 1986): 36-38.

²⁰²Theodore Sizer, "Rebuilding: First Steps by the Coalition of Essential Schools," Phi Delta Kappan 68 (September 1986): 38-42.

²⁰³Louis Harris and Associates, The Metropolitan Life Survey of the American Teacher, 1986 (New York: Metropolitan Life and Affiliated Companies, 1986).

²⁰⁴Chester E. Finn, Jr., "Teacher Unions and School Quality: Potential Allies or Inevitable Foes?," Phi Delta Kappan 66 (January 1985): 331-332.

²⁰⁵*Ibid.*, pp. 332-335 *passim*.

²⁰⁶National Education Association Blue Ribbon Panel on Educational Excellence, An Open Letter to America on Schools, Students, and Tomorrow (Washington, D.C.: National Education Association, 1984).

²⁰⁷*Ibid.*, p. 3.

²⁰⁸*Ibid.*, p. 5.

²⁰⁹Arizona Education Association, A Call to Excellence: A Plan for the Renewal of Arizona Public Schools (Phoenix: Arizona Education Association, 1984).

²¹⁰Delaware State Education Association, The Challenge for Educational Excellence (Dover: Delaware State Education Association, 1983).

²¹¹Unified Education Profession in Idaho, "A Vision of Excellence for Idaho's Public Schools," IEA Reporter 38 (January 1984): 1-12.

²¹²Ohio Education Association, Achieving Excellence in Education: A Challenge to Ohio (Columbus: Ohio Education Association, 1984); Washington Commission on Educational Excellence, Reducing the Risks: Educational Renewal for Washington's Future (Federal Way, Washington: Washington Education Association, n.d.); NEA-Alaska, Profile for Excellence in Alaska's Schools (n.p.: NEA-Alaska, 1984); and Colorado Education Association, The Profession Speaks -- Education Colorado: Components for Excellence (Aurora: Colorado Education Association, 1983).

²¹³National Education Association Instruction and Professional Development Committee, Excellence in Our Schools: Teacher Education, An Action Plan (Washington, D.C.: National Education Association, 1982).

²¹⁴National Education Association Instruction and Professional Development Committee, Teachers for Tomorrow (Washington, D.C.: National Education Association, 1987), p. 18.

²¹⁵*Ibid.*, p. 14.

²¹⁶The author is familiar with these initiatives on a personal level. While principal of North Asheboro Middle School (1986-1989), she and the school became part of the TABS network (one of two schools in North Carolina). Asheboro City Schools, for whom she currently works as Associate Superintendent, will be named North Carolina's Learning Lab site in early 1991.

²¹⁷Finn, "Teacher Unions," p, 334.

²¹⁸See, for example, Edward J. Doherty and Laval S. Wilson, "The Making of a Contract for Education Reform," Phi Delta Kappan 71 (June 1990): 791-796.

²¹⁹Albert Shanker, "The End of the Traditional Model of Schooling -- and a Proposal for Using Incentives to Restructure Our Public Schools," Phi Delta Kappan 71 (January 1990): 357.

²²⁰*Ibid.*, p. 256.

²²¹*Ibid.*, pp. 256-257.

²²²*Ibid.*, p. 257. For a variation on the same theme, see Ron Brandt, "On Restructuring Schools: A Conversation with Al Shanker," Educational Leadership 47 (April 1990): 11-16.

²²³Linda M. McNeil, "Reclaiming a Voice: American Curricular Scholars and the Politics of What is Taught in Schools," Phi Delta Kappan 71 (March 1990): 518.

²²⁴Shirley M. Malcom, Equity and Excellence: Compatible Goals (Washington, D.C.: American Association for the Advancement of Science, 1984), pp. 15.

²²⁵Westminster Conference on the High School/College Interface, What Drives Chemistry Curriculum? (Washington, D.C.: American Chemical Society, 1989), pp. 7-10 *passim*.

²²⁶John Allen Paulos, Innumeracy: Mathematical Illiteracy and Its Consequences (New York: Hill and Wang, 1988).

²²⁷John A. Dossey, et al., Mathematics: Are We Measuring Up? The Mathematics Report Card -- Executive Summary (Princeton, New Jersey: Educational Testing Service, 1987), p. 14.

²²⁸National Council of Teachers of Mathematics, Curriculum and Evaluation Standards for School Mathematics: Executive Summary (Reston, Virginia: National Council of Teachers of Mathematics, 1989), p. 1.

²²⁹National Research Council, Everybody Counts: A Report to the Nation on the Future of Mathematics Education -- A Summary (Washington, D.C.: National Academy Press, 1989), p. 16.

²³⁰*Ibid.*, pp. 16-20 *passim*.

²³¹For a more comprehensive bibliography and complete reference citations for the works listed, see National Research Council, Everybody Counts, pp. 104-113 *passim*.

²³²Stephen S. Willoughby, Mathematics Education for a Changing World (Alexandria, Virginia: Association for Supervision and Curriculum Development, 1990).

²³³See, for example, Judith A. Langer, et.al., Learning to Read in Our Nation's Schools: Instruction and Achievement in 1988 at Grades 4, 8, and 12 (Washington, D.C.: United States Department of Education, 1990); Lee Anderson, et.al., The Civics Report Card: Trends in Achievement from 1976 to 1988 at Ages 13 and 17; Achievement in 1988 at Grades 4, 8, and 12 (Washington, D.C.: United States Department of Education, 1990); David Hammach, et.al., The U.S. History Report Card: The Achievement of Fourth, Eighth, and Twelfth Grade Students in 1988 and Trends from 1986 to 1988 in the Factual Knowledge of High School Juniors (Washington, D.C.: United States Department of Education, 1990); Arthur N. Applebee, et.al., The Writing Report Card, 1984-1988 (Washington, D.C.: Department of Education, 1990); and Arthur Applebee, The Writing Report Card: Writing Achievement in American Schools (Washington, D.C.: United States Department of Education, 1986).

²³⁴National Endowment for the Arts, Toward Civilization: A Report on Arts Education (Washington, D.C.: National Education Association, 1988), pp. v-vi.

²³⁵The Educational Forum 54 (Fall 1989).

²³⁶Richard E. Gross, "Forward to the Trivia of 1890: The Impending Social Studies Program," Phi Delta Kappan 70 (September 1988): 47-49.

²³⁷Linda S. Lotto, "The Unfinished Agenda: Report from the National Commission on Secondary Vocational Education," Phi Delta Kappan 66 (April 1985): 575.

²³⁸William Bennett, First Lessons: A Report on Elementary Education in America (Washington, D.C.: Government Printing Office, 1986).

²³⁹William Bennett, What Works: Research about Teaching and Learning (Washington, D.C.: Government Printing Office, 1986).

²⁴⁰National Association of Secondary School Principals, Developing a Mission Statement for the Middle Level School (Reston, Virginia: National Association of Secondary School Principals, 1987); National Association of Secondary School Principals, An Agenda for Excellence at the Middle Level (Reston, Virginia: National Association of Secondary School Principals, n.d.).

²⁴¹Task Force on Education of Young Adolescents, Turning Points: Preparing American Youth for the 21st Century (Washington, D.C.: Carnegie Council on Adolescent Development, 1989).

²⁴²Columbus Dispatch, 7 August 1984 in Carol C. Collins, ed., America's Schools: Passing the Test of the '80s: An Editorial on File Book (New York: Facts on File Publications, 1985), p. 11.

²⁴³Wichita Eagle-Dispatch, 22 September 1984, in Collins, America's Schools, p. 12.

²⁴⁴Worcester Telegram, 27 August 1984, in Collins, America's Schools, p. 12.

²⁴⁵Indianapolis News, 25 April 1984, in Collins, America's Schools, p. 14.

²⁴⁶Martha Coffin Evans, "Is State Legislation a Catalyst for Change?," Phi Delta Kappan 66 (March 1985): 501.

²⁴⁷Bill Honig, "The Educational Excellence Movement: Now Comes the Hard Part," Phi Delta Kappan 66 (June 1985): 678. Honig has been a persistent advocate for change in California. See Bill Honig, Last Chance for Our Children: How You Can Help Save Our Schools (Boston: Addison-Wesley Publishing Company, 1985).

²⁴⁸*ibid.*, p. 681.

²⁴⁹Paul Berman, "The Next Step: The Minnesota Plan," Phi Delta Kappan 67 (November 1985): 188-189.

²⁵⁰Donald W. Burnes and Barbara J. Lindner, "Why the States Must Move Quickly to Assess Excellence," Educational Leadership 43 (October 1985): 18-20.

²⁵¹Beverly Anderson and Allan Odden, "State Initiatives Can Foster School Improvement," Phi Delta Kappan 67 (April 1986): 580-581. See also Allan Odden and Beverly Anderson, "How Successful State Education Improvement Plans Work," Phi Delta Kappan 67 (April 1986): 582-585.

²⁵²Laura Hersch Salganik, "Why Testing Reforms are so Popular and How They are Changing Education," Phi Delta Kappan 66 (May 1985): 607-610.

²⁵³Eleanor Farrar and Patricia Flakus-Mosqueda, "State-Sponsored Schoolwide Improvement Programs: What's Going On in the Schools," Phi Delta Kappan 67 (April 1986): 586-589.

²⁵⁴Susan Fuhrman, Eugene Huddle, and Jane Armstrong, "Improving Schools: The State Role," Phi Delta Kappan 67 (April 1986): 594.

²⁵⁵Michael W. Kirst, "Sustaining the Momentum of State Education Reform: The Link Between Assessment and Financial Support," Phi Delta Kappan 67 (July 1986): 345.

²⁵⁶National Governors' Association, Time for Results: The Governors' 1991 Report on Education (Washington, D.C.: National Governors' Association Center for Policy Research and Analysis, 1986), pp. 40-43.

²⁵⁷*Ibid.*, p. 57-60.

²⁵⁸*Ibid.*, pp. 85-88.

²⁵⁹*Ibid.*, pp. 103-111.

²⁶⁰*Ibid.*, pp. 130-134.

²⁶¹*Ibid.*, pp. 147-149.

²⁶²*Ibid.*, pp. 160-163.

²⁶³Joe Nathan, "Implications for Educators in Time for Results," Phi Delta Kappan 68 (November 1986): 197.

²⁶⁴*Ibid.*, p. 201.

²⁶⁵Lamar Alexander, "Time for Results: An Overview," Phi Delta Kappan 68 (November 1986): 203.

²⁶⁶*Ibid.*, p. 204.

²⁶⁷National Governors' Association, Results in Education 1987 (Washington, D.C.: National Governors' Association, 1987). See also Dean Honetschlager and Mike Cohen, "The Governors Restructure the Schools," Educational Leadership 45 (February 1988): 42-43.

²⁶⁸Michael Cohen, Restructuring the Education System: Agenda for the 1990s (Washington, D.C.: National Governors' Association Center for Policy Research, 1988), p. 29.

²⁶⁹Jane L. David, Restructuring in Progress: Lessons from Pioneering Districts (Washington, D.C.: National Governors' Association Center for Policy Research, 1989), p. 45.

²⁷⁰Arthur Wise, "Legislated Learning Revisited," Phi Delta Kappan 69 (January 1988): 329.

²⁷¹*Ibid.*

²⁷²Thomas B. Timar and David L. Kirp, "Education Reform in the 1980s: Lessons from the States," Phi Delta Kappan 70 (March 1989): 506.

273Ibid., p. 510.

274Michael W. Kirst, "Japanese Education: Its Implications for Economic Competition in the 1980s," Phi Delta Kappan 62 (June 1981): 787.

275Ibid., p. 708.

276William Ouchi, Theory Z (New York: Addison-Wesley Publishing Company, 1981).

277Paul S. George, Theory Z School: Beyond Effectiveness (Columbus, Ohio: National Middle School Association, 1983). See also J. Bonner, "Japanese Quality Circles: Can They Work in Education?," Phi Delta Kappan 63 (June 1982): 681; L. Chase, "Quality Circles in Education," Educational Leadership 40 (February 1983): 18-26; Samuel B. Bacharach and Sharon C. Conley, "Education Reform: A Managerial Agenda," Phi Delta Kappan 67 (May 1986): 641-645; Robert Deasy, "Education in Japan: Surprising Lessons," Educational Leadership 44 (September 1986): 38-43; Paul George, "Theory Z and Schools: What Can We Learn from Toyota?," NASSP Bulletin (May 1984): 76-81; Marsha Levine, "Excellent Companies and Exemplary Schools: Common Goals, Characteristics," NASSP Bulletin (January 1985): 56-69; and John Saphier and Matthew King, "Good Seeds Grow in Strong Cultures," Educational Leadership 42 (March 1985): 67-74.

278Research and Policy Committee of the Committee for Economic Development, Investing in Our Children: Business and the Public Schools (New York: Committee for Economic Development, 1985).

279Ibid., p. xiii.

280Ibid., pp. 3-7 passim.

281Ibid., pp. 14-100 passim.

282Ibid., p. 12.

283Denis P. Doyle and Marsha Levine, "Business and the Public Schools: Observations on the Policy Statement of the Committee for Economic Development," Phi Delta Kappan 67 (October 1985): 117.

284Manuel J. Justiz and Marilyn C. Kameen, "Business Offers a Hand to Education," Phi Delta Kappan 68 (January 1987): 379-383.

285Gerald G. Gold, "A Reform Strategy for Education: Employer-Sponsored Teacher Internships," Phi Delta Kappan 68 (January 1987): 384-387.

286W. Robert Houston, "Lessons for Teacher Education from Corporate Practices," Phi Delta Kappan 68 (January 1987): 388-392.

²⁸⁷Merry White, The Japanese Educational Challenge: A Commitment to Children (New York: The Free Press, 1987).

²⁸⁸David T. Kearns and Denis P. Doyle, Winning the Brain Race: A Bold Plan to Make Our Schools competitive (San Francisco: ICS Press, 1988), p. xi.

²⁸⁹*ibid.*, p. 1.

²⁹⁰*ibid.*, p. 140.

²⁹¹Denis P. Doyle, Endangered Species: Children of Promise (New York: McGraw-Hill, Inc., 1989), pp. E92-E94.

²⁹²*ibid.*, p. E94.

²⁹³"Saving Our Schools," Fortune (Spring 1990).

²⁹⁴Governor's Commission of Workforce Preparedness, The Skills Crisis in the Workplace: A Strategic Response for Economic Development (Raleigh: n.p., 1990), pp. 3-6 *passim*.

²⁹⁵Marvin Cetron and Owen Davies, Our Life at the Turn of the Century (New York: St. Martin's Press, 1989), pp. 46-69.

²⁹⁶K. Patricia Cross, "The Adventures of Education in Wonderland: Implementing Educational Reform," Phi Delta Kappan 68 (March 1987): 502.

²⁹⁷Jack Frymier, "Bureaucracy and the Neutering of Teachers," Phi Delta Kappan 69 (September 1987): 9.

²⁹⁸Gene I. Maeroff, The Empowerment of Teachers: Overcoming the Crisis of Confidence (New York: Teachers College Press, 1988).

²⁹⁹Gene I. Maeroff, "A Blueprint for Empowering Teachers," Phi Delta Kappan 69 (March 1988): 477.

³⁰⁰Linda M. McNeil, "Contradictions of Control, Part 3: Contradictions of Reform," Phi Delta Kappan 69 (March 1988): 485.

³⁰¹See, for example, Thomas J. Sergiovanni and John H. Moore, Schooling for Tomorrow: Directing Reforms to Issues that Count (Boston: Allyn and Bacon, 1989), pp. 207-250. Late in the decade increasing attention was paid to the role of the principal, his or her training, and ways to increase both autonomy and accountability. Most legislated reforms, however, were only in their beginning states. In many respects the literature parallels that on teaching: administrators are blamed for poor performance, efforts are made to make them more accountable without greater

autonomy, attention is paid to improving preservice programs, then recommendations incorporate a more autonomous role for them in restructured schools.

³⁰²Bruce R. Joyce, Richard H. Hersh, and Michael McKibbin, The Structure of School Improvement (New York: Longmans, 1983).

³⁰³Roland Barth, Improving Schools from Within: Teachers, Parents, and Principals Can Make the Difference (San Francisco: Jossey-Bass Publishers, 1990).

³⁰⁴National Association of State Boards of Education, Today's Children, Tomorrow's Survival: A Call to Restructure Schools (Washington, D.C.: National Association of State Boards of Education, 1988).

³⁰⁵Anne Lewis, Restructuring America's Schools (Arlington, Virginia: American Association of School Administrators, 1989).

³⁰⁶Herbert J. Walberg and John J. Lane, Organizing for Learning: Toward the 21st Century (Reston, Virginia: National Association of Secondary School Principals, 1989).

³⁰⁷William J. Bailey, School-Site Management Applied (Lancaster, Pennsylvania: Technomic Publishing Company, 1991).

CHAPTER FOUR

THE MORE THINGS CHANGE, THE MORE THEY REMAIN THE SAME

Alphonse Karr, Les Guepes

Given the almost continuous calls during the past decade for educational reform, for changes in the ways we conduct K-12 schools in this country how should an educator determine what works and what should be avoided in a particular setting? Should she try all of them, implementing each in sequence as they are announced? Should she sit back and wait for official mandates, ignoring recommendations that are not given the added weight of statute? Are there some things she should know to make successful change more likely? Will any of those initiatives really result in change?

William Reinsmith, writing in The Educational Forum, surveyed the findings of those blue ribbon panels and noted that "to anyone who has spent 25 years or more in the academic endeavor, optimistically called teaching, all this has a familiar ring."¹

"None of the complaints about education, either then or now, is very new. The focus shifts -- yesterday it was science, today it is basics or getting students to think critically and solve problems. But in both eras it seems the whole apparatus is falling down."²

Each generation of young people apparently fails. "Softened curricula of our public high schools place more emphasis on activities such as school band, and practical courses such as home economics, than they do on traditional subjects," wrote a Cosmopolitan author in 1958.³ John Keats, in an article written a year earlier, declared that "our schools pamper the jackasses, stuff the geniuses under the rug, and meanwhile envelop everyone in that fatuous diaperism they call life adjustment."⁴ Indeed, Richard Hofstadter has concluded that "the educational jeremiad is as much a feature of our

literature as the jeremiad in the Puritan sermons."⁵ He builds his case with conviction in Anti-intellectualism in American Life. For example, William Franklin Phelps, later a President of the National Education Association, wrote in 1872 that our elementary schools:

. . .are mainly in the hands of ignorant, unskilled teachers. The children are fed upon the mere husks of knowledge. They leave school for the broad theatre of life without discipline; without mental power or moral stamina . . . Poor schools and poor teachers are in a majority throughout the country. Multitudes of the schools are so poor that it would be as well for the country if they were closed.⁶

The New York Sun ran an article in 1902 in which the author commented that when he went to school students were made to learn their lessons. "Spelling, writing, and arithmetic were not electives . . . In these fortunate times, elementary education has become in many places a vaudeville show. The child must be kept amused, and learns what he pleases."⁷ Thomas Briggs, author of The Great Investment: Secondary Education in a Democracy, published in 1930, complains that high school students know little to nothing. Their math was so poor that if "applied in business, would lead to bankruptcy or the penitentiary." Only half the students could calculate the area of a circle. Most students left school without a taste for literature and their efforts to produce written English were "shocking."⁸ If our current educational crisis is one we have previously addressed, what happened to cause our initial solutions to fail?

A careful reader of the reform literature can find some implicit messages about what went wrong. The authors of Action for Excellence believe our academic malaise is the result of less homework, lower standards for entry into college, declining enrollments in science and mathematics courses, shortages of qualified teachers, an absence of rewards for teaching excellence, the tenure system, a lack of resources, inadequate management, and no clear consensus on an education agenda.⁹ In A Nation at

Risk diminished expectations, grade inflation, social promotions, homogenized curriculum, poor textbooks, less time spent on academic subjects, and inadequate faculty are among the reasons for our decline.¹⁰ Our nation's governors found some of the same "causes" in Time for Results. We lack a professional standards board for teachers. We are unable to attract and retain teachers of excellence. Our school leaders are inadequately prepared. Parents are unable to choose the school to which they want to send their child; schools have a monopoly and would profit from the competition parental choice can generate. We do not begin educating our educationally disadvantaged population early enough. Collective bargaining, misplaced confidence in piecemeal solutions, lack of consensus on parental roles, apathy, dependable and useful technical information, and money also present barriers to effective schooling.¹¹ The findings of blue ribbon panels included considerable finger pointing at the institution, its operation, and its operators.

A casual survey of professional journals yields somewhat the same results, albeit in a more sophisticated form. Carl Glickman blamed our inability to deal with the unknown.¹² Sharon Rallis and Martha Highsmith claimed that a principal could not administer a school and also serve as an instructional leader.¹³ Chester Finn and Diane Ravitch asserted that the establishment of and instruction in a canon of literature and history were necessary for the proper education of all American children.¹⁴ Harold Hodginson found fault with our colleges.¹⁵ Gene Maeroff concluded that the conditions of many of our urban schools were beyond the application of current remedies and needed total renewal of purpose and content.¹⁶ Milbrey Wallis and his colleagues condemned the working conditions under which teachers had to labor.¹⁷ Jack Frymier agreed, arguing that the bureaucratic organization of schools limited opportunities for professional creativity.¹⁸ Samuel Bacharach and Sharon Conley observed that early reform reports

in education, like those of industry during the early days of successful Japanese competition, focused on blaming employees. Reflection shifted that emphasis on staff malpractice to leadership, suggesting that new managerial styles were necessary before worker styles could change.¹⁹ David Elkind believes that we are miseducating our youngest students, putting them at educational risk by exposing them to academic material before they are ready to master it.²⁰

Another explanatory device is to look at theories about the way the organization itself functions. Following the second world war the social sciences became primary tools in the understanding of schools and, consequently, in the training of educational leaders. Schools became the objects of study as institutions and social theories which applied to business organizations were applied to educational ones. Such organizations were believed to be rational and subject to generalization. The result was a movement toward studying and understanding schools by the application of theories and models which could be grouped under the rubric of systems theory.²¹

Karl Weick modified that approach somewhat when, after noting that several scholars were observing differences in the ways schools behaved as organizations and the ways businesses and factories functioned, he decided that educational institutions functioned as "loosely-coupled" entities. If, according to Weick, one wanted to reform or change those institutions, then one must do so keeping in mind the unique nature of their composition. Loosely-coupled organizations are somewhat more resistant to changes in their environment, partially because they have so many semi-autonomous sensing elements. They adapt well to local conditions. When a part of the system breaks down, the system itself can cut off that area of breakdown and preserve other parts of the organization. There exists room for the participants in the system to self-determine individual behaviors (teachers in classrooms, for example). Weick claims that using

the loosely-coupled model or template to order school behaviors produces more interesting questions and more reliable observations than resorting to a strict bureaucratic, somewhat inflexible and rational, model. The ambiguity of the organization forces it to construct an elaborate rhetoric to define its operations and, in effect, make sense of what it does.²²

John Meyer and Brian Rowan built on Weick's work, defining loose-coupling as "structure . . . disconnected from technical (work) activity, and activity . . . disconnected from its effects."²³ Using that model, they develop reasons why reformers are so often frustrated in their efforts to change schools.

Reforms abound in the world of education. They paint a picture of schools as archaic, as organizations not yet rationalized, by proper output measures, evaluation systems and control structures, and therefore as systems that rely mainly on traditional types of authority among students, teachers, and school administrators. Reformers imagine that rationalized control and accounting measures can drive out less 'modern' mechanisms of control once a few recalcitrant and reactionary groups are eliminated.²⁴

But reformers, in the classic sense, are not the only critics of schools frustrated by the realities of the institution. Those who claim the school is dominated by an oligarchy of educational elites, known as administrators, who resist control from the community and evaluation of the success of their activities in order to preserve their status, are equally in error. Their solution would be somewhat contrary to that of classic reformers (who, according to Meyer and Rowan, want centralized organizations which will establish co-ordinated, measurable, and controlled instructional programs). Critics of unresponsive, bureaucratic schools advocate decentralizing the process and providing more opportunities for community choice and involvement. They see the problems of schools as goal displacement; emphasis is not placed on the products of education -- student learning.

So what explains the intractability of schools to becoming more attuned to and accountable for student achievement? Meyer and Rowan argue that schools "produce education for society, not for individuals and families."²⁵ "Education is a certified teacher teaching a standardized curricular topic to a registered student in an accredited school."²⁶ Ritual categories are decoupled, not merely loosely coupled, from outcomes. That decoupling allows schools to be inconsistent, to adapt to conflicting rules, to protect the classification system itself, and to measure quality in terms of inputs. A glance at the certification standards that regional agencies, such as the Southern Association of Colleges and Schools, hold sacred attests to that emphasis on defining quality.

However, Meyer and Rowan contend that confidence in that definition of quality can be maintained only so long as the "myth of teacher professionalism" is maintained. Once one begins to question that professionalism, one casts doubt on the rituals which hold together the organization and on the efficiency of decoupling those rituals from outcomes. Because of the flexibility of the decoupled system, the organization can tolerate considerable adaptation without disrupting its fundamental purpose -- to create "standard types of graduates from standard categories of pupils using standard types of teachers and topics."²⁷

Analysis of the system proper, such as that of Meyer and Rowan, provides a framework for understanding and studying schools. However, their theory of decoupling rests somewhat on the slippery ground of the myth of teacher professionalism, something one might certainly challenge. Given that a major theme in the complaints about schools throughout this century has been the quality and practice of teachers, one suspects that there are some structural limits to a model built upon that foundation.

Baldrige and Deal have observed that "rational ideas have dominated the change agenda for the last two decades."²⁸ Arthur Wise uses that idea as an explanation for the

failure of reforms and, like Meyer and Rowan, adopts the loosely-coupled organization of schooling developed by Weick as a theoretical tool in constructing his argument.

American schools are now being subjected to a variety of influences which either presuppose a very rational view of schooling or are designed to induce a further rationalization of schooling. State legislatures, demanding accountability in schooling, are imposing managerial accounting systems adopted from industry. State boards of education, concerned with the diffuse goals of schooling, endeavor to reduce the goals of education to basic skills. State courts, concerned with the ineffectiveness of schooling, require the schools to become 'thorough and efficient' as mandated by their state constitutions. Congress, concerned about the lack of articulation between education and work, calls for career education. The executive branch, responding to concerns for equality, promulgates affirmative action procedures and goals. The federal courts, concerned with arbitrariness toward individuals, demand that schools observe due process. Unions, unsatisfied with the protections afforded by civil service and tenure provisions, seek additional procedural safeguards through collective bargaining. Educational researchers, unable to discover the effects which schools have, create models of efficient and effective schooling.

In effect, summarizes Wise, constituencies attempt "to make school more rational."²⁹

The excessive and often contradictory prescriptions are merely added to the already existing procedures, making the organization larger and more cumbersome, but only procedurally altered. Yet when policymakers resort to a rational approach, they assume the school to be a closed, deterministic and, consequently, responsive entity. That it is not explains, in part, the failure of those initiatives. One creates the appearance of change (those new procedures), but progress (fundamental alterations which result in student learning) rarely occurs. Wise concludes that until we create a model of schooling which reflects reality and develop policies to mirror that model, the collective efforts of changemakers will result in continued failure.

A less theoretical explanation for failed reform involves cultural transfer. We, like other cultures, put great faith in our educational institutions to prepare the next generation for productive adulthood. Consequently, one way of interpreting the educational jeremiad present throughout the twentieth-century in our country is as an

expression of frustration by a nation's elders. There is evidence that such disappointment is not uncommon in the annals of history. For instance, a Babylon tablet, estimated to be three thousand years old, declares: "Today's youth is rotten to the core, it is evil, godless, and lazy. It will never be what youth used to be, and it will never be able to preserve our culture."³⁰ But given that such condemnations have been repeatedly made and we have survived, if not as Babylonians, at least as a species, one suspects the argument holds little substance in terms of understanding and responding to current demands for changes in the ways we prepare those "evil, godless, and lazy" beings to succeed us.

In our attempts to comply with such demands, have our schools become what Seymour Sarason characterizes as "the fastest changing status quo."³¹ As Robert Slavin concludes, "educational innovation is famous for its cycle of early enthusiasm, widespread dissemination, subsequent disappointment, and eventual decline -- the classic swing of the pendulum." As a result of its allegiance to faddism, "education resembles such fields as fashion and design, in which change mirrors shifts in taste and social climate and is not usually thought of as true progress."³² Patricia Cross in "The Rising Tide of School Reform Reports" also writes that educational change often corresponds to the swinging of a pendulum, one in constant motion but without destination.³³ The permissiveness of the thirties and forties is corrected by the emphasis on excellence in the fifties; the swing toward equity concerns in the sixties and seventies is balanced by a return to basics in the eighties. Certainly most practitioners in the field hold, at least informally, to a pendulum model of educational change. They will often respond to calls for innovation with a somewhat cynical "this, too, shall pass" comment in the faculty lounge.

Both Slavin and Cross suggest that some positive and permanent changes have occurred in our schools. Cross likens that progress to the metaphor of a spiral staircase. And, if pushed, many of us view change in somewhat that same way, reflecting what has been a long-standing tradition in western thought.

Some historians have viewed the past as a series of cycles and, using that model, have attempted to order or rationalize their observations. For instance, classical writers, like Herodotus and Plato, suggested that history was a repetition of cycles. Their cyclical interpretation of events did not lead to an end; there was not a necessary progression in the turns of the wheel of time. More contemporary historians, notably Vico (New Science, 1725), returned to the idea of cycles as an explanatory tool, but suggested that the cycles resembled not so much the turns of a wheel, but the progression of a Ptolemaic epicycle extended along a line rather than a circle. Imagine a slinky, a common children's toy. Events proceed in cycles, but move from one end along a line toward another end; progress, or at least directionality, is possible.³⁴ So, one way to consider calls for educational change is to adopt Karr's adage that the "more things change, the more they stay the same" and wait for the wheel or the cycle to turn.

In keeping with his pendulum model, Slavin argues that there are two phases in a reform initiative: the upswing and the downswing. During the former the program is proposed, piloted, introduced in several districts with a reputation for being progressive, advocated by professional staff developers, proliferates, and is tentatively evaluated. During the return of the pendulum the districts which initially adopted the program move on to other innovations, a rumbling is heard in the literature against the change, initial evaluations prove less than stellar, staff developers claim the fault is in uneven implementation, interest wanes, and controlled evaluation studies confirm that the hopes of the program, often exaggerated during the initial stages, were unfulfilled.³⁵

Probably few students of radical or revolutionary change have developed as comprehensive a model as Crane Brinton applied to his study of political upheavals in The Anatomy of Revolution.³⁶ The old regime is perceived by hopeful upstarts as corrupt, because it blocks them from expanding opportunities. Those citizens who wish to make the system more open and responsive to their needs begin to agitate against perceived tyranny, often using excessive rhetoric in describing the conditions under which they are forced to dwell. There exists clear class distinctions in society and the intellectuals begin to argue the case of the have nots, deserting ivory towers and the protection of the haves. The institutions of the old regime are not responsive to the new economic and social conditions which precipitated the aspirations of the upstarts. For example, they are unable to accommodate the growing needs of an aspiring professional or middle class. Some members of the old regime begin to lose confidence in it and the traditions which sustain it. They join the disgruntled intellectuals or become part of a growing party of humanitarian reformers. An event, sometimes minor in nature, serves as a catalyst to armed confrontation. However, the agitators, who have unified the various classes under a banner of reform, prove more able to use force than the old regime. They seize control.

Once in power the unity of the revolutionaries dissolves as it becomes obvious that they have different needs and aims. The moderates, who initially have control of the state, are deposed by extremists and the revolution enters a crisis period. Extremism is manifested in a reign of terror and an attempt to establish a regime of virtue. Ultimately, the excesses of that extremism are resisted by a coalition of disillusioned liberals and an equilibrium is restored. According to Brinton, when those liberals:

. . . come to turn against the revolutionary tradition, they conclude . . . that in effect revolutions change nothing of importance -- except perhaps for the worse

-- that revolutions are unpleasant and perhaps avoidable interludes in a nation's history.³⁷

Although at first glance Brinton's analysis appears to have little application to educational reform, there are some elements of similarity. Problems are identified, decried, bandwagoned. Solutions are articulated, provide a rallying point, and sometimes applied without regard to existing tradition and past experience. The problem-solvers, unified in complaint, become less unified when placed in charge. Revolutionary aims are attempted in excess; disillusioned moderates regain control and balance is resumed. The pendulum completes a swing; the cycle revolves. There is considerable, often intense and trying, activity, but the idealistic aspirations of the reformers are rarely achieved.

Eleanor Farrar, John DeSanctis, and David Cohen looked, in 1980, at two decades of federal reform initiatives. They concluded that failures occurred during project implementation which became "a tangle of unresolved problems, of competing political values."³⁸ They argued that when federal programs were placed in local settings what resulted was not an orderly march by a crack drill team to the tune of a specific song, but something that resembled a large lawn party, with random comings and goings, couplings and uncouplings. The project was the reason for the gathering, but the guests did not attend with the same motives nor did they see the party proper as more important than a myriad of other obligations. And, because "each is relatively free to make of the party whatever seems appropriate . . . within limits, guests create their own party."³⁹ Like Brinton's united revolutionaries, once the event occurs, that unity dissolves and mobs (or, for Farrar, et. al., a variety of lawn party-goers) take over. Consequently, when the party is finally over, changes "were not profound and often they were not new. Schools and school systems change much less than did the . . . program design."⁴⁰

Federal reformers, like the disillusioned liberals of Brinton's revolutions, probably concluded that more of the old regime remained than was altered.

Terrance Deal and Samuel Nutt found a similar pattern when they reviewed the success of the Experimental Schools program, which began in 1970.⁴¹ Michael Kirst concluded that the failure to implement PPBS (planning, programming, and budgeting systems -- an initiative of the Johnson years) in California was the result of an inability to sustain a coalition in favor of the change. That failure resulted only in an accounting manual that could at best be termed a "disjointed incremental step" forward.⁴²

Anthony Downs claims that there are distinct phases in the change process. Initially one must go through the "alarmed discovery" and "crisis activity" phase. Certainly A Nation at Risk and its companion reports qualify for alarm ringing and the flurry of legislative edicts, sometimes complementary and sometimes contradictory, which followed qualify as crisis activity. But there ultimately comes, according to Downs, an almost automatic "disillusionment with results" stage, which slips into a "return to neglect" period.⁴³

Although one might be tempted to join the faculty in the lounge and mutter that "this, too, shall pass," whether one does it in terms of cycles or in terms of a more linear progression, probably the most common way of looking at change is to assume that it accumulates in a positive way. Consider St. Augustine's The City of God. History, the collective story of humankind, has a beginning and an end. There is a goal, in the case of the early Christian scholars, a theological one, to mark the end of time. Arnold Toynbee presents a modern version of this perspective in A Study of History. "To change shape is in the very nature of history, because it is in the nature of history to go on adding to itself."⁴⁴ And those additions are, to Toynbee, cumulative. Karl Marx approached

history with the same confidence as a St. Augustine; there is a distinct beginning and an end. However, for Marx, that end is a secular heavenly city defined by classlessness. But accumulation is the tune to which time marches, using the dialectic of Hegel as the cyclical mechanism to make the slinky sway.⁴⁵

Robert Nisbet compares that method of describing our past to the metaphor of growth. We give history an organic character. There is a sense that with time "we" mature; change has directionality, it is cumulative, and irreversible. "The belief that there is a purpose in cultural, political, economic, or social development is one . . . legacy of the metaphor of growth."⁴⁶ Nor is a growth metaphor contradictory to the idea of cycles; organisms grow in cycles, reaching maturity, decaying, then reappearing in the spring sometimes in a changed or a proliferated form. History as life cycle has a long and distinguished pedigree. Applied broadly it can result in Oswald Spengler's The Decline of the West; writ small it can describe an organic variation of the period of Slavin's pendulum. From that analogy Nisbet argues that western thought derived:

. . .the whole cyclical conception of cosmic and social development, the framework of investigation of society and its changes, a framework built around such crucial concepts as origins, stages of growth, immanent cause, purpose, and the like. Above all, there was the whole characteristically Greek and Roman conviction that reality, whether social, physical, or biological was to be conceived in terms of incessant, ongoing change; change that was deemed to be as natural a part of society as any element of structure.⁴⁷

Baldrige and Deal in "The Basics of Change in Educational Organizations" appear to accept at least the derivation that change is natural and incessant. They conclude that "whether changes are minute or monumental in scope, the constant in our modern society is that organizations are always shifting, changing, transforming, and realigning."⁴⁸

To Baldrige and Deal "organizational change is natural and fundamental."⁴⁹ Yet that is precisely what Nisbet wants to argue it is not. In Social Change he defines change as "a succession of differences in time in a persisting identity" and concludes that "change is not the same thing . . . as mere interaction, motion, mobility, and variety." It is "interaction and motion" that "are constant and universal."⁵⁰ And that is particularly true, Nisbet asserts, for social institutions.

Robert Heilbroner agrees. "Contrary to our generally accepted belief, change is not the rule but the exception in life."⁵¹ Now how can change be both a constant and a rarity? It is in the resolution of that apparent paradox that one can develop a model of change which has the ability to make some sense out of the multiple layers of educational reform described in chapters two and three. Watzlawick, Weakland, and Fisch confronted that difficulty of universal vs. unique change in the beginning of Change: Problems of Problem Formation and Problem Resolution. They observed that "while many theories of persistence and change have been formulated throughout the centuries of western culture, these have mainly been theories of persistence, or theories of change, not theories of persistence and change."⁵² Our task becomes, then, to find a way in which persistence and change can co-exist and act one upon the other.

Nisbet notes that "social interaction, tension, dysfunction, and even conflict within, are reconcilable with a high degree of fixity and conservatism."⁵³ Once any system is established "countless pressures for its perpetuation arise."⁵⁴ "Every major organization, especially in our relatively dynamic society, has today a kind of built-in objective to effect change: that is, gradual, cumulative changes which are not calculated to change the structure."⁵⁵ In no way are those cumulative changes necessarily what Watzlawick, et. al. would characterize as second order or type changes -- the stuff of major reforms. "There is no evidence whatsoever," Nisbet writes, "that the macro

changes we find periodically occurring in the histories of all institutions, those of 'revolutionary order,' are the cumulative product of the smaller readjustments and modifications that may have preceded the macro-changes."⁵⁶

Heilbroner sees the same pattern, arguing that inertia characterizes history and "warns us against facile conceptions of 'progress.'"⁵⁷

The optimistic conception of progress calls our attention to the sweeping improvements which can be brought about by technology or democracy or economic advance. All that is certainly true as far as it goes. No one can doubt the capacity of history's forces to legislate beneficial changes in society. But there is a level of social existence to which these forces penetrate last and least. This is the level at which 'society' is visible only as the personal and private encounters of each of us with his fellow man. It is the level at which life is lived, rather than the level at which it is abstractly conceived.⁵⁸

So, when the authors of Action for Excellence write that "a cheerful belief in change and progress has been a marked trait of Americans through most of our history," they begin an understanding of the challenges of educational change with false optimism.⁵⁹ If we assume that the level at which schooling is lived occurs in classrooms, in the daily interaction between teacher and student, reforms which fail to alter that relationship profoundly will become mental constructs, paper products, failed projects.

A relatively simple, albeit accurate illustration is an overview of the implementation of technology in classrooms drawn by Larry Cuban. He traced the chronological introduction of twentieth-century hardware, such as the radio, the filmstrip projector, the movie projector, the tape recorder, the overhead, and the computer, to educators, comparing the promises each brought to transform the burden of teaching and to enliven the tedium of learning. The promises were remarkably similar in extravagance and specifics; the reality was also remarkably similar. Teachers continued to do what teachers had always been doing; the substance, even the processes of teaching, remained basically unchanged. The hardware gathered dust, to be removed and

replaced with the next technological wonder-worker.⁶⁰ Where people in education lived, the classroom, remained unmoved.

Acknowledging that the basic element of schooling, the activities of the classroom, appears static in spite of a spate of rhetoric, regulation, and reform does not resolve the dilemma of a school administrator vis-a-vis improving conditions within her institution to serve better its students. Persistence and change appear to co-exist; progress might be chimerical. Given that paradox, cynicism, an emotional state common to lounge educators, may appear to be a reasonable reaction to our current educational crisis.

