

Book Reviews

Review Coordinators: Charles W. Beegle, Associate Professor of Education, University of Virginia, Charlottesville; James B. Boyer, Professor and Institute Director, Urban Education Institute, Kansas State University, Manhattan; Wilma S. Longstreet, Professor of Education, University of Michigan, Flint; and Edna Mitchell, Head, Department of Teacher Education, Mills College, Oakland, California.

Essays on Curriculum. Arthur W. Foshay. New York: The A. W. Foshay Fund, Curriculum and Teaching Department, Teachers College, Columbia University, 1975. 185 pp. —Reviewed by Margaret Gill Hein, Associate Dean, School of Education, Lehigh University, Bethlehem, Pennsylvania.

Read no further if you are anticipating the typical "book review" with its analysis of good features and bad features followed by recommendations concerning what you should do about the volume. Do read on if you want to explore a significant work spanning the quarter century 1950-1975, and if you want the chance to compare your curriculum thinking with that of an educator who in his own words has "made a career as a student of the curriculum."

Essays on Curriculum by Arthur Wellesley Foshay is a volume of papers—some previously published, some unpublished—and some speeches presented at national conferences and seminars of a wide-ranging variety including those sponsored by ASCD, the American Educational Research Association, the National Art Education Association, the National Vocational Guidance Association, and the Social Science Education Consortium.

The papers were collected for publication in this volume by a self-appointed committee of seven of Foshay's students on the occasion of his early retirement from Teachers College,



Arthur Wellesley Foshay

Columbia University. These students warmly justified their efforts as "an expression of our affection for him [Foshay] personally and our heartfelt admiration for his unceasing efforts to direct educators' attention to the development of people, while stressing that the traditional academic school functions cannot be ignored." Then, quite selfishly but justifiably (as you may agree when you have finished the essays), "the bunch" of students continued: "In addition it [the book] is an expression of our interest in having his ideas accessible for ourselves

and for the profession in a readily available form." I agree with the students.

The seventeen, chronologically arranged papers were grouped under the headings: Part I—Values / Critical Examination / Humanness and Individuality (written from 1950 to 1962) and Part II—Values / Rational Assessment / Interrelationships and Perspectives (written from 1966 to 1975). This division in the book is, however, discernible only on the contents page.

Two essays—"Experimentation Moves into the Classroom" (1950) and "What Have Been the Contributions of Curriculum Research?" (1975)—begin and end the 25-year span. These two titles will allay your suspicions that this is just another "values" piece, an exhortation to teach values. For Foshay, values have always been the key referent in his dealing with curriculum problems. For his students, this referent has always been very clear, just as it has been to any other educators who know Arthur Wellesley Foshay, the educator and the man.

Those associated with

Foshay throughout his career (beginning with supervisors and administrators who still recall vividly his early days at Burkhalter Elementary School in Oakland, California, and including his many international colleagues from around-the-world and his many associates in his widespread national work and in the professional associations) soon learned to rely on his consistent behavior, based on values and also based on humanness and experimentation (or problem solving). Without deviating, Foshay has acted on his beliefs as expressed in this typical statement: "... educators must work within a framework that recognizes the function of values held by an individual, a community, and the larger society." In 1951, Foshay strongly described the power of values when he stated that: "The road to McCarthyism begins at the desk of the timid, doctrinaire teacher."

The always present attention to values, humanness, and problem solving is clear again in "Experimentation Moves into the Classroom" (1950). Foshay wrote of experimentation as "a willingness to reexamine old ways of doing things," and as "a function of the situation in which it takes place." He declared that: "The most effective educational research [effective in the sense that the experimenter learns, or changes his or her behavior] is likely to be

that undertaken cooperatively." Next, he expressed his "confidence in the ability of people to work out their own problems." In "Some Reflections on Cooperative Action Research" (1953), he stated that: "Any action represents an attempt to apply values to reality." No wonder his voice was reassuring during the heyday of the national curriculum projects when the academicians of the universities became curriculum developers overnight! Wells Foshay spoke from his long established values!

About values and schooling his words continue:

... after 1900, we as a nation stopped any deliberate consistent teaching in the field of social values. . . . most of what we teach now is intended, not to build values, but to build coping skills in a "neutral" fashion. . . . To teach values would be to make a student conscious of the value-building process in such a way as to give him control over his own values (1969).

He does gently chide educators in saying that: "... our study of values as something to teach in school—as object-matter—has been reluctant and scattered. . . ."

