We gratefully acknowledge the financial assistance of the Alberta Advisory Committee for Educational Studies.

Nous tenons à remercier vivement le Alberta Advisory Committee for Educational Studies pour leur aide financière.

The Journal of Educational Thought
Revue de la Pensée Éducative

Volume 48, No. 3 Winter 2015

EDITORIAL

ARTICLES

Could University Sessional Instructors Be Directly Compensated by Their Students in an Age of Academic Capitalism?

IAN WINCHESTER
University Of Calgary

One of the striking phenomena of our time in universities across Canada is the large presence of sessional instructors in both undergraduate and graduate programs. This is partly due to the increasing production of people with doctorates who would like to be part of the university professorate but for whom there are little full-time job opportunities. Universities in Canada are not in a steady expansion phase of the sort that was common immediately after the Second World War and in the early 1960s and 1970s. Many universities may be expected to increase their student numbers, often students from outside Canada who pay higher fees, but are not expected to increase their permanent faculty numbers. In many cases the reward for engaging in this expansion of student numbers is more money directly to departmental or Faculty coffers. But there is no guarantee that these numbers or this money will hold. So the solution is to hire recent doctoral graduates who can teach the courses but to whom no immediate prospect of a permanent, tenure track job can be offered.

In many cases a sessional instructor works out of home, has no office space in the university or college, has no connection with an academic union or faculty association, has few benefits if any, and can lose their teaching post at a moment's notice. Some faculty associations have realized their plight and offered to

Journal of Educational Thought
Vol. 48, No. 3, 2015, 113-115

bargain for them, but their bargaining power is limited given the fluctuating nature of the sessional instructors numbers. Some universities have been engaging large numbers of sessional a for a long time---York University in Toronto comes to mind. And given the numbers and the needs such jobs are almost permanent. I recall a remarkable story some years ago in the Globe and Mail to the effect that the highest paid faculty member at York was a sessional who taught a very large number of courses. The money paid to a sessional there per course was, as I recall, higher than at the rest of the country. Perhaps for some such an arrangement (being able to choose the number of courses you taught, minimal requirements or opportunities for publication or other university activities of a service nature and the like) might be just what one needed or wanted. But for most the pay would be hard to live on. A sessional instructor making, say, $6000.00 per course and able to teach two courses per term would only make $36,000 per year (assuming three terms) which would be rather difficult to live on and certainly very difficult to raise a small family on. At say $12,000 per course this would be a much better $72,000. But such opportunities must be very rare.

There was for a time in German universities the title Privat Docent for men (or Privat Docentin for women) was conferred to those qualified to teach at a university. These received payment directly from their students and not from the university. Indeed, the origin of universities in Italy began with such a principle of payment to the instructor directly by the students. In Germany this title is still conferred but payment is often through research projects and rarely through the university directly. The practice of direct payment from students to the instructor in this context was abandoned in the last century.

This has never been a practice at English language universities, but the present circumstances, with many teaching who hold doctorates but who have no immediate prospect of a tenure track appointment, suggests it might be a real possibility. Perhaps we ought to refer to such sessional instructors as "Private Instructors" or even "Private Assistant Professors" with permission to teach a specific range of university courses and to whom the students directly paid a fee with a token sum to the university for hosting the course. There need not be a fixed fee though a minimum would likely be a wise idea. This is a form of academic capitalism that recognizes that the instructor created the course and should receive credit for both creating it and for teaching it. The university for its part would receive the benefit of the course being taught by a competent instructor who is functioning as a professional selling a service to a student and compensating the university to some degree for the opportunity of teaching it for their students' benefit.

Ian Winchester
Editor

The People's Free University: Alternative to the Corporate Campus and Model for Emancipatory Learning

MICHAEL COLLINS
HOWARD WOODHOUSE
University of Saskatchewan

ABSTRACT: Our article describes how the People's Free University (PFU) emerged directly from a series of seminars at the University of Saskatchewan in the Fall of 2001 that addressed critical concerns about a discernible tendency on campus towards the adoption of a business corporate style of governance steered increasingly by marketplace priorities. The seminars, open to the public as well as students, staff and faculty, turned to a discussion on the significance of a "people's university" envisioned for the University of Saskatchewan by its first President, Walter Murray. Invoking Murray's vision opened the way to the remarkable beginning and subsequent creative program development of a free university. Examples of community-based adult education initiatives from which PFU drew are identified, situating it historically within an on-going critical legacy that has become even more relevant in the face of neo-liberal imperatives. The emancipatory pedagogy entailed is informed substantially through the theory and practice of Paulo Freire, Thomas Hodgskin and Alfred North Whitehead. Essential learning processes and guiding principles which characterize PFU pedagogy are illuminated under the rubric of "everyone can teach, everyone can learn." In drawing a connection between the PFU experience and resistance to attacks on academic freedom at the University of Saskatchewan, we align the enlightened aims of community-based popular education embodied in PFU against profit driven encroachments of corporate business interests.

Journal of Educational Thought
Vol. 48, No. 3, 2015, 117-144

RESUMÉ: l'article décrit la façon dont l'université libre des gens (PFU) est apparue directement à l'automne 2001 après une série de séminaires à l'Université de la Saskatchewan. Les séminaires traitaient de questions cruciales sur la tendance perçue sur le campus ; celle d'adopter la tactique d'entreprise qui est menée de plus en plus par les exigences du marché. Les séminaires ouverts aussi bien au public qu'aux étudiants, aux employés qu'au corps professoral, se sont transformés en discussion sur le sens de « l'université des gens », expression envisagée pour
l'Université de la Saskatchewan par son premier président, Walter Murray. L'ambition de Murray a ouvert la voie à des débuts remarquables et à une évolution ultérieure de la création du programme d'une université libre. Des exemples d'initiatives pédagogiques prises par des communautés adultes à partir desquels PFU a été imaginée, sont reconnus dans l'histoire au sein d'un legs fondamental en cours qui ne saurait être plus adapté à l'encontre des impératifs de néolibéralisme. Les théories et méthodes de Paulo Freire, de Thomas Hodgskin et d'Alfred North Whitehead ont inspiré la pédagogie inhérente, à caractère émancipatif. Les processus fondamentaux de l'apprentissage et les principes généraux qui caractérisent la pédagogie de PFU, sont en évidence dans la rubrique Tout le monde peut enseigner, tout le monde peut apprendre. En reliant l'expérience de PFU et la résistance aux attaques sur la liberté académique à l'Université de la Saskatchewan, nous mettons en place les objectifs bien réfléchis de l'enseignement public qui sont incarnés à PFU, contre des empiètements à but lucratif des intérêts de l'entreprise.

Introduction

To begin our task of writing this paper together (a meaningful learning experience in itself), we think it would be useful to identify briefly those relevant aspects

of our overlapping interests that led to a public critique at the University of Saskatchewan (U of S) of the corporate campus and the emergence from that discourse of The People's Free University (PFU).

The teaching and research of Howard Woodhouse, a professor in Educational Foundations, is very much inspired by the process philosophy of Alfred North Whitehead. From this perspective, he has drawn effectively on critical insights for an on-going defense against entrepreneurial university administrators allied to business corporate interests that ultimately diminish teaching and learning processes and the autonomous contribution of curiosity-based research.

As a professor of adult education, Michael Collins incorporates critical theory and cultural studies into his research and practice. Hence his concern with the ways that technical rationality now shape modern adult education practices in favoring top-down standardized curriculum and evaluation formats, in the service of business management style, known as Human Resource Development (emphasizing education for job training and the requirements of the economy), to the detriment of foundational adult education principles around autonomous learning and democratically implemented community-based initiatives as exemplified in the aims of the PFU.

During the course of our informal discussions about future prospects for universities in view of influential policy formation enacted by Margaret Thatcher's government in the UK and that of Ronald Reagan in the USA, we realized how our overlapping interests unveiled for us what was happening to re-caste the role of universities according to corporate business values and the imperatives of the market. Though ample evidence of this tendency was increasingly apparent elsewhere, especially

in the UK and USA, colleagues we spoke to at the U of S in the early years of the millenium were not inclined to acknowledge that our own university was in line to experience the same imperatives driven by the expansion of neo-liberal ideology world-wide. Critical questioning about the discernible effects of corporate culture on campus was fairly subdued as the entrepreneurial discourse on the knowledge economy gained momentum in these times of neo-liberal ascendency. More completely than we originally envisaged, neo-liberalism is now manifest throughout Canadian universities with the prioritizing of marketplace criteria. The notion of higher education as a public good is replaced by a level of commodification which casts students as consumers, professors in time-consuming competition for funds, and a growing number of non-tenure track instructors (underpaid and overburdened) as casual labour. In this context, student fees and class sizes increase while programs in arts and science and curiosity-based learning and research are diminished.

Early confirmation that our initial critical observations were not fanciful came with the decision that our university should provide data designated by external non-academic agencies for inclusion in University League Tables. A former president, among other critics, publicly acknowledged the serious shortcomings of the methodology entailed. External pressures prevailed. Concern about flawed methodology did not deter senior administration from imposing a formal top-down campus-wide evaluation at the U of S. Despite claims that this "systematic program review" (SPR) was home grown, its pedestrian and absurdly reductionist design virtually aped formal assessments already deployed on other campuses. Ongoing Systematic Program Reviews, as with universities elsewhere, have been re-enacted subsequently

under various public relations induced headings. Evaluation processes such as these are, in large part, about transforming the idea of a university as a setting for intellectual thought and curiosity-based research into the business-oriented campus shaped by a new generation of CEOs. They support the enthronement of marketplace values, subscribe often unwittingly to the mantra of Margaret Thatcher - "There is no Alternative" - and regard innovation in an exclusively economic sense as the mission of the University. At the same time, the numbers of these highly paid managers have increased drastically, and student fees continue to escalate.

Structure of the Article and Methodology

The structure of the article is as follows. An initial account of how the PFU emerged at a time of growing corporatization shows how it drew its inspiration from the U of S's first president's declaration of the "people's university," as well as from philosophically grounded notions of participatory democracy. We then consider the connections between the PFU and local, national, and international traditions of community oriented adult education and analyze the meaning of emancipatory education. By locating the PFU within the humanistic conception of education, we show how it built on the idea that every human being has the capacity to learn, embodied in the motto "Everyone can teach, Everyone can learn." In order to further examine the concept of emancipatory education, we relate its pedagogical approach to that of recent social movements in North America. The systematic attack on the people's university at the U of S is analyzed in order to contrast it with the PFU's pedagogy and to highlight the ways in which the senior administration exerts control over financial and

academic decisions through such measures as TransformUS, which have been adopted at other universities. We conclude by emphasizing that examples of community based higher education like the PFU abound, demonstrating the need for, and efficacy of, such approaches. This, indeed, is a recurrent theme of the article that the PFU embodied a living tradition which resonates with people throughout the world.

Our adoption of a narrative methodology, sometimes referred to as an "interpretive-hermeneutic" approach (Bruner, 1996; Kerdeman, 2014), has several advantages: it enables insights into the experience of those who participated in the PFU, insights gained by rising to a meta-level in describing their key characteristics (Clandinin & Connelly, 1994) too often ignored by what Jerome Bruner (1996) calls the "set of shallow experimental routines" of a "causal-explanatory" approach (p.112). Indeed, narrative has the power to select out the most important aspects of human experience in order to construct meaningful and holistic interpretations (Schulz, 1997; Woodhouse, 2011b).

Like the conference presentation on which it is based, the rest of the article is written as a dialogue. We have found this approach conducive to the kind of narrative about the People's Free University that we are exploring. It provides an accessible yet critical way to examine an alternative form of higher education that takes issue with the marketization currently engulfing universities.

Interchange: Problem Posing and Writing the Text Together

How did the People's Free University (PFU) begin?

Michael: It is not our intention to enthrone a discourse on The People's Free University Redux. But in answer to the kind of enquiries, which we have often

encountered, on how to begin a free university during a time when popular education movements are on the wane, our advice is straight forward: just do it. Now is the time. We can do it here. This vanguardist advice, albeit democratically enacted, actually reflects how the PFU began in Saskatoon.

In the fall of 2001, the largely informal bag-lunch seminars organized by the graduate adult and continuing education program at the University of Saskatchewan in 1984 moved decisively to an open public forum for addressing key issues of immediate political relevance. The politically charged pedagogical intent was signalled in the title of the first session held just before the invasion of Afghanistan: "Why War? Why Now? Why Canadians? Where is the College of Education on This?" (By this time, the adult and continuing education graduate program had joined the Department of Educational Foundations.) Apart from engendering a sense of solidarity among like-minded students, faculty and staff, a meaningful alliance was forged with activists of the local community-based peace movement. The next bag lunch public interest seminar series, beginning November 21, 2001, was entitled "U. of. S. Ltd: W(h)ither the Corporate University?" Each forum of the series, focusing on particular aspects of a burgeoning business corporate agenda at the University of Saskatchewan, was well attended and received local and national media attention. Meantime, then U of S President, Peter MacKinnon, unwittingly invoking the mantra of Margaret Thatcher, insisted that "there is no alternative" (TINA) to the adoption of a business corporate style orientation at the University. Subsequently, Howard Woodhouse has characterized this defeatist attitude, now pervasive on campus, as "selling out" (2009).

"Whatever happened to the People's University?" This question, posed with growing frequency during the sessions on "W(h)ither the Corporate University?," referred to a founding statement , cited by U of S historian, Michael Hayden (1983, p.295), made by the University of Saskatchewan's first President, Walter Murray, that "this is the university of the people, established by the people" (University of Saskatchewan, 1909, p.12).

Recalling the idea of a people's university set the course for the adoption of a democratic process in the development of the PFU. From the founding meeting on, it was understood that control of the institution should be effectively exerted according to the wishes of the majority. In addition to public meetings, planning committees were open to all members who wished to attend. Responsibility for chairing sessions was shared. In this setting, an open process of enquiry prevailed; everyone had a voice in the give and take of various points of view. This process (for which theoretical grounding can be derived, as examples, from the work of Jurgen Habermas (1984, 1987) on communicative action, Paulo Freire (1973) on dialogue and praxis , and John Dewey (1968) on democracy and education, may have appeared messy at first to those who had regarded Roberts' Rules of Order and focus groups as exemplars of democratic decision-making. Yet the approach spawned an impressive array of well-organized learning events in a very short time span. Thus, the PFU experience is illustrative of participatory democracy in action which casts learners as citizens, rather than individualistic consumers, who are engaged together in determining their learning needs. This form of engaged democracy in action, discernible in numerous popular education initiatives (the Occupy and Idle No More movements are recent examples), exposes the limitations

of even existing democratic style governments elected on the basis of one vote for every eligible adult citizen. And over the past three decades these "democratically" elected governments (more precisely viewed as plutocracies) are steered by globalized business corporate and financial interests. The value of individual voting, the benefits of universal franchise, are diminished accordingly. In these circumstances, the need for initiatives such as the PFU to sustain a meaningful discourse on genuine participatory democracy becomes an imperative.

Appropriately, the genesis of the PFU emerged spontaneously from a small but open meeting immediately after a bag lunch seminar by participants who wanted to respond to the question about the fate of Walter Murray's founding notion of a People's University in some practical kind of way. Since significant discussion at the public seminars had focused on tuition fee increases, the prospect of offering free courses was explored at this initial PFU meeting. Subsequent PFU organizational meetings (open to the public) were held at off-campus locations, mainly on the west side of town – a mixed blue collar, First Nations, and ethnic neighbourhood.

From the outset, there was no problem in finding enthusiastic volunteers who wanted to teach. Over 200 learners, ranging in age from 12 to 82 and varying in formal education from Ph.D.'s to those who had given up on formal schooling, enrolled in the first PFU classes. Students in academically oriented classes (the PFU program, also included public lectures and workshops) had the option of submitting work for detailed feedback and conventional grading. In this regard, the PFU anticipated the wider adoption in higher education, including the University of Saskatchewan, of a policy that grants credit for past experience through prior learning assessment (PLA).

From which traditions both in Saskatchewan and elsewhere did the PFU draw?

Michael: The PFU valued a grass-roots approach that is consistent with the province's historical legacy in community oriented adult education which combines an understanding of our capacities for self-directed (autonomous) learning with a commitment to education as an emancipatory means to social justice and equality. In this view, education cannot be neutral; it is inherently political. For Saskatchewan, we can look to the work of Watson Thomson who, in Michael Welton's assessment "utilized small study groups .... the indispensable context for learning to transform self and society through dialogue and action" (1987, pp.154-155). Though somewhat less radical, the Saskatchewan Wheat Pool also favoured a well-organized community-based approach in its contribution to adult education for progressive social change in rural communities.

Elsewhere, quintessential Canadian adult education initiatives such as the Antigonish movement, Frontier College, Newfoundland's Fogo Island project and Quebecois popular education are sources of inspiration from which founding members of PFU have drawn. Similarly, the guiding principles of PFU are akin to those of the free university classes at Berkeley during the 1960s and Highlander Folk School "unearthing seeds of fire" (Adams, 1975). In particular, the Swedish study circle method is well adapted for PFU pedagogy.

We interpret the history of these social and educational movements as evidence of an ongoing emancipatory impulse among different groups and peoples. In order to be true to these living traditions, we incorporate the concept of emancipation as integral to our notion of emancipatory learning. We believe the PFU marks an event from which we can imagine afresh those

aspects of adult education as emancipatory learning that matter to us most. This orientation corresponds to that of Thomas Hodgskin, adult educator, political economist and co-founder of the mechanics' institutes in the UK at the start of the 19th century, for whom the education of a free people should be in their own hands (Collins, 1994, p.32). Yet Hodgskin was no romantic. Whereas Karl Marx praised the usefulness of Hodgskin's work in the *Critique of Political Economy* (Marx, 1989) and all three volumes of *Das Kapital* (Marx, 1986, 1983, 1984), he was critical of what he regarded as the fanciful notions of utopian socialists. Though middle class sponsors, concerned that the lower classes should be informed according to current middle class values, were generally opposed to what the education of a free people in their own hands and in their own interests entailed (classes in political economy, for example), mechanics' institutes pre-figured the emphasis placed on worker education by the more militant Chartist and Trade Union movements later in the century. Yet Hodgskin's quest for the education of a free people, taken up partially by the PFU and increasingly relevant in these times, is still an unfinished project

In recent years, the educational theory and practice of Paulo Freire, in particular, has been paramount in forging a global discourse on the emancipatory potential of education. For Freire education is the practice of freedom. In *Pedagogy of the Oppressed* (1983) and *Education for Critical Consciousness* (1973), Freire explains why education cannot be neutral. Education in this view is inevitably a political process whether it serves, through critical enlightenment, the common interests of the majority of people or merely reproduces existing institutional arrangements, the status quo, that further the interests of a privileged minority.

Freire identifies dialogue, consciousness-raising *(conscientization)* and praxis as key overlapping dimensions of a methodology that were apparent in the emergence and development of the PFU. Briefly stated, dialogue in this regard joins people in a purposeful, but essentially non-coercive, attempt to reach an understanding in common about their shared reality with a view to changing it for mutual benefit (Collins, 1998). *Conscientization* refers to this learning process whereby people move from a naïve taken-for granted consciousness to a critical consciousness that empowers them to participate together in the transformation of their world. In praxis, critical reflection and action inter-twine and inform each other as an ongoing dialectical process.

In this light, the PFU can be regarded as emerging within a critical legacy exemplified in the emancipatory pedagogy of Thomas Hodgskin, Paulo Freire, and other outstanding popular education initiatives such as Highlander Folk School, which have advanced the quest for social justice and equality alongside a concern for community interests and the environment (Collins, 1998).

What do the learning processes "Everyone can teach, everyone can learn" espoused by the PFU mean? How were they put into practice?

Howard: The PFU built upon the humanistic conception of education that every human being has the capacity to learn and that their own experience and interests form the basis of knowledge. The metaphor commonly used to describe this process is that of organic growth in which the learner gains a more inclusive range of thought, feeling, and action.1 On this view, learners are quite capable of teaching others as their experience and interests expand and their range of understanding and feeling for others grows. This approach was the basis of

the PFU, where learning and teaching with-others-in-community was the norm; or, as Michael Collins put it, a community of "friends teaching friends" was established (1994; 1998). By building upon the humanistic conception of education in this way, the PFU invited learners and teachers to alternate in their pedagogical roles quite seamlessly.

What did this mean in practice? That there was a diversity of courses and a variety of teaching and learning styles offered. Courses took place in several accessible locations, and those offered at St. Thomas Wesley United Church in one of the poorest core neighbourhoods of Saskatoon attracted the largest number of students during the first semester in 2002. Qualified people from the community as well as recognized university teachers provided learning opportunities to many adults who could not otherwise afford higher education. For two years, classes were offered free of charge ranging from the theoretical - Aboriginal spirituality, Canadian legal and political systems, scientists questioning science, music, astronomy, and health care ethics – to the practical – How to construct a resume and learning portfolio, success in the workplace, gardening, and composting. Learners were encouraged to speak to their own experience as they were invited to a dialogue, founded on adventure in which ideas were explored, practices examined, and social norms critiqued (Whitehead, 1967). A series of café discussions also attracted participants on such topics as alternative budgets, factory farming, the criminalization of dissent, and global education (Collins, 2003a, 2000b; Woodhouse, 2009).

In this way, the PFU invoked the imagination as the intellectual and emotional capacity of learners to comprehend and discuss alternatives to the status quo. Imaginative learning is often denied in more formal

settings by what Alfred North Whitehead calls the teaching of "inert ideas" that do not relate to the learners' experience and "are merely received into the mind without being utilized, or tested, or thrown into fresh combinations" (1957, p.1). In contrast, at the PFU there was a concerted effort to relate abstract ideas to concrete or lived experience, thereby overcoming the dichotomy between the two (Woodhouse, 2014). This process encouraged learners "to construct an intellectual vision of a new world" in which their own capacities could be actualized, and they could avoid the tendency, which Whitehead decries in modern education, to produce "minds in a groove ... [focused on] a given set of abstractions ... [where] the groove prevents straying across country" (Whitehead, 1957, p.93; 1953, p.197).

In what ways is the PFU connected to current and future emancipatory forms of education?

Michael: The PFU can be viewed as an exemplary initiative within a discourse (theory and practice) on emancipatory education. (Elsewhere, we have drawn meaningful connections between the PFU, critical theory, process pedagogy, cultural studies, and participatory research (Collins, 2003a, 2003b; Woodhouse, 2005, 2009). As mentioned, the PFU emerged originally from a public forum concerned with critical issues around the acceleration of corporate business style innovation on campus. By the same token, a PFU orientation would constitute a **purposeful educative dimension** within a wide range of environmentalist and other politically engaged groups who make the case that widespread and serious attention to the effects of climate change and its causes is imperative. In this regard, a critical understanding of how deregulation and the enthronement of free market criteria has led to an intensification of

corporate power that is eroding democratic processes. However, we are learning from the genuinely democratic counter-discourse evident in fast-breaking initiatives like the Occupy Movement, Idle No More, and student demonstrations on the streets of Quebec. These recent social movements arrive already imbued with the spirit of the PFU. It is not all about critical analysis and political activism. As an emancipatory form of education PFU pedagogy also meets the need for an enriched curriculum that includes poetry, music and drama as well as community gardening and craft work.