Seymour Sarason observed that if we are to alter the "quality of life in a classroom" such changes involve "no less than a basic change in the culture of the school."⁶¹ Nisbet notes that the crisis elements from which change springs result from a conflict "of values, of perceptions, and of idea-systems," of the fundamental elements which compose a culture.⁶² Thorstein Veblen wrote in 1918 that an institution is "a prevalent habit of thought, and as such it is subject to the conditions and limitations that surround any change in the habitual frame of mind in the community."⁶³

Persistence exists because habits of the mind are difficult to remove. As Stanley Ivison reminds us in "Idols of the Mind," the metaphors which govern those intellectual habits, at least when applied to the process of schooling, have become restrictive and constraining, rather than serving to stimulate creative thought.⁶⁴ Henry Petroski presents an intriguing example of how powerful those habits can become in his new book The Pencil: A History of Design and Circumstance. In the 19th-century the discovery of a rich deposit of extremely high quality graphite in Siberia led to the production of Koh-I-Noor pencils, considered to be, at the turn of the century, the stylus of choice among choosy writers. Encased in a yellow-finished wood, the Siberian graphite attracted

those authors to the Koh-I-Noor product line. Although the decision to paint wood coverings came probably from a desire to mask imperfections in the casings, the yellow color became associated with the Koh-I-Noor products, then with such famous manufactured pencil names as Mongol and Mikado, providing, perhaps, a mental link to the Orient and the source of quality graphite. Even today 75% of all pencils are yellow, although that color no longer connotes necessarily the source nor the quality of the graphite within. Petroski related one instance in which a businessman had an equal quantity of pencils, identical in all other respects, painted green and yellow. Distributing them in an office, he discovered that those employees who received the green pencils were quick to condemn the quality of their writing implements -- the points broke, they sharpened with difficulty, they wrote less well.⁶⁵ Yellow and quality pencils had become habits of the mind, even after the substantive reason for that association had disappeared.

Institutions are, in many ways, a complicated set of associations, of mental habits. We become accustomed to those associations, and consequently, we accept them as realities independent of previous intellectual associations. In pencils yellow once represented a specific type of graphite which came from a specific region of the world and which reflected exceptional quality. Now yellow itself becomes the defining characteristic of quality.

Sarason, who has been a student for several decades of the role culture plays in limiting change in our nation's educational institutions, notes that "life . . . in a school is determined by ideas and values, and if these are not under constant discussion and surveillance, the comforts of ritual replace the conflict and excitement involved in growing and changing."⁶⁶ John Dewey concluded that "any theory and set of practices is dogmatic which is not based on critical examination of its own underlying principles."⁶⁷

Alfred North Whitehead claims that we shrink from the novelty, excitement, and potential for growth incumbent in change because we are "haunted by terror at the loss of the past, with its familiarities and its loved ones."⁶⁸ One key to understanding the limitations of our critique of schooling in the United States is that we have paid insufficient attention to Veblen's habits of mind which define our educational institutions. The initial associations have faded, partially because our discussions have been superficial and partially because we are comforted by the familiarities of the past. Most of the initial reforms in the past decade, for example, assumed that what was familiar worked -- we simply need more of it.

Nor should we be surprised at our reluctance to change, at our hesitation to leave the comfort of the familiar. As Leo Tolstoy observed:

I know that most men, including those at ease with problems of the greatest complexity, can seldom accept even the simplest and most obvious truth if it be such as would oblige them to admit the falsity of conclusions which they have delighted in explaining to colleagues, which they have proudly taught to others, and which they have woven, thread by thread, into the fabric of their lives.⁶⁹

For most of us involved with schools, those threads are many. We have been acculturated by decades in the institution as students. We have spent years in a college or university learning how to teach or administer, being trained to do things the way they have always been done by men and women whose training procedures mirrored those assumptions. We have then invested time, money, and ourselves in performing in those institutions the way they are; they have become the fabric of our lives.

Although there has been an increasing emphasis in the literature on culture, that description of the basic fabric of our lives, it has been our previous reluctance to explore sensitively and in depth that aspect of schooling which has made understanding reform initiatives so difficult and frustrating. Indeed, often that emphasis on culture

takes the form of a self-help manual, like the essay collection edited by Ann Lieberman, Building a Professional Culture in Schools, rather than a serious introspection of activities over time.⁷⁰ And because we have been shy about focusing our inquiries on a serious introspection, we have adopted growth, cycle, pendulum, or lawn party metaphors to define our notions about educational change. Thomas Haskel, building on the ideas of Bernard Bailyn and the theories of Thomas Kuhn, concludes that we understand "most fully" institutions in general and our educational institutions specifically only when we can identify those ideas, those presuppositions which supported their creation.⁷¹ Perhaps the time has come to direct some of our scholarly hours in a search for and an examination of our institutional cultural identity.

Thomas Kuhn's small book, The Structure of Scientific Revolution, was first published in 1962. Slowly it has gained a readership outside the philosophy of science, as scholars began to see the applicability of its ideas to their particular fields of study. For example, Richard Patten used the Kuhnian model to relate ideology to school reform.⁷² Gary Gutting edited a collection of essays which linked the Kuhnian model to a variety of scholarly areas, many of which are unconnected to the natural sciences.⁷³ An earlier collection of essays in Duane Roller's book Perspectives in the History of Science and Technology also debated the usefulness of the Kuhnian paradigm theory.⁷⁴ Ilya Prigogine, a Nobel laureate, takes exception to some of Kuhn's ideas, but concludes that while "cultural context cannot be the complete answer . . . it cannot be denied either."⁷⁵ John Casti playfully presents arguments in support of and as an extension of Kuhn in Paradigms Lost: Images of Man in the Mirror of Science.⁷⁶

Until recently educational practitioners or observers of those practitioners, except Sarason, have not dwelled on the importance of fundamental cultural assumptions in examining the resistance of schools to change. Barbara Tye expands Sarason and

applies his work to the evidence gathered by John Goodlad. She concludes that the elements of schooling she calls "deep structure are rooted in the values and assumptions of our society, they are part of the conventional wisdom about schooling, and they have come to be accepted without question."⁷⁷ Her essay, however, is somewhat unique. With the exception of some revisionist educational historians like Patte, educators have generally avoided using Kuhn except to adopt the language of paradigm without the theoretical implications of that term.

Yet Chester Finn, a conservative advocate of an academic core curriculum and a vocal mainline player in the reform initiatives of the Reagan era, has found Kuhn a congenial theorist in his examination of recent reform initiatives. Finn acknowledges that he came late to The Structure of Scientific Revolutions, put off in large part by the too frequent and casual references to the term paradigm in the literature. Once he read the book he concedes that it provided him with one of those "rare, clarifying experiences that have lent order and definition to a jumble of ideas and developments in which education -- and I -- have been tangled for a quarter century or so."⁷⁸

The paradigm shift that Finn sees and what he then claims is a fundamental revolution in schooling is the switch from an input-based system of accountability to an outcome-based system. He argues that the crisis began in the mid-sixties, when it became obvious that we could not educate all of the people to the extent our rhetoric promised. In spite of having the right goals, addressing those goals in the right way, and providing the resources, both human and material, to ensure that the right way was supported, we have failed to educate well a significant portion of our school-age population. That is because we have defined education in terms of what we put into the process and by the processes themselves. Early Reagan-era reforms were generally input variables. We would have more homework, more technology training, more hours

in school. But recent efforts, particularly, according to Finn, by our nation's governors (it is not coincidental that Finn has assisted them in their work) have shifted the focus from what goes into the schools to what comes out of them. Student performance is the linchpin of Finn's paradigm shift. As long as we craft reforms based on the old paradigm (throwing more resources at old problems), we will continue to fail. If we begin to focus on performance, specifically an expectation of high student performance by all, then changes which will significantly alter the ways we do schooling in this nation will occur.

Although I am not persuaded that Finn has articulated the philosophical shift which will change forever our paradigm of schooling, I am persuaded that his discovery of Kuhn's work and the publication of his essay based thereon in a popular and widely distributed journal (in this case, Phi Delta Kappan) suggests that Kuhn has something to offer practitioners. To understand what that something might be, we must first understand Kuhn's argument.

Thomas Kuhn seeks to answer several questions in The Structure of Scientific Revolutions. What is science? What is the nature of scientific truth? What causes scientists to change their minds about the ways they view the universe? What does the history of science tell us about the enterprise itself and about that universe? What is a scientific revolution? In the process of finding answers to those questions, Kuhn suggests a way to understand both stasis and change.

Today some historians would classify Kuhn's work as a contribution to the field known as sociology of knowledge. Peter Berger and Thomas Luckman, authors of The Social Construction of Reality: A Treatise in the Sociology of Knowledge, argue that their discipline is concerned with "whatever passes for 'knowledge' in a society, regardless of the ultimate validity or invalidity . . . of such 'knowledge.'"⁷⁹ Kuhn, then, is concerned

with what scientists consider true and believes that their truth is predicated not so much on an objective construction of reality, but on a social consensus of what constitutes truth. Once Kuhn makes that assumption, a significant departure from the way one normally views science, his argument leads him to a relativistic sense of reality, a distinction between normal science and revolutionary science, and an elegant argument on the nature of ideological crisis.

Kuhn believes that there was a world of scientists before science. That pre-paradigm world was destined to replicate itself with each generation. There did not exist a world view about the nature of things. "All of the facts that could possibly pertain to the development of a given science are likely to seem equally relevant."⁸⁰ Increasingly, however, specific disciplines developed consensus. "Acquisition of a paradigm and of the more esoteric type of research it permits is a sign of maturity in the development of any given scientific field."⁸¹ Sciences we consider old, like astronomy, developed such consensus early. Consensus among practitioners permits the givens necessary to control subsequent study; consensus gives way to what Kuhn characterizes as normal science.

Normal science, supported by the issuance of textbooks, by a canon to be mastered by apprentice scientists, by scholarly journals, and by "a special place in the curriculum," is concerned primarily with solving puzzles.⁸² Indeed, it gains ascendancy over competing paradigms by being able to answer more questions, to resolve more problems. Consequently, it is worth knowing more precisely and it is worth exploring in other situations. It is worth applying to future events and testing predictions. It is worth using to address anomalies, those areas which have been particularly resistant to problem-solving of any type. Normal science does not "aim to produce major novelties, conceptual or phenomenal," but to explicate or apply with

predictability the paradigm.⁸³ Scientists, then, are generally puzzle-solvers and it is the challenge of the puzzle-proper which stimulates and challenges them.

During the normal science phase of a particular paradigm there is considerable evidence of progress. "One of the reasons . . . is that its practitioners concentrate on problems that only their lack of ingenuity should keep them from solving."⁸⁴ Kuhn chooses a particularly vivid allusion to illustrate why the rules of a paradigm keep the problem-solving within predictable boundaries. Take a jigsaw puzzle. To solve successfully that puzzle the final product will be neatly placed together without disjointed edges, with the picture side up, and with the resultant montage recognizable, often a replication of the cover of the box from which the puzzle came. Now, it might be possible to invent a more interesting and certainly more original picture by disobeying those rules, by forcing edges, by inverting some pieces, and by creating a final product with little resemblance to "what was supposed to be," but that would not be the choice of most jigsaw puzzle players.⁸⁵ They will play by the rules and produce something entirely anticipated. They pursue the puzzle not in the hope of creation, but in the expectation of rising to the challenge of the puzzle itself. They pursue normal jigsawing in the way that scientists pursue normal science.

The scientific community reinforces the paradigm in its training procedures, its schools of science. It reinforces the paradigm in its textbooks, in the research it supports (grants are judged, for example, by peers), and in the articles accepted by refereed journals. "Normal science," as Kuhn describes it, "is a highly determined activity."⁸⁶

However, one of the unintended consequences of active research is the discover of puzzles for which there is no resolution. Called anomalies, these intractable puzzles are generally ignored, unconsciously overlooked, described but retained for later research

after the advent of more precise technologies, or judged errors. Because the paradigm is the group consensus of reality, an anomaly must be treated as an error precisely because reality can not be simultaneously two things. The classic example in science, used also by Kuhn, is Ptolemaic cosmology. An earth-centered system, Ptolemy's view of the heavens corresponded to psychological needs and observable truths. However, as the pursuit of normal science became more sophisticated, the number of anomalies increased. Because the paradigm was old, satisfying (who doesn't want to be the center of the universe?), and the basis of education for centuries of cosmologists and astronomers, that increase was discounted or explanations were generated to dismiss them. In the case of Ptolemaic cosmology, the result was an intricate and complicated set of deferents and epicycles.⁸⁷

Yet the anomalies continued as the technology improved. Telescopes revealed realities for which the paradigm could not account. The deferent-epicycle formula became increasingly complex. Observations of heavenly movements were more precise and suggested orbits impossible given an earth-centered universe. A sense of crisis clouded the debate, a feeling of insecurity about the paradigm itself.

Enter Copernicus with a remarkably simple solution: we exist in a heliocentric universe. But did the profession, for it is professions which cluster often around paradigms, immediately embrace the ideas of that humble monk? Certainly not. The crisis persisted and contending theories emerged. Research began to resemble the pre-paradigm stage. Rules were questioned. The canon became suspect. Kuhn notes, somewhat self-evidently, that "the significance of the crisis is the indication . . . that an occasion for retooling has arrived."⁸⁸ And a crisis is "a necessary precondition for the emergence of novel theories."⁸⁹

But science cannot reject one paradigm without claiming allegiance to another. The crisis blurs the paradigm and the rules under which normal science was conducted are loosened. They conclude, according to Kuhn, in one of three ways: (1) normal science ultimately is able to resolve the anomalies that led to the crisis in a way that satisfies the community; (2) normal science is unable to resolve the difficulties and the community shelves the problem, assuming that technological advances will make a resolution possible some time in the future; and (3) an alternative paradigm emerges and begins to contend for the loyalty of the community by presenting ways to resolve problems that are more satisfactory.⁹⁰ Prior to the collapse of a paradigm, during those moments between the emergence of crisis and questions and the introduction of new ways to look at the universe, scientists will often "push the rules of normal science harder than ever."⁹¹ They will also attempt to find ways "of magnifying the breakdown, of making it more striking and perhaps also more suggestive than it had been."⁹²

During the resultant crisis science will seek answers in philosophical inquiries; they will return to an examination of fundamental truths. Crisis "loosens the stereotypes."⁹³ Kuhn has found that many of the scientists who suggest the transfer of allegiance to something new are young chronologically or at least new to the field in crisis. They have not been as acculturated nor have they as large a stake in the persistence of the old truths. Kuhn argues that "the proliferation of competing articulations, the willingness to try anything, the expression of explicit discontent, the recourse to philosophy and to debate over fundamentals" are all "symptoms of a transition from normal to extraordinary research."⁹⁴ It is that transition which opens the gateway to revolution.

Scientists are confronted with a choice between incompatible ways of existing as a professional community. Because it is the professional community standard which sets

the limits of normal science and which permits the activities of normal science to occur, "changes in the standards governing permissible problems, concepts, and explanations can transform a science." And when that transformation results in a change in the paradigm, in the map and directions for map-reading which have governed the profession, "the world itself changes."⁹⁵ Although some of the aspects of postrevolutionary science will resemble normal science before the paradigm shift, will rely upon some of the same technologies and be discussed with some of the same vocabulary, the shift will be basic, thorough and relatively complete.⁹⁶

What the new paradigm must claim and what it must be able to do is resolve the anomalies which led to crisis.⁹⁷ Initially new paradigms will have few advocates and often its advocates will be considered outside the realm of legitimate science. Gradually, the number of supporters will grow as the new paradigm suggests productive avenues of research and provides answers to the questions which precipitated a sense of frustration with the previous paradigm. The community increasingly adopts the relationships, rules, standards, and procedures suggested by the paradigm, incorporating them into the institutions through which it acculturates its apprentices.

To Kuhn obvious scientific progress is observable "only during periods of normal science."⁹⁸ During periods of crisis and shift such progress is difficult to recognize. The inability to recognize progress during such times is one reason that revolutionary change comes infrequently and is approached with some hesitation.

An application of Kuhn to educational reform must begin with an examination of the paradigm in crisis. That paradigm in K-12 schooling was established before the turn of the current century and by the beginning of the first world war was commonly accepted by the profession. It is to the definition of that paradigm that we turn in the next chapter.

CHAPTER FOUR

FOOTNOTES

¹William A. Reinsmith, "The True Meaning of Education: A Radical Suggestion," The Educational Forum 51 (Spring 1987); 249-250.

²Ibid., p. 250.

³Bernard David, "How Progressive Education Failed Us," Cosmopolitan 144 (April 1958): 36.

⁴John Keats, "Are the Public Schools Doing Their Job? No," Saturday Evening Post (21 September 1957): 117-118.

⁵Richard Hofstadter, Anti-intellectualism in American Life (New York: Vintage Books, 1963), p. 301.

⁶Quoted in Ibid., 303.

⁷Quoted in Ibid.

⁸Quoted in Ibid., p. 304.

⁹Task Force on Education for Economic Growth, Action for Excellence: A Comprehensive Plan to Improve Our Nation's Schools (Denver: A.B. Hirschfield Press, 1983), pp. 3-32 passim.

¹⁰The National Commission on Excellence in Education, A Nation at Risk: The Imperative for Educational Reform (Washington D.C.: Government Printing Office, 1983), pp. 5-24 passim.

¹¹National Governors' Association Center for Policy Research and Analysis, Time for Results: The Governors' 1991 Report on Education (Washington D.C.: National Governors' Association, 1986), pp. 8-22 passim.

¹²Carl Glickman, "Unlocking School Reform: Uncertainty as a Condition of Professionalism," Phi Delta Kappan 69 (October 1987): 120-121.

¹³Sharon Rallis and Martha Highsmith, "The Myth of the Great Principal," Phi Delta Kappan 68 (December 1986): 300-304.

- ¹⁴Chester Finn and Diane Ravitch, "No Trivial Pursuit," Phi Delta Kappan 69 (April 1988): 559-564.
- ¹⁵Harold Hodginson, "Reform? Higher Education? Don't Be Absurd," Phi Delta Kappan 68 (December 1986): 271-274.
- ¹⁶Gene Maeroff, "Withered Hopes, Stillborn Dreams: The Dismal Panorama of Urban Schools," Phi Delta Kappan 69 (May 1988): 632-638.
- ¹⁷Milbrey Wallis, et al., "Why Teachers Won't Teach," Phi Delta Kappan 67 (February 1986): 420-426.
- ¹⁸Jack Frymier, "Bureaucracy and the Neutering of Teachers," Phi Delta Kappan 69 (September 1987): 9-14.
- ¹⁹Samuel Bacharach and Sharon Conley, "Education Reform: A Managerial Agenda," Phi Delta Kappan 67 (May 1986): 641-645.
- ²⁰David Elkind, "Formal Education and Early Childhood Education," Phi Delta Kappan 67 (May 1986): 631-636.
- ²¹Daniel Griffiths, "Evolution in Research and Theory: A Study of Prominent Researchers," Educational Administration Quarterly 19 (Summer 1983): 201-221; Bruce S. Cooper and William L. Boyd, "The Evolution of Training for School Administrators," in Leaders for America's Schools: The Report and Papers of the National Commission on Excellence in Educational Administration, ed. Daniel Griffiths, Robert Stout and Patrick Forsyth (Berkeley, California: McCutchan Publishing Corporation, 1988), pp. 260-261.
- ²²Karl Weick, "Educational Organizations as Loosely Coupled Systems," Administrative Science Quarterly 23 (December 1978): 541-552.
- ²³John Meyer and Brian Rowan, "The Structure of Educational Organizations," in The Dynamics of Organizational Change in Education, ed. J. Victor Baldrige and Terrence Deal (Berkeley, California, 1983), p. 61.
- ²⁴*Ibid.*, p. 68.
- ²⁵*Ibid.*, p. 72.
- ²⁶*Ibid.*, p. 73.
- ²⁷*Ibid.*, p. 74.
- ²⁸J. Victor Baldrige and Terrence Deal, "Complications of Rational Approaches to Change," in The Dynamics of Organizational Change, p. 90.

²⁹Arthur Wise, "Why Educational Policies Often Fail: The Hyperrationalization Hypothesis," in The Dynamics of Organizational Change, pp. 93-94.

³⁰Quoted in Paul Watzlawick, et. al., Change: Principles of Problem-Formation and Problem-Resolution (New York: W.W. Norton & Company, 1974), pp. 33, n.3.

³¹Seymour Sarason, The Creation of Settings and Future Societies (San Francisco: Jossey-Bass, 1972), p. 4.

³²Robert Slavin, "PET and the Pendulum: Faddism in Education and How to Stop It," Phi Delta Kappan 70 (June 1989): 752.

³³K. Patricia Cross, "The Rising Tide of School Reform Reports," Phi Delta Kappan 66 (November 1984): 168.

³⁴For a concise summary of cyclical theory in history see Hans Meyerhoff, "Introduction," in The Philosophy of History in Our Time, ed. Hans Meyerhoff (New York: Doubleday Anchor Books, 1959), pp. 1-8.

³⁵Slavin, "PET and the Pendulum," pp. 755-756.

³⁶Crane Brinton, The Anatomy of Revolution (New York: Vantage Books, 1965).

³⁷*Ibid.*, p. 237.

³⁸Eleanor Farrar, John DeSanctis, and David Cohen, "The Lawn Party: The Evolution of Federal Programs in Local Settings," in Dynamics of Organizational Change, p. 115.

³⁹*Ibid.*, p. 118.

⁴⁰*Ibid.*, p. 121.

⁴¹Terrence Deal and Samuel Nutt, "Planned Change in Rural School Districts," in Dynamics of Organizational Change, p. 137-165.

⁴²Michael Kirst, "The Rise and Fall of PPBS in California," Phi Delta Kappan 56 (April 1975): 535-538.

⁴³Anthony Downs, "Up and Down with Ecology: The Issue-Attention Cycle," Public Interest (Fall 1972): 39-50.

⁴⁴Arnold Toynbee, A Study of History (New York: Weathervane Books, 1972), p. 93.

⁴⁵See, for example, Gordon Leff, History and Social Theory (New York: Anchor Books, 1977), p. 7, and Meyerhoff, The Philosophy of History, p. 8.

⁴⁶Robert A. Nisbet, Social Change and History: Aspects of the Western Theory of Development (New York: Oxford University Press, 1969), p. 8.

⁴⁷Ibid., pp. 9-10.

⁴⁸J. Victor Baldrige and Terrence E. Deal, "The Basics of Change in Educational Organizations," in The Dynamics of Organizational Change, p. 1.

⁴⁹Ibid., p. 3.

⁵⁰Robert Nisbet, "Introduction: The Problem of Social Change," in Social Change, ed. Robert Nisbet (New York: Harper & Row, Publishers, 1972), pp. 1, 4, 5.

⁵¹Robert Heilbroner, The Future as History (New York: Harper Torchbooks, 1960), p. 195.

⁵²Watzlawick, Change, p. 2.

⁵³Nisbet, "Introduction," p. 6.

⁵⁴Ibid., p. 10.

⁵⁵Ibid., p. 18.

⁵⁶Ibid., p. 22.

⁵⁷Heilbroner, The Future as History, p. 195.

⁵⁸Ibid., p. 196.

⁵⁹Action for Excellence, p. 13.

⁶⁰Larry Cuban, Paper presented at the Association for Supervision and Curriculum Development (ASCD) National Conference, San Antonio, Texas, 4 March 1990.

⁶¹Seymour Sarason, The Culture of the School and the Problem of Change, 2nd ed. (Boston: Allyn & Brown, 1982), p. 219.

⁶²Nisbet, "Introduction," p. 32.

⁶³Thorstein Veblen, The Higher Learning in America, quoted in Thomas Bender, et.al., "Institutionalization and Education in the Nineteenth and Twentieth Centuries," History of Education Quarterly 19 (Winter 1980): 449-450.

⁶⁴Stanley O. Ivie, "Idols of the Mind," The Educational Forum 53 (Spring 1989): 281-288 passim. Obviously, Ivie uses Francis Bacon's famous false idols argument in Novum Organum as a springboard to his own examination of schooling idols of the mind.

⁶⁵Henry Petroski, "Of Styluses and Diamonds: Annals of the Pencil," Educational Week (18 April 1990): 56, 36. This article is a summary of Petroski's recently published book The Pencil: A History of Design and Circumstance (New York: Alfred A. Knopf, 1989).

⁶⁶Seymour Sarason, "The Principal and the Power to Change," National Elementary Principal 53 (July 1974): 53.

⁶⁷John Dewey, Experience and Education (New York: Macmillan, 1959), p. 10.

⁶⁸Alfred North Whitehead, Process and Reality (New York: Macmillan Company, 1929), Part V, Chapter 1.

⁶⁹Quoted in James Gleick, Chaos: Making a New Science (New York: Viking Books, 1987), p. 38..

⁷⁰Ann Lieberman, ed., Building a Professional Culture in Schools (New York: Teachers College Press, 1988). The characterization of this volume as essentially a self-help guide, although essentially correct, should not detract from the quality and practical value of several of the essays included therein. Although I am arguing for a conscious and historically sensitive awareness of the presuppositions which frame our concept of school culture, I am also cognizant of the need to apply some immediate prescriptive measures to the current climate which characterizes most of our nation's K-12 institutions.

⁷¹Thomas Haskell, quoted in Bender, "Institutionalization and Education," p. 457. Bernard Bailyn is often credited with revitalizing the historiography of the history of education with an examination of schools and schooling (both in a specific and in a general sense) in colonial America.

⁷²Richard Pratte, Ideology and Education (New York: David McKay Company, 1977).

⁷³Gary Gutting, ed., Paradigms and Revolution: Appraisals and Applications of Thomas Kuhn's Philosophy of Science (Notre Dame: University of Notre Dame Press, 1980).

⁷⁴Duane H.D. Roller, ed., Perspectives in the History of Science and Technology (Norman: University of Oklahoma Press, 1971).

⁷⁵Ilya Prigogine and Isabelle Stengers, Order Out of Chaos: Man's New Dialogue with Nature (New York: Bantam Books, 1984), p. 309. For readers interested in a critical analysis of Kuhn, including essays by some of his most vocal critics, Gutting's book is a good starting point. Prigogine's volume serves as an extended case study in opposition.

⁷⁶John Casti, Paradigms Lost: Images of Man in the Mirror of Science (New York: William Morrow and Company, Inc., 1989), note particularly pp. 1-67.

⁷⁷Barbara Benham Tye, "The Deep Structure of Schooling," Phi Delta Kappan 69 (December 1987): 283.

⁷⁸Chester Finn, "The Biggest Reform of All," Phi Delta Kappan 71 (April 1990): 585-586.

⁷⁹Peter Berger and Thomas Luckman, The Social Construction of Reality: A Treatise in the Sociology of Knowledge (New York: Anchor Books, 1967). For an application of the sociology of knowledge to a single aspect of change, see Peter Berger, Bridgitte Berger, and Hansfried Kellner, The Human Mind: Modernization and Consciousness (New York: Vintage Books, 1974).

⁸⁰Thomas Kuhn, The Structure of Scientific Revolutions, 2nd edition (Chicago: University of Chicago Press, 1970), p. 15.

⁸¹*Ibid.*, p. 11.

⁸²*Ibid.*, p. 19.

⁸³*Ibid.*, p. 35.

⁸⁴*Ibid.*, p. 37.

⁸⁵*Ibid.*, p. 38.

⁸⁶*Ibid.*, p. 42.

⁸⁷I first encountered this system as an undergraduate at the University of Iowa in a core course on the history of ideas, taken in the mid-1960s. Like Chester Finn, I had one of those clarifying experiences. Interestingly, the textbook we used for part of the course was Thomas Kuhn's The Copernican Revolution: Planetary Astronomy in the Development of Western Thought (New York: Vintage Books, 1959). At the time I was planning to write the great American novel and had very little indication that I would study to be an historian, thereby rediscovering Kuhn in yet another course -- this time in the mid-1970s in Texas. I waited another decade to begin to use his ideas to help me understand educational reform issues. Kuhn has been a well-traveled part of my intellectual development.

⁸⁸Kuhn, The Structure, p. 76.

⁸⁹*Ibid.*, p. 77.

⁹⁰*Ibid.*, p. 84.

⁹¹*Ibid.*, p. 87.

⁹²*Ibid.*, p. 89.

⁹³*Ibid.*, p. 90.

⁹⁴*Ibid.*, p. 106.

⁹⁵*Ibid.*, p. 111.

⁹⁶*Ibid.*, pp. 130 and 149.

⁹⁷*Ibid.*, p. 153.

⁹⁸*Ibid.*, p. 163.

CHAPTER FIVE
BROTHER, CAN YOU PARADIGM

Traditionally, American youngsters have been introduced to the Civil War as the turning point between two semesters. Before that conflict we were westward migration, slavery, and rural society. After the war we became diverse, industrial, and modern. It served as a line of demarcation between the old and the new. Scholars, however, have pointed to the signs of industrialization in the early nineteenth-century, arguing that the Civil War was an interruption of modernization rather than a stimulus.

But there is something to be said of the symbolic and cultural significance of that unfortunate clash of wills. Although the battles were rhetorically about territory and human bondage, they also represented a contest over what William Taylor termed national character. In the nineteenth century a new America emerged, one defined by "restless mobility" and "strident materialism." Its citizens, new Americans, were acquisitive and ambitious. They lived in cities and engaged in commerce. Their values were secular and relative.¹ Henry James claimed that the war "left a different tone from the tone it found." Americans had "eaten from the tree of knowledge" and had gained "a certain sense of proportion and relation, of the world being a more complicated place than it had hitherto seemed."² If the wilderness of the Puritans became metaphorically an ante-bellum pastoral Eden, then the Civil War, fueled by the engines and engineers of the north, abruptly introduced Americans to a reality of steam, factories, and competition in which the winners were exalted and lived in Newport palaces and the losers huddled in New York tenements.

One could argue that we have yet to come to terms with the national character implications of that northern victory. We still cling to the idea that, like Mark Twain's

Huck, we can "light out" to the west when civilization encroaches. We romanticize the life of Marlboro men and elect cowboy Presidents. Adlai Stevensons are suspect, eggheads better suited for effete rustbelt universities and think tanks than for real work. We admire a Donald Trump, at least momentarily, or a Ross Perot, because each has behaved like a mountain man in an entrepreneurial frontier. Although we condemn the depersonalization of modern society, we simultaneously demand the accoutrements of that society for our comfort and material well-being.

If the ante-bellum world was contained, provincial, personal, and knowable, the world after the Civil War was difficult to grasp. Things became, in the words of James, more complex. One way to understand the years after Reconstruction and before our entry into the first world war is to consider them a time of making sense of change. We had already taken the fateful steps toward industrialization in advance of the election of 1860. Historians like George Taylor have documented the early technological changes which made inevitable the socio-economic transformation of our nation.³ In our attempts to make sense of that transition we as a nation found it necessary to create a concomitant set of institutions, procedures, and regulations to re-establish the security of the old regime.

Robert Wiebe, author of the appropriately titled The Search for Order, 1877-1920, argues that it is the establishment of a structural and, ultimately, mental framework to control the new industrial world which is the dominant theme of the last decades of the nineteenth century and the first decades of this one. Even the largest of the new industrial giants, men like John D. Rockefeller, operated "jerry-built organizations" characterized by "ad hoc assumptions of responsibility, obsolete office techniques, and . . . an astonishing lack of communication."⁴

As the network of relations affecting men's lives . . . became more tangled and more distended, Americans . . . no longer knew who or where they were. The

setting had altered beyond their power to understand it, and within an alien context they had lost themselves.⁵

The resultant sense of crisis precipitated the creation of a new America, the context within which Taylor's new America could function.

America's schools were immune to neither the crisis nor the activities which attempted to eliminate that sense of living in a world without control. As the nation built the parameters of modernity, established a bureaucratic paradigm within which to function as an industrial and urban power, the education establishment created a paradigm of modern schooling. It contains the intellectual parameters within which we have debated educational change and reform for the past century and its strength is the primary reason that we have difficulty altering our schools today.

The common school movement was the foundation of early educational reform in the United States. Small, often one room, schoolhouses dotted the landscape. Ultimately supported by public dollars, these institutions offered community children a rudimentary introduction to reading, writing, and arithmetic. Taught generally by young women whose own educations rarely exceeded a few years in a secondary school, they did not pretend to be fonts of academic activity nor did they teach specific skills necessary for success in the world of work. They introduced young people of a variety of ages and abilities to those basic educational functions which were generic to most post-school enterprises and which formed the foundation of an educated electorate.

Horace Mann, the man most often associated with the common school movement, envisioned a system of institutions open to all citizens. He believed that universal education could be the "great equalizer" and the "balance wheel of . . . social machinery." Such schools could create a "more far-seeing intelligence and a purer morality" than had theretofore existed among men.⁶ Almost messianic in tone, Mann's annual reports to the

Massachusetts Board of Education reflect the optimism and hopes of the young American republic. Educated men will do good; the democratic experiment will endure; all Americans will benefit from the wealth of the nation; a sense of community and virtue will guide our actions. By the eve of the Civil War a majority of states had created public school systems and over fifty percent of our young people were receiving some form of formal education.⁷

The common school functioned well within the confines of the island communities of ante-bellum America. However, when the war concluded those island communities, already in jeopardy by transportation and communication intrusions from the outside world, were rent by change. A new economic order demanded workers with different skills, skills not readily learned through apprenticeships with master craftsmen. The development of cities clustered around transportation and manufacturing centers brought people closer together, crowding out small schools and requiring larger buildings to house the increased number of students. Schools which theretofore had not been considered primarily custodial institutions now served working parents by providing a place for their children during factory hours. When the pace of immigration accelerated, reaching significant proportions at the dawn of the current century, the school also became a primary means of assimilation. As school systems were formed, new professions evolved to manage them. The lengths of the school day and the school year increased; demands for more professionally competent teachers trained to prepare youngsters for a modern world likewise grew. In response to those new requirements between Reconstruction and World War I, roughly between 1880 and 1920, the dimensions of modern schooling emerged into what David Tyack has called "the one best system."

Tyack summarizes the forces leading to that transition in Wiebian terms:

Thoughtful educators . . . were aware that the functions of schooling were shifting in response to these 'modernizing' forces. As village patterns merged into urbanism as a way of life, factories and counting houses split the place of work from the home; impersonal and codified roles structured relationships in organizations, replacing diffuse and personal role relationships familiar in the village; the jack-of-all-trades of the rural community came to perform specialized tasks in the city; the older reliance on tradition and folkways as guides to belief and conduct shifted as mass media provided new sources of information and norms of behavior and as science became a pervasive source of authority; people increasingly defined themselves as members of occupational groups . . . as they became aware of common interests that transcended allegiance to particular communities, thus constituting what Robert Wiebe calls 'the new middle class.'⁸

The goal of America's responses to industrialization was the rationalization (to make reasonable and sensible) of those transformations. Americans sought to make the new tune melodic rather than a cacophony of discordant sounds. One of the primary instruments in the ensuing quest for melody was the public schools.

Although Tyack's "one best system" referred primarily to the schools which emerged in cities, the characteristics of that "best system" would, eventually, be found in the flatlands of the midwest and slowly, albeit ultimately, in the south. Joel Spring called the resultant system a "sorting machine," which, he argued, operated at the bequest and benefit of modern industrialists.⁹ But the machine did more than sort and it did it in areas beyond the urban sprawl built on a foundation of new mass production factories. It transformed the institution itself.

Industrialization required divisions. Some Americans would rule the boardrooms, some would rule the factory floors, some would work on assembly lines, and some would sweep the floors and clean the lines. In a sense our schools helped define those divisions. Industrialization required obedient, responsible workers who would purchase the products of their colleagues, and whose "productive use" of leisure time would ensure a ready market. Our schools assisted in preparing workers to work and to consume. While the schools melted millions of diverse immigrants and non-immigrants

alike in a cultural cauldron of standardized education, they simultaneously provided them with both a sense of distinctiveness (those divisions) and sameness (a national identity built upon common links to production and consumption).

The century began, not unlike the way it is ending, with educators acknowledging socio-economic transitions and connecting those changes to education. For example, Elwood Cubberley wrote in his 1909 publication Changing Conceptions of Education that:

. . .so great have been the changes wrought that agriculture, commerce, and manufacturing have been more profoundly modified during the past hundred years than they had been before since the days of the Crusades. Newspapers, customs, religious observances, political ideas, and views of life, as well as ways of living, have been almost equally transformed. Business knowledge, industrial skill, executive capacity, and personal efficiency have been emphasized; peace and industrial welfare have been substituted in large part of the wastefulness of war; and leisure, culture, and education have come to be regarded as the birthrights of all.¹⁰

Rather than being part of an island community or even a nation, we "belong to the world."¹¹ "The problems now before us are more numerous and larger than ever before, and they call for men of large training and capacity."¹² Among those problems Cubberley included the "illiterate, docile, lacking in self-reliance and initiative" new immigrant.¹³

The home, which in the past had exercised "a much stronger restraining and directive influence over . . . children," no longer ensured that youngsters were taught "obedience, proper demeanor, respect, courtesy, honesty, fidelity, and virtue." The church, too, "has lost its influence over the young . . . and many children grow up . . . without any religious training."¹⁴ "Parents everywhere are less strict than they used to be."

Along with these changes there has come not only a tremendous increase in the quantity of our knowledge, but also a demand for a large increase in the amount of knowledge necessary to enable one to meet the changed conditions of our modern life. The kind of knowledge needed, too, has fundamentally changed.¹⁵

Schools were to function in loco parentis, as custodians of a secular morality capable of providing the focus and direction once considered the responsibility of the home, the church, and the master craftsmen.

Cubberley sometimes seems to be speaking as much for the 1990s as he was for the 1900s.

The industrial and social revolution which we have experienced has been far reaching in its consequences, and the 'good old times' of our grandfathers are gone, never to return. In their place, we have a new and a vastly more complex civilization, with a great and an ever increasing specialization of human effort, and new and ever more difficult social and industrial problems awaiting solution. The specialization of labor and effort has been applied to all fields of work. We have been made dependent even the for the necessities of life upon the commerce of remote regions and distant peoples to an extent that it is difficult for us to understand. The world has become very much smaller than it used to be, and its parts have become more interdependent to an extent never known before.¹⁶

Anticipating the global economic trend which has contributed to John Naisbitt's rise to fame and fortune, Cubberley noted economic battles might become more important than those which took place on a field of war.¹⁷ Anticipating A Nation at Risk, as well as dozens of subsequent reports on workplace skills for the twenty-first century, Cubberley believed that brains would count more than brawn in a world dominated by new technologies.¹⁸

Nor was Cubberley's generation immune to the educational complaints which characterize our current age of reform.

The need of broad, general, and diversified training, adapted to the needs of the future rather than to the needs of the present or the past, becomes even more evident. The educational system is subjected to new and increased criticism. We hear this on all sides today.¹⁹

"The many state educational commissions which have been created within the past five years indicate a general dissatisfaction with existing conditions and a desire for change

and improvement."²⁰ Education must "prepare the future citizen for the tomorrow of our complex life."²¹

Ernest Carroll Moore began his 1917 publication Fifty Years of American Education: A Sketch of the Progress of Education in the United States from 1867 to 1917

with a litany of the changes which had occurred during that period. For example, from 1866 to 1896 the nation had profited from the invention and/or construction of the transatlantic cable, the transcontinental railroad, the telephone, the cable car, electric lights, the linotype machine, the internal combustion engine, automobiles, the electric wave telegraph, the Langley flying machine, and the submarine.²² "Forty years ago . . . the world did not know the cause of any of the great infections," but the last half-century "has done more than a hundred centuries to solve" the mysteries of infectious disease.²³ Moore even acknowledged the significance of Darwin's work in enriching our understanding of humankind.²⁴ And, although Moore did not include him in his list of intellectual advances, Freud's work began to reach these shores at the turn of the century and the social sciences became recognized as legitimate disciplines, sanctioned by the establishment of professional organizations and graduate courses of study.²⁵

Nor were the institutions of education unresponsive to the changing character of America.

The development . . . of all the great present-day agencies of education -- free graded elementary schools, intermediate schools, high schools, normal schools, the great universities, schools for the Negro and the Indian, vocational schools, the great foundations, departments in universities for the study of education, statistical information concerning schools, new courses of study, a vast literature about teaching, well-nigh the whole present-day science of education (including school administration, child-study, educational psychology, the history and theory of education, school hygiene, and educational standards and measurements, and very nearly the entire machinery of school supervision (city superintendents, supervising principals, supervisors of subjects, and state inspectors and agents) -- is a growth of the last fifty years.²⁶

Even in the southern states, where the pace of change was slower and support for educational attainments more tenuous:

. . . improvements appeared in many ways: the educational provisions of the constitutions and laws were revised and strengthened; in a decade school revenues were increased by 100 to 200 per cent; the improvement of schoolhouses was marked; by 1910, the annual school term was lengthened to 121 days; and the enrollment and average attendance increased.²⁷

Although Edgar Knight, author of the 1924 publication Education in the South, found the road to progressive schooling still significantly untraveled in the region, he believed that there was a foundation of improvement on which to build. In 1885 John Philbrick, a Boston educator, wrote that the task of a school manager was to perfect "the system itself." He should always have:

some project in hand: the establishment of a training school for teachers, an evening school, or an industrial school; the adoption of a better method of examining and certificating teachers . . . an improvement in the plan of constructing school-houses; the devising of a more rational program and a more rational system of school examinations.²⁸

Changes in the schools should be on-going and should come with the frequency of changes in the marketplace, thereby ensuring a congruence between the two.

