


1974

## Graduate Education and New Jobs in Education

Paul A. Olson

*University of Nebraska-Lincoln*, polson2@unl.edu

Follow this and additional works at: <http://digitalcommons.unl.edu/englishfacpubs>

 Part of the [Comparative Literature Commons](#), [Education Economics Commons](#), [English Language and Literature Commons](#), [Higher Education Commons](#), [Higher Education Administration Commons](#), [Modern Literature Commons](#), and the [Reading and Language Commons](#)

---

Olson, Paul A., "Graduate Education and New Jobs in Education" (1974). *Faculty Publications -- Department of English*. 151.  
<http://digitalcommons.unl.edu/englishfacpubs/151>

This Article is brought to you for free and open access by the English, Department of at DigitalCommons@University of Nebraska - Lincoln. It has been accepted for inclusion in Faculty Publications -- Department of English by an authorized administrator of DigitalCommons@University of Nebraska - Lincoln.

# *Graduate Education and New Jobs in Education*

Paul A. Olson

Study Commission on Undergraduate Education and the Education of Teachers  
University of Nebraska-Lincoln, Lincoln, Nebraska

In the next ten years, today's doctoral candidates will be competing with the three to four hundred thousand Ph.D.'s emerging from our graduate schools (I'm not sure how many Ed.D.'s we'll have in addition to that). In the same period of time, we are likely to have twenty thousand retirements from the Ph.D. core. Additional R & D may require 12,000 to 50,000 Ph.D.'s, depending on how many the government needs. That makes only 70,000 jobs for the possible 400,000 candidates.

Of course, there are various ways in which the surplus can be "handled." If the faculties on all 2-year colleges, 4-year colleges, all universities, and all graduate schools are entirely made up of Ph.D.'s—that is, if we were to push a kind of new credentialism in the next ten years, we could absorb the Ph.D. surplus. If every college teacher were to be a Ph.D., we would have no surplus. Now there are only about 6 percent Ph.D.'s in the 2-year colleges, about 40 percent in the 4-year colleges, about 60 percent in the universities, and about 90 percent on the graduate faculties. A certain number of people could be absorbed by a more intense credentialism, an extension of the sort of credentialism which has already been developed in the common schools which has been neither humane nor productive.

A fair portion of this surplus will undoubtedly occur in education because education is the area of least new undergraduate demand. Since there will be a surplus of elementary and secondary teachers developed in the next ten years, some say as many as a million, there is not likely to be much of a demand for the teachers of teachers or for graduate educators, the educators of those who, in turn, teach teachers what to do in school. Nor will there be much demand for undergraduate educators.

The response of higher education management systems to the school teacher surplus has been varied and the Study Commission has written to virtually all of the higher education planning and management systems in the country as part of a study to find out what they are doing about the education manpower surplus. In some states, the planning or management response is a *laissez-faire* response, as if to say—"We're not doing anything about it." Other states using a *laissez-faire* approach supply consumer information to the student and tend to say: "It's fine to go into education, but the likelihood of your getting a job is such-and-such." By providing that sort of information and counseling, these states have produced some decline in the number of people going into teacher education. Other states are acting more vigorously, and are

limiting enrollments, closing institutions, or closing or reshaping the teacher education segments of institutions to respond to new needs.

I recently talked to Arnold Jirik from Minnesota. He had evidence that there were more undergraduate education majors being trained in physical education in Minnesota than there were total jobs—not only jobs that were likely to become available, but total jobs. Jirik estimated that such teacher education was wasting many millions of dollars in his state alone. Where teacher education has produced the “physical education” teacher, it has no market any longer; and it is coming under increasing legislative scrutiny. Where it has produced another kind of teacher, it still has a role. It will still provide jobs.

First, we must consider the areas of continuing need. Practically all the statistics that I can gather suggest that some states still need mathematics teachers, science teachers, and certain sorts of special education teachers (particularly those who can deal with the handicapped—the more intense the handicap, the more clinical the skills need to be, and the greater the shortage). I cluster these areas together as the subject areas requiring the more precise intellectual or pedagogic skills.