In the process of creating a fulfilling collective learning environment, the PFU experience enables us to raise parlous questions about the means, contrary to liberal humanist guiding principles, by which our publicly funded universities are being hijacked and reconstructed.

Is there a relationship between the current opposition to administrative attacks on academic freedom at the University of Saskatchewan and the PFU?

Howard: The vision which animated the founding of the PFU was "the people's university" articulated by Walter Murray, the first president of the U of S, who insisted that "*There should be ever present the consciousness that this is the university of the people, established by the people, and devoted by the people to the advancement of learning and the promotion of happiness and virtue*" (University of Saskatchewan, 1909, p.12). Murray's statement was made in the historical circumstances of a newly emergent province in which mercantilist agricultural production was dominant. The sentiments embodied in it are striking. They set the U of S apart from the more elitist Anglophone universities in Ontario and Quebec, and aligned more closely with other universities in Manitoba, Alberta, and British Columbia

(McLean, 2007). While the idea that the U of S should belong to the people can be interpreted as a justification for the existence of a fledgling institution to taxpayers, there is at the same time a strong emancipatory element to it. The advancement of learning was to be shared among the people of Saskatchewan, and the goal of university education was the common good of the province.2 Murray's language may appear rhetorical, even archaic – how many university presidents today would dare to make the claim that learning leads to virtue – but its message that all knowledge advanced at the U of S was to be shared with the people of the province is undeniable (Woodhouse, 2005; 2009).

A systematic attack on the people's university has taken place in the last couple of decades. This corporatist approach finds its core in the senior administration's attempts to centralize control over academic and financial affairs to an unprecedented degree. Collegial decision making, once the established form of university governance, has been subverted in several ways: the formation of a central committee of top administrators (the Provost's Committee on Integrated Planning), which controls millions of dollars annually, disbursing them at will; a massive growth in the number of administrators who now outnumber faculty3; the dismantling of the General Academic Assembly as the forum for academic decision making4; its replacement by University Council, which has become stacked with administrators from associate deans upwards; the imposition of a flurry of integrated plans designed to plough money into "Signature Areas," many of them "attractive to corporate interests" (Card, 2014, p.4); the introduction of TransformUS, a "program prioritization process" designed to restructure both academic programs and administrative units because of an alleged "structural deficit" of $44 .5 million.

TransformUS was based upon the methodology of Robert Dickeson (2010), which was designed for restructuring programs at technical and community colleges in the United States, not at a so-called "research intensive" university in the U15 in Canada. Among other things, Dickeson proposes "to measure quality by assessing inputs: the quality of faculty, students, facilities, equipment," and he concludes "there is little debate that quality inputs do make a significant difference in sustaining quality" (p.75). Not only is quality reduced to quantity, but the latter statement is a tautology: quality sustains quality. Nevertheless, Dickeson's methodology has been adopted by the universities of Guelph, Regina, Brock, and York. One hundred and sixty members of staff were dismissed from the U of S during the period of TransformUS, many of them marched off campus by private security agents (Matheson, 2013). Among U of S faculty critical of TransformUS was economist Eric Howe (2013), who had resigned from the Academic Program Transformation Task Force, because he saw TransformsUS as "intellectually bankrupt" and riddled with "biases" (pp.4, 1).5 Others like Terry Matheson (2013) questioned the existence of the "structural deficit" in light of previous healthy budget reports (p.3), while Len Findlay (2014) saw TransformUS as "deeply flawed" and "a major waste of time and resources" despite the effort of "honest faculty" who had worked on the task force (p.3), and Claire Card (2014) was critical of TransformUS as a means of restructuring the U of S so as to better serve the interests of the mining industry. The widespread scepticism towards claims of a $44.5M deficit was later confirmed by the Vice President Finance at a meeting of University Council in February 2015: "The University 'sort of' had a surplus and a deficit at the same time; last year $497M in funds was (sic) allocated and $494M in

revenue taken in. The $3M deficit assumes that all of the money in the allocation process is spent as budgeted; however, a surplus exists in the sub allocation streams of approximately $21M due to money not being allocated in its entirety, leading to an $18M surplus" (University of Saskatchewan, 2015). TransformUS was officially abandoned at the U of S in 2014, but a "gentler" version based upon six main "priorities" has since been adopted (Hill, 2014).

In many ways, the most egregious of these actions was the Board of Governors' granting veto power over tenure to the president who could then act as "gatekeeper" to the careers of faculty. In his arbitration award Andrew Sims made it clear that both parties were in the wrong: "It was the board's process that was flawed as a result of the president's advice and the decision to accept that advice" (Warick, 2014). The University Act as the constitutional mission of the university under public funding and the law had been usurped. The impetus for the veto came from then president Peter MacKinnon, who had used it in the case arbitrated by Sims. The senior administration which had initially persisted by launching an appeal against the decision, finally agreed to drop it following negotiations with the faculty association (Barnhart, 2015). Nevertheless, MacKinnon (2014) continues to uphold the right of presidents in market based terms:

> And presidents must exercise rather than delegate or concede their authority to make recommendations to the board [of governors] on awards of tenure. These are multi-million-dollar investments by universities, and it is part of the board's fiduciary responsibility to be satisfied on the part of its senior executive

> that every such investment is a good one. (p.150)

On this view, faculty are no more than resources, much like pork bellies or stocks and shares, and the overriding authority of any president is to ensure they maximize the money invested in them through the award of tenure.6

As a culmination of this totalizing corporatist approach, the director of the School of Public Health was stripped of tenure and marched off campus by security officers in May 2014. He had made public a document criticizing the president for preventing deans from speaking out about TransformUS. The threat to academic freedom was palpable. A tidal wave of condemnation resulted in the senior administration scrambling to change course, reinstating Robert Buckingham's tenure but not his position as dean. As pressure mounted on the University both from without, in the form of the Canadian Association of University Teachers, and within, including a large student demonstration, the Board of Governors held two emergency meetings. Shortly before the first on May 19, the provost resigned. Following the second, the chair of the chair of the board announced that President Ilene Busch Vishniac had been terminated without cause.7 Two months later, the chair of the board herself resigned after a protracted dispute over her legitimacy to remain in the position. And a few days later, the vice-president of human resources stepped down. None of this would have happened without ongoing pressure mounted by students, faculty, staff, alumni, and the general public in the form of motions of no confidence, letters to the editor, and rallies against the corporate ethos embodied in TransformUS. The actions of this diverse coalition were animated by an opposing vision of the university and its functions to that

espoused by senior administrators. And they reemphasized the *praxis* of the people's university first articulated more than one hundred years earlier.

Conclusion

As we have shown, the PFU took its name in part from Murray's defining vision. It built upon the founding president's idea that teaching and learning, scholarship and research, should serve both theoretical and community interests (Hayden, 1983). As a community based form of higher education open to all regardless of their ability to pay, the PFU established connections with local not-for-profit organizations and learned from the knowledge and insights which they embodied. At the same time, many of the teachers and learners at the PFU were connected with the broader intellectual community through the process of research and learning.

In these and other ways, the PFU strengthened Murray's vision. Rather than romanticising that vision in this article, we have interpreted it for the purposes of community based adult education today. While recognizing the different social and historical context in which it was articulated, we drew strength from the view that knowledge and learning are to be shared among different groups and social classes. This emancipatory potential, which Murray invoked, thrived at the PFU between 2002 and 2004. Evidence for the need and efficacy of community based higher education abounds. One such example is "The University of the Streets," established by Concordia University in Montreal, another is a popular series of learning experiences at Simon Fraser University in Vancouver, a third is the "Philosophy in the Community" series of monthly talks from the U of S itself, the fourth was a series of seminars marking the

renaissance of the PFU in the spring of 2013, and a fifth the Université Populaire de Caen (UPC) in Normandy, France. Like the PFU, the UPC has offered courses free of charge in a wide variety of areas, and operates independently of any university. It was founded by Michel Onfray, who took early retirement from teaching philosophy to "provide an education for ordinary people to understand the world by offering alternative visions to further global market totalization, which now controls … the very ways in which we think" (2006, Authors' translation). With support for its educational functions provided by the local community, the UPC enables the vision of an open university beyond fees and bureaucracies in a "concrescence" of resistance to and supersession of the market model of education (Woodhouse, 2011a; McMurtry, 1998). Most recently, a documentary film on the Purple Thistle Learning Collective entitled "Common Notions: No Handbook Required" (Berman, Browne, & Collins, 2016) has been selected for showing at the Doxa Documentary Film Festival. Founded by grassroots community activists who are advocates for alternative education, the Purple Thistle, as with the PFU, is guided by learning principles which reveal the creative potential and empowerment that emerge when people take their education into their own hands. In this hopeful scenario, we continue to draw on our PFU experience, "unearthing seeds of fire" (Adams, 1975), and guided by the principles of an emancipatory pedagogy.

Acknowledgements

An earlier version of this article was presented to the bi-annual conference of the Canadian History of Education Association Conference, Bessborough Hotel, Saskatoon, 23rd-26th October 2014. We wish to thank the chair of the

session, the other presenter, and the audience for their questions and comments, which have enriched the article. We also wish to thank the review panel for their comments.

Notes

1. See John McMurtry (1988). The humanistic tradition of education has different strands. On the one hand, Paulo Freire, Noam Chomsky, and those in the tradition of critical pedagogy seek radical social change (Collins, 1998); on the other, John Dewey, Bertrand Russell, and Alfred North Whitehead in the liberal tradition argue for greater individual, social, and educational freedoms (Hendley, 2011).
2. Women were represented at the "people's university" from its inception, their numbers growing to match those of men in certain colleges. Aboriginal peoples were largely excluded until the opening of the Indian and Northern Education Program, Indian Teacher Education Program, Northern Teacher Education Program, Saskatchewan Urban Native Teacher Education Program, and the Native Law Centre in the 1960s and 1970s, Hayden (1983, pp.62, 142, 301). An extension program, situated initially in the College of Agriculture, provided knowledge to farmers and their families throughout the province and later became the Extension Division, introducing credit and non-credit courses in a wide variety of subjects (McLean, 2007, pp.11-17). The Extension Division was disbanded in 2007.
3. According to a document circulated by the Academic Integrity Committee in March 2014, the number of administrators at the U of S grew by more than 104% between 2000 and 2013, totalling 1,335. Faculty increased by 11.6% in the same period, numbering

1,109; and student enrollment increased by 10.9% to 21,610.

4. The General Academic Assembly now meets once a year, comprising the president's speech and the opportunity for faculty and students to ask questions. It has only once had quorum enabling decision making to take place at a special meeting called by faculty concerned about administrative control over the College of Medicine in September 2012.
5. Between March and November 2013, the task force adopted review criteria, designed templates as the basis for gathering information, and reviewed a total of 485 programs (not departments). A system of four quintiles was adopted with the aim of assigning 20% of all programs to each quintile, varying from "investment" to "disinvestment" of "the resources they consume" (University of Saskatchewan, 2013, p.11). *The Report of the Academic Program Transformation Task Force* claimed that because of an alleged budgetary crisis "our assessment was not exclusively focused on the quality of programs or on the soundness of the objectives underlying the creation of the programs" (p.13). Professor Howe resigned in the summer of 2013.
6. Recently Mackinnon, interim president of Athabasca University, was warned by the Canadian Association of University Teachers that the institution could "face possible censure by CAUT Council in November unless they (sic) agree to remedy violations of basic university governance principles and address concerns about academic freedom," CAUT (2015, p.A5).
7. University of Saskatchewan (2014, p.1).

References

Adams, F. (with Horton, M.) (1975). *Unearthing seeds of fire: The idea of Highlander.* Winston-Salem, NC: John F. Blair.

Barnhart, G. (2015). *Update on appeal process for authority of the University of Saskatchewan Act. University Communications.* February 5.

Berman, C., Browne, C., & Collins, J. (2016). *Common notions: Handbook not required.* Vancouver, BC: Doxa Documentary Film Festival, May 5-15.

Bruner, J. (1996). *The culture of education.* Cambridge, MA: Harvard University Press.

Card, C. (2014). The new normal. *Vox: University of Saskatchewan Faculty Association.* April, 3-4.

CAUT. (2015). Manitoba, Athabasca face censure. *CAUT Bulletin.* May, A5.

Clandinin, D.J. & Connelly, F.M. (1994). Personal experience methods. In Denzin, N.K. & Lincoln, Y.S. (Eds.), *Handbook of qualitative research.* (pp.413-427). Thousand Oaks, CA: Sage.

Collins, M. (1994). *Adult education as vocation: A critical role for the adult educator.* London, UK: Routledge. (Work first published 1991)

Collins, M. (1998). *Critical crosscurrents in education.* Malabar, FL: Krieger Publishing.

Collins, M. (2003a). Back to the future in community education: The People's Free University. In Collins, M. (Ed). *Learning for life: A compendium of papers on lifelong learning.* (pp.45-54). Saskatoon, SK: Department of Educational Foundations, College of Education, University of Saskatchewan.

Collins, C. (2003b). The People's Free University: Counteracting the Innovation Agenda on campus

and model for lifelong learning. *Saskatchewan Notes: Canadian Centre for Policy Alternatives.* 2(9), 1-4.

Dewey, J. (1968). *Democracy and education.* New York, NY: The Free Press. (Work first published 1916)

Dickeson, R.C. (2010). *Prioritizing academic programs and services: Reallocating resources to achieve strategic balance.* San Francisco, CA: Jossey-Bass.

Findlay, L. (2014). Manufacturing collegial consent? *Vox: University of Saskatchewan Faculty Association.* April, 1-3.

Freire, P. (1983). *Pedagogy of the oppressed.* New York, NY: Continuum. (Work first published 1970)

Freire, P. (1973). *Education for critical consciousness.* New York, NY: Seabury.

Habermas, J. (1984). (Trans., T. McCarthy). *The theory of communicative action,* vol. 1. Boston, MA: Beacon Press.

Habermas, J. (1987). (Trans. T. McCarthy). *The theory of communicative action,* vol. 2. Boston, MA: Beacon Press.

Hayden, M. (1983). S*eeking a balance: The University of Saskatchewan, 1907-1982.* Vancouver, BC: University of British Columbia Press.

Hendley, B. (2011). *Dewey, Russell, Whitehead: Philosophers as educators.* Carbondale and Edwardsville, IL. Southern Illinois University Press. (Work first published 1986)

Hill, A. (2014). Barnhart announces end to TransformUS. *The StarPhoenix*, September 10: A1-2.

Howe, E. (2013). The emperor isn't wearing any clothes: Intellectually bankrupt academic prioritization. *Vox: University of Saskatchewan Faculty Association*. November: 1-4.

Kerdeman, D. (2014). Hermeneutics. In Phillips, D.C. (Ed). *Encyclopedia of Educational Theory and Philosophy, Volume 1.* (pp.375-382). Los Angeles, CA: Sage Publications.

MacKinnon, P. (2014). *University leadership and public policy in the twenty-first century: A president's perspective.* Toronto, ON: University of Toronto Press.

Matheson, T. (2013). Checking out of the Bates motel: Thoughts from a recent retiree on the changing face of the U of S. *Vox: University of Saskatchewan Faculty Association.* October, 1-4.

Marx, K. (1989). (Ed., M. Dobb). *A contribution to the critique of political economy.* New York, NY: International Publishers.

Marx, K. (1983). (Trans., S. Moore & E. Aveling. Ed., F. Engels). *Capital, Volume.1.* London, UK: Laurence & Wishart. (Work first published 1954)

Marx, K. (1986). (Ed. F.Engels). *Capital, Volume 2.* London, UK: Laurence & Wishart. (Work first published 1956)

Marx, K. (1984). (Ed. F.Engels). *Capital, Volume 3.* London, UK: Laurence & Wishart. (Work first published 1959)

McLean S. (2007). University extension and social change: Positioning a university of the people in Saskatchewan. *Adult Education Quarterly. 58*(3), 3-21.

McMurtry, J. (1988). The history of inquiry and social reproduction: Educating for critical thought. *Interchange. 19*(1), 31-45.

McMurtry, J. (1998). *Unequal freedoms: The global market as an ethical system.* Toronto, ON: Garamond Press.

Onfray, M. (2006). Le jardin (potager) d'Epicure. Retrieved from http://up-argentan.pagesperso-orange.fr/michel-onfray.html

Schulz, R. (1997). *Interpreting teacher practice ... Two continuing stories.* New York, NY: Teachers College Press.

University of Saskatchewan. (1909). *The president's report, 1908-1909.* Saskatoon, Saskatchewan: Author.

University of Saskatchewan. (2013). *Report of the academic program transformation task force: Presented to President Ilene Busch-Vishniac*, November 30.

University of Saskatchewan. (2014). *Statement from the University of Saskatchewan Board of Governors.* Saskatoon, Saskatchewan, May 21.

University of Saskatchewan. (2015). *University council minutes*. Saskatoon, Saskatchewan, February 26.

Warick, J. (2014). Arbitrator rules against tenure veto power. *The StarPhoenix,* June 4, 2014.

Welton, M. (1987). Mobilizing the people for socialism: The politics of adult education in Saskatchewan, 1944-45. In Welton, M. (Ed). *Knowledge for the people: The struggle for adult learning in English-speaking Canada.* (pp.151-169). Toronto, ON: Ontario Institute for Studies in Education.

Whitehead, A.N. (1953). *Science and the modern world.* New York, NY: The Free Press. (Work first published 1925)

Whitehead, A.N. (1957). *The aims of education and other essays.* New York, NY: The Free Press. (Work first published 1929)

Whitehead, A.N. (1961). *Adventures of ideas.* New York, NY: The Free Press. (Work first published 1933)

Woodhouse, H. (2005). A process approach to community-based education: The People's Free University of Saskatchewan. *Interchange. 36*(1-2), 121-138.

Woodhouse, H. (2009). *Selling out: Academic freedom and the corporate market.* Montreal, PQ & Kingston, ON: McGill-Queen's University Press.

Woodhouse, H. (2011a). Learning for life: The People's Free University and the civil commons. *Studies in Social Justice. 5*(1), 77-90.

Woodhouse, H. (2011b). Storytelling in university education: Emotion, teachable moments, and the value of life. *Journal of Educational Thought. 45*(3), 211-238.

Woodhouse, H. (2014). Whitehead, A.N. In Phillips, D.C. (Ed). *Encyclopedia of Educational Theory and Philosophy, Volume 2.* (pp.849-853). Los Angeles, CA: Sage Publications.

About the Authors:

Michael Collins, Professor Emeritus, Department of Educational Foundations, University of Saskatchewan

Howard Woodhouse, Professor, Department of Educational Foundations, University of Saskatchewan

Looking for the Ethical Self in Others: Relationality, Self-Knowing, and Education

Jeffrey A. Bos
Gonzaga University

ABSTRACT: This paper seeks implications of human relationality and ethical subjectivity for education. Embracing relationality as ontologically basic, as well as the basis of self-knowing, has ethical implications for educators' self-knowledge and their communities. Focusing on ethics as relational draws the condition of living in and among a community of others to the foreground and refuses to resolve tensions based on universal and absolute principles. As educators assume responsibility within their communities and for students, they find themselves within an unsolvable predicament of partial self-knowing. However, through engagement with others they press against the limits of self-knowledge and risk themselves in caring for others. In the process, they uncover their vulnerability to the "Other" as a resource for an ethic of leadership and education.

Keywords: Ethics, Relationality, Intersubjectivity, Responsibility, Vulnerability, Reciprocity

RESUMÉ: Le présent article cherche à dégager les rôles que les relations humaines et la subjectivité déontologique peuvent jouer dans le domaine de l'enseignement. Un relationnel fondé sur l'ontologie et la connaissance de soi, joue un rôle éthique pour les enseignants et leurs sociétés, dans la connaissance du soi. Une politique relationnelle construite sur la déontologie exige, avant tout, une vie en communauté avec les autres et refuse de résoudre les conflits reposant sur les principes universels et absolus. Puisque les enseignants assument la responsabilité au sein de leurs environnements et pour les étudiants, ils se retrouvent emprisonnés dans une situation problématique insoluble

d'une connaissance partielle du soi. Il est à noter cependant qu'à travers l'engagement avec les autres, ils se retrouvent aux confins de la connaissance d'eux-mêmes et s'exposent à prendre en charge les autres. Au fur et à mesure, ils révèlent aux autres leur vulnérabilité ; instrument dont ils se servent pour la déontologie de l'encadrement et de l'enseignement.

Mots-clefs : déontologie, relationnel, intersubjectivité, responsabilité, vulnérabilité, réciprocité

If human beings become ethical in and through relationships with others, then modernist foundations of education may not be suited for a democratic, pluralist future. Biesta (2006) observed that modern education, as derived from the Enlightenment project, has become based on a particular conception about the nature and destiny of the human being that connected rationality and autonomy with education. If, as Biesta argued, the essence and nature of human beings should not be assumed *a priori*, then education must be treated as a "radically open question," in which the question of what it means to be human "can only be answered by engaging in education rather than as a question that can be answered before we can engage in education" (p. 4). As Kolvenbach (2001/2008) stated: "Tomorrow's 'whole person' cannot be whole without an educated awareness of society and culture with which to contribute socially, generously, in the real world. Tomorrow's whole person must have, in brief, a well-educated solidarity." (p. 155). The Jesuit educational standard to "educate the whole person of solidarity for the real world," according to Kolvenbach, who cites a papal address, is comprised of solidarity learned through "contact" rather than "concepts" (John Paul II, 2000). Human relationality and the call to

solidarity enable a move beyond the modernist foundations of education. Creating contact and fostering dialogue with others becomes the *modus operandi* of education and primary endeavor of the educator.

An Educator's Predicament

This paper seeks an understanding of ethics and responsibility for engaging in education that, as Todd (2003) wrote, "refuses to locate responsibility with a rational, autonomous subject but in the forms of relationality that structure our encounters with other people" (p. 141). It ponders how an educator's subjectivity is given and derived from others, particularly from the students to whom he or she is related and in some way ethically responsible. This means that the educator's subjectivity is not prior to engaging in education but is emergent and always just beyond the limits of what is known.

The educator's predicament bespeaks the fact that reality is radically relational and ethics matter in the mix. Ethical subjects emerge in relationship and through responsibility. Ethics typically refers to codes of conduct which regulate the ethical life and imply knowing how to act. Ciulla (2004) claimed, "[Ethics] is about what we should do and what we should be like as human beings, as members of a group or society, and in the different roles that we play in life" (p. 302). However, while leading an ethical life implies following an ethical code, there is little sense in speaking of an ethical subject apart from human relationality and without an "Other" to whom a subject is ethically related. Ethical codes of conduct must be grounded in a sense of relationality that understands humans as intersubjectively constituted by virtue of

mutuality, reciprocity, interaction with others and the world. Todd (2003) argued:

> In this regard, what counts as conditions of responsibility are therefore based in the quality of relations we have to others as opposed to adhering to predefined principles that we apply to the particular situations in which we find ourselves. . . . Each of us, then, is therefore burdened with a responsibility for the Other that is not of our own making. (p. 141)

Ethical responsibility, as well as both the possibility and difficulty of teaching and education, emerges from and within a position of susceptibility and the conditions of vulnerability and openness to others. In such a condition, the subjective self is literally ecstatic, outside of the self, a heteronomous identity, not in control of oneself, but nonetheless responsible. If relationality forms the basis of the ethical life and education, it becomes necessary to explore the ways in which human subjects are related and conceived to be in relationship with the "Other." This exploration leads to the limits of what is knowable about the subject's self, since the students, who relationally constitute teacher's subjectivity, are present as an "Other."

