which technology will demand creative geniuses and skillful interpreters of the dreams. New and specific understandings and appreciations of an individual's responsibilities toward the democratic way of life must be developed by our schools.

As teachers, the most important responsibility is to improve the quality of learning of boys and girls. The needs of all children, and particularly our own group's needs, will be interpreted into learning activities in the classroom. Children of all levels of ability must function effectively and creatively. The world will survive on ideas and their skillful interpretation and application. As Winston Churchill says, "The empires of the future will be the empires of the mind."

FANNIE R. SHAFTEL

Evaluation—

for Today and for the Future

Realization of educational objectives is an intimate process of social change that involves reorientation of teacher perspectives based upon new knowledge that is carefully worked into the culture of the school and community.

HOW EFFECTIVE are our means of achieving our objectives in education? In recent years much thoughtful effort has gone into the reformulation and clarification of educational objectives in the light of an ever-growing body of knowledge about society and human development. The Association for Supervision and Curriculum Development, NEA, has taken a leadership role in this task and has made some distinguished contributions through its publications.

Are we implementing these objectives? In looking for evidences of school practices that implement these objectives we find some exciting and provocative experiments, such as the work of Hilda Taba and her associates in the Committee on Intergroup Education, and the work of The Horace Mann-Lincoln Institute of School Experimentation and the schools associated with it. There are also emerging some action research studies of real promise. But these efforts are rare enterprises in the general school programs.

There is, by and large, a great hiatus between our stated objectives and actual school practices. A visit to schools and classrooms across the country reveals little fundamental change in classroom practices from those of 30 years ago. It is true that today there is less arbitrary restriction on child behavior, better understanding of children's growth needs, and more attractive and interesting instructional materials. But a very large majority of classroom teachers still are
teaching in terms of mechanistic theories of learning and superficial, usually extrinsic motivation, using standardized routine text materials.

Any attempt to explore reasons for this gap must give recognition to the impact of certain negative critics on school practice. In numerous instances schools rush for cover as they retreat from many educational objectives. Educators strive to prove that they too espouse the old values, many of which are outmoded in terms of the demands of modern life and increased knowledge of human behavior. We see this retreat expressed in much more tightly structured curricula, which only too often specify a single text series as the means of teaching certain skills, and in the frantic espousal of various educational "toots"—such as special educational programs for the "gifted" and sudden avowal of new science education enterprises—to meet the demands of pressure groups.

We seem to be operating on the basis of "one step forward, two steps back." But any attempt to explain this situation alone in terms of the forces that have created such negative criticism is inadequate. It is my contention that there is another fundamental reason for this stalemate.

**Levels of Implementation**

We have developed a group of technical workers (idea people) at the policy level who are proposing changes that fundamentally challenge the values and goals of the group (teachers) whom they are attempting to change. Let us, for the moment, take a careful look at those programs that seemingly are trying to implement our stated objectives. What is happening in these school situations?

Procedure A is quite common. A school system officially adopts the stated objectives (the Educational Policies Commission reports, or yearbook statements, for example) and incorporates these into the written teaching guides of the district. They may affirm that "children should learn through vital experiences," or that "pupil-teacher planning is essential to an effective program." But, in reality, such statements are little more than "status ideas" which make the published documents professionally respectable. Actually the major efforts of the school system continue to be placed upon the standardized procedures that embody "stereotyped notions and conventional ideas of how children learn."¹

Ironically, while giving lip service to the objective of developing problem solving and critical thinking, we go on channeling learning through basal textbooks in which the experiences have been selected for the children, analyzed and interpreted by the authors, and the children are expected to come through with the "right answer." Thus we are actually teaching children conformity rather than problem solving.

Procedure B is higher up on the scale of attempted implementation. This procedure, I am sorry to say, is quite representative of practices in many of that minority of school systems which are seriously trying to change their teaching-learning procedures. In this type of implementation many activities are attempted on a very superficial level. For example, having accepted the objective that children shall learn through direct experiences (learning by doing), enter-

prises may be set up that involve "doing" simply for the sake of "doing." The means have become ends in themselves.

This was illustrated only too well in a recent educational film which recorded a classroom social studies program. The children were studying colonial life. One enterprise consisted of the construction of a miniature log cabin. This was done by pasting twigs on squares of board to simulate the sides of the cabin. The children then demonstrated for their parents a colonial house-raising bee by fastening the sides together! No analysis had been made of why children might build a miniature log cabin—that we might wish to guide children through the process of cutting and notching miniature logs and interlocking them, as the pioneers did, in order to better understand the industrial processes devised by a people when they had no milled lumber and only a few nails. Instead, the children were encouraged to do some dubious busy-work which might serve as extrinsic motivation for reading about log cabins.

The same superficial thinking is evidenced in the expensive and well-intentioned provision of buses to take children on field trips. Too often these trips are mere sightseeing junkets because the children lack specific purposes and because the trips are not the result of problem-solving enterprises in which children have raised questions important to themselves. The school has merely institutionalized a useful tool.