There are also continuing shortages in the area of community education. There may be a surplus of foreign language teachers but there is a shortage of teachers who speak “the language of the child,” in that about 11 million of the 41 million children in classrooms face teachers who don’t speak their first language. That at least was the estimate of *The Education Professions: 1968*; and the recent Kennedy Bilingual Bill testimony suggests that bilingual monies have not changed matters much. The 11 million figure includes children who speak either a reservation dialect or a black dialect or children who are French speaking from Louisiana or New England, children who speak one of the Spanish-American dialects, and the children of Eastern European backgrounds in some sections of the country who use a language other than English at home. However, creating a market in bilingual or bidialectal areas may require moving some present teachers—a procedure which must also have the support of legal sanctions. Teachers who can teach in vocational and career education formats, partic-

ularly career education teachers, are needed. These should be people who can relate to work and industry outside the schools and who can represent what they are doing within the schools—teachers who can handle Parkway-style formats. Open classroom teachers have also been much in demand, as have various community teachers—sensitivity session conductors, adult education teachers, non-traditional, post-secondary educators, community services teachers.

The master of precise intellectual or pedagogic skills and the master of community building skills—these are in demand. This suggests that the demand exists, and will exist, where education can show that it clearly makes a difference.

A disturbing piece of research by James Popham suggests that one can take people who have gone through conventional teacher education and people off the streets who have comparable intellectual ability, and one can’t, testing results with students and using a conventional research design, distinguish the results of their teaching.

I suspect that our failure to produce teachers and teachers of teachers who make a clear difference explains why the world is not enthusiastic about our services. The departments of graduate and undergraduate education which will suffer as a consequence of the surplus will be school administration departments, departments of elementary and secondary curriculum and instruction, and conventional foundations and educational psychology departments. Such departments have too often not created the skills needed. These would not be the areas where I would prepare myself were I planning to be a teacher of teachers.

First, there is presently an oversupply of school administrators, and there is a movement gaining momentum to remove licensing requirements for administrators—by virtue of legislative action in California (the Ryan bill) and litigation in New York (*Mercado and Chance v. New York City Board of Examiners*). One need not go too far afield to demonstrate that conventional graduate school administration departments in education have not sought and found persons having a high degree of intellectual or community building skill; *Leadership in American Education* describes the educational administrator as community builder:

The future educators [i.e., school administrators] also had fewer of their numbers at the far right or far left of the political spectrum than men aspiring to other fields. While they tended in larger proportions to agree that the federal government should be involved in such social issues as eliminating poverty, speeding school desegregation and changing some aspects of the environment, they were less prone to take an activist role in protesting U.S. military policy, college administration policy, or racial policy. The future educators also more heavily favored mandatory approval of student publications by college officials as well as the banning of extremist speakers on campus. They had larger percentages agreeing that colleges are too lax on student protesters and that the courts give too much concern to the rights of criminals. In other words, the men indicating their career choice as education tended to assign institutions more power in controlling societal problems and individuals than men planning to go into all other fields.<sup>1</sup>

It is my sense that administrator sanctioned institutional coercion is something different from building a community in which children can be reared (educated) to serve the common profit of the community.

The second area where the job market may be tight is elementary and secondary curriculum and instruction simply because of the surplus. In-service teacher education in these areas will go on in community field sites: Lighthouse Schools, Portal Schools, or "school-community" teacher training centers. If one can develop first rate analytic skills as a clinician, particularly as a school-based clinician, if one can in some way act as an analyst in the school to improve the capacity of the school to function, if one can, as a trainer of teachers, assist the capacity of teachers to function, there will be a job available to one as a specialist in curriculum and instruction. Teacher educators should develop a pretty clear idea of how they can use their training not only in the school, and not only as clinicians in the schools, but in other sorts of educa-

tional enterprises. How can teachers be trained for industry? Reading is taught in industry—almost as much as it is taught in the schools. How can teachers be trained for adult education jobs? How, if one is in political science and curriculum, can he train community action program people, community organizers, street political educators? There is a wide assortment of arenas in which one could develop curriculum and instruction talents.

The third area where I think there is going to be a glut on the market is in the area of foundations. I don't think that higher education is going to hire a great many more people in such areas as the history of education, the philosophy of education, and educational psychology. There may, in the future, be more intensive work in educational anthropology and sociology because of interest in the community function of education. The reasons for the surplus in the other areas again are: (1) the teacher surplus, and (2) the increasing recalcitrance of college administrators to support separate graduate departments in education-and-social science areas. Psychology in an institution should be one department and not fifteen. There should be joint liberal arts-education graduate faculties and the same sorts of quality controls should be applied to psychology departments in liberal arts colleges or medical schools and in colleges of education.

