

N787

© 1978

CHARLES J. VOLIN, Jr.

ALL RIGHTS RESERVED

SOCIAL AND PHILOSOPHICAL FOUNDATIONS OF CAREER EDUCATION:

DEWEY, MARX AND GOODMAN

By

Charles J. Volin, Jr.

A DISSERTATION

Submitted to
Michigan State University
in partial fulfillment of the requirements
for the degree of

DOCTOR OF PHILOSOPHY

Department of Secondary Education and Curriculum

1978

6112712

ABSTRACT

SOCIAL AND PHILOSOPHICAL FOUNDATIONS OF CAREER EDUCATION:
DEWEY, MARX AND GOODMAN

By

Charles J. Volin, Jr.

Career education is presently one of the most widely accepted educational innovations in our nation. As a concept, it offers the potential for many needed changes in our educational system. However, it has not achieved its expected potential in practice. This is unfortunate given the models, programs, and studies that have been developed to accomplish exactly that end. It is clear that the "how to" of career education is very well detailed in the literature, but it is equally evident that the "why" of career education has not been adequately addressed. Thus the problem can be summarized by stating that career education presently exists as a practice without a unifying theory.

The purpose of this study is to explore the reasons for career education's existence in our society. It remains an unclear concept that is open to virtually all interpretations which can be related to present or future employment. Educationally it is without a coherent philosophy, and socially it does not

identify with a particular social system. It is understood to validly represent positions ranging from modified vocational training to develop a salable skill to education involving all aspects of one's life. This places practicing educators in the position of being unable to adequately develop and critically analyze the movement.

What is needed to address these weaknesses in the career education concept is: (a) a viable generic definition detailing what is to be career education and what will remain general education; (b) a clear and understandable description of the type of society that should exist for the best possible enactment of career education; (c) a coherent philosophy of education to enable proper critiquing of career education, both theoretically and in practice; and (d) a general description of teaching methods and educational environments that would be conducive to successful implementation of a career education program.

This study will examine the major works of John Dewey, Karl Marx and Paul Goodman related to how men should live and function in a proper society. It is clear that these men are diverse, but it is also apparent upon closer examination that they are unified in many ways. They all have basic assumptions about man and his environment, and his particular needs to live a fully human life. The study will also show that there exists a logical and progressive pattern, relevant to career education, in the work of Dewey, Goodman, and Marx. This pattern will center

Charles J. Volin, Jr.

on the idea of "praxis," the unity of theory and practice in the active transformation of society.

Dewey's work will be examined primarily to detail educational institutions, practices and philosophy via his praxis. Goodman will relate, more so than Dewey, the relationship of contemporary schools and society. Further, he reviews present day problems from a humanistic psychological perspective; i.e., speaking directly to human nature and growth. Marx will explore alienation and show its relationship to social structure. It is by uniting these three thrusts of educational thought, in conjunction with points (a) and (b) above, that career educators will be able to create an educational "praxis" that will affect our society in a positive way.

DEDICATION

In warmest memory of my father

Charles J. Volin

and to my mother

Jane G. Volin

ACKNOWLEDGMENTS

Deep appreciation is extended to present members of my Doctoral Guidance Committee: Dr. George Barnett, Chairman; Dr. Marvin Grandstaff, Dissertation Director; Dr. Carl Brautigam; Dr. James B. McKee; and former members Dr. Frank Blackington, Past Chairman; Dr. George Ferree and Dr. Dale Alam.

I particularly wish to extend a warm thanks to Dr. George Barnett, Dr. Marvin Grandstaff and Dr. Frank Blackington for their vital and active roles in my entire educational program. It was through their classwork and discussions that I became involved in educational philosophy and found the challenge to relate it to current practice.

I wish to extend a special thanks to the following friends who have aided my writing greatly through their conversations, encouragement, technical assistance, and general support: Dr. James Kaminsky, A. Joseph Hollerbeck, Mary Ellen Malina, Fr. Theodore LaMarre, Marion Stiles, Linda Kathleen Bergan, Dr. William Horie, Freddie Rumbaugh, and in a special way to Noel Patrick Volin and Nicole Patrice Volin.

TABLE OF CONTENTS

	Page
DEDICATION	ii
ACKNOWLEDGMENTS	iii
Chapter	
I. SOCIAL AND PHILOSOPHICAL FOUNDATIONS OF CAREER EDUCATION: DEWEY, MARX AND GOODMAN	1
II. CAREER EDUCATION: REVIEW AND PERSPECTIVE	18
III. DEWEY ON SOCIETY, EDUCATIONAL PHILOSOPHY AND VOCATIONAL EDUCATION	42
On Society	42
On Educational Philosophy	54
On Vocational Education	67
IV. PAUL GOODMAN: A SOCIAL AND HUMANISTIC CRITIQUE OF SOCIETY AND EDUCATIONAL INSTITUTIONS	78
V. KARL MARX ON SOCIETY AND ALIENATION	97
VI. THE SOCIAL AND PRACTICAL UNITY OF DEWEY, GOODMAN, AND MARX RELATED TO CAREER EDUCATION	116
VII. CONCLUSION	135
BIBLIOGRAPHY	162
APPENDIX	167

CHAPTER I

SOCIAL AND PHILOSOPHICAL FOUNDATIONS OF CAREER EDUCATION: DEWEY, MARX AND GOODMAN

The purpose of this investigation is to examine the educational concept of career education in a different light than that most often used to illuminate its features. Most often career education is discussed and examined in the "how to" category, i.e., how it is presently practiced and how educators can improve upon that practice. The problem with that approach is found in the inherent assumption that all questions and problems of "why" pursue career education have been examined and satisfactorily answered. Major proponents of career education do not, of course, say that all the answers are in. They clearly admit adjustment will be forthcoming and will be welcomed. Again the problem centers not on the willingness to adjust but rather on the question of what will be adjusted. Exponents are open to definition adjustments and implementation adaptations. Yet, have they adequately explored "why" schools ought to install this new educational model?

The major thrust of this study will be to explore the "why" aspect of career education. However, prior to that examination it will be necessary to clarify the definition and/or general guidelines to properly conceive of career education. The sides

are split between an expanded version of vocational education and the newer concept of "whole or lifelong career education." Clarification is needed because there is confusion among the leaders of the movement. If the definition goes toward vocational education it would be hard to argue that change is offered. If, on the other hand, the definition goes toward educating for "careers" or "roles" for one's "whole life," then change is to take place in educational settings. It must be noted that change cannot be justified by mere dictation; it implies the obligation for such action to be examined for its pro and con elements in the environment in which it is to take place.

This study will hypothesize that the type of definition that is compatible with the movement of career education will follow the general form of "whole or lifelong" careers. It will then hypothesize that for that general type or kind of career education to evolve it will be necessary to develop a social and philosophical foundation; i.e., a justification that will meet necessary and sufficient tests. It is assumed that mandated law does not sufficiently define or justify this curriculum any more than compulsory attendance laws justify any "education."

Presently career education is taking place in Michigan because it is mandated by law. Actual practice varies from highly developed structures that call for curriculum modification to curricula that remain unchanged with a brief rationale stating that career education is to be incorporated into the existing

program. Obviously, the type of school systems described view career education from vastly different vantage points, yet both can meet the test of the law. It is for this reason that the hypothesis claiming social and philosophical foundations for the movement must be identified and explored. This is not to state only one social structure or one educational philosophy exists for career education; rather it is meant to convey the point that social structure and educational philosophy must be part of any such educational scheme. Further, a superficial description of either component is not enough. It is interesting to note that the very same problem career education aims to eliminate is, in fact, built into its present program; i.e. alienation. To eliminate alienation, a person performing a task must understand its total importance, and its relation to himself, society and the environment. Also he must view such relationships as positive. It is clear that career education as presently conceived does not allow a practitioner to be non-alienated. The educator implementing career education does not have the knowledge to allow him to be non-alienated; he is in the "classic labor" position.

Perhaps Plato's Ideal State can help illustrate the above claim on alienation. Briefly, Plato divided his ideal society into three levels and assigned corresponding metal labels to each. The lowest level was composed of farmers, artisans, and traders. They were named "people of brass." This level was ruled by an appetitive desire for material gain and lacked the intellectual

ability to know higher "goods." The middle level was labeled "people of silver." This group was made up of warriors and middle level public officials. They were capable of identifying higher "goods" and believed those goods had real worth. This group was noble and spirited--the protectors of the society. Further, they could balance the natural appetitive desires with knowledge of what was good beyond mere physical satisfaction and they were capable of deferred gratification. However, they were not able to understand exactly why "X" was good but they knew it was by "right belief;" i.e., they knew it bettered life for all but were unable to explain why.

The highest group was labeled "people of gold" and this group became the famed "Philosopher Kings." They were the rulers of the society and, according to Plato's design, were such only because of merit, ability, and knowledge. This group directed all others because they "knew" and "understood" why "X" was good and could explain it to others according to their level. Plato held that ideal goods existed and the "people of gold" were capable of knowing the ideal form of each good and were able to guide the two lower classes to its attainment. The people of gold were governed by a balance of mind, spirit, and appetite.

The analogy takes on meaning when we ask, "At what level are career educators operating?" It is obvious that they have not attained the "gold level," in that the "why" is not explained, not explored, save for economic need, an appetitive level of good. A few leaders may have attained the silver level by the belief

that career education is the "right" path to follow, but they have not yet discovered why, save statistical data that states we are not meeting the needs of 80% of the nation's high school graduates. This is cause to question our present educational structure but from that we cannot take the leap to its justifying "career" or other educational innovations. Such a leap would cause one to think that most educators are at the lower level of brass by reacting rather than reflecting. In Michigan, Public Law 97 said, in effect, "Let there be career education because it is needed!" It was understood that non-compliance would result in punitive measures. Thus, based on those conditions, educators created career education. They did so without necessarily examining its good or bad aspects and effects on society, or why it "ought to be" incorporated in the first place. The appetitive desire to avoid pain and hardship; i.e., violation of the law, was sufficient for them to act. Thus, most educators lacked the knowledge of career education's importance to themselves, their society and their environment, leaving them in an alienated position.

The point to be made here is simply that Plato's Ideal State could not become a reality, mentally or historically, without examining the "why" of creating such a state. (Many flaws, of course, exist in Plato's model but not the "why" it would be good given his ethical and social structure.) In many ways he was striving for the claimed goods of career education; i.e., for each to attain what he is capable of by removing all possible

restrictions and then to view that attainment with dignity. However, career education has not brought social or philosophical criticism to bear. Nor has the movement given sufficient reasons for such an endeavor, at least at a level above the superficial.

Therefore, this study will offer a rationale necessary and sufficient for such an undertaking. It will not be the only rationale available and/or applicable, but it will meet the tests of why, of logical consistency (socially and philosophically), of allowing for future growth, of defining a social structure compatible for such an educational model, and of defining necessary elements in the delivery system to insure career "education" vs. career "training."

One of the first problems with this undertaking is arriving at the direction career education is to take. Therefore, it is imperative that a working definition be identified. This study is in agreement with the major proponents of the movement that "A" definition would not serve the best interests of the career education concept. However, the complete lack of direction that now exists allows anything to qualify as valid "career education."

This investigation will argue that for career education to be innovative or a new direction, its definition must contain elements that are not presently contained in public education per se. Therefore, definitions that follow an expanded redefinition of vocational education will be dropped from further investigation. They do not call for educational change but only

superficial renaming and refocusing. The two definitions to follow could serve as guidelines of type definitions compatible with the assumed direction of career education. The Appendix contains several other definitions but these were selected because of completeness and direction.