David Tyack has argued that late nineteenth-century reformers "saw the school [as] a critical means of transforming the pre-industrial culture -- values, attitudes, work habits, time orientation, even recreations -- of citizens in a modernizing society."²⁹ Lawrence Cremin noted that once established as a conscious initiative, something he dates from the publication of Joseph Myer Rice's series of Forum articles in 1892, progressive education reforms "in less than two generations transformed the character of the American school."³⁰ Henry Perkinson dates that transformation from the time we "began to look at the schools as central to the economic life of the country."³¹ In an effort to restore the opportunities symbolically lost by the closing of

the American west and radically transformed by the process of industrialization, "America built a school system . . . to provide, in [Andrew] Carnegie's words, 'a ladder on which the aspiring would rise.' They expected their schools to guarantee all Americans an equal opportunity for success."³²

That guarantee came in an unwritten compact containing assumptions about the nature of schools and schooling which, by 1920, were part of the world view of a majority of Americans, be they professional educators or laymen. All children must attend school and a significant number of them must complete their formal education in a high school. Schools were to be part of a coherent system supervised by a professionally trained superintendent and overseen by a politically neutral reasonably small board of education. Superintendents were to be assisted by an organization whose pyramid structure reflected practices found in large, modern factories. Students were to be viewed as raw materials to be transformed by those schools into finished goods whose educational specifications were set by the economic needs of business and industry. That transformation was to occur through the presentation of a carefully sequenced and standardized course of study to youngsters in graded classrooms arranged roughly by the chronological ages of students. Instructional presentations were made by appropriately credentialed teachers whose work was monitored by experts and whose effectiveness was judged, as much as possible, by quantifiable measurements.

The industrial paradigm of schooling ensured that those institutions were bureaucratic in the Weberian sense; they were authoritarian, hierarchical, and impersonal. The majority of workers were certified educators, administered by certified managers, who perceived students as passive participants on an educational assembly line whose products were designed to meet the needs of the nation.

Those needs were generally defined, even in the nineteenth-century, by economics. For instance, differentiated programs of study helped students prepare for the world of work by teaching placement. Some students were destined for advancement; others were destined for routine and often boring manual labor. Schools helped judge and sort the raw materials into categories, assisting students in not only finding a rung on the economic ladder, but also in finding a modicum of contentment with that rung. By becoming compulsory institutions, schools kept potential low-wage laborers off the market. As we gradually eliminated child labor, schools increasingly provided custodial care for children whose parents were thereby freed to work outside the home. By stressing moral education, vestiges of which can be seen today on report cards with "citizenship" check lists or conduct grades, schools helped to reinforce the virtues necessary for an industrial society to prosper. For example, an emphasis on obedience to authority ensured the docile workers necessary to keep factory line moving. An emphasis on responsibility meant that factory tools would be handled respectfully. An emphasis on following instructions would later make the job of a foreman easier. Overt attention to attitudes both stemmed from and was perceived as a solution to the rise in lawlessness which accompanied the rapid influx of immigrants and rural Americans into already crowded cities at the turn of the century. Then as now an ancillary function of schools was to deter crime. Money spent on a student today might mean that we would not need to spend money on a convict tomorrow.

The bell-shaped curve epitomized the sorting and selecting functions schools assumed. We needed only a few students to progress to the university and become our nation's factory owners, inventors, and innovators. They were the students who received the A's. We needed slightly more students to serve as mid-level managers; they, too, attended post-secondary schools, although those colleges were often without the pedigree

of the Harvards and Yales. Those students received B's. The majority of high school students were destined for the world of work. They received C's. We needed some support personnel, the cleaners and the food providers. The students who would sweep our floors received D's. But we also needed a stick to ensure our students filled those first four ranks of the classic bell curve. Teachers learned early on to refer to the F's as "what might happen to you if you don't . . ." changing the ending of that treat to fit the situation. None of that sorting was necessarily conscious nor was it as clean as a bell curve as certain education historians suggest, but most Americans agreed by the turn of the century that some students were destined for good things and some were destined for lives which were framed by diminished opportunities. Youngsters quickly learned where they fit and many left school early once their lesson in placement was mastered.

Because workers generate capital through the products of their labor, it is in the interest of capitalists to obtain workers with appropriate skills. Many skills were attitudinal, but some skills were defined by new business and industrial needs. The appearance of industrial education, a "scientific" course of study in high schools, and vocational guidance programs were all responses to demands inherent in a new economic order. Whereas apprenticeship with master craftsmen or an agricultural practicum on the family farm were staples of a rural, agrarian social order, they were no longer applicable in a society in which most employees would ultimately be engaged in specialized, repetitive tasks.

Industrialization, even given the disastrous social and personal consequences to many of its participants, yielded significant economic benefits. Once the major dislocations were resolved by the rise of such ameliorating counter-institutions as unions, industrialization provided our nation with sufficient capital to spend our leisure time by consuming the temporal and material fruits of our labors. Schools taught young

people about philanthropy (service projects), political participation (student government associations), boosterism (spirit clubs), hobbies (clubs), and sports (interscholastic athletics). They also taught students about tangible rewards, self-interest, and competition -- lessons played out today in commercial battles even over such trivial items as tennis shoes.

Philosophically, our educational system retained the theme of equity sounded earlier by Horace Mann and the common school founders. Schools were to be "doorways to success," "windows to opportunity" for everyone. Learning would provide equality, because everyone shared the same access to education, at least theoretically. Once aboard the educational assembly line, a student could, by hard work and perseverance, excel. The equity implicit in our Protestant heritage (everyone is equal before God and has an equal chance for salvation) combined easily with the excellence possible through competition (the winner deserved the victory). Factory schools brought an additional element to the equity-excellence pendulum. Schools were to meet those twin goals efficiently. They were to ensure that equity and excellence were attainable without waste, with the lowest possible expenditure of resources.

Historically, the American Revolution gave us an argument for all men being equal. Notwithstanding the severe limitations on that phrase at that time, the basic premise of equity is established during our transition from colonists to successful revolutionaries. The Civil War freed the nation from the identification shackles of the south. The north's victory was a victory for more than union and emancipation; it ensured that our economic and social path would be that of modernization through industrialization. Our form of modernization emphasized competition; to the victor, the one who excelled, went the spoils. Hence schools began to speak the language of excellence. The transformation described by Wiebe, our search for order within the

chaos of change, wed us to a third plank in our establishment of modernity. The triumph of industrialization provided the rationale for business stewardship of our nation's institutions, including our nation's schools. They were destined to be cost-effective entities whose bottom lines were often facile declarations about equity and/or excellence, but whose bare bones baseline was the adoption of scientific management techniques geared toward efficiency. Our schools were to provide us with the promises of success cheaply.

David Nasaw accurately captured the relationship of the common school movement and the transformation of those schools which took place between 1880 and 1920. Prior to the Civil War there "appeared to be wide agreement among Americans on the importance of schooling for their child," but "there was no consensus on the shape that schooling should take."³³ The common schools movement provided the ideological groundwork, that agreement of importance, for the industrial-age school, in much the same way that the communication and transportation innovations of the ante-bellum period presaged the demise of Wiebe's island communities. However, when transition came, it was cloaked in late nineteenth-century terms. Granted there was opposition to developing a public education system which responded to the needs of a growing capitalist, industrial state. William Reese, for example, has chronicled such resistance in Power and the Promise of School Reform: Grassroots Movements during the Progressive Era.³⁴ But that opposition was swept aside by the economic imperatives of industrialization.

Schools became education factories. As Ellwood Cubberley, touted by many as the most influential educator of the early twentieth-century, claimed:

Our schools are, in a sense, factories in which the raw materials are to be shaped and fashioned into products to meet the various demands of life. The specifications for manufacturing come from the demands of the twentieth century civilization, and it is the business of the school to build its pupils to the

specifications laid down. This demands good tools, specialized machinery, continuous measurement of production to see if it is according to specifications, the elimination of waste in manufacture and a large variety of outputs.³⁵

Charles Ham believed that "the distinguishing characteristic of the Ideal School building is its chimney, which rises far above the roof, from whose tall stack a column of smoke issues, and the hum and whir of machinery is heard."³⁶ He asserted that in that building, "which resembles a factory or machine-shop an educational revolution is to be wrought." We are in the process of replacing "the enervating influence of Grecian aestheticism" with "the scientific direction of the followers of Bacon, whose philosophy is common sense and its law, progress."³⁷ Ham links industrialization with science and with progress; by implication the liberal arts one associates with classical studies are irrelevant in a twentieth-century world. When William Wirt described how the Gary Plan to platoon schools worked, he echoed Ham, describing the resultant institution as the "improved school machine."³⁸

An article in a 1912 issue of a New York education journal compared the pupil to a product and the purpose of the new "scientific management" of schools was to "increase the amount of output."³⁹ James Munrow in that same year demanded the employment of educational engineers who would study:

(1) The pupils who constitute the raw material of the business of education; (2) the building and other facilities for teaching which make up the plant; (3) the school boards and the teaching staff, who correspond to the directorate and the working force; (4) the means and methods of instruction and development; (5) the demands of society in general and of industry in particular upon boys and girls -- this corresponding to the problem of markets; and (6) the question of cost, which is almost always a business problem.⁴⁰

A businessman speaking to the National Education Association in 1915 concluded that "it is proper to say that the schools are like factories turning out graduates, which, in turn,

become employees of the business houses and may be considered the raw materials of business."⁴¹

In 1906 James Earl Russell linked several Gilded Age concerns when he argued that "anything that will lead the workman to take more pride in this work tends to make him a better citizen and a more conservative member of society."⁴² School curriculum should encourage pride in products, because the good workman was the good citizen. And, lest those citizens, frightened by the increasing numbers of strangers moving into American cities, worry about the socialist or the anarchist, they could find solace in the fact that good workmen also made good conservatives of the status quo, of capitalist democracy.

An editorial in the Kansas City Democratic Times written 27 years earlier made the same connection. "The object of the school is to prepare the children for the duties of citizenship and to make them law-abiding and wealth-producing citizens."⁴³ Since law-abiding frequently meant respectful of private property, the author linked wage-earner, work, and political persuasion. A speaker at the 1909 NEA conference, the Superintendent of the Illinois Farmer's Institute, declared that education should stimulate students toward "acquisition by 'earning.'" "Education that does not promote the desire and power to do useful things -- that's earning -- is not worth the getting."⁴⁴ Leonard Ayers, whose 1909 classic Laggards in our Schools made a case against retention based on cost-effectiveness, reduced students to the status of clumps of clay to be processed quickly and without waste.⁴⁵ Lewis Terman, author of Health Work in the Schools, claimed that "children . . . must be viewed as the raw material of the state" and detailed an argument for better medical care for poor students on the grounds that we thereby conserved a natural resource as we would "coal, iron, and water power."⁴⁶ That theme is reflected in an article by John Franklin Bobbitt in 1912 in which educators

were advised, in dealing with students, to "work up the raw material into that finished product for which it is best adapted."⁴⁷

The success of the factory metaphor can be gauged by its critics. Mary Abigail Dodge, a former school teacher, complained in 1880 that "the thing which a school ought not to be, the thing which our system of supervision is strenuously trying to make the school into, is a factory, with the superintendents for overseers and the teachers for workmen."⁴⁸ A letter in a December, 1892, issue of the Kansas City Journal of Commerce lamented that:

Every child in the school seems to be a machine. If one asserts any individuality he gets demerit marks in 'form,' and his promotion is endangered . . . Is that education which leaves the child's individuality undeveloped, or crushes it out altogether? Should our schools make automatons, educationally, of our boys and girls?⁴⁹

In a 1914 debate on the application of the platoon system to the New York City schools, Benjamin Gruenberg argued that there were significant differences between factories and schools which negated the potential benefit of applying methods designed for the former to the latter.⁵⁰ Margaret Haley, long an American Federation of Teachers activist, summarized the limitations of the platoon system in a biting attack in The New Republic. After comparing the long lines of marching children to the assembly lines of Detroit automobile plants she concluded that platoon schools lacked "only the closing-time whistle to make complete its identification with the great industrial plants."⁵¹ William Bagley determined that the establishment of a "factory plan" which entailed a hierarchy of authority in which the school board functioned as a board of directors, the superintendent as general manager, the assistant superintendent as foreman, the principals as bosses, and the teachers as routine workers was "especially unfortunate."⁵²

Bagley's statement reflects the organizational structure which quickly characterized large school systems. William Payne, anticipating the establishment of a hierarchy, wrote in 1875 that "organization implies subordination. If there is to be a plan, some one must devise it, while others must execute it."⁵³ Given the reality of what David Tyack has termed "the pedagogical harem," the one to devise the plan quickly became the male administrator and the ones to execute it, the subordinate female teaching staff.⁵⁴ "Hierarchical organization of schools and the male chauvinism of the larger society," Tyack concluded, "fit as hand to glove."⁵⁵

Page Smith found that the number of male and female teachers was roughly balanced in 1876; there were approximately 110,000 men and 150,000 women employed in our nation's schools. By 1900 the scales had dipped decidedly. The ratio was then 127,000 men to 296,000 women.⁵⁶ "Women teachers," according to a Harpers article published in 1879, "are preferred by superintendents because they are more willing to comply with established expectations."⁵⁷ A Denver administrator told women they should offer advice to their administrators only "as the good daughter talked to the father."⁵⁸ The ever-candid Mary Abigail Dodge summarized another, perhaps more compelling reason for the feminization of teaching, when she declared that "women preponderate in schools, not because they soften the boys, but because they cost less than men."⁵⁹

Whatever the reason -- financial, emotional, or social -- women did, by the turn of the century predominate in the nation's classrooms. They consequently filled (and continue to fill) the ranks of the bottom portion of the education pyramid. Their presence reinforced a social stratification which continued throughout the twentieth century, reflected in the relative earning power of men and women.

Ella Flagg Young, herself an anomaly as an early superintendent of Chicago's schools, captured the status of public education organizations in a 1916 address to the NEA:

There has been a tendency toward factory-evolution and factory-management, and the teachers, like children who stand at machines, are told just what to do. The teachers, instead of being the great moving force, educating and developing the powers of the human mind in such a way that they shall contribute to the power and efficiency of this democracy, tend to become mere workers at the treadmill.⁶⁰

Superintendents were seen increasingly as the administrators of businesses, mill foremen overseeing plants filled with inexpensive female labor. John Franklin Bobbitt's 1913 publication, The Supervision of City Schools, clearly reflected the premise that all endeavors which required a group effort, be they in manufacturing or education, had in common the same "fundamental tasks of management, direction, and supervision."⁶¹ "Directors and supervisors must keep the workers supplied with detailed instructions as to the work to be done, the standards to be reached, the methods to be employed, and the materials and appliances to be used."⁶² Reflecting the treadmill described by Young, Bobbitt narrowly defined the role of teachers, arguing that they "cannot be permitted to follow caprice in method."⁶³

Reinforcing the influence of the factory model was the growing tendency for school boards to be selected "at large," and to be filled by "sane, progressive, business and professional men who have business ideas."⁶⁴ Ellwood Cubberley, ever prescriptive of the "best" in educational remedies, joined his voice to that of others in identifying the characteristics of the ideal boardsmen. They should be:

Men who are successful in the handling of large business undertakings -- manufacturers, merchants, bankers, contractors, and professional men of large practice -- would perhaps come first. Such men are accustomed to handling business rapidly; are usually wide awake, sane, and progressive; are not afraid to spend money intelligently; are in the habit of depending upon experts for

advice, and for the execution of administrative details; and have the tact and perseverance necessary to get the most efficient service out of everyone from the superintendent down.⁶⁵

Among those whom Cubberley would exclude were "inexperienced young men, unsuccessful men, old men who have retired from business, politicians, saloon-keepers, uneducated and relatively ignorant men, men in minor business partnerships, and women."⁶⁶

Excluded from the boardroom, women were free to fill the classrooms. In those classrooms, as Joel Spring has argued, "the modern school bureaucracy emerged," "educational administration became professionalized," "new concepts of educational control arose," and "teachers modeled their teaching on forms of industrial organization and initiated the first teachers' unions."⁶⁷ Bureaucracies operate through standardization. Between 1880, the first census in which the majority of Americans were employed in industries, and 1920, the first census in which the majority of Americans lived in cities, standardization took hold in America's schools, beginning in the urban systems, where size required systematization. The graded school became the norm.

The idea of grading had been in the professional literature since Henry Barnard's 1838 lecture "Gradation of Public Schools, with Special Reference to Cities and Large Villages." Barnard elaborated on that idea in an 1845 speech in which he summarized the concept:

The great principle to be regarded in the classification either of schools . . . or of scholars in the same school, is equality of attainments, which will generally include those of the same age. Those who have gone over substantially the same ground, or reached or nearly reached the same point of attainment in several studies, should be put together and constitute, whenever their numbers will authorize it, one school.⁶⁸

As a consequence of gradation, "a division of labor can be introduced in the department of governance, as well as that of instruction."⁶⁹ Not only could one take advantage of the resultant specialization within a school, but the schools themselves could be divided.

A regular gradation of schools might embrace Primary, Secondary, and High schools, with Intermediate Schools, or departments, between each grade, and Supplementary Schools, to meet the wants of a class of pupils not provided for in either of the above grades.⁷⁰

What Barnard anticipated became the organizational reality of our modern schools.

Francis Adams reiterated, in 1875, the "obvious" benefits of graded schools:

Under a system which aims to give something beyond the merest elements of instruction there are certain broad and natural lines where grading may be advantageously adopted. Studies adapted to the capacity of more advanced pupils cannot be successfully pursued where primary classes are under instruction. There are different methods of discipline and teaching suited to children of different ages and developments. The quietness and attention necessary to the progress of an advanced school, if enforced amongst primary scholars, would be injurious to them, mentally and physically . . . the economy of the graded plan is also another strong recommendation, enabling as it does, a specified number of teachers to superintend a larger number of schools . . . But the economy of time is even more apparent . . . one teacher [can] do the work of two. The system . . . is also advantageous to the teacher. In a badly classified school is every abuse; teachers hurried and fretted beyond measure; some pupils shuffling from one thing to another with such haste and irregularity as to occasion bewilderment; others, having excess of time to prepare for lessons, inclining them to listlessness or mischief.⁷¹

William T. Harris observed that as elementary schools become graded "there is a division of labor on the part of teachers" and "the inevitable consequence of such a division of labor is increase of skill."⁷² Partially that increase of skill was the result of the standardization in curriculum and methods grading invariably produced. And with standardization came control. As Adams noted: "each teacher's work being laid out for the year, the comparative merits of teachers come out more decidedly under the graded system."⁷³

Nor was simply the control of teachers a result of grade divisions. One could control the course of study and the progress of pupils from stage to stage on the educational assembly line. John Philbrick clearly saw that "the division of labor in educational matters" resulted in "the teacher's time and talents being concentrated upon certain work" and becoming "easier by repetition, and therefore, . . . performed more efficiently."⁷⁴ Exit from grades depended upon mastery of a set curriculum, often demonstrated through examinations. Consequently, "a good program for one city," asserted Philbrick, "would be . . . a good program for every city."⁷⁵

Given the opportunity for a common course of study, educators began the process of devising a curriculum segmented into specific grades and monitored by examinations. Textbook publishers began to print materials to support those programs, thereby initiating the industry which has, as much as any, given the United States a national curriculum. If we assume that raw material throughout the nation was approximately the same (children were children everywhere) and that our vision of the finished product was somewhat similar (prepare children to become good workers in an industrial nation), then we could assume that by making the assembly line similar (graded schools and systems; a standardized program of study; "scientific" teaching methods) the conversion of child to worker would be inevitable, consistent, and efficient.

With the rudiments of the "one best system" in place, schoolmen started to focus more precisely on what the real world wanted schools to deliver. What were the requirements of a rapidly developing industrial nation? What did students need to know and when did they need to know it?

Francis Parker argued that "the purpose of school is educative work."⁷⁶ After all, the students would grow up to be workers. William Harris wrote that "the great object . . . of education is the preparation of the individual for a life in institutions, the

preparation of each individual for social combination."⁷⁷ After all, the worker would be employed in economic institutions, laboring beside often scores of fellow employees.

To achieve that fitness for institutional life, Harris advocated a formal education of "the will." That training should consist "of imposing upon the child a set of forms of behaviors rendered necessary in order to secure concert of action -- such forms as regularity, punctuality, silence, and industry." "These," he declared, "are the four cardinal duties of the school pupil."⁷⁸ Calvin Woodward, an advocate of the manual training movement which arose in the 1880s, noted that he was unconcerned about the specific tools a child learned to use "as long as proper methods (morals) are formed."⁷⁹ Success in manual training would result in the student acquiring the "two most valuable habits, which are certain to influence their whole lives . . . namely, precision and method."⁸⁰ "Manual training," as Nicholas Butler observed, "is mental training."

No one with any appreciation of what our public school system is and why it exists, would for a moment suggest that it be used to train apprentices for any trade or for all trades. It is not the business of the public school to turn out draughtsmen, or carpenters, or metal workers, or cooks, or seamstresses, or modellers. Its aim is to send out boys and girls that are well and harmoniously trained to take their part in life.⁸¹

The moral training, rather than preparing a student for participation in a democratic society or for a good life in the classical sense, was to control and fit the student for a vocational life, albeit unspecified in occupation. The training was generic to the needs of industrial America.

Reflective of that philosophy, a report issued after an 1874 national meeting recorded that:

The commercial tone prevalent in the city tends to develop, in its schools, quick, alert habits and readiness to combine with others in their tasks. Military precision is required in the maneuvering of classes. Great stress is laid upon (1) punctuality, (2) regularity, (3) attention, and (4) silence, as habits

necessary through life for successful combination with one's fellow-men in an industrial and commercial civilization.⁸²

Harris entitled a sub-section of a treatise on early childhood education "Kindergartens Prepare for Trades."⁸³ In "Moral Education in the Common Schools" Harris made clear that after obedience to parents, the application of that discipline is "towards employers, overseers, and supervisors, as regards the details of work."⁸⁴ Linking industrialization with moral discipline, Harris hailed the emancipation of man from drudgery by the advent of new technologies.

Machinery has quadrupled the efficiency of human industry within the past half century. There is but one general training especially needed to prepare the generations of men who are to act as directors of machinery and managers of the business that depends upon it -- this training is the habits of punctuality and regularity.⁸⁵

Under "Duties to Self" Harris advocated cultivating the virtue of industry which he defines as "devotion to one's calling or business."⁸⁶

Such attention to the attitudes necessary to work successfully under supervision in the company of others was complemented by an increasing call for a more modern vocational education. In 1909 a speaker at the annual convention of the NEA declared that "there can be no doubt that industrial education is needed to perpetuate the prosperity of our industries."⁸⁷ The National Society of the Promotion of Industrial Education claimed that "what we are looking for more especially, is the promotion of schools for the training of foremen and superintendents."⁸⁸ New techniques demanded workers with higher skills.

It is only the uneducated, unintelligent mechanic who suffers from the invention of a new tool. The thoroughly trained mechanic enjoys the extraordinary advantage of being able . . . to apply his skill to every problem; with every new tool and new process he rises to new usefulness and worth.⁸⁹

We wanted workers who were more highly skilled than those of previous generations, who had a sense of the demands of industrial vocations and the technologies which accompanied the recent economic revolution, and who possessed the attributes associated with "good work habits" in a factory. As a nation we turned to the schools to produce such workers.

Partially we wanted schools to produce such workers as a response to changing socio-economic and demographic conditions. We wanted them to tame the immigrant, keep delinquents off the streets and in workshops, and ensure a better quality of life for all of us, including those inhabitants of our tenements. We wanted those things to quell the rising fear we held of the mob, of the masses who might, unless controlled or pacified, turn to the admonitions of Marx for comfort. We wanted those things to keep at bay the uneasiness which rested in the bellies of the Gilded Age winners, the uneasiness of wealth and leisure time unshared and earned at the expense of cheap labor.⁹⁰ Partially we wanted attention paid in schools because we feared that we might lose our golden ring of prosperity; we might cease to have a competitive edge.

In 1905 a vice-president of the National City Bank in New York declared:

In the group of great industrial nations, there has come forward in recent years one that has taken place in the very front rank among industrial competitors. That nation is Germany . . . I have had a somewhat unusual opportunity to study the underlying cause of the economic success of Germany, and I am firmly convinced that the explanation of that progress can be encompassed in a single word -- schoolmaster. He is the great corner-stone of Germany's remarkable commercial and industrial success. From the economic point of view, the school system of Germany stands unparalleled.⁹¹

The 1907 Menomonie, Wisconsin, superintendent of schools echoed those views:

Manufacturers and men of affairs have noted the marvelous studies Germany has made in recent years in the industrial world, and have studied the reasons and have found them not in the advantages which Germany possesses in raw material things which we possess to a degree far in excess of any other country in the world, but in the development of the educational system of Germany on technical

and industrial lines, and they are demanding a modification of our educational system on similar lines.⁹²

The necessity to compete did not escape the attention of Cubberley. In Changing Conceptions of Education he argued, somewhat erroneously given the events in Europe five years hence, that "we are slowly beginning to see . . . that the great battles of the world in the future are to be commercial rather than military."⁹³ "Whether we like it or not, we are beginning to see that we are pitted against the world in a gigantic battle of brains and skill, with the markets of the world, work for our people, and internal peace and contentment as the prizes at stake."⁹⁴ Although we had begun to consolidate our schools, structure our curriculum around national goals, better prepare our teachers, and devise new organizational and governance structures, it was ultimately the threat to economic hegemony that came with competition which quickened the tacit adoption of the industrial paradigm school.

An indication of that connection was, with the realization of potential competition, particularly from Germany, a concomitant increase in the stridency of criticism. Granted, the schools had always been the target of complaints. But the new skeptics leveled their comments at more than ill-prepared teachers, boring lessons, and "unscientific" methods. They worried that our schools were preparing students for an old world rapidly passing into obscurity; schooling had failed to keep pace with the progress of the late nineteenth-century. Everything "up to date in Kansas City" should also be up to date in Kansas City's classrooms.

M.C. Wilson suggested that it might be time to "discard the old machine for a lighter and a more efficient one," since the current model failed to prepare children to earn a living.⁹⁵ Simon Patten, writing in 1911, demanded that school officials demonstrate results or lose money through reduced budgets. He wanted results that could

be "readily seen and measured."⁹⁶ Ladies Home Journal in that same year concluded that "on every hand the signs are evident of a widely growing distrust of the effectiveness of the present educational system."⁹⁷ In March of 1912 the Saturday Evening Post entitled one article "Our Medieval High Schools -- Shall We Educate Children for the Twelfth or the Twentieth Century?"⁹⁸ In a follow-up article, "Medieval Methods for Modern Children," the Post noted that "there is inefficiency in the business management of many schools such as would not be tolerated in the world of offices and shops."⁹⁹ Ladies Home Journal in August of 1912 contained an editorial headlined "The Case of Seventeen Million Children -- Is Our Public-School System Proving an Utter Failure?"¹⁰⁰ In that same issue Ella Frances Lynch, a former teacher, declared that "the American public-school system, as at present conducted, is an absolute and total failure."¹⁰¹ In September the Journal ran an article by a principal which concluded that the education system was "permeated with errors."¹⁰² That same month the head of a California normal school wondered if we were "living in B.C. or A.D." in terms of the conduct of our educational enterprise.¹⁰³

Previously criticism had been primarily restricted to muckraking journals (note, for example, J.M. Rice's articles published in the 1892 and 1893 Forum, to debates among intellectuals, or to local discussions about primarily regional issues. But both the Ladies Home Journal and the Saturday Evening Post reached a national audience. In the days before electronic communication, they helped form what then constituted our national media. Many of the reforms which became part of the industrial school had already begun prior to the 1911 and 1912 articles. However, those attacks, reaching the audience they reached, helped gain a wider reception for such initiatives, paving the way for aspects of schooling we consider commonplace today.

Immediate responses included the acceptance of a broader, differentiated course of study at the high school level and the gradual substitute of industrial or vocational programs for manual training.¹⁰⁴ It included the systematization of teaching strategies and curriculum. And it established a consensus on the citizenship skills an industrial democracy needed.

However, these responses did not come without some internal debate. The curriculum which evolved into the course of study we now associate with the comprehensive high school was the product of accommodation. In Public Education in the United States: From Revolution to Reform R. Freeman Butts identifies three contending curricular directions public secondary schooling could take. All three strands were the subject of national campaigns during the progressive era. They included mental discipline, social efficiency, and civic responsibility.¹⁰⁵ Advocates for each strand hoped to initiate a drive for order or coherence in the curriculum. The result of their efforts was what is today sometimes termed the shopping mall high school.

Prior to 1880 few youngsters progressed to a secondary school. Those who did, generally economically advantaged young men, were destined for the university. The courses that they studied, heavily laced with the classics, Greek and Latin, prepared them for post-secondary education and for the mental discipline such education required. There were relatively few high schools, courses of study reflected requirements set by local colleges, and purposeful examination of the curriculum in terms of other student needs was rare. The introduction of significant numbers of young people to the upper grades of the educational system as the century turned, the expanded roles that system was to play, and the economic needs of industrialization precipitated demands for change and resultant recommendations by a plethora of blue ribbon panels.

Initially local courses of study were the responsibility of local superintendents and school boards. The cyclical curriculum geared to progression through a graded sequence of courses, at least from kindergarten through grade eight, evolved throughout urban districts after the Civil War. Elements of a comprehensive course of study were present in some sophisticated systems even before that time. For example, in 1862 William Wells, then superintendent of Chicago's schools, issued A Graded Course of Instruction with Instructions to Teachers which listed topics to be covered by grade, with appropriate teaching strategies, through primary and grammar school.¹⁰⁶ Portland's superintendent, reflective of trends after the war, had a uniform curriculum in place by 1874 with an annual testing program to ensure that course of study was taught.¹⁰⁷ But most of those initial efforts at standardization were local, and excluded consideration of what students were to master in high school. As a result, even with the systematization encouraged by textbooks, the curriculum, particularly at the secondary level, appeared "scattered and fragmented."¹⁰⁸

The first significant voice for a standard national curriculum in response to change was heard by those educators and lay citizens who read the 1893 report of the NEA Committee of Ten on Secondary School Studies. Established in 1892, chaired by Charles W. Eliot, President of Harvard, the committee outlined eleven questions which framed their inquiry into the perceived status and desired direction of high school education in America.¹⁰⁹ The complaints which guided the recommendations reflected the higher education backgrounds of most members of the committee. College professors observed that their students not only knew little of the subjects they were to be taught, but more disturbing, they failed to have the "habits of observing, reflecting, and recording" which "they should have acquired in early childhood."¹¹⁰ The lack of mental habits necessary for advanced education provided a focus for recommendations not only

for secondary schools, but for the inclusion of certain types of training in elementary schools as well. To accomplish those goals "teachers more highly trained will be needed in both the elementary and the secondary schools."¹¹¹ Some subjects would need to be moved into the elementary program, "such as algebra, geometry, natural science, and foreign language" to ensure that everything required for a sound high school education could be acquired in a four year period.¹¹² The committee further recommended looking at reducing the elementary school to six years and using the seventh and eighth years as preparation for high school -- a "junior" high school program, although to its credit the committee did not use that term.¹¹³

To meet the academic needs of a diverse population, the committee recommended different programs of study: Classical, Latin-Scientific, Modern Languages, and English. The decision to retreat from one curriculum intended specifically to prepare young people for college was significant, although the four courses were related and contained considerable overlap. It was the result of an important conclusion:

The secondary schools of the United States, taken as a whole, do not exist for the purpose of preparing boys and girls for colleges. Only an insignificant percentage of graduates of these schools go to colleges or scientific schools. Their main function is to prepare for the duties of life that small proportion of all children in the country . . . who show themselves able to profit by an education prolonged to the eighteenth-year, and whose parents are able to support them while they remain so long at school . . . A secondary school program intended for national use must therefore be made for those children whose education is not to be pursued beyond the secondary school.¹¹⁴

That did not exempt the schools from college preparation (the Carnegie unit evolved from the Committee of Ten study, as did suggestions on uniform college admission exams), but it did expand the task to include a curriculum sufficiently broad to introduce students to a greater variety of subjects, many of which were as applicable to the world of work as to the college classroom.

Lawrence Cremin claims correctly that the Committee of Ten report was influenced by Eliot's on-going campaign for "new education based on the pure and applied sciences, the modern European languages, and mathematics."¹¹⁵ Clarence Karier concluded that "the committee's blueprint for secondary education was not generally accepted in practice," but that "it did serve as a catalytic agent" for an "intense, serious analysis of [the] secondary education program."¹¹⁶ One element of that blueprint which was certainly abandoned early on was the emphasis on making "no distinction in course content or method between those students bound for college and those bound for the world of work."¹¹⁷ Certainly, that is one reason that Eliot and his fellow educators urged flexibility in the four programs they suggested; that flexibility allowed students to move from one course of study to another easily and reflected the assumption that the four courses were equally challenging. Butts agreed that the Committee of Ten proposal was grounded in the value of rigorous academic or intellectual preparation for all students and he concluded that the various sub-committee reports did have a "standardizing effect," but he also noted that the Committee erred in its conclusion about who would attend secondary schools in the twentieth-century. It was not the insignificant percentage predicted by Eliot, but by 1930 it was nearly 50 percent of all potential students aged 14 to 17.¹¹⁸

Criticism of the report inevitably followed its publication. G. Stanley Hall, for instance, condemned the entire trend toward standardization that Eliot's group and several others had advanced. In a particularly prescient argument, Hall wrote:

Everything must count and so much, for herein lies its educational value. There is no more wild, free, vigorous growth of the forest, but everything is in pots or rows like a rococo garden. Intellectual pabulum has lost all gamey flavor and is stall-fed or canned. These bales or blocks of condensed and enriched knowledge, which are used to calibrate the youthful mind or test its lifting or carrying power, seem to it stale; the stints become monotonous, mechanical, factory work to the pupil.¹¹⁹

Most critics, however, came not from those citizens worried about the potentially intellectually stifling effects of such a curriculum, but from those citizens who wanted the high school to be more present-minded in its preparation program. These citizens were advocates of social efficiency and, as Butts notes, they believed "that education ought to perform the function of social control on behalf of the values of the predominantly business society in a modernizing world."¹²⁰

In 1911 the NEA appointed a Committee on Economy of Time in Education, charged with determining how best to eliminate waste from the schools, with particular emphasis on the course of study. Between 1915 and 1919 that group published four reports. It was guided by the idea that the purpose of education was to ensure that students acquire "those habits, skills, knowledges, ideas, and prejudices which must be made common property of all, that each may be an efficient member of a progressive democratic society." Such citizens possessed "the power of self-support and self-direction, the capacity and disposition for co-operative effort, and, if possible, the ability to direct others in positions of responsibility requiring administrative capacity."¹²¹ In reaching its conclusions that waste did indeed exist in our country's schools and particularly in our elementary institutions, they developed an elaborate set of recommendations for individual subjects. Many of those recommendations, ostensibly derived from scientific study of the requirements of life (what math, for example, does a homemaker need to master?) as well as processes for acquisition of such habits as good handwriting, reflected the absurdity of some of the extremes of Frederick Taylor's time and motion studies.¹²² A fundamental premise guiding their conclusions was that because "people differ in talents, abilities, interests, and aptitudes," that "they should be prepared for . . . different social roles."¹²³

Those distinctions reflected the attitudes and associations of the industrial training movement which had been gaining a national audience since the issuance in 1905 of the National Association of Manufacturers' Committee on Industrial Education report. That report appealed to the rising fear of foreign competition, claiming that "in the world's race for commercial supremacy we must copy and improve upon the German method of education." Because that nation "relies chiefly upon her trained workers for her commercial success and prosperity," and because those workers came from secondary schools, then the United States needed to redirect its efforts in that area.¹²⁴

In 1912 the National Association of Manufacturers Committee on Industrial Education issued a report which classified children into three groups. One, somewhat small, group was "abstract-minded and imaginative" and they should receive a classical education to exercise their mental faculties and prepare them for additional educational opportunities. A second group consisted of "concrete, or hard-minded" youngsters. They would not profit from a traditional secondary school program, even one reformed through (perhaps especially one reformed through) the recommendations of the Committee of Ten. These students and to a lesser degree those who constituted the third group, "the great intermediate class," needed a more practical education.¹²⁵ They required a differentiated curriculum which tracked them into distinctly different courses of study. James Earl Russell, dean of Teachers College in New York, argued that "if the chief object of government be to promote civil order and social stability," then "how can we justify our practice in schooling the masses in precisely the same manner as we do those who are to be our leaders?"¹²⁶ Russell called for a three-fold division of the curriculum: *humanistic studies, scientific studies, and industrial studies.*¹²⁷

Feinberg and Rosemont argued in their introduction to Work, Technology, and Education that "the public school picked up where the frontier had left off."¹²⁸ The

frontier forced a set of allegiances, expectations, and behaviors on those who set out to settle there. Once the frontier closed, symbolically in 1890 according to Frederick Jackson Turner, the creation of those common values became one of the primary reasons for public schools. They became "the memory bank of modern industrial societies, serving to pass on to the young the social image, habits, and skills that important segments of society deem admirable."¹²⁹ One element thereof was fitting those youthful minds to their social future. Edward Thorndike noted, in 1906, that "no high school is successful which does not have in mind . . . the work in life its students will have to perform, and try to fit them for it."¹³⁰ In the absence of such natural forces as a frontier to separate our futures, schools were asked to segregate students by abilities and ambitions.

Cremin identifies two movements of curriculum reform during the first quarter of this century. One harkened back to Eliot and sought to develop better ways to teach the traditional curriculum to all students. Another reflected the attitudes of the Committee on Economy of Time, arguing that the curriculum should prepare students for a full spectrum of adulthood tasks, sowing the seeds for life adjustment programs which were to appear in the 1940s.¹³¹ That spectrum of tasks became our high school tracks.

Butts argues for a third strand, "the desire to prepare students for civic responsibility in a democratic society," which he suggests is at odds with social efficiency narrowly defined as conformity to a business-oriented set of values.¹³² In some respects that third strand is articulated in the NEA's Commission on the Reorganization of Secondary Education's 1918 report Cardinal Principles of Secondary Education. Those principles, which still appear as guideposts in some educational debates, included: health, command of fundamental processes, worthy home membership, vocation, citizenship, worthy use of leisure, and ethical character.

The need to reorganize was considered "imperative" for three reasons: changes in society, changes in the secondary-school population, and changes in educational theory.¹³³ Changes in society were three in number and called "for a degree of intelligence and efficiency on the part of every citizen that cannot be secured through elementary education alone, or even through secondary education unless the scope of that education is broadened." Those three alterations precipitating the need for reform were: (1) the need for citizens to take a more active role in coping with "the problems of community life, State and National Governments, and international relationships"; (2) adjusting to "a more complex order" as a productive worker; and (3) having more leisure time.¹³⁴ The major challenge of the secondary-school population resulted from the increasing numbers of students determined to continue their education. "The entrance of large numbers of pupils of widely varying capacities, aptitudes, social heredity, and destinies in life," the decision of many of those pupils to complete only a portion of a high school program, and the likelihood that many students in the future will work part-time and attend school part-time meant the uniform rigor of the Committee of Ten curriculum had become inappropriate.¹³⁵ And four areas of scientific advancement of educational theory could no longer be ignored. There existed "individual differences in capacities and aptitudes among secondary-school pupils." There existed the need to re-examine the traditional curriculum and the value of certain subjects, as well as the teaching methods used in teaching those disciplines, as they related to the instruction of "general discipline." There was increasing evidence that students needed to be taught the application of knowledge and not simply the knowledge itself; schooling needed to be related to life itself. Finally, the study of child development suggested a continuity of development rather than a significant jump from stage to stage (for

instance, from elementary to secondary school). As a result teaching methods needed to be modified to ensure a transition from one part of the spectrum to the other.¹³⁶

Given the apparent need for reorganization, what purpose should that reorganization serve? What was the ideal goal of education in a democracy. The report argued that "education . . . both within and without the school should develop in each individual the knowledge, interests, ideals, habits, and powers whereby he will find his place and use that place to shape both himself and society toward ever nobler ends."¹³⁷ The objectives necessary to reach that goal were the seven cardinal principles, each of which contributed to the whole, but all of which were inter-related one to the other. Education was to be seen "as a process of growth." Students were to attend six years of elementary school and then progress to junior high schools, where "there should be the gradual introduction of departmental instruction, some choice of subjects under guidance, promotion by subjects, prevocational courses, and a social organization that calls forth initiative and develops . . . responsibility." A student would then progress to a senior high school which will provide a program of study "systematically planned with reference to his needs as an individual."¹³⁸ Each period will be approximately three years in length.