What then are the graduate areas where there are likely to be jobs? I have covered some of the obvious areas of need. I want to discuss five areas which are less obvious and almost certain to be required of some future graduate education persons by circumstances, if not by edicts: (1) education law; (2) educational economics; (3) validation; (4) studies in the community factor; and (5) epistemology:

*The Law.* I think the first area of new need is public interest education law. It will be increasingly necessary that teachers know the law in several areas. One is the area of student rights. I have a Missouri ACLU brief summarizing the cases involving student rights. There must be several dozen cases which have been decided within the last few

---

1. Donald P. Mitchell, Anne Hawley, *Leadership in Public Education Study: A Look at the Overlooked*, Academy for Educational Development, Inc., 1972, p. 22.

years which make a significant difference about the rights of students and the obligations of teachers in such areas as academic freedom, political freedom, behavior control, etc. It is irresponsible to send young education personnel into the schools without their knowing their legal obligations, what sorts of torts they might commit, and which behavior control devices are available to them and which are not.

The law may become increasingly severe in the area of the responsibility of the teacher-accountability. I would suggest that you read the brief in the Peter Doe case in San Francisco. The center of the case rests not on the general negligence of the San Francisco school system, but on the negligence of specific school employees. The plaintiff is holding the system responsible for torts which were performed by individual employees, particularly employees who appear to have communicated, or of whom it is alleged that they communicated, misinformation to the parents. If that case succeeds, teaching will change. A case of the Peter Doe sort will certainly succeed. It is simply impossible that school districts should be able to require people to go to school, have no accountability for what happens in the schools, and not be subject to suit for negligence. If the Doe case succeeds, the school districts are increasingly going to want to know what the canons of accountability are, and they're going to require that their employees demonstrate that they meet criteria of professionalism upheld by the courts.

The third area of school law that graduate people need to know has to do with credential law. A series of court cases will follow in the wake of the Griggs case in North Carolina. The Griggs case held that the giving of intelligence tests to black employees was a non-job specific impediment to the holding of a job. The Mercado case was raised on the basis of the Griggs case. There are several other cases which are pending with respect to supervisor licensing and teacher licensing based on Griggs. What the court held in the

Griggs case, what courts have held in subsequent cases, was that the EEOC guidelines for licensing are the guidelines which they will support. The EEOC guidelines say that licensing can be based on three sets of validation: content validation, construct validation, or predictive validation. None are in use in education now.

The first two forms of validation may not hold up in the courts. Content validation means that a person demonstrates that he knows prior to getting the license, content which is, according to expert testimony, related in significant symmetrical ways to the nature of the job. By virtue of a person's having had that content and someone else's not having that content, you could assure the public that this person can do the job better than that person. Construct validation is more an assessment of what a person is than what he knows, an assessment of a certain gestalt or pattern of talents which demonstrates that one can handle a job. Predictive validity, which the courts are increasingly insisting on, requires the creation of a test which, when administered to people, arrays them in such a way that when they go into the jobs, the way in which the test has arrayed them also becomes the way in which they array themselves in their performance of a job. For a licensing procedure to be predictively valid with respect to teaching, it would have to show that a teacher who ranked high in this test would have X salutary effects on the students; that teachers who ranked low on the test, or teachers-to-be who ranked low on the test, would have Y undesirable effects on the students. The validation will have to be culture specific for there is no evidence whatever that the same teaching talents or skills are needed in Rough Rock, Arizona, and Westport, Connecticut. Licensing tests will have to be re-validated by culture and neighborhood by neighborhood.

I could elicit other legal areas—school finance, cultural neutrality, accreditation—where we need graduate level legal special-

ized skill to develop American education and educators, but these instances show that advanced expertise is needed.

*Economics.* The second graduate area which I think will develop quickly and partly out of such legal cases as the Serrano and Rodriguez cases is the area of economics—the study of economics and learning. Education is our largest industry. It is larger than the military, larger than General Motors. It is almost wholly in the grants, not the exchange, economy. It has hardly been studied at all by economists. The relationship between resource allocation and learning, between the ways in which resources are allocated and how children learn, has not been studied. It is beginning to be studied in experiments, a few very low-key experiments, such as the voucher system study at Alum Rock. Some of the experiments with behavior modification could perhaps also qualify as experiments in resource allocation.

People learn in terms of some image of the world (Boulding argues this and I believe him), some sort of image of a payoff that will come as a consequence of the learning. The payoff need not be monetary, but it must be there. The institutions which prepare people for our laissez faire economy are almost entirely in the grants economy and like the military in that their continuation depends on a one-way grant from the government to the client. The way in which they receive and offer “payoffs” varies from the way of society. As people try to investigate the economics of a new laissez faire education, the voucher experiments and the behavior modification experiments may be supplemented by efforts to support proprietary institutions and efforts to challenge the monopoly powers of accrediting associations and credentialing agencies. This work will be done by graduate level specialists in economics-and-education. Ultimately we may achieve an education in which education’s system of payoffs will both encourage learning and fit with society’s system. In this search, research in the free schools with their new form of organization and of payoff will be crucial.