"Career education is the total effort of public education and the community to help all individuals become familiar with the values of a work-oriented society, to integrate those values into their personal value systems, and to implement those values in their lives in such a way that work becomes possible, meaningful, and satisfying to each individual."¹

To further explain Hoyt's meaning it is vital that his explanation of work be detailed:

"Work is a conscious effort, other than activities whose primary purpose is either coping or relaxation, aimed at producing benefits for oneself or for oneself and others. In this context, the word "work" is distinguished from the word "labor" by the fact that it represents a purpose chosen by the individual. This definition can be used to cover the world of paid employment. It also applies to work of the full-time homemaker, the volunteer worker, work performed as part of one's leisure time, and the work of the students as a learner. Its four key words are: conscious, effort, producing, and benefits."²

Keith Goldhammer describes Career Education as a

"Curriculum to be systemic--an integrated and cumulative series of experiences designed to help each student achieve (1) increased power to make relevant decisions about his life, and (2) increased skill in the performance of his roles. Specifically, career education is designed to capacitate individuals for their several life roles: economic, community, home, avocational, religious and aesthetic. It recognizes the centrality of careers in shaping our lives by determining or limiting where we work, where we live, our associates, and other dimensions that are significant in defining our life style. Designed for all students, career education should be viewed as lifelong and pervasive, permeating the entire school program and even extending beyond it."³

Goldhammer in a more recent article stated:

"Career education is an educational program designed to assist every individual to become a fully capacitated, participating, contributing and fulfilled citizen. The goal of career education is to achieve a healthy state of society in which all individuals have found a place for themselves, can cope with the problems which confront them, and can become effective in the performance of their roles."⁴

Goldhammer explained the last definition further by adding that a capacitated person would find his place in society. Further, that place would allow him to develop and utilize his capabilities and fulfill his aspirations. Such a person would also recognize his own self-worth and become satisfied in developing his abilities to the fullest. He then stated that a capacitated person would find that:

"Career education emphasizes not only the skills essential for becoming a competent worker, but also the development of knowledge, understanding, attitudes and skills required for the performance of roles as a member of a family group, as a citizen of a community, as a participant in the avocational, aesthetic, religious, and moral life of the community."⁵

These definitions will serve as the base from which this study will develop. They both recognize a general direction toward more than vocational roles and include roles outside remunerated work. Both call for educational experiences that are outside the normal concept of work life; i.e., they include all social functions of a human being living in today's society. Thus, it is logical to assert that education classified as "career education," of the type outlined above, will be required to justify itself in relation to the guideline definitions. "Education" that does not contribute in a meaningful way to one's life "roles"

or "careers" would be eliminated from the educational program. Therefore, all educators would be placed in the position of justifying the content of course work related to the real society for which they are educating people. This is certainly not undesirable nor an impossible task for any educator who has examined why he or she is instructing a particular curriculum. It is also well known that most educators do not conduct such an investigation but instead assume that it (the curriculum) is important; e.g., the "Saber Tooth Tiger Curriculum."

It is also obvious that definitions or working guidelines in and of themselves are not sufficient to judge the validity or invalidity of particular curricula or lessons. What is needed in addition to the working definitions is a description of the society one is educating for and in, and a coherent philosophy of education. To achieve the "whole life career education" concept one will need a particular type of society conducive to its development and an identifiable philosophy with which to critically examine and guide the entire concept. Such a foundation would allow the educator to rank in importance the curricula to be taught, thereby creating a rationale for stating curriculum "X" is of greater benefit than curriculum "Y" in this society, at this time, for these reasons.

The working definitions above have inherent assumptions about the individual, society, educational programs, and the good life. Yet, none of these have been explored in detail. Career

education literature abounds with programs, models, descriptions, etc., of what it is about and how to do it. What is missing is the uniting element of reasoned explanation of "why" career education in the first place and, the "why" career education of the type described above in the second. This study will clarify the "why" career education and "why" of this general type by examination of social and philosophical foundations of education related to the general concept.

It might be beneficial to discuss briefly what is meant by social and philosophical foundations of education. For the purpose of this investigation "social" foundation will refer to the type of society that exists. It will also include in the concept what society "ought to be." The examination of "society" will be limited to the American Society and in particular the relationship of that society to educational institutions. Simply, career education will be examined in the context of the American Society, which is a qualified democracy. It is also assumed the Americans hold the perfectibility of man as an ideal goal; i.e., that mankind can, by concerted effort, continuously better his lot.

The philosophical foundation will contain the criticism and guidelines for a coherent educational scheme. It will examine the relationship of the society and the education of its members. Philosophy will establish a theory of education, which will require certain methods of teaching. Philosophy of education in the

context of this study will serve to explain "why" such a concept of career education in the American Society "ought to be." It will serve to clarify and identify important and necessary concepts for the development of career education.

Philosophic foundations of education will play the role of uniting the social and educational structure of career education and supply a justification for its existence that is more than economic. It will draw upon the nature of man as conceived by recent thinkers, the goals of man and society for a meaningful existence, and balance this against objective economic and social facts. It will also supply a foundation with which the above definitions will be compatible and by which they can be questioned as a complete theory. This study will explore one major school of thought, namely, pragmatism, but this in no way attempts to limit the philosophy of education that has relevance to career education.

It is hoped that by uniting social and philosophic theory with career education one can envision a complete educational program, one that can withstand criticism, explain its existence and grow in the future as man learns to apply more to the concept.

The title also presents the obvious question, "How can a study on an American educational design unite such diverse thinkers as John Dewey, Karl Marx, and Paul Goodman?" Dewey is clearly a democrat, Marx a communist, and Goodman an anarchist. It is not the intent of this dissertation to bring unity to the political

philosophy and beliefs of these three men. It will be the intent to examine the unity of their thought related to mankind. It is clear that these men are diverse, but it is also apparent that they are unified in many ways. They all make basic assumptions about man and his environment, and the particular necessities to live a "human" life. It is this relationship that will be examined. Further, it will be shown that there exists a logical and progressive pattern, relevant to career education, of the work of Dewey, Goodman and Marx. This pattern will center on the idea of "praxis," the unity of theory and practice in the active transformation of society. Career education examines schooling at a very superficial level. It will be the "praxis" of the three theorists that will logically develop from this point. Dewey will be examined primarily to detail educational institutions and practices via his "praxis," while Goodman will treat the relationship of contemporary schools and society. Further, he reviews present day problems from a humanistic psychological perspective; i.e., speaking directly to human nature and growth. Marx will detail alienation and show its relationship to social structure. It is by uniting these three thrusts of social and educational thoughts that career educators will be able to create an educational "praxis" that will affect our society in a positive way. Each man's contribution to the whole will become evident in later chapters. It is to be noted that they are held to be socially and educationally compatible.

Dewey's pragmatism will serve as the overall educational theory contained in this study. It is felt that his concept of philosophy is most compatible with the new movement of career education. Many similarities can be drawn from Dewey's works and the major concerns and directions of career education described by Goldhammer and Hoyt above. The definitions demand the ability to identify legitimate educational curricula and at the same time must allow for change in a positive direction. It is apparent to this writer that this is at the heart of Dewey's major works. His concept of society; i.e., "democracy as a way of life," is also such as to allow this type of growth. Simply, Dewey has a coherent social and educational philosophy that can shed light upon the dim concept of career education. For these reasons Dewey will be the major theorist examined in both contexts; i.e., social and philosophic.

Karl Marx will be studied in relation to his treatment of alienation. Marx is certainly one of the foremost writers on this subject and his work remains a cornerstone in this area. Marx's thoughts on how individuals ought to be able to live in society will also be explored in relation to the whole life career concept. His writings on production and labor will have a definite place in this study as his thoughts relate to social contexts. Again, it is to be emphasized that his political theory will not be examined nor recommended as part of this dissertation. The study will assume a democratic society. Along with Marx's remarks, the works of Herbert Marcuse will be discussed.

Paul Goodman will be united with Dewey and others as a social and educational critic. Goodman's later work centers on the dysfunction of educational institutions in providing meaningful educational programs for young people. He proposes that one major reason for this problem is the lack of meaningful activities in the lives of adults who serve as examples for our youth. Goodman's thoughts on man and mankind fall into the general frame of reference put forth by Marx and Dewey. As with Marx, Goodman's political thoughts will not be presented nor argued for. The work of Paulo Freire will also be examined and related to the thoughts expressed by Goodman.

Thus, Dewey will serve as the major theorist both socially and educationally. He will be joined by Marx socially and Goodman will support from social and educational positions. The concepts of society, mankind, the individual, alienation, and the need for change held by those men (via praxis) will be the points of unity of their works in this investigation. Jointly, their thoughts will develop into a solid social and educational base from which career education as outlined above can be assessed and developed.

Above it was stated that career education will be studied in relation to the American Society, which is in essence, a democratic one. For this reason, and others to follow, John Dewey's concept of democracy will serve as the social framework of this study. The political beliefs of Dewey, Marx and Goodman will not be examined, nor will they be held as meaningful here.⁶ The social views of all three will be examined. It will be assumed that the

philosophy of pragmatism will not do violence to the views of mankind held by any of the thinkers. Dewey's theory of democracy is well outlined in chapter seven of his book, Democracy and Education, and this will serve as the base for this dissertation. This chapter contains his view of democracy as a way of life and since this study is relating to the societal more so than the political aspects of democracy, this work was selected over his more clear works involving the political aspects of democracy.

The major purpose of this investigation will be to clarify our understanding of career education, society, and educational philosophy to aid practitioners to better serve the real needs of their students. It will be an attempt at supplying rational and logical arguments for necessary change in our schools; i.e., our educational process.

In an attempt to summarize the major thrusts of this dissertation, the following points will serve as a list of the goals to be reached:

1. Clarify the direction of career education. It will be hypothesized that career education lacks clear direction because virtually anything can be labeled career education. To resolve that dilemma, a clear guideline or working definition is needed, Hoyt and Goldhammer will serve to make up that definition.

2. Career education virtually exists as a program without wholeness of theory. The means to the end are invalid. It exists primarily as an educational practice without the development of

educational theory. It will be hypothesized that given a social and philosophical base, career education would be an identifiable, analyzable, and a further clarified concept. Such an investigation would give career education "Praxis."

3. Given the clarity of definition and foundation, it will be hypothesized that Dewey's social and educational philosophy; Marx's concept of praxis and alienation; and Goodman's social and educational criticism will offer necessary and sufficient reasons for the existence of career education. Basically, it will be argued that the reasons currently advanced are not sufficient to justify career education in and by themselves.

4. Given a definition, a social and philosophical rationale, and Dewey's, Marx's and Goodman's "praxis," it will be hypothesized that for career education to enter the "becoming" stage it will necessitate curriculum and structural changes in our nation's schools. Such changes must be logical and consistent with the concepts outlined in this study.

5. The accomplishment of the above would allow enlightened career educators to proceed knowing the "why" and being able to justify their course of action.

Footnotes--Chapter I

¹Kenneth B. Hoyt, Career Education: Contributions to an Evolving Concept (Salt Lake City, Utah: Olympus Publishing Company, 1975), p. 156.

²Ibid., p. 378.

³Keith Goldhammer and Robert Taylor, Career Education: Perspective and Promise (Columbus, Ohio: Charles E. Merrill Publishing Company, 1972), p. 6.

⁴Keith Goldhammer, "Career Education," MASB Journal (October, 1973):10.

⁵Ibid., p. 11.

⁶Dewey's political activity and beliefs were no less known than those of Marx. Dewey in the end would likely opt for a classless society as Marx would, but the means used to arrive to that end were quite different; i.e., the political states from which such a society would evolve were opposite. For this study, the political beliefs of all men will be set aside to examine their views of how individuals ought to live in a society. It is to be understood that as it is hard to separate Marx from his politics, it is equally hard to so treat Dewey. It is not the intent of this study to downplay the very active role Dewey played politically, but rather to utilize his strong convictions in examining the democratic way of life from both philosophical and social perspectives. Further it is the thrust of this study to examine the social role(s) of government rather than the political or institutional.

CHAPTER II

CAREER EDUCATION: REVIEW AND PERSPECTIVE

Career education has rapidly become one of education's most influential concepts. It is thought to be one of the most important innovative approaches to education in existence today. Some of its proponents have envisioned it to contain the solutions to our nation's education, economic and social ills. There have been few, if any, educational movements that have received the wide ranging support and the rapid implementation that have been shown to the career education movement. It has undoubtedly become one of the most influential educational concepts of this century; in many states it enjoys the support of law. Yet, despite the national, state and local endorsement of career education it is facing serious difficulties.