Secondary schools should include a wide range of subjects from which a student can elect a program which met his needs, an opportunity for vocational exploration in the early years of such schooling with appropriate vocational guidance (school guidance programs as we now know them began with vocational guidance), adaptation of methods to the needs of students, flexibility in organization and administration so students of lesser or greater ability can move at speeds suited to those capacities, a differentiated curriculum, the basis of which was vocational, and opportunities for all students to mingle socially, thereby muting the potential elitism in a differentiated program of

study. Reflecting a central theme of education during the past century, the commission's report concluded that:

While seeking to evoke the distinctive excellencies of individuals and groups of individuals, the secondary school must be equally zealous to develop those common ideas, common ideals, and common modes of thought, feeling, and action, whereby America, through a rich unified, common life, may render her truest service to a world seeking for democracy among men and nations.¹³⁹

A demand for excellence for individuals and unity through safeguarding those things common to us all by ensuring that everyone had access to them permeated the commission's work.

Butts believed that "what the seven Cardinal Principles did was to shift the emphasis in schooling away from a preoccupation with the academic and intellectual disciplines and to broaden the social role of education almost beyond recognition."¹⁴⁰ Of the three major attempts, each of which was supported by a variety of committee and sub-committee reports, journal articles, speeches, and public debate in the popular press, none succeeded in achieving lasting curricular coherence. Rather, they introduced Americans to the parameters of our current discussions about curriculum.

Although a focus on curricular issues seemed to dominate the pages of blue ribbon commission monographs, many of them alluded to the need to improve teacher training. Programs of study were moot issues without effective teachers. Teachers complained that they were not able to do their jobs well given the conditions under which they were forced to labor. Their critics claimed that they clung to inappropriate and out-dated methods which inhibited rather than enhanced the acquisition of knowledge.

William James, writing in 1892, noted that "our teachers are overworked already. Every one who adds a jot or tittle of unnecessary weight to their burden is a foe of education."¹⁴¹ Cubberley listed "the teaching corps" at the bottom of the educational

hierarchy, reflecting accurately the degree of empowerment the profession had at the turn of the century.¹⁴² One contemporary observed that "supervisors . . . go about from schoolroom to schoolroom, note-books and pencil in hand, sitting for a while in each room like malignant sphinxes, eying the frightened teacher, who in his terror does everything wrong, and then marking him in a doomsday book."¹⁴³ When school systems began to evaluate their performance using surveys, "the unobtrusive sterling qualities, which so characterize the faithful overworked teacher, are not the first thing in sight."¹⁴⁴

Although teachers worked often in crowded conditions, generally at low salaries, for long hours, with limited resources, and, in the case of women, with inane personal restrictions unrelated to their professional obligations, they were regularly the object of blame for the lack of academic success experienced by their students. Bobbitt argued that they were sometimes the greatest obstacle to reform.¹⁴⁵ Often they came from training institutions which poorly prepared them to perform the duties of a teacher.¹⁴⁶

Many commentators noted the characteristics they expected to find in teachers, anticipating attitudes and attributes beyond the scope of many mere mortals. Emma Maxwell, writing in an 1880 edition of the San Francisco Herald believed that "she has to be true, firm, just, and above all, loving . . . She must live in all and for all, never devoting herself to one while neglecting others. She must hear and see, have an eye for every thing, good or bad."¹⁴⁷ Francis Parker believed that:

. . .the highest qualification of a teacher is dominating love for children . . . The second qualification . . . is that a teacher must be deeply in love with the subjects of study . . . Third, he must have power and skill in the manifestation of thought . . . fourth, he must have the courage of his convictions.¹⁴⁸

In another article Parker, apparently unconscious of what might be perceived as a contradiction in terms, wanted society to demand "the artist teacher, the teacher trained

and skilled in the science of education -- a genuine leader of little feet."¹⁴⁹ G. Stanley Hall advocated an extensive extra-curricular knowledge for teachers. "The teacher who is well informed on the favorite out-of-school amusements and occupations of his pupils, and on the life led by them, and who knows his classes individually and collectively, can shorten the road to learning."¹⁵⁰

Probably the most comprehensive commentary on the conditions of teaching and the performances of teachers was J.M. Rice's series of articles published in The Forum in the early 1890s and collected together in an 1893 book entitled The Public-School System of the United States. Teachers were "the greatest problem."¹⁵¹ "The professional weakness of the American teacher is the greatest sore spot of American schools" and that weakness "can be well observed even in those cities where only the best obtainable are employed."¹⁵² "The office of teacher in the average of American school is perhaps the only one in the world that can be retained indefinitely in spite of the grossest negligence and incompetency."¹⁵³

"The degree of excellence of a school system is governed to the extent to which the teachers strive to abandon unscientific methods and to regulate their work according to the requirements of the new education."¹⁵⁴ The primary offense against scientific education was the perpetuation of attempting to drill students in the memorization of unconnected facts. Schools in which such teachers predominated were labeled "mechanical schools"; those in which teachers attempted to relate and integrate the disciplines their students studied and in which teachers were attuned to the developmental needs of their charges were labeled "scientific schools." Mechanical schools think "only of results, and . . . forget the child."¹⁵⁵ Mechanical schools have "a discipline of enforced silence, immobility, and mental passivity."¹⁵⁶

Rice believed that in addition to the inability to remove incompetent teachers without appeal to politics, teachers had "absolutely no incentive to teach well."¹⁵⁷ There existed no source of inspiration to raise teaching standards, nor were there sufficient staff members to supervise them adequately. Principals were equally ill-schooled in new techniques, so they were also unable to alter the course of mechanical or rote learning. Rice discovered that responsibility for conditions was impossible to fix. In New York City, for example, he found that:

. . .the course of studies is highly unscientific, but no one has constructed it, and no one is responsible for it. When appointments are to be made, every one is on the alert; when responsibility is to be fixed, no one is in readiness to step forward. Everything appears to be involved in a most intricate muddle.¹⁵⁸

He did find that in schools which seemed to work, supervision was "largely of the nature of guidance, inspiration, and instruction rather than of the nature of inspection."¹⁵⁹ And in the systems which seemed to work better, were more effective in terms of Rice's self-designed tests of student achievement, teachers attempted to teach scientifically, instruction in subject areas was integrated and related to life beyond the classroom, reading was designed for the purpose of gaining thoughts rather than saying words, writing was an integral part of the strategies employed, and there was a greater degree of program articulation.

Cremin, in the last of his major works on the history of education in the United States, American Education: The Metropolitan Experience, summarized the changes which took place during the first four decades of the twentieth-century. That summary reflects the trends in education initiated between 1880 and 1920.

School systems expanded, as ever larger percentages of the population attended kindergartens, on the one hand, and high schools, on the other . . . There was a continuing enlargement and reorganization of curricula . . . particularly at the secondary level, where there were vastly extended opportunities for work in trades, commerce, agriculture, home economics, physical education, and the arts

. . . and there was a concomitant expansion in the ranges and variety of extracurricular activities . . . and of noninstructional services such as vaccinations, health examinations, meals, and vocational and psychological counseling. There were dramatic changes in the materials of instruction: textbooks became more colorful . . . and supplementary devices . . . appeared in growing numbers of classrooms. There was more variation in the grouping of students, increasingly on the basis of intelligence, aptitude, and achievement tests, and more tracking of students within schools and among schools. Discipline became less harsh . . . School architecture was modified to include assembly rooms, gymnasiums, swimming pools, playgrounds, athletic fields, laboratories, shops, kitchens, clinics, cafeterias, and lounges . . . And through it all, systematization moved relentlessly forward, as state departments of education became more powerful and more prescriptive; as school districts consolidated and grew larger, more complex, and more bureaucratic; and as administrative hierarchies developed to manage the system.¹⁶⁰

There is little in Cremin's summary of schooling in 1940 that could not have been found in some form in 1920 and in more urban settings in the 1880s. The paradigm of industrial age schooling was set by the end of the first World War. We have been conducting our calls for reform within that paradigm since that time and it is for that reason that we have returned time and again to the same complaints and the same solutions. That cycle is evident in a comparison of the early paradigm described above and the efforts to reform education during the 1980s, a comparison which forms the focus of the next chapter.

CHAPTER FIVE

FOOTNOTES

¹William Taylor, Cavalier and Yankee: The Old South and American National Character (New York: Harper Torchbooks, 1961), p. 334. The tension between an agrarian, genteel existence and a life of entrepreneurship through technological progress has been a persistent theme in American history and literature. Note, for example, R.W.B. Lewis, The American Adam: Innocence, Tragedy, and Tradition in the Nineteenth Century (Chicago: University of Chicago Press, 1955); Leo Marx, The Machine in the Garden: Technology and the Pastoral Ideal in America (London: Oxford University Press, 1964); and Henry Adams, The Education of Henry Adams (Boston: Houghton Mifflin Company, 1961).

²Henry James, Hawthorne (London, 1879), p. 144. Interestingly, one historian addresses specifically the idea of "new knowledge" in the language of "the fall" in his survey of the years immediately preceding our entry into World War I. See Henry F. May, The End of American Innocence (Chicago: Quadrangle Paperbacks, 1964).

³See, for instance, George Rogers Taylor, The Transportation Revolution, 1815-1860 (New York: Harper Torchbooks, 1951); R.L. Thompson, Wiring a Continent: The History of the Telegraph Industry in the United States (1947); and M. Walsh, The Manufacturing Industry in Ante-Bellum Wisconsin, 1830-1860 (1972).

⁴Robert H. Wiebe, The Search for Order, 1877-1920 (New York: Hill and Wang, 1967), p. 19.

⁵Ibid., p. 43.

⁶Horace Mann, Twelfth Annual Report of the Board of Education. Together with the Twelfth Annual Report of the Secretary of the Board (Boston, 1849), p. 84, quoted in Lawrence Cremin, The Transformation of the School: Progressivism in American Education, 1876-1957 (New York: Vintage Books, 1964), p. 9. See also H. Warren Button and Eugene F. Provenzo, Jr., History of Education and Culture in America, 2nd ed. (Englewood Cliffs, New Jersey, 1989), p. 106.

⁷Cremin, Transformation of the School, p. 13.

⁸David Tyack, The One Best System: A History of American Urban Education (Cambridge, Massachusetts: Harvard University Press, 1974).

⁹Joel Spring, The Sorting Machine: National Education Policy Since 1945 (New York: Longman, 1976).

¹⁰Ellwood Cubberley, Changing Conceptions of Education (Boston: Houghton Mifflin Company, 1909), pp. 4-5.

¹¹Ibid., p. 7.

¹²Ibid., p. 8.

¹³Ibid., p. 15.

¹⁴Ibid., p. 17.

¹⁵Ibid., p. 18.

¹⁶Ibid., pp. 20-21.

¹⁷Ibid., p. 45.

¹⁸Ibid., p. 50.

¹⁹Ibid., p. 51.

²⁰Ibid., p. 53.

²¹Ibid., p. 54.

²²Ernest Carroll Moore, Fifty Years of American Education: A Sketch of the Progress of Education in the United States from 1867 to 1917 (Boston: Ginn and Company, 1917), pp. 4-5. In a recent popular magazine article listing the "Ten Patents that Changed the World," six of the ten were issued between 1874 and 1906 and one of the remaining four, the sewing machine, was instrumental in the proliferation of modern textile factories after the Civil War. See Oliver Allen, "The Power of Patents," American Heritage 41 (September/October, 1990): 46-59.

²³Moore, Fifty Years of American Education, p. 5.

²⁴Ibid., p. 6.

²⁵See, for example, Wiebe, The Search for Order, p. 121; Thomas Haskell, The Emergence of Professional Social Science: The American Social Science Association and the Nineteenth Century Crisis of Authority (Urbana: University of Illinois Press, 1974); and Thomas Haskell, "Power to the Experts," New York Review of Books 24 (October 13, 1977): 28-34.

²⁶Moore, Fifty Years of American Education, pp. 40-41.

²⁷Edgar W. Knight, Education in the South (Chapel Hill: The University of North Carolina Press, 1924), p. 23. Knight addresses the vicissitudes of southern education

more completely in Edgar W. Knight, Public Education in the South (New York: Ginn and Company, 1922).

²⁸John D. Philbrick, City School Systems in the United States (Washington, D.C.: U.S. Bureau of Education, 1885), pp. 58-59.

²⁹Tyack, The One Best System, p. 29.

³⁰Cremin, The Transformation of the School, p. 22.

³¹Henry J. Perkinson, The Imperfect Panacea: American Faith in Education, 1865-1965 (New York: Random House, 1968), p. 127.

³²*ibid.*, p. 156.

³³David Nasaw, Schooled to Order: A Social History of Public Schooling in the United States (New York: Oxford University Press, 1979), p. 81.

³⁴William J. Reese, Power and the Promise of School Reform: Grassroots Movements during the Progressive Era (Boston: Routledge & Kegan Paul, 1986). See also Michael Katz, Reconstructing American Education (Cambridge, Massachusetts: Harvard University Press, 1987).

³⁵Ellwood Cubberley, Public School Administration: A Statement of Fundamental Principles Underlying the Organization and Administration of Public Education (Boston: Houghton Mifflin, 1916), p. 338. For Cubberley's role in influencing the course of schooling in early twentieth-century America see Raymond E. Callahan, Education and the Cult of Efficiency: A Study of the Social Forces that Have Shaped the Administration of Public Schools (Chicago, Illinois: The University of Chicago Press, 1962) and David Tyack and Elisabeth Hansot, Managers of Virtue: Public School Leadership in America, 1820-1980 (New York: Basic Books, Inc., 1982).

The school as factory metaphor has been explored in a number of recent monographs, including Joel Spring, The American School and Development of American Education (New York: Longman, 1986); Clarence Karier, Shaping the American Educational State, 1900 to Present (New York: Free Press, 1975); Paul C. Violas, The Training of the Urban Working Class: A History of Twentieth-Century American Education (Skokie, Illinois: Rand McNally, 1978); Joel Spring, Education and the Rise of the Corporate State (Boston: Beacon, 1972); Michael Katz, Class, Bureaucracy, and Schools: The Illusion of Educational Change in America (New York: Praeger, 1971); and Clarence Karier, Paul Violas, and Joel Spring, Roots of Crisis: American Education in the Twentieth Century (Chicago: Rand McNally, 1973).

³⁶Charles H. Ham, Mind and Hand: Manual Training, the Chief Factor in Education (New York, 1886), quoted in Education in the United States: A Documentary History, vol. 3, ed. Sol Cohen (New York: Random House, 1974), p. 1857.

³⁸William A. Wirt, "Scientific Management of School Plants, American School Board Journal 42 (February 1911): 2.

³⁹High School Teachers Association of New York City, Bulletin 36 (December 1912): 47, quoted in Callahan, Education, p. 58.

⁴⁰James Phinney Munroe, New Demands in Education (New York:), p. v.

⁴¹NEA Proceedings (1915), quoted in Callahan, Education, p. 151.

⁴²James Earl Russell, The Trend in American Education (New York: American Book Company, 1922), p. 24. Russell's comments come from a 1906 article he authored for Educational Review.

⁴³Quoted in Reese, Power and Promise, p. 10.

⁴⁴Quoted in Callahan, Education, p. 10.

⁴⁵Leonard Ayers, Laggards in Our Schools: A Study of Retardation and Elimination in City School Systems (New York: Charities Publication Committee, 1909). See, for example, pp. 176-177.

⁴⁶E.B. Hogg and Lewis Terman, Health Work in the Schools (Boston: Houghton Mifflin Company, 1914), p. 4. The quotation appears in a chapter authored by Terman.

⁴⁷John Franklin Bobbitt, "The Elimination of Waste in Education," Elementary School Journal 12 (February 1912): 260.

⁴⁸Gail Hamilton [Mabel Abigail Dodge], Our Common School System (Boston: Estes and Laurait, 1880), p. 91.

⁴⁹Kansas City Journal of Commerce (21 December 1892), quoted in Reese, Power and the Promise, p. 52.

⁵⁰Callahan, Education, p. 139.

⁵¹Margaret Haley, "The Factory System," New Republic 40 (November 12, 1924): 18.

⁵²William C. Bagley and John A.H. Keith, An Introduction to Teaching (New York: n.p., 1924), p. 379.

⁵³William H. Payne, Chapters on School Supervision: A Practical Treatise on Superintendence: Grading: Arranging Courses of Study: the Preparation and Use of Blanks, Records, and Reports: Examinations for Promotion, etc. (New York: American Book Company, 1903), pp. 13-14. Payne's book was originally published in 1875.

⁵⁴Tyack, The One Best System, p. 45.

⁵⁵*Ibid.*, p. 60.

⁵⁶Page Smith, A People's History, vol. 6: The Rise of Industrial America (New York: McGraw Hill Book Company, 1984), p. 589.

⁵⁷Quoted in Tyack, The One Best System, p. 60.

⁵⁸*Ibid.*

⁵⁹Hamilton [Dodge], Common School System, p. 303.

⁶⁰Quoted in Tyack and Hansot, Managers of Virtue, p. 181.

⁶¹Franklin Bobbitt, The Supervision of City Schools: Some General Principles of Management Applied to the Problems of City Schools (Bloomington, Illinois: National Society for the Study of Education, 1913), p. 7.

⁶²*Ibid.*, p. 8.

⁶³*Ibid.*, p. 95.

⁶⁴L.N. Hines, NEA Proceedings (1911), quoted in Callahan, Education, p. 150.

⁶⁵Cubberley, Public School Administration, pp. 124-125.

⁶⁶*Ibid.*, p. 125.

⁶⁷Joel Spring, The American School, p. 150.

⁶⁸Henry Barnard, Report of the Condition and Improvement of the Public Schools of Rhode Island, 1845 (Providence, Rhode Island, 1848), in Cohen, Education in the United States, vol. 3, p. 1321. Although not in the 1838 speech, the quoted portion reflects Barnard's initial idea.

⁶⁹*Ibid.*, p. 1322.

⁷⁰*Ibid.*, p. 1323.

⁷¹Francis Adams, The Free School System of the United States (London: Chapman and Hall, 1875), pp. 199-202 *passim*.

⁷²William T. Harris, "Elementary Education," in Cohen, Education in the United States, vol. 3, p. 1921.

⁷³Adams, The Free School System, p. 202.

⁷⁴Quoted in Tyack, The One Best System, p. 45.

⁷⁵Ibid.

⁷⁶Francis Parkman, Talks to Pedagogics: An Outline of the Theory of Concentration (New York, 1894), quoted in Cohen, Education in the United States, vol. 3, p. 1825.

⁷⁷William T. Harris, Compulsory Education in Relation to Crime and Social Morals (Washington, D.C., 1885), quoted in Cohen, Education in the United States, vol. 3, p. 1915.

⁷⁸Ibid., p. 1916.

⁷⁹Calvin M. Woodward, The Manual Training School (Boston, 1887), quoted in Cohen, Education in the United States, vol. 3, p. 1806.

⁸⁰Ibid., p. 1863.

⁸¹Nicholas Murray Butler, The Argument for Manual Training (New York, 1888), quoted in Cohen, Education in the United States, vol. 3, p. 1867.

⁸²A Statement of the Theory of Education in the United States as Approved by Many Leading Educators (Washington, D.C., 1874), quoted in Cohen, Education in the United States, vol. 3, p. 1905.

⁸³William T. Harris, "The Kindergarten in the Public School System," quoted in Cohen, Education in the United States, vol. 3, p. 1902.

⁸⁴William T. Harris, "Moral Education in the Common Schools," U.S. Bureau of Education Circular of Education, no. 4 (Washington, D.C., 1888), quoted in Cohen, Education in the United States, vol. 3., p. 1910.

⁸⁵Ibid., p. 1911.

⁸⁶Ibid., p. 1912.

⁸⁷NEA Proceedings (1909), p. 288, quoted in Callahan, Education, p. 13.

⁸⁸NSPIE Bulletin, no. 3 (September 1907), quoted in Nasaw, Schooled to Order, p. 124.

⁸⁹Woodward, The Manual Training School, p. 1865.

⁹⁰One of the most persuasive arguments made by a turn of the century contemporary, which incorporated the potential of violence within the urban setting was Jacob Riis, How the Other Half Lives: Studies Among the Tenements of New York (New York: Hill and Wang, 1957), note particularly the twenty-third chapter, "The Man with the Knife." Riis's indictment was initially published in 1890.

⁹¹Frank A. Vanderlip, NEA Proceedings (1905), quoted in Callahan, Education, p. 12.

⁹²L.D. Harvey, NEA Proceedings (1907), quoted in Callahan, Education, pp. 12-13.

⁹³Ellwood Cubberley, Changing Conceptions of Education (Boston: Houghton Mifflin Company, 1909), p. 49.

⁹⁴*Ibid.*, p. 50.

⁹⁵M.C. Wilson, "Some Defects in Our Public School System," Educational Review 41 (March 1911): 238-244, *passim*.

⁹⁶Simon Patten, "An Economic Measure of School Efficiency," Educational Review 41 (May 1911): 467-469, *passim*.

⁹⁷"What Is the Matter?," Ladies Home Journal 28 (June 1911): 5.

⁹⁸William Hughes Mearns, "Our Medieval High Schools -- Shall We Educate Children for the Twelfth or the Twentieth Century?," Saturday Evening Post 184 (2 March 1912): 18-19.

⁹⁹Maude Radford Warren, "Medieval Methods for Modern Children," Saturday Evening Post 182 (12 March 1912): 35.

¹⁰⁰"The Case of Seventeen Million Children -- Is Our Public School System Proving an Utter Failure?," Ladies Home Journal 29 (August 1912): 3.

¹⁰¹Ella Frances Lynch, "Is the Public School a Failure? It Is: The Momentous Failure in Our American Life Today," Ladies Home Journal 29 (August 1912): 4.

¹⁰²William McAndrew, "The Danger of Running a Fool Factory," Ladies Home Journal 29 (September 1912): 7.

¹⁰³Frederic Burk, "Are We Living in B.C. or A.D.?", Ladies Home Journal 29 (September 1912): 6.

¹⁰⁴For a detailed look at the evolution of a high school course of study during this period see David F. Labaree, The Making of an American High School: The Credentials Market and the Central High School of Philadelphia, 1838-1939 (New Haven,

Connecticut: Yale University Press, 1988) and Edward Klug, The Shaping of an American High School, 1880-1920 (Madison, Wisconsin: University of Madison Press, 1964).

¹⁰⁵R. Freeman Butts, Public Education in the United States: From Revolution to Reform (New York: Holt, Rinehart, and Winston, 1978), p. 188.

¹⁰⁶Tyack, One Best System, p. 46. See also H. Warren Button and Eugene F. Provenzo, Jr., History of Education and Culture in America, 2nd ed. (Englewood Cliffs, New Jersey: 189): pp. 129-130.

¹⁰⁷Ibid., p. 47.

¹⁰⁸Butts, Public Education, p. 188.

¹⁰⁹The Report of the Committee of Ten on Secondary-School Studies (1893), printed in Cohen, Education, vol. 3, pp. 1932-1933.

¹¹⁰Ibid., p. 1934.

¹¹¹Ibid., p. 1935.

¹¹²Ibid., p. 1938.

¹¹³Ibid.

¹¹⁴Ibid., p. 1942.

¹¹⁵Cremin, The Transformation of the School, pp. 92-93.

¹¹⁶Clarence J. Karier, The Individual, Society, and Education: A History of American Educational Ideas (Urbana: University of Illinois Press, 1986), p. 73.

¹¹⁷Ibid.

¹¹⁸Butts, Public Education, p. 90.

¹¹⁹G. Stanley Hall, Adolescence: Its Psychology and Its Relation to Physiology, Anthropology, Sociology, Sex, Crime, Religion, and Education (New York, 1905), quoted in Cohen, Education, vol. 3, p. 1947. Charles Eliot published a lengthy response to Hall's critique that same year. See Eliot, "The Fundamental Assumptions in the Report of the Committee of Ten," Educational Review 30 (1905): 325-343.

¹²⁰Butts, Public Education, p. 191.

¹²¹Quoted in Cremin, The Transformation of the School, p. 193.

¹²²See, for example, Cremin, The Transformation of the School, pp. 194-197, and "Report of the Committee on Economy of Time on the Minimum Essentials in Elementary School Subjects," (1905), printed in Cohen, Education, vol. 4, pp. 2261-2266.

¹²³Butts, Public Education, p. 191.

¹²⁴Nasaw, Schooled to Order, p. 123.

¹²⁵Quoted in Marvin Lazerson and W. Norton Grobb, eds., American Education and Vocationalism: A Documentary History, 1870-1970 (New York: Teachers College Press, 1974), p. 97.

¹²⁶Nasaw, Schooled to Order, p. 131.

¹²⁷James Earl Russell, "The School in Industrial Life," Educational Review 34 (December 1909), reprinted in Russell, The Trend in American Education, p. 97.

¹²⁸Walter Feinberg and Henry Rosemont, Jr., eds., Work, Technology, and Education: Dissenting Essays in the Intellectual Foundation of American Education (Urbana: University of Illinois Press, 1975), pp. 1-2.

¹²⁹*Ibid.*, p. 4.

¹³⁰Edward L. Thorndike, "The Opportunity of the High School," The Bookman 24 (October 1906), quoted in Herbert Kleibard, "Compromise and Diversity in the American High School," History of Education Quarterly 27 (Spring 1987): 89.

¹³¹Cremin, The Transformation of the School, pp. 197-198.

¹³²Butts, Public Education, p. 192.

¹³³Cardinal Principles of Secondary Education (1918), quoted in Cohen, Education, vol. 4, pp. 2279-2280.

¹³⁴*Ibid.*, p. 2279.

¹³⁵*Ibid.*

¹³⁶*Ibid.*, p. 2280.

¹³⁷*Ibid.*, pp. 2280-2281.

¹³⁸*Ibid.*, p. 2282.

¹³⁹*Ibid.*, p. 2289.

¹⁴⁰Butts, Public Education, p. 194; see also Lawrence Cremin, American Education: The Metropolitan Experience, 1876-1980 (New York: Harper & Row, 1988), pp. 232-233.

¹⁴¹William James, Talks to Teachers on Psychology and to Students on Some of Life's Ideals, quoted in Cohen, Education, vol. 3, p. 1855.

¹⁴²Callahan, Education and the Cult of Efficiency, p. 218.

¹⁴³Tyack, One Best System, p. 97.

¹⁴⁴Sara Helena Fakey, quoted in Button and Provenzo, History of Education, p. 227.

¹⁴⁵Callahan, Education and the Cult of Efficiency, p. 86.

¹⁴⁶*Ibid.*, p. 88.

¹⁴⁷Emma Maxwell, "Kindergarten Work in California," San Francisco Herald (July 1880), quoted in Cohen, Education, vol. 3, p. 1799.

¹⁴⁸Francis Parker, "On the School and Moral Training," (1891), quoted in Cohen, Education, vol. 3, p. 1825.

¹⁴⁹Francis Parker, Talks on Pedagogics (1891), quoted in Cohen, Education, vol. 3, p. 1828.

¹⁵⁰G. Stanley Hall, "Child-Study and Its Relation to Education," (1900), quoted in Cohen, Education, vol. 3, p. 1843.

¹⁵¹J.M. Rice, The Public School System of the United States (New York: The Century Co., 1893), p. 13.

¹⁵²*Ibid.*, p. 14.

¹⁵³*Ibid.*, p. 15

¹⁵⁴*Ibid.*, pp. 19-20.

¹⁵⁵*Ibid.*, p. 22.

¹⁵⁶*Ibid.*, p. 39.

¹⁵⁷*Ibid.*, p. 44.

¹⁵⁸*Ibid.*, p. 48.

¹⁵⁹Ibid., p. 222.

¹⁶⁰Cremin, The Metropolitan Experience, pp. 230-231.

CHAPTER SIX

THE FAILURE OF EDUCATIONAL REFORM IN REAGAN'S AMERICA

In the last full year of the Reagan presidency Newsweek published a review of school improvement efforts since the publication of the Bell Commission report. Entitled "A Nation Still at Risk," it rated the country an "A" for effort, but conceded that the effort had yielded meager results.¹ A cursory survey of backward looks at the 1980s confirms that assessment. For example, Mary Anne Raywid, in the October 1990 issue of Phi Delta Kappan notes that some reformers "have given up."² She sees three possible outcomes to the initiatives of the eighties as a result of their persistent failure to improve significantly our schools:

The first possibility is that reform efforts will be limited to pseudo-reforms that bring no instructional improvements and to well-intended but largely unsuccessful incremental reforms. In this event, the very existence of public education may be in real doubt.

The second possibility is that the displeasure of an irate public may be formally expressed in events similar to those in Kentucky and Illinois. New decision makers will take over, and authority will be extensively redistributed.

The third possibility is that genuine restructuring will begin in a less extreme and less roughshod fashion. School policy makers will seriously explore ways to systematically decentralize authority in education . . . and ways to better organize schools for instruction.³

Lynne Cheney, chairman of the National Endowment for the Humanities, concludes that "tyrannical machines dominate American education." Those machines are the cumulative result of "practices that begin by filling needs," but which "become detached from their original purposes." "Having been adopted on a large scale . . . these practices take on a power of their own."⁴ Cheney, like Raywid, believes that only restructuring will remedy the situation.

Yet throughout the decade there have been advocates for changing the institution, for altering the school setting, for managing the culture of schooling, for fundamental restructuring. Did those messages ever filter down to classrooms? Recent books about the daily works of teachers (Tracy Kidder's Among Schoolchildren, Samuel Freedman's Small Victories, Susan Johnson's Teachers at Work, and Susan Dichter's Teachers) indicate that schools remain as they have been for most of this century.⁵ The population changed, the curriculum broadened and was supported by fancier textbooks and technologies, and our ability to measure aspects of the student achievement improved. But the model, the template, the paradigm of modern schooling we evolved at the turn of the century persists.

In his most recent book, The Predictable Failure of Educational Reform, Seymour Sarason addresses essentially three questions.⁶ What needs to be fixed in our schools? Have we tried to fix those things before? If so, why didn't they stay fixed? Granted, Sarason narrows his focus in discussing the intractability of schools to improve, but his inquiry has applicability to the broad range of reform activity in the past decade. Our school problems are not new ones. At the turn of the century we complained about the quality of our teachers, our textbooks, our administrators, and the products of our schools. J.M. Rice used a test to determine the competence of students and schools. The primary difference between his tests and contemporary standardized tests is degree of sophistication. We have ranked states educationally throughout the century; report cards are not a new idea.⁷ We have faced the spectre of foreign competition not merely in the 1980s, but in the 1890s, and the 1920s, and the 1950s. Each time we have announced a need for change, we have "fixed" those problems with legislation or policy changes or initiatives within the profession. Each time they have stubbornly become unfixed.

A student of educational reform could have predicted the failure of most of our efforts during the past ten years. A few did. For example, in 1984 Joel Spring wrote that "until the federal government and the state legislators stop making curriculum changes on the basis of social, political, and economic needs, the curriculum . . . will continue to be in a state of flux and chaos."⁸ They didn't; it is. In that same year Anne Dodd observed that throughout the past decade the education pendulum continued its back and forth motion. To stop it we must "develop a whole new structure for public education."⁹ We didn't; the pendulum continues to swing. Also in 1984 Harry Passow observed that "we know . . . exhortation, however strongly worded, is not likely to produce change."¹⁰ We exhorted; change did not come. Patricia Cross anticipated the Sarason dilemma: why can't we "find excellence in education and then hang on to it?"¹¹

The task of changing does appear to be monumental. Gordon Donaldson compared it to the labors of Sisyphus.¹² Carl Kaestle, in a well-turned metaphor, noted that although we sometimes like to see public schools as sleek sailboats tacking with the wind, they are more like large, clumsy tankers. It takes a sizeable force to cause them to rock gently and tremendous expenditure of energy and resources to stop and change directions.¹³ Ted Sizer noted in 1983 that schools, particularly high schools, are resistant to change. "It is not that school structure had remained totally unchanged over the last 20 years. It has changed, but the changes have been remarkably small relative to those in American living patterns, careers, values, needs, and technologies."¹⁴

I have written about some of those small changes in chapters two and three. The reason they have failed to turn our tanker is because the changes which might have made such a turn possible have never received the popular or financial support necessary to gain sufficient momentum for such an event. We have worked within the tanker, within the paradigm, throughout the past decade. Rather than challenging its direction, we have

assumed it was heading where we wanted it to head and needed only some adjustments in its design, some staff development for its crew, and more accountability for its progress. The indictments and solutions directed toward our schools and educators for the past forty years are alarmingly familiar and that repetition has been documented on previous pages.

Why don't things we fix in education stay fixed? We continue to operate within an industrial paradigm school and anomalies which do not fit that model continue not to fit. As we become more adept at measuring where we are and what we are doing, anomalies proliferate. Our confidence in the paradigm to resolve those anomalies diminishes, creating a crisis of confidence.

This brief summary is entitled "The Failure of Educational Reform in Reagan's America" not because I want to imply that Reagan should assume responsibility for that failure or that Reagan and what he represented speaks for the totality of our national experience during the 1980s, but because he symbolizes the backward glance which characterized so much of what we did during the past ten years. Ronald Reagan came into office pledging a return to America's glorious past. Borrowing from the Puritans, he promised to make us once again a "city on a hill." We wanted to be that shining beacon, to be assured, once again, that there was something special about our accident of birth in this privileged nation.

The most powerful campaign poster that I ever saw of Reagan was printed during his first successful race for the presidency. It showed him in a cowboy hat, western shirt and vest, and blue jeans. He was astride a horse looking toward an unseen sunrise or sunset -- certainly looking into the distance, looking resolute. Reagan was the Marlboro man, a forceful individual unafraid of speaking his mind. With his faithful woman he came riding into sinful Washington, D.C. to fight for all of us who wanted to

ride tall in the saddle again. For those of us who came of age with television, he was as comfortable as Ozzie and Harriet, as Donna Reed, as the Cleavers. He personified what seemed the best of our past and, consequently, became a symbol for an attitude which colored much of our school improvement efforts.

We looked throughout the decade for the good old days when everyone took advanced math, four years of a foreign language, physics, and college prep English. We sought schools in which all students behaved, in which teachers were respected, in which authority went unchallenged. We wanted institutions populated by children who did not use drugs, did not consider sex a casual recreational activity, did not know anyone their age who had taken his or her life. We wished for fresh-scrubbed adolescents who wouldn't talk back, who would do their homework, who would take out the trash without complaint. We talked about the good old days that never were, because Reagan led us to believe that they had been and could be again. As a consequence, we did not look hard when we looked at our schools. If we had, we would have seen that they are no longer able to meet the challenges of today, because the children in them and the socio-economic and demographic conditions which surrounded them have changed profoundly. Reagan's America sought simple solutions to complex problems, because it denied the complexity and because it viewed our past through rose-colored lenses. That America favored pseudo-reforms and incremental measures and, as Raywid suggests, has placed the existence of our schools in doubt.

Consider the paradigm parallels between the schools at the beginning of the century and those we now have. Both were built on the premise of "one best system." We have given lip service to local control, but William Bennett's James Madison High School is what we have tried to create. In North Carolina, for example, we now have a standard course of study, a testing system to ensure that the course of study is taught, a

standard method of teaching, an evaluation instrument to ensure that is the method which is used to teach the curriculum which is to be taught in the time periods determined by legislators with the textbooks approved by the appropriate authorities. Tyack's "one best system" of the 1890s continues in sometimes numbing detail.

Schools became hierarchical, authoritarian, and bureaucratic at the turn of the century. We devised systems to rationalize the chaos of common schooling. Today, although we acknowledge that change needs to begin at the school level, we continue to admire size. Rather than reduce school systems to manageable units, we push for consolidation based on county lines, not student populations. We argue for flattening the pyramid which has characterized our managerial system, but have very few schools and fewer systems actually altering lines of authority, power arrangements, or job descriptions. One of the primary characteristics of a bureaucracy is operation by regulation. Even restructuring efforts, such as the 1989 School Improvement and Accountability Act in North Carolina, come accompanied by such cumbersome regulation and paperwork that real innovation is impossible.

We have, since the turn of the century, been ambivalent about teachers. Because they were primarily women when the modern school assumed its current form, we believed they would easily fit into a hierarchical system. We trained them to accept that role and acculturated them to play it well when they entered the classrooms. In the United States the status of any occupation associated primarily with women has always been low, as has compensation for such occupations. Reformers who remember times when teachers were well paid, held in esteem by the community, and considered differently than today remember times that frequently never were. And we forget that it is only since the end of World War II that teachers were generally graduates of four year

institutions. Complaints about the old normal schools at the turn of the century read like the complaints we now hear about colleges of education.

Because of that ambivalence and because we are generally willing to blame teachers for the failures of their students, we have always monitored their actions. Classroom materials were generally selected at central offices, not at schools. Teachers were evaluated at the turn of the century, often on the success or failure of students on public examinations. The difference between then and now is, again, one of degree.

The reasons we have public schools have also persisted. The economic well-being of the United States has, since the rise of industrialization, provided the *raison d'être* for schooling at taxpayer expense. We have articulated other reasons (citizenship, for example), but we have clearly served the needs of the marketplace. Business and industry should not seek to forge new partnerships with our nation's schools; they have always been partners, albeit at times more silent than vocal. The admonitions of a Xerox CEO to his colleagues to become active board members reads like descriptions of ideal board members in the early decades of this century. Then as now successful businessmen were preferred. Students continue to be our public raw materials, whether we use that term or something more polite, like human resources. Denis Doyle talks about the business community being interested in schools now, because businesses are interested in bottom line issues. That is precisely what motivated them to become involved in pushing scientific management into our schools earlier. Then it was Taylorism; today it is Theory Z. Then superintendents saw themselves as businessmen; today we are considering turning school operations over to businessmen or at least training our would-be superintendents in business principles.

At the turn of the century some parents felt alienated by their children's schools; today some parents feel the same way. At the turn of the century schools began to assume

educational tasks once considered the responsibility of the home; today, although we say we would like to take schools out of the parenting business, we legislate an increasing number of behaviors (oversight for child abuse, elementary guidance programs, AIDS education, health screening) which ensure we continue in that role.

We also are uncertain what role parents should play in the formal education of their children, an uncertainty which existed at the turn of the century. At that time we argued that parents, particularly those newly arrived in America, should turn their youngsters over to the schools for appropriate education, because the schools were staffed with experts, with professionals. We continue to reinforce that distinction, making credentialing a game played by personnel experts. The number of certificates has proliferated as have the jobs in schools. The credentialing process, both for people and for institutions, is a quality assurance system that began at the turn of the century and continues today in roughly the same form, although with a significant increase in variety and paperwork.

The educational pendulum at the dawn of the modern industrial-age school circled three points: equity issues (schooling for everyone), excellence (finished goods from raw materials), and efficiency (get the most for the taxpayer dollar). We have not added to that pendulum playing field, nor have we changed the educational field on which the pendulum swings. The elementary, middle, and high school divisions have been in approximately the same relationship throughout the century. The ideas of age cohort grades and a graded curriculum remain with us, in spite of nearly a decade of reformers urging the adoption of mastery alternatives. The curriculum has continued to be divided into specialty areas. Those specialty areas have been fixed for most of this century, including, in some cases, the types of literature taught in particular grades and the sequence of math courses. Those divisions continue even though "integrated curriculum"

has been part of the reformer lexicon for decades, and even turn of the century reformers like Rice advocated making what is taught relevant to the experiences of children. At the turn of the century educational guidance counselors were added to the school staff to advise students on appropriate courses of study. The curriculum was used to sort students, ostensibly according to abilities and inclinations. In spite of the evidence that tracking inhibits learning for most youngsters, we continue to sort today. Students still learn at different rates and we still "fail" them, rather than develop organizational configurations which recognize those differences.