This paper first examines Butler's (2005) *Giving an Account of Oneself* to argue that impartial self-knowledge does not exonerate human subjects from leading an ethical life; rather, responsibility is established by the inescapable relation to the "Other." In the next section, it draws on Noddings' (2003) *Caring*: *A Feminine Approach to Ethics and Moral Education* to begin thinking how educators are reciprocally and ethically bound to their students in ways that extend beyond rationality. The implications of

Butler's analysis of ethical relationality and Noddings' ethic of care is expounded in following sections to draw implications for education in pluralist and democratic contexts. It begins to paint a picture of an ethical and dialoging educational community in which the "I" of an educator comes into being through intersubjective engagement within a community of students.

Limited Knowing and Unlimited Responsibility: Who Knows?

In *Giving an Account of Oneself,* Butler (2005) suggested that "the 'I' has no story of its own that is not also the story of relation – or set of relations – to a set of norms. . . . The 'I' is always to some extent dispossessed by the social conditions of its emergence" (p. 8). Butler asserted that this "dispossession" of the subjective "I" does not mean that we have lost the subjective ground for ethics but is the condition under which ethical considerations arise. The subject and its formulation is the very problem to which ethical inquiry lends itself. As one seeks to give an account of oneself, he or she must undertake a delimiting act with a set of norms that precede and exceed the subject (p. 17) and are not of the subject's own making (p. 21). The first chapter concluded with poignant questions to which Butler returned frequently:

> There is that in me and of me for which I can give no account. But does this mean that I am not, in the moral sense, accountable for who I am and for what I do? If I find that, despite my best efforts, a certain opacity persists and I cannot make myself fully accountable to you, is this ethical failure? Or is it a failure that gives rise to another ethical

> disposition in the place of a full and satisfying notion of narrative accountability. Is there in this affirmation of partial transparency a possibility for acknowledging a relationality that binds more deeply to language and to you than I previously knew? And is the relationality that conditions and blinds the "self" not, precisely, an indispensable resource for ethics? (2005, p. 40)

For Butler, ethics is tied to the critique of the ability to give an account of oneself and an acknowledgement of one's relatedness. Butler moved in ensuing chapters to construct an ethic based on the "shared, invariable, and partial blindness about ourselves" (p. 42).

The acknowledgement that we will always fail to completely know ourselves and achieve self-identity is an essential resource of ethics. Butler (2005) wrote, "To know oneself as limited is still to know something about oneself, even if one's knowing is afflicted by the limitation that one knows" (p. 46). From this it also follows that one cannot reasonably expect anything different from others. Limited self-knowledge demands an ethical disposition toward humility and generosity that calls out for forgiveness on both sides, precisely since "any effort 'to give an account of oneself' will have to fail in order to approach being true" (p. 42).

Butler (2005) contended that the meaning of responsibility will need to be rethought on the basis of an avowing of the limits of self-understanding and establishing these limits as the condition for the subject, which is the human predicament (p. 83). This human predicament exists by virtue of the fact we do not belong to ourselves but are constantly given over to the "Other." Continuing this thread of thought, Butler wrote:

> I speak as an "I," but do not make the mistake of thinking that I know precisely all that I am doing when I speak that way. I find that my very formation implicates the other in me, that my own foreignness to myself is, paradoxically, the source of my ethical connection with others. . . . I cannot think the question of responsibility alone, in isolation from the other. If I do I take myself out of the mode of address (being addressed as well as addressing the other) in which the problem of responsibility first emerges. (p. 84)

Butler has shown that though the subject is authored by what "precedes and exceeds" its formation, this does not exonerate one from having to give an account nor does it render one not responsible (p. 82). What "precedes and exceeds" are social norms that are not of one's own making and an encounter with the "Other," by whom the accusative subject is addressed and to whom he or she must give an account.

The condition of being impinged upon by others belongs to the relational structure of social life. Butler (2005) laid out a social ethic focusing on social norms in identity construction and the second-person pronoun in a relationship of intersubjectivity. The "Other" impinges upon the subject such that from the onset, claimed Butler (2005), "*I am my relation to you*" (p. 81.), and similarly, "*I am only in the address to you*" (p. 82). The inaugural impingement on the accusative subject is the first formation of the self and ethical responsibility. The capacity to be "*acted upon*" implicates the accusative subject in a relationship that entails responsibility (p. 88). Butler wrote, "The other's actions 'address' me in the

sense that those actions belong to an Other who is irreducible, whose 'face' makes an ethical demand upon me…Thus responsibility emerges not with the 'I' but with the accusative 'me'" (p. 90). This susceptibility to the impingement of the "Other" creates the very conditions upon which one becomes responsible (p. 91).

Vulnerability to the other and the other's address does not remove the agency of the subject, but disassociates agency from responsibility for one's actions, and establishes responsibility by virtue of the relation to the "Other." As a consequence, claimed Butler (2005), "responsibility is not a matter of cultivating a will, but of making use of an unwilled susceptibility as a resource for becoming responsive to the 'Other'" (p. 91). In answering the question of what it means to construct an ethic on the basis of unwilled action upon the accusative subject, Butler proposed, "It might mean that one does not foreclose primary exposure to the Other, that one does not try to transform unwilled into willed, but, rather to take the very unbearability of exposure as the sign, the reminder, of a common vulnerability, a common physicality and risk" (p. 100). The human predicament entails an inescapable vulnerability and unwilled condition. This predicament, for which humans are not responsible, is "the conditions under which we assume responsibility" (p. 101). "To be human," stated Butler, "seems to mean being in a predicament that one cannot solve" (p. 103).

Educators live, act, and assume responsibility within the unsolvable human predicament. Butler's analysis of emergence of the ethical self and ethical responsibility, as identified not with the subjective "I" but emerging within the accusative "me" under address, suggests that leadership and education involve an accusative identity that is received from the "Other." As an educator, one's identity belongs or derives first from students and is

received by virtue of that relation. This relationality formulates the basis of the ethical responsibility the teacher must bear. As educators press against the limits of self-knowledge and risk themselves at the point of unknowingness, they must consequently acknowledge and embrace their own vulnerability and the frailty of human relationships. This embrace of vulnerability and frailty is the primary resource of ethics and demands a posture of humility and vulnerability which lives within the tensions of relationality.

An Ethic of Care through Reciprocity with the Other: Who Cares?

Challenging the Kantian concept of the rational self, or the transcendent logical ego, feminist ways of knowing propose a more complex and multi-faceted view of the self as integral and interrelated (Wesselius, 1997, p. 54). In *Caring: A Feminine approach to Ethics and Moral Education*, Noddings (2003) combined critical theory and relational ontology to express an ethic of care typified in the experiences of women and motherhood. She argued for an alternative naturalistic and intuitive ethic founded on relationships rather than rationality. Noddings contended:

> Many persons who live moral lives do not approach moral problems formally. Women, in particular, seem to approach moral problems by placing themselves as nearly as possible in concrete situations and assuming personal responsibility for the choices to be made. (p. 8)

Noddings looked to feminine notions of "receptivity, relatedness, and responsiveness," utilizing motherhood as a model, to develop an ethic rooted in the act of caring (p. 2).

Noddings' (2003) approach enables a paradigm that is critical and concrete, while placing ethics in the foreground. Though Noddings distinguishes between natural and ethical caring, she portrayed ethical caring as arising out of the sentiment and recognition of natural caring (p. 79). Natural caring is the human condition in which one responds as "one-caring" out of love or natural inclination. This natural condition is "good" and drives humans to meet each other morally (p. 4). Noddings viewed absolute principles as unstable and ambiguous, functioning to separate humans from each other (p. 5). To preserve the uniqueness of human encounters and subjective experience, she rejected the notion of universalizability while striving to avoid an ethical relativism, even though the conditions under which objective morality is possible cannot be described. According to Noddings, an "irremovable subjective core, a longing for goodness, provides what universality and stability there is" (p. 27). Caring is natural and accessible to all, which implies that certain feelings, attitudes, and memories might then be taken as universal. An ethic of caring does not so much embody moral judgments, but considers moral impulses and locates morality in "pre-act consciousness" of the one-caring (p. 28). Noddings argued that rational, objective thinking may need to be suspended to allow subjective thinking and reflection: "Judgment (in the impersonal, logical sense) may properly be put aside in favor of faith and commitment" (p. 25).

A fundamental claim of taking caring as the primary ethic is the recognition that "we are dependent on each other even in the quest for personal goodness" (Noddings,

2003, p. 6). Thus, dependency is the source of ethics. The virtue one exercises is completed and fulfilled in the other. "As I think about how I feel when I care, about what my frame of mind is, I see that my caring is always characterized by a move away from self" (p. 16). Noddings (2003) utilized the term "engrossment" to draw attention to the fundamental aspect of caring (p. 17). Describing the term, she wrote: "When I look at and think about how I am when I care, I realize that there is invariably this displacement of interest from my own reality to the reality of the other" (p. 14). The one-caring is present in acts of caring and is sufficiently engrossed in the cared-for to take pleasure and pain in what the cared-for recounts (p. 19). Presence and engrossment entail vulnerability, as caring involves and embraces both guilt and risk (p. 18). Caring also increases the possibility of pain and joy (p. 39). It nurtures the ethical ideal of joy that accompanies and fulfills caring and satisfies longing for relatedness. This type of caring is at the heart of ethical relationships (p. 92). Noddings rejected universal caring and contended: "My first and formal obligation is to meet the other as one caring" (p. 17). Though one should be ready to care for whomever one may encounter and be committed to the possibility, for Noddings, caring refers to an actuality. This is the difference between "caring-about" and "caring-for." Noddings limited the focus of her ethic to a caring that has its object as the one "cared-for." Noddings insisted that in so far as caring involves stepping out of one's personal frame of reference into another's, it is specific action. "To act as one-caring, then, is to act with special regard for the particular person in a concrete situation" (p. 24).

Whereas the Western ethical tradition has removed the family and local communities from considerations of universal ethical principles, a feminine ethic puts it back in

center place. The act of caring is reactive, responsive, and exists within the concrete relationship. Noddings (2003) sought to avoid reducing the need for human judgment to a rule-bound ethic and resisted any movement away from the concrete act of individual engrossment (p. 25). Caring entails authentic presence and is fulfilled by the reciprocal presence of another. If leadership and education are about ways people relate, then an ethic of relationship and analysis of the care that occurs in the authentic acts of relating are paramount.

An ethic based on caring elucidates relationality as the preliminary ontological reality. As Noddings (2003) showed, caring rests upon a mutuality of presence in which "we are dependent on each other" (p. 6). Noddings' claim that "How good *I* can be is partly a function of how *you* – the other – receive and respond to me" (p. 6) echoes Butler's (2005) understanding of the ethical subject as derived from social norms in identity construction and the second-person pronoun in a relationship of intersubjectivity. If ethical responsibility emerges not with the "I" but with the accusative "me" and in reciprocal acts of caring then no one lives from or for himself or herself. No man or woman is an island but exists only in his or her relationship to the other. Ethical self-knowing and moral education require a community of caring persons, mutual dependence and vulnerable presence with one another.

Knowing and Being in Community with Others

Can education open an "other" way out of the totalitarian dilemma? Can the educator lead the way? A relational ontology opens ethical ways of self-knowing through contact with other persons. Caring and loving locate and concretize this ethical self-knowing in concrete

relationships. The inclusion of insights derived from theories of human relationality and intersubjectivity, like Butler's (2005) and Noddings' (2003) approaches that take ethical responsibility as primary, may enable such a turn in ethics and moral education. These insights inform the role of the educator, to structure the practices of theological education and formation of the educational communities, as intersubjective, interacted, and ethical.

Who I am: Who makes the teacher? When an "I" looks at itself in a looking-glass and peers into the face of the void, the "I" sees "You" too. "Who are you?" "You" too are a "Who." "You" also are a self-consciousness and self-reflective being, calling for recognition. Self-recognition and reflection is confounded, for the "I" sees itself in another self. When an "I" encounters another self-reflecting and knowing subject, whose presence gives evidence that he or she has taken one's sense of "I" and put it into a reflective process of his or her own, then the potential for unpacking one's own "I" is awakened (Loder, 1989, p. 78). It impinges upon the educator to ask, "Who am I in the experience of my students?"

In *The Phenomenology of Mind*, Hegel (1910/2004) contends that in the process of recognition, when self-consciousness has before it another self-consciousness, it has come outside itself. It loses itself, since it finds itself as another being. It sublates the other for it sees its own self in the other, but also thereby sublates its own self for this other is itself (p. 224). As Butler (2005) urged, the "You" is a real "Other" with a face. The "You" is an "Other" which addresses me, impinges upon me, and makes an ethical demand upon me to which I am obliged to respond (pp. 90-91). The question "Who are you?" assumes that there is an Other before me who I cannot know or apprehend, who is unique and non-substitutable (p. 31). Self-recognition and reflection is not closed in

upon itself. Rather, as Butler (2005) admitted, one comes to recognize that "I exist in an important sense for you, and by virtue of you" (p. 32).

The educator's predicament emerges here at the limit of intelligibility and self-knowing. The problem occurs as the educators ask themselves, "How can I teach when I do not know who I am in the presence of the Other?" In Butler's (2005) words, the question of ethics emerges where it is asked:

> what it might mean to continue in dialogue where no common ground can be assumed, where one is, as it were, at that limits of what one knows yet still under the demand to offer and receive acknowledgement: to someone else who is there to be addressed and whose address is to be received. (p. 21-22)

In this condition,

> I speak as an 'I," but do not make the mistake of thinking that I know precisely all that I am doing when I speak that way. I find that my very formation implicates the other in me, that my own foreignness to myself is, paradoxically, the source of my ethical connection with others. (p. 84).

The relation one has to oneself is located in the context of an address to another (Butler, 2005, p. 131), which is formed within the social life of the educational context, with and through those by whom one is called teacher. The willingness to become undone in relation to others and by others becomes a primary necessity. It is chance "to be addressed, claimed, bound to what is not me," and so "be prompted to act, to address myself elsewhere, and

so to vacate the self-sufficient 'I'" (p. 132). The self-sufficient "I" never existed anyway. No teacher is an island. While students are dependent upon and subject to the teacher, the teacher's subjectivity is also found to be mutually dependent on the students.

Thus, the predicament of an educator entails an inescapable vulnerability and unwilled condition. The educator is not an "I" alone, but only in relationship to "You." Through the practice of giving an account and the practice of dialogue, the condition of unknowingness about ourselves is shared and awakened. It is also through mutual accountability that responsibility becomes possible, as unknowingness and partial self-knowingness maintain dependence on the student by whom is addressing me and to whom one is bound. As a consequence, "I" become ethical and am able to profess along with Levinas (1974/1998), "Thanks to God. I am another for others" (p. 158). Individuality, subjectivity, and agency depend upon this relationality: "I" am "Who" as are "You."

Noddings' ethic, based on the reciprocal relationship of the one-caring and the cared-for, and Butler's analysis of emergence of the ethical self, identified within the accusative "me," suggests that leadership and education involve subjects whose subjectivity is received from others. Subjectivity is derived, received, and reciprocally constituted by virtue of the relationship. According to Semetsky (2004), the autonomy of the subject is "not given but contingent on acts of shared communication embedded within the experiential situation" (p. 324). Teachers are as dependent on the students as the students are on the teacher (Noddings, 1998, p. 196). Given that a teacher's subjectivity is heteronomously derived from the students to whom he or she is subject, Groome (1999) worded the difficulty of the educator well: "We are fellow

and sister pilgrims alongside of them, of whom they ask the way. As we point ahead of them, we also point ourselves ahead" (p. 17).

We are all in this together: Who are we? If we are ethically bound to each other, such that only together we become ethical subjects, then the question of what it means to be human "can only be answered by engaging in education rather than a question that needs to be answered before we can engage in education" (Biesta, 2006, p. 4). As Aristotle wrote in Nicomachean Ethics, "For the things which we have to learn before we can do them we learn by doing" (II 6 1106a 15-25). Furthermore, the turn toward relationality, the way in which I am bound to you, and you are bound to me, implies an inescapable intersubjective condition in which we are mutually accountable, responsible, and vulnerable. Applying an ethic of care to the shared condition of teachers and students entails that, as Noddings (2003) asserted, "all bear the responsibility for the ethical perfection of others" (p. 171). Noddings wrote:

> [Moral education] has for us a dual meaning. It refers to education which is moral in the sense that those planning and conducting education will strive to meet all those involved morally; and it refers to an education that will enhance the ethical ideal of those being educated so that they will continue to meet others morally. (p. 171)

Palmer (1999) similarly asserted, "If we are made for community, then leadership is everyone's vocation" (p. 74). Palmer (2007) also pointed toward a comprehensive form of community that has the capacity to support authentic education: "The hallmark of a community of

truth is in its claim that *reality is a web of communal relationships, and we can know reality only by being in community with it*" (p. 97). The reality we come to know, both teacher and student alike, is therefore relational. We do not know ourselves by ourselves.

Chinnery (2006) asked "what it might mean to think about community as a kind of 'permanent coexistence with the stranger' wherein community is based on a 'negative commonality – on our shared condition of existential lack or incompleteness" (p. 331). While no community comes into being without a shared condition and practice, the educational community, in which we seek ourselves, "rests, not on some form of shared identity, but on the recognition that we are all inescapably and irreducibly other to the other" (p. 331). The urgency of the question concerning how to live with others in a world of plurality and difference prompted Biesta (2006) to write:

> I challenge the idea that we can only live together in such a world if we can provide a common definition of our humanity. Instead I explore implications for the ways in which we educate if we treat the question of what it means to be human as a radically open question: a question that can only be answered by engaging in education rather than a question that needs to be answered before we can educate. (p. ix)

Taking up Biesta's challenge, we might cling to the almost impossible hope of knowledge about ourselves within an educational community, where others are encountered in their alterity and the single most important question, "Who are we?" is asked but never satisfactorily answered.

Though we may have little else in common beyond being bound to each other by our partial and limited knowledge of ourselves, educational communities are nonetheless called into ethical relationships with each other and by others beyond our own cultures and traditions. We are held responsible to those others, even as they marginalize and impinge on us, that we might learn together to live with ambiguity and uncertainty, while resisting the impulse "to reduce the other to the same, and to take that demanding path together" (Chinnery, 2006, p. 336).

At the Limit of Education

Embracing relationality as ontologically basic, as well as holding relationships to be the basis of self-knowing, has ethical implications for leaders, educators, and their communities. In a vein that echoes Noddings' (2003) descriptions of motherhood, Butler's claim that "To be human seems to mean being in a predicament that one cannot solve," is an apt description of education (2005, p. 103). Relational ethics draws the condition of community living to the foreground and refuses to resolve the tensions based on universal and absolute principles. As leaders and educators engage an impossible task of living, acting, and assuming responsibility within the unsolvable human predicament of partial self-knowing, they press against the limits of self-knowledge and risk themselves in caring for others and about things that matter.

The embrace of vulnerability to the Other is a resource for an ethic of leadership and education. In order to flourish and become more human, rather than simply survive in their professions and communities, leaders and educators must courageously commit to ethical postures of humility, generosity, and forgiveness. According to Biesta (2006), the responsibility of the educator lies in both the

cultivation of "worldly spaces" in which the encounter with otherness and difference is a real possibility, and in the asking of "difficult questions" that summon students to respond responsively and responsibly to otherness and difference in their own, unique ways (p. ix). In so doing, educators acknowledge and embrace their own vulnerability before the presence of their students. Equally important as moral courage is the posture of humility that lives within the tensions of human relationality and intersubjectivity. As Noddings (2003) wrote, "We are fragile; we depend on each other for our own goodness" (p. 102). Ethics matter, precisely because it may not be up to "me" but rather up to "you."

REFERENCES

Aristotle. (1962). *Nicomachean ethics*. (M. Ostwald, trans.). Indianapolis, IN: The Bobbs-Merrill Company.

Biesta, G.J.J. (2006). *Beyond learning: Democratic education for a human future*. Boulder, CO: Paradigm Publishers.

Butler, J. (2005). *Giving an account of oneself*. New York: Fordham University Press.

Chinnery, A. (2007). On compassion and community without identity: Implications for moral education. In D. Vokey (ed.), *Philosophy of Education 2006* (pp. 330-338), Urbana-Champaign, IL: Philosophy of Education Society.

Ciulla, J. B. (2004). Ethics and leadership effectiveness. In J. Antonakis, A.T. Cianciolo, & R.J. Sternberg (Eds.), *The nature of leadership* (p. 302-327). Thousand Oaks, CA: Sage Publications.

Groome, T.K. (1999). *Christian religious education: Sharing our story and vision* (reprint). San Francisco: Jossey Bass.

Hegel, G. W. F. (2004). The phenomenology of the mind (J. B. Baillies, Trans.). In J. T. Wren, D. A. Hicks & T. L. Price (Eds.), *Traditional classics on leadership* (pp. 222-292). Northampton, MA: Elgar. (Reprinted from *The phenomenology of the mind*, pp. 175-188, 1910, London: Swan Sonnenschein & Co, limited)

John Paul II. (2000, May 5). Message of the Holy Father John Paul II to the Catholic University of the Sacred Heart, Milan. Retrieved from http://www.vatican.va/holy_father/john_paul _ii/ speeches/2000/apr-jun/documents/hf_jp-ii_spe_20000505_sergio-zaninelli_en.html

Kolvenbach, P-H. SJ. (2008). The service of faith and the promotion of justice in American Jesuit Higher Education. In Traub, G.W. SJ. (Eds.), *A Jesuit education reader* (pp. 144-162). Chicago: Loyola Press. (Original work published 2001)

Levinas, E. (1998). *Otherwise than being, or, beyond essence* (A. Lingis, Trans.). Pittsburgh, Pa: Duquesne University Press. (Original work published 1974)

Loder, J. E. (1989). *The transforming moment* (2nd ed.). Colorado Springs, CO: Helmers and Howard.

Noddings, N. (1998). *Philosophy of Education.* Boulder, CO: Westview Press.

Noddings, N. (2003). *Caring: A feminine approach to ethics and moral education* (2nd. ed.). Berkeley, CA: University of California Press.

Palmer, P.J. (1999). *Let your life speak: Listening for the voice of vocation.* San Francisco: Jossey-Bass.

Palmer, P. J. (2007). *The courage to teach: Exploring the inner landscape of a teacher's life* (10th anniversary ed.). San Francisco: Jossey-Bass.

Semetsky, I. (2004). Becoming-Language/Becoming-Other: Whence ethics? *Educational Philosophy & Theory*, *36*(3), 313-325. doi: 10.1111/j.1469-5812.2004.00070.x

Todd, S. (2003*). Learning from the other: Levinas, psychoanalysis, and ethical possibilities in education*. Albany, NY: State University of New York Press.

Wesselius, J. C. (1997). Points of convergence between dooyeweerdian and feminist views of philosophic self. In J. H. Olthuis (Ed.), *Knowing other-wise: Philosophy at the threshold of spirituality* (pp. 54-68). New York: Fordham University Press.

About the Author:
Jeffrey A. Bos is a Candidate in the Doctoral Program in Leadership Studies, Gonzaga University; Lecturer, College of Christian Theology Bangladesh.
2881 Faucher Rd. Moxee, WA 98936, USA.
Email: jbos2@zagmail.gonzaga.edu

John Dewey and the No Child Left Behind Act (NCLB): What Would He Say?