Foshay's concern for humanness was likewise demonstrated long before the concept became a popular theme of the late 1960's. Who but a sensitive educator, warmly human, would state: "What is thrilling about the ideals of Progressive Education is the vision of chil-

dren as fellow human beings," and who but such an educator would later assert that: "The doctrine of respect for the individual is a declaration that mankind is worthwhile"? Because he held this philosophy, it followed naturally that he would urge in the 1960's that we "... treat the young with the respect they deserve" and that we remember the lesson the young and the "ex-young" have learned: "... to be true to what makes us human; to be true to ourselves" as "the only way we can be true to one another" (1962).

Contrast Foshay's respect for one's individuality and his emphasis on the need "to learn how to have faith in ourselves" with his gentle remonstrance that: "... our tradition in general education consists of treating everything as if it finally were intellectual." To Foshay, "We do our best to reduce everything to cognition." Consider his 1973 summary:

Children grow up not only intellectually, but also socially, emotionally, aesthetically, spiritually, and physically. Our preoccupation with the intellectual has yielded us a school tradition that portrays man as less than he is.

The following year he wrote: "Education institutions fail to carry out the joyous affirmation of what it is to be a human being—to celebrate the human condition." Foshay distinguished a teacher of the

arts from other teachers in that, the former "makes the nature of man his fulltime preoccupation—the nature of the whole man."

Referring to the six aspects of man which, taken together, make him human, Foshay maintained: "All six, I will assert, are basic requisites for life. That is, if any one of them were wholly missing from one's persona, one would cease being human and would destroy himself or be destroyed by others." From this belief, he assessed the school's role: "The six large categories I propose are these, given in decreasing order of our familiarity with them in schools and the research that bears on them: the intellectual, the emotional, the social, the physical, the aesthetic, and the spiritual." He proceeded to apply each of the qualities to the curriculum with the *caveat* that each of the six must be a recognizable way that people behave, "for the quality of the curriculum is to be found in responses—the behavior it elicits." Then, he developed a grid—a rare tool for him—to show that a humane curriculum exists only when each subject matter responds to all aspects of the human condition.

Try to read this slender volume of 185 pages in one sitting. Treat yourself to the pleasure of clear and lucid prose. The prose moves along easily, resulting as it does from clear

thinking, with no confusing diagrams, lines, circles, or arrows masquerading as "models." There are happy words here, such as "joyous" and "celebrate," which are not part of the usual curriculum vocabulary. There are also precise words for precise thoughts.

Note, too, elegantly simple definitions. "School . . . a place where the young are invited to grow up" (1959). "A value is a positively loaded attitude" (1969). "Cooperative research is an approach to making what we do consistent with what we believe." Foshay observed that: "The difficulty with the term 'humane' is that it invites sentimentality, moralizing, and rhetoric, not concerted action—witness the diffuse writing of the educational romantics since 1960."

Foshay, the realist, resisted dabbling in futurism. The one rare exception found in *Essays* is this statement: "It is predictable that we will reinvent the core curriculum, perhaps with some modifications, that a substantial incursion into the regular school day will be made by what was formerly thought of as co-curricular activities and that students will increasingly refuse to undertake discipline-oriented studies." Judge the accuracy of this 1970 "prediction" against recent enrollment figures compiled in one attempt to explain current SAT scores!

Foshay also resisted com-

mon criticizing and "pointing the finger of blame" at various actions, or individuals perceived to be "the bad guys." However, he offers a bit of criticism for researchers, teacher educators, and curriculum people, whose roles Foshay himself shares. Teacher preparation programs receive the largest number of suggestions. For example, "If we want to change young teachers," he notes, "we would do well to examine what they are being taught in college." According to Foshay, "Nice young people attend nice, undemanding local colleges and return home to teach other children how to be as nice as they are." Nice, ugh! "Their beliefs about education are set in education courses which, despite the many faults that afflict them, nevertheless have great influence" (1966).

More gently, Foshay notes that: "Unhooked from philosophy, the educational researcher contributes to what is already underway, but originates nothing." In discussing the current issue of accountability, he notes that:

We curriculum people have very often been prey to the problem of triviality. We, too, would do well to pay attention to the problems raised by the moral philosophers. . . . The curriculum people there, as elsewhere, have failed to lead the public effectively, and the schools are on their way to becoming mindless skill factories. What about citizenship?

What about transcendence? What about mutual respect, not to say love?