Many of the ideas touted as recent reforms have been in progressive school systems for nearly one hundred years. Some urban school districts had breakfast and lunch programs in place at the turn of the century. Many school systems had required kindergartens which used teaching methods that today would be considered "developmentally appropriate." Complaints about the quality of textbooks and the dependence of some teachers on them were present in the late nineteenth-century in the same form that they can be found today. We have believed that technology will provide us with the magic necessary to convert the educationally apathetic student into an enthusiastic learner, but motion pictures, film strips, tape recordings, programmed textbooks, and overhead projectors have failed us. We can anticipate that neither will computers become that magic wand. Today we are experimenting with a vocational education alternative known as Tech Prep, forgetting that the roots of industrial education, of the vocational movement itself, can be found in the same arguments we now believe are new. The suggestion that all seniors have a palm card printed with a high school transcript to be used in applying for jobs was made at the turn of the century as well as in 1991 in North Carolina.

Our education tanker looks the same, but the wear and tear of a century afloat and the turbulence of new waters make its future usefulness dubious. Kuhn provides us with a way to understand both why the things we thought were fixed are all undone and how we might actually begin to build another type of boat. Kuhn posits that paradigms are adopted because they resolve problems and provide the basis for continued experimentation. The industrial school resolved problems (What do we do with all these children while both parents are employed outside the home? How do we Americanize immigrants? How can we prepare a nation of agrarian workers to be a nation of industrial employees?). Indeed, it did quite well at fitting a population for economic success in the early years of the industrial age. Also, that school provided ways to design and teach a set curriculum and measure degrees of success. We could work on problems of curriculum design, instructional methods, assessment, organization to complement those three processes, and materials to help us achieve our goals. Schools provided us with internal problems to solve, such as "which spelling series would work best?" or "what is the most cost-effective way to teach elementary science?"

But in the course of those internal investigations anomalies began to appear. Some students did not respond well to any teaching methods used. Some students did not respond predictably to tests. Some groups of students tested poorly on some instruments. Some students dropped out of school without minimal reading skills. As long as those anomalies did not compromise the general effectiveness of the paradigm, they could be tolerated. However, as the paradigm began to lose its effectiveness, the anomalies began to assume an importance they had not previously had. No one, for instance, worried that we had a 50% drop-out rate in 1950 or that the drop-out rate for minority males was close to 90% in some areas at that time. The educational level

required in 1950 was not so high that the loss of those students to the world of work constituted a problem.

One of the unintended consequences of our economic and political success as a nation is that to maintain our level of prosperity relative to the rest of the world we must increase our level of general education significantly. Our schools, as presently constituted, do not seem able to do that. Each measure of academic mediocrity is essentially another anomaly. Each student who departs our schools uneducated is an anomaly. Our inability to translate increased resources into increased student learning is an anomaly. Our failure to attract and retain talented people to the work of teaching is an anomaly. According to Kuhn, when anomalies begin to proliferate, as they will when a paradigm ages and technologies become more sophisticated and, consequently, more able to detect anomalies, there is a gradual loss of confidence in the paradigm itself.

When that loss of confidence begins two contradictory things happen. Proponents of the paradigm, defenders of the good old days, fervently cling to it, becoming ardent defenders of what used to be. In education one can see that reaction in the tone of the rhetoric which has characterized much of our recent debate, in the increase in canon-defenders with a "one best curriculum" to sell, in the fundamentalist coalition which helped put Ronald Reagan into office with the hope that daily prayer in classrooms would root out the evil lurking in secular humanism, and in the vague sense that somewhere in the past a little red schoolhouse contains the solution to our academic woes.

Simultaneously, prophets of change appear, advocating ideas which seem radical, foreign, or impossible. I am not sure that we have seen any paradigm leapers during the 1980s, but the work ofSizer and Goodlad has certainly challenged some of our assumptions about schools and schooling.

Because the defenders of the paradigm control the institutions, they are able to resist effectively initial challenges. Because they believe in the integrity of the paradigm, they will try to reform it initially by requiring more of what defined it -- more homework, more tests, more years of preparation. Only when the resulting maze of regulations, reforms, programs, and projects becomes so cumbersome that even the parts of the paradigm which have continued to be effective (upper-level college-bound students continue to do well in our schools) begin to be dysfunctional will some defenders begin to seek the voices of radicals.

We are at a threshold in public education in this nation. The defenders have controlled the education agenda during this century; they continue to control it in 1991. Reagan was followed by his Vice President, George Bush, whose educational summit produced goals and strategies reflective of our past rather than suggestive of our future. We are still trusting our tanker to transport us safely into tomorrow. But there are a few scattered voices articulating alternatives, alternatives that focus on culture, on setting, on the organization of schools, teaching and learning. Those voices do not yet constitute a chorus, but there are some ensembles worth watching during the coming decade. The final chapter considers why our paradigm is in jeopardy and how we might begin to look at alternatives to our current definitions of schools and schooling.

CHAPTER SIX

FOOTNOTES

¹Melinda Beck, et. al., "A Nation Still at Risk," Newsweek (2 May 1988): 54-55.

²Mary Anne Raywid, "The Evolving Effort to Improve Schools: Pseudo-Reform, Incremental Reform, and Restructuring," Phi Delta Kappan 72 (October 1990): 139.

³*Ibid.*, p. 143.

⁴Lynne V. Cheney, Tyrannical Machines: A Report on Educational Practices Gone Wrong and Our Best Hopes for Setting Them Right (Washington, D.C.: National Endowment for the Humanities, 1990), p. 1.

⁵Tracy Kidder, Among Schoolchildren (Boston: Houghton Mifflin Company, 1989); Samuel G. Freedman, Small Victories: The Real World of a Teacher, Her Students & Their High School (New York: Harper & Row, 1990); Susan Moore Johnson, Teachers at Work: Achieving Success in Our School (New York: Basic Books, 1990); and Susan Dichter, Teachers: Straight Talk from the Trenches (Los Angeles: Lowell House, 1989).

⁶Seymour Sarason, The Predictable Failure of Educational Reform: Can We Change Course Before It's Too Late?, (San Francisco: Jossey-Bass Publishers, 1990).

⁷See, for example, Frank M. Phillips, Educational Ranking of States by Two Methods (Milwaukee: Bruce Publishing Company, 1925).

⁸Joel Spring, "Education and the Sony War," Phi Delta Kappan 65 (April 1984): 537.

⁹Anne Wescott Dodd, "A New Design for Public Education," Phi Delta Kappan 65 (June 1984): 685.

¹⁰A. Harry Passow, "Tackling the Reform Reports of the 1980s," Phi Delta Kappan 65 (June 1984): 683.

¹¹K. Patricia Cross, "The Rising Tide of School Reform Reports," Phi Delta Kappan 66 (November 1984): 168.

¹²Gordon A. Donaldson, Jr., "Sisyphus and School Improvement: Fulfilling the Promise of Excellence," Educational Leadership 2 (March 1985): 4-7.

¹³Carl Kaestle, "Education Reform and the Swinging Pendulum," Phi Delta Kappan 66 (February 1985): 423.

¹⁴Theodore Sizer, "High School Reform: The Need for Engineering," Phi Delta Kappan 64 (June 1983): 680.

CHAPTER SEVEN

ALL THAT IS SOLID MELTS INTO THE AIR

Karl Marx and Friedrich Engels, The Communist Manifesto

We might feel more secure with the current educational condition if we could play out our critiques on a stage designed for melodrama. We could root for Dudley Do-right, worry about Sweet Nell's virtue, and hiss whenever Snidley Whiplash makes an appearance. We can recognize those characters without a program. They are clearly delineated by the clean, comfortable black and white lines of our initial cartoon introductions. We know, as much as we can know anything, the rights and wrongs of melodrama -- the ultimate winners and losers, the folks who deserve our cheers or our jeers. And we have tried to use the comfortableness of melodrama in understanding schooling. We easily identify the students with Ness (it is their virtues which are in jeopardy), but we have difficulty distinguishing caped villains and shining knights.

Granted, we have tried to make those identifications. Initially we blamed those people closest to Nell: their teachers. Surely, if teachers would work harder, if they were smarter, if they would demand more writing or more reading or more homework, if they would only be what teachers once were, then everything would be resolved. The system would work again. So, we demanded more teacher accountability. We designed new evaluation instruments. We moved toward outcome-based assessments. We developed teacher-proof curricula. We asked for more required staff development. We questioned tenure. We added mentorships. We strengthened certification standards, then sometimes abolished them altogether. But the schools did not profoundly change.

We then blamed teacher preparation programs. We strengthened accreditation standards, locally at the state level, regionally, and at the national level through the NCATE redesign. We questioned the traditional four-year program and sought blue ribbon committees to assess the merits of past practice. Foundations joined the preservice bandwagon, hoping to do for education what Flexner and Carnegie had once done for medicine.¹ Five-year programs were recommended and, in some cases, established. We made entrance and exit requirements more stringent. While some of us demanded more professional training, others decided to limit the amount of professional training that could be counted toward a degree. But the schools did not profoundly change.

We then turned our attention to the administrators. To the course of study. To correlates for effective schools. To the parents. To the students. To society. To drugs. To television. To class size. To the length of the school day or the school year and to the extraneous or the traditional things which fill those days and years. To instructional practice. To political intervention. To political laissez faire. To assessment systems and accountability models. To curriculum alignment. To nationwide, statewide, and systemwide report cards. To declarations of educational bankruptcy. To technical assistance programs. To new curricula. To revised curricula. To team teaching and peer tutoring and seminars. To HOTS -- higher order thinking skills. To whatever flashy red handkerchief the educational magician pulled out of the hat. But the schools did not profoundly change.

No one was in charge of the reform vortex. William Butler Yeats might have been addressing us all as we participated in an educational St. Vitus's dance.

Turning and turning in the widening gyre
 The falcon cannot hear the falconer;
 Things fall apart; the center cannot hold;
 Mere anarchy is loosed upon the world,
 The blood-dimmed tide is loosed, and everywhere
 The ceremony of innocence is drowned;

The best lack all conviction, while the worst
Are full of passionate intensity.

Those lines are the opening stanza of "The Second Coming," perhaps a prophetic title as well as theme. We are now sometimes like residents of a Tower of Babel, speaking in tongues without ears to hear the sounds or minds to comprehend the syllables were they to penetrate our ears. We have, since World War II, blamed all the victims of modern schooling for the present failure of that institution. We have blamed the social and economic context of that schooling. We have blamed the reforms we have imposed willy-nilly, in an effort to hit the right combination and open the door to a working system. We have blamed each other. What we have failed to blame sufficiently is the passage of time.

Yeats' poem is a pessimistic anticipation of the dissolution of modern civilization.

It concludes with these lines:

And what rough beast, its hour come round at last,
Slouches towards Bethlehem to be born?

That "rough beast" does not conjure up visions of Rubeens' cherubs or domesticated rustic stable scenes. Nor does "slouching" suggest a direct and impressive entry. I suspect that there will be a number of rough beast candidates to replace industrial age schools and I suspect that none of them will find the field of ideological battle clear of bleeding bodies when it advances its candidacy for the paradigm of the future.

Our current educational system once worked remarkably well. It helped transform a wilderness into an industrial giant. It provided an essential assimilation experience for millions of immigrants. It educated generations of workers and citizens, whose combined efforts took a collection of disorganized colonies and welded them into a nation seen by most of the world as a land of opportunity, into what is still the most powerful economic power on this planet. For all its blemishes and delays, it has

articulated a rational world view which provides, albeit imperfectly, minorities protection against majorities and citizens protection against tyrants to a degree previously unknown. The industrial age school played a part in that drama.

But that educational system no longer works as well as it must in the future, because the conditions in which it operates, the sorting and selecting functions which provide a significant part of the philosophical premises upon which it was based, have significantly changed. So, too, have the workplace and global requirements of a post-industrial world changed. We failed to note the passage of time and that passage has made all the difference.

Humankind has had the opportunity to live through two major social revolutions, events so sweeping that they altered profoundly, fundamentally, and forever the institutions which defined the lives of all beings on this earth.² The first occurred when we moved from being nomads to being farmers. The second resulted in the transition of farmers to industrialists. There is persuasive evidence that we are now engaged in a third such revolution, one which will move industrialists toward information workers.³ It is because of that change that we need to re-examine our schooling paradigm qua paradigm and, if we want to prepare our children for an information-driven future, make paradigmatic changes rather than internal shifts in emphasis.

Nomadic life is defined by tribal considerations. Societies are small and familial. The constant need to abandon a campsite and follow the seasons or the animals narrows the possibilities of permanence. Possessions must be light and small; cultures must be portable. There is no room for libraries, no space for books, and, consequently, no need for a written language. The vagaries of weather, of cataclysm, of accident all conspire to make life appear Hobbesian: "solitary, poor, nasty, brutish, and short."⁴ Learning is

incidental, based on oral tradition, and often steeped in the superstitions which come from a life filled with mysteries.

Around 10,000 years ago, almost simultaneously, wheat was domesticated in at least three places: along the Nile in Egypt, in the Tigris-Euphrates River Valley, and in China. That even was probably the conscious process of planting and harvesting developed over several generations, but finally some tribesmen understood that here was something which could remove the tenuousness of a nomadic life. Because humans could sow and reap in a regular cycle and because they could produce and store a sufficient quantity to ensure survival when new crops were not yet ripe, they could stop, both literally and figuratively. Freed from the limitations of constant travel, now captured by the necessity of understanding the regularities of nature, those early farmers created new institutions based on new relationships. Whereas kinship once defined a person, geography now did. Rather than being the son of Abraham, one became the son of a geographic Israel.

Stopped in one place, compelled by the requirements of planting to develop sciences (when to plant, for example, led to a careful examination of the stars, which led to astronomy), farmers soon had other needs. Architecture changed. Mobile tents gave way to increasingly complex structures designed for permanence. Such buildings required engineers; engineers required mathematics, as did the keepers of the wheat, who needed to record how much belonged to whom and, eventually, to record transactions. Wheat became a medium of exchange and to simplify exchanges coins appeared, and with them money-changers and lenders, and with them the men and women who had wares to trade or to sell.

Exchanges became more complex and we needed people to count and record them. They worked in a written language and needed paper on which to write. Paper became a

means of recording our past and maintaining it in the present for our future use.

Scribes became record-keepers and record-keepers kept histories. They made plans, then policies. They recorded personal and national commitments.

Transactions promoted transportation, now for the luxuries of wealth rather than the biological needs of nomadic life. To regulate the trade we made laws, recorded and preserved by the public servants, and enforced by another level of bureaucrats. Governments were formed to administer regulations and to define the parameters within which lives would be lived. The existence of surpluses led to even greater wealth and to the development of things on which that wealth could be spent -- entertainments, palaces, the visual arts, jeweled treasures, monuments. Craftsmen, artisans, and artists found employment. Religions, once personal, mysterious, and often frightening, became more complex, following the patterns of economic and political life.

Place became important as did the ownership of place; wars ensued. Wars created their own hierarchies and cottage industries. And all these new endeavors required education beyond listening to wise men or wise women around campfires. Artisans took apprentices; generals schooled privates; scholars taught fledgling scientists, mathematicians, and secretaries. But most of the inhabitants of these newly created kingdoms remained tied to the daily, often arduous, labor associated with farming. For the few to enjoy the profits of the surplus, the many were forced to work in cycles linked to seasons and the daily rotation of the sun.

Beginning in the late eighteenth-century another series of fortuitous inventions (foreshadowed, to be sure, by developments of the preceding several hundred years) changed the course of history. Farming emancipated us from the fortunes of following herds. Industrialization liberated most of us from the land and left those who chose to remain farmers with mechanized tools to make their labors easier and far more

efficient. Within three hundred years we went, at least in those nations which were industrialized, from countries in which over nine out of every ten people worked to provide food to sustain the population to three out of every hundred. The son and eventually the daughter of Israel became a doctor, an engineer, a technician or a lawyer, became what he or she did for a living.

Industrialization changed the institutions which had characterized the old regime. The world of Adam Smith and the Enlightenment was not the world of Elizabeth I and Louis XIV. The splendor of Versailles reflected a different consciousness than the spare, triumphant statement of an Eiffel Tower. Kingdoms became constitutional monarchies; colonies became representative democracies. Whereas we could at one time work the land or find employment in cottage industries, we now moved to places where, because of energy or transportation needs, cities could flourish. Those cities placed new demands on government, themselves newly restructured to reflect the aspirations of a rising middle class composed of capitalists or at least those whose money came from the surplus of goods exchanged for money.

Educational institutions responded to the requirement of industrialization. In the United States the basic education envisioned in common schools on a sparsely settled frontier gave way to an increasingly more comprehensive experience designed to respond, ultimately, to the needs of that industrial society. What resulted, at least in terms of formal educational institutions, was the paradigm described in chapter five. Given what it was initially designed to do, it worked exceedingly well.

Those schools were to keep children off the labor market, provide an element of custodial care, sort and separate, track students into vocations, prepare some youngsters for college, prepare most of them for the world of industrial work or for work which supported that enterprise, assimilate immigrants, and promote commonwealth. We

were the most successful nation on the planet from 1880 to 1960, at least in terms of accumulated wealth, advanced technology, and military might. We remain in that position, but our hold on the top of a metaphorical international power mountain has become far less secure during the past three decades.

Our current crisis (our economic insecurity, our loss of confidence, our "declining" schools) was precipitated in part because modernization is not a static process. Other nations caught up. Because of their abilities to profit from what we had done in the past and our own inability to break the shackles of our increasingly out-dated economic, social, and educational behaviors (what one does without global competition and succeeds in doing is far different than what one might need to do for that same success in the midst of such competition), they began to outperform us in a number of very visible ways. They gained market shares of high tech products, of traditional industries, of automobiles, and of student achievement test scores. We have had similar crises in the past and generally they, too, have been the result of competition. For instance, we felt a need to reform economic and educational institutions prior to World War I because of German successes; in 1957 we responded to the perceived technological supremacy of the Soviet Union, at least in space exploration.

The difference today is that we are not within an historic era (within the agrarian period or the industrial period), but on the edge of a time of profound change. The twenty-first century success stories will be written about men and women who possess the knowledge and skills to access, analyze, manage, and communicate information. Widgets will be manufactured in what is today the third world, or, if they are made here, they will be made by Americans whose quality of life is profoundly diminished relative to certain other nations or to the lives of their parents.

The evidence for our approach to that edge abounds. Futurists have been stargazing for millennia, and it continues to be a popular occupation. Alvin Toffler, for example, and John Naisbitt have made careers out of predicting our tomorrows. Toffler's Future Shock first appeared in 1970. In that book he argued that many of our planet's inhabitants were suffering from the "greatly accelerated rate of change in society."⁵ To survive the material and intellectual changes wrought by constant technological innovation, we must become adaptable and we must understand transience. The world toward which we are hurtling through space and time, then called the super-industrial society by Toffler, will require a different type of education. Because "our present school system parallels that of the factory," we need to question whether we want to continue into the future with those types of schools at all.⁶ Toffler questioned many of the sacred cows of our egg-carton schools: compulsory attendance, exclusive use of certified teachers, continued reliance on separate disciplines, a standardized curriculum. "Tomorrow's illiterate will not be the man who can't read; he will be the man who has not learned how to learn."⁷

In The Third Wave, Toffler argues that "the most basic raw material . . . is information, including imagination." Because of the importance that will be placed on information in the coming epoch, new civilizations "will restructure education."⁸

More learning will occur outside, rather than inside the classroom. Despite the pressure from unions, the years of compulsory schooling will grow shorter, not longer. Instead of rigid age segregation, young and old will mingle. Education will become more interspersed and interwoven with work, and more spread out over a lifetime. And work itself . . . will probably begin earlier in life than it has in the last generation or two.⁹

In his latest set of prognostications, Powershift, Toffler completes his trilogy of change. If Future Shock addresses the process of change and The Third Wave addresses the direction of change, then Powershift talks about who will control those changes and how

they will obtain and exercise that control. "The reconceptualization now required" in education reaches "beyond questions of budgets, class size, teacher pay, and the traditional conflicts over curriculum."¹⁰ "A high-choice system will have to replace a low-choice system if schools are to prepare people for a decent life in the new Third Wave society, let alone for economically productive lives."¹¹ Attesting to the importance of education, Toffler claims that "in a knowledge-based economy the most important domestic political issue is no longer the distribution (or redistribution) of wealth, but of information and media that produce information."¹² That might explain, at least somewhat, the heightened public attention on schooling and the sense of urgency some of us have about that debate.

John Naisbitt, whose rhetoric is less messianic than Toffler's, agrees that we're in the midst of major change. In the introduction to Megatrends he notes that:

As a society, we have been moving from the old to the new. And we are still in motion. Caught between eras, we experience turbulence. Yet, amid the sometimes painful and uncertain present, the restructuring of America proceeds unrelentingly.¹³

Observing that "the 1970s were not the best years for the public school system" and that they "may have been the system's darkest hour," Naisbitt wrote that among the responses had been a variety of self-help measures from supplements for enrichment to an increase in alternative and private schools to home schooling.¹³ At one point he concludes that there exists an "educational mismatch" between what the traditional schools are capable of producing in terms of student learning and what will be needed in a technologically sophisticated information age.¹⁴ And Naisbitt does not hesitate to claim that the major trend he and his research team has discerned, the trend which in many ways drives the others, is the transition from an industrial society to a society in which information will be the most important strategic resource.¹⁵

In Megatrends 2000, co-authored with Patricia Aburdene, Naisbitt builds on his information-age argument. Although he does not directly address formal education or schooling, he notes that the twenty-first century workplace will be profoundly different, requiring a higher level of general education and skills unlike those which have contributed to success in an industrial society.¹⁶ That is a theme which echoes throughout the increasingly voluminous excellence literature which describes the leadership needs of businesses and industries that hope to be successful in the next century.¹⁷

That excellence literature is replete with themes which we have ignored as we went about the business of reforming our schools. We ignored it even though many of the reform reports were adopted by commissions on which leading businessmen sat and in many of those reports were admonitions to the schools to become more businesslike. We forgot that one of the reasons our schools became the hierarchical, bureaucratic, regulation-burdened institutions that they continue to be is because they were formed in the image of the most successful factory-driven businesses of their day.

Tom Peters and Robert Waterman noted that the initiation of the research which today drives the culture and policies of those businesses that they judge excellent began in the 1930s, partially as a reaction to the work of Max Weber and Frederick Taylor.

Weber had pooh-pooed charismatic leadership and doted on bureaucracy; its rule-driven, impersonal form, he said, was the only way to assure long-term survival. Taylor, of course, is the source of the time and motion approach to efficiency; if only you can divide work up into enough discrete, wholly programmed pieces and then put the pieces back together in a truly optimum way, why, then you'll have a truly top-performing unit.¹⁸

The Weber-Taylor model is rational. It is governed by managers rather than leaders. It sets short-term goals, is run "by the numbers," motivates through supervision and threat, disregards customer needs, and is concerned with trivia. It is overly regulated,

governed by excessively long policy manuals which stress technical expertise over vision. Peters and Waterman conclude that "the old rationality is a . . . direct descendent of Frederick Taylor's school of scientific management and has ceased to be a useful discipline."¹⁹ Citing Kuhn as the inspiration for another model, they demand the establishment of a new set of values to govern the realities of the new marketplace.

From a detailed study of companies successful in the world of international competition, they indicated the characteristics that excellent companies seemed to hold in common, much like the advocates of effective schools established common correlates. However, in the reform of our schools, institutions whose rational model is as out-dated as the industrial version thereof, we have paid little attention in practice (considerable attention in rhetoric) to them. For instance, where is the "bias for action?" We retain a bias for studies and reports, for plan upon plan upon plan which suffocate even the opportunity for action. We have established standard courses of study, rigid teaching techniques which form the basis of personnel evaluations, and tight parameters for most of the early legislated reforms and even some of the later ones aimed at individual school restructuring. We have expected uniform programs to have uniform results which can be measured by uniform tests, without even considering that the levels of "ambiguity and paradox" which must be managed in an institution which deal with people are far greater than institutions engaged in making widgets. Although we know that excellent companies conceive of all workers as potential winners and design incentive systems which maximize winning opportunities, we design incentive systems which limit such opportunities and continue to blame the state of our schools on the very people who will form the front line of any change. Although we know that a clear focus and an emphasis on "sticking to the knitting" yields productive results, we continue to add to the burden our schools must shoulder, rather than providing them opportunities to abandon tasks

unassociated with their primary mission -- perhaps because we are still not certain what that primary mission should be.

The implications of change seem obvious. Given that we are on the edge of a new era in which the knowledge and skills necessary for success are different from those we have needed for success in the industrial age; given that our current education system was established during the industrial period to reflect the needs and values of that time; given that those needs have now changed and that those values often inhibit success in an information society; then we need to change the values which form the philosophical basis for our educational institutions, the knowledge and skills to be acquired therein, and, quite probably, the institutions themselves.

The irony of current school reform is that we articulate the need for change, but we continue to apply "more of" solutions which we have already tried and found unsuccessful. To borrow from the language of Kuhn, we have failed to challenge sufficiently or for a sustained time our industrial paradigm of schooling. To move from schools as they have been for the past one hundred years to the educational programs we will probably need in the next century will require a paradigm shift, a leap of faith.

What programs are likely to continue to fail us, to deny us the degree of equity and excellence we demand? Certainly it seems probable that "more of" solutions fall into that category. Calls for more hours in a school day, more days in a school year, more courses in a program of study, more homework, more teacher supervision of the kind already done, or more years of preservice training in our current colleges of education will yield disappointing results unless they are accompanied by other changes. A child who fails to understand multiplication by two digit numbers will not understand any better if he or she does an extra ten problems incorrectly. Nor will a child who understands the concept necessarily profit from a homework increase of from ten to

twenty problems. One of the behaviors I have encountered every time I have found myself in a setting in which English is not the language of choice is the inclination of my fellow English-speakers to assume that if they talk very loudly somehow the volume will compensate for the lack of a common vocabulary. Volume is not necessarily a solution, although in the United States the notion of "more is better" seems a part of the cultural landscape; we are a nation of excess. Ted Sizer's call for a "less is more" curriculum makes sense and the effective schools folks argue that for everything we add we must look carefully at what we can abandon, implying that we can probably risk abandoning far more than we add.

Other likely candidates for failure are reforms that are designed to be bandaids. Granted, bandaids are sometimes preferable to bleeding (certainly less messy), but they should never be identified as ultimate solutions. Bandaids tend to be responsive to political swings of the equity-excellence-efficiency pendulum and seasonal, appearing more frequently in election years. An example of bandaid proliferation is the contending solutions to educational troubles in North Carolina which emerged in late 1990 and early 1991. When North Carolina slipped to last on the SAT wall chart, the State Superintendent of Public Instruction, at the direction of the State Board of Education, established a commission to study the situation and make recommendations on how to remedy it. Assisting that commission, which included representatives from most education stakeholders, were several special committees representing specific constituencies -- there were, for example, an administrator group, a teacher group, a parent group, a student group and so on. Before that panel could finalize its report and present its recommendations, the State Superintendent issued a twenty point school improvement plan independent of, although overlapping, the group he had so recently convened. In the interim a task force working with business leaders and the Public

School Forum, a local think tank, at the behest of the governor, issued a report on skills needed for the modern workplace and recommendations to schools to ensure their attainment. Nor were these folks operating independently. There already existed a Basic Education Plan, somewhat stalled due to funding reverses, and a Basic Education Plan Study Committee, whose implicit task was to justify the implementation delay, the 1989 School Improvement and Accountability Act (known as Senate Bill 2), a statewide effective schools initiative, and a redesign of the secondary school vocational program called Tech Prep. The Lt. Governor was pushing an anti-drug school initiative and freely criticizing plans by both the Governor and the State Superintendent. Everyone has a box of bandaids; no one has a way to make coherent those contenders for public action and dollars. Paralysis and cynicism seem likely results of such political confusion, unless some sense of coherence emerges.

A third reason reforms might fail is our lack of a clear consensus on the mission of our public schools. Economic changes certainly stimulated the latest round of reforms; that economic imperative was tinged with the vocabulary of national defense, which provided the stimulus in the 1950s. In the 1960s we used the schools to resolve pressing social issues, hoping they would serve as a mechanism for integrating society and providing equal opportunities for previously underserved groups. When there is a new problem on the horizon, schools came to be our means for resolving it. For instance, when AIDS became a potential medical nightmare for a population other than gay men, we decided that everyone needed to be more knowledgeable about the devastating consequences of that disease and, consequently, asked public school educators to meet that need. Many states adopted a specific curriculum, to be delivered in a specific time sequence at a specific grade level with specific materials, and required that it be added to the course of study.

A sensitive, but good, example of our desire to have it all and have it now is the position of interscholastic athletics in our secondary schools. Few events focus public pride as much as a successful football season, but to support that experience high schools must provide space, resources (fields must be groomed, stadia cleaned before and after the events, half-time entertainments provided, uniforms purchased and maintained), personnel, and time. They do so at a cost. Although a successful season will produce gate revenues sufficient to fund most of a high school sports program, that money rarely covers expenses for the training leagues in the middle and junior high schools, the coaching supplements to attract winners to work with a community's athletes, the trainer now required by many state laws, or the cost of the athletic complexes which support practice and performance. Nor are those revenues sufficient to compensate for the time lost to teacher-coaches for preparing lessons or grading papers related to their academic duties. For the course of their seasons, most (not all) coaches spend their time preparing and evaluating the athletic performances of their extra-curricular students far more carefully than they do the academic performances of the students whom they encounter in classes. Nor do these revenues compensate for the messages we sometimes must carry when we recruit teachers based not entirely on their academic and teaching credentials, but on what they can coach.

I have yet to read a reform report which suggests that the support of community entertainment and athletic programs is a part of the central mission of our public schools. I am sensitive to the arguments for maintaining such programs. But we maintain them at a price and that price often comes at the expense of the basic academic mission of a school. At a time when we worry about the ability of our young people to function in a world which requires information manipulation skills, we have ensured that we send mixed messages continually to our students. Often the students most at risk

of failing to master basic skills are the ones who absorb the implicit messages best. For instance, the number of inner-city urban males who believe they can possibly play basketball one day in the NBA far exceeds that of any other group and significantly exceeds the number who are likely to have a chance of ever making that goal a reality. Given that belief, however, where will such a youngster spend time -- studying mathematics or practicing hoops?

If we continue to use people as we currently use them we can also count on educational reform to fail. Incentive plans are sometimes disguised attempts to reduce the tremendous cost in personnel required by the current public school system. They are often ill-conceived, mistrusted by the people who will supposedly benefit therefrom, and rarely last. No large-scale incentive plan has persisted over time in any state nor has any plan made a dramatic difference in the quality of education. Pay schedules fluctuate depending on a number of variables and are always tied to the current financial health of a particular state; they rarely pay certain teachers what they could earn in the private, non-education sector. In terms of what salaries will actually purchase, the standard of living for teachers has not risen significantly during the past two decades. Until we make radical adjustments in the roles we have those people (state departments of public instruction, central office staff members, principals and their support staff, teachers, and teaching assistants) play, the ways in which we compensate them, and the ways in which we evaluate their performances, we will not be able to make profound educational strides based on those performances. Excellence is dependent on people -- a lesson everyone who has worked in a school knows as well as one reinforced by the Peters and Waterman literature. Yet we rarely invest sufficient funds to attract the caliber of people we say we need and we certainly do not invest the funds required to retrain those who are now employed in our schools.

A trivial example illustrates our difficulty. In North Carolina teachers are employed for 200 days, only 180 of which are designated student contact days. The other twenty are a combination of professional work days and vacation days. When initially conceived, those work days were to provide time for co-operative planning, for meetings, and for professional development activities. However, to provide teachers with a benefit without dipping into funds, the state legislature in the early 1980s declared that veteran teachers who were earning extra vacation days could take them on work days. However, they could not bank those days as they did sick days. If they accumulated more than thirty, they would lose them. Teachers now had the choice of using the workdays for their intended purposes, taking them as vacation days, or losing the benefit of those vacation days. What happened? Time intended to help professional practice became, for large numbers on veteran staffs, time off. As a consequence few school systems could run a coherent staff development plan which depended on activities on the very days once intended for that purpose.

Another set of reforms destined for failure are those fraught with the arrogance of certainty. The Greeks certainly knew the limitations of hubris and based a significant body of their tragic literature on it. Yet we are often so certain in education. We know "the" standard course of study, "the" core curriculum which all students in all states in all cases should (must) master. In many states there are statewide curricula reinforced by a mandated statewide testing system. We are often so confident of our ability to measure mastery, that we sometimes forget the possibility that we might be asking students to master things which are unimportant.

In North Carolina in 1991 we have a sixth grade social studies test to cover information taught in the fifth and sixth grades. In 1989-90 events in eastern Europe so radically changed what was (an eastern and western sector as opposed to a rapidly

unifying Germany; an eastern bloc dominated by the Soviet Union and communism as opposed to an eastern bloc rapidly becoming something quite different and definitely separated from the USSR) that for a few questions on the test, which had been written and normed several years before, the previously correct answers were no longer correct. What had worked in the 1988-89 administration of the exam had been pre-empted by the political realities of the next academic year. Granted textbooks were also incorrect, but one assumed that teachers supplemented them with what was then happening. So, the question became "what should we do with the test?" Obviously, we could eliminate the administration, design and norm a new one, and use it the next year. Or, we could throw out those questions, recognizing that it would alter our scientific norm-referencing. Or, we could rewrite the score guides, count the now right answers right and the previously right answers wrong, and also compromise our norm tables. Or, we could read to the students a statement which would go something like this: "Remember that when these questions were written, 1986-87, the world might have been a different place. Answer these questions based on how things were then." I realize that the last suggestion seems absurd, but it was actually the leading contender for a time. The fact that it was even considered suggests the extent to which we will entertain maintaining a fossilized curriculum to preserve the potentially false integrity of the instruments we have to measure student achievement. There is probably no curriculum which we, educated to an industrial age world, can design which will totally serve the needs of our children in the next century. To imply with confidence that we are such skillful a set of designers is to commit the sin of hubris.

Another way to think about this issue is to consider the place of the written word in our educational institutions and the sacredness we apply to it and a relatively traditional definition of literacy in terms of future needs. At one time, the days of the

nomads, societies survived and functioned well without writing. The storyteller was the custodian of the past and, as such, an important person in the tribe. Once writing replaced telling as the primary means of conveying information, the storyteller's position declined, although that decline was slow until the advent of the printing press. Prior to printing, there were few books and limited access to those which existed. Widespread access to printed books and the skill of reading is relatively recent. Yet it is almost impossible for us to conceive of literacy in its absence -- even in the form we now know. Although we know story tellers are now only delightful cultural additions and certainly not essential, we assume that reading books and writing with pens and pencils will be with us throughout our tomorrows.

Once everyone needed to know how to build, out of few materials, a fire. Today most of us have never built a fire without the help of matchings, unless we were playing primitives or earning merit badges. We don't question the inevitability of matches, nor doubt that they will always be there. Most of us rarely question the inevitability of a switch to turn on our heater or a lamp. So, should we assume the inevitability of printed words? Yet we deprive many students of the skills which involve manipulating words, because we do not think their ability to identify and pronounce some words is sufficient. We deny many students the skills to manipulate and understand sophisticated math because they make mistakes on calculations a machine can do for them. I'm not advocating that we ignore such skills or dismiss them as inconsequential, but I am suggesting that we should be very careful when we make them unnecessary gatekeepers to other areas of knowledge or when we assume they will remain as they are forever.

A sixth category of failure candidates is that set of reforms which perpetuate hierarchy and bureaucracy, which continue the isolation of the profession by maintaining egg-carton schools and six period high school days, which over-regulate and

prescribe curriculum, methods, and procedures, which tie the hands of the people who are closest to the students they must teach. Max Weber identified bureaucracy as the institutional means of coping with modernization. Emile Durkheim argued that anomie was one of the results of that modernity.²¹ That sense of alienation is evident in our public schools, which have become large, rigid institutions. Parents, students, teachers, and administrators often feel isolated from each other, from the work one associates with schools, and from the school itself. Increasing levels of vandalism, loss of public support and confidence, and reports of burn-out all attest to a problem associated with something other than academic achievement. Decisions which require local action are made in distant places (statehouses, federal courtrooms, and Washington, D.C.); no one feels ownership of them, nor an enthusiasm for their implementation. As a consequence, watchdog regulations and forms appear, exacerbating that alienation.

Nor can we anticipate success if we continue to recommend reforms which are sticks rather than carrots. "Gotcha" measures were the substance of many of the early 1980s initiatives. In North Carolina, for example, we created a standard course of study, because we did not trust professionals to design one which was appropriate. Because we did not trust them to teach it, we designed a testing program which measures how well students learned what the state decreed should be taught. Because we did not believe that even if they would teach the approved course of study that they would do it right, we designed an approved teaching method. Because we worried that they would fail to follow the approved teaching strategies, we designed and required an evaluation system keyed to those methods, even if the research base in some content areas at some levels was weak. Because we worried that bad marks would not adequately stimulate compliance, we tried to develop a statewide incentive pay plan keyed to scoring high on

the compliance chart. And to ensure that teachers picked the correct materials with which to teach, we had a textbook commission which selected the approved texts. We teacher-proofed the system in the 1980s, even though there was abundant evidence that one of the reasons for the failure of the new math and the new science in the post-Sputnik period was because the curriculum designers viewed teachers as barely capable technicians.

We have played "gotcha" games with students and the process of learning itself. I don't like brussel sprouts. It's an acquired taste that I have taken pride in not acquiring. However, I have been known to eat brussel sprouts, because I recognize that they contain things that are good for me, that contribute to my general health. Why would I have done that when I was too young to know what "good for me" meant from a health perspective? I did so because someone I trusted or respected or loved or feared told me to do it. In schools, students frequently do things that they are told to do, because someone they trust, respect, love, or fear tells them to do it. However, there comes a time when students no longer fear what they once feared and when they make decisions for reasons other than the trust, respect, or love of some authority figures. Then a willing inclination to partake of the brussel sprouts of schooling will come only because the lesson of "it's good for you" has been mastered. As long as we continue to make learning a brussel sprout activity, we will continue to ensure that life-long learning, something almost every knowledgeable businessman and futurist will tell you is an ingredient of the twenty-first century workplace, never happens.

Essentially we have taken many potentially chocolate pudding activities associated with learning and made them brussel sprouts, without mastering the knack of teaching young people the healthful value of some culinary pain. We've done it by decreeing that not everyone gets to eat chocolate pudding, thereby ensuring that the excluded will leave

the brussel sprouts arena of learning as soon as possible and have no inclination to return for a further taste. And, for those who have remained with the promise of chocolate pudding, we have diluted its potential by declaring that everyone must eat specific portions in the same flavor, in the same type of container, at the same time, and served in the same way. We have further assumed that the serving will taste the same to everyone, dished up in thirteen chronologically equal portions provided sequentially. And we have assumed that we can measure externally the quality of each individual's taste abilities against some standardized reference scale. The process becomes *distasteful for everyone because it is sensitive to no one*. Even teachers and principals cease to be lifelong learners. That process also eliminates the possibility of brussel sprout souffles.

Finally, reforms which abrogate a significant commonweal interest in and responsibility for matters of public education are likewise candidates for failure. As much as I like the idea of a return to local control, to assume that something like the Chicago multiple school board reform will cure the problems of that city's schools is to assume that education is not a profession. Anyone can do it, everyone has what it takes to make good decisions about learning and children. Moreover, they will make them fairly. During the free school movement of the sixties one of the surprises to romantic reformers was that when storefront schools returned control to parents, parents made some educationally unwise decisions. Given the people likely to be elected to a school board of the middle school of which I was once principal, among the educational decisions which would have been mandated were required corporal punishment and strict tracking. In the storefront school example, the parents were often uneducated minorities; in my fantasy school board they would probably have been upwardly mobile professionals.

Nor am I willing to abrogate responsibility to the fates, which is what I sometimes believe revisionist historians would have me do. For many of our more recent historians, educational change is impossible without concomitant changes in the entire structure of our society -- changes which can only come from a radical redesign of the economic relationships therein. Capitalist America, their argument goes, will produce only sorting and selecting schools. Sorting and selecting schools will always fail to meet equity and excellence standards at the levels we might desire and need for the next century. Somehow the prospect of waiting for another turn of the Marxian wheel seems to be yielding an essential responsibility to the inevitability of a synthesis independent of conscious choice-making humanity.

If I seem to think (and I do) that the current and recent past reforms are doomed to failure, what do I think might work? I confess that I don't know. I do not have a gift for prognostication nor have I the vision required to promote a Kuhnian leap of faith. But were I to have stewardship of the public education treasury, I do have some notions of how I might be willing to spend those tax dollars.