VANCE HIGH
West Virginia University

ABSTRACT: Using John Dewey's writings and hypothetical thinking, this paper presents a critical review of the *No Child Left Behind Act (NCLB)* and its implication for reform. It begins with Dewey's early work and includes his greatest success at Arthurdale WV in the 1930's. The importance of constructivist thinking is juxtaposition among the reformist views of today's assessment driven policy to qualify for funding. Like Dewey, the author argues for experiential learning to make connections in real life situations presented through school opportunities. In trying to highlight transparency, closing failing schools, bringing equanimity, raising standards, and improving curriculum, the *No Child Left Behind Act (NCLB)* produced a culture of assessment without its accompanying experiential component. Learning best occurs when the experience connects with other aspects, so transfer of the knowledge becomes easily retrievable.

RESUMÉ: à l'appui des écrits et des hypothèses de John Dewey, un examen critique sur la loi *Ne laissez aucun enfant de côté (NCLB)* et son implication en faveur de la réforme, est mené. Dès le début, les travaux de Dewey sont passés en revue dont les plus connus à Arthurdale WV dans les années trente. Le point essentiel du raisonnement constructiviste est la juxtaposition au sein des opinions réformistes d'analyses guidées par la politique d'aujourd'hui afin de bénéficier de fonds. De même que Dewey, l'auteur plaide en faveur de l'instruction qui repose sur l'expérience afin d'établir les liens avec des circonstances parfois présentes à l'école. A essayer de mettre en évidence la transparence, de fermer les écoles en situation d'échec, de susciter l'impartialité, d'élever

Journal of Educational Thought
Vol. 48, No. 3, 2015, 167-187

> les normes et d'améliorer le programme, la loi *Ne laissez aucun enfant de côté (NCLB)* a élaboré une culture d'évaluation sans composante expérientielle. La compréhension se fait au mieux lorsque l'expérience est mise en rapport avec d'autres aspects ce qui permet de repérer plus facilement la connaissance transférée.

Let us assume John Dewey were alive and venerated in his later years reflecting on educational change. How would he view the events and arguments supporting the educational reform that created the *No Child Left Behind Act (NCLB)*? He believed in reforming education (Dewey & Dewey, 1915), but his thinking was antithesis for federal assessments holding U.S. school districts hostage to qualify for federal funds all for summative testing supported by *No Child Left Behind (NCLB).*

Learning how to take a test, an assessment supported by the *No Child Left Behind Act (NCLB)*, markedly contrasts to learning based on experimental teaching (Dewey & Dewey, 1915). That is experimenting in the sciences, creating through the arts, hypothesizing, and predicating. He argued *"Growing is not which is complete in odd moments; it is a continuous leading into the future"* (Dewey, 1966 p.65), so that education is a process and not a vignette of formatted knowledge. Dewey believed education becomes an unfolding of events layered in experiences supported by making the present experiences as rich and meaningful as possible (Dewey, 1938). *No Child Left Behind (NCLB)* and the updated, *Race to the Top (RTTT)* force accountability through assessments. *Dewey took another sip of his cooling coffee, "The purpose of the experiment is not to devise a method by which the teacher can teach more to the child in the same length of time or even prepare him more pleasantly for his college course. It is rather to give the child an education*

which will make him a better, happier, more efficient human being..." (Dewey & Dewey, 1915, p.58).

His coffee cold, he sighed at the newspaper's words on tiers stressing uniform graduation rates, mandated timelines, targets, disaggregating graduation rate data, extension of deadlines. This thing called Adequate Yearly Progress (AYP), and restructuring. No Child Left Behind (NCLB) fails to address learning but teaches taking a test without developing process skills. *No Child Left Behind (NCLB)* is a program of regressive policies dedicated to issues of socioeconomic realities without addressing the cause, a disproportion of resources between student populations. Dewey thought scaffolding would build on a skill set supplementing processes, leading to a foundation winnowing knowledge.

He knew the curriculum he selected produced active learning. Students experiment, vote, participate in orchestra, recite lines from Shakespeare, and do trigonometry. Observation, recollection, and aesthetic taste are deemed essential to learning (Dewey, 1916). Participants actively pursue courses of instruction facilitated by educators. *No Child Left Behind (NCLB)* does none of this.

No Child Left Behind (NCLB) increased federal spending on education in an attempt to increase "proficiency" on state wide exams. Dewey believed in causality: "Observation is an outcome, a consequence of the interaction of sense organ, and subject matter" (Dewey, 1966 p.77). When students march through the episodes of life, the experiences unfold and become reconstructed similar to an accordion. It is a reconstruction and reorganization of the many experiences which create meaning (Dewey, 1938).

By understanding this process, the learner grasps the true meaning of causality. He wanted educators to build

communities. Isolation occurs with *No Child Left Behind (NCLB)* and *Race to the Top (RTTT)* by reducing the recognition of shared common interests (Dewey, 1938). *He remembers typing "learners are not one size fits all, but rather experience is an active transaction that coordinates doing and undergoing" (Dewey, 1938).* This realization of social aspect to education demonstrates the mutual interpretation leading to a democratic society. *No Child Left Behind* and *Race to the Top* dictate processes for obtaining a score for ranking student success on that specific assessment. There is no ranking for values, imagination, and creativity.

The playground was the place to get fresh air, learn team rules, play by the accepted etiquette, chase butterflies, and organize your thoughts (Dewey and Dewey, 1915). The playground provided exercise time at recess. *Play consists typically in an area devoid of trees and covered in sawdust and his sigh took the tenor of a long drawn out billows at one of Carnegie's steel mills. This was so unlike his boyhood in the Vermont woods and paddling a canoe.* Dewey believed education involved the trying out of ideas. Recess was a process, a laboratory of activities. Children played and learned limitations, experimented on the monkey bars, chose teams, and skipped rope.

No Child Left Behind (NCLB) separates and distills the student population so that a proficient *Adequate Yearly Progress (AYP)* is achieved. It allegedly provides instruction which accommodates all students. The special needs population has to receive services and also satisfactory *Adequate Yearly Progress* scores for advancement (and continued federal funds). *Nothing is cited with regard to improved participation in democracy for Adequate Yearly Progress (AYP) for those students.*

Dewey's educational beliefs in *Democracy and Education* present a methodology counter to the logic posited by the approach of intervention strategies of *No Child Left Behind (NCLB).* He suggests the 'essentials' of method, to include fostering of good habits in thinking while at school. "But apart from the fact that the acknowledgement is not so great as in practice as in theory, there is not adequate theoretical recognition that all which the school can or need do for pupils, so far as their *minds* are concerned (that is, leaving out certain specialized muscular abilities), is to develop their ability to think"(Dewey, 1916, p. 153). He adds, "The parceling out of instruction among various ends such as acquisition of skill (in reading, spelling, writing, drawing, reciting); acquiring information (in history and geography), and training of thinking is a measure of the *ineffective* way in which we accomplish all three" (Dewey, 1916, p. 152).

The single path to improvement in educational instruction consists on centering upon specific conditions making the course as exact as possible. This path makes it a method of intelligent learning and not reciprocal flipping of words and numbers. There is a method to thinking, a method of intelligent experience in the context of the events. Thinking can be cultivated and honed in isolation so that it can be retrieved for application and use.

In an ideal learning environment, actual materials, appliances, and opportunities for doing things should be provided, so the student manipulates tools in the setting and becomes engaged. Even with indifferent modes of instruction, children's inquires become spontaneous with proposals often varied and insightful (Dewey, 1916). From the offering of a manipulative (e.g. making a bird feeder), a child gets drawn into a world of his invention learning from the interaction with nature, events, and others. They become a player on the stage and not a

member of the audience. This is how one learns to deal with difficulty and the unexpected.

He believed in providing an obstacle to facilitate learning: "A difficulty is an indispensable stimulus to thinking, but not all call out thinking" (Dewey, 1966 p.184). Some create perplexing discouragement. Then the path of instruction is one where encouragement and small incremental successes lead to modeling of productive challenges and beneficial thinking. These challenges stem from artful introduction of well enacted pedagogy.

There is a correlation of facts, data, thoughts, learning, and knowledge already acquired and assessable to manipulate as inferences, playful 'chess pieces' for creating. These actions define and locate the question. They stimulate an arousal of associations to induce a new way or interpretation. This inventiveness shows a new light that is different than before. The originality lay in the use of what was learned and already observed. *No Child Left Behind* allows for neither preparing a table of questions nor prefacing it for understanding. Many of the facts were known when Isaac Newton thought of the theory of gravitation but the creative insight was his and not the recitation of the known. This might occur when a child learns that by entwining one length of string over another and putting a loop in it will create a knot to tie and untie his shoe lace. Or later when he puts five pennies with another five pennies, he has a dime.

Shaking his head he grudgingly admitted, No Child Left Behind attempts to bring the horse to the water to drink; nonetheless, the effort is one using a shotgun to hunt for a butterfly. Most probably, dulling the connections, nature embellished for exploration in a child's life. A child is only young for a short time and curious for a shorter time and educators should provide

every opportunity to make connections possible through perceptible conditions, especially play. Children experience joy of intellectual constructiveness, creativeness, when the learning experiences connect. The winnowing of ability occurs soon enough without the dictates of a contrived grouping.

Ideas or "humble guesses" can lead to theorizing by students of all ages. Through the connections created by mind play and drawing out of ideas, concepts become firmed, organized for acting upon and experimentation. They become a "guide and organize further observations, recollections, and experiments" (Dewey, 1916 p.189). Play and games become opportunities for reproducing situations in life for progressive mental and physical growth. This was foreseen when Dewey insightfully addressed a perspective in his writing:

> But this state of affairs does not afford instructors an excuse for folding their hands and persisting in methods which segregate school knowledge. Every recitation in every subject gives an opportunity for establishing cross connection between matter of the lesson and wider and more direct experiences of life (Dewey, 1916 p. 191).

He thought the *least* desirable of educational pedagogy treats instruction without attempting to find the points of connectivity, such as *No Child Left Behind* and *Race to the Top* derived teaching emphasize. Though teachers are models and resources for others, their knowledge places them in a position of misuse with *No Child Left Behind* requirements. Much of their time becomes obligated to training for a test and precludes building steps and connectivity between ideas. The

students fail to grasp putting the connectivity with an idea in a multiple choice formatted test for *Adequate Yearly Progress (AYP)* reporting. Without exercise and play, the situation is plaintively worse. This results in using school time for drill on test taking.

He believed the measure of the value of experience was in the perception of the relationships or continuities leading up to the founding of the learning (Dewey, 1916). This includes free play for the student mind to have a break from sitting. Present, neuroscience research has shown that physical activity enhances learning (Sejnowski, 1999). *He wrote in Democracy and Education about the importance of fostering good school habits of thinking.* Dewey addressed the knowledge of this habit by limitation of creating the ability in reality. This is done through the effort or attempted development of the ability, in the parceling out of the instruction, thereby producing a measured acquisition of learning. The world becomes a kaleidoscope of experiences connected with senses of purpose and usage. Through the problems initiated the *No Child Left Behind Act*, the responses for compliance have addressed little more than taking a test in reading to assuage passage of *Adequate Yearly Progress* to qualify for federal dollars. Then learning is sidetracked with the promotion of scores and not experience. In this kind of atmosphere, there is no fostering of being a good person or developing a community of shared ideas and values, nor development of experiential foundations. There is development of problem solving and collective sense of purpose.

He could see his breadth in late afternoon chill, dang this No Child Left Behind attempts to address education by assessment spurred by Adequate Yearly Progress (AYP), nothing in the No Child Left Behind 'protocol' fosters the thinking of students. Thinking requires

practice situations and examination of case studies to develop their ability to think. The primary method of instruction is a path for improvement in methods for teaching. This becomes an enduring legacy seen in years of transference from generation to generation. The reality is the student has to have something done to him and then do something in response.

The "material of thinking" is not mere thoughts but active participation tying facts and events together in a relative manner (Dewey, 1916). This involves actual material so the engagement of opportunities for connecting ideas is provided. Learning progresses when these opportunities present themselves to students. The students experience joy as the increments augment constructiveness of information. This is creativeness. Every recitation and educational activity provides an opportunity for establishing cross connections between a lesson's material and experience of everyday life, but there needs to be scheduled time to harbor these connections. Students miss genuine experience of a situational response and activity. There needs to be a link made to thought. In different areas of science, linking ideas has lead to inquiry and discovery. Louis Pasteur said: "Chance favors the prepared mind." Developing a train of thinking begins with associating observations with thinking. This is how suggested solutions occur while following the continuity or flow of linking thought and action. The validity of the observation comes when there is an opportunity for testing the application. Preparation begins long before the opportunity presents itself and conclusions leading to discoveries are made (Dewey, 1916).

Learning about cause and effect exemplifies the pragmatic nature of learning. Dewey realized, "Method is not antithetical to subject matter; it is the direction of

subject matter to desired results" (Dewey, 1966 p.172). He believed in a criterion of development of a good society which espoused the preceding arguments that grew from practical applications as has been mentioned in the aforementioned. Learning is a constant process of constructing and reconstructing methods ushered by thinking facilitated by a teacher. This learning occurs with a framework of a moral reality set in beliefs. Keeping in mind a wheel with spokes, there should be relationship of practical, useful, and developmental stages to learning with the hub being the school. The *No Child Left Behind Act (NCLB)* exists to satisfy federal funding requirements and has no hub for the analogous school.

Trying to ameliorate critical voices should be done by each state and not in a catch all context through a mandate. *Dewey cringed at change. Don't the present day reformists read my work?* "Frontal attacks are even more wasteful in learning than in war" (Dewey, 1966 p.199). The reasoning for a lesson needs to be thoroughly known and not just a recapitulation of facts. If instructors were to comprehend the need for quality of mental effort, not the production of correct answers, then the measure of educational growth would be profound and short of a revolution (Dewey, 1916). The need of contextual understanding cannot be left understated. Learning occurs within a context of connections which supply content to existing social life. This is one process where lessons may be transmitted to the next generation, and learning ensured a legacy.

He believed in a continuous professional spirit in teaching. This includes the standards and licensure that are prevalent today among the certifying agencies in all the fifty states. He encouraged continuous learning, studying of methods, upgrading pedagogy, and camaraderie. This *esprit de corps* made the calling or

nature of the work a desirable, even vital concern (Dewey, 1913). The National Teacher Advisory Council (TAC) supposedly provides training for implementation of *No Child Left Behind* requirements to teachers. This includes technical issues, standards, accountability, and training. No where is mentioned the professional standards or incorporation of camaraderie of the profession. It becomes an edict without input from the ones doing the teaching. The young were due protection and proper nurture in Dewey's belief of teacher's responsibility. He believed in continuous study of the questions leading to good teaching through leadership provided by educators formatting public opinion. The *No Child Left Behind Act* prohibits the teacher with implementing policy. Teachers have not been as active as counterparts (in Washington D.C.) trying to raise standards through sweeping federal statutes.

This lack of participation of input for direct change is not unique or new. He addressed his concern for the lack of esprit de corps and attributed the major advances in educational policy to philanthropists, charity workers, and social settlements. Yet, the methods of discipline in the classroom and graduation rates seem to be easily attributed to teaching performance even though the profession has to teach to a test instead of actual experience making. The chief motive for a unified professional spirit in teaching continues to be absent today as it was in Dewey's time. *No Child Left Behind* has augmented the lack of teaching spirit and arguably made it worse through the lack of leadership. *No Child Left Behind* invites a mechanical response to providing assessments. Dewey thought much more of the profession of teaching. He viewed it as an intellectual enterprise and not a routine mechanical activity (Dewey, 1913). *No Child Left Behind* retards and discourages building of *esprit d corps* because of the

corralling methodology to address assessment planning and implementation. The teacher is not in the school to impose regimen, establish habits, but to become a member of the community to select specific influences "which shall affect the child and to assist him in properly responding to these influences" (Dewey, 1897 p.7). Teachers should model moral training implicit with teaching how to get along with others in work and thought. Many of these influences came about in relation to the child's own social life. Dewey believed literature to be a reflex expression and interpreted it as a social experience. This relation created by literature with its need to read is important but the interpretation of what is read should radiate the reflection of the experience.

The responsibility of carrying out the instruction must be born by all those concentrated with distributing it. This means every human being "with their brains and their hearts, by hundreds or thousands of people in a dozen or so at the top, no matter how wise and skillful they are, is not to concentrate responsibility—it is to diffuse irresponsibility" (Dewey, 1913 p. 112). NCLB has not given more control to the aforementioned people, but instead, it limited the control and forbearance to create and accept responsibility, for issues like diversity, large classroom populations, and consolidation. The federal government cannot proclaim top down solutions to local problems best resolved through a democratic society tackling these issues distributed to responsible citizen input. According to Dewey, the teacher's business was simply to ascertain the discipline of life that should come to the child wholly based on the larger experience and wisdom of those involved. *Contemplating assessments, he thought grades and promotion should be based on the same standard* (Dewey, 1897). And he considered tests to be of use only as they examine the child's fitness for

social life and foreshadow the place he can best serve and receive assistance.

One must review past successes using Dewey's life to reflect on the advances that have been given little recognition in the present era. In an experiment during the Depression-era America, a small school system became an experiment for the community of Arthurdale, WV. This 1930's area suffered severe economic and educational deprivation. The Arthurdale experiment fostered a principle of giving several hundred disadvantaged families an education designed around the community and individual transformation. It promoted learning around the needs and wishes of the poor. Dewey helped design the curriculum and selection of educators who taught in the school system. He believed these schools to be of special value and is quoted as saying Arthurdale possessed "extraordinary significance to education" (Clapp, 1952 p.vii). These schools became noted to a degree where they attracted a hundred plus visitors weekly to observe the success and transformation of the community residents and its student population.

Then, as presently exists, finances dictated the delivery of resources, and Arthurdale succumbed to those forces. Now, more than a half century later, funding again dictates how the federal government supports education with *No Child Left Behind* being the yardstick. It seems clichéd to think what goes around comes around, but education issues seem to be reinvented more than they are overcome. When community members and schools worked together through democracy and fostering group solutions, Arthurdale flourished leaving a legacy for those people and their children. Dewey's philosophy showed that it could be successful even in economic times where a dollar was harder to obtain than most of present state educational budgets. Given the present disgruntlement

with *No Child Left Behind*, the input for democratic alteration remains to be seen. Present educational values do not have the same significance as it did to the families of students freezing in winters at Arthurdale in the 1930's. These families valued their schoolhouse coupled with building their Jeffersonian civilization. Education is mainly a social process, so the community becomes a vital channel for its successes and failures (Dewey, 1938). By making the school the focus of the community a myriad of other issues were also confronted at Arthurdale. Educators addressed medical needs, social activities, and leisure pursuits through the schools. Henceforth, mutual trust from community building provided the residents with insurance for success of the schools. This followed Dewey philosophy for building a society through community development. He thought that students should work in wood, metal, weaving, sewing, cooking and in general ways of learning. These subjects were not thought of as separate and distinct entities because they incorporate use of hands and cooperation.

A society becomes a team when the group holds a common goal, a common spirit, and mutual aims. These common aims require developing an interchange of thought and sympathetic feelings. There is a uniform empathy which develops and shared among the group (Dewey, 1902). Many of the issues which prompted the passing of *No Child Left Behind* were evident in earlier times such as discipline problems, overcrowding, and teacher development. He believed a major reason that a school cannot organize as a natural social unit is due to the absence of common activity. Dewey witnessed this occurring on the playground in game and sport, and considered it predictable when children played (Dewey, 1902). "How children play reflects the life going on around them" (Clapp, 1952 p.191). The architect of the

Arthurdale schools designed the plans so there were gardens, nearby woods, and plenty of playground space. "There was always a ballgame going on" (Whipkey, 2009). Children had roads to walk on and sled when it snowed. The layout of the homes lent convenience of social activity and conversation at all levels.

The educators at Arthurdale believed they had to share in the trials and problems in order to succeed with the students. Teachers visited the homes of students and mentored work in these settings. They fostered work habits, building skills, and active participation in education. The educators guided and integrated activities whereby intellectual framework could develop culture stemming from the interests found at the school. In addition to sporting events, there were plays, quilting and sewing demonstrations, canning classes, and concerts. Community field trips helped the children gain insights to their environment and interactions of people. They became an integrated part of events, business transactions, and day-to-day life at Arthurdale. This reflected Dewey's belief in hands on activities in the educational process.

For Dewey, the student should exercise his thoughts, not the rudimentary drill of *No Child Left Behind* review. The goal was to learn and apply later. Education "is a progress of living and not a preparation for future living" (Dewey, 1897 p.63). The school is a facsimile of real life and provides opportunities for development in a Dewey mindset of simplifying the world for children to experience and to grow into (Kilpatrick, 1971). Schools are now in a debate of self process cultivated in creative self activity. *No Child Left Behind* has furthered this thinking disregarding hands on inquiry methodology. *He knew learning was something that went beyond the classroom, and he promoted physical activity*: "Upon the playground, in game and sport, social organization takes

place spontaneously and inevitably" (Dewey, 1903 p.10). Dewey frowned at the current practice of allotting time to be used for rudimentary skill building, like reading and memorizing multiplication tables. Both skills can be practiced at home or places conducive to such activity. *He accepted time for experimenting and for teachers to try new ideas and methods obviously with a goal to promote democracy*. There is a disdain in not promoting liberty of thought leading to learning. This is unapparent in the present context of teaching to a test, especially how to score well on *Adequate Yearly Progress* assessments.

The subject needs to be translated into a format for immediate and specific transference. That means it should be individualized. This is like play and its reinforcing experience. *He was a pragmatist and realized that preparing the child needed doing in a way which ideas became linked, connected, in order for the tools developed and application occurred as he or she might encounter situations*. "It is impossible to foretell definitely just what civilization will be like in twenty years from now. Hence it is impossible to prepare the child for any precise set of conditions" (Dewey, 1897). A student needs to train the eye and ear and hand as tools to take command when judged to exercise action directed by judgment. This can be thought of as a bonding to other human beings and certainly was in evidence at Arthurdale and their schools. Education should begin with insight into a child's capacitates and directing it towards assessment for ranking, goes against the habits of social development. *He recalled writing, "I believe school, as an institution, should simply social life: should reduce it, as it were, to an embryonic form*" (Dewey, 1897 p.9).

In summary, the human race marked decisions with alacrity and little thought to the future. *Learning is not a neat affair as he typed*: "The history of man shows,

however, that man takes his enjoyment neat, and at as short range as possible" (Dewey, 1934 p. 69). The justification of the *No Child Left Behind Act* was a short sighted remedy for educational reform. In trying to highlight transparency, closing failing schools, bringing equinity, raising standards, and improving curriculum, *No Child Left Behind* produced a culture of assessment without its accompanying experiential component. Learning best occurs when the experience connects with other aspects so transfer of the knowledge becomes easily retrievable. Memorization based assessments for merely obtaining a 'score' for a ranking "dulls the ability to use knowledge" (Dewey, 1910 p. 144). The nature of the experience is what indelibly connects the learning narrative. The ideas support community building and being a good person. Dewey most probably would have admonished the implementation of curriculum using assessment criteria developed through a program like *No Child Left Behind.* The *No Child Left Behind Act* creates programs that deal with passing *Adequate Yearly Progress (AYP)* goals.