Career education does not come upon the educational community as a totally new and distinct reform. Its historical base is and has been quite evident. It is new to the 1970's and likely a reaction to the 1960's both educationally and socially. One can reflect upon the design and purposes of our nation's first colleges--Harvard, Yale, Princeton, William and Mary, and others, and recall that the classic conception of "Vocation" was at the core of their respective curricula. They were to produce the

lawyers, ministers and medical personnel to serve the needs of our growing country. Vocation at that point in history was thought of as one's work--his status--his chances--his lifestyle, in sum, a way of life. The United States was at that time an agrarian society where most were not in need of a professional vocation. There was not time to ponder concepts of alienation or reflect on life's purpose. Time was utilized maintaining life, physically and economically. Vocation for many was survival and following the Protestant ethic.

As the country grew in wealth and could afford and demanded more diverse vocations, education met that demand with schools modeled after Benjamin Franklin's Academy. The academy movement served the average man as the colleges did the more established. Land Grant Colleges followed to meet the expanding needs of a growing nation. Vocation was still viewed as one's life work and way of life. At least this was so for those who pursued an education. As factories developed, the need for unskilled labor increased, the time and number of people needed in agriculture declined, resulting in a labor force that carried with it the concept of alienation.

The American laborer's plight was brought to national attention by strikes and rebellions, but perhaps it was placed in the hearts of men by writers such as Upton Sinclair. It was shortly after The Jungle became popular that social legislation began to pour forth. The turn of the century saw education go

from Dame and Grammar Schools to Academies and Land Grant Colleges for the talented, to public education for most. The central idea was and continued to be, education for the preparation of one's life role in society. Shortly after the turn of the century public schools became involved in the precepts of "Taylorism." They were to be efficient and productive and they were modeled after the industries of the nation. Their mandate was clearly to educate youth with the necessary skills to enter the world and be economically and socially productive. Education was viewed as the way to solve the economic and social ills brought about by rapid industrialization. Its challenge was to restore the concerns raised by Sinclair in the model developed by Taylor.

In the twentieth century education continued to develop, keeping central to its purpose of "vocation." In 1918, the Commission on Reorganization of Secondary Education listed "vocation" as one of its seven objectives. The goal was to develop good citizens, capable workers and persons capable of positive social relations with others. The National Education Association in 1938 listed economic efficiency as one of their four current objectives. In 1944, the Educational Policies Commission stated as one of 10 needs of the young that:

"All youth need to develop salable skills and those understandings and attitudes that make the worker an intelligent and productive participant in economic life."¹

"Vocation" or "Career" has also been strongly supported in federal legislation; i.e., the Vocational Education Acts of

1963 and 1968. Most significantly with the enactment of Section 406, Title IV, P.L. 93-380, career education became part of federal legislation. Many states have since enacted laws requiring the inclusion of career education in their curricula. Again legislation was attempting to solve social problems via education. The "Jungle" of the 1960's demanded action in the 1970's.

Career education has always played a vital role in American education under one label or another. In its classic sense it was once called "vocation" or "one's calling" in life. Yet, those vocations and callings were more often found in economic and historic accidents than innate ability. The positive aspects of "vocation" are central to the concept of "career" today, with the addition of viable and rational choice on the part of the individual.

Career education is not new, as can be demonstrated by a very cursory review of educational history. Yet, in today's educational setting it appears to be quite innovative and in part it is. Socially and economically this nation faces many complex problems that were neither examined nor dealt with by our predecessors. Alienation, for example, was not approached educationally and only recently has it been faced by industries. It is noteworthy that once again, as it was when The Jungle brought out deep seated social ills, education is being asked to meet the challenge of the times, again with the help of the industrial sector. Yet, one change is significant--industry is

not establishing the model, but rather education and industry are together developing an expanded model, one that involves more than occupational efficiency.

Alienation has been central to the development of career education from the perspective of returning the American working population back to the concept of meaningful, purposeful and useful work and away from the disconnected and remote "labor" now being performed by so many. In addition to this problem, educators have allowed two other beliefs to enter curricula and end the meaning of the former concept of "vocation." First, in line with "Taylorism," time-motion studies, division of labor, etc., education was broken down into various parts, without the benefit of a reuniting of concepts at a later juncture. This resulted in the traditional tracking system with the schools involved in stratifying society by deciding who qualified for what curriculum. Students no longer enjoyed the arts if their "vocation" was related to industrial arts, nor were the college bound exposed to mechanics or agriculture. Life became preparation for "occupations" not "vocation" or "career." Schools had in fact, if not by design, brought an end to the unifying characteristic of the classic notion of "vocation" and replaced it with the concept of "occupation." This evolved during the thirties, forties, and fifties and paralleled society in many ways. The nation was surging forth in industry--labor. Labor in the pejorative sense became the end of this type of education at most levels, if not at all levels.

"Vocation" became vocational education for the untalented academically, as determined by the educational powers. In addition to this was the problem of near deification by the educational and public communities of the college degree. Success was identified with the well educated, but unfortunately only a person capable and willing to endure could become well educated. American values placed vocational education in the consolation category and raised the college preparation to the highest level. Unfortunately, American educational leaders allowed our schools to become a bifurcated system. Vocation had lost its classic meaning and in practice became the curriculum for those unable to endure the vigorous requirements of the academic subjects. Education sought to place each individual into a productive life but somehow productive took on the meaning found in the industrial complex rather than that found in current social-philosophical literature.

Education today has been the result of the last thirty to forty years of approaching the task of preparing for life in much too narrow a perspective. The classic "vocation" became synonymous with present-day "occupation." The attainment of the collegiate bachelor's degree became the ultimate end to be achieved. Unfortunately, nothing was perceived beyond the degree, it was just assumed happiness and goods would follow, but nobody seemed to educate one to identify what "goods" existed. Therefore, it is not difficult to understand why alienation has become a revived social theory receiving close and careful examination. Today we

have in large part a society with "occupations" that have no meaning because they are little more than positions of labor. In addition, we have an overly credential conscious public unable to place its educated products, which has also raised the alienation factor to one of its highest levels.

In perspective, it is apparent that many basic tenets of the career education concept have been a viable aspect of American education since its beginning. Today it is hailed as a new and logical approach to solve our problems in education. In part it is a new or innovative approach. It is not the "rediscovery" of a formerly operative educational concept, it is beyond that. Robert Merton, in Social Theory and Social Structure, discusses the problem of determining the source of social theory. In applying his model to educational concepts one would find career education most properly labeled an "anticipation" of an earlier formulation. Merton states that a "rediscovery" is in essence finding the same implications of a formulation in current times; i.e., a high degree of resemblance between earlier and later findings. However, Merton states:

"Anticipations refer to somewhat less of a resemblance, in which the earlier formulations overlap the later ones but do not focus upon and draw out the same set of implications."²

Career education is similar to the concept of "vocation," yet in today's society it must be expanded to take in concepts that may have been assumed rather than addressed under "vocation;" i.e., alienation, leisure time, etc,

Career education has entered the educational arena and met with rapid success but now appears to be slowing down in local school districts. Many have stated what they have done in the past has always incorporated career education and therefore see no reason to greatly adjust their present curricula. This stance would definitely violate the precepts at the heart of the movement, but at the same time represents a justified position given the basis offered for career education. The question of, "why career education," must be examined in more detail in order to yield a justifiable base to cause the educational community to enact, rather than verbally agree with, its major tenets. A brief examination of what career education is by definition, as viewed by major proponents, and why it is thought to be a justifiable course of action, would be a proper digression at this juncture. Upon completion of this review some of the major difficulties ought to be apparent, thereby allowing for the development of hypotheses for solutions.

The first and foremost difficulty a local school district would face in its attempt to develop and implement a career education program would be in deciding what career education in fact consists of. The debate as to proper definition is still an ongoing process. Hoyt, Goldhammer and others state that, as a concept, career education is still developing and to cite an exact or absolute definition would tend to stifle positive growth. Yet leaders of the movement, departments of education, state legislatures

and school districts do define career education. The problem centers not just on the differences caused by the interpretation of one or two words in the definition but on the direction to be embarked upon by following the direction of the various definitions to their respective logical ends. Basically, we have definitions that include the concept of "work" in common. However, debate does exist as to what aspects of living should incorporate "work." Hoyt envisions work to include all activity that "is conscious effort aimed at producing benefits for oneself or for others."³ Hoyt believes that "work" need not result in monetary remuneration, only that it benefits someone. This view of work is certainly beyond the occupational perspective offered by others. The states of Texas and Washington offer perspectives of career education that speak only to the point of job preparation and therefore "work" that would result in some measurable remuneration. The state of Texas describes career education as:

"Coordinated instruction, integrated into the entire curriculum, K-12, and designed to assist students in (a) understanding both the world of work and attitudes toward it, (b) understanding the relationships which exist between education and career opportunity, (c) understanding the economic and social structures of our society and how they influence the ways people support themselves, (d) making informed decisions concerning how they will earn a living and taking responsibility for making those decisions, and (e) acquiring marketable skills as preparation for earning a living."⁴

And the state of Washington states:

"Career Education is a term currently used to describe a sequentially developed education program offering career orientation, exploration, and job preparation for all students. Programs begin in the first grade, or earlier, and continue through adult life."⁵

The above statements do place career education, by these states, in an educative role for occupations. They do not examine the concept of work beyond that point.

In essence, present definitions operative today view career education as, (a) redefined occupational training; i.e., vocational education, (b) an educational program to educate people to accept "work," in Hoyt's sense, as a valuable part of one's life and to apply it to remunerative and non-remunerative "work" and, (c) as a concept enhancing the former classic position of "vocation," adding individual choice. If career education is "a" above it seems fair to argue that, as a concept, it would only be a "rediscovery" of a previous formulation labeled "vocational education" and not a substantive educational change. Simply, if career education equals vocational education educators have been playing a semantical game. However, this does not appear to be the case given the literature and curricula development of recent times. Therefore, it would be safe to assume the definitions of the type exemplified by the states of Washington and Texas above would be too narrowly described to be considered in line with the basic career education movement. Further, this study will no longer consider like positions valid for the purposes of investigating career education. The question as to what is a suitable description of career education must now be addressed. At this juncture a more detailed review of positions "b" and "c" must be undertaken.

Position "b" in the above paragraph is best posited by Kenneth B. Hoyt. He states:

"Career Education is the total effort of public education and the community to help all individuals become familiar with the values of a work-oriented society, to integrate those values in their personal value systems, and to implement those values in their lives in such a way that work becomes possible, meaningful, and satisfying to each individual."⁶

To further clarify his meaning it is important to understand his concept of work. Hoyt explains:

"Work is a conscious effort, other than activities whose primary purpose is either coping or relaxation, aimed at producing benefits for oneself or for oneself and others. In this context, the word 'work' is distinguished from the word 'labor' by the fact that it represents a purpose chosen by the individual. This definition can be used to cover the world of work of paid employment. It also applies to work of the full-time homemaker, the volunteer worker, work performed as part of one's leisure time, and the work of the students as a learner. Its four key words are: conscious, effort, producing and benefits."⁷

In uniting the ideas of Hoyt above one would see the position described in "b" of the preceding paragraph. It does involve a set of values beyond one's occupation and includes many aspects of one's life, but it is somewhat unclear as to what parts would be included and excluded. For Hoyt, it appears that career education is a viable plan for those parts of society that include his definition of work. He does not address political, religious, moral, etc. aspects of life as would be done under the classic position of "vocation." He does clearly address his position to student and worker "labor" and alienation. This overall position extends far beyond what is normally conceived of as vocational education.