Foshay unfailingly applied to himself the same standards that he wrote about. For example, he viewed man as a "self-evaluator" (1956). The application of this concept is illustrated in his ASCD presidential address to the 1961 conference in which he said: "For me, for us—to respond in towering anger to those who abuse us would be to lose the perspective our responsibilities require; it would be to indulge in mere pettiness." Next, he examined his training and experience and gave a frank appraisal of what he perceived to be a shortcoming of his own theory and work:

Armed with some knowledge of child development, and some knowledge of society, I entered upon a career in education convinced that I was different from my pedagogical forebears, that my era was one full of freshness and vigor. . . . I have to say that the theory on which I was behaving now seems to me to have been true, but inadequate. Hindsight says that it was flawed from the beginning by a failure to acknowledge a third element necessary for the making of intelligent curriculum decisions. I learned that curriculum decisions should be based on a knowledge of the child and of society. Included in the term "society" was the culture society represents. What was left out of this theory was the nature of organized knowledge. . . . I do not propose that we become "subject-centered" either in a new or an old sense. What I propose is that we

examine the subject matter we teach with the same rigor, and with the same kinds of help, that we have used in examining the child and society.

Immediately following the conference presentation another well known educator in the curriculum field viciously accused Foshay of selling out to the subject-matter crowd and deserting the child. He patiently repeated his explanation of the need for three, not two, sources for curriculum decisions. His critic listened no more carefully in the one-to-one conversation than she had listened earlier in the large crowd. Foshay had responded typically—"in a disciplined way of dealing with an event for which he felt responsible." This incident suggests the reason it is easier to keep one's self-evaluations buried, but this is not so for one who feels responsibility.

There are other instances of Foshay's self-evaluation, openly published, although the shortcomings he perceived in himself could have been ignored. Referring to an outline he presented in an article for *Educational Leadership* in 1956, he stated his belief that the "real difficulty" with the outline was that it allowed him "only to patch up what exists when something more fundamental can be said. . . ."

Note the first person pronouns in the following evaluation: "I have suggested that the

reason for the sometimes trivial and almost always status-quo-oriented curriculum studies in the research enterprise is that the researchers have come unhooked from the philosophers and the historians. I wish to add this: they have also become unhooked from the curriculum people. This last is in rather large measure our own fault, since we have failed to give theory development, our own history, and the question of aims their due." So ends the volume. The last words are addressed to his own curriculum people, "ASCD types"!

This final criticism is indeed a challenge that is supported by Foshay's statements elsewhere. "The problem of curriculum design . . . continues to defy adequate formulation," he points out. ". . . Curriculum development is not yet a science—though there are some lawful elements in it."

How do you react to these challenges? How do the writings of Wells Foshay compare with your curriculum thinking? In his unrelenting pursuit of order in curriculum development, whether he be in New York City or Massachusetts, or consulting about the world, he will prepare other papers and other speeches. We eagerly and confidently await the post-1975 works.

If you have been fortunate to share at firsthand some portion of Wells Foshay's career,

you will want to have *Essays on Curriculum*. You will relive the excitement of working with a man of ideas whose eyes sparkle at new possibilities for systematically examining curriculum problems. You will "re-catch" the contagion of his ideas, but you will also recall the steps he took toward implementing some of them. Here is one example. *The idea*: NEA needed visibility in instruction. ASCD President Foshay—with Hollis Caswell, President of Teachers College—called on NEA Secretary William G. Carr. *The implementation*: From that visit came NEA's Center for the Study of Instruction, admirably headed by Ole Sand.

You will find many spots in *Essays* where you can reinforce your belief that educators should practice what they preach. (This is equally true of those who know Foshay through his writings.) Does he? Do we? Look at Foshay's comments:

On Values: "... we learn to speak in a way that makes our values, as well as our practical proposals, clear."

On Humanness: "... to be true to what makes us human; to be true to ourselves. That is the only way we can be true to one another."

On Problem Solving: "... in order to live an intellectual life, one must have a disciplined way of dealing with the events

for which one takes responsibility."

If you conclude that Wells Foshay has consistently reminded you of the importance of values, humanness, and the problem-solving approach, then your reading of *Essays on Curriculum* will restore or renew, as the case may be, your faith in the curriculum process. For this valuable contribution to the curriculum literature, we thank Foshay's students. For sharing yourself so generously in the seventeen papers, we salute you, Wells—with gratitude and fond memories!

Social Development in Young Children: A Report for Teachers.

Wendy C. Roedell, Ronald G. Slaby, and Halbert B. Robinson. Washington, DC: The National Institute of Education, U.S. Department of Health, Education, and Welfare, 1976. 54 pp. —Reviewed by John W. Hol-lomon, Associate Professor of Early Childhood Education, University of Texas, San Antonio.

In this compact report, the authors summarize basic and applied research findings concerned with social development in young children. The compilation of data is designed to provide a basis for selecting procedures early childhood teachers can use in the classroom. In this manner, it relates research findings to practical issues faced

by teachers and children in the classroom.