Adequate Yearly Progress supposedly identifies troubled schools, but not whether learning occurs. States use *Adequate Yearly Progress* assessments to qualify for continued Title I funding at the expense of identifying learning objectives; and, their contribution on building a community is questionable. *He sought to build good citizenship through participation in school curriculum and activities leading to accepting responsibility, empathy, and mentoring collective community behavior. No Child Left Behind lacks the rationale and scope for connecting experience as he bites his lip.* "But the basic material for study cannot be picked up in a cursory manner" (Dewey, 1938 p.52). This is the approach of the *No Child Left Behind* Act has impressed upon public opinion and made

it into policy. Educational policy needs a thorough understanding of pedagogy in order for practical and successful implementation to work. While being a pragmatist, Dewey realized that curriculum needed to be founded in accepted values held by the community. This was the way that it had the best chance of success.

He believed in progressive education and saw his contribution at Arthurdale as testament to what schools could be by the nature of the success witnessed in that community. "Dewey believed that Arthurdale possessed what was in many respects the best public schools in the United States" (Dewey, 1936 p. 236). To him, Arthurdale schools were proof of what democracy could produce in America. The experiment vindicated his belief in the educative process through sharing, cooperation, and engagement of students and teachers meeting as equals and learners. *He reached the end his walk, and the surroundings of the brownstones close to Columbia. It had been a long day and more were sure to come. It is all in my writings. Experience is the best educator, not an assessment used to play catch up. No Child Left Behind is a politician's 'do over' he mused and sat down at the dinner table.*

At Arthurdale, the teachers' needed independent action to provide direction for the impoverished community. In the end they succeeded during a time of great deprivation and national crisis. This augmented the philosophy of Dewey regarding the teaching profession. He thought that teachers should have the "the ability to think independently and critically, together with command of the tools and processes that give access to the accumulated products of past cultures" (Dewey, 1930 p. 236). *He realized that decisions would need to be made in a continuous fashion by the nature of the vast change he had witnessed in his life. The social side of teaching*

would include personal development so there would be desire and will to share democratic thought which has been unevenly obtained as historical events dictated the education rank and file. When a vacuum exists, it soon is filled with quick fixes such as NCLB. Schools need to decide what the nature of their social function is and "general versus specific objectives, or whether they have a responsibility for social planning" (Dewey, 1930 p.326). Dewey wanted people to question life, knowing this would spiral down into a course of action. He questioned the act of public education: "Is it the duty of the schools to give indoctrination in economic and political, including nationalistic principles that are current in contemporary society" (Dewey, 1930 p.328). One would have to weave this question into the present controversy of *No Child Left Behind*, and its questionable success. "What tests and what method of their administration would tend to greater release of creative work on the part of teachers" (Dewey, 1930 p. 328). The transfer of thinking habits becomes restricted and subsumed when teaching is dictated by teaching based on assessment like *No Child Left Behind* does. This he acknowledged "...that much of the present adverse reaction of the public to free consideration of social questions is due to the failure of the teaching profession to claim actively and in a organized way its own autonomy" (Dewey, 1930 p. 248). It now needs to claim the notoriety the profession deserves. The alternative is one where soon teachers will be providing lessons and insights at drive in windows as noted by Dewey how humans like its "enjoyment neat, and at short range as possible" (Dewey, 1938 p. 69).

REFERENCES

Clapp, E. (1934 February 12). *Use of Resources*, p.8; Wager, "School Building," pp. 304-319; *Dominion News*, p.2.

Clapp, R. (1939). Community Schools. New York: Viking.

Dewey, J. (1897). *My Pedagogic Creed.* The School Journal. pp.86-87.

Dewey, J. (1902). *School and Society.* London: The University of Chicago Press.

Dewey, J. (1910). *How We Think.* New York, NY: Houghton Mifflin Co., pp. 52-53.

Dewey, J. & Dewey, E. *Schools of Tomorrow.* (1915). New York, NY: E.P Dutton Co.

Dewey, J. (1929). *Experience and Nature* (2nd ed). Chicago and London: Open Court Pub.

Dewey, J. *Democracy and Education.* (1966). New York and London: The Free Press Paperback, Macmillan Co.

Dewey, J. (1930). *The Duties of Responsibilities of the Teaching Profession*, School and Society 32 (9 August): 188-91.

Dewey, J. Letter to J.A. Rice, 16 Apr. 1936, General File, Box 7, 1933-1936, Black Mountain College Papers, Special Collections, Morris Library, Southern Illinois University, Carbondale Ill.

Dewey, J. (1938). *Experience and Education*, New York, NY: Touchtone Pub.

Dewey, J. (1913). *Professional Spirit among Teachers.* Address to NYC teachers group.

Dewey, J. (1938) *Education and Experience.* First Touchstone (ed.) 1997. New York, NY: Simon & Schuster.

Dewey, J. (1939). "Foreword," in Elsie Ripley Clapp, *Community Schools in Action*. Viking: New York, NY.) vii.

Dewey, J. *The Duties and Responsibilities of the Teaching Profession*. School and Society 32 (9 August 1930)

Kilpatrick, W. (1971). Teachers College, Columbia University,

Semel, S. & Sadovnik A. *History of Schools and Schooling-Schools of Tomorrow Schools of Today*. (8) 226-227 New York, NY: Peter Lang.

Sejnowski, T. (1999). *American Academy of Science Proceedings*. Howard Hughes Medical Institute.

About the Author:
Vance High Ed.D.
West Virginia University
PO Box 6122
Morgantown, WV 26505-6122
vancehigh@gmail.com

Doctoral Student Attrition: A Problem for Higher Education

Gail D. Caruth
Texas A&M University-Commerce

ABSTRACT: The attrition of doctoral students is a significant problem for higher education. The purpose of this archival quantitative, data mining research study using data from Integrated Postsecondary Education Data System (IPEDS) of the National Center for Education Statistics (NCES) was to identify the demographics of doctoral graduates during the 2011-2012, 2012-2013, and 2013-2014 academic years at public, private, and for-profit universities in the United States. This study is significant because universities need to know what the demographics of potential doctoral graduates are before they can begin to work effectively on improving the attrition rates of aspiring doctorates. Findings revealed that here has been an increase in doctoral degrees awarded. While most of the degrees were awarded at public universities, students between the ages of 18-24 tended to earn doctoral degrees at private, nonprofit universities at a higher rate. Also, female doctoral degrees awarded during the 2013-2014 academic years increased to 52% of the total degrees awarded. For-profit universities increased doctoral degrees awarded at a higher percentage than public and private universities (9%-18% at for-profit universities, 3% at public universities, and 0% increase at private universities).

Keywords: Doctoral students, doctoral process, doctoral degree, and doctorate

RESUMÉ: le taux d'abandon des doctorants préoccupe sérieusement l'enseignement supérieur. Le but de cette étude quantitative à archiver (étude d'exploration des données qui utilise des données du Système de données de l'enseignement supérieur intégré (IPEDS) du Centre

américain des données statistiques en éducation (NCES)), devait dégager les données démographiques des titulaires d'un doctorat obtenu dans les années universitaires 2011-2012, 2012-2013 et 2013-2014 d'universités d'Etat, d'universités privées et d'universités à but lucratif aux Etats-Unis. Cette étude représente un intérêt majeur pour les universités car elles ont besoin d'avoir les données démographiques des titulaires de doctorats avant qu'elles ne puissent commencer à travailler efficacement sur l'amélioration des taux d'abandon chez les doctorants. En fait, il y a eu une augmentation de réussite d'obtention de doctorats. Alors qu'en général les diplômes sont décernés par les universités publiques, les étudiants âgés de 18 à 24 ans qui ont eu tendance à décrocher leur doctorat dans les instituts privés et les universités à but non-lucratif, ont représentés un taux plus important. Dans l'année universitaire 2013-2014, la proportion des femmes qui ont obtenu leur doctorat, a augmenté de 52% par rapport à l'ensemble des diplômes décernés. Le nombre de doctorats décernés par les universités à but lucratif représente un taux plus élevé que celui des universités publiques et privées (9% à 18% dans les universités à but lucratif, 3% dans les universités publiques et 0% d'augmentation dans les universités privées).

Mots clefs : doctorants, processus doctoral, diplôme de docteur et doctorat

The academy is facing a crisis. The attrition of doctoral students is becoming a noteworthy challenge for higher education. It is estimated that almost 50% of the students who register in doctoral programs leave the program before earning the degree (Burkard, 2014; Cakmak, Isci, Uslu, Oztekin, Danisman, & Karadag, 2015; King and Williams, 2014). This deficiency of earned doctorates creates damaging consequences for institutions, as well as students. Some of the damaging consequences include student disappointments, concern about the future

of various disciplines, apprehension about the prospect of a range of professions, and financial burdens for institutions of higher learning. The attrition of doctoral students, for example, results in the waste of university human and financial resources due to unrecoverable time invested on students who never matriculate (Kong, Chakraverty, Jeffe, Andriole, & Wathington, 2013; Willis & Carmichael, 2011). Student attrition rates could be the result of unpleasant experiences faced during the doctoral process rather than merely an obstacle at the stage in which the attrition transpires. These unpleasant student experiences could inturn produce unpleasant institutional consequences, as maintained by Willis and Carmichael.

Earning a doctoral degree is how students learn to conduct research, prepare a dissertation, and contribute to the body of knowledge (Callary, Werthner, & Trudel, 2012). Developing the ability to conduct research and establish a record of scholarship that adds to the body of knowledge is vital during the doctoral process (Mello, Fleisher, & Woehr, 2015). There has been a number of research studies conducted on the experiences of aspiring doctorates during this process. While this journey is challenging, there are distinctions between the (a) various academic requirements, (b) encouragement received from classmates, and (c) socialization of the students. Some of the more acknowledged challenges include: loneliness, responsibilities (family and work), limitations (time and financial), self-esteem, and advisor-advisee relationships. These challenges vary from student to student, as claimed by Callary et al.

Kong et al. (2013) posited that socialization might be the reason why doctoral students are not earning their degrees. Socialization is the process by which one learns the social skills and behaviors needed to adjust to a new environment. It includes the learning of new competences,

protocols, convictions, and individual identities required of doctoral students in order to become integrated into the doctoral program. In other words, socialization refers to the myriad of experiences from being accepted into the program to when students finally earn the official designation of doctor. Hence, the level of socialization acquired relates directly to the desire to remain in or depart from the academic program. Kong et al. (2013) found that "family interaction" (p. 82), academic guidance, classmate collaboration, and department and university interactions all influence the decision of whether to continue in the program or to depart.

Registering for doctoral study requires doctoral students to rethink their academic potential, understand faculty assessments of students, identify with their discipline's environment, and manage their own standing as an academic and expert in their chosen field of study. It is essential that doctoral students accept their faculty advisor as a guide who moves them through the doctoral process. This acceptance entails the consideration of faculty and advisors as mentors. Accordingly, any effort on the part of doctoral students to negotiate conflicts between stakeholders (students, faculty, administrators, and peers) regarding the control of their doctorate is one-sided due to the lack of student empowerment. Conflicts between faculty, departmental staff, and advisors have been recognized as principal reasons why students have left doctoral programs and the academic field altogether. Consequently, balancing these relationships has been an ongoing concern. The identification of effective sources of encouragement from all stakeholders is vital for the retention and matriculation of doctoral students, as maintained by Russell (2015).

Hopwood and Paulson (2012) explored doctoral experiences and claimed that doctoral students experience

the doctoral process according to various bodily characteristics. Consequently, each characteristic provides a unique perspective on the experience, which in turn provides opportunities to study the doctoral experiences according to these characteristics. Students think of their gender, for example, as bodily, noticeable, and structured according to ethnic customs, standards, and prejudices. Student characteristics frequently suggest "otherness" (p. 671) based on ethnicity and race.

The purpose of this paper was to identify the demographics of doctoral graduates during the 2011-2012, 2012-2013, and 2013-2014 academic years at public, private, and for-profit universities in the United States. This study is significant because the attrition of doctoral students is becoming an obstacle for higher education. A deficiency of earned doctorates generates damaging consequences for the academy. Identifying who these doctorates are is vital to the future of institutions of higher learning and industry. Universities need to know what the demographics of potential doctoral graduates are before they can begin to work effectively on improving the attrition rates of aspiring doctorates.

A review of the literature presents a compilation of research, peer-reviewed journals, non-peer reviewed journals, books, and online sources on doctoral students. The academic databases used were from the online library of Texas A&M University-Commerce and included, but were not limited to, Academic Search Premier, EBSCO, Education Research Complete, Eric, ProQuest, and Sage Publications. The key descriptive terms used for this research were doctoral students, doctoral process, doctoral degree, and doctorate.

Review of the Literature

For nearly 30 years the socialization practice has been a means for studying doctoral experiences. Many are in agreement that the socialization experience has many sides and is complicated. There have been numerous aspects of socialization and factors that have been shown to impact significantly student socialization and final attainment of the doctorate. Russell (2015) alleged that faculty are thought to be vital to the socialization of doctoral students and are the "primary socialization agents" (p. 148) as they directly influence the learning experiences and training and development opportunities of these students.

Advisor-Advisee Relationships

Research has indicated that a number of doctoral student advisor-advisee relationships were not effective (Barnes, Williams, & Stassen, 2012; Willis & Carmichael, 2011). However Barnes et al. revealed that almost 66% of doctoral students across disciplines were very satisfied with their advisors. This finding was significant given the importance of the relationships in consideration of the influence advisors had over their advisees.

While doctoral students have similar experiences during their academic training, a great number of these experiences are unique to the various academic departments or disciplines. It is plausible, for example, that positive advisor-advisee experiences in one discipline might not be positive in another discipline. Barnes et al. (2012) alleged that advisor-advisee relationships tend to be more successful when students have the opportunity to select their major advisor rather than being assigned an advisor. Nevertheless, doctoral students are generally assigned an advisor after a professor has consented to

undertake the role of guiding the student through the doctoral process (Pauline, Olson, & Gul, 2014).

Progressing through the doctoral process can be taxing for any doctoral student. Koltz, Odegard, Provost, Smith, & Kleist (2010) suggested that assisting doctoral students with the creation of an action plan to complete the comprehensive examination phase effectively might be a valuable activity to facilitate the process. Advisors might also consider designing a "mentoring action plan" (p. 408) as an activity to work together with their doctoral advisees.

Koltz et al. (2010) further suggested that this mentoring action plan should be an activity of collaboration that incorporates comparing experiences of comprehensive examinations, assessing comprehensive examinations, and designing the mentoring action plans jointly. According to Koltz et al., self-doubt tends to recur throughout the comprehensive examination phase. As a result, it is important for advisors to locate a suitable place for doctoral students to be able to communicate uncertainties to their advisors. By collaborating together on these examination experiences advisors are presenting a sense of normality to their advisees which encourages confidence.

Barnes et al. (2012) cautioned that a number of doctoral students eventually become university professors. It is through the doctoral process that doctoral students are trained for the professorate (Barnes et al., 2012; Callary et al., 2012). Consequently, how doctoral students are institutionalized, taught, advised, and managed will impact the future of the academy. It is the academic department that is the principal institutional representative and the advisor is the primary intermediary between the student and the academic department. The advisor, as a result, plays a major role in institutionalizing doctoral students.

Advisors, as "gatekeepers" (Barnes et al., 2012, p. 310) to the professorate, are ultimately the wardens of the academy as they train the future academicians. Advisors train their advisees by performing specific functions such as being (a) a resource for knowledge, (b) an academic department mentor, (c) a sponsor, (d) an exemplar, and (e) a resource to facilitate integration into the institution.

Stubb, Pyhältö, and Lonka, (2014) claimed that doctoral students' perceptions of conducting research operate as a context for choices and behaviors during the doctoral process. Additionally, perceptions of doctoral students on conducting research establish a foundation for achieving academic proficiency. By being aware of doctoral students' perceptions of conducting research, advisors can empathize with students more effectively. However, one student's perception of conducting research does not take precedence over another student's perception. Students are advised to familiarize themselves according to the various types of research, as suggest by Stubb et al. This familiarity with the various types of research available should advance cooperative skills for conducting research in different settings. These skills would ultimately increase the value of these doctoral students in research communities, as well as their ability to add to the body of knowledge.

Supervisory Relationships

The supervision of doctoral students differs between doctoral programs. While the most common relationship is the one supervisor to one student relationship, Pauline et al. (2014) recommended the "co-supervision" (p. 2) relationship. Co-supervision is defined as two members of the faculty mutually consenting to undertake the role of guiding a student through the doctoral process. Initially the doctoral student and the two faculty members are

encouraged to discuss the triad relationship, what each member of the triad brings to the relationship, and how the triad arrangement can complement the doctoral experience for the student.

The most effective co-supervisory relationships occur when the two academicians have collaborated previously by team-teaching, researching, and publishing; agreed on a student-centered emphasis; and regarded learning as the principal objective of the doctoral process. Both members of the faculty should take pleasure in being a member of the team by adapting, cooperating, trying new ideas, and sharing academic endeavors in an attitude of mutuality and reciprocity. According to Pauline et al. (2014), the potential benefits of this type of relationship outweigh any challenges during the doctoral process. Whereas issues during the doctoral process generally include challenges with the single advisor-advisee relationship, a co-supervisory relationship helps to thwart many of these potential issues.

According to Lahenius and Ikävalko (2014), those in supervisory positions for the education of doctoral students are encouraged to rethink the supervision and guidance of doctoral students during the doctoral process. The potential for co-supervision is becoming more and more essential for guaranteeing the excellence of the doctoral education. In addition, the intricacies of supervision make the prospect of co-supervision more crucial for ensuring a quality education. Lahenius and Ikävalko suggested three types of co-supervision: "complementary" (p. 443), "substitutive" (p. 443), and "diversified" (p. 443). These three types of co-supervision vary according to the supervisory support students receive while in their doctoral programs. Complementary and diversified supervision are similar to the committee type

of supervision while substitutive supervision is similar to co-supervision.

Lahenius and Ikävalko (2014) claimed that those who are supervisors in academic departments and members of the faculty should offer supervision arrangements that encourage and endorse co-supervision. The use of co-supervision relationships should also encourage doctoral students to search for supervision assistance from multiple sources. Lahenius and Ikävalko also claimed that lenient doctoral systems require too much responsibility from the doctoral students. More structured and official supervision guidelines for doctoral students are therefore needed from those who are supervisors in academic departments and members of the faculty. Consideration for the use of supervision contracts can help establish the responsibilities of students from the supervisors' responsibilities. Guidelines for handling conflicts would also be beneficial to include in the contracts, as maintained by Lahenius and Ikävalko.

Providing feedback to students is vital for learning. This feedback acknowledges what was done well, points out what was not done as well, and provides constructive comments and advice for future efforts. In doctoral research, constructive comments and advice from supervisors is an important function in helping doctoral students develop the skills necessary for academic research. Doctoral students gain insight from doctoral supervisors during these discussions. It is through the constructive comments and advice provided from supervisors that guide students through the rite of passage of academic research toward the ultimate distinction of researcher and academic scholar (Wang & Li, 2011).

Doctoral students tend to suffer from disturbing reactions to constructive comments and advice regarding research efforts. Doctoral supervisors are therefore

encouraged to be sensitive to these reactions, acknowledge these reactions, and be prepared to respond effectively to these reactions. Responding to and acknowledging these reactions with sensitivity validate the students. Responding to and acknowledging these reactions also facilitate the development of these students into researchers, scholars, and published authors. Transparent and honest communications are fundamental for guiding doctoral students who are aspiring toward research and scholarship distinction. In addition, doctoral supervisors are encouraged to be sensitive to students' perceived lack of power with supervisors and students' impending anxiety relative to potential conflicts. Consequently, these relationships need to include a sense of reciprocity and mutuality between supervisors and doctoral students (Wang & Li, 2011).

Departmental Relationships

Dickens, (2007) reported that doctoral students experience role confusion. For that reason, those in positions of working in academic departments are encouraged to be mindful when introducing new doctoral students into doctoral programs. For example, students reported disharmony between faculty communications and program handbooks concerning roles and relationships throughout the doctoral process. Doctoral students are accordingly, encouraged to recognize and understand that multiple roles and relationships are presented during the doctoral process. These multiple roles and relationships result in countless advantages and disadvantages.

Generally those responsible for doctoral programs have the best intentions but are uncertain about applicants during the admissions process. Even though the literature is replete on the undergraduate college selection process, it is hungry for the doctoral college selection process.

Bersola, Stolzenberg, Fosnacht, and Love (2014) claimed that diversity strengthens the quality of doctoral programs. For that reason academic department heads are encouraged to seek applicants with diverse perspectives. The impact of diverse graduate research strengthens the quality of doctoral programs and benefits academic departments, as maintained by Bersola et al.

Russell (2015) identified transition points in which doctoral students are in need of distinctive styles of mentoring and encouragement. Department heads are also encouraged to study the needs of their doctoral students throughout the doctoral process as needs change. One member of the faculty should not be expected to supply all the mentorship for any doctoral student. Instead, the "academic village" (p. 149) should be expected to provide an assortment of encouragement and support interactions aimed at effective socialization and development of doctoral students. Every effort should be made to provide a supportive and inclusive environment for the benefit of doctoral students transitioning toward their professional roles as stewards of their discipline.

Furthermore, doctoral students are information hungry. They require a thorough understanding of all program requirements and deadlines necessary to earn degrees with minimal roadblocks to degree completion. Student mentors provided to doctoral students from respective departments can result in better understanding of program requirements and deadlines for doctoral students. These student mentors can also guide doctoral students throughout the entire doctoral process. This mentoring and information sharing can be completed either one-on-one or in group settings (Campbell, 2015; Koltz et al., 2010; Onwuegbuzie, Rosli, Ingram, & Frels, 2014).

Willis and Carmichael (2011) suggested that disharmony between doctoral students and departments transpire throughout the entire doctoral process. Disharmony between doctoral students and departments transpire even during the later stages of study, which results in student reevaluation of their individual objectives. Bersola et al. suggested that those responsible for doctoral programs should strive to obtain better understanding of how their respective program impacts student experiences early in the admission process in order to influence appropriately how their programs are perceived by students.

Mello et al. (2015) suggested that, as one example of how doctoral programs impact student experiences, programs should provide doctoral students with opportunities to become thriving researchers and scholars. Mello et al. also suggested that doctoral students should be provided with opportunities to interact with industry. Establishing connections with industry assists students and faculty in attaining grants and creating more practical academic research. This connection with industry should ultimately enhance the potential for harmony between the doctoral student training and the actual job requirements sought by industry employers.

Mello et al. (2015) indicated that in addition to teaching sound theory structures, doctoral programs should encourage doctoral students to link theory to industry issues. Stressing attentiveness to any chasms between education and industry should provide the next generation of researchers with the ability to close these gaps. It is crucial that department heads strive to put into practice programs that lead to prepared and successful doctoral graduates. Instructing students on how to draw connections between research and industry should unite

education to industry more effectively, as suggested by Mello et al.

