

JUST THINK is the missing link

Unique sequential curriculums that expand and develop your students' creative and cognitive thinking skills. **JUST THINK** programs have been proven successful during six years of testing with U.S. military children.

Each **JUST THINK** program provides a complete year's curriculum with easy-to-follow directions and worksheets to:

- develop oral language and creative design skills
- teach comprehension and critical thinking
- adapt to a wide range of learners (gifted, learning disabled, etc.)
- parallel multicultural requirements

Found to be in compliance by the review panel and therefore meet the social content requirements of Education Code Sections 50049-50044, State of CA.

Young Think (Ages 3 & 4)	\$15.00
Just Think One (Kindergarten)	\$15.00
Just Think Two (Ages 6, 7)	\$25.00
Just Think Three (Ages 7, 8)	\$25.00
Just Think Four (Ages 8, 9)	\$25.00
Just Think Five (Ages 9, 10)	\$25.00
Just Think Six (Ages 10, 11 & 12)	\$25.00
Just Think Seven (Ages 11, 12 & 13)	\$25.00
● Stretch Think One (Ages 5-7, Grades 1-2)	\$35.00
● Stretch Think Two (Ages 7-10, Grades 2-3-4)	\$35.00
● Stretch Think Three (Ages 11-14, Grades 5, 6, 7, 8)	\$35.00
● These are Multi-Age Level and/or Combination Class Programs .	

Make Checks payable to:

Thomas Geale Publications Inc.
P.O. Box 370540
Montara, CA 94037 U.S.A.
(213) 276-6394

School Purchase Orders Are Accepted.

Please send me

<input type="checkbox"/> YOUNG THINK	\$15.00
<input type="checkbox"/> JUST THINK ONE	\$15.00
<input type="checkbox"/> JUST THINK TWO	\$25.00
<input type="checkbox"/> JUST THINK THREE	\$25.00
<input type="checkbox"/> JUST THINK FOUR	\$25.00
<input type="checkbox"/> JUST THINK FIVE	\$25.00
<input type="checkbox"/> JUST THINK SIX	\$25.00
<input type="checkbox"/> JUST THINK SEVEN	\$25.00
<input type="checkbox"/> STRETCH THINK ONE	\$35.00
<input type="checkbox"/> STRETCH THINK TWO	\$35.00
<input type="checkbox"/> STRETCH THINK THREE	\$35.00

Shipping & Handling: Add 5% per order (\$1.50 minimum)
CA residents add 6% sales tax.

Name _____

Address _____

City _____

State _____ Zip _____

Amount Enclosed \$ _____

Letters

20 Years of Research Say Zahorik Is Wrong

John Zahorik ("Let's Be Realistic About Flexibility in Teaching," October 1986) directly attacks the idea of designing teacher education programs to ensure that new teachers have a repertoire of effective teaching skills they can use in the classroom. He cites advocates of that position who have approached the problem of identifying goals for teacher training from a number of perspectives. These include Dunn and Dunn, who emphasize the importance of dealing with different learning styles and objectives, Rosenshine and Brophy, who base their position on naturalistic studies of teachers whose students achieve more than average; Brophy, who approaches the issue from the perspective of a historian of educational philosophy, and Joyce and Weil, who have identified theory-based "models" of teaching.

Zahorik says, "Using many teaching skills effectively in order to meet a range of student needs or objectives is both reasonable and supportable. Unfortunately it is impossible" (p. 50). I question Zahorik's assertions, primarily because (1) I believe we should consider evidence when it is available, and (2) he appears to believe that alternative teaching strategies which are directed toward different goals are necessarily undermined by conflicting ideologies.

Twenty years' research speaks to the first issue. The result is unequivocal evidence that teacher candidates and experienced teachers have the capability to master a repertoire of models (see Joyce, Peck, and Brown, *Flexibility in Teaching*, Longman, 1981; Joyce and Showers, *Human Resource Development Systems in Education*, Longman, 1987) provided appropriate training procedures are used. Neither teachers' natural styles nor their ideological preferences are impediments. Given conceptual flexibility and a desire to help students, nearly all of us can acquire a range of strategies.