Position "c" would be best represented by the concept of career education described by Keith Goldhammer. He describes the concept as a:

"Curriculum to be systemic--an integrated and cumulative series of experiences designed to help each student achieve (1) increased power to make relevant decisions about his life, and (2) increased skill in the performance of his roles. Specifically, career education is designed to capacitate individuals for their several life roles; economic, community, home, avocational, religious and aesthetic. It recognizes the centrality of careers in shaping our lives, our associates, and other dimensions that are significant in defining our life styles. Designed for all students, career education should be viewed as lifelong and pervasive, permeating the entire school program and even extending beyond it."⁸

He has expanded to this central idea stating:

"Career education is an educational program designed to assist every individual to become a fully capacitated, participating, contributing and fulfilled citizen. The goal of career education is to achieve a healthy state of society in which all individuals have found a place for themselves, can cope with the problems which confront them, and can become effective in the performance of their roles."⁹

Goldhammer describes the roles that are necessary for a capacitated person by positing:

"Career education emphasizes not only the skills essential for becoming a competent worker, but also the development of knowledge, understanding, attitudes and skills required for the performance of roles as a member of a family group, as a citizen of a community, as a participant in the avocational, aesthetic, religious, and moral life of the community."¹⁰

This position comes much closer to, if not beyond, the classical conception of "vocation." This becomes education for one's life and all of its social aspects. The point to be decided is how this is different from education. Certainly, education can be

viewed more generally than this and it might be better to view career education as a focusing of general education with added specificity to an identifiable end-in-view.

Career education must come to a guideline or generic definition if it is expected to be implemented in local school districts. The positions described by Hoyt and Goldhammer above would serve well as guideline definitions from which one could develop. For the purpose of this study, these positions will be assumed to represent the overall movement of career education. They address the overall spectrum that must be involved, including, but not limited to: the individual, human dignity, life roles, choice, occupations, alienation, and society. If career education would do less than the above described by Hoyt and Goldhammer, it would result in neither a new nor innovative educational concept but rather only a "rediscovery."

If the above "guideline definitions" can be assumed to fairly represent the career education movement, and upon review of the literature they can, then it would be fair to state that the question of, "what is career education?," has been partially answered. The definitions are understood to be only a beginning point, but in the case of career education it is a significant one. Prior to such a description; i.e., in present development, anything can qualify as legitimate career education given the open ended position of proponents of the movement. Again by reviewing the positions of governmental agencies, school districts,

departments of education, etc., those who are not restating vocational education as occupational training would find the above guideline position acceptable or else risk self-contradiction. It is understood that a continuum would exist between the position expressed by Hoyt and that of Goldhammer, yet, it is also to be noted that the range is not great and overlap is present.

At this juncture it will be assumed that for the present the question, "What does career education consist of?," has been initially answered. Later it will be necessary to restate its definition upon arriving at a complete concept. It is interesting to reflect how much has been done nationally under the name of career education without overwhelming agreement as to what it in fact is meant to be. Agreement did and continues to center on the tenet that every individual must be prepared to enter the job market with a salable skill. Both vocationally oriented and career oriented positions accepted this principle, with their respective views as to what occupation and career meant serving to separate the camps.

It now would be of value to review "why" career education has developed to its present point. It is assumed as explored briefly above that it is in part the result of historic educational development. However, that is certainly not the reason for the development of any major innovation in and of itself. In reviewing the "why" of career education, one would look for the

theoretical development and then how it is implemented in practice. Career education literature is rich in books, papers, dissertations, models, etc., describing how it is to be implemented but lacks sound theoretical foundation. In attempting to discover the "why" one looks not to educational theory, philosophy or sociology per se but rather to the statistics of the department of labor related to under and unemployment of our nation's young. The points discussed by major personalities in the movement all point to the conclusion that presently our nation's high schools have curricula that do not meet the needs of our present society. The problem that exists in this line of reasoning is that the end they argue as being correct, career education, is assumed correct because what is now done is obviously wrong. The position they hold as right may or may not be the course to follow, but if it is right, it would be so only by accident for most career educators. They have not adequately reviewed the needs of society, the environment, what type of society their proposal would produce, etc. They have leaped logically from the position "A", present high school curricula are inadequate, to "B", career education is good. Few have addressed the overall concept, and fewer, if any, have developed an overall model including definition, society to be produced (or that which would result from this change), an educational philosophy, historic examination of major concepts; e.g., surplus repression, alienation, working model, etc. What has been achieved in essence is the development of a definition, which may

or may not agree with others. No standards exist in terms of a description of stages of the educational plan that correlate to elementary, junior high, senior high and in a few cases continuing education; a model school; or alternatives to the model. Lacking is the ability to assess success or failure of the plan because it is so open ended that virtually no end is in view. All is relative and constantly changing. Theoretical development, unity of educational and social philosophy and the incorporation of society is all but non existent in career education literature.

The "how to" of establishing career education from a logistical perspective is well developed by the movement and many models offer great hope if a way can be discovered to assess their worth against accepted values both educational and societal. Clearly a need for change does exist and contained within the definitions outlined above is the potential to meet the challenge, but they are in and of themselves not sufficient upon which to base an entire educational plan. A brief review of the present rationale would be instructive in that for the most part this is the rationale offered to justify and guide the movement. The moral and ethical questions that could be raised are unlimited. One only needs to remember the full employment (an obvious end in view) of Germany in the 1940's to question the position as a valid one without other considerations.

Among the social ills with which our society is faced, one of the most outstanding is unemployment, followed by under

or misemployment. Kenneth B. Hoyt states that unemployment is higher now than at any time in the past 35 years.¹¹ He finds that presently

"nationally 80 percent of all secondary students are enrolled in either college preparatory or general curriculum designed to ready them for college . . . (only) 17 percent of these students . . . attain a degree."¹²

In reviewing the overall problem the former U.S. Commissioner of Education, S. Marland, Jr. stated in reference to students presently enrolled in high school:

". . . three out of ten will go on to academic college-level work. One-third of those will drop out before getting a baccalaureate degree . . . eight out of ten present high school students should be getting occupational training . . . two out of those eight are. . . . Consequently, half our high school students, a total of approximately 1,500,000 a year, are being offered what amounts to irrelevant, general educational pap!"¹³

Hoyt supports Marland's position on the general high school curriculum finding that:

". . . it enrolls about 25 percent of the high school graduates, but it also produces, according to limited evidence, 70 percent of the high school dropouts, 88 percent of the Manpower Development and Training Act trainees, and over 78 percent of the inmates of correctional institutions."¹⁴

Most major proponents have attacked the general education curriculum as the more useless aspect of high school "education."

Success has been evident to some extent with vocational and college preparatory programing but the percentage served remains small.

Edwin L. Herr addresses the same problems of high school failure discussed above, referring to a 1965 study by the U.S. Office of Education which reported:

" . . . that for every 10 pupils in the fifth grade in 1957-58, 9.4 entered ninth grade in 1961-62; 8.1 entered the eleventh grade in 1963-64; 7.1 graduated from high school in 1965; 3.8 were expected to enter college in the fall of 1965; 1.9 would likely earn baccalaureate degrees in 1969 . . . approximately 30 percent of American children leave education before high school graduation."¹⁵

Dale Parnell, Oregon State Superintendent of Public Instruction, cites similar data finding that:

" . . . one in five Americans still does not finish high school, and only one in ten actually graduates from a four-year college. Yet, most of the school curriculum (high school in particular) has been structured as though everyone were preparing for a four-year college education."¹⁶

It is an accepted fact by most that not more than 10 to 20 percent of the occupations in the United States require a baccalaureate degree. Keith Goldhammer found the data above to be in agreement with his research, stating that less than 20 percent of our students receive occupational training specific enough to have value, while we are faced with 80 percent who do not graduate from college. He also found during 1970-71 that:

" . . . 3.7 million young people left formal education . . . 2.5 million lacked skills adequate to enter the labor force at a level commensurate with their promise. Many left with no marketable skill whatever . . . 850,000 dropped out of elementary or secondary school; 750,000 graduated from high school general curricula; 850,000 left college without a degree or completion of an organized occupational program. These people represent an educational outlay of \$25 billion--about one-third of the amount spent on education in the country last year (1969-70)."¹⁷

One could continue to present like data but the conclusion seems overwhelmingly clear that our high schools are not meeting the needs of its individual charges; i.e., not the presently vocalized expectation of society. This information clearly dictates that

change must come about, but it does not demand that this change be career education as it is apparently argued by its proponents. The question of "why" career education cannot be adequately answered with only the above data, because that data supplies only the answer to the question of why the nation's schools need to be changed.

Career education is in need of a complete educational theory to guide and justify its goals. Presently career education is an educational practice without a theory upon which to base it. A well conceived theory would provide adequate and justifiable means to an end or ends and a framework from which the ends and means can be continually appraised and evaluated. The movement presently speaks primarily to the goal of employability and few have gone beyond that point in a complete and meaningful sense. Hoyt and Goldhammer have made statements that go well beyond the goal of employment but have not offered a framework from which one could adequately judge whether a particular school district, school, or instructor, was incorporating the major tenets of career education into the curriculum. They have, as have others, also failed at offering a solid case for career education as the specific direction to be embarked upon. The writers have touched upon rationale, but have not developed it well. Sociology and philosophy have many studies and theories that would have direct application in building a strong case for the career education movement but have for some reason been ignored.

Presently career education can be anything that an educator or educational institution believes will benefit a student in his or her later life of employment. The greatest problem is that this stand assumes all career educational opportunities or experiences are equal, for there is no way in which one can rank or select one over another as better. A theoretical framework would identify a justifiable means to a justifiable end and therefore allow rationale for selection and a procedure for evaluating the educational endeavor.

Educational practitioners of career education presently are, at best, in the position of "right belief," Plato's "people of silver." They are performing because they believe career education is the right concept but there has not been enough research into the overall concept for them to know. Unfortunately most instructors are likely reacting to the concept because they are dictated to do so by the system by which they are employed. The point is that career education without a developed theoretical framework, educational philosophy, and understanding and incorporation of societal values into its overall concept cannot succeed save in isolated and disjointed examples. Further, it is clear from review of the literature that such a view is not in existence. Parts of the concept and hints of philosophy are scattered about but not unified into a coherent theory.

This study will hypothesize that for career education to continue to develop as an idea, and more importantly to become an educational practice, in fact, in local school districts it

will need a guideline definition along the lines of Hoyt and Goldhammer. Further, to enable educators to incorporate the major tenets of the movement and for students to accept them, practitioners will have to "know" and "understand" why career education is needed from a social and philosophical perspective. They will also have to be in the Platonic position of "the people of gold" in their knowledge related to what career education is and should be, and how it should be implemented to result in justified means to justified ends.

Presently career education is made up of a multitude of means to achieve a variety of ends which is dependent upon the particular proponent you elect to follow. The means to the end are not capable of justification because there is no unity of theory to be found. It will be hypothesized that given a social and philosophical base, career education would be an identifiable, analyzable and further clarified concept. Such input with the additional review of sociological concepts would offer necessary and sufficient reasons to alter our national educational structure in keeping with the concept of career education. Career education could then be on solid ground from which to explain and justify its course of action and given such a base, it would be fair to require educators to instruct within such guidelines, or else offer counter or alternative examples.

The type of society for which one expects to educate youth is of paramount significance. The relationship of the society to

educational methods and techniques is also of crucial importance, as is the development and/or application of a viable educational philosophy that will augment the accomplishment of the goals set in the preceding sentences. In order to accomplish these basic goals one philosophy and social system will be reviewed not to be "the" model but rather to offer "a" model that can be placed into practice with minor adjustments, or offer a point from which sincere reaction could develop. To begin this task the works and philosophy of John Dewey will be examined for application to the career education movement.

Footnotes--Chapter II

¹Keith Goldhammer and Robert E. Taylor, Career Education--Perspective and Promise (Columbus, Ohio: Charles E. Merrill Publishing Company, 1972), p. 2.

²Robert K. Merton, Social Theory and Social Structure (New York: The Free Press, 1968), p. 13.

³Kenneth B. Hoyt, Career Education: Contributions to an Evolving Concept (Salt Lake City, Utah: Olympus Publishing Company, 1975), p. 153.

⁴Ibid., p. 55.

⁵Ibid., p. 56.

⁶Ibid., p. 156.

⁷Ibid., p. 378.

⁸Keith Goldhammer and Robert E. Taylor, Career Education--Perspective and Promise (Columbus, Ohio: Charles E. Merrill Publishing Company, 1972), p. 6.