*Validation.* A third graduate area connected to the study of education law and education economics will be the area of “education validation.” As you probably know, 30,000 black teachers in the South who had conventional credentials—many of them from NCATE institutions—have lost their jobs on the basis of their being forced to take the NTE, and receiving “inappropriate scores.” A certain cutoff point was established. If one got a score below that level, he or she couldn’t become or continue to be a teacher. There is a test case in the courts in Virginia, two tests in North Carolina and South Carolina, challenging the NTE test as non-job specific and as culturally biased. Having a conventional credential from an accredited institution may not mean much any more. Why should it? Obviously when racist opportunities for taking away the credential presented themselves to the states, the states took advantage of the opportunities, took away the credentials from people who had them from accredited institutions, and did not recognize that their initial accrediting-credentialing procedures were wrong. And that constitutes an interesting precedent. It may well be that, in the future, teachers will not simply have to validate their credentials, but that they will have to revalidate them. The Fleischman Commission in New York has presented the notion that revalidation should be a necessity in another five years. So, in the future, much of the work of the graduate level teacher educator may be concerned with validation and revalidation.

How will it be done? If one makes a predictive test, he must know what the teacher is to do—what kinds of effects on the kids the teacher should have. One of the great educational decisions of the future will require our deciding whether we’re trying to make teachers for all sections of the country who should have the same sorts of effects on all kids, or whether we are trying to educate different sorts of teachers whose effects will be neighborhood and culture-specific. The effect of the national educational assessment (and of many other things which the Office of Education has created) has been to create or solidify nation-

wide norms, utterly wrong-headed norms. The pressure ought to be in the direction of de-centralization, in the direction of assigning the community the responsibility for the rearing and the education of its own children, and for the discerning of which sorts of educational and vocational skills are necessary.

Decentralization may *yet* happen. The Yoder case in Wisconsin gives to the parents the right to take their children out of school if they can show that their children become productive citizens of the adult community without receiving high school educations. The informal educational processes which the community controls allow the children to become competent adults. The same right has been extended to the Miccosukee Indians in Florida. If many more such decisions are made, they will point to the development of more community-specific norms for validating what the child rearing and educating process should do and how it should be done. I see a time where parents may well decide, in certain communities, "We want high reading scores." But other communities may want people who can operate successfully in local crafts and industries. Other communities may want people with a high level of political sophistication. Other people may emphasize quality of life and expressive activities. And the educational validation will be the validation of the right to hold an educational job in a specific sort of environment given specific sorts of school goals. The teacher educator will have to show that certain persons have certain sorts of skills and can deliver in such-and-such environments.

*The Community Factor.* In order to do decent in-community educational validation, we're going to have to be much more knowledgeable about the relationship between education and culture, between work and education, between child rearing and education, between play and education, and between formal and informal education than we have been in the past. So this is the fourth graduate area—what I would call the "community factor in education": what is the relationship

between what happens in the community and how children learn; what sorts of interventions beyond a sort of ongoing organic sort of biological life are likely to produce learning in the direction that the community and the parents want? Presently we have a heavy emphasis on education for careers in this country. But "education" and "work" are not autonomous. Education is set in a community setting. The meaning of work depends on the history of the community and the extent to which work in the past has produced productive gains for the community. What happens not only in education, but what happens in the common expressive and cultural life of the community is tremendously closely associated with peoples' attitudes toward work. You get little sense of that in much national career education literature.

I've been placed on a career education task force for the Office of Education. I'm trying to call attention to the notion that it doesn't make much sense to tell people to develop a work ethic if they've never profited from work in the past. You will not develop a strong work ethic if, say, the primary expressive motive in the community is "dicing" on the street corner, which is dependent on a providential, fortunistic notion of the universe, where a providential god is going to intervene any moment and deliver the goods for you anyway. If fortunistic notions are perpetuated through the media and through the expressive life of the culture, then it's very, very difficult to develop the notion that "work is good for you." Simultaneously, in a community where there is no history of productive gain from work and no experience of ownership or profit sharing, it's very difficult to develop a work ethic. It is nonsensical to try to develop a work ethic simply by working on the exposure of young people to work environments and telling them about the intellectual content of those work environments without working on the expressive and cultural life. We have to have some kind of analysis of how expressive culture relates to education and how education relates to work. I personally am interested in the work of Brian

Sutton-Smith. He views play as a rehearsal of various sorts of educational and social processes, rehearsing the laws of logic, rehearsing the laws of social relationships. He views it as rehearsing what goes on in the work environment. He sees the relationships as going the other way, too: work as being renewed through education and through various expressive activities in the community. One of the things that we don't know very much about is how these rehearsals take place, and which rehearsals are productive—how the game life of the community relates to its educational and work life. How much of education is redundant? I'm certain lots of it is—perhaps most of it. Coleman recently released a report suggesting that almost all of what we do in formal education is redundant.