Demographics

Hopwood and Paulson (2012) maintained that diverse student characteristics evoke perceptions of "otherness" (p. 671) as well as differing perspectives on the doctoral experience itself. In an autoethnographic research study for example, Bates and Goff (2012) discovered nominal information in the literature regarding the experiences of part-time doctoral students. In addition, the definition of a part-time student is not clear. What Bates and Goff uncovered was that these students often have multiple obstacles to overcome throughout the doctoral process resulting in lower matriculation rates. Findings revealed that the greater part of seminars, conventions, appointments, and dissertation defense activities normally take place on the weekday when it is more difficult for part-time students to attend. Bates and Goff suggested that if these activities were scheduled during the first part of the evening or during the weekend then these "invisible" (p.375) students could have opportunities to become involved and feel more like a part of their university community. Also, encouraging the use of technology would provide additional opportunities for student participation.

Research has also suggested that students working full-time while working on a doctorate would create additional challenges for students (Willis & Carmichael, 2011). For example, attending a doctoral program part-time rather than full-time results in delayed student matriculation. Also, there are less female students enrolled in doctoral programs, which indicates that female doctoral students balance family and study times delaying matriculation of future female researchers. In spite of

these findings, doctoral students were generally satisfied with their support during the doctoral process, as maintained by Stackhouse and Harle (2014).

Stackhouse and Harle (2014) revealed that doctoral students are generally older, which is apt to create a shortage of qualified researchers. This shortage produces a diminishing research base. In addition, doctoral students were more likely to have family and work responsibilities to handle while in school. Having these additional responsibilities also postpones matriculation.

Mukminin and McMahon (2013) found that foreign students studying in American universities experienced language problems such as "listening, speaking, reading, and writing during their first semester" (p.14). Nevertheless, these students experienced fewer language obstacles over time and were able to engage confidently in class discussions and collaborate with classmates. Mukminin and McMahon also alleged that in spite of language barriers, these students focused on learning during their first semester. This intense focus on learning positively impacted learning by their second semester which ultimately facilitated the attainment of their goals at their respective institutions.

Research suggested that those who are charged with the responsibility for the learning of doctoral students are to be mindful of the dual or even triple roles in which female and international students must manage. Administrators and professors are also encouraged to validate these students by demonstrating as much compassion as necessary to help reduce negative feelings and experiences. Demonstrating compassion could begin with assigning papers and projects with sensitivity to time commitments of these students with multiple roles (Campbell, 2015; Onwuegbuzie et al., 2014).

Providing support to female and international students in doctoral programs, such as compassion, encouragement, friendship, and collaboration, would in turn result in energizing these students. Providing support also tends to defuse enmity between classmates, produce helpful and constructive criticism for one another, and create unity between students (Campbell, 2015; Onwuegbuzie et al., 2014). Ghosh and Githens (2009) alleged that doctoral students, however, are ultimately responsible for developing their own relationships with classmates, faculty, staff, and administrators in their respective departments.

During the 2011-2012 academic year there were approximately 4 million graduate students enrolled in public, private, and for-profit universities in the United States as maintained by Integrated Postsecondary Education Data System (IPEDS) of the National Center for Education Statistics (National Center for Education Statistics, 2014). IPEDS is a system of interrelated surveys compiled each year by the National Center for Education Statistics. IPEDS gathers information from colleges, universities, and technical and vocational institutions that are involved in federal student financial aid programs. The Higher Education Act of 1965, as amended, requires institutions that are involved in federal student aid programs to submit data on enrollment, program completion, graduation rates, faculty and staff, finances, institutional prices, and student financial aid (The Higher Education Act of 1965). These data are made available to the public through the IPEDS Data Center. The IPEDS reported the demographic information shown in Table1.

Table 1

Among graduate degree programs, percentage distribution of graduate students, by selected program, institutional, and student characteristics: 2011–12

Program, institutional, and student characteristics	**Doctor's degree – research/ scholarship**	**Doctor's degree – professional practice**
Total	**100.0**	**100.0**
Field of study		
Business administration1	4.9	0.1
Education	17.1	
Law	0.4	34.0
Medicine & other health science	6.6	59.6
STEM fields	42.4	1.9
Other	28.7	3.7
Type of institution		
Public	61.7	39.1
Private nonprofit	29.8	59.4
For-profit	8.5	1.5
Attendance status		
Full-time, full-year	54.2	82.5
Part-time or part-year	45.8	17.5
Sex		
Male	50.0	45.8
Female	50.0	54.2
Race/ethnicity		
White	55.3	68.3
Black	11.1	6.6
Hispanic	7.2	5.9
Asian	23.6	15.2
Other or Two or more races	2.9	4.0
Citizenship		
U.S. citizen	71.3	94.7
Resident alien	4.4	2.5
Foreign or international student	24.2	2.7

Source: National Center for Education Statistics, U.S. Department of Education (2014)

In summary, a review of the literature indicated that the estimated nearly 50% attrition rate of doctoral students is regarded as a major problem in higher education. This deficiency of earned doctorates creates damaging consequences for institutions, as well as doctoral students who leave the academy prior to graduation. Additionally, it is through the doctoral process that doctoral students are trained for the professorate. Consequently, how doctoral students are socialized, advised, supervised, mentored, and handled by their respective departments, supervisors, and advisors responsible for their progression through the doctoral process will ultimately impact the future of the academy. Identifying the demographics of doctoral student in higher education is the first step in determining effective socialization processes to meet the individual needs of these students for degree completion.

Table 1 indicated that the demographics of doctoral students enrolled in universities in the United States are United States citizens (71.3 %-94.7%), full-time (54.2%-82.5%), white (55.3%-68.3%), and female (50%-54.2%). In addition, doctoral students studying in research/scholarship programs (STEM, education, and other fields) are attending public universities (61.7%) while those in professional practice programs (medicine and other health science fields) are attending private, nonprofit universities (59.4%).

Consequently for-profit universities (1.5%-8.5%) are not enrolling doctoral students at the same degree that public (39.1%-61.7%) and private, non-profit (29.8%-59.4%) universities are. Also, just under half of the doctoral students are enrolling on a part-time basis (45.8%) in research/scholarship programs (STEM, education, and other fields) but under one-fifth of the students are enrolled on a part-time basis (17.5%) in

professional practice programs (medicine and other health science fields).

Method of Procedure

This research study was an archival quantitative, data mining study using data from IPEDS. This study identified the number of doctoral degrees awarded during the 2011-2012, 2012-2013, and 2013-2014 academic years according to available demographic data from public 4-year or above universities, private 4-year or above universities, and for-profit 4-year or above universities in the United States.

Data were extracted according to institution type in 4-year or above universities in the United States. The data were downloaded from IPEDS and converted into an Excel document. The Excel document was formatted and cleaned up.

Findings

The findings revealed the following information shown in Table2 about doctoral degrees awarded from public, private, and for-profit 4-year or above universities in the United States during the 2011-2012, 2012-2013, and 2013-2014 academic years.

Table 2
2011-2012, 2012-2013, and 2013-2014 Doctoral Degrees Awarded According to Institutional Type and student Demographics

Doctoral Degrees Awarded	2011-2012			2012-2013			2013-2014		
	Public (314)	Private Non-Profit (529)	Private For-profit (51)	Public (324)	Private Non-Profit (547)	Private For-profit (57)	Public (328)	Private Non-Profit (570)	Private For-profit (58)
Total	83327	79548	6033	86053	81431	7111	88753	81120	7781
Sex									
Male	40969	38814	2320	42403	39697	2832	43675	39126	2922
Female	42358	40734	3713	43650	41734	4279	45078	41994	4859
Race/ethnicity									
White	49199	47552	3345	50394	47991	3854	51166	46998	3966
Black	4616	4981	1144	4756	5047	1343	4929	5077	1675
Hispanic	3775	4394	253	4265	4636	377	4565	4884	446
Asian	6960	8638	292	7189	9016	404	7787	9273	400
Other	5932	7533	915	6104	7914	1029	6356	7717	1209
Nonresident alien	12845	6450	84	13345	6827	104	13950	7171	85
Age									
Under 18		1		2				10	
18-24	3954	5969	100	4604	6063	137	5152	5823	99
25-39	68979	64211	3022	71389	65482	3811	72314	65259	3831
40 plus	9797	8576	2860	9888	8950	3141	9993	9280	3821
Unknown	597	791	51	170	936	22	1294	748	30

Discussion and Conclusion

Findings revealed an overall increase of almost 2% to over 3% increase of doctoral degrees awarded during the 2011-2012, 2012-2013, and 2013-2014 academic years. According to the available IPEDS demographic data on public 4-year or above universities, private 4-year or above universities, and for-profit 4-year or above universities in the United States, the majority of doctoral degrees awarded during the 2011-2012, 2012-2013, and 2013-2014 academic years were to females (females made

up approximately 51%-52% while males earned about 49% to 48%), whites (earned 57%-59% of the degrees awarded), and students ages 25-39 (earned 80%-81% of the degrees awarded). Public universities awarded the majority of doctoral degrees (49%-50% at 314-328 public universities, 46%-47% at 529-570 private universities, and 4% at 51-58 for-profit universities) during the 2011-2012, 2012-2013, and 2013-2014 academic years.

In conclusion, there has been an increase in doctoral degrees awarded during the 2011-2012, 2012-2013, and 2013-2014 academic years at public 4-year or above universities, private 4-year or above universities, and for-profit 4-year or above universities in the United States. While most of the degrees were awarded at public universities, students between the ages of 18-24 tended to earn doctoral degrees at private, nonprofit universities at a higher rate. Also, female doctoral degrees awarded during the 2013-2014 academic years increased to 52% of the total degrees awarded. Additionally, for-profit universities increased doctoral degrees awarded at a higher percentage than either public or private universities (9%-18% at for-profit universities, 3% at public universities, and 0% increase at private universities).

Implications

The implications from this research are numerous. To begin with, there are a number of doctoral students who do not matriculate. Higher education must examine the demographics of its respective doctoral students during the socialization process in its doctoral programs to avoid continued loss of valuable student resources. Another implication, there are a number of doctoral candidates who are never awarded their doctoral degrees. Institutions must follow these students to determine what happens to these

lost scholars. Consequently, institutions must also communicate with these students to determine if they provided sufficient advisory, supervisory, and departmental socialization needed during the doctoral process.

Limitations and Delimitations

At the onset of this study, specific limitations and delimitations were recognized. In view of the completed study, discussion of these limitations is necessary. The quantitative data for this study were obtained from the 2011-2012, 2012-2013, and 2013-2014 academic years of institutions that reported to IPEDS. An examination of previous or subsequent years may have yielded different results. Additionally, data were only gathered from institutions that report to IPEDS. Although the IPEDS Data Center provided large sample sizes in all sectors of institutions, the inclusion of institutions that do not report to IPEDS may have altered the results of this study. In addition, as with all self-reported data, it is possible that data were reported to IPEDS incorrectly. If this were the case, the information would yield inaccurate results.

Recommendations

It is recommended that this study be replicated to validate these findings. Further research could be conducted examining why these demographics exist in the first place. Moreover, why are there more women then men in doctoral studies? Why are minority groups underrepresented in doctoral studies? Why does the age of enrollment leave out mature students above the age of 39? It is also recommended that studies be conducted to determine if the role of socialization is impacted by other

factors than student demographics. In addition, studies could be conducted to ascertain if similar problems exist in other countries regarding the attrition rates of doctoral students. It is further recommended that ongoing studies be conducted to monitor the attrition rates of doctoral degrees in the United States.

REFERENCES

Barnes, B. J., Williams, E. A., & Stassen, M. A. (2012). Dissecting doctoral advising: A comparison of students' experiences across disciplines. *Journal of Further And Higher Education*, *36*(3), 309-331.

Bates, P., & Goff, L. (2012). The invisible student: Benefits and challenges of part-time doctoral studies. *Alberta Journal of Educational Research*, *58*(3), 368-380.

Bersola, S. H., Stolzenberg, E. B., Fosnacht, K., & Love, J. (2014). Understanding admitted doctoral students' institutional choices: Student experiences versus faculty and staff perceptions. *American Journal of Education*, *120*(4), 515-543.

Burkard, A. Z. (2014). Dissertation experiences of doctoral graduates from professional psychology programs. *Counselling Psychology Quarterly*, *27*(1), 19-54.

Cakmak, E., Isci, S., Uslu, F., Oztekin, O., Danisman, S., & Karadag, E. (2015). Overview of the dissertation process within the framework of flow theory: A qualitative study. *Educational Sciences: Theory & Practice*, *15*(3), 607-620 doi:10.12738/estp.2015.3.2606

Callary, B., Werthner, P., & Trudel, P. (2012). The lived experience of a doctoral student: The process of learning and becoming. *Qualitative Report, 17*

Campbell, T. A. (2015). A Phenomenological study on international doctoral students' acculturation experiences at a U.S. university. *Journal of International Students, 5*(3), 285-299.

Dickens, K. N. (2007). *Counselor education doctoral students' experiences with multiple roles and relationships*. (Unpublished doctoral dissertation). University of New Orleans School of Education, New Orleans, LA.

Ghosh, R., & Githens, R. P. (2009). Application of social network theory: Doctoral students' experiences in conferences. *New Horizons in Adult Education & Human Resource Development, 23*(1), 25-28.

The Higher Education Act. 20 U.S. C. §1001. (1965)

Hopwood, N., & Paulson, J. (2012). Bodies in narratives of doctoral students' learning and experience. *Studies In Higher Education, 37*(6), 667-681. doi:10.1080/03075079.2010.537320

IPEDS Data Center. (n.d.). The integrated postsecondary education data system [Database]. Retrieved from http://nces.ed.gov/ipeds

King, S. B., & Williams, F. K. (2014). Barriers to completing the dissertation as perceived by education leadership doctoral students. *Community College Journal of Research & Practice, 38*(2/3), 275-279.

Koltz, R. L., Odegard, M. A., Provost, K. B., Smith, T., & Kleist, D. (2010). Picture perfect: using photo-voice to explore four doctoral students' comprehensive examination experiences. *Journal of Creativity In Mental Health, 5*(4), 389-411. doi:10.1080/15401383.2010.527797

Kong, X., Chakraverty, D., Jeffe, D. B., Andriole, D. A., Wathington, H. D., & Tai, R. H. (2013). How do interaction experiences influence doctoral students' academic pursuits in biomedical research? *Bulletin of Science, Technology & Society*, *33*(3-4), 76-84.

Lahenius, K., & Ikävalko, H. (2014). Joint supervision practices in doctoral education--A student experience. *Journal of Further And Higher Education*, *38*(3), 427-446.

Mello, A. L., Fleisher, M. S.,& Woehr, D. J. (2015). Varieties of research experience: Doctoral student perceptions of preparedness for future success. *International Journal of Management Education (Elsevier Science)*, *13*(2), 128-140. doi:10.1016/j.ijme.2015.01.007

Mukminin, A., & McMahon, B. J. (2013). International graduate students' cross-cultural academic engagement: Stories of Indonesian doctoral students on an American campus. *Qualitative Report*, *18*

National Center for Education Statistics. (2014). Web Tables: Profile and financial aid estimates of graduate students: 2011–12, Among *graduate degree programs, percentage distribution of graduate students, by selected program, institutional, and student characteristics: 2011–12 (Table 1.1)*. Washington, DC: Author. Retrieved from http://nces.ed.gov/pubsearch/pubsinfo.asp?pubid=2015168

Pauline, P., Olson, J.K., & Gul, R.B. (2014). Co-supervision of doctoral students: Enhancing the learning experience. *International Journal of Nursing Education Scholarship*, *11*(1), 1-8. doi:10.1515/ijnes-2012-0004

Russell, J. A. (2015). Rolling with the punches: Examining the socialization experiences of kinesiology doctoral students. *Research Quarterly for Exercise & Sport*, *86*(2), 140-151.

Onwuegbuzie, A. J., Rosli, R., Ingram, J. M., & Frels, R. K. (2014). A critical dialectical pluralistic examination of the lived experience of select women doctoral students. *Qualitative Report*, *19*.

Stackhouse, J., & Harle, J. (2014). The experiences and needs of African doctoral students: Current Conditions and Future Support. *Higher Education Policy*, *27*(2), 175-194.

Stubb, J., Pyhältö, K., & Lonka, K. (2014). Conceptions of research: The doctoral student experience in three domains. *Studies in Higher Education*, *39*(2), 251-264.

The Higher Education Act. 20 U.S. C. §1001. (1965)

Wang, T., & Li, L. Y. (2011). "Tell me what to do" vs. "Guide me through it": Feedback experiences of international doctoral students. *Active Learning in Higher Education*, *12*(2), 101-112.

Willis, B., & Carmichael, K. D. (2011). The lived experience of late-stage doctoral student attrition in counselor education. *Qualitative Report*, *16*(1), 192-207.

About the Author:

Gail D. CARUTH, Ed.D., is a member of the adjunct faculty in the Department of Higher Education and Learning Technologies at Texas A & M University-Commerce, a member of the adjunct faculty at Dallas County Community College District, and a Dissertation Chair at the University of Phoenix. She is a former human resource manager as well as an organizational consultant specializing in training and development. She holds the professional designation of Senior Professional in Human Resources (SPHR). Her articles on adult learning, human resource management, and higher education have appeared in over 83 academic and trade journals. She serves as an editor, member of the editorial board, or reviewer for a variety of academic journals.

P.O. Box 3011
Commerce Texas 75429-3011
Email: gaildianna@flash.net

The Sphinx of American Education: Ralph Tyler's Peculiar Relationship with Standardized Testing

JAMES E. SCHUL
Winona State University

ABSTRACT: Standardized testing currently dominates the American educational landscape. Federal and state policy makers use standardized tests as the primary means to evaluate school performance, resulting in schools narrowing their curriculum toward experiences specifically aimed toward improving test scores. Ralph Tyler, the renowned evaluation expert from the twentieth century, had much to say about how standardized tests should be used, with warnings about the detrimental effects that ill-advised use of these tests can have on the school experience. Yet, his advice on tests garner little attention by policy makers and the public writ large. In this article, I examine Tyler's advice about how tests should be used in the school experience and then explore how Tyler's *Rationale* for educational evaluation may actually be linked to the contemporary paradigm that embraces high stakes testing. Although Tyler's *Rationale* never endorsed high stakes assessments, policy makers and educational evaluators alike, in the wake of the contemporary standards and accountability movement and the spirit of social efficiency, use the linearity of Tyler's *Rationale* for educational evaluation to justify the wide and far-reaching use of standardized testing. These policy makers, I discuss, should strongly consider Tyler's warnings about the misuse of standardized testing in the evaluation of a school curriculum.

RESUMÉ: Aujourd'hui, le monde de l'enseignement aux Etats-Unis a recours, en majorité, aux examens standards. Les décideurs scolaires des gouvernements fédéral et d'Etat s'en servent avant tout pour vérifier les résultats scolaires ce qui permet aux écoles de spécialiser leur programme afin d'améliorer les résultats

Journal of Educational Thought
Vol. 48, No. 3, 2015, 217-238

d'examens. Ralph Tyler, connu du XXe siècle comme expert chargé de l'évaluation, avait beaucoup à dire sur la façon de se servir des examens standards. Il mettait en garde sur les effets néfastes qu'un emploi fâcheux peut causer sur l'expérience scolaire. Néanmoins, ses conseils n'ont que très peu retenu l'attention des décideurs scolaires et du public dans son ensemble. J'analyse ici les suggestions de Mr Tyler sur la façon de se servir des examens standards dans un cadre scolaire, puis j'étudie la manière dont The Tyler Rationale peut, en fait, être mis en rapport avec le paradigme du monde moderne qui intègre des examens d'enjeux élevés. Bien que The Tyler Rationale n'ait jamais considéré des contrôles d'enjeux élevés, les décideurs académiques ainsi que les juges à la suite d'un mouvement contemporain de normes et de responsabilité, utilisent la linéarité de ses observations pour les contrôles ou examens scolaires afin de justifier l'emploi massif et répandu des examens standards. Je traite du fait que les décideurs scolaires devraient sérieusement prendre en considération les mises en garde de Tyler sur le mauvais emploi des examens standards lors de contrôle d'un programme scolaire.

The American school experience is infiltrated by high stakes standardized testing. A recent report produced by the American Federation of Teachers revealed that test preparation and testing absorbed between nineteen and forty-five full school days in heavily tested grades. The annual cost for this testing, the report revealed, ranged from $200 to $400 per student for grades K-2 to $600-$800 per student for grades 3-8. One high school in the Eastern coast of the United States was even reported to have an annual cost of tests above $1,100 per student in grades 6-11 (Nelson, 2013). This current emphasis upon tests has an enormous tail-wind effect on entire school communities. Test scores, for instance, affect evaluation results of administrators and teachers alike, students'

advancement from grade to grade, and even the property values within a school district. These tests are mandated to schools by American policy makers under the auspice of ensuring that individual students are academically prepared for challenges of the twenty-first century, and that schools and their teachers are effectively meeting the public's expectations of academic rigor. In 2001, for instance, the *No Child Left Behind Act* (NCLB) affixed standardized testing into federal law by judging school performance on a singular test score (Schul, 2011). NCLB was followed by *Race to the Top*, the crown jewel of the American Recovery and Reinvestment Act of 2009, which furthered the use of tests to evaluate teacher effectiveness (Ravitch, 2013; Tanner, 2013). This litany of American policy measures that emphasize high stakes standardized testing leads to the following riddle: Who receives the ire of blame for the high stakes standardized testing movement, yet forewarned us of its dangerous effects on the school experience? The answer to this riddle is Ralph Tyler, renowned curriculum developer and evaluation expert from the twentieth century. I am befuddled to classify Tyler as either a protagonist or antagonist in this saga of standardized testing in the American school experience. Like the sphinx of antiquity, Tyler is a historical mystery, an anomaly among all of the major contributors to the high stakes testing movement. This investigation is an intellectual exercise for me, and hopefully for you, the reader, to better understand and clarify Ralph Tyler's role in the high stakes standardized testing movement.

If there is such a thing as a hallowed shrine of educators in American history, Tyler would certainly have a prominent place within it. One admirer of Tyler (Simpson, 1999) classified him as "one of the most brilliant educational thinkers of our century, a giant among

educational giants" (p. 85). Tyler's accomplishments are numerous and significant. His career spanned most of the twentieth century and his influence upon the landscape of education remains prominent. Tyler first rose to prominence in the 1930s as a curriculum professor at the Ohio State University and then became nationally renowned when he moved to the University of Chicago. In 1933 Tyler headed the evaluation team of the Progressive Education Association's Eight Year Study which arose out of a concern that college admission requirements at the time were unduly burdensome on high school innovation and resulted in a confirmation that progressive education strategies better prepared students for the rigors of college than traditional schooling strategies ("What did the Eight Year Study reveal," 1942). Tyler's book *Basic Principles of Curriculum and Instruction* (1949), which emerged out of his work on the Eight Year Study, has long been regarded by most in the curriculum field as a classic and central work in understanding curriculum development. In this book he laid out his well-known *Rationale* for the school curriculum where he provided four key questions that should be asked when designing a curriculum:

1) What educational purposes should the school seek to attain?
2) What educational experiences can be provided that are likely to attain these purposes?
3) How can these educational experiences be effectively organized?
4) How can we determine whether these purposes are being attained?