⁹Keith Goldhammer, "Career Education," Michigan School Board Journal (October, 1973):10.

¹⁰Ibid., p. 10.

¹¹Kenneth B. Hoyt, Career Education: Contributions to an Evolving Concept (Salt Lake City, Utah: Olympus Publishing Company, 1975), p. 27.

¹²Ibid., p. 37.

¹³Keith Goldhammer and Robert E. Taylor, Career Education--Perspective and Promise (Columbus, Ohio: Charles E. Merrill Publishing Company, 1972), p. 36.

¹⁴Kenneth B. Hoyt, et al., Career Education: What It Is and How to Do It (Salt Lake City, Utah: Olympus Publishing Company, 1972), p. 36.

¹⁵Keith Goldhammer and Robert E. Taylor, Career Education Perspective and Promise (Columbus, Ohio; Charles E. Merrill Publishing Company, 1972), p. 63.

¹⁶Ibid., p. 56.

¹⁷Ibid., p. 4.

CHAPTER III

DEWEY ON SOCIETY, EDUCATIONAL PHILOSOPHY AND VOCATIONAL EDUCATION

On Society

One of the major defects of the career education position is its incomplete description of the type of society for which schools ought to be educating youth. Leaders have neglected reviewing this aspect of the movement, with some actually asserting that career education is operative in all nations under their respective governments, a view that represents naivete at its height. To propose an educational scheme without careful examination of the society through which one intends to generate such a program is inexcusable. For career education to continue its development in agreement with the definitions described in the preceding chapter would require an open and flexible state. However, by open and flexible is not meant one without a clear idea of the end it is trying to achieve or one lacking an order to serve as the means for such attainment.

Given the positions of Goldhammer and Hoyt in respect to open possibilities of work and various careers, one would automatically discount states that determined or limited opportunities for people to select their life's roles. Certainly a society ruled

by a despot would serve as a case in point as would totalitarian states. It should also be noted that within democratic states there exist many practices that would prevent the attainment of the goals expressed in the generic descriptions of Goldhammer and Hoyt; e.g., admission requirements, social class structure, opportunity for viable experiences, quality of early education, etc. The existence of such practices hamper in varying degree the attainment of a fully democratic way of life.¹

Dewey, in researching societies that would be most conducive to continued growth as a society and for individuals within such a political organization, discovered certain characteristics that are necessary. The two cardinal principles Dewey cites

"to measure the worth of a form of social life are: the extent which the interests of the group are shared by all its members, and the fullness and freedom with which it interacts with other groups."²

He added that an undesirable society would be one that establishes restraints on free interchange and communication of experiences. The Ideal State of Plato serves to exemplify the limiting aspects of closed society.

Dewey, reflecting on Plato's concept of society, discovered many points that are still of value today, but not within the societal framework of the Ideal State. Plato held that it was possible to know the end of existence and therefore he could, in the Ideal State, establish a social order based on known ends. Dewey, of course, does not hold the view that one can come to know the ultimate ends or goals of life.³ He did believe that

for an individual or society to act intelligently, there must be an end or a goal in mind, coupled with justifiable means to its attainment. He stated, in relation to Plato's social system:

"Unless we know the end, the good, we shall have no criterion for rationally deciding what the possibilities are which should be promoted, nor how social arrangements are to be ordered."⁴

He was here describing Plato's view of society but would accept the above quote within his own system of thought. Dewey held that for experience to be meaningful, one must have conceived of an end and a means to seek its attainment; he did not hold the end to be absolute for that would be determined by experience. The point here is that unless we know the type of society we are developing we will only come to an end that is the result of whim, caprice or accident.

Plato's society held a view that is at the heart of the career education movement, save its limited outlook. Dewey expressed it, saying:

"No one could better express than did he the fact that a society is stably organized when each individual is doing that for which he has aptitude by nature in such a way as to be useful to others (or to contribute to the whole to which he belongs); and that it is the business of education to discover these aptitudes and progressively to train them for social use."⁵

The position, as it stands, is quite noble and acceptable to the position of career education as established in the preceding chapter. However, what is important is the placement of this concept in the society it was designed to serve. By so doing one will be able to see the vital importance of viewing the society as an integral

aspect of any major educational viewpoint. The problems that come to light in Plato's system are like those of any other closed society and demonstrate the need for another style of social arrangement to meet the goals and aspirations of career education.

Plato's Ideal State did not allow for growth or change; the ultimate ends, or "Forms," were known by the philosophic rulers of the state. The educational system was designed to maintain the social order as it was established by the rulers. In many ways Plato's society was like that of a benevolent despot, with the major exception centering on the fact that rules were based on "known ultimate ends" rather than caprice or whim. But as with any closed system all the questions had been answered and the possibility for societal changes were non-existent, barring the influx of outside influence. Individuals had to fit into the present possibilities for employment, class and education. For Plato,

"there were only three types of faculties or powers in the individual's constitution. Hence, education would soon reach a static limit in each class, for only diversity makes change and progress."⁶

Dewey finds any society that limits the potential for positive growth for the society and individuals within it undesirable because it will ultimately come to the place where regression will set in and the society will cease to be capable of achieving its potential.

In projecting a new educational format, such as career education, it is absolutely necessary that proponents take into

careful consideration the type of society that is necessary for the concept to be functional, and secondly, the type of changes that should occur as a result of the new educational scheme. This has not been accomplished by the movement. It appears that almost exclusively energy has been spent on the formulation of educational models without projecting the effects that would likely accrue to society. It would follow that if career education is to produce "fully capacitated individuals" that a society such as Plato's or other closed systems; e.g., totalitarian states, would be unacceptable due to the limiting factors placed on individuals to seek their highest potential. The only type of society that presently exists that does not place such limitations on individuals is one that is democratic.⁷ However, a democratic society only allows for certain concepts to be operative and it is to the degree that they are operative that Dewey would find that society acceptable to full educational development.

Dewey was a pragmatist and he viewed society and its potential from a realistic viewpoint, remarking:

"We must base our conception upon societies that actually exist, in order to have any assurance that our ideal is a practicable one . . . the ideal cannot simply repeat the traits which are actually found. The problem is to extract the desirable forms of community life which actually exist, and employ them to criticize undesirable features and suggest improvement."⁸

Dewey did believe that for a society to be positive and growing it would be so to the degree that it could respond in the positive to the questions; "How numerous and varied are the interests which

are consciously shared?" and "How full and free is the interplay with other forms of association?"⁹ For Dewey, these two concerns represented his standard to judge the "democracy" existent. He stated: "A Democracy is more than a form of government, it is primarily a mode of associated living, of conjoint communicated experience."¹⁰

Education is perhaps the most important social function in which a society engages save perhaps perpetuation of its members. Yet, career education leaders have not drawn a solid relationship between society and education. Dewey expressed the connection succinctly when he stated: "The conception of education as a social process and function has no definite meaning until we define the kind of society we have in mind."¹¹ Given this position it seems apparent that for an educational plan to become fully operative it must state the type and conditions of the society in which the plan is to be implemented. Dewey's values related to society will be reviewed as one approach to this problem. There are certainly others but Dewey has been selected because of the direct relationship of his societal values to those of education and individuals.

The relationship between society and its education was vital to Dewey; he saw one dependent on the other for real existence. Education here is understood to be one of "growing" vs. "training." A society cannot perpetuate itself without educating its young to its values, mores and way of life, but for Dewey it

went beyond maintenance of what is to include development of what could and should be. Education had to involve a growing quality or it would only be a form of training; i.e., teaching those living in the present how to live in the past; e.g., the logical outcome of Plato's Ideal State. Education was to serve both society and the individual. Dewey stated that the very idea of education was to free "individual capacity in a progressive growth directed toward social aims."¹² Valid education and a living society are both dependent upon their ability to grow in a positive direction as new data comes into existence. The unforgivable sin was for a society to limit an individual in attainment of positive growth and the converse of the principle would also be applicable in judgment of individuals. It is for these beliefs that Dewey held strongly to the principles of free association and shared experiences, for anything less would hinder the opportunity for future development.

The only societal structure that was amiable to Dewey's social philosophy was a democratic one; it was with the utilization of those principles that he could perceive continual advancement of mankind. Goldhammer has spoken for a like position in his writings and quotes from John and Evelyn Dewey's, Schools for Tomorrow, to bring out his position:

"The democracy which proclaims equality of opportunity as its ideal requires an education in which learning and social application, ideas and practice, work and recognition of the meaning of what is done, are unified from the beginning and for all."¹³

The relation of school and society is quite apparent for Dewey and Goldhammer. Goldhammer is more descriptive than other writers in relating career education to a society; he does not however develop an educational philosophy to work with his ideal.

Goldhammer's description of the individual has been much more developed than his contemporaries and one can understand why a democratic society was so important to his position by a brief review of his "capacitated person." The goal for career education is to develop every

"individual to become a fully capacitated, participating, contributing and fulfilled citizen. The goal of career education is to achieve a healthy state of society in which all individuals have found a place for themselves, can cope with the problems which confront them, and can become effective in the performance of their roles."¹⁴

The words "capacitated," "participating" and "contributing" are significant in that they demand the type of society that Dewey outlined. Also of importance from the perspective of social and educational philosophy is Goldhammer's use of the "ing" ending denoting a continual vs. ending process. The view is in complete agreement with Dewey's precept of growth.

Dewey described the type of society in which real education can take place as follows: Given that

". . . education is a social process, and there are many kinds of societies, a criterion for educational criticism and construction implies a particular social idea. The two points selected by which to measure the worth of a form of social life are the extent in which the interests of a group are shared by all its members, and the fullness and freedom with which it interacts with other groups. An undesirable society . . . is one which internally and externally sets up barriers to free intercourse and communication of experience."¹⁵

It should be noted here that societies need not be that of one nation or another. The United States can easily be viewed as a country of many societies and the above principles need to be applied to each. In reviewing race, religion and sex conflicts of the present time one can see the positions held by the various societies, or groups, within the larger society called the American Society. The last line of the quote above has particular relevance to the functioning of groups or societies in a democratic state.

Dewey proceeds to add the following points:

"A society which makes provision for the participation in its good of all members on equal terms and which secures flexible readjustment of its institutions through interaction of the different forms of associated life is in so far democratic. Such a society must have a type of education which gives individuals a personal interest in social relationships and control, and the habits of mind which secure social changes without introducing disorder,"¹⁶

Participation in the good of society is a limited viewpoint for Dewey and is not a hedonistic position. He uses the example of a gang of thieves and a family to exemplify his belief. He holds that all groups are such because they hold things in common, they have shared interests, concerns, problems and experiences. All groups also have contacts with other groups resulting in communication and degrees of cooperation. In the case of the gang of thieves their common bond centers on stealing and escaping the punishment of the law. Because of the very nature of their activities they cannot be open and become involved with other groups without leading to the group's demise. Thus such a group must close itself off from others and educate its members away

from the "outside" society. They will set up their own rules and values and educate their members to accept them; the result is obviously a partial and distorted view of society. Members are prevented from developing and growing, and they suffer individually as the society suffers collectively both by not having this group contribute to its potential and by its parasitic purpose.

Dewey also examines these points in relation to classes within a society. He does not discount the fact that classes exist but questions why and how they come about:

"In order for society to be just, it must have and allow for free interaction among groups and members of groups; it must be built upon many commonly shared interests and values, and all members of the group must have an equal opportunity to receive and take from others. There must be a large variety of shared undertakings and experiences."¹⁷

Further, the lack of "free and equitable intercourse which springs from a variety of shared interests makes intellectual stimulation unbalanced."¹⁸ Related to class division into a "privileged and subject class" Dewey remarked, it

"prevents social endosmosis. The evils . . . affecting the superior class are less material and less perceptible, but equally real. Their culture tends to be sterile, to be turned back to feed on itself; their art becomes a showing display and artificial; their wealth luxurious; their knowledge over specialized; their manners fastidious rather than humane."¹⁹

In such a society education serves to promote one group to the level of masters and others to the role of slaves. This lesson has been demonstrated many times in history. However, such a division of class is often very subtle and found in democratic

states. If one examines the English educational system one finds that after grammar school students may pursue higher education if they pass the proper tests. The doors are closed for those who don't pass at an age too young to understand the importance of such programming. In our country the misuse of guidance counseling offices had the same net effect when students were separated into college prep vs. terminal or "vocational" curricula. Such educational systems are the antithesis of Dewey's view of what society should be and the position taken by career educators falls in line with Dewey. The type of society required to meet Dewey's goals needs to be one that does not at any time close the door to individuals who wish to pursue further education or developments.