*Epistemology.* The final area where I think graduate teacher educators are needed is in the area of epistemology-epistemological studies. We've learned a great deal about human learning in the last fifty years; not much of it has come from colleges of education or education research specialists. It has come from people like Piaget, Chomsky, Levi-Strauss. Many of them have been structuralists. While structuralists do excellent jobs of describing how human learning takes place, they aren't very helpful in describing what sorts of interventions are helpful. You have, among the structuralists, interest in whole systems: identifications of particles, of operations (different things that can be done with the particles) and of the constraints on those operations (laws). If one looks at whole systems, it is difficult to know what sorts of interventions will produce productive changes in the total system. We know very little about what interventions ought to take place and what the functions of the interventions might be in children or in adults.

Much of the future belongs to adult education. We are very naïve about adult learning. Some of the most interesting research I've seen recently is research that David Hawkins did at the Mountain View Center in Boulder, Colorado. What he has found is that many of the operations that children apparently can

perform, given the experimental matrix that Piaget offered to the child, are experiments that adults can't perform on other sorts of environments. For example, conservation of matter experiments: Give people marbles instead of clay, or instead of liquid, and adults have difficulty with those experiments; very fundamental sorts of logical operations are apparently internalized at very different ages.

Teacher education has too largely concerned itself with a study of schooling rather than a study of education. In the next generation, given the concerns that I've talked about, we're going to have to look much more intensively, on the one hand, at how much human beings learn as biological creatures and, on the other hand, at all the cultural and legal constraints on learning that exist. We will look at education in industry, in the community, in community action programs, in the tribal council, education through ritual, and through play, as well as through public schooling. The job of the graduate educator will be to know how people learn in order to create the legal, economic, and community mechanisms to help people learn in community how to achieve fulfillment in community.

The pressure of the job market, of society, and of the law on the graduate teacher educator is going to move many graduate educators to become *community clinicians*—working in such areas as law, validation, economics, epistemology, and community building. In the future I look for the development of school-community teacher training centers. Graduate teacher educators, clinicians, will be hired by school districts and higher education. The group which will determine the day-to-day job of the teacher educator, the perimeters of that job, would be the parents themselves, and the children. The teacher educator will be the servant of the community. When I speak of the school-community teacher training center, I am talking about the general movement in this country toward combining the human services and centering them in the schools or centering them in single agencies. This is happening in Vermont. It is happening in New York. It is happening also in the restructuring of colleges of education. More and more colleges of



education are moving from being simply colleges of education to being human resources schools or human services and education schools. The school-community teacher training center might include a credit union; it might include an employment agency; it might include banquets in the evening and folk dancing as at Canaan, Vermont (a teacher training center that I heard about recently); it might also be a center for adult education; for political counsel and legal aid. Many of these activities are already, in part, centered in the school, but they tend to be centered there only as they deal with the child and not as they deal with the total community. (One of the real difficulties in the human services areas has been the difficulty of families getting contradictory advice from a variety of human service agencies –not being dealt with as total families—and the community not being dealt with as a total community.)

If such a school-community center were created, this would mean that the children would have access to the adult work spaces. To many, this is an important agenda: that children have access to adult political, health, occupational, and fiscal space. And in the center context, I would hope that the teacher educator would act as a clinician—as a

technical assistance expert. The center, as I envisage it, would also be a conduit into the community. Increasingly the school as a surrogate workspace is going to be dissolved, and children are going to learn in industry and professional workspaces and in the other expressive areas that are available to the adult culture.

What would the graduate teacher educator do in such a school? I can think of several things. He might be a validation expert. This professional might validate the skills of either first-time teacher trainees or in-service teachers: their capacity to serve a certain kind of community, a specific kind of culture, and the educational goals of that community and culture. The teacher educator might validate those skills in the community or the classroom. With specialized training in economics, he might be a fiscal consultant and teacher trainer. He might be a legal consultant and teacher trainer, or an analyst of the community's cultural life, its play life, its industrial life, and what goes on in the schools. But whatever the job, the graduate teacher educator would be looking at something more than the school—looking at education in the real sense: learning what needs to be known to achieve fulfillment in community.