For example, I would require every school system to fill and maintain a quota of gadflies and employ for the superintendent at least one court jester. Excellent companies promote skunkworks; we in education have always avoided such things. We need people whose jobs are to question, to poke, to prod, to tease, and to irritate the rest of us who lead schools or school systems. If there is not a sufficient degree of discomfort, we are never moved to do anything different. Because we are accustomed to cycles of reform, we tend to wait them out. Our gadflies are generally outsiders. So, when a return of prosperity or the emergence of some national emergency moves the spotlight from schools, we tend to rest content once again with the status quo. Now even when they buzz around our offices, we remind ourselves that they don't know real schools, that they live

in legislative halls or ivory towers. It will be far more difficult to ignore ourselves and that's why we need to ensure that the gadflies of the future become us.

Knowledgeable kings knew that there would be times when they would become arrogant, when they would become full of themselves to the exclusion of everything else, including wisdom. So, they hired fools whose role was to deflate the royal ego. An in-house jester can be a useful employee. His role is not to irritate, but to monitor reality. Because he is the official fool, his job is secure when he tweaks the Superintendents' proverbial nose. In emergencies he could be loaned to legislatures.

I would also begin a search for prophets and publish what might be prophetic books. We already have sufficient Old Testament advocates; Hofstadter was correct about the perpetuation of educational Jeremiahs. But we need some prophets of hope. In schools we tend to dismiss such prophets as idealistic or as over-achievers attempting to embarrass the rest of us. We try hard to shut them up or, failing that, to run them out of town. We need to find where they have gathered and persuade a few to return. We need to hope that one of them might be able to propose the verbal spin which pulls apart our paradigm and forces us to search for an alternative.

When I was a sixties romantic radical, I admired and identified with Holden Caulfield, the protagonist of J.D. Salinger's Catcher in the Rye. His impatience, rage, and alienation seemed to personify some of the things I felt and many of the things I saw. I even found his vision of what he wanted to do with his life something worth emulating.

Anyway, I keep picturing all these little kids playing some game in this big field of rye and all. Thousands of little kids, and nobody's around -- nobody big, I mean -- except me. And I'm standing on the edge of some crazy cliff. What I have to do, I have to catch everybody if they start to go over the cliff -- I mean if they're running and they don't look where they're going I have to come out from somewhere and catch them. That's all I do all day. I'd just be the catcher in the rye and all. I know it's crazy, but that's the only thing I'd really like to be. I know it's crazy.²²

At that time I didn't know it was crazy. But age has brought me to another author and another cliff. Appolinaire has a story that goes something like this: "A man beckoned us to the side of a cliff, but we would not go, because we were afraid. He beckoned us again and we went and he kicked us off and -- we flew." If we play our lives as Holden's, we condemn each generation to repeating the past, however idyllic it might seem. It is only by taking risks, by being willing to make a leap into the unknown, that we can approach the future. Each risk brings with it the possibility of failure, but also the possibility of success. In education it seems a risk now worth taking and to do it we will need some men and women with a message that beckons. So, I would invest some money in prophet seeking.

I would initiate a national debate on the purposes of schooling. I would also require a discussion of the broadened stages on which education can and should take place. One of the strengths of Lawrence Cremin's work is that he refuses to confine his educational histories to school buildings. We need to consider opening our definitions of schools and providing support for other educational ventures. And we certainly need to remove chronological barriers to public education. Given that we know what happens in the first years of a child's life are probably the most important things relative to later education, it is absurd to wait until age five to begin the commonweal's interest in schooling.

I would support efforts that decentralize and deregulate the institutions we now have, that propose programs in which less is more and the traditional disciplines are approached holistically or in which new disciplines are taught, that remove "more of" reforms, that understand the chocolate pudding of learning and can make brussel sprouts palatable, that equalize funding formulas so that accidents of geography do not dictate adequacy of programs and competence of teachers, and that redefine roles and

responsibilities in significant ways. I would support schools which ungrade themselves and become open institutions for anyone who wants to learn, in addition to those young people for whom we are providing compulsory learning experiences. I would support schools which, in co-operation with universities, develop pilot programs to train the next generation of teachers.

I would also spend money to require that anyone who could propose an educational reform must first become a competent reader of our past. In the early 1970s Jacob Bronowski, a scientist, poet, and historian who fled Hitler's advance and moved eventually to California, authored what became a popular PBS program, Ascent of Man. He traced the rise of western civilization, primarily from the perspective of widening intellectual horizons. His conclusion contained, however, a hint of pessimism.

I am infinitely saddened to find myself surrounded in the west by a sense of terrible loss of nerve, a retreat from knowledge . . . It sounds very pessimistic to talk about western civilisation with a sense of retreat. I have been so optimistic about the ascent of man; am I going to give up at this moment? Of course not. The ascent of man will go on. But do not assume that it will go on carried by western civilisation as we know it. We are being weighed in the balance at this moment. If we give up, the next step will be taken -- but not by us. We have not been given any guarantee that Assyria and Egypt and Rome were not given. We are waiting to be somebody's past too, and not necessarily that of our future.²³

Bronowski believed that we could not maintain "informed integrity" if we continued "to live out of a ragbag of morals that come from past beliefs."²⁴ "History is not events, but people. And it is not just people remembering, it is people acting and living their past in the present."²⁵ Yet we have been guilty of forgetting the wisdom of Santayana: "Those who cannot remember the past are condemned to repeat it."²⁶

Bronowski's reputation as a scholar comes primarily from his work as a scientist. Yet it is not technology to which he turns in his advice to western man.

It is pointless to advise people to learn differential equations, or to do a course in electronics or in computer programming. And yet, fifty years from now, if an

understanding of man's origins, his evolution, his history is not the commonplace of the schoolbooks, we shall not exist.²⁷

Consider how well we have mastered that lesson as we have begun to prepare our schools for the requirements of the next century. We are so unskilled in reading our past that we have repeated the same complaints, uttered the same condemnations, blamed the same people, and proposed in most cases the same solutions for decades. Possibly that reception is because we have not joined our scholars with our legislators in a meaningful dialogue; possibly it is because we have been reluctant to declare the emperor's clothes are transparent. I would spend some of those dollars on children (chronological age is unimportant) willing to take the risk of proclaiming our nakedness.

I remember once being part of a panel on which I complained that we in education had done a poor job in setting the standards by which good schooling should be judged. Because of our inadequate attempts at self-examination and disclosure, we had let test-makers, politicians, and the media determine a set of multiple choice indicators which have become those measures by which we are assessed. A colleague told me that I was naive to think that we could do anything else, that standardized tests were here to stay as the major indicator of school success, and that we should learn to play that game as well as we can, even if we thought it was educationally unsound. I was reminded of T.S. Eliot's poem, "The Hollow Men" which ends with these lines:

*This is the way the world ends
Not with a bang but a whimper.*

I intend no money to go to schools or administrators or teachers or communities or academicians or legislators who advocate whimpers. The agenda for tomorrow remains unset, although modern Jeremiahs rage into the night and Kuhnian anomalies grow apace.

The title of this chapter comes from The Communist Manifesto, not because that polemic contains a clue to the educational direction we might take, but because the writing occasionally rises to the level which touches both the hearts and minds of people and because it addresses the potential for major change. We can not make twenty-first schooling on the foundation of twentieth-century schools.

Some schools and parts of schooling will, in the future, resemble some of what we now have. We will not need to eliminate everything which benefits us today and replace it with something else tomorrow. Remember that the technologies which were developed in one paradigm were often used to move us from that paradigm to another and that they remained useful even in that new one. Galileo's telescope, for example, helped him see the flaws which confirmed a heliocentric universe. The telescope has remained part of the astronomer's bag of tricks. But the way in which we see our world, the way in which we define schools and schooling for reform purpose, the very reforms we consider today, will have to melt into the air before they can be transformed into something that will successfully form the basis of an alternative world view with sufficient power and persuasiveness that we will permit the solidity of our common school tradition to be so dramatically changed. I would also spend some of my taxpayer dollars on modern crucible makers.

CHAPTER SEVEN

FOOTNOTES

¹See, for example, Paul Starr, The Social Transformation of American Medicine (New York: Basic Books, 1982), pp. 116-127.

²What follows is admittedly simplistic and ignores somewhat the fact that a sizeable portion of the world exists today in a nomadic culture or an agrarian nation. However, once any part of the globe enters a dramatic change like those described in the ensuing pages, the rest of the world, if not directly transformed, is changed thereby.

³Accessible summaries of those changes can be found in James Burke, Connections (Boston: Little, Brown and Company, 1978) and Jacob Bronowski, The Ascent of Man (Boston: Little, Brown and Company, 1973).

⁴Thomas Hobbes, Leviathan, Part I, Chapter 6. Quoted in John Bartlett, Familiar Quotations, ed. Emily Morison (Boston: Little, Brown and Company, 1980). p. 264.

⁵Alvin Toffler, Future Shock (New York: Bantam Books, 1971), p. 11.

⁶*Ibid.*, p. 405.

⁷Herbert Gerjuoy, Quoted in *ibid.*, p. 414.

⁸Alvin Toffler, The Third Wave (New York: Bantam Books, 1981), p. 351.

⁹*Ibid.*, p. 385.

¹⁰Alvin Toffler, Powershift: Knowledge, Wealth, and Violence at the Edge of the 21st Century (New York: Bantam Books, 1990), p. 368.

¹¹*Ibid.*, p. 369.

¹²*Ibid.*, p. 368.

¹³John Naisbitt, Megatrends: Ten New Directions Transforming Our Lives (New York: Warner Books, Inc., 1982), pp. 142-145 *passim*.

¹⁴*Ibid.*, pp. 31-35 *passim*.

¹⁵*Ibid.*, p. 15.

¹⁶John Naisbitt and Patricia Aburdene, Megatrends 2000 (New York: William Morrow and Company, Inc., 1990), see for example, pp. 219-220.

¹⁷In addition to the works listed below, see Richard Tanner Pascale and Anthony G. Athos, The Art of Japanese Management (New York: Simon & Schuster, 1981); William Ouchi, Theory Z (New York: Addison-Wesley Publishing Company, 1981); Walter Bennis and Robert Nanus, Leaders: The Strategies for Taking Charge (New York: Harper & Row, 1985); James McGregor Burns, The Power to Lead: The Crisis of the American Presidency (New York: Simon and Schuster, 1984); James M. Kouzes and Barry Z. Posner, The Leadership Challenge (San Francisco: Jossey-Bass Publishers, 1987); Charles Garfield, Peak Performers: The New Heros of American Business (New York: Avon Books, 1986); Tom Peters and Nancy Austin, A Passion for Excellence: The Leadership Differences (New York: Random House, 1985); Tom Peters, Thriving on Chaos (New York: Harper & Row, 1987); Rosabeth Moss Kanter, The Change Masters (New York: Touchstone Books, 1984); and John Naisbitt and Patricia Aburdene, Re-inventing the Corporation (New York: Warner Books, 1985).

¹⁸Thomas J. Peters and Robert H. Waterman, Jr., In Search of Excellence (New York: Harper & Row, Publishers, 1982), p. 5.

¹⁹*Ibid.*, p. 42.

²⁰No application of Michael Katz's thesis is necessarily intended, although the phrase is applicable in a modern context, too. Michael Katz, The Irony of Early School Reform: Educational Innovation in Mid-Nineteenth Century Massachusetts (Cambridge, Massachusetts: Harvard University Press, 1968).

²¹For a brief discussion of the thought of Max Weber and Emile Durkeim, see Talcott Parsons, The Structure of Social Action, 2 vols. (New York: The Free Press, 1968). Parsons' book was originally published in 1937.

²²J.D. Salinger, Catcher in the Rye (New York: Bantam Books, 1964), p. 173.

²³Bronowski, The Ascent of Man, p. 437.

²⁴*Ibid.*, p. 436.

²⁵*Ibid.*, p. 438.

²⁶George Santayana, The Life of Reason, vol. 1: Reason in Common Sense quoted in Bartlett Quotations, p. 703.

²⁷Bronowski, The Ascent of Man, pp. 436-437.

BIBLIOGRAPHY

- Abelove, Henry. Visions of History. New York: Pantheon, 1983.
- "About Those 'Frills' in Schools." U.S. News and World Report (13 April 1956): 36-38.
- Abramovitz, Susan, and Rosenfeld, Stuart, eds. Declining Enrollment: The Challenge of the Coming Decade. Washington, D.C.: Government Printing Office, 1978.
- Achilles, Charles M. "Forecast: Stormy Weather Ahead for Educational Administration." Issues in Education 2 (Fall 1984): 127-135.
- Adams, Charles Francis. "The Development of the Superintendency." Addresses and Proceedings of the NEA (1880).
- Adams, Francis. The Free School System of the United States. London: Chapman and Hall, 1875.
- Adams, Henry. The Education of Henry Adam. Boston: Houghton Mifflin Company, 1961.
- Adkins, Gary. "Megatrends Author Foresees the Millennium." Educational Leadership 47 (September 1989): 16-17.
- Adler, Jerry, and McKillop, Peter. "Have Gays Taken Over Yale?" Newsweek (12 October 1987): 96.
- Adler, Mortimer. Paideia Problems and Possibilities: A Consideration of Questions Raised by the Paideia Proposal. New York: MacMillan Publishing Company, 1983.
- _____. The Paideia Program: An Educational Syllabus. New York: MacMillan Publishing Company, 1984.
- _____. The Paideia Proposal: An Educational Manifesto. New York: MacMillan Publishing Company, 1982.
- _____. Reforming Education: The Opening of the American Mind. Edited by Geraldine Van Doren. New York: MacMillan Publishing Company, 1988.
- Alberty, Harold. Reorganizing the School Curriculum. New York: MacMillan Publishing Company, 1953.
- Albrecht, James E. "A Nation at Risk: Another View." Phi Delta Kappan 65 (June 1984): 684-685.

- Alexander, Lamar. "Time for Results: An Overview." Phi Delta Kappan 68 (November 1986): 202-204.
- Alger, Chadwick, and Harf, James. Global Education: Why? For Whom? About What? Columbus, Ohio: Ohio State University, 1984.
- Allen, Oliver. "The Power of Patents." American Heritage 41 (September/October 1990): 46-59.
- Altor, Jonathan, et. al. "Teachers Get No Respect." Newsweek (24 September 1984): 70.
- American Association of Colleges for Teacher Education. Teacher Education Policy in the United States: A 50-State Survey of Legislative and Administrative Actions. Washington, D.C.: State Issues Clearinghouse, 1988.
- American Association of State Colleges and University. Showcase for Excellence: Developing Models to Enhance the Teaching Profession. Washington, D.C.: American Association of State Colleges and Universities, 1985.
- Anderson, Beverly, and Odden, Allan. "State Initiatives Can Foster School Improvement." Phi Delta Kappan 67 (April 1986): 580-581.
- Anderson, Lee, et. al. The Civics Report Card. Washington, D.C.: United States Department of Education, 1990.
- Anrig, Gregory. "Teacher Education and Teacher Testing: The Rush to Mandate." Phi Delta Kappan 67 (February 1986): 447-451.
- Anyon, Jean. "Elementary Social Studies Textbooks and Legitimizing Knowledge." Theory and Research in Social Education 6 (September 1978): 40-55.
- _____. "Ideology and United States History Textbooks." Harvard Educational Review 43 (August 1979): 361-368.
- Apple, Michael W. "Standing on the Shoulders of Bowles and Gintis: Class Formation and Capitalist Schools." History of Education Quarterly 28 (Summer 1988): 231-241.
- Applebee, Arthur. The Writing Report Card: Writing Achievement in American Schools. Washington, D.C.: United States Department of Education, 1986.
- Applebee, Arthur, et. al. The Writing Report Card, 1984-88: Findings from the Nation's Report Card. Washington, D.C.: United States Department of Education, Office of Educational Research and Improvement, 1990.
- Arizona Education Association. A Call to Excellence: A Plan for the Renewal of Arizona Public Schools. Phoenix: Arizona Education Association, 1984.

- Armento, B.J. "Research on Teaching Social Studies." In Handbook on Research on Teaching, pp. 942-951. Edited by M.L. Wittrock. New York: MacMillan, 1986.
- Ashton-Warner, Sylvia. Teacher. New York: Bantam Books, 1964.
- Association for Supervision and Curriculum Development Task Force on Merit Pay. Incentives for Excellence in America's Schools. Alexandria, Virginia: ASCD, 1985.
- Atkin, J. Myron. "Can Educational Research Keep Pace with Educational Reform?" Phi Delta Kappan 71 (November 1989): 200-205.
- Attenbaugh, Richard. "Our Children are Being Trained Like Dogs and Ponies: Schooling, Social Control, and the Working Class." History of Education Quarterly (Summer 1981): 213-222.
- Averill, Lawrence. "A Plea for the Educational Survey." School and Society 7 (1918): 187-191.
- Ayers, Leonard. Laggards in Our Schools: A Study of Retardation and Elimination in City School Systems. New York: Charities Publication Committee, 1909.
- Ayers, William. "What Do Our 17-Year Olds Know? A Critique." Education Week (25 November 1987): 24, 18.
- Ayres, Leonard. A Comparative Study of the Public School Systems in the Forty-Eight States. New York: Russell Sage, 1912.
- _____. "History and Present Status of Educational Measurement." In Seventeenth Yearbook of the National Society for the Study of Education. Bloomington, Illinois: Public School Publishing Company, 1918.
- Bacharach, Samuel B., and Conley, Sharon C. "Education Reform: A Managerial Agenda." Phi Delta Kappan 67 (May 1986): 641-645.
- Bagley, William. Education and Emergent Man: A Theory of Education with Particular Application to Public Education in the United States. New York: Thomas Nelson, 1934.
- Bagley, William C., and Keith, John A.H. An Introduction to Teaching. New York, 1924.
- Bailey, Adrienne Y. "The Education EQuality Project: Focus on Results." Phi Delta Kappan 65 (September 1983): 22-25.
- Bailey, William J. School-Site Management Applied. Lancaster, Pennsylvania: Technonic Publishing Company, 1991.
- Bakalis, Michael J. "Power and Purpose in American Education." Phi Delta Kappan 64 (September 1983): 7-13.

- Baldrige, J. Victor, and Deal, Terrence, eds. The Dynamics of Organizational Change in Education. Berkeley, California: McCutchan Publishing Corporation, 1983.
- Barbour, Nita H. "School Reform: Is More Education for Teachers the Answer?" Childhood Education 65 (Fall 1988): 3-4.
- Barnard, John, and Burner, David, eds. The American Experience in Education. New York: Franklin Watts, Inc., 1975.
- Barr, Donald. Who Pushed Humpty Dumpty? Dilemmas in American Education Today. New York: Atheneum, 1971.
- Barr, Robert D. "Alternatives for the Eighties: A Second Decade of Development." Phi Delta Kappan 62 (April 1981): 570-573.
- _____. "New Ideas for Teacher Education." Phi Delta Kappan 66 (October 1984): 127-130.
- Barth, Roland S. Improving Schools from Within: Teachers, Parents, and Principals can Make the Difference. San Francisco: Jossey-Bass Publishers, 1990.
- _____. "Oh Sheep and Goats and School Reform." Phi Delta Kappan 68 (December 1986): 293-296.
- Bastion, Ann, et. al. Choosing Equality: The Case for Democratic Schooling. New York: New World Foundation, 1985.
- Beck, Melinda, et. al. "A Nation Still at Risk." Newsweek (2 May 1988): 54-55.
- Bell, Bernard Iddings. "Our Schools -- Their Four Grievous Faults." Reader's Digest 58 (January 1951): 124-126.
- Bell, Daniel. The Reforming of General Education. New York: Columbia University Press, 1966.
- Bell, Terrel H. "American Education at a Crossroads," Phi Delta Kappan 65 (April 1984): 531-534.
- _____. "Education Policy Development in the Reagan Administration." Phi Delta Kappan 67 (March 1986): 487-493.
- Bender, Thomas, et al. "Institutionalization and Education in the Nineteenth and Twentieth Centuries." History of Education Quarterly 19 (Winter 1980): 449-450.
- Benjamin, Steve. "Our Ideascapes for Education: What Futurists Recommend." Educational Leadership 47 (September 1989): 8.

- Bennett, William J. First Lessons: A Report in Elementary Education in America. Washington, D.C.: Government Printing Office, September, 1986.
- _____. James Madison High School: A Curriculum for American Students. Washington, D.C.: United States Department of Education, 1987.
- _____. To Reclaim a Legacy. Washington, D.C.: Government Printing Office, 1984.
- Bennett, William. What Works: Research about Teaching and Learning. Washington, D.C.: Government Printing Office, 1986.
- Bennis, Walter, and Nanus, Robert. Leaders: The Strategies for Taking Charge. New York: Harper & Row, 1985.
- Benowitz, Madge, et. al. Today's Children, Tomorrow's Survival: A Call to Restructure Schools. Washington, D.C.: National Association of State Boards, n.d.
- Berger, Peter, and Luckman, Thomas. The Social Construction of Reality: A Treatise in the Sociology of Knowledge. New York: Anchor Books, 1967.
- Berger, Peter; Berger, Bridgitte; and Kellner, Hansfried. The Human Mind: Modernization and Consciousness. New York: Vintage Books, 1974.
- Berliner, David C. "Making the Right Changes in Preservice Teacher Education." Phi Delta Kappan 66 (October 1984): 94-96.
- Berman, Barbara. "Business Efficiency, American Schooling and the Public School Superintendency: A Reconsideration of the Callahan Thesis." History of Education Quarterly 23 (Fall 1983): 297-319.
- Berman, Paul. "The Next Step: The Minnesota Plan." Phi Delta Kappan 67 (November 1985): 188-189.
- Bestor, Arthur. Educational Wastelands: The Retreat from Learning in Our Public Schools. Urbana: University of Illinois Press, 1953.
- _____. The Restoration of Learning. New York: Knopf, 1955.
- _____. "What Went Wrong with U.S. Schools." U.S. News and World Report 44 (24 January 1958); 68-77.
- Bledstein, Burton. The Culture of Professionalism: The Middle Class and the Development of Higher Education in American. New York: W.W. Norton, 1976.
- Block, Robert. "We Already Know Our Problems Out Here in the Field." Phi Delta Kappan 65 (November 1983): 183.

- Bloom, Allan. The Closing of the American Mind. New York: Simon & Schuster, 1987.
- Bloom, Benjamin; Davis, Allison; and Hess, Robert. Compensatory Education for Cultural Deprivation. New York: Holt, Rinehart & Winston, 1965.
- Blumberg, A. "The Craft of School Administration and Some Other Rambling Thoughts." Education Administration Quarterly 20 (Fall 1984): 24-40.
- Bobbitt, John Franklin. "The Elimination of Waste in Education." Elementary School Journal 12 (February 1912): 260.
- _____. "Some General Principles of Management Applied to the Problems of City-School Systems." Twelfth Yearbook of the National Society for the Study of Education. Chicago: University of Chicago Press, 1913.
- _____. The Supervision of City Schools: Some General Principles of Management Applied to the Problems of City Schools. Bloomington, Illinois: National Society for the Study of Education, 1913.
- Bonner, J. "Japanese Quality Circles: Can They Work in Education?" Phi Delta Kappan 63 (June 1982): 681.
- Bowles, Samuel, and Gintis, Herbert. Schooling Capitalist America: Educational Reform and the Contradictions of Economic Life. New York: Basic Books, Inc., 1976.
- Boyer, Ernest. College: The Undergraduate Experience in America. New York: Harper & Row, Publishers, 1987.
- _____. High School: A Report on Secondary Education in America. New York: Harper & Row, Publishers, 1983.
- _____. "In the Aftermath of Excellence." Educational Leadership 42 (March 1985): 10-15.
- _____. "Reflections on the Great Debate of '83." Phi Delta Kappan 65 (April 1984): 525-530.
- Braddock, Jomills Henry. "Quality and Equality: Compatible or Incompatible Goals?" Phi Delta Kappan 63 (November 1981): 166.
- Brameld, Theodore. "Four Point Agenda for Education." Nation 173 (15 December 1951): 523-526.
- Brandt, Ron. "A Changed Professional Culture." Educational Leadership 46 (May 1989): 2-3.
- _____. "On Restructuring Schools: A Conversation with Al Shanker." Educational Leadership 47 (April 1990): 11-16.

- Breinin, Charles M. "A Complaint and a Prediction." Phi Delta Kappan 69 (September 1987): 15-16.
- Brinton, Crane. The Anatomy of Revolution. New York: Vantage Books, 1965.
- Brodinsky, Ben. "Something Happened: Education in the Seventies." Phi Delta Kappan 61 (December 1979): 238-241.
- Bronowski, Jacob. The Ascent of Man. Boston: Little, Brown and Company, 1973.
- Brookover, W.B., et. al. School Social Systems and Student Achievement: Schools Can Make a Difference. New York: Praeger, 1979.
- Brooks, Hunter O., and Barker, Paula R. "Alternative Schools in a Traditional Setting." Social Education (November 1973): 650-651.
- Buckner, Edward. "School Surveys." U.S. Commissioner of Education Report of 1914. Washington, D.C.: Government Printing Office, 1915.
- Bullough, Robert V., Jr., The Forgotten Dream of American Public Education. Ames: Iowa State University Press, 1988.
- Burk, Frederic. "Are We Living in B.C. or A.D.?" Ladies Home Journal 29 (September 1912): 6.
- Burke, James. Connections. Boston: Little, Brown and Company, 1978.
- Burkhard, Austin. "Big Business and the Schools." Nation 173 (10 November 1951): 400-402.
- Burnes, Donald W., and Lindner, Barbara J. "Why the States Must Move Quickly to Assess Excellence." Educational Leadership 43 (October 1985): 18-20.
- Burns, James McGregor. The Power to Lead: The Crisis of the American Presidency. New York: Simon and Schuster, 1984.
- Business-Higher Education Forum. America's Competitive Challenge: The Need for a National Response. Washington, D.C.: Business-Higher Education Forum, 1983.
- Button, H. Warren, and Provenzo, Eugene F., Jr. History of Education and Culture in America. 2nd ed. Englewood Cliffs, New Jersey, 1989.
- Butts, R. Freeman. Public Education in the United States: From Revolution to Reform. New York: Holt Rinehart and Winston, 1978.
- _____. The Revival of Civic Learning. Bloomington, Indiana: Phi Delta Kappa Educational Foundation, 1980.

- Calhoun, Daniel. The Intelligence of a People. Princeton, New Jersey: Princeton University Press, 1977.
- California Commission on the Teaching Profession. Who Will Teach Our Children? Sacramento, California: Commission on the Teaching Profession, 1985.
- Callahan, Raymond E. Education and the Cult of Efficiency: A Study of the Social Forces That Have Shaped the Administration of Public Schools. Chicago: The University of Chicago Press, 1962.
- Campbell, Colin. "Experts on Thinking Fear a Decline of Reasoning." New York Times (27 August 1984): A8.
- Canby, Henry Seidel. "The Luxury of Being Educated." Harper's Magazine 128 (December 1913): 68-74.
- Carroll, Joseph M. "The Copernican Plan: Restructuring the American High School." Phi Delta Kappan 70 (January 1990): 358-365.
- "The Case of Seventeen Million Children -- Is Our Public School System Proving an Utter Failure?" Ladies Home Journal 9 (August 1912): 3.
- Cass, Abraham. "What a School Was." New York Times (16 April 1983): Op-Ed Page.
- Casti, John. Paradigms Lost: Images of Man in the Mirror of Science. New York: William Morrow and Company, Inc., 1989.
- Caswell, Hollis, L. "The Great Reappraisal of Public Education." Teachers College Record 54 (October 1952): 12-22.
- Cawelti, Gordon. "Key Elements of Site-Based Management." Educational Leadership 46 (May 1989): 46-54.
- Cetron, Marvin, and Davies, Owen. American Renaissance: Our Life at the Turn of the 21st Century. New York: St. Martin's Press, 1989.
- Chambers, Marcia. "Politics and Patronage Dominate Community-Run School Districts." New York Times (26 June 1980): B6.
- Chandler, Harry N. "Just Among Us Teachers." Phi Delta Kappan 65 (November 1983): 181-182.
- Chase, L. "Quality Circles in Education." Educational Leadership 40 (February 1983): 18-26.
- Cheney, Lynne, V. American Memory. Washington, D.C.: Government Printing Office, 1987.

- _____. Tyrannical Machines: A Report on Educational Practices Gone Wrong and Our Best Hopes for Setting Them Right. Washington, D.C.: National Endowment for the Humanities, 1990.
- Church, Robert L., and Sedlak, Michael W. Education in the United States: An Interpretative History. New York: The Free Press, 1976.
- Clabaugh, Gary K.; Feden, Preston D.; and Vogel, Robert. "Revolutionary Teacher Education: Training Developmentally Oriented Teachers." Phi Delta Kappan 66 (May 1985): 615-616.
- Clark, Blake. "Denver Schools Connect Learning with Life." Reader's Digest 59 (February 1951): 89-92.
- Clark, David L. "Better Teachers for the Year 2000: A Proposal for the Structural Reform of Teacher Education." Phi Delta Kappan 66 (October 1984): 116-120.
- Clark, David; Astuto, Terry A.; and Rooney, Paul M. "The Changing Structure of Federal Education Policy in the 1980s." Phi Delta Kappan 65 (November 1983): 188-193.
- Clark, David, and Amiot, Mary Anne. "The Disassembly of the Federal Educational Role." Education and Urban Society (May 1983): 367-387.
- Clark, David, et. al. "Effective Schools and School Improvement: An Appraisal of Some Recent Trends." Education Administration Quarterly 20 (Summer 1984): 41-68.
- Clark, Richard L.; Loorem, Nancy; and Murray, Vicky. Renewing a Place Called School: A Guidebook. Chicago: Encyclopedia Britannica Educational Corporation, 1988.
- Clinchy, Evans. "Public School Choice: Absolutely Necessary but Not Wholly Sufficient." Phi Delta Kappan 71 (December 1989): 289-294.
- _____. "Yes, but What About Irving Engleman?" Phi Delta Kappan 65 (April 1984): 542-545.
- Clinchy, Evans, and Cody, Elisabeth Allen. "If Not Public Choice, Then Private Escape." Phi Delta Kappan 60 (December 1978): 270-273.
- Clowse, Barbara B. Brainpower for the Cold War. Westport, Connecticut: Greenwood Press, 1981.
- Cohen, David K. "Reforming School Politics." Harvard Educational Review 48 (November 1978): 429-447.
- Cohen, David K., and Neufeld, Barbara. "The Failure of High Schools and the Progress of Education." Daedalus 110 (Summer 1981): 69-90.

- Cohen, David K., and Rosenberg, Bella H. "Functions and Fantasies: Understanding Schools in Capitalist America." History of Education Quarterly 17 (1977): 125-132.
- Cohen, Michael. "Instructional Management and Social Conditions in Effective Schools." In School Finance and School Improvement: Linkages for the 1980s. Edited by Allan Odden and L. Dean Webb. Cambridge, Massachusetts: Ballinger, 1983.
- _____. "State Boards in an Era of Reform." Phi Delta Kappan 69 (September 1987): 60-64.
- Cohen Sol, "The Industrial Education Movement, 1906-17." American Quarterly 20 (Spring 1968): 95-110.
- _____. Progressives and Urban School Reform. New York: Teachers College Press, 1964.
- Cohen, Sol, ed. Education in the United States: A Documentary History. 4 vols. New York: Random House, 1974.
- Coleman, James S. Equality of Educational Opportunity. Washington, D.C.: U.S. Department of Health, Education and Welfare, 1966.
- _____. "Public Schools, Private Schools, and the Public Interest." The Public Interest (Summer 1981): 19-30.
- _____. "Quality and Equality in American Education: Public and Catholic Schools" Phi Delta Kappan 63 (November 1981): 159-164.
- Collins, Carol C., ed. America's Schools: Passing the Test of the '80s: An Editorial on File Book. New York: Facts on File Publications, 1985.
- Collins, Marva, and Tamarkin, Civia. Marva Collins' Way. Los Angeles: Jeremy P. Tarcher, Inc., 1982.
- College Board Education EQuality Project. Academic Preparation for College: What Students Need to Know and Be Able to Do. New York: College Board, 1983.
- Colorado Education Association. The Profession Speaks - Education Colorado: Components for Excellence. Aurora: Colorado Education Association, 1983.
- Commission for Quality Education. Access to Quality: Undergraduate Education. Atlanta, Georgia: Southern Regional Education Board, 1985.
- Commission for Quality Education. Improving Teacher Education: An Agenda for Higher Education and the School. Atlanta, Georgia: Southern Regional Board, 1985.
- Committee on Education and Labor, United States House of Representatives. Merit Pay Task Force Report. Washington, D.C.: Government Printing Office, 1983.

Committee on the Objectives of a General Education in a Free Society. General Education in a Free Society. Cambridge, Massachusetts: Harvard University Press, 1945.

Conant, James B. The American High School Today. New York: McGraw-Hill, 1959.

_____. "A Hard Look at Our High Schools." Look 23 (3 February 1959): 27-32.

_____. My Several Lives: Memoirs of a Social Innovator. New York: Harper & Row, 1970.

Conley, Sharon C., and Bacharach, Samuel B. "From School-Site Management to Participatory School-Site Management." Phi Delta Kappan 71 (March 1990): 539-544.

Coombs, Philip H. The World Education Crisis: A Systems Analysis. New York: Oxford University Press, 1968.

Cooper, Bruce, S. "Retooling Teachers: The New York Experience." Phi Delta Kappan 68 (April 1987): 606-609.

Cowley, Geoffrey, et. al. "Not Just for Nerds." Newsweek 115 (9 April 1990): 53.

Cremin, Lawrence A. American Education: The Metropolitan Experience, 1876-1980. New York: Harper & Row, 1988.

_____. Popular Education and Its Discontents. New York: Harper & Row, 1989.

_____. Public Education. New York: Basic Books, Inc., 1975.

_____. The Transformation of the School: Progressivism in American Education, 1876-1957. New York: Vintage Books, 1964.

Creton, Marvin, and Davies, Owen. Our Life at the Turn of the Century. New York: St. Martin's Press, 1989.

Cronbach, Lee J., and Suppes, Patrick, eds. Research for Tomorrow's Schools: Disciplined Inquiry for Education. New York: MacMillan, 1969.

Cross, K. Patricia. "The Adventures of Education in Wonderland: Implementing Educational Reform." Phi Delta Kappan 68 (March 1987): 496-502.

_____. "The Rising Tide of School Reform Reports." Phi Delta Kappan 66 (November 1984): 167-172.

Cuban, Larry. "A Fundamental Puzzle of School Reform." Phi Delta Kappan 69 (January 1988): 340-344.

_____. How Teachers Taught: Constancy and Change in American Classrooms, 1890-1980. New York: Longman, 1984.

- _____. "School Reform by Remote Control: SB 813 in California." Phi Delta Kappan 66 (November 1984): 213.
- _____. "You're on the Right Track, David." Phi Delta Kappan 69 (April 1988): 571-572.
- Cubberley, Ellwood. Changing Conceptions of Education. Boston: Houghton Mifflin Company, 1909.
- _____. Public School Administration: A Statement of Fundamental Principles Underlying the Organization and Administration of Public Education. Boston: Houghton Mifflin, 1916.
- _____. "The American School Program from the Standpoint of the Nation." In Addresses and Proceedings of the NEA, 1923.
- _____. Changing Conceptions of Education. Boston: Houghton Mifflin, 1909.
- _____. "The School Situation in San Francisco." Educational Review 21 (1901): 364-381.
- Culbertson, John. "Leadership Horizons in Educational Administration." Education Administration Quarterly 19 (Summer 1983): 273-296.
- Curti, Merle. The Social Ideas of American Education. New York: Scribner's, 1935.
- Cusick, Paul A. The Egalitarian Ideal and the American High School: Studies of Three Schools. New York: Longman, 1983.
- Damerell, Reginald G. Education's Smoking Gun: How Teachers Colleges Have Destroyed Education in America. New York: Freundlich Books, 1985.
- Danner, Mark, et. al. "How Not to Fix the Schools." Harper's Magazine 272 (February 1986): 39-52.
- Darling-Hammond, Linda. Beyond the Commission Reports: The Coming Crisis in Teaching, Santa Monica, California: Rand Corporation, 1984.
- Darwick, Richard. "Spare Us Your Saviors." New York Times (14 July 1984): Op-Ed Page.
- David, Bernard. "How Progressive Education Failed Us." Cosmopolitan 144 (April 1958): 36-39.
- David, Jane. Restructuring in Progress: Lessons from Pioneering Districts. Washington, D.C.: National Governors' Association Center for Policy Research, 1989.

- _____. "Synthesis of Research on School-Based Management." Educational Leadership 46 (May 1989): 45-46.
- Deasy, Robert. "Education in Japan: Surprising Lessons." Educational Leadership 44 (September 1986): 38-43.
- de Grazia, Alfred, and Sohn, David A., eds. Revolution in Teaching: New Theory, Technology, and Curriculum. New York: Bantam Books, 1964.
- DeVoto, Bernard. "Parable of the Lost Chance: The Easy Chair." Harper's Magazine 200 (January 1950): 42-45.
- Delaware State Education Association. The Challenge for Educational Excellence. Dover: Delaware State Education Association, 1983.
- Dewey, John. Experience and Education. New York: MacMillan, 1959.
- Dichter, Susan. Teachers: Straight Talk From the Trenches. Los Angeles: Lowell House, 1989.
- Dill, David. "New Strategies for Schools of Education Ought to Include Schools of Teaching." Chronicles of Higher Education (18 January 1984).
- Dodd, Anne Wescott. "A New Design for Public Education." Phi Delta Kappan 65 (June 1984): 685-687.
- Donaldson, Gordon A., Jr. "Sisyphus and School Improvement: Fulfilling the Promise of Excellence." Educational Leadership 2 (March 1985): 4-7.
- Dossey, John A., et. al. Mathematics: Are We Measuring Up? The Mathematics Report Card -- Executive Summary. Princeton, New Jersey: Educational Testing Service, 1987.
- Downs, Anthony. "Up and Down with Ecology: The Issue-Attention Cycle." Public Interest (Fall 1972): 39-50.
- Doyle, Denis P. Endangered Species: Children of Promise. Businessweek Reprint, 1989.
- Doyle, Denis P., and Levine, Marsha. "Business and the Public Schools? Observations on the Policy Statement of the Committee for Economic Development." Phi Delta Kappan 67 (October 1985): 113-118.
- Doyle, Denis P., and Levine, Marsha. "Magnet Schools: Choice and Quality in Public Education." Phi Delta Kappan 66 (December 1984): 265-269.
- Dreeben, Robert. On What is Learned in Schools. Reading, Massachusetts: Addison-Wesley, 1968.

- "Drive to Reserve America's Battered High Schools." U.S. News and World Report (8 September 1981): 46-47.
- Drost, Walter. David Snedden and Education for Social Efficiency. Madison: University of Wisconsin Press, 1967.
- Duke, Daniel L. "What is the Nature of Educational Excellence and Should We Try to Measure It?" Phi Delta Kappan 66 (June 1985): 671-674.
- Ebel, Robert L. "Three Radical Proposals for Strengthening Education." Phi Delta Kappan 63 (February 1982): 375-378.
- Edmonds, Ronald R. "Effective Schools for the Urban Poor." Educational Leadership 37 (1979): 15-27.
- _____. "Making Public Schools Effective." Social Policy 12 (1981): 56-60.
- _____. "Program of School Improvement: An Overview." Educational Leadership 40 (December 1982): 4-11.
- _____. "Some Schools Work and More Can." Social Policy 9 (1979): 28-32.
- "Education." Time (4 January 1954): 38-39.
- "Education." Time (28 June 1954): 73.
- Education Commission of the States. A Summary of Major Reports on Education. Denver, Colorado: Education Commission of the States, 1983.
- Educational Policies Commission. The Unique Function of Education in American Democracy. Washington, D.C.: National Education Association, 1937.
- Educational Research Service. Coleman Report on Public and Private Schools: A Summary and Eight Critiques. Arlington, Virginia: Educational Research Service, 1981.
- Educational Research Service. Educator Opinion Poll: Report on the Opinions, Status, and Experiences of American Public School Educators. Arlington, Virginia: Educational Research Service, 1986.
- Educational Testing Service. Mathematics: Are We Measuring Up? The Mathematics Report Card Executive Summary. Princeton, New Jersey: National Assessment of Educational Progress, 1987-88.
- Eisenhower, Dwight David. "Our Future Society." Vital Speeches 24 (1 December 1957).
- Eisner, Elliot W. "Passionate Portraits of Schools." Harvard Educational Review 54 (May 1984): 195-200.