Alternative models of teaching are not so ideologically different as Zahorik assumes. Consider his example about information-giving and inquiry-

oriented teaching skills. Neither David Ausubel, whose Advance Organizer model is designed for presentations, nor Joel Levin and Michael Pressley, whose recent work on Mnemonic Models is outstanding, take the position that information acquisition is passive. Their models promote learner cognitive activity. When their models are used properly, and *taught* to students (a model of teaching is really a model of learning, and it is the learner's repertoire that is at issue here), learning is increased greatly over the types of teaching/learning transactions that characterize the schools today. The effect sizes of these models, when well-used, are so large that it is not uncommon for the average student to achieve what the 18th or 19th percentile student achieves without their assistance.

Both inquiry-oriented and information-processing models are well within the cultural mainstream, enhance normal capabilities, and are not exotically different from one another. Although education is not ideology-free, and there are important philosophical issues about education's goals and means, a range of teaching skills and strategies that can get the *jobs* of teaching done constitutes our heritage.

BRUCE R. JOYCE
Booksend Laboratories
Eugene, Oregon

Emphasis on Academic Requirements Appropriate for Today's Students

It is difficult, and perhaps foolhardy, to disagree with an educator as distinguished as Professor Goodlad. Yet throughout his excellent analysis of the core curriculum, I find two themes which have become very popular among critics of educational reform: the folly of requiring students to complete a specific number of academic courses, and the admonition that increasing enrollment in these courses will result in "pushing more students out of school."

Empirically speaking, I find no evidence to support either of these propositions. In fact, I would argue the opposite: the increase in academic requirements will in the long run benefit the schools. In our district we are already seeing positive effects through improved student performance and more constructive attitudes toward learning. Further, students are remaining in school even though the units required for graduation have increased.

Of course, I am in support of Professor Goodlad's thesis: the need for students to have common encounters with the essential domains of human experience. But, as he points out, appropriate curriculum and learning experiences for such encounters are still in the embryonic stage. I submit, therefore, that given our limited knowledge, our emphasis on academic requirements is appropriate: these subjects contain powerful ideas essential for engaging in the great conversation.

I think we are on the right track. We are involving significantly greater numbers of students in an educational curriculum typically considered the best education for the best students. No doubt we could do better. We also could do far worse.

JOSEPH M. APPEL
Superintendent
Shasta Union High School District
Redding, California

Association for Core Curriculum Is Alive and Well

John Goodlad's "A New Look at an Old Idea: Core Curriculum" (December 1986) focuses much-needed attention on a semantic problem that has plagued educators for decades. His assessment of the core movement is essentially correct except for the death notice. The core movement did not

die in the 1950s, even though widespread discussion of the concept did taper off. The National Association for Core Curriculum, founded in 1953, continues to this day, promoting person-centered education at all levels, elementary through college. Moreover, the NACC position paper, *Core Today: Rationale and Implications*, now in its third edition, spells out both the philosophical rationale and the implications for curriculum and teaching of the core concept that Goodlad would have us reinvent.

The NACC stands ready with more than 30 years of funded experience and research to help educators respond to Goodlad's call for a "rethinking of the domains of human experience and thought to be encountered commonly by children and youth."

GORDON F. VARS
Professor of Education
Kent State University
Executive Secretary-Treasurer
National Association for
Core Curriculum, Inc.

Critical and Creative Thinking in the Classroom

This institute gives teachers and other educational practitioners an opportunity to work with leaders in the field of teaching for critical and creative thinking. Participants will gain an understanding of the nature of critical and creative thinking, learn classroom techniques for teaching and assessing thinking, and develop curriculum materials and teaching strategies for infusing critical thinking into mainstream instruction. They may also earn graduate credit. The institute offers one-day practitioner seminars, week-long mini-courses, and three-week curriculum-building courses, as well as a special seminar for administrators. Residential accommodations are available.

The staff will consist of active researchers, classroom teachers, and school administrators who have made major contributions to the field. Among them are Arthur Costa, California State University (Sacramento); Stephen Norris, Memorial University of Newfoundland; David Perkins, Harvard University; Robert Swartz, University of Massachusetts at Boston; Mary Anne Wolff, North Reading (MA) Public Schools.



UMass/Boston

Second National Summer Institute for
Teachers, School Administrators, and
Other Educational Practitioners

Sponsored by the Critical and
Creative Thinking Program,
University of Massachusetts
at Boston

Boston, Massachusetts
July 6-25, 1987

For further information, contact

Nancy Adams
University of Massachusetts at Boston
Division of Continuing Education
Harbor Campus
Boston, MA 02125-3393
(617) 929-7900

This advertisement appears at the discretion of the
Commonwealth of Massachusetts.

Copyright © 1987 by the Association for Supervision and Curriculum Development. All rights reserved.