With this *Rationale*, Tyler introduced the educational community to the simple idea that "you cannot evaluate something unless you know what it is meant to do"

(Finder, 2004). In the 1960s, Tyler spearheaded the development of the National Assessment of Education Progress (NAEP), which still to this day serves as the sole national assessment of learning outcomes in the United States. In sum, Tyler's fingerprints can be found all over the American educational landscape. But there is debate about Tyler in the curriculum field as to the nature of these fingerprints. After all, Tyler's warnings about the use of tests, which I will later lay out for you, were given simultaneously with his creation of the *Rationale*. Critics of Tyler's *Rationale* (e.g., Pinar, 1975; Kliebard, 1995; Block, 2012) argue that it paved the way for American school reformers to use standardized tests as a clean and efficient measurement of academic outcomes of schools. But, as you will see, this was far from Tyler's intent.

Revisiting the Rationale

Ralph Tyler, ever the pragmatist, created the *Rationale* simply as a means to solve a problem. In 1929, he was brought to Ohio State by W.W. Charters, then the director of the university's Bureau of Educational Research, as someone who could improve the education of undergraduates. Charters believed that standardized tests could play a positive role with improving education and Tyler sought to create useful tests that were tied to educational objectives. At the time, faculty at the Ohio State University were not connecting their evaluation techniques to their educational objectives. This is perhaps when Tyler first developed his *Rationale* – as a simple means to better do his task of evaluating the undergraduate curriculum of Ohio State. A few years later, in his work in the Eight Year Study throughout the 1930s as its director of evaluation, Tyler first used his *Rationale* at the national level. The Eight Year Study examined thirty U.S.

secondary schools and three hundred colleges and universities. Tyler's work with evaluating the curriculum of so many educational institutions led to his conception of the four questions that make up the *Rationale*. As previously mentioned, Tyler published his *Rationale* in 1949's bestseller *Basic Principles of Curriculum and Instruction.* Tyler was clear that his *Rationale* was not meant to be a prescription for how all school curriculum should be evaluated: "This book outlines one way of viewing an instructional program as a functioning instrument of education," Tyler proclaimed and then went on to say the following: "The student is encouraged to examine other rationales and to develop his own conception of the elements and relationships involved in an effective curriculum" (Tyler 1949, p. 1). However, while Tyler stated a hope that its readers would form their own conclusion, it became common stance for others to simply affirm Tyler's *Rationale* as the sole means to evaluate a curriculum as evidenced by the popularity of sales of the book, its translation into three dozen languages, and the fact that no alternative emerged from academia that had any traction with educational evaluation[1].

It is possible that Tyler's *Rationale* became popular because of the era in American history from which it was conceived. At the cusp of the twentieth century, a "social efficiency" movement swept the economic and political landscape of the United States and since schools are public institutions with both economic and political implications, they served as likely dance partners for this overarching movement. The nature of social efficiency involved an

[1] Hlebowitsh (1992) refers to personal correspondence with Ralph W. Tyler, 23 August, 1990 to make this point about the poverty of alternatives to the *Rationale*.

emphasis upon practicality and proper use of resources, talent, and time in the school experience (Knoll, 2009). Two forces were responsible for the increasing popularity of social efficiency in the school experience. First, rising industrialism in the decades before and after World War I led to a surge of interest among school administrators in Frederick Taylor's theory of scientific management as a means of ensuring that taxpayers' monies were efficiently spent. Second, schools embraced social efficiency in the wake of the political progressive movement that swept across the socio-economic landscape of America. The political progressive movement affected any one thing from the food industry to the management of the labor force, and, yes, a growing concern toward improving the school (Callahan, 1964). At the center of the social efficiency movement's effort to improve school was the standardized test. A pivotal point in the development of standardized tests in schools emerged when E.L. Thorndike, a renowned American psychologist from Teachers College in Columbia University, extended the use of them as a means to measure "anything and everything relevant to education – mental capacities, changes in behavior, and even the aims of education" (Lagemann 2002, p. 59). During the 1920s, Thorndike, whose work at Teachers College was popularized by a series of textbooks that he authored, developed a standardized test used to measure individual intelligence that consisted of completion, arithmetic, vocabulary, and directions (CAVD) which became a precursor to modern intelligence tests. The work of Thorndike and others led to a revolution in the use of standardized achievement tests in American schools. Between 1917 and 1928, nearly 1,300 achievement tests were created in the United States; by 1940 that figure rose to 2,600 (Monroe, 1950). By the 1930s and 40s, a multitude of objective tests were

available that aimed to assess anything from intelligence, personality, or vocational aims (Reese, 2005). In the wake of this fury of measurement, Tyler came upon the educational landscape with his *Rationale* in hand, ready to clarify how schools may be effectively evaluated.

At the core of Tyler's *Rationale* is the measurement of student behavior. Critics of Tyler such as Herbert Kliebard (1975, 1995), William Pinar (1975), and Alan Block (2012) assert that the *Rationale's* formulaic nature led to a narrow curriculum that focused on the immediate behaviors of students in response to their teacher's instructional purposes and activities. Peter Hlebowitsh (2013), in his forward of the most recent version of Tyler's *Basic Principles of Curriculum and Instruction*, asserted that Tyler did not seek to narrow the curriculum toward scripted behaviorist tendencies, as Kliebard accused, but instead sought to identify behaviors at a generalized level "so that teachers could exercise their own intelligence and creativity in fashioning responsive school experiences" (p. viii). However, Hlebowitsh (1992) did note in an earlier appraisal of the Tyler *Rationale* that Tyler indeed "valued clarity in the specification of the behavioural objectives" but that "Tyler did not at any time make these claims in the name of efficiency and cost-saving" (p. 536). Regardless of Tyler's intent, there can be little substantive debate about the effect of Tyler's objective-driven evaluation formula: it fostered a conception of the school experience that fit well with the social efficiency movement and set the stage for a business-model approach toward evaluating the school experience (i.e., input results in output). Hlebowitsh (2013) even admitted that "well-meaning interpreters of Tyler have indeed taken his ideas and turned them into behavioristic devices that have favored hyperspecific objectives and highly atomized classroom

applications" (p. viii). Although Tyler may not lay claim to these interpreters of his *Rationale* as heirs, they are his heirs nonetheless.

The contemporary wave of standardized testing in American educational policy has been influenced by a behavioristic interpretation of Tyler's *Rationale*. To contemporary educational policy makers, Tyler's *Rationale* is a perfectly sensible means to evaluate a school curriculum. The public ensures that certain academic standards are imbedded within the context of the school experience by answering the first question of the *Rationale*: What educational purposes should the school seek to attain? The creators of NCLB even sought to answer Tyler's second question (What educational experiences can be provided that are likely to attain these purposes?) by prescribing "scientifically based research (SBR) teaching methods. The U.S. Department of Education attached a requirement into NCLB that instructional practices be "evidenced based" and directed federal funding toward educational research that produced "ideas with proven results into the classroom" (Schul, 2011). The final question of Tyler's *Rationale* (How can we determine whether these purposes are being attained?) was, of course, answered with standardized tests that conveniently produced tangible results to the prescribed standards imbedded into the school experience by the policies.

While the fit between the contemporary high-stakes testing movement with Tyler's *Rationale* may appear to be, at first glance, seamless, it is not what Tyler surmised should happen. While Tyler's critics are usually busy pinpointing the connections of his *Rationale* to the social efficiency movement and immediately align this connection to standardized testing, it is essential to note that Tyler's *Rationale* never supported a test-driven

curriculum nor did Tyler himself advocate for one in his writings and interviews (Hlebowitsh, 2005). In fact, Tyler's words and actions serve as a clear forewarning of the high-stakes standardized test movement. In this next section, I will provide for you why Tyler's contribution to standardized testing is mired in a fog for those of us who seek to objectively understand both the man and the movement. While his *Rationale* might seem to create a school curriculum that enables for seamless use of standardized testing as a measurement tool, Tyler, perhaps more than anyone else in the history of American education, was immensely concerned with the dangers of overemphasizing standardized testing in an evaluation program.

Tyler and Tests

Test development was central to Tyler's career as he sought means to evaluate various curricular projects. He maintained close ties with giants of testing, most notably E.F. Lindquist. Lindquist, a University of Iowa professor of education in a timespan similar to Tyler's own career, was known for his creation of the *Iowa Test of Basic Skills*, the *American College Test* (*ACT*), and inventor of the optical recognition scanner (popularly known as a *Scantron*® machine). Tyler was hopeful of tests as he saw in them the possibility for the upward expansion of educational opportunities for all American citizens since they had the potential to inform colleges of students' learning needs and enable them to make the appropriate curricular adjustments to fit those needs (Lemann, 1999, Schul, 2013). While Tyler's career closely connected with the rise of standardized tests in American society, he was not blind to their shortcomings and to the curricular pitfalls if used unwisely.

Tyler fully understood the public's impulses when it came to standardized testing. In a 1978 report of a conference on testing, Tyler candidly explained that tests were used in American society for four reasons: accountability of teachers and schools; selection of students; evaluation of educational innovations and projects; and guidance for teachers in the classroom (Tyler & White, 1979). Tyler clearly believed that testing itself was helpful but ill-advised use of tests could be damaging to the school experience. "Educational testing can be a useful aid to contemporary education or it can be an impediment," Tyler warned (Tyler & White, 1979, p. 47). In that same report, Tyler outlined the major criticisms of tests emphasizing, among other things, that standardized tests "have only limited value for holding teachers, schools, and school systems accountable for the quality of education" and that "tests exercise a limiting effect on classroom teaching" (pp. 8-9). At the forefront of determining the usefulness of a test, according to Tyler, was pinpointing exactly what it was meant to assess while resisting the ever-present temptation to grandiosely use tests as a means to evaluate the entire school experience.

Education, as a public entity that is subject to large-scale policy initiatives, is vulnerable to faddish impulses. Tyler believed that curriculum developers, particularly those who use tests, should be leery of these impulses due to their likelihood of distorting exactly what tests can assess. Because test results can be quantified, an aura of scientific sway surrounds the standardized test. Instead, Tyler was adamant that tests have the capacity to evaluate a certain problem, or problems, but not the school experience in its entirety:

> You've got to use common sense about it rather than falling into movements … We

> should always ask the question, "What are our problems?" Find out what is really happening. The problem is, we get into movements rather than saying where we are now, what's the problem here? The problem in my school may not be the problem in your school. All assessments should be performing whatever actions they are required to perform. Better ask them to do things that require them to use that knowledge rather than just to answer questions (Horowitz, 1995, p. 71).

It is paramount, Tyler cautioned, for curriculum developers to first determine what an assessment has the capacity to assess before using it in school evaluation. The contemporary use of tests as the barometer to gauge the entire school experience may appear to be an efficient means to evaluate the school experience but it is impossible, Tyler believed, for a singular assessment to be the lone assessment tool and the entire school experience defaults to that singular assessment, narrowing the learning experience for students. Tyler emphasized that an effective educational appraisal should include a wide array of techniques, including the standardized test. In a book published in 1942 in the aftermath of the Eight Year Study, Tyler explained his reasoning behind why multiple learning purposes and experiences should be accompanied by multiple forms of assessment:

> A written test may be a valid measure of information recalled and ideas remembered. In many cases, too, the student's skill in writing and in mathematics may be shown by written tests, and it is also true that various techniques of thinking may be evidenced

> through more novel types of written test materials. On the other hand, evidence regarding the improvement of health practices, personal-social-adjustment, interests, and attitudes may require a much wider repertoire of appraisal techniques. This assumption emphasizes the wider range of techniques which may be used in evaluation, such as observational records, anecdotal records, questionnaires, interviews, check lists, records of activities, products made, and the like. The selection of evaluation techniques should be made in terms of the appropriateness of these techniques for the kind of behavior to be appraised (Maddaus & Stufflebeam 1988, pp. 103-04).

Tyler's warnings about tests were clear: they are part of a larger evaluation process that must encompass other variants of assessment. If the school is evaluated on a lone assessment, particularly a standardized test, then that assessment has a controlling effect on the classroom curriculum. Tyler understood that tests should be the servants of the teacher, not their master and a variety of assessments are essential in upholding that axiom[2].

---

[2] This axiom was actually used by E.F. Lindquist during the American Historical Association's Commission on Social Studies (1929-1934). Lindquist helped his colleague at The University of Iowa, Ernest Horn, to craft a response to the Commission's statement on standardized testing. This statement included the advice: "tests should be the servant and not the master". Lindquist and Horn both consulted with Tyler during the work of Commission. This quote was found on page 14 on the following archival source: Horn, E. (1933). Compromise Statement created by AHA subcommittee, box 2, Papers of Ernest Horn (RG 99.0223, Box 2), Special Collections and University Archives, University of Iowa Libraries.

Ralph Tyler placed a great deal of hope in the ingenuity of education measurement, not to direct the curriculum but instead to assist the teacher and school officials in the appraisal of the school experience. Yet, how can an appraisal of the school experience not direct the curriculum? Tyler fully understood that the school experience and its appraisal system were intrinsically linked with one another. Because of this link, Tyler believed that key measures by test administrators needed to be taken to ensure that tests did not "master" the teacher. These measures are mirrored in Tyler's evaluation masterpiece that is well known as the "nation's report card": the *National Assessment of Educational Progress* (NAEP).

The *National Assessment of Educational Progress* has a unique nature among standardized tests used for educational evaluation in the American school experience. The test is not aggregated to the individual; in fact, no individual who has ever taken the NAEP knows what score they earned on it. The scores are only taken at the state and national level and sometimes, for research purposes, at the district level. Far different than tests mandated under NCLB and *Race to the Top*, the scores are never taken at the school building or classroom or individual level. These features of the NAEP are intentional and Tyler created them. Tyler understood that test scores, once publicly known, can overtake the curriculum and become the basis for the curriculum. At the inception of the NAEP, in the 1960s, fears were abound that the test would become a national assessment that would direct the school curriculum at the national level. Tyler soothed these concerns by explaining his plans to ensure this did not occur:

> A good deal of public confusion has been encountered. The project is being confused with a nation-wide, individual testing program, and several common fears are expressed by those who make this confusion. They note that tests used in a school influence the direction and amount of effort of pupils and teachers. In this way, if national tests do not reflect the local educational objectives, pupils and teachers are deflected from their work. This criticism does not apply to the assessment project because no individual student or teacher can make a showing. No student will take more than a small fraction of these exercises. No scores will be obtained on his performance. He will not be assessed at any later time and can gain no desired end, like admission to college or a scholarship. (Tyler, 1966, pp. 2-3)

Tyler's parameters on the NAEP have ensured that the test does what test scores are intended to do: assess the curriculum. Interestingly, Tyler's approach has worked despite the contemporary thirst for quick methods of assessment at the local and teacher level. Today, no teacher or principal is ever compelled, or even interested, in teaching to the NAEP, or cheating on the NAEP, or otherwise making the NAEP the basis of the school experience. This cannot be said about state assessments, given all of the documented cheating scandals (Booher-Jennings and Beveridge, 2008) and the now common practice of judging good teaching by student achievement measures (Ravitch, 2010; 2013). The difference is that Tyler removed all the incentives to convert the NAEP into a curriculum by making it a no-stakes exam with only a

randomly chosen testing population, making it impotent as a political tool yet more meaningful as a long-standing evaluative measure for school improvement.

Discussion

The contemporary wave of high stakes testing is, arguably, fostered by the linearity of the Tyler *Rationale.* Critics of Tyler's *Rationale* have been quick to point out the deficiencies in its linearity and how it has narrowed the American school experience toward a behavioristic-oriented curriculum. Recent research in the learning sciences clearly support the critics' concerns. As a case in point, Allison Gopnik's (2009, 2012) research on infants and young children reveals the exploratory nature of a person's learning processes. A teacher's craft is more than a scripted science but is an art form that allows for emergent learning experiences (Eisner, 1967). While it is crucial for teachers to initially determine their instructional purposes, it is equally crucial for the teacher to provide students leeway to add or supplant to those initial learning purposes. In doing this, the curriculum planner ensures that the process of learning is given consideration amidst a scripted plan of learning. Tyler's *Rationale* did not take emergent learning into consideration. It is, therefore, easy to take sides with Tyler's critics on this matter. Yet, little attention is paid by these critics to the fact that Tyler had much to say about the dangers of tests' reckless use as a single measurement tool in the evaluation of schools.

There are many lessons to take from Tyler's protocol on the use of testing as an evaluation tool. First, Tyler was always quick to point out that tests are used by the public for a myriad of purposes, most notably to judge the performance of teachers and schools. He emphasized that

tests can, and should, help to inform school administrators and teachers about teaching and learning in the classroom if special precautions are made. Tests are a neutral commodity that are used as the evaluator determines they should be used. Second, the purpose of a test used in an evaluation program should be reflected upon and used wisely in the midst of multiple forms of assessments. Evaluation, to Tyler, was an evidence collection process. Tests, he believed, are only one piece of evidence that should be used deliberatively. Finally, the parameters that Tyler set around the NAEP should remind contemporary policy makers and school officials how tests do not necessarily need to have a detrimental effect upon the school experience. By ensuring that the NAEP scores are not aggregated to the individual or school district, political pressure to use tests to judge teacher and school performance is paralyzed.

Ralph Tyler's place in the sanctum of American educators is secure. He is the creator of educational evaluation and his wisdom with the use of tests has been silenced amidst the contemporary surge in standardized testing as a means to evaluate schools and teachers. He warned us about the dangers of standardized testing yet moved forward with an optimism based upon its possibilities. The parameters that he created around the NAEP reveal that he was so far ahead of his time with the use of tests, but in many ways, his *Rationale*, what he is best known for, is indicative that he was of his time as well. The *Rationale* was written in the shadow of the social efficiency movement in education and was guided by a behaviorist paradigm of educational psychology. We are in the midst of the second decade of the twenty-first century, and the *Rationale* is still used by policy makers (though perhaps unknowingly) as a means to evaluate the school experience in the wake of the high-stakes academic

accountability movement. In need of a means to quickly evaluate the educational purposes of these policy measures, federal and state authorities default to the test. The contemporary wave of high stakes testing is, arguably, fostered by the linearity of the Tyler *Rationale*. It is safe to say that Tyler would be appalled with this outcome. Perhaps attempts on the part of curricularists to reexamine Tyler with hopes to heroify or villianize him is to make a moot point. His legacy is a complex one, and maybe it is best to leave it at that. Tyler's legacy remains shrouded in mystery. He offered the *Rationale* as one way to evaluate school curriculum and even urged others to offer other ways to do the same. The more crucial mystery for the contemporary world to solve might be why curriculum developers and policy makers are not breaking ground with new ways to conduct educational evaluation that ensures teachers and students are not enslaved by a single standardized test.

REFERENCES

Block, A. (2012). Toward objectives and assessment: Means of control. *Journal of the American Association for the Advancement of Curriculum Studies, 8*, 1-10.

Booher-Jennings, J. and Beveridge, A. (2008). Who counts for accountability? High- stakes test exemptions in a large urban school district. In A. Sadovnik, J. O'Day, G. Bohrnstedt, & K. Borman (Eds.), *No Child Left Behind and the Reduction of the Achievement Gap: Sociological Perspectives on Federal Education Policy* (pp. 77-96). New York: Routledge.

Callahan, R. E. (1964). *Education and the cult of efficiency*. University of Chicago Press.

Eisner, E. (1967). "Educational Objectives: Help or Hindrance?" *The School Review, 75*, 250-260.

Finder, M. (2004). *Educating America: How Ralph W. Tyler Taught America to Teach*. Greenwood Publishing Group.

Gopnik, A. (2009). The philosophical baby. *London: Bodley Head.*

Gopnik, A. (2012). Scientific thinking in young children: Theoretical advances, empirical research, and policy implications. *Science*, *337*(6102), 1623-1627.

Hlebowitsh, P. S. (1992). Amid behavioural and behaviouristic objectives: reappraising appraisals of the Tyler Rationale. *Journal of Curriculum Studies*, *24*(6), 533-547.

Hlebowitsh, P. S. (2005). Generational ideas in curriculum: A historical triangulation. *Curriculum Inquiry*, *35*(1), 73-87.

Hlebowitsh, P.S. (2013). Foreword. In Tyler, R. W. (2013). *Basic principles of curriculum and instruction*. University of Chicago press.

Horowitz, R. (1995). A 75-year legacy on assessment: Reflections from an interview with Ralph W. Tyler. *The Journal of Educational Research*, *89*(2), 68-75.

Kliebard, H.M. (1975). Reappraisal: the Tyler *Rationale*. In W. Pinar (ed.) *Curriculum Theorizing: The Reconceptualists* (Berkeley, CA: McCutchan), 70-83.

Kliebard, H. M. (1995). The Tyler rationale revisited. *Journal of Curriculum Studies*, *27*(1), 81-88.

Knoll, M. (2009). From Kidd to Dewey: The origin and meaning of 'social efficiency'. *Journal of Curriculum Studies*, *41*(3), 361-391.

Lagemann, E. C. (2002). *An elusive science: The troubling history of education research.* University of Chicago Press.

Lemann, N. (1999). The Big Test: The Secret History of the American Meritocracy. New York: Ferrar, Straus & Giroux.

Madaus, G. F., & Stufflebeam, D. L. (Eds.). (1988). *Educational evaluation: classic works of Ralph W. Tyler*. Springer Netherlands.

Monroe, W. S. (Ed.). (1950). *Encyclopedia of educational research: a project of the American educational research association* (Vol. 2). Macmillan.

Nelson, H. (2013). Testing more, teaching less: What America's obsession with student tests costs in money and invested time. *American Federation of Teachers*. Retrieved from http://www.aft.org/pdfs/teachers/testingmore2013.pdf

Pinar, W.F. (1975). *Curriculum theorizing: The reconceptualists*. Berkeley, CA: McCutchen Publishing.

Ravitch, D. (2010). *The death and life of the great American school system: How testing and choice are undermining education.* New York: Basic Books.

Ravitch, D. (2013). *Reign of error: The hoax of the privatization movement and the danger to America's public schools*. New York: Alfred A. Knopf.

Reese, W. J. (2005). *America's Public Schools: From the Common School to" No Child Left Behind"*. JHU Press.

Schul, J. E. (2013). Ensuing dog fight: the AHA Commission on the Social Studies' testing controversy. *Journal of Educational Administration and History*, *45*(1), 1-27.

Schul, J. (2011) Unintended consequences: Fundamental flaws that plaque the No Child Left Behind Act. *eJournal of Education Policy.* Retrieved from http://nau.edu/uploadedFiles/Academic/COE/About/Projects/Unintended%20Consequences.pdf

Simpson, R. D. (1999). Ralph Tyler on curriculum: A voice from the past with a message for the future. *Innovative Higher Education*, *24*(2), 85-87.

Tanner, D. (2013). Race to the top and leave the children behind. *Journal of Curriculum Studies*, *45*(1), 4-15.

Tyler, R., W. (1949). Basic principles of curriculum and instruction. Chicago: The University of Chicago Press.

Tyler, R. W. (1966). The objectives and plans for a national assessment of educational progress. *Journal of Educational Measurement*, *3*(1), 1-4.

Tyler, R. W., & White, S. H. (Eds.). (1979). *Testing, Teaching and Learning: Chairmen's Report of a Conference on Research on Testing*. August 17-26, 1978. Washington, DC: National Institute of Education.

What did the Eight Year Study reveal? (1942). *The High School Journal*, *25*(7), 305-309.

About the Author:
James E. Schul is an Associate Professor of Education at Winona State University. His research interests include documentary making in history classrooms as well as curriculum history.
201C Gildemeister Hall
P.O. Box 5838
175 West Mark Street
Winona, MN 55987
jschul@winona.edu

How Does Maintenance of Psycho-Socio-Physio Parameters Enrich Educational Leaders?