- Elam, Stanley M. "Differences Between Educators and the Public on Questions of Education Policy." Phi Delta Kappan 69 (December 1987): 294-296.
- Elam, Stanley M. "The National Education Association: Political Powerhouse or Paper Tiger?" Phi Delta Kappan 63 (November 1981): 169-174.
- Eliot, Charles. "The Fundamental Assumptions in the Report of the Committee of Ten." Educational Review 30 (1905): 325-343.
- Elkind, David. "Formal Education and Early Childhood Education." Phi Delta Kappan 67 (May 1986): 631-636.
- Ellwood, Charles A. "On Compulsory Education Laws." Education 34 (May 1914): 572, 575-576.
- Elshtain, Jean Bethke. "Time to Politize the Schools." Nation (25 September 1982): 271.
- Engel, Joanne B. "Preserving Quality: Teacher Training from a Liberal Arts Perspective." Phi Delta Kappan 70 (February 1989): 475-477.
- English, Fenwick. "Still Searching for Excellence." Educational Leadership 43 (December 1984/January 1985): 34-35.
- _____. "We Need the Ghostbusters: A Response to Jerome Freiberg." Educational Leadership 42 (December 1984/January 1985): 22-25.
- English, Raymond. "The Politics of Textbook Adoption." Phi Delta Kappan 62 (December 1980): 275-278.
- Eubanks, Eugene, and Parish, Ralph. "Our Inside View of Change in Schools." Phi Delta Kappan 68 (April 1987): 610-614.
- Evans, H. Dean. "We Must Begin Education Reform Every Place at Once." Phi Delta Kappan 65 (November 1983): 173-177.
- Evans, Martha Coffin. "Is State Legislation a Catalyst for Change?" Phi Delta Kappan 66 (March 1985): 501-503
- Fadiman, Clifton. "The Mess in Education -- Who Is Responsible?" Reader's Digest 73 (October 1958): 49-52.
- Farguhar, R.H. The Humanities in Preparing Educational Administrators. Eugene: University of Oregon, 1970.
- Farrar, Eleanor, and Flakus-Mosqueda, Patricia. "State-Sponsored Schoolwide Improvement Programs: What's Goign On In the Schools." Phi Delta Kappan 67 (April 1986): 586-589.

- Featherstone, Joseph. "How Children Learn." New Republic (2 September 1967): 17-12.
- _____. "Schools for Children." New Republic (19 August 1967): 17-21.
- _____. "Teaching Children to Think." New Republic (9 September 1967): 15-25.
- Feinberg, Walter, and Rosemont, Henry, Jr., eds. Work, Technology, and Education: Dissenting Essays in the Intellectual Foundation of American Education. Urbana: University of Illinois Press, 1975.
- Feinberg, Walter, et. al. Revisionists Respond to Ravitch. Washington, D.C.: National Academy of Education, 1980.
- Feistritzer, C. Emily. The Making of a Teacher: A Report on Teacher Education and Certification. Washington, D.C.: National Center for Educational Information, n.d.
- Fenstermacher, Gary D. "Three Nonradical Proposals for Strengthening Ebel's Argument." Phi Delta Kappan 63 (February 1982): 379-380.
- Fetsko, William. "Textbooks and the New Social Studies." Social Studies 70 (March/April 1979): 51-55.
- Fine, Benjamin. Our Children Are Cheated: The Crisis in American Education. New York: Henry Holt, 1947.
- Finn, Chester E., Jr., "The Biggest Reform of All." Phi Delta Kappan 71 (April 1990): 585-586.
- _____. "The Drive for Educational Excellence: Moving Toward a Public Consensus." Change (April 1983): 14-22.
- _____. "Teacher Unions and School Quality: Potential Allies or Inevitable Foes?" Phi Delta Kappan 66 (January 1985): 331-332.
- _____. "Toward Strategic Independence: Nine Commandments for Enhancing School Effectiveness." Phi Delta Kappan 65 (April 1984): 518-524.
- Finn, Chester, E., Jr., and Ravitch, Diane. "No Trivial Pursuit." Phi Delta Kappan 69 (April 1988): 559-564.
- Finn, Chester, E., Jr.; Ravitch, Diane; and Fancher, Robert E., eds. Against Mediocrity: The Humanities in America's Schools. New York: Holmes and Meier, 1984.
- Fiske, Edward B. "Community-Run Schools Leave Hopes Unfulfilled." New York Times (24 June 1980): B4.

- _____. "Eight Year Study of Public Schools Finds Chronic Problems in System." New York Times (19 July 1983): 1.
- _____. "An Expert Urges Multiple Reforms?" New York Times (26 July 1983): C7.
- _____. "Noted Educator Foresees Resurgence in Teaching." New York Times (5 June 1984): C11.
- _____. "Study Asks Tighter Curriculum." New York Times (16 September 1983): A13.
- _____. "Test Misuse if Charged by Its Maker." New York Times (29 November 1983): C11.
- _____. "'Tide of Mediocrity' May Not Be Rising as Fast as It Seems." New York Times (18 September 1983): E20.
- _____. "U.S. Pupils Lag from Grade 1, Study Finds." New York Times (17 June 1984): 30.
- Fitzgerald, Frances. America Revisited: History Schoolbooks in the Twentieth Century. Boston: Little, Brown, 1979.
- "Flapdoodle." Time 54 (19 September 1949): 64.
- Flesch, Rudolf. Why Johnny Still Can't Read. New York: Harper, 1981.
- Foreman, Margaret. Minority Educators: Are They an Endangered Species? Raleigh: North Carolina Association of Educators, 1986.
- Forum of Educational Organization Leaders. Educational Reform - A Response from Educational Leaders: Recommendations of the Forum of Educational Organization Leaders. Washington, D.C.: Institute for Educational Leadership, 1983.
- Foster, William. Paradigms and Promises: New Approaches to Educational Administration. Buffalo, New York: Prometheus Books, 1986.
- Fraser, B.J. "Deterioration in High School Students' Attitudes Toward the Social Studies." The Social Studies 72 (1981): 65-68.
- Freedman, Samuel G. Small Victories: The Real World of a Teacher, Her Students and Their High School. New York: Harper & Row, 1990.
- Freire, Paulo. Pedagogy of the Oppressed. New York: Continuum Publishing Company, 1984.
- French, Russell I. "Dispelling the Myth about Tennessee's Career Ladder Program." Educational Leadership 42 (December 1984/January 1985): 9-13.

- Frymier, Jack. "Bureaucracy and the Neutering of Teachers." Phi Delta Kappan 69 (September 1987): 9-14.
- _____. "Legislating Centralization." Phi Delta Kappan 67 (May 1986): 646-648.
- Fuhrman, Ausan; Huddle, Eugene; and Armstrong, Jane. "Improving Schools: The State Role." Phi Delta Kappan 67 (April 1986): 594-596.
- Fullan, Michael. The Meaning of Educational Change. New York: Teachers College Press, 1982.
- Futrell, Mary Hatwood. "Mission Not Accomplished: Education Reform in Retrospect." Phi Delta Kappan 71 (September 1989): 8-14.
- Gagnon, Paul. "Why Study History." The Atlantic Monthly (November 1988): 43-66.
- Galambos, Eva. Teacher Preparation: The Anatomy of a College Degree. Atlanta, Georgia: Southern Regional Education Board, 1985.
- Garfield, Charles. Peak Performers: The New Heroes of American Business. New York: Avon Books, 1986.
- Gartner, Alan; Greer, Colin; and Riessman, Frank, eds. After Deschooling. What? New York: Harper & Row, Publishers, 1973.
- George, Paul S. "Theory Z and Schools: What Can We Learn from Toyota?" NASSP Bulletin (May 1984): 76-81.
- _____. Theory Z School: Beyond Effectiveness. Columbus, Ohio: National Middle School Association, 1983.
- Gibbons, Maurice. "Walkabout Ten Years Later: Searching for a Renewed Vision of Education." Phi Delta Kappan 65 (May 1984): 591-600.
- Gilbert, Robert J. "Social Knowledge, Action and the Curriculum." Social Education (May 1985): 380-383.
- Gideonse, Hendrik, D. "The Necessary Revolution in Teacher Education." Phi Delta Kappan 64 (September 1982): 15-18.
- _____. "State Education Policy in Transition: Teacher Education." Phi Delta Kappan 66 (November 1984): 205-208.
- Ginsberg, Rick, and Berry, Barnett. "Experiencing School Reform: The View from South Carolina." Phi Delta Kappan 71 (March 1990): 549-552.
- Giroux, Henry. "Critical Theory and Rationality in Citizenship Education." Curriculum Inquiry 10 (Winter 1980): 329-366.

- Giroux, Henry. "Theories of Reproduction and Resistance in the New Sociology of Education: A Critical Analysis." Harvard Educational Review 53 (August 1985): 257-293.
- Giroux, Henry, and Penna, Anthony N. "Social Education in the Classroom: The Dynamics of the Hidden Curriculum." Theory and Research in Social Education 7 (Spring 1979): 21-42.
- Glasser, William. The Quality School: Managing Students Without Coercion. New York: Perennial Library, Harper & Row, Publishers, 1990.
- Glatthorn, Allan A. "Nine Proposals to Improve Our Health Care System." Phi Delta Kappan 64 (November 1983): 186-187.
- Glazer, Nathan, and Moynihan Daniel. Beyond the Melting Pot. 2nd edition. Cambridge, Massachusetts: Massachusetts Institute of Technology Press, 1970.
- Gleick, James. Chaos: Making a New Science. New York: Viking Books, 1987.
- Glenn, Charles L. "The New Common School." Phi Delta Kappan 69 (December 1987): 290-294.
- _____. "Putting School Choice in Place." Phi Delta Kappan 71 (December 1989): 295-300.
- Glickman, Carl D. "Good and/or Effective Schools: What Do We Want?" Phi Delta Kappan 68 (April 1987): 622-624.
- _____. "Unlocking School Reform: Uncertainty as a Condition of Professionalism." Phi Delta Kappan 69 (October 1987): 120-122.
- Gnaubard, Allen. Free the Children: Radical Reform and the Free School Movement. New York: Pantheon Books, 1972.
- Godhammer, K. "Evolution in the Profession." Education Administration Quarterly 19 (Summer 1983): 249-272.
- Gold, Gerald G. "A Reform Strategy for Education: Employer-Sponsored Teacher Internships." Phi Delta Kappan 68 (January 1987): 384-387.
- Goldberg, Milton, and Harvey, James. "A Nation at Risk: The Report of the National Commission on Excellence in Education." Phi Delta Kappan 65 (September 1983): 14-18.
- Gollnick, Donna, and Kunkel, Richard. "The Reform of National Accreditation." Phi Delta Kappan 68 (December 1986): 310-314.
- Gomez, Joseph J. "Restructuring Means Scaling Obstacles." American School Board Journal 176 (October 1989): 20-22.

- Goodlad, John. "Can Our Schools Get Better?" Phi Delta Kappan 60 (January 1979): 342-347.
- _____. "The Great American Schooling Experiment." Phi Delta Kappan 67 (December 1985): 266-271.
- _____. "Let's Get On with the Restructuring." Phi Delta Kappan 64 (September 1982): 19-20.
- _____. A Place Called School: Prospects for the Future. New York: McGraw-Hill Book Company, 1984.
- _____. "The Reconstruction of Teacher Education." Teachers College Record (September 1970): 61-72.
- _____. "Studying the Education of Educators: Values-Driven Inquiry." Phi Delta Kappan 70 (October 1988): 104-111.
- _____, ed. The Ecology of School Renewal. Chicago: University of Chicago Press, 1987.
- Goodman, Paul. Compulsory Mis-education and the Community of Scholars. New York: Vintage Books, 1962.
- Governor's Commission on Workforce Preparedness. The Skills Crisis in the Workplace: A Strategic Response for Economic Development. Raleigh: n.p., 1990.
- Gow, Haven Bradford. "The True Purpose of Education." Phi Delta Kappan 70 (March 1989): 545-546.
- Graham, Patricia A. "Black Teachers: A Drastically Scarce Resource." Phi Delta Kappan 68 (April 1987): 598-605.
- _____. Community and Class in American Education, 1865-1918. New York: Teachers College Press, 1974.
- _____. Progressive Education from Academy to Academie: A History of the Progressive Education Association, 1919-1955. New York: Teachers College Press, 1967.
- _____. "The Twentieth Century Fund Task Force Report on Federal Elementary and Secondary Education Policy." Phi Delta Kappan 65 (September 1983): 19-21.
- Grant, Gerald. The World We Created at Hamilton High, 1953-1987. Cambridge, Massachusetts: Harvard University Press, 1988.
- Graubard, Stephen R. "Alarmist Critics Who Cry Beowulf." New York Times (1 October 1987): A27.

- Graves, Michael F., and Slater, Wayne H. "Could Textbooks Be Better Written and Would It Make a Difference?" American Educator (Spring 1986): 35-41.
- Gray, Dennis. "The Emperors Have No Clothes: Leaders Respond to Education Reports." Basic Education (December 1983).
- _____. "The 1980s: Season for the High School Reform." Education Leadership (May 1982):
- Green, Joslyn. The Next Wave: A Synopsis of Recent Education Reform Reports. Denver, Colorado: Education Commission of the States, 1987.
- Greenfield, Meg. "Creating a 'Learning Society.'" Newsweek (16 May 1983):
- Greenfield, W.D., ed. Instructional Leadership: Concepts, Issues and Controversies. Boston, Massachusetts: Allyn and Bacon, 1987.
- _____. "The Moral Socialization of School Administrators: Informal Role Learning Outcomes." Education Administration Quarterly 21 (Fall 1985): 99-120.
- Griesemer, Lynn, and Butler, Cornelius. Education Under Study: An Analysis of Recent Major Reports on Education. Chelmsford, Massachusetts: Regional Exchange, Inc., 1984.
- Griffiths, Daniel. "Evolution in Research and Theory: A Study of Prominent Researchers." Educational Administration Quarterly 19 (Summer 1983): 201-221.
- _____. "The Crisis in American Education." New York University Education Quarterly 14 (Fall 1982).
- Griffiths, Daniel; Stout, Robert; and Forsyth, Patrick, eds. Leaders for America's Schools: The Report and Papers of the National Commission on Excellence in Educational Administration. Berkeley, California: McCutchan Publishing Corporation, 1988.
- Gross, Beatrice, and Gross, Ronald, eds. The Great School Debate: Which Way for American Education? New York: Touchstone, 1985.
- Gross, Beatrice, and Gross, Ronald, eds. "A Little Bit of Chaos." Saturday Review (16 May 1970): 71-73, 84-85.
- Gross, Beatrice, and Gross, Ronald, eds. Radical School Reform. New York: Touchstone Books, 1969.
- Gross, Bertram. Friendly Fascism: The New Face of Power in America. Boston: South End Press, 1980.

- Gross, Richard E. "Forward to the Trivia of 1890: The Impending Social Studies Program." Phi Delta Kappan 70 (September 1988): 47-49.
- Gross, Ronald, and Murphy, Judith, eds. The Revolution in the Schools. New York: Harcourt, Brace & World, 1964.
- Grost, Harold. "An Educational Revolution." New American Review 189 (March 1909): 372-385.
- Gumbert, Edgar, and Spring, Joel. The Superschool and the Superstate. New York: Wiley, 1974.
- Gursky, Daniel. "Without Principal." Teacher Magazine. (March 1990): 56-63.
- Guskey, Thomas R. "Integrating Innovations." Educational Leadership 47 (February 1990): 11-16.
- Guthrie, James W. "School-Based Management: The Next Education Reform." Phi Delta Kappan 68 (December 1986): 305-309.
- Guthrie, James W., and Clifford, Geraldine J. "A Brief for Professional Education." Phi Delta Kappan 70 (January 1989): 380-385.
- Gutman, Herbert. Work, Culture, and Society in Industrializing America. New York: Alfred A. Knopf, 1976.
- _____. "Work, Culture, and Society in Industrializing America, 1815-1919." American Historical Review 78 (June 1973): 531-588.
- Gutting, Gary, ed. Paradigms and Revolution: Appraisals and Applications of Thomas Kuhn's Philosophy of Science. Notre Dame: University of Notre Dame Press, 1980.
- Haber, Samuel. Efficiency and Uplift: Scientific Management in the Progressive Era, 1890-1920. Chicago: University of Chicago Press, 1964.
- Hale, Janice E. Black Children: Their Roots, Culture, and Learning Styles. Provo, Utah: Brigham Young University Press, 1982.
- Haley, Margaret. "The Factory System." New Republic 40 (12 November 1924): 18.
- Hall, Gene. "Policies, Practices, and Research in Teacher Education: Beyond the Looking Glass." R&DCTE Review 3 (Spring/Summer 1985): 1-2, 10.
- Hamilton, Gail [Dodge, Mabel Abigail]. Our Common School System. Boston: Estes and Laurait, 1880.
- Hammach, David, et. al. The U.S. History Report Card. Washington, D.C.: United States Department of Education, 1990.

- Hampel, Robert L. The Last Little Citadel: American High Schools Since 1940. Boston: Houghton Mifflin Company, 1986.
- Hanrahan, John, and Kosterlitz, Julie. "School for Scandal." Common Cause (September/October 1983): 16-27.
- Harris, Louis, and Associates. The Metropolitan Life Survey of the American Teacher, 1986. New York: Metropolitan Life and Affiliated Companies, 1986.
- _____. The Public Speaks: Redesigning America's Schools. New York: Carnegie Forum on Education and the Economy, 1986.
- Harrison, Cynthia R.; Killion, Joellen P.; and Mitchell, James E. "Site-Based Management: The Realities of Implementation." Educational Leadership 46 (May 1989): 55-61.
- Hart, Leslie. "The Horse is Dead." Phi Delta Kappan 71 (November 1989): 237-242.
- _____. "Three Cheers for Smaller Failures?" Phi Delta Kappan 64 (January 1983): 303-307.
- Haskell, Thomas. The Emergence of Professional Social Science: The American Social Science Association and the Nineteenth Century Crisis of Authority. Urbana: University of Illinois Press, 1974.
- Haskell, Thomas. "Power to the Experts." New York Review of Books 24 (13 October 1977): 28-34.
- Haskins, Ron, and Macrae, Doncan. Policies for America's Public Schools: Teachers, Equity, and Indicators. Norwood, New Jersey: Ablex Publishing, 1988.
- Hawke, Sharryl Davis, and Davis, James E. "A Small Publisher's Perspective on the Textbook Controversy." Social Education (February 1986): 68-69.
- Hawley, Willis D. "A Critical Analysis of the Holmes Group Proposals for Reforming Teacher Education." Journal of Teacher Education (July/August 1986).
- _____. "False Premises, False Promises: The Mythical Character of Public Discourse About Education." Phi Delta Kappan 67 (November 1985): 183-187.
- _____. "Toward a Comprehensive Strategy for Addressing the Teacher Shortage." Phi Delta Kappan 67 (June 1986): 712-718.
- Heath, Robert W., ed. New Curricula. New York: Harper & Row, 1964.
- Heckinger, Fred M. "But Will Anything Come of All Those Reports?" New York Times (4 October 1983): C8.

- _____. "Rush of Contradictory Ideas on School Reform." New York Times (2 August 1983): C7.
- _____. "Standing Guard Over Aptitude Tests." New York Times (30 August 1983): C9.
- Hefly, James C. Textbooks on Trial. Wheaton, Illinois: Victor Books, 1976.
- Heilbroner, Robert. The Future as History. New York: Harper Torchbooks, 1960.
- Henley, Martin. "Something is Missing from the Education Reform Movement." Phi Delta Kappan 69 (December 1987): 284-285.
- Henloff, Nat. Our Children Are Dying. New York: Viking Press, 1966.
- Herman, Wayne, Jr. "What Should be Taught When." Social Education (February 1983): 94-100.
- Herndon, James. How to Survive in Your Native Land. New York: Bantam Books, 1972.
- _____. The Way It Spozed to Be. New York: Bantam, 1969.
- Herriott, Robert E., and Gross, Neal, eds. The Dynamics of Planned Educational Change: Case Studies and Analyses. Berkeley, California: McCutchen, 1979.
- Hirsch, E.D., Jr. Cultural Literacy: What Every American Needs to Know. Boston: Houghton Mifflin, 1987.
- Hodgkinson, Harold. "Reform? Higher Education? Don't Be Absurd." Phi Delta Kappan 68 (December 1986): 271-274.
- _____. "What's Still Right with Education." Phi Delta Kappan 64 (December 1982): 231-235.
- Hofstadter, Richard. Anti-intellectualism in American Life. New York: Vintage Books, 1963.
- Hogg, E.B., and Terman, Lewis. Health Work in the Schools. Boston: Houghton Mifflin Company, 1914.
- Hollings, Ernest F. "The Case Against Tuition Tax Credits." Phi Delta Kappan 60 (December 1978): 277-279.
- The Holmes Group. Tomorrow's Teachers: A Report of the Holmes Group. East Lansing, Michigan: The Holmes Group, Inc., 1986.
- Holmstrom, Engin Inel. "Recent Changes in Teacher Education Programs." No. 67 Higher Education Panel Reports. Washington, D.C.: American Council on Education, November 1985.

- Holt, John. Freedom and Beyond. New York: Dell Publishing, 1972.
- _____. How Children Fail. New York: Dell Publishing, 1970.
- _____. The Underachieving School. New York: Pitman Publishing Corporation, 1969.
- Honetschlager, Dean, and Cohen, Mike. "The Governors Restructure the Schools." Educational Leadership 45 (February 1988): 42-43.
- Honig, Bill. "The Educational Excellence Movement: Now Comes the Hard Part." Phi Delta Kappan 66 (June 1985): 675-681.
- _____. Last Chance for Our Children. Reding, Massachusetts: Addison-Wesley Publishing Company, 1985.
- Hook, Sidney. Education and the Taming of Power. LaSalle, Illinois: Open Court Publishing Company, 1973.
- Houston, W. Robert. "Lessons for Teacher Education from Corporate Practices." Phi Delta Kappan 68 (January 1987): 388-392.
- Howe, Harold, Jr. "Education Moves to Center Stages: An Overview of Recent Studies." Phi Delta Kappan 65 (November 1983): 167-172.
- Howsmam, Robert B., ed. Educating a Profession. Washington, D.C.: American Association of Colleges for Teacher Education, 1976.
- _____. "The Workplace: Does It Hamper Professionalization of Pedagogy?" Phi Delta Kappan 62 (October 1980): 93-96.
- Hoyle, John R. Guidelines for the Preparation of School Administrators. Arlington, Virginia: American Association of School Administrators, 1982.
- _____. "Preparing the 21st-century Superintendent." Phi Delta Kappan 70 (January 1989): 376-379.
- _____. "Programs in Education Administration and the AASA Guidelines." Education Administration Quarterly 21 (Winter 1985): 71-93.
- Hunt, James B., Jr. "Education for Economic Growth: A Critical Investment." Phi Delta Kappan 65 (April 1984): 538-541.
- Hunter, Elizabeth. "Under Constant Attack: Personal Reflections of a Teacher Educator." Phi Delta Kappan 67 (November 1985): 222-224.
- Hurd, Paul DeHart. "Perspectives of the Reforms of Science Education." Phi Delta Kappan 67 (January 1986): 353-358.

- Hutchins, Robert M. The Conflict in Education in a Democratic Society. New York: Harper and Brothers, 1953.
- _____. "The Great Anti-School Campaign." In The Great Idea Today. Chicago: Encyclopedia Britannica, 1972.
- Hyman, Irwin A. Reading, Writing and the Hickory Stick: The Appalling Story of Physical and Psychological Abuse in American Schools. Lexington, Massachusetts: Lexington Books, 1990.
- Hymes, Rita, M., and Bullock, Franklin O. "Alternative Schools: Answer to the Gifted Child's Boredom." The Gifted Child Quarterly 19 (1974): 340-345.
- Illich, Ivan. Deschooling Society. New York: Harper & Row, 1970.
- Imig, David. "The Greater Challenge." Phi Delta Kappan 68 (September 1986): 32-33.
- Irwin, Elizabeth. "Why Teachers Quit School." Colliers 118 (24 August 1946): 20, 38.
- Issel, William. "Modernization in Philadelphia School Reform, 1882-1905." Pennsylvania Magazine of History and Biography 94 (July 1970): 358-383.
- Ivie, Stanley O. "Idols of the Mind." The Educational Forum 53 (Spring 1989): 281-288.
- Jackson, Philip. "Comprehending a Well-Run Comprehensive: A Report on a Visit to a Large Suburban High School." Daedalus 110 (1981): 82-85.
- Janko, Edmund. "Knowing Is Not Thinking." Phi Delta Kappan 70 (March 1989): 543-544.
- Jencks, Christopher. Who Gets Ahead: The Economic Determinants of Success in America. New York: Basic Books, 1979.
- Jencks, Christopher S., et. al. Inequality: A Reassessment of the Effect of Family and Schooling America. New York: Basic Books, 1972.
- Jennings, John F. "The Sputnik of the Eighties." Phi Delta Kappan 69 (October 1987): 104-109.
- Joekel, Ron. "President's Newsletter." Phi Delta Kappan Bulletin (February 1986): 2.
- Johnson, Joseph S., et. al. Those Who Can: Undergraduate Programs to Prepare Arts and Sciences Majors for Teaching. Washington, D.C.: Association of American Colleges, 1989.

- Johnson, Susan Moore. Teachers at Work: Achieving Success in Our Schools. New York: Basic Books, Inc., 1990.
- Johnson, Susan Moore and Nelson, Niall. "Teaching Reform in an Active Voice." Phi Delta Kappan 68 (April 1987): 591-597.
- Joyce, Bruce; Hersh, Richard H.; and McKibbin, Michael. The Structure of School Improvement New York: Longman, 1983.
- Judd, Charles, H. "How Modern Business May Aid in Reconstructing the Curriculum." School and Society 17 (17 March 1923): 283-287.
- Justiz, Manuel J., and Kameen, Marilyn C. "Business Offers a Hand to Education." Phi Delta Kappan 68 (January 1987): 379-383.
- Kaestle, Carl. "Education Reform and the Swinging Pendulum." Phi Delta Kappan 66 (February 1985): 422-423.
- _____. "Ideology and American Educational History." History of Education Quarterly 20 (Summer 1982): 123-137.
- _____. The Evolution of an Urban School System: New York City, 1750-1850. Cambridge, Massachusetts: Harvard University Press, 1973.
- Kandel, I.L. The Cult of Uncertainty. New York: MacMillan, 1943.
- Kane, Ralph J. "The Mindless Box: The Case Against the American Classroom." Phi Delta Kappan 60 (March 1979): 502-503.
- Kanter, Rosabeth Moss. The Change Masters. New York: Touchstone Books, 1984.
- Kantor, Harvey. "Work, Education, and Vocational Reform, 1890-1920." American Journal of Education (August 1986): 401-426.
- Kantrow, Alan M. The Constraints of Corporate Tradition: Doing the Correct Thing. Not Just What the Past Dictates. New York: Harper & Row, 1984.
- Kaplan, George R. "Some Cranky Fulminations on Reagan and Education." Phi Delta Kappan 63 (May 1982): 590-595.
- Karier, Clarence. Shaping the American Educational State, 1900 to Present. New York: Free Press, 1975.
- _____. The Individual Society and Education: A History of American Educational Ideas. 2nd ed. Urbana, Illinois: University of Illinois Press, 1986.
- Karier, Clarence; Violas, Paul; and Spring, Joel. Roots of Crisis: American Education in the Twentieth Century. Chicago: Rand McNally, 1973.

- Katz, Michael. Class, Bureaucracy, and Schools: The Illusion of Educational Change in America. Expanded ed. New York: Praeger Publishers, 1975.
- _____. The Irony of Early School Reform: Educational Innovation in Mid-Nineteenth Century Massachusetts. Boston: Beacon Press, 1968.
- _____. Reconstructing American Education. Cambridge, Massachusetts: Harvard University Press, 1987.
- Kearns, David T. "An Education Recovery Plan for America." Phi Delta Kappan 69 (April 1988): 565-570.
- Kearns, David T., and Doyle, Denis P. Winning the Brian Race: A Bold Plan to Make Our Schools Competitive. San Francisco, California: Institute for Contemporary Studies, 1988.
- Keats, John. "Are Public Schools Doing Their Job? - No." Saturday Evening Post 230 (21 September 1957): 38-39, 117-118, 120, 124-125.
- Keller, Paul G.W. "Open School Organizations." School Review 13 (1905): 10-13.
- Kent, John D. "A Not Too Distant Past: Echoes of the Calls for Reform." The Educational Forum 51 (Winter 1987): 137-150.
- Keough, W.F., Jr. "Ways of Dealing with Enrollment Decline." Phi Delta Kappan 60 (September 1978): 20-25.
- Keppel, Francis. "A Field Guide to the Land of Teachers." Phi Delta Kappan 68 (September 1986): 18-23.
- Kerr, Stephen K. "Reform in Soviet and American Education: Parallels and Contrasts." Phi Delta Kappan 71 (September 1989): 19-28.
- Kett, Joseph F. Rites of Passage: Adolescence in America, 1790 to the Present. New York: Basic Books, 1977.
- Kidder, Tracy. Among Schoolchildren. Boston: Houghton Mifflin Company, 1989.
- Killian, Michael G. "Local Control - the Vanishing Myth in Texas." Phi Delta Kappan 66 (November 1984): 192-195.
- Kingsley, Clarence. "New Aims of the Modern High School." Journal of Education 79 (April 1914): 458.
- Kirst, Michael W. "How to Improve Schools Without Spending More Money." Phi Delta Kappan 64 (September 1982): 6-8.
- Kirst, Michael. "The Rise and Fall of PPBS in California." Phi Delta Kappan 56 (April 1975): 535-538.

- _____. "Japanese Education: Its Implications for Economic Competition in the 1980s." Phi Delta Kappan 62 (June 1981): 707-708.
- _____. "Loss of Support for Public Secondary Schools: Some Causes and Solutions." Daedalus 110 (Summer 1982): 45-68.
- _____. "The Rationale for Public Schools." Phi Delta Kappan 63 (November 1981): 164-165.
- _____. "Sustaining the Momentum of State Education Reform: The Link Between Assessment and Financial Support." Phi Delta Kappan 67 (January 1986): 341-345.
- Kirst, Michael, and Wirt, Frederick. Schools in Conflict. Berkeley, California: McCutchan, 1982.
- Kleibard, Herbert. "Compromise and Diversity in the American High School." History of Education Quarterly 27 (Spring 1987): 89-96.
- Klug, Edward. The Shaping of an American High School, 1880-1920. Madison Wisconsin: University of Wisconsin Press, 1964.
- Knight, Edgar W. Education in the South. Chapel Hill: The University of North Carolina Press, 1924.
- _____. Public Education in the South. New York: Ginn and Company, 1922.
- Koerner, James D. The Miseducation of American Teachers.
- Koerner, James D., ed. The Case for Basic Education. Boston: Little, Brown, 1959.
- Kohl, Herbert. 36 Children. New York: New American Library, 1967.
- Koretz, Daniel. Educational Achievement: Explanations and Implications of Recent Trends. Washington, D.C.: U.S. Government Printing Office, 1987.
- Kouzes, James M., and Posner, Barry Z. The Leadership Challenge. San Francisco: Jossey-Bass Publishers, 1987.
- Kozol, Jonathan. Death at an Early Age: The Destruction of the Hears and Minds of Negro Children in the Boston Public Schools. New York: Bantam Books, 1968.
- _____. Illiterate America. New York: New American Library, 1985.
- _____. The Night is Dark and I Am Far From Home. New York: Bantam Books, 1977.
- Krug, Edward. The Shaping of the American High School, 1880-1920. Madison: University of Wisconsin Press, 1964.

- Kuhn, Thomas. The Copernican Revolution: Planetary Astronomy in the Development of Western Thought. New York: Vintage Books, 1959.
- _____. The Structure of Scientific Revolutions. 2nd ed. Chicago: University of Chicago Press, 1970.
- Labaree, David F. The Making of an American High School: The Credentials Market and the Central High School of Philadelphia, 1838-1939. New Haven, Connecticut: Yale University Press, 1988.
- "Landmark Report Calling for Revolutionary Changes in Schools, Teaching Profession." Carnegie Forum on Education and the Economy, 12 May 1986. (Typewritten Press Release.)
- Langer, Judith A., et. al. Learning to Read in Our Nation's Schools: Instruction and Achievement in 1988 at Grades 4, 8, and 12. Washington, D.C.: United States Department of Education, 1990.
- Lapointe, Archie E. "The Good News About American Education." Phi Delta Kappan 65 (June 1984): 663-667.
- "The Last Rampart." Time (8 February 1954): 63.
- Lazerson, Marvin, and Grubb, W. Norton. American Education and Vocationalism: 1870-1970. New York: Teachers College Press, 1974.
- Leff, Gordon. History and Social Theory. New York: Anchor Books, 1977.
- Leonard, George B. "The Trust About the Teacher Crisis." Look (21 February 1956): 40-48.
- Lerner, Barbara. "American Education: How Are We Doing?" Public Interest 69 (Fall 1982): 59-82.
- Levine, Marsha. "Excellent Companies and Exemplary Schools: Common Goals, Characteristics." NASSP Bulletin (January 1985): 55-69.
- Lewis, Anne. "Getting Unstuck: Curriculum as a Tool of Reform." Phi Delta Kappan 71 (March 1990): 534-538.
- _____. "Presidents Don't Make Education Policy." Educational Leadership 42 (October 1984): 34-38.
- _____. Restructuring America's Schools, Arlington, Virginia: American Association of School Administrators, 1989.
- Lewis, R.W.B. The American Adam: Innocence, Tragedy, and Tradition in the Nineteenth Century. Chicago: University of Chicago Press, 1955.

- Lieberman, Ann, ed. Building a Professional Culture in Schools. New York: Teacher College Press, Columbia University, 1988.
- Lieberman, Myron. "Educational Specialty Boards: A Way Out of the Merit Pay Morass?" Phi Delta Kappan 67 (October 1985): 103-107.
- Lightfoot, Sarah Lawrence. The Good High School: Portraits of Character and Culture. New York: Basic Books, Inc., 1983.
- "Little Red Poorhouse." Time (13 December 1954): 41.
- Long, Sandra M. "Reflections on the Past and Visions of the Future: An Interview with Harold G. Shane." Phi Delta Kappan 67 (March 1986): 527-531.
- "A Look Ahead: Education and the New Decade." Education Week (10 January 1990): 29-32.
- Lortie, Dan. Schoolteacher. Chicago, Illinois: University of Chicago Press, 1975.
- Lotto, Linda S. "The Unfinished Agenda: Report from the National Commission on Secondary Vocational Education." Phi Delta Kappan 66 (April 1985): 568-573.
- Lynch, Ella Frances. "Is the Public School a Failure? It Is. The Most Momentous Failure in Our American Life Today." Ladies Home Journal 29 (August 1912): 4-6.
- Lynd, Albert. "Quakery in the Public Schools." Atlantic Monthly 185 (March 1950): 33-38.
- _____. Quakery in the Public Schools. Boston: Little, Brown, 1953.
- Lyons, Gene. "It's Working in North Carolina." Newsweek (9 May 1989): 52-53.
- _____. "Why Teachers Can't Teach." Phi Delta Kappan 62 (October 1980): 108-112.
- McAndrew, William. "The Danger of Running a Fool Factory." Ladies Home Journal 29 (September 1912): 7.
- Macaulay, Thomas Babington. Speeches. London: Longman, Brown, Green, and Longman, 1854.
- McCall, John R. The Provident Principal. Chapel Hill, North Carolina: Institute of Government, 1986.
- McDaniel, Thomas R. "Demilitarizing Public Education: School Reform in the Era of George Bush." Phi Delta Kappan 71 (September 1989): 15-18.

- McDonald, Joseph. "When Outsiders Try to Change Schools from the Inside." Phi Delta Kappan 71 (November 1989): 206-211.
- McGrath, Ellie. "To Stem 'A Tide Of Mediocrity.'" Time (9 May 1983): 63.
- McNeil, Linda M. Contradictions of Control. Boston, Massachusetts: Routledge and Kegan Paul, 1985.
- _____. "Contradictions of Control, Part 3: Contradictions of Reform." Phi Delta Kappan 69 (March 1988): 478-485.
- _____. "Reclaiming a Voice: American Curricular Scholars and the Politics of What Is Taught in Schools." Phi Delta Kappan 71 (March 1990): 517-518.
- Maddan, Nancy; Slavin, Robert; Karweit, Nancy; and Livermon, Barbara. "Restructuring the Urban Elementary School." Educational Leadership 46 (February 1989): 14-20.
- Maeroff, Gene. "Achievement Lagging in Community Run Schools." New York Times (25 June 1980): B4.
- _____. "A Blueprint for Empowering Teachers." Phi Delta Kappan 69 (March 1988): 472-477.
- _____. Don't Blame the Kids: The Trouble with America's Public Schools. New York: McGraw-Hill Book Company, 1982.
- _____. The Empowerment of Teachers: Overcoming the Crisis of Confidence. New York: Teachers College Press, Columbia University, 1988.
- _____. "Harried School Leaders See Their Role Wanning." New York Times (5 March 1971): 1.
- _____. "The Traditional School: Keep It Among the Alternatives." Phi Delta Kappan 54 (March 1973): 473-475.
- _____. "Withered Hopes, Stillborn Dreams: The Dismal Panorama of Urban Schools." Phi Delta Kappan 69 (May 1988): 632-638.
- Malcom, Shirley, M. Equity and Excellence: Compatible Goals. Washington, D.C.: American Association for the Advancement of Science, 1984.
- Marks, Russell. "The Revisionist World View." History of Education Quarterly (Winter 1979): 507-514.
- Marlen, Betty; Ogawa, Rodney; and Kranz, Jennifer. "Unfulfilled Promises: Evidence Says Site-Based Management Hindered by Many Factors." The School Administrator 2 (February 1990): 30-32.

- Marsh, Paul E., and Gortner, Ross A. Federal Aid to Science Education: Two Programs. Syracuse, New York: Syracuse University Press, 1963.
- Martinez, Matthew G. "Proposal for NAEP in 'Recipe for Disaster.'" Education Week (14 March 1990): 27-28.
- Marx, Leo. The Machine in the Garden: Technology and the Pastoral Ideal in America. London: Oxford University Press, 1964.
- May, Henry F. The End of American Innocence. Chicago: Quadrangle Paperbacks, 1964.
- Meadows, B.J. "The Rewards and Risks of Shared Leadership." Phi Delta Kappan 71 (March 1990): 545-548.
- Means, William Hughes. "Our Medieval High Schools -- Shall We Educate Children for the Twelfth or the Twentieth Century?" Saturday Evening Post 182 (2 March 1912): 18-19.
- Mecklenburger, James A. "Looking Back to School." Phi Delta Kappan 67 (October 1985): 119-126.
- Mecklenburger, Jim. "Minimum Competency Testing: The Bad Penny Again." Phi Delta Kappan 59 (May 1978): 697-698.
- Mehlinger, Howard P. "American Textbook Reform: What Can We Learn from the Soviet Experience?" Phi Delta Kappan 71 (September 1989): 29-35.
- _____. "A Risky Venture." Phi Delta Kappan 68 (September 1986): 33-36.
- Methuin, Eugene H. "Guess Who Spells DISASTER for Education?" Reader's Digest (May 1984): 89-94.
- Metzger, Christa. "Gummibears Instead of Sour Grapes: A Positive Response to the National Reports on School Reform." Phi Delta Kappan 66 (November 1984): 177-180.
- Meyerhoff, Hans, ed. The Philosophy of History in Our Time. New York: Doubleday Anchor Books, 1959.
- Miklos, E. "Evolution in Administrator Preparation Programs." Education Administration Quarterly 19 (Summer 1983): 153-178.
- Miller, Douglas T., and Nowak, Marion. The Fifties: The Way We Really Were. Garden City, New York: Doubleday and Company, Inc., 1975.
- Milner, Joseph O. "English in the Eighties: A Global Projection." Phi Delta Kappan 62 (February 1981): 415-416.