Dewey also has stated that a society must start with what exists, extract the good and build from that point. Given the type of societies in existence and the individual and societal goals of the career education movement, it could only find itself capable of fulfillment in a democratic form of society. The society and its educational institutions must offer as many opportunities for the growth of each individual as are possible. Such an organization would continually strive to increase such opportunities and seek ways to increase communication among agencies within and outside its environment.

Career educators have not properly addressed the type of Society their educational plan requires nor have they demanded

educational institutions to meet in practice the very principles that would allow career education to succeed. As can be readily demonstrated by reviewing vocational education programming, an approach to education that does not require free interaction and exchange of information will result in narrow viewpoints and results. The result of past educational orientation has resulted in stratified schools; i.e., the college preparatory, vocational track and general (terminal) student. The very organizational structure prevents meaningful interaction among the students. Such structure is far from what Dewey describes for a democratic society or its institutions. Schools, for Dewey, were to mirror society both as it is and as it should be. This view would require career educators to posit both the social structure they envision students to enter, create and maintain as well as the organizational arrangement the schools are to develop to allow the major goals of career education to operate.

Career education requires a democratic form of organization at the societal and educational levels if the result of the union of society and education is to yield "capacitated persons." Career education requires such a base to offer a sound plan for development; without it the concept is but an impotent one. Its goals are founded in our history, yet that aspect of our past is obvious in its absence from the development of career education. The point is clear, career education as described in the preceding chapter can only exist in a democratic

society as viewed by Dewey. Further, it can only be operative in a society that is open to change. Finally, career education cannot be a complete concept without understanding and accepting the type of society for which it is educating. How can instructors be expected to produce persons capable of performing various roles in a society that to date is nondescript?

On Educational Philosophy

Many have stated that theory and practice do not often complement each other in that one is usually wrong. These people generally comment in this way: "It sounds good in theory, but would not work in real life situations." It takes little reflection to conclude that if an idea is not operative in life, it is not a complete or accurate theory; it needs more work. Such a position would also find itself in direct conflict with the philosophy of John Dewey, in particular with his conception of pragmatism. Yet, in reviewing the "philosophy" of the career education movement, one is astounded to find no coherent, complete, nor even partial philosophy representing the movement. One does discover many forms and ways of practicing the idea, but not an overall unifying system guiding it. One is immediately reminded of the thinking mentioned above related to the division of theory and practice and one concludes this must be the view of career educators. They have developed the "practices" but not the theory.

The problems of such a practice are many, including no overall guidance; anything can be properly labeled career education,

for no criteria exist to exclude or include practices; and the practitioners of the concept are literally in the position of the people described in Plato's famous "Cave Allegory."²⁰ A concept cannot properly develop without an overall theory. A few well meaning beliefs; e.g., capacitated persons, people skilled in various roles, continuing education, etc. will not replace a coherent philosophy that includes such noble ideas. Such a philosophy or theory would serve to spearhead the development and fulfillment of such ideas. The practitioner, administration and public would be guided by such a theory and be able to include and exclude programs by valid criteria vs. whim and caprice of interest groups.

Dewey's educational views have not been fully explored by the movement's power elite, an interesting omission. Dewey's central ideas will be examined in relation to providing an overall educational theory compatible with the major goals posited by career educational leaders and for providing criteria for daily implementation of the concepts in the preceding chapter. Also it should be noted that his educational theory applies and becomes functional in the democratic society as reviewed above. One can see a unity in Dewey's concept of society and education as well as theory and practice. For Dewey, nothing was stagnant including theories and ideas; like living things, they are growing if properly developing. Dewey's complete thought related to this or other educational concepts would be a dissertation in and of itself,

the purpose here is to offer a workable guiding philosophy for career education. Further, it is not meant to offer Dewey's pragmatism as the only philosophy and social theory of merit for the movement but only to offer the same as "a" viable social and educational system. For if by career education it is meant students will be "educated" rather than "trained," Dewey's remarks will become increasingly important to the movement.

Dewey's remarks concerning the intimate compatibility of philosophy and education serves to bring forth the living and dynamic aspect of a developing educational scheme. He states, concerning philosophy:

"Philosophy thus has a double task: that of criticizing existing aims with respect to the existing state of science, pointing out values which have become obsolete with the command of new resources showing what values are merely sentimental because there are no means for their realization; and also that of interpreting the results of specialized science in their bearing on future social endeavor. It is impossible that it should have any success in these tasks without educational equivalents as to what to do and what not to do."²¹

He here clearly points out the relationship of philosophy in active ongoing life situations. It should be noted that science for Dewey refers to any aspect of human life under study and not just the physical sciences. In addition to the role of education in philosophy just cited he adds:

". . . by the educative arts philosophy may generate methods of utilizing the energies of human beings in accord with serious and thoughtful conceptions of life. Education is the laboratory in which philosophic distinctions become concrete and are tested."²²

The role of philosophy is not, for Dewey, to deal in the lofty idealisms so often conceived of by practitioners of education. Philosophy involves thinking that involves the past, and presenting facts of living from which one projects the future as it should be. Philosophy is tested in action or practice and it is there that it is judged and altered if necessary. Dewey never believed in absolutes, therefore allowing for necessary adjustments to philosophic designs as new information comes forth in the process of enacting the preconceived plans. The problem career educators face is in the development and adaptation of a philosophy. Dewey expressed it well when he stated, "If a theory makes no difference in educational endeavor, it must be artificial."²³

In discussing the intimacy of philosophy and education Dewey has placed the relationship properly in the two following quotes:

"Philosophy of education is not an external application of ready-made ideas to a system of practice having a radically different origin and purpose: it is only an explicit formulation of the problems of the formation of right mental and moral habitudes in respect to the difficulties of contemporary social life. The most penetrating definition of philosophy which can be given is . . . it is the theory of education in its most general phases."²⁴

It is clearly apparent that for any educational program to be enacted without a developed theory relevant to education and society would be untenable, as would the present state of development of career education, for John Dewey. He summarizes the relationship of philosophy, education, thinking and society developmentally as follows: Philosophy is

"defined as the generalized theory of education. Philosophy was stated to be a form of thinking, which, like all thinking, finds its origin in what is uncertain in the subject matter of experience which aims . . . to frame hypotheses for its clearing up to be tested in action. Philosophic thinking has for its differentia the fact that the uncertainties with which it deals are found in widespread social conditions and aims, consisting in a conflict of organized interests and institutional claims . . . philosophy is at once an explicit formulation of the various interests of life and a propounding of points of view and methods through which a better balance of interests may be effected."²⁵

Specifically to education he states:

". . . education is the process through which the needed transformation may be accomplished and not remain a mere hypothesis as to what is desirable; we reach a justification of the statement that philosophy is the theory of education as a deliberately conducted practice."²⁶

Given the goals of career education as posited by leaders at national, state, and collegiate levels, it is apparent that those goals are to transform the educational and social systems of our society. To state less is simple naivete. Given Dewey's arguments related to the unity of education, philosophy and society in the process of education it becomes clear that his ideas have direct bearing on the career education movement. Further, if he is correct in his line of reasoning as to the relationships mentioned, the point of the unity of theory and practice is proven and it would become the obligation of career educators to develop the proper social and theoretical base.

Dewey has developed a very cogent and practical system of educational philosophy. His thoughts related to "experience," "growth," "continuity," and "an experience" have a direct relationship to the goals and development of career education from

both the theoretical and practicing levels. To fully grasp his reasoning, one needs to properly perceive his concept of experience. He breaks it into levels which could be fairly described as happenings, which lack understanding or are mechanical; experiences, which are understood by the person(s) involved as to the ends and means of the action; and ultimately "an experience," which would represent a higher and more fulfilled "experience." It would be possible to enter a metaphysical discussion related to the distinguishing characteristics between "experience" and "an experience" but our purpose here does not require exploration of that level. Related to career education, or education, this distinction will well serve the purposes of this investigation.

The cornerstone of Dewey's educational philosophy is experience that is conducive to positive growth. Related to education, he remarked,

"The more definitely and sincerely it is held that education is a development within, by, and for experience, the more important it is that there shall be clear conceptions of what experience is."²⁷

He posited that life is made of experiences; i.e., one's total life is the result of his/her total experiences. However, not all experiences are equal, positive, nor educative. Experiences that did not enhance future growth were judged non-educative, such as those encountered by mechanical or automatic action. They are experiences of a type that go by virtually unnoticed; they happen to us but do not influence us toward future actions in any significant way, save the possibility of preventing our more wisely

utilizing our time. Things that are done mechanically without reflection or thought are examples of this type of experience or happening.

The type of experience that has value is one in which those involved understand the relationship of the action to the past, present and future. The cause and effect is clear. The person involved reflects upon the activity and projects consequences that have at least the logical possibility of occurring a particular way given the information at hand. This type of experience is one that is genuinely educative; it will open future possibilities, it is a net gain in one's understanding of self and the environment with which the self is in constant interaction. The experience is internalized within the individual, not the result of an external action being forced upon him.

Dewey broke the "educative" type experience into active and passive parts. He states:

"On the active hand, experience is the trying--a meaning which is made explicit in the connected term experiment. On the passive, it is undergoing. When we experience something we act upon it, we do something with it; then we suffer or undergo the consequences. We do something to the thing and then it does something to us in return: such is the peculiar combination."²⁸

Experience is a change in the person who has undergone and interacted with his/her environment and it also effects a change on the environment. However, such change has no meaning unless the person makes a conscious connection with the consequences which are involved. For example, a child who strikes a dog and is summarily

bitten by the dog has only been acted upon or had a happening type experience; i.e., the child makes no connection between his striking and the dog's retaliation. If however, the child reflects and connects his action to the dog's and understands that by hitting the dog he is likely to be bitten, he has had an educative experience, he has learned to connect the action and consequence. Experience must involve learning. Dewey has said:

" . . . many things happen to us in the way of pleasure and pain which we do not connect with any prior activity of our own. They are mere accidents . . . there is no before or after to such experience; no retrospect nor outlook, and consequently no meaning."²⁹

The relationship to education, or an educational scheme without a theory, is self evident, happenings do not result in students learning, only their being acted upon. Worthwhile experiences or to "learn from experience"

"is to make a backward and forward connection between what we do to things and what we enjoy or suffer from things in consequence. Under such conditions, doing becomes trying; an experiment with the world to find out what it is like; the undergoing becomes instruction--discovery of the connection of things."³⁰

The educational significance of the above remark is often missed, but career education is nothing more than trying to lay a practical program to expose youth to the world and have them discover what it is and how they may individually interact with it.

The other type of experience Dewey examines is what he calls a "mis-educative" experience. It is the type of experience that has a negative effect on the individual, in that it would

result in limiting future positive or educative experiences for that person. They would be the type of experiences that would be had by a thief in his actions related to stealing.

Educative experiences require that certain conditions exist in the objective conditions of the situation. The two most central are growth and continuity. In examining experience that is positive to Dewey no concept is more important than growth or growing. He stresses the "ing" in growing to show its ever evolving character. Today's ends are to become tomorrow's means to attain the future's ends and so on infinitely. Dewey viewed growth and education as follows:

"Since growth is the characteristic of life, education is all one with growing; it has no end beyond itself. The criterion of the value of school education is the extent in which it creates a desire for continued growth and supplies the means for making the desire effective in fact."³¹

Thus the planning and development of situations from which students can grow becomes the overall responsibility of each educator. "In directing the activities of the young, society determines its own future in determining that of the young."³² Dewey finds that the primary condition for growth is immaturity found in all people. Immaturity is found to be a positive force in that it has the potentiality for further development. The two aspects he discusses are dependence and plasticity. Again Dewey finds both conditions positive and necessary for growing individuals.