MANI MAN SINGH RAJBHANDARI
University of Johannesburg

ABSTRACT: Why does educational leadership need maintenance? In educational settings, leadership roles occur almost everywhere from principals to classroom teachers; and also among students and within student groups. In all of these cases, leadership roles are demonstrated in different ways. In all such cases, leadership maintenance is necessary. Leadership maintenance is a reflection of behaviour generated through leader's psychological state of mind, sociological state of relational building, and physiological parameters of logistic adequacy. The maintenance of leadership, through Psychological, Sociological and Physiological (PSP) parameters, is an important ingredient to shape leadership competencies. The maintenance of PSP generates and offers wellness to leaders and further generates followership wellbeing, thus creating a mirror effect to followership maintenance and towards building a favourable organisational environment in educational settings.

Keywords: Leadership maintenance, leadership competencies, followership maintenance, psychological, sociological and physiological paradigm, reflexive and mirror effect, leaders' wellness and followers' wellbeing

RESUMÉ: pourquoi les dirigeants pédagogiques ont-ils besoin de continuité ? Dans la mise en place pédagogique, le rôle de dirigeant, ou de décideur, intervient à tous les niveaux, que ce soit du directeur de l'établissement à l'instituteur, avec les élèves ou avec les groupes d'élèves. Dans tous ces cas de figure, diriger est une action qui intervient sur plusieurs plans et, est nécessaire. La façon de diriger n'est que le miroir où se

reflète un comportement dû à l'état d'esprit psychologique du décideur, au contexte sociologique où les relations se développent et aux paramètres physiologiques pour choisir une bonne logistique. Les paramètres psychologiques, sociologiques et physiologiques (PSP), sont les premières pierres à poser pour construire une bonne direction. Les PSP génèrent et offrent le bien-être aux décideurs, et plus tard, à ceux qui les suivent ; c'est en quelque sorte créer un miroir qui se reflète sur les successeurs et c'est constituer un environnement organisationnel accueillant dans le cadre pédagogique.

Mots clefs: continuité directionnelle, qualités directionnelles, continuité des successeurs, paradigme psychologique, sociologique et physiologique, miroir qui reflète le bien être des décideurs et de ceux qui leurs succèdent.

Introduction

Why does educational leadership require maintenance? Leadership maintenance is essential for educational leaders to enable their wellness and their employees' wellbeing in an organisational setting. While the wellness of oneself is important, it is equally important to offer wellbeing for others in an organisational setting. This wellness and wellbeing can be initiated by maintaining the psychological state of oneself, bonding sociological aspects in a community-focused organisation, while maintaining physiological stability. Leadership maintenance is therefore a paradigm of applying and enabling Psychological, Sociological and Physiological (PSP) parameters for the leaders, as well as for the employees in the organisation. Enabling wellness by understanding the Psychological, Sociological and

Physiological (PSP) paradigm can enhance the wellbeing for others and enrich the contextual environment.

Psychological, Sociological and Physiological aspects present as contextual variables offer leadership maintenance by which educational leadership can improve their followers' maintenance. Moreover, the positive 'vibe' of the leaderships' psychological state improves wellbeing, behaviour and performance in the organisation (Liden, Wayne, Zhao, & Henderson, 2008; Peterson, Walumbwa, Byron, & Myrowitz, 2009). In addition, followers' behaviour is strongly associated with leaderships' behaviour. Maintenance of PSP parameters can enrich leadership flexibility and mobility, which can further generate leadership elasticity. Rajbhandari (2013) explains leadership elasticity as a desired level of flexibility of leadership behaviour towards followers, and other contextual variables. Followers and followership domains are strong components in organisational settings that shape leadership behaviour. In regard to this, maintenance of PSP parameters by educational leaders enhances their ability and capability to motivate their followers towards their shared organisational goal. This, therefore, enables the wellbeing of the followership maintenance through a cause and effect relationship with the leader's PSP maintenance.

Therefore, psychological, sociological and physiological (PSP) parameters are essential elements in human resource maintenance. These three parameters may not necessarily be applicable at the same time. However, they are also not mutually exclusive. Psychological, sociological and physiological maintenance complements leadership maintenance and generates leadership capabilities. Leadership maintenance of psychological (leaders cognitive process) of being mindful, sociological (understanding contextual variables and being relational to

followers oriented and followership) and physiological (being resourceful) aiding toward logistic mobility, thereby enhances the improvement of organisational effectiveness.

Most educational leaders presume that leadership is an assigned position in an educational setting. It is however necessary to understand who is actually presuming the educational leadership role for the educational system in the country? In considering this, and to enable educational leadership, the leaders from the local to the national level need to maintain their leadership by applying PSP parameters to their leadership maintenance.

Educational leaders are the drivers of organisational settings to accomplish the mutually defined goals for all school actors and community professionals. To reach their desired goals, educational leaders depend on leadership maintenance that is initiated through PSP maintenance. These PSP parameters can be enriched by a 'Driving Leadership Style' that pragmatically initiates toning, teaming, tasking, transforming and timing (Rajbhandari, 2011, 2012) within the educational setting among the followership domains within the professional community and the student and students' groups. This pragmatic 'Driving Leadership Style' can enrich the followership domain by creating a harmonious environment and social wellbeing between the leaders and followers. Creating an organisational climate are the deliberate actions of leaders (Dowd, 1936; Bass and Stogdill, 1990; Jones and Rudd, 2008; Center for Comprehensive School Reform and Improvement, 2009). Therefore, PSP parameters are essential elements that enrich leadership and followership relationships, thus generating a cooperative and harmonious environment for all.

Leadership maintenance through PSP parameters is not mutually exclusive, as these parameters can be applied

according to the need that arises in the situational context. However, it is important to understand the situational variations and the contextual variables that have cause to persuade educational leaders to initiate these parameters at an equal rate. Maintaining these PSP parameters according to the need of the contextual variables, can generate the wellness of the leaders and consequently provide for the wellbeing of the followers, such as teachers, non-teaching staff and the students in educational settings. In the same vein, Luthans et. al. (2007) suggests leadership combined with positive psychological capital could offer leadership success through perseverance and self-appraisal. The psychological capital is considered as maintenance of the psychological parameters that generate a positive 'vibe' in creating followership psychological capital. This creates the mirror effect referred to earlier.

Wellness and wellbeing are necessary in organisational settings that can be obtained by the PSP paradigm. Psychological parameters can enrich leaders' minds to focus on the wellbeing of their followership, and to understand the immediate contextual variables. This enables educational leaders to become successful by generating wellbeing in the followership domain and to remain effective for accomplishing the organisational goal. Understanding the immediate contextual variations can be initiated by applying 'Referee Leadership Style' (Rajbhandari, 2013). The maintenance of PSP additionally enables this Referee leadership style to take the necessary course of action to measure the outcome.

However, in most educational settings, educational leaders' minds are diverted away from schools. This is caused by the national level policy makers, who are only concerned about the national educational system. They create policies that require educational leaders to focus on reporting school progress. This often provides barriers to

school leaders who have then to delegate most of their school management authorities to the deputy and vice principals. Often, these binding policies can frustrate the educational leaders, who remain psychologically unwell due to the external pressure – be it either changes in policy or in reporting.

The maintenance of the psychological parameters is of utmost importance for educational leaders to provide followership wellbeing. Moreover, maintenance of psychological parameters are equally necessary for the leaders at national level to enrich the wellness of school leadership.

Additionally, sociological parameters enable the harmonising of organisational environments which can maintain both educational leadership and followership. This initiates the bonding of leadership and followership that inspires a healthy culture in educational settings. Teachers and students both contribute to producing a harmonious environment for each other (Tsai, 2011). Healthy social relations enhance the psychological wellness of the followership environment (Owen, 2004). The maintenance of sociological parameters further generates wellbeing in the organisational environment and brings about a productive environment for all actors including the teachers, administrative staff and the students in the educational settings. Furthermore, PSP factors generate stable and long lasting leadership maintenance of harmony. Hoffman, Hutchman, and Reiss, (2009) state that a harmonious environment generates a good organisational climate and a conducive work environment where employee's wellbeing, in an educational setting, is of critical importance.

In the same vein, physiological parameters play an equally vital role in enhancing educational settings, both at local and national levels. The maintenance of adequate

physiological parameters enhances the wellness of the organisational settings as a whole by investing in them as the context demands. Being unable to tackle the necessary issues required by the organisational setting can negatively affect leadership success and may frustrate educational leaders. Thus, leadership maintenance has a reciprocity effect on the PSP maintenance of followership. Leadership maintenance within a PSP paradigm can generate the mirror effect that enhances the reciprocal effect between the leaders to the followers and vice a versa. The mirror effect generates the reciprocal effect of PSP that further generates the wellness to educational leaders and enrich followership wellbeing.

In regard to producing wellbeing in organisational settings among the leadership and followership, it is essential for leaders to create a trade-off and generate mirror effect. However, there is a real danger that when educational leaders create specific PSP parameters, they oppose followership expectations. This can be hazardous to educational settings and their professional community, mainly affecting the students. This can further disrupt the educational environment and create disturbances in the domain of followership wellbeing.

Generating positive PSP environment will maintain the wellbeing of the leadership and followership domain. Educational settings involve social wellbeing and, it is therefore understood, that maintenance of leadership and followership are equally vital for organisational effectiveness and efficiency. The maintenance of PSP enables leadership to understand themselves within contextual settings and the domain of followership. This further enables wellness of educational leaders and provides the maintenance of followership wellbeing.

Educational leaders can enhance PSP maintenance through leadership readiness – by maintaining their flexibility and mobility to meet the readiness of followership. This creates a beneficial climate in the educational settings between the leadership and followership domains (Rajbhandari et. al. 2014). Leadership readiness for flexibility and mobility enables educational leaders to maintain proper PSP parameters by understanding the immediate contextual variations and followership demands.

Although, school contexts differ, PSP parameters can also differ depending on each context. Therefore, educational leaders must be ready to understand their immediate variables in the contextual setting and to initiate maintenance of the PSP environment to suit the context. While, context plays an important role in shaping the leaders, so does leadership behavioural patterns (Rajbhandari, 2013). These leadership behavioural patterns generate the wellness of educational leaders and offer wellbeing in the professional community, causing a mirror effect on the reciprocal relationship from leadership to followership and vice versa.

Contextual variations can also occur from internal and external sources. Although external variations do not often occur, they can have an impact on educational settings by diverting the attention of educational leaders away from internal variations. Even though internal contextual variations are frequent, they have a long term impact. Despite understanding the importance of internal variables on organisational effectiveness, educational leaders are often distracted by having to meet and fulfil demands from external variations. This may cause psychological distress through social calamities, or through the inadequate availability of physical resources. This could be harmful towards leadership effectiveness

and success. Therefore, concern with both the internal and external variations, can enhance leadership maintenance and wellbeing in the organisational setting.

External variations are more powerful and difficult to control compared to internal variations, which are controllable but may occur more frequently. Frequently occurring internal variations can cause stress to both leaders and followers. In connection with this, leadership maintenance of PSP parameters plays an important role in alleviating the environmental context for both leaders and followers. This enriches one's wellness and the wellbeing to others through appropriately enabling psychological, sociological and physiological parameters as a tool to leadership maintenance.

Maintaining PSP parameters enables leaders to become successful through the enhancement of self-awareness and increased understanding of their contextual environment. Leadership maintenance enables educational leaders, not only to understand their surroundings, but also to understand their own capabilities and to maintain readiness for flexibility and mobility. This facilitates the maintenance of appropriate leadership styles to suit each situational context, which is achieved through leadership flexibility and the ability to understand the social contextual variables (Yulk, 2008). Furthermore, maintaining the appropriate leadership style enables educational leadership mobility and responsiveness to contextual variables. Adaptability in leadership personality and traits facilitates responsiveness to followership expectations.

Discussions and implications

Maintenance of psychological, sociological and physiological parameters enhances the leader wellness.

This generates a positive PSP followership domain through the mirror effect. Leader wellness is directly affected by the PSP parameters, which in turn affects employee wellbeing and generates a favourable environment for organisations.

The maintenance of PSP parameters for educational leaders, can be discussed with each parameter separately or as connected to each other. Although these PSP parameters are generally studied separately, they have significant importance in generating wellness among leaders and followers, and should also be studied together as they are interconnected, with different actors in the educational settings taking the lead in different contexts.

Moreover, studying these PSP parameters together strengthen the leadership paradigm, which provides a foundation for leadership maintenance. However, most research in leadership is situated in a psychological and sociological paradigm. It would be incomplete to measure leadership maintenance without the physiological component, which is one of the core factors in determining leadership competency in the context of logistics management.

It is, therefore, argued that one needs to understand variations in leadership practices in educational settings in relation to the sociological and psychological paradigm. However, logistics administration has an equal contribution towards school development and advancement. Thus, by strengthening the maintenance of PSP parameters, the wholeness of leadership can be strengthened – generating leadership confidence; trust and communication through the social interaction; cognitive enrichment; and resourcefulness. This would furthermore enhance leadership capability and willingness to sustain the school development.

Discussing the importance of leadership maintenance through the maintenance of PSP parameters produces a healthy environment as these parameters are strongly interlinked. Sociologically disturbed environs can affect the psychological state of being. In addition, disturbance in sociological and physiological parameters can also affect the mental state of leaders and negatively affect the organisational environment. Moreover, the inadequacy of physiological parameters can also influence the sociological and psychological parameters. Therefore, educational leaders, whether at local or national level, need to strive for appropriate PSP maintenance. This will enable educational leaders to gain confidence and win trust from their followers and co-workers.

Appropriate PSP maintenance can also enhance leadership driving elements that support the environmental contextual settings at a time of need. For example, maintaining physiological parameters alone, and becoming resourceful, enables an educational leader to support and prevent an organisation from unforeseen circumstances. However, being physiologically inadequate can cause distress to the organisation, as well as frustration in the followership domain, leading to the reciprocity referred to earlier as the mirror effect. In the same way, psychological distress causes social disturbance which further affects employee social wellbeing. Therefore, maintenance of PSP parameters can boost leadership competency to enhance PSP parameters among followership, bringing about organisational effectiveness.

The mirror effect between leaders and followers initiates and enriches PSP maintenance for both parties and in both domains. In educational settings, PSP maintenance is essential to leader and follower readiness. This leadership readiness improves leadership competence by enabling leadership flexibility and mobility. This, in

turn, generates follower readiness. In an educational setting, both leadership readiness and follower readiness play a vital role in organisational effectiveness. Thus, PSP maintenance can generate readiness for flexibility and mobility causing the reciprocal effect between the educational actors. This readiness for flexibility and mobility can have a positive effect on overcoming organisational contextual obstacles through professional socialisation, and by having a positive psychologically state of mind. This is caused by promoting the wellness of oneself, and by maintaining resourcefulness.

Furthermore, the responsibility for PSP maintenance lies with the leaders of an organisation, who are comparable to a bus driver with the followers as the passengers who are traveling in the same destination. Therefore, all actors in similar settings need PSP maintenance, which facilitates a harmonious ride through their leadership and followership relationship. Therefore, the maintenance of PSP parameters is necessary for the wellness of leaders and followership wellbeing.

In addition, reflexive leadership behaviour generates the reciprocal effects in follower actions, which are in turn reflexive towards the leaders. This cause-and-effect relationship between leader and follower behaviour determines the organisational climate and culture. Moreover, leadership maintenance of PSP parameters can contribute towards the formation of a positive climate and culture amongst the professional community and students. Consequently, the need for leadership maintenance of favourable PSP parameters can provide personal wellness and wellbeing for the professional community. This, in turn, further enables leadership's ability and willingness to contribute to the formation of a positive organisational climate among and between members of the professional

community, and improve their attitudes toward leadership approaches.

Conclusion

The need for leadership maintenance of favourable Psychological, Sociological and Physiological (PSP) parameters is essential for leadership wellness for mental brilliance, which is associated with the psychological paradigm to generate positive mind-sets of nature in understanding the immediate contextual setting. Sociological parameters generate wellbeing for educational leaders by creating a favourable climate in the followership domain. Similarly, physiological parameters enable educational leaders to build their confidence by remaining resourceful and able to meet uncertainty in the immediate and future context.

PSP parameters are strongly intertwined and are reflexive, generating a reciprocity or 'mirror effect' between leaders and followers. Although these parameters are strongly interconnected, they can be applied separately when necessary. However, because of their strong interconnectedness, an absence of one can create a disturbance. Therefore, the need for PSP maintenance is vital in shaping leaders' wellness and bringing about a harmonious organisational environment. However, the question of how PSP is applied is determined by contextual variables (such as situations), followership domain, leadership intelligence and organisational vision.

Moreover, leadership PSP maintenance is reflexive and can be transformed. This has a reciprocal effect on the followership domain causing a mirror effect. Therefore, leader PSP maintenance spontaneously generates the maintenance of favourable PSP parameters in the followership domain. Thus PSP parameters shape

leadership wellness, as well as follower's wellness and organisational wellbeing. This reciprocal relationship emphasises the need for leadership to initiate and maintain favourable PSP parameters in the organisational context.

REFERENCES

Bass, B. M. & Stogdill, R. M. (1990). *Hand book of leadership Theory, research and managerial applications* (3rd ed.). New York: The free press.

Center for Comprehensive School Reform and Improvement. (2009). *Developing a Positive School Climate.* Newsletter, Learning point associates. Author. http://eric.ed.gov/PDFS/ED505238.pdf

Dowd, J. (1936). *Control in human societies*. New York: Appleton-Century

Hoffman, L. L., Hutchman, C. J., & Reiss, E. (2009). On improving school climate: reducing reliance on rewards and punishment. *International Journal of Whole Schooling,* 5 (1), 13—24.

Jones, D & Rudd, R. (2008). Transactional, transformational, or laissez-faire leadership: an assessment of college of agriculture academic program leaders' (deans) leadership styles. *Journal of Agricultural Education*, 49 (2), 88—97.

Liden, R. C., Wayne, S. J., Zhao, H., & Henderson, D. (2008). Servant leadership: Development of a multidimensional measure and multi-level assessment. *Leadership Quarterly*, *19*, 161-177.

Luthans, F., Avolio, B. J., Avey, J. B., & Norman, S. M. (2007). Positive psychological capital: Measurement and relationship with performance

and satisfaction. *Personnel Psychology, 60,* 541-572.

Owens, R. G. (2004). *Organizational behaviour in education: Adaptive leadership and school reform* (8th ed.). Boston: Allyn & Bacon.

Peterson, S. J., Walumbwa, F. O., Byron, K., & Myrowitz, J. (2009). CEO positive psychological traits, transformational leadership, and firm performance in high technology start-up and established firms. *Journal of Management, 35,* 348-368.

Rajbhandari, M. M. S. (2013). *School leadership en-route to grand leap. Case studies from Nepal and Finland.* (Doctoral Dissertation). University of Tampere. ISBN 978-951-44-9235-8 (pdf)

Rajbhandari, M. M. S., Loock,C., Du Plessis, P & Rajbhandari, S. (2014). *Leadership Readiness for Flexibility and Mobility: The 4th Dimensions on Situational Leadership Styles in Educational Settings*. ED552915

Rajbhandari, M. M. S. (2012). *Growing with driving leadership style in school: A case study on leadership of Finnish elementary schools in Tampere*. University of Tampere. School of Education. Tampere, Finland. ED532213. Retrieved from http://eric.ed.gov/PDFS/ED532213.pdf

Rajbhandari. M. M. S. (2011). *Driving leadership style in leading to enhance participation and involvement in school.* University of Tampere. School of Education. Tampere, Finland. ED520899.

Tsai, Y. (2011). Relationship between Organizational Culture, Leadership Behavior and Job Satisfaction. *BMC Health Services Research*. Vol (11). No (98). doi:10.1186/1472-6963-11-98

Yulk, G. (2008). *The Importance of Flexible Leadership.* The importance, assessment, and development of flexible leadership, practitioner forum presented at the 23rd annual conference of the Society for Industrial-Organizational Psychology, April, 2008. San Francisco, CA.

About the Author:
Dr. Mani Man Singh Rajbhandari
Postdoctoral Researcher
Department of Educational Leadership and Management
Faculty of Education
University of Johannesburg
mannierajbhandari@hotmail.com

MANUSCRIPT GUIDELINES

1. Submissions in either English or French are welcome.
2. Manuscripts should conform to the guidelines set out in the *Publication Manual of the American Psychological Association* (*APA*, 2010, 6th ed.)
3. Manuscripts should not exceed 5,000 words and must include an abstract of 100-150 words.
4. The manuscript title should be shown on the first page only. The name(s) of the author(s), address(es), email(s), and affiliation(s) should be on a separate sheet. Electronic submission is preferred.
5. Manuscripts are accepted for consideration on the understanding that the material is original and is not under consideration for publication elsewhere. All manuscripts will be subject to review by a panel of jurors.
6. If tables or figures are to be included, they must be submitted in electronic copy, formatted with two-inch (2") margins all sides. (For extensive graphics or photographs, Print ready PDF may be required).
7. If notes to the text are required, they must be included as Endnotes, and NOT Footnotes. The use of extensive notes is not encouraged.

Address: *Journal of Educational Thought*
Werklund School of Education, University of Calgary
2500 University Dr. N.W.
Calgary, Alberta T2N 1N4
Email: jet@ucalgary.ca

COPYRIGHT POLICY

Alberta Advisory Committee for Educational Studies (AACES)


University
of Alberta

The Alberta
Teachers' Association

The
University of
Lethbridge

AACES is a partnership among the faculties of education at the Universities of Alberta, Calgary and Lethbridge and the Alberta Teachers' Association. The main purpose of AACES is to encourage and financially support educational research in Alberta. Recent projects AACES has contributed funding to are:

Institute	*Principle Researcher*	*Title*
U of C	Dr A Kassan	A Phenomenolgical Investigation of Adolescent Newcomers' Experiences of School Integration
U of C	Dr J Seidel	Towards a Curriculum for the Anthropocene: An Inquiry into Teacher Practice
U of A	Dr M Kim	Argumentation in-the-making in/for Socioscientific Problem Solving
U of A	Dr D Cormier	Examining Specific Cognitive Abilities as Potential Contributers to an Efficacious Model of Academic Intervention
U of A	Dr G Georgiou	How is Reading Fluency Achieved?
U of C	Dr K Lenters	Playing on Words: Multi-model Composing in the Elementary Classroom
U of C	Dr K Koh	Building Teachers' Capacity in Authentic Assessment and Assessment Learning
U of C	Dr M Schroeder	A Comparison of Models Used to Identify Learning Disabilities in Reading and Mathematics
U of L	Dr K Adams	Access of Hands-on Math Activities in the Classroom for Children with Severe Physical Disabilities
U of C	Dr S Russell-Mayhew	Recruiting and Engaging Teachings in the Area of Health and Weight: Feasibility, Utility and Efficacy

For further information on AACES and to obtain an application form, contact

Doreen Link, Secretary, Alberta Advisory Committee for Educational Studies
c/o The Alberta Teachers' Association
3016 5 Avenue NE Suite 100, Calgary AB T2A 6K4
Telephone 403-265-2672 or 1-800-332-1280, E-mail: doreen.link@ata.ab.ca
Online applications are available at:
www.teachers.ab.ca/For Members/Professional+Development/Resources