The report is limited to particular topics concerning children's social behavior. These topics have the content of experience and the logic of experimentation to support them. That is, the authors recognized the risk of undertaking the task of summarizing research in psychology, and were, therefore, guided by effective procedures for dealing with children's social behavior, based on reliable findings of experimental psychological research. Thus, the authors avoided the danger of espousing the premature application of incompletely tested psychological conclusions.

Throughout the report, recommendations for teachers are derived from logical extensions of experimental findings and classroom adaptations of experimental procedures. The rationale undergirding the report is that children's social behaviors and attitudes are shaped by the contexts of the situations in which they interact.

This report provides refreshing insights that parallel the prevalence of attitudes that lead to an almost singular emphasis on the intellectualization of the young child—emphasis on the child as "brain"—the cultivation of narrowly defined cognitive skills and abilities. The messages conveyed in this report should serve to stimulate early childhood teachers to think

more seriously about social development in young children in classroom situations. At the same time, the report should offer teachers some insight into the context of classroom situations in which some teaching strategies seem to fail and others constantly succeed.

The Unconscious Conspiracy: Why Leaders Can't Lead.

Warren Bennis. New York: AMACOM, a division of American Management Association, 1976. 176 pp. —Reviewed by Charles A. Speiker, Associate Director, Association for Supervision and Curriculum Development, Washington, D.C.

Anyone currently holding or aspiring to a position that requires one to bring more than management skills to bear on tasks will find this book a valuable resource. Author Warren Bennis is speaking of leadership in this book. Furthermore, he writes from a perspective that few enjoy. As current President of the University of Cincinnati, he has found a moment of truth. In his words: "I had become the victim of a vast, amorphous, unwitting, unconscious conspiracy to prevent me from doing anything whatever to change the university's *status quo*."

His description of this "unconscious conspiracy" is studded with examples of personal experiences. His keen in-

sight gained from years as a student of organizational behavior, years as a person on the "firing-line," and critical "moments" of self-discovery is captured in his hopeful words:

I believe that changes in higher education during the seventies will come about not merely for the sake of change but, rather, for the sake of humanity and the future of our human organizations. Without, however, a thorough understanding of the processes of change, our leadership needs, and the social architecture of our giant, multifaceted institutions, we might just as well continue to work diligently on blue-ribbon "task force" committees. Nothing insures the *status quo* so much . . . as these task forces. For their reports continue to get better as our problems get worse.

As problems get worse, people must opt for certain avenues of living in or out of their particular organization. One might speak out—understanding the consequences to the organization and self—realizing the dynamics that are operating.

When banal politeness is assigned a higher value than accountability or truthfulness, the result is an Orwellian world where the symbols of speech are manipulated to create false realities.

One might resign on principle, loudly or softly, or one might wish to resign himself or herself to a less than livable situation where personal convictions are at odds with institutional policy. Bennis' personal examples from his own life and

from the lives of people of repute add credence and power to his lines of reasoning on the topic of dissent.

The remaining chapters of the book carry on the theme of hope for leaders—for people as they learn to cope with, guide, and be guided by change. Bennis' fresh insights bring clean air to the oft-times stale topic of change.

It is not so much the articulation of goals of what a profession should be doing that creates a new practice. It's the imagery that creates the understanding, the compelling moral necessity that the new way is right.

Bennis' desire to have people possess the qualities of openness, humility, creativity, integrity, and dedication in their quest for truth is overpowering, as he describes a new age of "openness" in dealing with our fellow people, the obstacles to good leadership, and the requirements of leadership.

Bennis' final papers in this collection focus on the "Moral Stakes—Where Have All the Leaders Gone?" and "The Shape of the Future." After making the compelling statement that: "True leaders today are an endangered species," Bennis drives home bits of wisdom on problems and pressures of organizational life, why leaders don't lead, and why leaders are so desperately needed in these challenging times.

The 176 pages of this book

contain eleven essays by Warren Bennis. If read with an open mind and a desire for truth, this book will aid one in an understanding of the "unconscious conspiracy."

New Techniques for Effective School Administration. Norman K. Hamilton. New York: Parker Publishing Company, 1975. 205 pp. —Reviewed by Floyd Keller, Director, Elementary and Secondary Education, Minnesota State Department of Education, St. Paul, Minnesota.

For those modern educational managers whose experience and education have ranged outside of traditional education/administration contexts, there is not much "new" in *New Techniques*. What is new and valuable to the practicing administrator, regardless of role, is the simple, humanistic, and systematic compilation of the best techniques that behavioral science has brought to bear in the management of modern social systems.