Dependence is viewed by Dewey as a necessary condition for growth to transpire. If one were independent of others to the

degree that the person would become anti-social, he would be unable to grow, lacking interaction with others. Thus dependence is for the gain of knowledge and not to be carried by others. One learns in the dependent state and grows, enabling himself/herself to develop one's ability further. Plasticity

"... is essentially the ability to learn from experience; the power to retain from one experience something which is of avail in coping with the difficulties of a later situation. This means power to modify actions on the basis of the results of prior experiences, the power to develop dispositions."³³

Thus, immaturity, with its component parts, dependence and plasticity, supplies the conditions necessary to grow in a positive direction and discover new ways to continue growing.

The final major aspect of educative experiences involves what Dewey has labeled "the experiential continuum" or "category of continuity."³⁴ The purpose of this principle is to judge which experiences are worthwhile and which are not. Growth is directly related and involved in this principle. For continuity to be operative, growth must be present. However, growth is not a sufficient criterion by itself; "we must also specify the direction in which growth takes place, the end towards which it tends."³⁵ Experience is an active-passive event that is moving toward some end but for the experience to be judged worthwhile it must contain the elements of positive growth and have in it the quality "to prepare a person for later experiences of a deeper and more expansive quality. That is the very meaning of growth, continuity, reconstruction of experience."³⁶ Thus experiences

are to flow together toward ends that become the means for future ends resulting in the continual development of the person.

Experience has been discussed as (a) a happening, a non-educative act, (b) a mis-educative act, and (c) an educative act resulting in growth. The final discussion of experience is an expansion of "c", it is a higher level of experience in that it has esthetic qualities, Dewey labeled it "an experience." Educationally, and in particular, career educationally, it has potential for increasing significance. Admittedly, to arrive at the point where career educational instruction could achieve the status of being "educative experiences" would be a fine accomplishment but there is a higher level. "An experience" could represent the arriving at the point of "fulfilled capacitated person." Dewey selects the artist as his model and medium to explain what is meant by the connotation "an experience." Debate does exist about his exact meaning of "experience" and "an experience" but, for the purpose and application to career education his meanings are sufficiently clear; degrees do exist among educative experiences.

"Experience in the degree in which it is experience is heightened vitality . . . at its height it signifies complete interpenetration of self and the world of objects and events."³⁷

Dewey finds the major difference between experience and "an experience" to be of completion, fulfillment; i.e., actions that are interrupted, sidetracked, not complete, etc., would not be called "an experience." One could have an educative experience

as outlined above and have the potential for growth but decide not to pursue that line of experience any further. For example, a student could be exposed to masonry and experience it positively, but at the end decide not to go on; the flow is stopped. This is not bad but it would not represent a higher experience, such as a student who experiences music, the life of a musician, and decides to continue the flow to completion and becomes fully involved in the process of continual learning in this field. Dewey posits:

"We have an experience when the material experienced runs its course to fulfillment. Then and then only is it integrated within and demarcated in the general stream of experience from other experiences. A piece of work is finished in a way that is satisfactory; a problem receives its solution; a game is played through; a situation, whether that of eating a meal, playing a game of chess, carrying on a conversation, writing a book . . . is so rounded out that its close is a consummation and not a cessation. Such an experience is a whole and carries with it its own individualizing quality and self-sufficiency. It is an experience."³⁸

Dewey's concept of "an experience" could be related to the idea of a person who is leading a fulfilling or capacitating life; i.e., a life that is complete and at the same time still growing in positive ways. Goldhammer's "capacitated person" would serve as a fair model if one were to change the past tense of "capacitated" to the present and future of "capacitating." In experiencing life or educational aspects of life, Dewey relates "an experience" in this way: "It is this degree of completeness of living in the experience of making and of perceiving that makes

the difference between what is fine or esthetic in art and what is not."³⁹ He also states:

"Wherever conditions are such as to prevent the act of production from being an experience in which the whole creature is alive and in which he possesses his living through enjoyment, the product will lack something of being esthetic."⁴⁰

Here Dewey is referring to an object to be produced, but for human meaning such acts of production could and do include thoughts and acts. He views "an experience" as unity of the self with his/her life and the world and expounds the above points in addressing the esthetic quality of "an experience." The esthetic quality must be included for experience to be called "an experience."

"The uniquely distinguishing feature of esthetic experience is exactly the fact that no such distinction of self and object exist in it, since it is esthetic in the degree in which organism and environment cooperate to institute an experience in which the two are so fully integrated that each disappears."⁴¹

Dewey's concepts above related to educative experience, growth, continuity, and "an experience" have many direct applications for education and career education. They certainly establish guidelines for the determination of curriculum content and pedagogical techniques. Contained in the above discussion is a workable and sufficient criterion from which to judge the development of career education. This will be reviewed and applied in a later chapter. At this point the discussion will turn to Dewey's comments on career education per se.

On Vocational Education

The educational, philosophic and societal values of John Dewey are well exemplified in his discussion of vocational education. His pragmatism is best illuminated in the vocational aspect of his thinking. It is by examining his conceptualization of vocations for individuals that one is able to identify and understand the practicing aspects of his concepts of growth continuity and worthwhile experiences in society. It is amazing that his discussion of this topic, written in 1916, is as clear and pertinent today as it was at that time. The major problems he addressed then are the very ones that are so important today. The comparison of his definition of careers and those representing the center of the career education movement is also of interest.

As with his overall social and educational views he felt the greatest danger of vocational education would be to view it from a narrow and specialized vantage point. To develop careers of occupations that would lack in the potential for an individual to grow would seem an immoral development to Dewey. He viewed the role of schools as being to prepare students simultaneously for careers that do exist in the present, but to develop in each student as well the aptitudes, abilities, and skills to seek out and succeed at occupations that lie in the future. The latter idea, at face value, appears to represent idealism; but upon reflection in Dewey's philosophy related to growth it becomes pragmatic. He was warning that educators must develop students

along many career lines and must include therein their ability to look toward occupations that remain in the future. Basically, by practicing non-growth educational acts, one would cut off the future and that would result in preparing students for "a salable skill" rather than salable skills and the aptitude of continually increasing one's abilities along many lines.

Dewey's central worry in 1916 became fact during the 50's, 60's, and continues into the 70's. He stated concretely that "there is a danger that vocational education will be interpreted in theory and practice as trade education as a means of securing technical efficiency. . . ." ⁴² He was fearful that rather than "educating" youth, schools would simply "train" them to perform. Their work and learning would be mechanical in experience, they would not see or understand the consequences of their occupational acts. He further believed that such educational and occupational pursuits would result in a bifurcated school system and ultimately such a society. The result of vocational education in the main has been a segregation of students according to academic ability. The socialization process of the college and non-college student is self evident. Such a result for Dewey would be immoral and unjustifiable given his concept of democracy and free association and interaction. Curricula, as presently designed, do not prevent such academic and social segregation. The view expressed by the career education movement does offer the possibility of integration of students and curricula, which would open schools and society

for greater interaction and association among members. If the belief in human dignity is sincere, then our schools must begin to treat with respect all individual aspirations rather than only those of the college bound.

Dewey holds that vocational education will demand both social and educational reorganization, because if it is properly conceived, it will call forth "a more equitable and enlightened social order."⁴³ He asks that

"those believing in a better order to undertake the promotion of a vocational education which does . . . not subject youth to the demands and standards of the present system, but which utilizes its scientific and social factors to develop a courageous intelligence, and to make intelligence practical and executive."⁴⁴

It is apparent that vocational education, as recently practiced by our nation's schools, has not come close to the attainment of such a practical goal.

Dewey describes vocation as "such a direction of life activities as renders them perceptibly significant to a person, because of the consequences they accomplish, and also useful to his associates."⁴⁵ The comparison of this description to Hoyt's in the previous chapter is significant. Both men address the importance of the self worth of an activity as well as its social value. Dewey defines the opposite of career as "aimlessness, capriciousness, the absence of cumulative achievement in experience, on the personal side, and idle display, parasitic dependence upon others on the social side."⁴⁶ Again his beliefs correlate

highly with those of Hoyt and Goldhammer on the subject of self and social worth of careers.

Dewey continued to develop his thoughts on vocational or career education and he strongly argued against the preparation of students toward one career. He stated, "We must avoid not only limitation of conception of vocation . . . but also the notion that vocations are distributed in an exclusive way, one and only one to each person."⁴⁷ For to do such according to his belief would be absurd. He held that each individual has many callings in life and if one should pursue an occupation at the expense of excluding others, one would be in violation of free association and interaction with others to the degree that the person remained separate. Also, by such a narrow life one would be preventing future growth for him/her self and society. Dewey was very aware of the many roles in which an individual must be involved to become a full or "capacitated person" and he posited that to prepare such individuals, society must create

"an education which acknowledges the full intellectual and social meaning of a vocation (it) would include instruction in the historic background of present conditions, training in science to give intelligence and initiative in dealing with the material and agencies of production; and study of economics, civics, and politics, to bring the future worker in touch with the problems of the day and the various methods proposed for its improvement. Above all, it would train power of readaptation to changing conditions so that future workers would not become blindly subject to a fate imposed upon them."⁴⁸

The constant for Dewey was change rather than the status quo, change was to be in agreement with his social and philosophic

beliefs. Dewey also addresses other roles a person is expected to carry out, including those of family member, community involvement and those associated with friends.

Dewey, as do career educators of today, saw as a central and unifying role the occupation a person would select. It was apparent to him that a person's life chances, social relationships, marriage partner, status, etc. was very much related to one's occupation. However, the good life would result only if the person had selected a right occupation for themselves. Included in such a decision would be the potential to grow, contribute and experience life in its fullness. Such a life would be one that would reduce or eliminate alienation. Dewey stated:

"An occupation is the only thing which balances the distinctive capacity of an individual with his social service. To find out what one is fitted to do and to secure an opportunity to do it is the key to happiness."⁴⁹

One of the saddest experiences would be for a person to discover that they have not found what their business or occupation in life is, that they come to realize they have become what they have by being externally acted upon rather than deciding themselves for themselves what life occupation they ought to pursue. Dewey explained by right occupation is meant "simply that the aptitudes of a person are in adequate play, working with the minimum of friction and the maximum of satisfaction."⁵⁰ The satisfaction would result from the person's self-awareness of his/her own worth and contribution and also by such recognition being given by society. Occupations or careers that would offer less would in the degree to which they offered less approach slavery, either physically,

mentally, or both. The result of such an alienated condition is the mutual loss for the individual and the society. "The dominant vocation of all human beings at all times is living intellectual and moral growth."⁵¹

John Dewey did not, in 1916, use the term alienation in his writings on career education but contained within his discussion all the elements that result in a person becoming alienated. His theory and projected practice, if followed, would prevent or at least greatly limit alienation from taking hold of an individual or a group within society. He saw the role of education as that of effecting social change, rather than perpetuating society and its institutions as they presently exist. Dewey held the belief that man could infinitely better his lot. He addressed the concept of alienation in two ways, the first, related to the concept of non-growth, mental and/or physical slavery, and secondly, as the concept pertains to education as a transformational element of society. He held that a society which would undergo transformation of the existing order would be

"... a society in which every person shall be occupied in something which makes the lives of others better worth living, and which accordingly makes the ties which bind persons together more perceptible--which breaks down the barriers of distance between them. It denotes a state of affairs in which the interest of each in his work is uncoerced and intelligent: based upon its congeniality to his own aptitudes."⁵²

Further, educators cannot select an occupation for students, they can only guide and set conditions from which students may develop; such conditions are understood to be educative experiences, but

". . . to predetermine some future occupation for which education is to be a strict preparation is to injure the possibilities of present development and thereby to reduce the adequacy of preparation for a future right employment . . . such training may develop a machine-like skill in routine lines (it is far from being sure to do so, since it may develop distaste, aversion, and carelessness), but it will be at the expense of those qualities of alert observation and coherent and ingenious planning which make an occupation intellectually rewarding."⁵³

Thus, it is quite apparent that Dewey's philosophy demands that a person come to his/her occupation via an intelligent means rather than external pressure. Further, it is clear that for an occupation to be worthwhile the individual who is performing that occupation must view it as important to themselves and to the society. People must be in a position of having experience in their various roles; i.e., they must be able to understand the meaning and consequences of their acts. Occupations and other roles must contain the potential and means to continue growth. Following Dewey's social and philosophic concepts of growth, continuity and experience (as educative experience or "an experience") would result in educative institutions that would develop individuals capable of leading fulfilling or capacitating lives. The result for society would be one that is virtually free of alienated persons, and one that is continually advancing toward the good life; i.e., increased growth for its members.