Procedure C is higher on the implementation scale. In this instance, thoughtful, sophisticated curriculum workers have developed implementation that does move us forward considerably in the realization of our objectives. The products of their work are represented in the many resource units for experience-centered programs and in the demonstration schools and workshops that have been devised to promote the use of this implementation by classroom teachers. A promising number of teachers who have participated in the development of the resource units use them well and are charting new dimensions for the teaching-learning situation. But the great majority of those who adopt the new methodology learn it mechanically; and, again, means become ends in themselves. Thus a teacher who has faithfully learned to guide children through the life processes of the Pueblo Indians helps children to grind corn with a mortar and pestle but is not sure why she does this, except that "the Indians did it"; nor does she know how to help children to achieve the cross-cultural understandings for which the activities were originally devised.

Specialists in Charge

What has happened? Why do we have these varying levels of implementation, and so few instances even of these? It is my hypothesis that this hiatus occurs because professional leaders are proposing fundamental curricular changes without facing up to the realities inherent in any social practice as intimately involved with human values as is public education.

I should like to illustrate this thesis by borrowing some leaves from the social anthropologists' notebooks, for they have learned some lessons the hard way that should be exceedingly useful to us.

In Human Problems in Technological Change, Spicer and his associates advance the thesis that modern life is characterized by a fundamental condition of different rates of progress by different parts of society. A large part of the reason for this is the fact of specialization, which has led to considerable stores of knowledge and tested practice in each of these specialties.
"... but the new ideas and the new ways of doing things have not, obviously, spread immediately and automatically in smooth-flowing waves from the specialists to the millions of persons over the world who can profit from their use.

"Instead, the process seems to be something like this: From the specialists who make the discoveries, the new ideas move to 'the educated,' that is, to persons who have (up to a certain point) the same kind of schooling as the specialists. ... As the educated become aware of the findings of the specialists, they usually realize how much better off the new knowledge would make thousands of poverty-stricken or disease-ridden people, if only ways could be found to get them to use it. Out of such vision have grown programs toward betterment on dozens of fronts. ..." 2

This situation has given rise to a new kind of specialist—one who specializes in spreading knowledge and practice beyond the small world of "the educated." These specialists consciously and unconsciously direct changes in people's customs and beliefs. The authors of this casebook report both successful and unsuccessful attempts at social change and analyze them in terms of working concepts.

One might draw a parallel to the field of education. In this modern age of specialization, education also draws upon specialists—sociologists, anthropologists, psychologists—and their ever-increasing fund of knowledge of human behavior. Their findings are translated by "the educated"—curriculum and guidance experts, for example. Such concepts as "readiness," "developmental tasks," "social class influence upon learning," are taken by the curriculum experts and studied for implications for practice.

The interpretations of "the educated" are now taken on by transmitters—school supervisors, administrators, chairmen of curriculum committees, for dissemination to the broad base of classroom teachers.

So far so good! Educators have problems similar to those of the anthropologists and other technologists who attempt to effect improvement in general living patterns.

Let us pursue this parallel further. Spicer and his colleagues point out that they have learned that "... people resist changes that appear to threaten basic securities; they resist being forced to change." 3 While pointing out that change is a process which people are undergoing all the time, these social scientists emphasize that resistance is a symptom of something wrong in the cross-cultural situation, perhaps of the real impracticability of the proposed change, perhaps of unsatisfactory relations between the worker and the people.

These authors go on to emphasize the concept of culture, the understanding that people everywhere behave in accordance with patterns which they have learned in the process of growing up in society and which make sense to them as an over-all design for living. While asserting faith in the infinite possibilities for human adaptation, they point out that change involves some degree of unlearning and of new learning and that we can find help in guiding improvement through using what is known of the psychological processes of suggestion and of learning.

Since change involves reorganization of the patterns of living, it does threaten feelings of security related to a way of life. Therefore, technologists working for improved ways of living (or of educating) need a systematic theory of action programs for change.

Spicer and his associates suggest that


3 Ibid. p. 18.
such systematic attempts should be based on the following fundamentals:

1. Identify the culture pattern.
2. Assess the social organization — the recognized groups of individuals who are accustomed to act together for certain purposes and who abide by certain codes of behavior.
3. Define the new elements (innovations) to be introduced.
4. Assess the role of the innovator.

In a case describing the introduction of the use of the wagon into the life of the Papago Indians, the authors show how the introduction of one material item brought about changes in the social life of the people, as well as in their stock of tools and ways of making a living. The case suggests that the wise handling of an innovation calls for knowledge of how the different traditional ways of doing things are linked together and how the new trait may affect the linkage.

In a description of the refusal to go out and pick cotton by people in a war-time Japanese relocation center, the correct analysis of the strength of the local group, in this case the block, as a social unit, enabled administrators to completely change the situation from one of resistance to one of high cooperation.