- Mitchell, James E. "Coaxing Staff from Cages for Site-Based Decisions to Fly." The School Administrator 2 (February 1990): 23-29.
- Mitchell, Morris. "Fever Spots in American Education." Nation 173 (27 October 1951): 344-347.
- Monroe, Paul. "Quantitative Investigations in Education." School Review Monographs no. 1. Chicago: University of Chicago Press, 1911.
- Monroe, Walter, et. al. Ten Years of Educational Research, 1918-1927. Urbana, Illinois: University of Illinois Bureau of Educational Research, 1928.
- Moore, Ernest Carroll. Fifty Years of American Education: A Sketch of the Progress of Education in the United States from 1867 to 1917. Boston: Ginn and Company, 1917.
- Mooser, Etta. "What They Do Know." Nation (9 January 1988): 4.
- Morris, Barbara M. "The Real Issues in Education as Seen by a Journalist on the Far Right." Phi Delta Kappan 61 (May 1980): 613-615.
- Moynihan, Daniel Patrick. "The Case for Tuition Tax Credits." Phi Delta Kappan 60 (December 1978): 274-276.
- Murphy, Jerome. "The Paradox of Decentralizing Schools: Lessons from Business, Government, and the Catholic Church." Phi Delta Kappan 70 (June 1989): 808-812.
- Murphy, Joseph. "Is There Equity in Educational Reform?" Educational Leadership 46 (February 1989): 32-33.
- Murphy, Joseph; Mesa, Richard P.; and Hallinger, Phillip. "A Stronger State Role in School Reform." Educational Leadership 42 (October 1984): 20-26.
- Murray, Charles. Losing Ground: American Social Policy, 1950-1980. New York: Basic Books, 1984.
- Murray, Frank B. "Goals for the Reform of Teacher Education: An Executive Summary of the Holmes Group Report." Phi Delta Kappan 68 (September 1986): 28-31.
- Nachtigal, Paul M. A Foundation Goes to School: The Ford Foundation Comprehensive School Improvement Program, 1960-1970. New York: Ford Foundation, 1972.
- Naisbitt, John. Megatrends: Ten New Directions Transforming Our Lives. New York: Warner Books, Inc., 1982.
- Naisbitt, John, and Aburdene, Patricia. Megatrends 2000. New York: William Morrow and Company, Inc., 1990.

- Naisbitt, John, and Aburdene, Patricia. Re-inventing the Corporation. New York: Warner Books, 1985.
- Nasaw, David. Schooled to Order: A Social History of Public Schooling in the United States. New York: Oxford University Press, 1979.
- Nathan, Joe. "Implications for Educators of Time for Results." Phi Delta Kappan 68 (November 1986): 197-201.
- Nathanson, Jerome. "The Foot in the Door." Nation 173 (17 November 1951): 423-425.
- National Association of Secondary School Principals. An Agenda for Excellence at the Middle Level. Reston, Virginia: National Association of Secondary School Principals, n.d.
- _____. Developing a Mission Statement for the Middle Level School. Reston, Virginia: National Association of Secondary School Principals, 1987.
- National Association of State Boards of Education. Today's Children, Tomorrow's Survival: A Call to Restructure School. Washington, D.C.: National Association of State Boards of Education, 1988.
- National Commission for Excellence in Teacher Education. A Call for Change in Teacher Education. Washington, D.C.: American Association of Colleges for Teacher Education, 1985.
- National Commission on Excellence in Education. A Nation at Risk: The Imperative for Educational Reform. Washington, D.C.: Government Printing Office, 1983.
- National Commission on Excellence in Educational Administration. Leaders for America's Schools. Columbus, Ohio: University Council for Educational Administration, 1987.
- National Commission on the Reform of Secondary Education. The Reform of Secondary Education. New York: McGraw-Hill, 1973.
- National Council of Teachers of Mathematics. Curriculum and Evaluation Standards for School Mathematics: Executive Summary. Reston, Virginia: National Council of Teachers of Mathematics, 1989.
- National Education Association Blue Ribbon Panel on Educational Excellence. An Open Letter to America on Schools, Students, and Tomorrow. Washington, D.C.: National Education Association, 1984.
- National Education Association. Merit Pay: Promises and Facts. Washington, D.C.: NEA, 1984.

- National Education Association Instruction and Professional Development Committee. Excellence in our Schools: Teacher Education. An Action Plan. Washington, D.C.: National Education Association, 1982.
- _____. Teachers for Tomorrow. Washington, D.C.: National Education Association, 1987.
- National Endowment for the Arts. Toward Civilization: A Report on Arts Education. Washington, D.C.: National Endowment for the Arts, 1988.
- National Governors' Association. Results in Education. 1987. Washington, D.C.: National Governors' Association, 1987.
- National Panel on High Schools and Adolescent Education. The Education of Adolescents. Washington, D.C.: United States Department of Health, Education, and Welfare, 1976.
- National Research Council. Everybody Counts: A Report to the Nation on the Future of Mathematics Education -- A Summary. Washington, D.C.: National Academy Press, 1989.
- National School Boards Association. Education Vital Signs 5 (1989).
- National School Public Relations Association. Declining Enrollment: Current Trends in School Policies and Programs. Arlington, Virginia: National School Public Relations Association, 1976.
- National School Public Relations Association. Excellence: Your Guide to Action Now. Arlington, Virginia: National School Public Relations Association, 1983.
- National Science Board Commission on Precollege Education in Mathematics, Science and Technology. Educating Americans for the 21st Century. Washington, D.C.: United States Government Printing Office, 1983.
- National Science Foundation. What Are the Needs in Precollege Science, Mathematics, and Social Science Education? Views from the Field. Washington, D.C.: Government Printing Office, 1980.
- NEA-Alaska. Profile for Excellence in Alaska's Schools. n.p.: NEA-Alaska, 1984.
- Nehring, James. Why Do We Gotta Do This Stuff. Mr. Nehring? Notes from a Teacher's Day in School. New York: Fawcett Columbine, 1989.
- Neill, A.S. Summerhill: A Radical Approach to Child Rearing. New York: Holt Publishing Company, 1960.
- Network for Effective Schools. Expecting the Best: Effective Public Education for All Students. New York: Kelwynn Press, 1987.

"The New Three Rs." Time (15 March 1954): 12.

Nisbet, Robert A. Social Change and History: Aspects of the Western Theory of Development. New York: Oxford University Press, 1969.

_____, ed. Social Change. New York: Harper & Row, Publishers, 1972.

Nixon, Richard. "Our Urgent Need for Better Schools." Parents' Magazine 33 (March 1958): 35, 75.

Noble, David F. America by Design: Science, Technology, and the Risk of Corporate Capitalism. New York: Knopf, 1977.

North Carolina Commission on Education for Economic Growth. An Action Plan for North Carolina: Executive Summary. Raleigh: Office of the Governor, 1984.

Nussell, Edward J. "What the Holmes Group Report Doesn't Say." Phi Delta Kappan 68 (September 1986): 36-37.

Nyquist, Ewald B., and Hawes, Gene R., eds. Open Education: A Sourcebook for Parents and Teachers. New York: Bantam Books, 1972.

Odden, Allen. Education Finance in the States: 1984. Denver, Colorado: Education Commission of the States, 1984.

Odden, Allan. "Sources of Funding for Education Reform." Phi Delta Kappan 67 (January 1986): 335-340.

Odden, Arthur, and Anderson, Beverly. "How Successful State Education Improvement Plans Work." Phi Delta Kappan 67 (April 1986): 582-585.

Odden, Allan, and Odden, Eleanor. "Education Reform, School Improvement, and State Policy." Educational Leadership 42 (October 1984): 13-19.

Ohio Education Association. Achieving Excellence in Education: A Challenge to Ohio. Columbus: Ohio Educational Association, 1984.

Olson, Keith W. The G.I. Bill, the Veterans, and the Colleges. Lexington, Kentucky: University Press of Kentucky, 1974.

Olson, Lynn. "An Overview of the Holmes Group." Phi Delta Kappan 68 (April 1987): 619-621.

_____. "Reaction to Holmes Report: Plaudits, Skepticism, and Muted 'Sour Grapes.'" Education Week (23 April 1986): 1, 12-15.

Orlich, Donald. "Education Reforms: Mistakes, Misconceptions, Miscues." Phi Delta Kappan 70 (March 1989): 512-517.

- Orth, Samuel P. "Plain Facts about Public Schools." Atlantic Monthly 102 (March 1909): 28.
- Osborn, Jean; Jones, Beau Fly; and Stein, Marcy. "The Case for Improving Textbooks." Educational Leadership 42 (April 1985): 9-16.
- Ouchi, William. Theory Z. New York: Addison-Wesley Publishing Company, 1981.
- Owen, David. High School: Undercover with the Class of '80. New York: Viking Press, 1981.
- _____. None of the Above: Behind the Myth of Scholastic Aptitude. Boston: Houghton Mifflin Company, 1985.
- Packard, Vance. Our Endangered Children: Growing Up in a Changing World. Boston: Little, Brown and Company, 1983.
- Pajak, Edward F., and Glickman, Carl D. "Dimensions of School District Improvement." Educational Leadership 46 (May 1989): 61.
- Panel on Youth of the President's Science Advisory Committee. Youth: Transition to Adulthood. Chicago: University of Chicago Press, 1974.
- Park, J. Charles. "Preachers, Politics, and Public Education: A Review of Right-Wing Pressures Against Public Schooling America." Phi Delta Kappan 61 (May 1980): 608-612.
- Parker, Franklin. "Ideas that Shaped American Schools." Phi Delta Kappan 62 (January 1981): 314-319.
- Parsons, Talcott. The Structure of Social Action. 2 vols. New York: The Free Press, 1968.
- Pascale, Richard Tanner, and Athos, Anthony G. The Art of Japanese Management. New York: Simon and Schuster, 1981.
- Passow, A. Harry. Secondary Education Reform: Retrospect and Prospect. New York: Teachers College, Columbia University Press, 1976.
- _____. "Tackling the Reform Reports of the 1980s." Phi Delta Kappan 65 (June 1984): 674-683.
- _____. "Urban Education for the 1980s: Trends and Issues." Phi Delta Kappan 63 (April 1982): 519-522.
- Patten, Simon. "An Economic Measure of School Efficiency." Educational Review 41 (May 1911): 467-469.

- Paulos, John Allen. Innumeracy: Mathematical Illiteracy and Its Consequences. New York: Hill and Wang, 1988.
- Payne, William H. Chapters on School Supervision. New York: American Book Company, 1903.
- Payzant, Thomas W. "Restructuring Means Changing the Bureaucracy." American School Board Journal 176 (October 1989): 19.
- Perelman, Lewis. "Restructuring the System Is the Solution." Phi Delta Kappan 70 (September 1988): 20-24.
- Perkinson, Henry J. The Imperfect Panacea: American Faith in Education, 1865-1965. New York: Random House, 1968.
- Perrone, Vito. The Abuses of Standardized Testing. Bloomington, Indiana: PDK Educational Foundation, 1977.
- Perrone, Vito, et. al. Portraits of High Schools: A Supplement to High School: A Report on Secondary Education in America. Lawrenceville, New Jersey: The Carnegie Foundation for the Advancement of Teaching, 1985.
- Peters, Thomas J., and Waterman, Robert H. In Search of Excellence. New York: Harper & Row, Publishers, 1982.
- Peters, Tom. Thriving on Chaos. New York: Harper & Row, 1987.
- Peters, Tom, and Austin, Nancy. A Passion for Excellence: The Leadership Differences. New York: Random House, 1985.
- Peterson, Kent, and McCue, Lydia. The North Carolina School Improvement Project: Resource Notebook. Madison, Wisconsin: National Center for Effective Schools, 1990.
- Peterson, Paul. "Did the Education Commissions Say Anything?" The Brookings Review (Winter 1983): 9.
- Peterson, Paul. The Politics of School Reform, 1870-1940. Chicago: University of Chicago Press, 1985.
- Petroski, Henry. "Of Styluses and Diamonds: Annals of the Pencil." Education Week (18 April 1990): 56, 36.
- _____. The Pencil: A History of Design and Circumstance. New York: Alfred A. Knopf, 1989.
- Philbrick, John D. City School Systems in the United States. Washington, D.C.: U.S. Bureau of Education, 1885.

- Phillips, Frank M. Educational Ranking of States by Two Methods. Milwaukee, Wisconsin: Bruce Publishing Company, 1925.
- Pipho, Chris. "Implementation Brings Reality to the Reform Movement." Phi Delta Kappan 67 (December 1985): 253-254.
- _____. "Minimum Competency Testing in 1978: A Look at State Standards." Phi Delta Kappan 59 (May 1978):
- Podeschi, Ronald, and Hackbarth, David. "The Cries for Excellence: Echoes from the Past." The Educational Forum 50 (Summer 1986): 419-431.
- Popham, W. James. "The Standardized Test Flap Flop." Phi Delta Kappan 59 (March 1978): 470-471.
- Postman, Neil. Teaching as a Conserving Activity. New York: Delacorte Press, 1979.
- Postman, Neil and Weingartner, Charles. The Soft Revolution: A Student Handbook for Turning Schools Around. New York: Dell Publishing, 1971.
- Postman, Neil, and Weingartner, Charles. Teaching as a Subversive Activity. New York: Dell Publishing, 1969.
- Powell, Arthur G. "Being Unspecial in the Shopping Mall High School." Phi Delta Kappan 67 (December 1985): 255-261.
- Powell, Arthur G.; Farrar, Eleanor; and Cohen, David K. The Shopping Mall High School: Winners and Losers in the Educational Marketplace. Boston: Houghton Mifflin, 1985.
- Prasch, John C. "Reversing the Trend Toward Centralization." Educational Leadership 42 (October 1984): 27-29.
- Pratte, Richard. Ideology and Education. New York: David McKay Company, 1977.
- "Prescribed Mediocrity." Time (13 December 1954): 42.
- President's Commission for a National Agenda for the Eighties. An Educational Agenda for the Eighties. Washington, D.C.: Government Printing Office, 1981.
- Presidential Commission on Civil Rights. To Secure These Rights. New York: Simon and Schuster, 1947.
- Presseisen, Barbara Z. Unlearned Lessons: Current and Past Reform for School Improvement. Philadelphia: Falmer Press, 1985.
- Prigogine, Ilya, and Stengers, Isabelle. Order Out of Chaos: Man's New Dialogue with Nature. New York: Bantam Books, 1984.

- Public School Forum of North Carolina. Who Will Teach Our Children? Raleigh: Public School Forum of North Carolina, 1986.
- Quinby, Nelson. "Improving the Place Called School: A Conversation with John Goodlad." Educational Leadership 42 (March 1985): 16-20.
- Rallis, Sharon, and Highsmith, Martha. "The Myth of the Great Principal" Phi Delta Kappan 68 (December 1986): 300-304.
- Ratzki, Anne, and Fisher, Angela. "Life in a Restructured School." Educational Leadership 47 (December 1989/January 1990): 46-51.
- Ravitch, Diane. "The Continuing Crisis: Fashions in Education." The American Scholar (Spring 1984): 183-193.
- _____. "Education in the 1980s: A Concern for 'Quality.'" Education Week (10 January 1990): 48, 33.
- _____. The Great School Wars: New York City, 1805-1973. New York: Basic Books, Inc., 1974.
- _____. The Revisionists Revised: A Critique of the Radical Attack on Schools. New York: Basic Books, 1978.
- _____. The Schools We Deserve: Reflections on the Educational Crisis of Our Times. New York: Basic Books, 1985.
- _____. The Troubled Crusade: American Education, 1945-1980. New York: Basic Books, Inc., 1983.
- Ravitch, Diane, and Finn, Chester E., Jr. What Do Our 17-Year Olds Know? A Report on the First National Assessment of History and Literature. New York: Harper & Row Publishers, 1987.
- Raywid, Mary Anne. "The Evolving Effort to Improve Schools: Pseudo-Reform, Incremental Reform and Restructuring." Phi Delta Kappan 72 (October 1990): 139-143.
- Reese, William J. Power and the Promise of School Reform: Grassroots Movements during the Progressive Era. Boston: Routledge and Kegan Paul, 1986.
- Reich, Robert. The New American Frontier. New York: Times Books, 1983.
- Reinsmith, William A. "The True Meaning of Education: A Radical Suggestion." The Educational Forum 51 (Spring 1987): 249-250.
- Reisler, Raymond F. "An Education Agenda for the Eighties." Phi Delta Kappan 62 (February 1981): 413-414.

"Report Card." Time (8 November 1954): 90.

"Report Card." Time (24 January 1955): 50.

Report on the Massachusetts Commission on Industrial and Technical Education. Boston: n.p., 1906.

Resnick, Daniel P., and Resnick, Lauren B. "Improving Educational Standards in American Schools." Phi Delta Kappan 65 (November 1983): 178-180.

Rice, J.M. The Public-School System of the United States. New York: The Century Co., 1983.

Richman, Julia. "A Social Need of the Public School." Forum 43 (February 1910).

Rickover, Hyman G. American Education: A National Failure. New York: E.P. Dutton, 1963.

_____. Education and Freedom. New York: E.P. Dutton, 1959.

_____. "A Size-up of What's Wrong with American Schools." U.S. News and World Report 43 (6 December 1957): 86-91.

Riessman, Frank. The Culturally Deprived Child. New York: Harper & Row, Publishers, 1962.

Riis, Jacob. How the Other Half Lives: Studies Among the Tenements of New York. New York: Hill and Wang, 1957.

Rist, Ray. The Urban School. A Factory for Failure: A Study of Education in American Society. Cambridge, Massachusetts: MIT Press, 1973.

Robinson, Virginia. Making Do in the Classroom: A Report on the Misassignment of Teachers. Washington, D.C.: Council for Basic Education, 1985.

Rockefeller Brothers Fund. The Pursuit of Excellence. New York: Doubleday, 1958.

Roller, Duane H.D., ed. Perspectives in the History of Science and Technology. Norman: University of Oklahoma Press, 1971.

Roth, Robert A. "Emergency Certificates, Misassignment of Teachers and Other 'Dirty Little Secrets.'" Phi Delta Kappan 67 (June 1986): 725-727.

Rothman, Esther P. Troubled Teachers. New York: David McKay Company, Inc., 1977.

Rubin, Louis. "Formulating Education Policy in the Aftermath of the Report." Educational Leadership 42 (October 1984): 7-12.

- Rudman, Herbert. "The Standardized Test Flap." Phi Delta Kappan 59 (November 1977): 179-185.
- Rule, Sheila. "Locally Run Schools Disappoint Minority Educators and Parents." New York Times (27 June 1980): B3.
- Russell, James. "The Trend in American Education." Educational Review 32 (June 1906): 28-41.
- Russell, James. The Trend in American Education. New York: American Book Company, 1922.
- Ryan, Kevin, ed. Teacher Education: 74th Yearbook of the National Society for the Study of Education, Part II. Chicago: University of Chicago Press, 1975.
- Ryan, William. Blaming the Victim. New York: Vintage Books, 1976.
- Sadker, Myra; Sadker, David; and Steindam, Sharon. "Gender Equity and Educational Reform." Educational Leadership 46 (March 1989): 44-47.
- Salganik, Laura Hersh. "Why Testing Reforms Are So Popular and How They Are Changing Education." Phi Delta Kappan 66 (May 1985): 607-610.
- Sadler, Michael. "Impressions of American Education." Educational Review 25 (1903): 217-231.
- Salinger, J.D. Catcher in the Rye. New York: Bantam Books, 1964.
- Saphier, John, and King, Matthew. "Good Seeds Grow in Strong Cultures." Educational Leadership 42 (March 1985): 67-74.
- Sarason, Seymour. The Creation of Settings and Future Societies. San Francisco, California: Jossey-Bass, 1972.
- _____. The Culture of School and the Problem of Change. Boston: Allyn & Bacon, 1971.
- _____. The Predictable Failure of Educational Reforms: Can We Change Course Before It's Too Late? San Francisco: Jossey-Bass Publishers, 1990.
- _____. "The Principal and the Power to Change." National Elementary Principal 53 (July 1974): 53.
- _____. Schooling in America: Scapegoat or Salvation. New York: Free Press, 1983.
- Say, Elaine, and Miller, Leslie. "The Second Mile Plan: Incentive Pay for Houston Teachers." Phi Delta Kappan 64 (December 1982): 270-271.

- Schein, Edgar H. Professional Education: Some New Directions. New York: McGraw-Hill, 1972.
- Schlechty, Phillip C., et al. "The Charlotte-Mecklenburg Teacher Career Development Program." Educational Leadership 42 (December 1984/January 1985): 4-8.
- Schlechty, Phillip C., and Ingwerson, Donald W. "A Proposed Incentive System for Jefferson County Teachers." Phi Delta Kappan 68 (April 1987): 585-590.
- Schlechty, Phillip C., and Vance, Victor S. "Do Academically Able Teachers Leave Education? The North Carolina Case." Phi Delta Kappan 63 (October 1981): 106-112.
- Schlechty, Phillip C., and Vance, Victor S. "Institutional Responses to the Quality/Quantity Issue in Teacher Training." Phi Delta Kappan 65 (October 1983): 94-101.
- Schmid, Ralph. "A Study of the Organizational Structure of the National Education Association, 1884-1921." Ph.D. dissertation, Washington University, 1963.
- Schmuck, Patricia A.; Charters, W.W., Jr.; and Carlson, Richard O., eds. Educational Policy and Management: Sex Differences. New York: Academic Press, 1981.
- "Schoolboys Point to a U.S. Weakness." Life 44 (24 March 1958): 26-28.
- Schulman, Lee, and Sykes, Gary. "A National Board for Teaching? In Search of a Bold Standard." January 1986. (Typewritten.)
- Schuster, Edgar. "In Pursuit of Cultural Literacy." Phi Delta Kappan 70 (March 1989): 538-542.
- Science and Education for National Defense: Hearings Before the Committee on Labor and Public Welfare, United States Senate, Eighty-fifth Congress, Second Session. Washington, D.C.: Government Printing Office, 1958.
- Schuster, Jack H. "Out of the Frying Pan: The Politics of Education in a New Era." Phi Delta Kappan 63 (May 1982): 583-591.
- Sedlak, Michael, and Schlossman, Steven. Who Will Teach? Historical Perspectives on the Changing Appeal of Teaching as a Profession. Santa Monica, California: Rand Corporation, November, 1986.
- Seib, Kenneth. "How the Laws of Acodynamics Work to Prevent Change." Chronicles of Higher Education (25 January 1984): 72.
- Seligman, Daniel. "The Low Productivity of the Education Industry." Fortune 58 (October 1958): 135-138+.

- Sergiovanni, Thomas. "Will We Ever Have a True Profession?" Educational Leadership 44 (May 1987): 44-50.
- Sergiovanni, Thomas J., and Moore, John H. Schooling for Tomorrow: Directing Reforms to Issues that Count. Boston: Allyn and Bacon, 1989.
- Sewall, Gilbert T. "Against Anomie and Amnesia: What Basic Education Means in the Eighties." Phi Delta Kappan 63 (May 1982): 603-606.
- _____. Necessary Lessons: Decline and Renewal in American Schools. New York: The Free Press, 1983.
- Shanahan, Timothy. "The Writing Crisis: A Survey and a Solution." Phi Delta Kappan 61 (November 1979): 216-217.
- Shane, Harold G. "The Academic Score Decline: Are Facts the Enemy of Truth?" Phi Delta Kappan 59 (October 1977): 84.
- _____. "Educated Foresight in the 1990s." Educational Leadership 47 (September 1989): 4-7.
- _____. "Education in Transformation: Major Developments of the 'Uneasy Eighties' (In Retrospect)." Phi Delta Kappan 61 (December 1979): 241-243.
- Shanker, Albert. "The End of the Traditional Model of Schooling - and a Proposal for Using Incentives to Restructure Our Public Schools" Phi Delta Kappan 71 (January 1990): 345-357.
- Shaughnessy, Joan M., and Haladyna, Thomas M. "Research on Student Attitude Toward Social Studies." Social Education (November/December 1985): 629-695.
- Silberman, Charles E. Crisis in the Classroom: The Remaking of American Education. New York: Vintage Books, 1971.
- Silver, P.F.; Paula, F.; and Spuck, D.W. Preparatory Programs for Educational Administrators in the United States. Columbus: Ohio State University, 1978.
- Sinclair Upton. The Goslings: A Study of the American Schools. Pasadena, California: the Author, 1924.
- Sirotnik, Kenneth. "Studying the Education of Educators: Methodology." Phi Delta Kappan 70 (November 1988): 241-247.
- Sirotnik, Kenneth, and Clark, Richard. "School-Centered Decision Making and Renewal." Phi Delta Kappan 69 (May 1988): 660-664.
- Sizer, Theodore. "Common Sense." Educational Leadership 42 (March 1985): 21-22.

- Sizer, Theodore R. "High School Reform: The Need for Engineering." Phi Delta Kappan 64 (June 1983): 679-683.
- _____. Horace's Compromise: The Dilemma of the American High School. Boston: Houghton Mifflin, 1984.
- _____. "Rebuilding: First Steps by the Coalition of Essential Schools." Phi Delta Kappan 68 (September 1986): 38-42.
- Sizer, Theodore K., and Schen, Molly. "Arthur Bestor's Educational Wastelands." History of Education Quarterly 27 (Summer 1987): 259-264.
- Slavin, Robert. "PET and the Pendulum: Faddism in Education and How to Stop It." Phi Delta Kappan 70 (June 1989): 753-758.
- Smith, B. Othanel. "Pedagogical Education: How About Reform?" Phi Delta Kappan 62 (October 1980): 87-93.
- _____. "Research Bases for Teacher Education." Phi Delta Kappan 66 (June 1985): 685-690.
- Smith, Donald H. "Finding Beacons of Success." Phi Delta Kappan 63 (November 1981): 168.
- Smith, Frank. Insult to Intelligence: The Bureaucratic Invasion of Our Classrooms. Portsmouth, New Hampshire: Heinemann, 1986.
- Smith, Mortimer. And Madly Teach: A Layman Looks at Public School Education. Chicago: Henry Regnery, 1949.
- _____. The Diminished Mind: A Study of Planned Mediocrity in Our Public Schools. New York: Greenwood Press, 1969.
- Smith, Page. The Rise of Industrial America 8 vols. New York: McGraw Hill Book Company, 1984.
- Smith, Timothy. "Progressivism in American Education, 1880-1900.: Harvard Educational Review 31 (Spring 1961): 168-193.
- Smith, William Hawley. "The Black Beast of Every Child's School Life." Ladies Home Journal 29 (October 1912): 7-8.
- Soder, Ralph. "Studying the Education of Educators: What We Can Learn from Other Professions." Phi Delta Kappan 70 (December 1988): 299-305.
- Southern Education Foundation. Teacher Supply and Quality in the South: A Search for Strategies and Solutions. Atlanta, Georgia: Southern Education Foundation, 1986.

- Spady, William G. "Organizing for Results: The Basics of Authentic Restructuring and Reform." Educational Leadership 46 (October 1988): 4-8.
- Spillane, Robert R. "Some Unfortunate Assumptions." Phi Delta Kappan 64 (September 1982): 21.
- Spodek, Bernard, and Walberg, Herbert J., eds. Studies in Open Education. New York: Agathon Press, 1975.
- Spring, Joel. The American School, 1642-1985: Varieties of Historical Interpretation of the Foundation and Development of American Education. New York: Longman, 1986.
- _____. Conflicts of Interest: The Politics of American Education. New York: Longman, 1988.
- _____. Education and the Rise of the Corporate State. Boston: Beacon, 1972.
- _____. "Education and the Sony War." Phi Delta Kappan 65 (April 1984): 534-537.
- _____. The Sorting Machine: National Education Policy Since 1945. New York: Longman, 1976.
- Stanley, William B. "The Radical Reconstructionist Rationale for Social Education." Theory and Research in Social Education 8 (Winter 1981): 55-79.
- _____. "Social Reconstruction for Today's Education." Social Education (May 1985): 384-388.
- _____. "Toward a Reconstruction of Social Education." Theory and Research in Social Education 9 (Spring 1981): 67-89.
- Stanley, William B., and Nelson, Jack. "Social Education for Social Transformation." Social Education (November/December 1986): 528-533.
- Starr, Paul. The Social Transformation of American Medicine. New York: Basic Books, 1982.
- Stearns, Peter. "New Wine in Historical Bottles." Social Education (May 1985): 360-362.
- Stedman, Lawrence, and Smith, Marshall. "Recent Reform Proposals for American Education." Contemporary Education Review 2 (Fall 1983): 85-104.
- Subcommittee on the Preparation of School Administrators. School Leadership Preparation: A Preface for Action. Washington, D.C.: American Association of Colleges of Teacher Education, 1988.

- Supranovich, Beth Bond. "Differentiated Staffing Revisited." Phi Delta Kappan 64 (September 1982): 20-21.
- Swaim, John, et. al. In Search of Excellence: The National Reports - Implications for Middle Schools. Columbus, Ohio: National Middle School Association, 1984.
- Swidler, Ann. Organization Without Authority: Dilemmas of Social Control in Free Schools. Cambridge, Massachusetts: Harvard University Press, 1979.
- Sykes, Gary. "Contradictions, Ironies, and Promises Unfulfilled: A Contemporary Account of the Status of Teaching." Phi Delta Kappan 64 (October 1983): 87-93.
- Tanner, Daniel. "Splitting Up the School System: Are Comprehensive High Schools Doomed?" Phi Delta Kappan 61 (October 1979): 92-96.
- Task Force on Education for Economic Growth. Action for Excellence: A Comprehensive Plan to Improve Our Nation's Schools. Washington, D.C.: Education Commission of the States, June, 1983.
- Task Force on Education of Young Adolescents. Turning Points: Preparing American Youth for the 21st Century. New York: Carnegie Council on Adolescent Development, 1989.
- Task Force on Higher Education and the Schools. The Need for Quality. Atlanta, Georgia: Southern Regional Education Board, 1981.
- Task Force on Teaching as a Profession. A Nation Prepared: Teachers for the 21st Century. New York: Carnegie Forum on Education and the Economy, 1986.
- Task Force on the Preparation of Teachers. The Education of North Carolina's Teachers: A Report to the 1987 North Carolina General Assembly. Chapel Hill: Board of Governors of the University of North Carolina, 1986.
- Taylor, George Rogers. The Transportation Revolution, 1815-1860. New York: Torchbooks, 1951.
- Taylor, William. Cavalier and Yankee: The Old South and American National Character. New York: Harper Torchbooks, 1961.
- Thomson, Scott D. "Troubled Kingdoms, Restless Natives." Phi Delta Kappan 70 (January 1989): 371-375.
- Thompson, Dorothy. "Education and Civilization." Ladies Home Journal 64 (October 1947): 11.
- _____. "Our Schools Are in Danger." Ladies Home Journal 64 (March 1947): 11-12, 243.

- "The Tides of Mediocrity." Time (23 February 1948): 52-54.
- Timar, Thomas. "The Politics of School Restructuring." Phi Delta Kappan 71 (December 1989): 364-375.
- Timar, Thomas, and Kirp, David L. "Education Reform in the 1980s: Lessons from the States." Phi Delta Kappan 70 (March 1989): 504-511.
- Time for Results: The Governor's 1991 Report on Education Washington, D.C.: National Governors' Association, 1986.
- Toch, Thomas. "The Dark Side of the Excellence Movement." Phi Delta Kappan 66 (November 1984): 173-176.
- Toffler, Alvin. Future Shock. New York: Bantam Books, 1971.
- _____. Powershift: Knowledge, Wealth, and Violence at the Edge of the 21st Century. New York: Bantam Books, 1990.
- _____. The Third Wave. New York: Bantam Books, 1981.
- Toynbee, Arnold. A Study of History. New York: Weathervane Books, 1972.
- Travers, Eva Foldes, and Sacks, Susan Riemer. "Joining Teacher Education and the Liberal Arts in the Undergraduate Curriculum." Phi Delta Kappan 70 (February 1989): 470-474.
- Tucker, Marc, and Mandel, David. "The Carnegie Report: A Call for Redesigning the Schools." Phi Delta Kappan 68 (September 1986): 24-27.
- The 21st Century Family Newsweek Special Edition (Winger/Spring 1990).
- Twentieth Century Fund. Report on the Twentieth Century Fund Task Force in Federal and Secondary Education Policy. New York: Twentieth Century, 1983.
- Tyack, David. The One Best System: A History of American Urban Education. Cambridge, Massachusetts: Harvard University Press, 1974.
- Tyack, David, and Hansot, Elisabeth. "Conflict and Consensus in American Public Education." Daedalus 110 (Summer 1982): 1-26.
- _____. "From Social Movement to Professional Management: An Inquiry into the Changing Character of Leadership in Public Education." American Journal of Education 88 (1980): 29-39.
- _____. "Hard Times, Hard Choices: The Case for Coherence in Public School Leadership." Phi Delta Kappan 63 (April 1982): 511-515.

- _____. Managers of Virtue: Public School Leadership in America, 1820-1980. New York: Basic Books, 1982.
- Tyack, David; Kirst, Michael W.; and Hansot, Elisabeth. "Educational Reform: Retrospect and Prospect." Teachers College Record 81 (Fall 1980): 253-269.
- Tyack, David; Lowe, Robert; and Hansot, Elisabeth. Public Schools in Hard Times: The Great Depression and Recent Years. Cambridge, Massachusetts: Harvard University Press, 1984.
- Tyack, James, and Tyack, David. "Learning from Past Efforts to Reform the High School." Phi Delta Kappan 64 (February 1983): 400-407.
- Tye, Barbara Benhan. "The Deep Structure of Schooling." Phi Delta Kappan 69 (December 1987): 281-284.
- Tyler, Ralph. "Education Reforms." Phi Delta Kappan 69 (December 1987): 277-280.
- _____. "What We've Learned from Past Stories of Teacher Education." Phi Delta Kappan 66 (June 1985): 682-684.
- Tyson-Bernstein, Harriet. A Conspiracy of Good Intentions: America's Textbook Fiasco. Washington, D.C.: Council for Basic Education, 1988.
- Tyson-Bernstein, Harriet, and Woodward, Arthur. "The Great Textbook Machine and Prospects for Reform." Social Education (January 1986): 41-45.
- Uchitelle, Susan. "What It Really Takes to Make School Choice Work." Phi Delta Kappan 71 (December 1989): 301-303.
- Unified Education Profession in Idaho. "A Vision of Excellence for Idaho's Public Schools." IEA Reporter 38 (January 1984): 1-12.
- Van Rensselaer, Mariana. "Our Public Schools: A Reply." North American Review 169 (June 1899): 77-89.
- Van Sickle, James. "The Investigation of the Efficiency of Schools and School Systems." Addresses and Proceedings of the NEA, 1915.
- Vance, Victor S., and Schlechty, Phillip C. "The Distribution of Academic Ability in the Teaching Force: Policy Implications." Phi Delta Kappan 64 (September 1982): 22-27.
- Violas, Paul C. The Training of the Urban Working Class: A History of Twentieth Century American Education. Chicago: Rand McNally College Publishing Company, 1978.
- "The Voice." Time (19 July 1954): 46.

- Walberg, Herbert, et. al. "Reconstructing the Nation's Worst Schools." Phi Delta Kappan 70 (June 1989): 802-805.
- Walberg, Herbert, and Lane, John J., eds. Organizing for Learning: Toward the 21st Century. Reston, Virginia: National Association of Secondary School Principals, 1989.
- Wallis, Milbrey, et. al. "Why Teachers Won't Teach." Phi Delta Kappan 67 (February 1986): 420-426.
- Warner, Carolyn. "Choice Is the Central Issue." Phi Delta Kappan 63 (November 1981): 167-168.
- Warren, Donald R., ed. History, Education, and Public Policy. Berkeley, California: McCutchen Publishing Corporation, 1978.
- Warren, Maude Radford. "Medieval Methods for Modern Children." Saturday Evening Post 182 (12 March 1912): 35.
- Washington Commission on Educational Excellence. Reducing the Risks: Educational Renewal for Washington's Future. Federal Way, Washington: Washington Education Association, n.d.
- Watson, Goodwin. "Teachers and the 'Thing.'" Nation 173 (3 November 1951): 371-374.
- Watts, Doyle. "Admission Standards for Teacher Preparatory Programs: Time for a Change." Phi Delta Kappan 62 (October 1980): 120-122.
- Watzlawick, Paul; Weakland, John H.; and Fisch, Richard. Change: Principles of Problem Formation and Problem Resolution. New York: W.W. Norton & Company, 1974.
- Weaver, W. Timothy. America's Teacher Quality Problem: Alternatives for Reform. New York: Praeger, 1983.
- _____. "The Need for New Talent in Teaching." Phi Delta Kappan 61 (September 1979): 29-32.
- _____. "Solving the Problem of Teacher Quality, Part I." Phi Delta Kappan 66 (October 1984): 108-115.
- Weick, Karl. "Educational Organizations as Loosely Coupled Systems." Administrative Science Quarterly 23 (December 1978): 541-552.
- Weiler, Hans N. "Education, Public Confidence, and the Legitimacy of the Modern State: Do We Have a Crisis?" Phi Delta Kappan 64 (September 1982): 9-14.

- Welter, Rush. Popular Education and Democratic Thought in America. New York: n.p., 1962.
- Westminster Conference on the High School/College Interface. What Drives Chemistry Curriculum? Washington, D.C.: American Chemical Society, 1989.
- "What Is the Matter?" Ladies Home Journal 28 (June 1911): 5.
- "What It Will Take to Get Better Schools." U.S. News and World Report (8 September 1980): 49-50.
- "What the U.S. Thinks About Its Schools." Life 29 (16 October 1950): 11-18.
- "What's Wrong with Our Teachers." U.S. News and World Report (14 March 1983): 37-40.
- White, Merry. The Japanese Educational Challenge: A Commitment to Children. New York: The Free Press, 1987.
- Whitehead, Alfred North. Process and Reality. New York: Macmillan, 1929.
- "Why Public Schools are Flunking." Newsweek (20 April 1981): 62-65.
- Wiebe, Robert H. The Search for Order, 1877-1920. New York: Hill and Wang, 1967.
- Wiggins, Sam P. "Revolution in the Teaching Profession: A comparative Review of Two Reform Reports." Educational Leadership 44 (October 1986): 56-59.
- Williams, Dennis A. "Call for Radical Reform." Newsweek (27 February 1984): 74.
- _____. "The Merits of Merit Pay." Newsweek (27 June 1983): 61-62.
- _____. "Rx for High Schools." Newsweek (26 September 1983): 97-98.
- _____. "Why Teachers Fail." Newsweek (24 September 1984): 64-70.
- _____. "Longer, Harder School Days." Newsweek (19 September 1983): 83-84.
- _____. "How to Reform the Schools." Newsweek (1 August 1983): 75.
- Williams, Dennis A., et al. "Can the Schools Be Saved?" Newsweek (9 May 1983): 50-58.
- Willoughby, Stephen S. Mathematics Education for a Changing World. Alexandria Virginia: Association for Supervision and Curriculum Development, 1990.
- Wilson, M.C. "Some Defects in Our Public School System." Educational Review 41 (March 1911): 238-244.

- Wilson, Sloan. "It's Time to Close Our Carnival." Life 44 (24 April 1958): 36-37.
- Winn, Ira. "High School Reform: Stuffing the Turkeys." Phi Delta Kappan 65 (November 1983): 184-185.
- Wirt, William A. "Scientific Management of School Plants." American School Board Journal 42 (February 1911): 2.
- Wirth, Arthur G. Productive Work in Industry and Schools: Becoming Persons Again. Lanham, Maryland: University Press of America, 1983.
- Wise, Arthur. Legislated Learning: The Bureaucratization of the American Classroom. Berkeley: University of California Press, 1979.
- _____. "Minimum Competency Testing: Another Case of Hyper-Rationalization." Phi Delta Kappan 59 (May 1978): 596-598.
- _____. "Three Scenarios for the Future of Teaching." Phi Delta Kappan 67 (May 1986): 649-652.
- _____. "The Two Conflicting Trends in School Reforms: Legislated Learning Revisited." Phi Delta Kappan 69 (January 1988): 328-332.
- Wise, Arthur, and Darling-Hammond, Linda. "Teacher Evaluation and Teacher Professionalism." Educational Leadership 42 (December 1984/January 1985): 28-33.
- Wolfe, Dael. "Diversity of Talent." The American Psychologist (August 1960): 535-545.
- Woodring, Paul. "A Second Open Letter to Teachers." Phi Delta Kappan 59 (April 1978): 515-516.
- Wooten, William. SMSG: The Making of a Curriculum. New Haven, Connecticut: Yale University Press, 1965.
- Yaffe, Elaine. "Public Education: Society's Band-Aid." Phi Delta Kappan 61 (March 1980):
- Zerchykov, Ross. A Review of the Literature and an Annotated Bibliography of Managing Decline in School Systems. Boston: Institute for Responsive Education, 1982.