IN THESE DAYS of teacher unrest it might be wholesome "for the good of the service" to report on some of the causes of teachers' discontent which have aggravated the low salary crisis. Our periodicals for administration could take the lead in bringing about any needed changes not connected primarily with money rewards. These publications are run by fine men and women, not by pedagogues (in the hostile modern sense) and what is published is, or could be, the best that our leaders have to offer. Teachers respect these publications, of which indeed many are well worth reading from delightfully written editorials to the very last advertisement.

It is true, the reader may feel that the contributors, in their effort to be "constructive," show too much acceptance of school administration as it exists and too little critical analysis of the way schools in some districts are actually run, too much unconsciously smug approval of the newest theories being tried out, and too little concern for the talents, capabilities, personality and rights of teachers. It has long been the habit for administrative officials in large public school systems to arrange and for teachers to accept, but teachers who are worth their salt are today unanimous in thinking that this should not be if teaching is to be as good as it should and could be.

The emphasis upon duty for teachers and not for administrators has been one weak spot in our attitude towards the problem of educational leadership. The startling exodus of teachers from the classrooms warns us to mend our ways and before it is too late transfer back to the teachers their authority and the freedom to use it.

Just run through the tables of contents of most of our educational periodicals, especially those concerned with administration and supervision and see how few titles point to the need for improvement in our "leadership" personnel, and how many emphasize the need for improvement of teachers. Even where the title indicates a criticism of leadership the article itself turns out to be merely a warning to attend to the improvement of teachers.

In fact, teachers think the administrator believes that all teachers, like belated adolescents, need radical improvement and constant overseeing. It sometimes looks as if the administrative body, by implication, at least, considers itself—ipso facto—always superior to teachers, not only in the practice of administration but—no matter how long they have been out of the classroom—also in ability to teach. Some of the articles make teachers angry. Why, they ask, is it that even teachers whom the administration has chosen on its own terms, seem to need so much improvement; why should painstakingly trained graduates of approved teachers colleges, who must have been satisfactory when chosen, at once appear to be in need of repairs which they are not capable of making for themselves, while the administrators, who once were teachers too, require in their own eyes, no improving?

Teachers believe, from their own experiences, that it is a very rare executive who ever thinks he should sit down and look himself and his administrative colleagues in their educational faces and honestly appraise what he sees. He is probably not aware, even then, that, although he is himself not guilty, there are some "leaders" who think they can do no wrong, that their way is the only right way. It is too bad; since, for best results, a teacher should be working for a cause and not for administrators.

If administrators as a group of educators,
and not officials, under the aegis of our
best periodicals remembered that "teach-
ing" alone cannot make children learn, that
some children never learn as well as we
want them to learn, no matter what any
one does; if all administrators, and not only
some of them, would assume that teachers
in the classroom know far more about the
children in their classrooms than any
supervisor; if all administrators, and not
only the most revered, would now and
then inspect the teachers' work in a spirit
of humility and with the purpose of learn-
ing instead of criticizing; if there were
fewer "training" efforts and more matter-
of-fact acceptance of teachers' complaints,
judgments, opinions, and hints; if all ad-
ministrators, and not only the most
thoughtful and best beloved, remembered
at least occasionally that for good teach-
ing they are, in the last analysis, the least
necessary of all school personnel whose
existence is justified pedagogically only if
they make the teachers' work easier and
more worthwhile; if all administrators, as
well as those who in their souls remain
teachers to the end of time no matter what
they are called, remembered that for edu-
cation the essentials are the teachers and
their talents, our school systems would
stand a better chance of doing a real job
of educating.

The great teacher is humble because he
knows how much more there always is to
learn; the great supervisor is a human
being, who also knows his limitations,
and his associates—even the least to the
proudest—love and respect him for it. The
useful administrator knows he is not wiser
than the teacher simply because he has
more power and a larger salary. He knows
he gets his position and the higher salary
because so few persons want the thankless
job, i.e. his salary is the answer to supply
and modern demand. Let the administrator
tell the teaching force just that, and see
how quickly morale improves and how
much more responsibility teachers will
accept for their own success.

Teaching will not improve so long as
others want to do the thinking; teachers
who have brains and ability will not want
to be called teachers if that means carrying
out orders. Talking about it never made
any teacher better, criticism never did any
good—it only "riles" the good teacher and
makes the less industrious willing to let the
administrator do the work. Why think
when thinking is not needed, why use one's
intelligence when intelligence is not
wanted, but only obedience.—MYRTLE
MANN GILLET, Supervisor, Special Edu-
cation, Philadelphia Public Schools.
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these two groups together and give pros-
ppective teachers experience and children
needed instructional service? Similarly,
schools of education, teachers colleges, and
other institutions preparing teachers are
located in rural or urban communities that
need community services of various sorts.
The students in these colleges could secure
fine experience in this type of community
service and the communities could benefit
from the services rendered.

We shall never have a really vital edu-
cation until we have a vital teacher educa-
tion, and we cannot secure this educa-
tion out of formal bookish materials and
even more bookish experiences. Teach-
ing is a vital human endeavor; it is con-
tantly changing in terms of the life which
supports the school. Teachers must under-
stand human beings. To do so they must
know something of the sciences which
throw light on the human organism and
behavior. But they can best study these
sciences when they spend at least part of
their educational lives and experiences
working with people in schools and com-
munities. Some schools of education, teach-
ers colleges, and liberal arts colleges are
going to undertake this kind of program
in the near future. These schools will
lead the way to a really effective teacher
education.