In an attempt to establish a stable water supply in the Viru Valley in Peru, the project failed because, among a number of reasons, key local leaders were ignored and the site chosen for the well was on the land of a man who was heartily disliked by many influential community people. Also, a large group of men of prestige in the village conceived of this operation as a threat to an old way of life which they valued.

These anthropologists point out that the application of the concepts of culture and social organization provides maps of the terrain with which we are working. However, every case of directed change involves something new. The nature of the new element sets the problem, and the new technique or form of innovation is always introduced by someone — extension agent, technician, administrator or native leader. The role of this innovator is a basic part of the situation and must be carefully assessed.

**Innovation in Curriculum**

I would like to suggest that the task of curriculum development to implement our objectives involves the same major steps and considerations.

Teachers operate in a school culture that is inextricably linked to the wider culture. They have learned their ways of teaching in a tradition of schooling and have developed their own outlook on the educative process. This is probably much more influenced by the community’s expectations than by new professional knowledge (witness the resistance to change in terms of new professional concepts). The security of the teacher depends very largely upon staying close to the values held by the community.

The innovators (curriculum directors, supervisors, etc.) have, generally speaking, tended to ignore the social organization of the teacher population and have created their own social organization for the achievement of curriculum change which is not in communication with the key groups in the sub-culture of teachers. This is one major reason why educational objectives receive such superficial or token treatment at the practice level.

How does the innovator operate at present in educational change? One way is to call a teachers meeting and have an expert (speaker) bring in “The Word.” Another is the “quickie” workshop which pours a lot of bright shining verbiage over the heads of the novitiates. In gen-

---

eral practice, in large districts, is the use of the curriculum committee in which the professionally more advanced teachers analyze needs and construct instructional materials which are passed on to teachers who did not participate in the process and for whom the material is again just verbiage. The teachers' guides are documents with varied meanings for those who are expected to use them. In many instances, well-meaning curriculum directors and supervisors have caught "the word" from the "experts" but have not worked them through with classroom teachers to the thoughtful, practical level so that their full meanings are known. This is, of course, a summary of common malpractices, but is not a description of the careful innovation represented in promising action research and workshop programs.

If we are to realize educational objectives which are defined in terms of highly specialized analyses of society, educators would do well to draw upon the lessons learned by the social scientists working with underdeveloped areas. An acceptance of the working principles delineated in the Russell Sage casebook has some immediate implications for public school practice: educational objectives cannot be defined at the "policy level" and then passed down through a hierarchy of officials to the classroom teachers through mass procedures—courses of study, elaborate curriculum committees, bulletins, etc.

The realization of educational objectives is an intimate process of social change that involves reorientation of teacher perspectives based upon new knowledge that is carefully worked into the culture of the school (and community!) through systematic use of the four fundamental steps mentioned above.

I propose that we make more explicit

"Now when we think of America, we think of ... a kind man, The American Soldier, who was once an enemy," writes Miss Mutsumi Kurochashi in her prize-winning article, "America Seems Near to Me Now," in the January Educational Edition of Reader's Digest.

This story tells of the change in Miss Kurochashi's opinion, points out compellingly that the hopes and fears of men everywhere are the same. It was selected by a committee of Weehawken, New Jersey, High School students as one of the "Teen-Age Top Ten" articles in the January Digest.

"America Seems Near to Me Now" is but one of the many Digest articles that will help your students develop increased appreciation of other peoples, greater interest in international affairs, better understanding of the issues behind today's world-shaking events.
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a theory of curriculum change that a number of our colleagues have already enunciated. Such a theory would take into full consideration that the person who realizes educational objectives at the classroom level—meaning the teacher—must be intimately involved in the entire process of change. For me this means that curriculum change involves small teams of educational workers, each team consisting of (a) specialists, who share their knowledge with (b) "the educated," who interpret, analyze this knowledge with (c) the supervisors, administrators and teachers—especially the teachers!—who will develop the implementation for practice.

Each team works, then, in a cycle of (a) drawing upon new knowledge, (b) defining educational objectives, (c) developing hypotheses for teaching procedures, (d) trying out the proposed practices in the classroom and (e) evaluating the resultant child behavior in terms of the stated objectives.

Such a process would, in my opinion,

develop educators at the public school level who are clear as to their objectives and present status of achievement and are continually changing procedures as their action research helps them to develop ever better hypotheses for implementation. It will be a slow process, of small teams at work, planning for and with known groups of children and parents, rather than system-wide curriculum committees that are remote from the basic process.

Unless we make the decision to work much more fundamentally than we now do in our present curricular procedures, we shall continue to formulate objectives at the "expert" level and continue to have little basic change, or, at best, superficial change at the classroom and school level.

In the final analysis, the classroom teacher is the key person in reaching our educational objectives. Our educational procedures should be designed to make accessible to the teacher the knowledge of the specialists in such direct ways that new needs are felt that generate ever better educational objectives.

In the words of Spicer and his associates, "Needs cannot be established by fiat. . . . Real participation involves taking part in the planning and discussion of advantages to be gained, in the devising of methods of introduction, and in the execution of the innovation. . . ."