Hamilton has distilled and translated through his educational experience the useful parts of such systems approaches as program budgeting (PPBS), Planning-Evaluating-Review-Techniques (PERT), and Critical Path (CPM) in order that real benefit might be provided to educational decision makers.

The five objectives of this

book are to help the practicing school administrator improve efficiency, effectiveness, accountability, creditability, and communication. The selected techniques suggested to accomplish these objectives include: decision making; needs assessment; consensus building; flow charting; program budgeting; future forecasting; force field analysis; public information; and management and organization development and diagnosis. A most useful glossary is appended to orient the reader to current management terminology.

All this makes the volume a handy desk reference tool. Each chapter introduces a technique, descriptively followed by an outline of its essential components. At this point, real school situations are used to exemplify the technique's application. A chapter summary finally provides a quick visual reference to all the preceding steps and a way of quick reentry for future referral.

Although this book is entitled *New Techniques*, these techniques are tied to and integrated around the human values of openness, honesty, and collaboration long espoused by the National Training Lab in Bethel, Maine, and its various offshoots. These are important considerations, in view of the recent mindless and wholesale adoption of business methods by many school administrators as

they scurry to meet mechanistic accountability demands.

Hamilton has not fallen for the cult of efficiency that causes educational ends-means reversal. He has, rather, put together in a simple and systematic way the best and more efficient parts of current management techniques that will enhance humanistic education for all decision makers, regardless of school role. While one ought to be skeptical of all-purpose administrative cookbooks, Hamilton has provided, nevertheless, a handy and comprehensive one.

The Politics of Educational Innovation. Ernest R. House. Berkeley, California: McCutchan Publishing Corporation, 1974. 312 pp. —Reviewed by William R. Miles, Director of Curriculum and Instruction, Beaver Dam, Wisconsin; formerly Project Assistant, Wisconsin Research & Development Center.

Ernest House has provided students of the politics of educational change with a provocative insight into three areas: (a) a review of the causes for innovation adoption in the local school district, (b) a case study of statewide educational innovation, (c) a discussion of federal policy structures and school organizational structures for educational research and development (R&D). While House is, in my opinion, essentially correct in

his interpretations of educational innovation, I felt slightly disappointed at the issues he left untouched.

House's treatment of the causes of local school innovation consists of a review of the literature on superintendents' and local school districts' incentives to innovate. His reliance on the Carlson study of Pennsylvania superintendents is now somewhat dated by the community/school board/superintendent policy study analysis as posited and confirmed in McCarty and Ramsey's *School Managers: Power and Conflict in American Public Education* (Greenwood Press, Inc., 1971). Based on the McCarty and Ramsey findings, we should expect that superintendents, school boards, and communities should act differently in varying environments. Carlson's interpretation of superintendents' actions and the adoption of educational innovations does not lead one to that conclusion. On the other hand, House's chapter on teacher incentives for innovation is excellent and should be thoroughly

digested by practitioners interested in initiating local educational change.

The case study section of the book describes the spread of PLATO—a highly sophisticated computer assisted instruction package—throughout the state of Illinois. House's most critical insight into PLATO is developed far too late in the case study, that is: How does a capital intensive innovation (computer assisted instruction) fit into a labor intensive (school) industry? Instead of selecting PLATO and computer assisted instruction, House might have discussed some of the concepts developed by Goodlad and Klein in *Behind the Classroom Door* (Charles A. Jones Publishing Co., 1970); or by Gross, Giacinta, and Bernstein in *Implementing Organizational Innovations* (Basic Books, Inc., 1971); or by Sarason in *The Culture of the School and the Problem of Change* (Allyn and Bacon, Inc., 1971). Use of these sources would have allowed House to focus more sharply on teacher-behavior-centered inno-

vations and what actually happens in the daily school program. The point is that PLATO is an atypical innovation in that it doesn't involve changes in the behaviors of teachers to the extent that other innovations in the past ten years have attempted to do so.

Finally, House turns his analysis to federal policy making and raises several probing questions about the federal role in educational R&D and organizational constraints in schools. He raises far more questions than he provides answers. This section would be an excellent beginning to a book of readings on federal policy and educational R&D.

House's *Politics of Educational Innovation* is a useful stimulus for thought and discussion. If students and policy makers can follow through on just some of the questions the author raises, educational innovation can only be prodded forward to a more critical analysis of what school change can and should be in the future. *FL*

Index to Advertisers

Association for Childhood Education International	150
CTB/McGraw Hill	140
Dow Jones & Company, Inc. (Educational Service Bureau)	Inside Front Cover
Houghton Mifflin Company	126
Monroe. The Calculator Company	156

Copyright © 1976 by the Association for Supervision and Curriculum Development. All rights reserved.