Footnotes--Chapter III

¹It should be noted that the scope of this study does not include a discussion of the political aspects of democracy, socialism, communism or anarchy; nor the respective positions of Dewey, Marx and Goodman relative to these political ideas. Rather the study will accept the belief that the United States is a "democratic state" and will examine the concept expressed by Dewey "a democratic way of life." It is this philosophical position suggested to be practical socially which is at the heart of this study. Further, it is this social ideal which seems to unite Dewey and Marx, rather than the political beliefs ascribed to and misinterpreted of each. To see a more detailed description of Dewey's political view of society, see The Public and Its Problems.

²John Dewey, Democracy and Education (New York: The Free Press, 1916), p. 99.

³Dewey did not identify "the good" of belief in "the Forms" as did Plato, and it is in this sense that Dewey did not hold to ultimate ends. It is clear from his various writings that he did, however, hold "growth" as the one end; i.e., without growth, a valid position cannot be taken in his philosophic system.

⁴John Dewey, Democracy and Education (New York: The Free Press, 1916), p. 88.

⁵Ibid., p. 88.

⁶Ibid., p. 90.

⁷The type of democratic state that is referred to here is not meant to be related to a given political or economic system; i.e., capitalism. Rather it is meant to refer to one that contains Dewey's principles of free interaction of citizens and free exchange of ideas and the way of life that should result from such a state. Clearly it is opposite a totalitarian and/or limited state in that the individual can freely select his life role as opposed to having is prescribed by others. (See Dewey, Democracy and Education, Chapter 7, for a detailed explanation.) Further, it is to be clearly pointed out that such a way of life does not adopt nor require the economic system of capitalism. Dewey has been critical of most aspects of capitalism throughout his life.

⁸John Dewey, Democracy and Education (New York: The Free Press, 1916), p. 83.

⁹Ibid., p. 83.

¹⁰Ibid., p. 87.

¹¹Ibid., p. 97.

¹²Ibid., p. 98.

¹³Keith Goldhammer and Robert E. Taylor, Career Education Perspective and Promise (Columbus, Ohio: Charles E. Merrill Publishing Company, 1973), p. 29.

¹⁴Keith Goldhammer, "Career Education," Michigan School Board Journal (October, 1973):10.

¹⁵John Dewey, Democracy and Education (New York: The Free Press, 1916), p. 99.

¹⁶Ibid., p. 99.

¹⁷Ibid., p. 84.

¹⁸Ibid., p. 84.

¹⁹Ibid., p. 84.

²⁰Francis M. Cornford, trans., The Republic of Plato (New York: Oxford University Press, 1945), pp. 227-235.

²¹John Dewey, Democracy and Education (New York: The Free Press, 1916), p. 329.

²²Ibid., p. 329.

²³Ibid., p. 328.

²⁴Ibid., p. 331.

²⁵Ibid., p. 331.

²⁶Ibid., p. 332.

²⁷John Dewey, Experience and Education (New York: Collier Books, 1963), p. 28.

²⁸John Dewey, Democracy and Education (New York: The Free Press, 1916), p. 139.

²⁹Ibid., p. 140.

³⁰Ibid., p. 140.

³¹Ibid., p. 53.

³²Ibid., p. 41.

³³Ibid., p. 44.

³⁴John Dewey, Experience and Education (New York: Collier Books, 1963), p. 33.

³⁵Ibid., p. 36.

³⁶Ibid., p. 41.

³⁷John Dewey, Art as Experience (New York: Capricorn Books, 1934), p. 19.

³⁸Ibid., p. 35.

³⁹Ibid., p. 26.

⁴⁰Ibid., p. 27.

⁴¹Ibid., p. 249.

⁴²John Dewey, Democracy and Education (New York: The Free Press, 1916), p. 316.

⁴³Ibid., p. 319.

⁴⁴Ibid., p. 319.

⁴⁵Ibid., p. 307.

⁴⁶Ibid., p. 307.

⁴⁷Ibid., p. 307.

⁴⁸Ibid., pp. 318-319.

⁴⁹Ibid., p. 308.

⁵⁰Ibid., p. 308.

⁵¹Ibid., p. 310.

⁵²Ibid., p. 316.

⁵³Ibid., p. 310.

CHAPTER IV

PAUL GOODMAN: A SOCIAL AND HUMANISTIC CRITIQUE OF SOCIETY AND EDUCATIONAL INSTITUTIONS

Career education has been strongly supported for a number of reasons, but seemingly most often for its perceived ability to reduce the number of unemployed and underemployed persons in our society, in particular that among our young people. This does represent a positive rationale for career education's existence, but it fails to bring out a much deeper and more meaningful rationale. What is needed, related to vocation, was simply expressed by Paul Goodman: "Vocation . . . is a solid means of finding one's opportunities, things worthwhile, useful, and honorable to do and be justified doing."¹ This concept has been touched upon by others in the movement, but it has not been drawn out as a major thrust as it should be. Producing employment opportunities for individuals is only part of the challenge facing our nation; the more difficult aspect is developing such opportunities that are non-alienating. Paul Goodman presents a cogent review of our society, schools and general way of life, which attacks the more central problem that career education should be addressing; i.e., quality of life. He develops his arguments from a Gestalt base and therefore more closely examines

the psychological aspects of our society. Goodman is a strong critic of America's society and its schools, but he does hold an optimistic outlook for both. He questions the logic of our present state of affairs from the perspective that man is now made to fit a society that does not serve his needs, rather than having a society that serves mankind for the growth and betterment of all. He does address the same general concerns as career educators, but more from a humanistic psychological base, rather than an economic and productive perspective. To assist in exploring this rationale and critique, the work of Paulo Freire will be explored to demonstrate the logical possibility of all citizens being able to participate actively in society and its varied activities.

Paul Goodman, in reviewing the present stage of social development of the American society, summed his criticism in this way:

"It has: slums of engineering--boondoggling production--chaotic congestion--tribes of middlemen--basic city functions squeezed out--garden cities for children--indifferent workmen--underprivileged on a dole--empty 'belonging' without nature or culture--front politicians--no patriotism--an empty nationalism bound for a cataclysmically disastrous finish--wise opinion swamped--enterprise sabotaged by monopoly--prejudice rising--religion otiose--the popular culture debased--science specialized--science secret--the average man inept--youth idle and truant--youth sexually suffering, and sexually obsessed--youth without goals--poor schools."²

Yet after outlining a grim existence that few would argue against, he remarked:

"We have a persisting grand culture. There is a steady advance of science, scholarship, and the fine arts. A steady improvement in health and medicine. An economy of abundance . . . a genuine civil peace and a stubborn affirming of democracy."³

Goodman finds much wrong with our way of life, but within it he clearly sees the great potential for growth of society and each of its individuals. He does ask, however, in light of the quote above, what models do we offer to our youth? Are we not asking them to grow up in an absurd society?

Goodman's charge against the schools and society in defense of the young is clear; you cannot continue to ask or train the young to accept a life that is not fully human. It is the obligation of the present powers to recreate the social and psychological environment to allow for growth for all society's members, or else all that can result is a continued expansion of the dim view expressed above and an increasingly decaying social system. Growth

"like any ongoing function, requires adequate objects in the environment to meet the needs and capacities of the growing child, boy, youth, and young man, until he can better choose and make his own environment."⁴

Goodman raises two fundamental issues in his critique of society and its schools. The first relates to questioning the validity of the type of life most are expected to live as adults in our present society. Related to working in our society he remarked:

". . . workmen are indifferent to the job because of its intrinsic nature; it does not enlist worthwhile capacities, it is not 'interesting'; it is not his, he is not 'in' on it; the product is not really useful."⁵

Goodman finds similarity in his position and that of John K. Galbraith in that society via mass advertising is creating a mass demand for products that are not needed, which in turn creates mass production and consumption. Unfortunately it appears to also create mass alienation on the part of the workers in that they are aware of the products' uselessness and this then reflects on them as people. How do you, under such conditions, explain to your family and friends the worthwhile quality of your life's work? Goodman asks, what real opportunities exist for persons to search out and discover worthwhile experiences? He posits that we cannot on one hand demand a conformist social environment and on the other hope to find skillful and spirited men and women to direct the system. He argues that man can no longer be required to fit the dominant system, especially when the dominant system no longer fits mankind. Do we have the right to socialize individuals to the life of the dominant system; or do we have the obligation to adjust the system to benefit the people that come together or compose that system? Goodman would opt for the latter.

Related to work, he stated the following:

"Men like to make things, to handle the materials and see them take shape and come out as desired, and they are proud of the products. And men like to work and be useful, for work has rhythm and springs from spontaneous feelings just like play, and to be useful makes people feel right. Productive work is a kind of creation, it is an extension of human personality into nature. But it is also true that the private or state capitalist relations of production, and the machine industry as it now exists under whatever system, have so far destroyed the instinctive pleasures of work that economic work is what all ordinary men dislike. . . . Mass production, analyzing the acts of labor into small steps and

distributing the products far from home, destroys the sense of creating anything. Rhythm, neatness, style belong to the machine rather than to the man."⁶

Goodman here very clearly brings out the need for career educators to look into the aspects of "career" rather than to flippantly accept the term "salable skill" as so many do. Goodman asks seriously if it is better to be employed at a useless dehumanizing occupation or if one is better off unemployed and in possession of one's human qualities. He clearly selects the latter and posits the beat culture as a case in point. It is clearly his position that our present work force in the main is wasting the abilities and insulting the skills of the people within it.

Goodman's second major issue centers on the schools that are in the business of preparing our youth to go out into the world and "make it." Obviously, he questions if programming youth to fit emptied spaces in the labor force is a worthwhile activity. He also strongly questions the viability of compulsory education, at least as it is presently operative. He is generally opposed to compulsory education but seems to offer alternatives that would remove his major points of concern. Goodman, in his criticism, hit upon the same major fault so often discussed among career educators; that is, the fact, according to the Conant report, that only 15% of the student population is academically talented enough to be taught difficult subjects; thus, if this is true, and there is excellent reason to project doubt, schools are then not attending to the needs of the other 85% of the school

population. Perhaps Goodman comes closer to the truth; i.e., why only 15% are found to be talented, in the following statement:

"... all classes learn that life is inevitably routine, depersonalized, venally graded; that it is best to toe the mark and shut up; that there is no place for spontaneity, open sexuality, free spirit. Trained in the schools, they go on to the same quality of jobs, culture, politics. This is education, miseducation, socializing to the national norms and regimenting to the national 'needs.'"7

Goodman felt Dewey's belief that schools can and should exist as agents for social change was a fine ideal that never found its place. Instead, schools have become the training centers for the labor force and the stratifiers of our social system. Goodman, however, has remained a Deweyan educator and argues for his type of progressive education. He, as Dewey, stands diametrically opposed to what is often found operating in our schools today under the name "learning":

"Learning means to give some final response that the programmer considers advantageous (to the students). There is no criterion of knowing it, of having learned it, of Gestalt--forming or simplification. That is, the student has no active self at all; his self, at least as student, is a construct of the programmer."8

Under this system the student is deemed successful when he can demonstrate that he is clearly conditioned to the others' thoughts. This, according to Bloom, would represent the lowest cognitive skill--that of memorizing. Bloom's taxonomy of learning contains seven levels of thinking and if followed would develop a substantially different type of student than is presently being "produced." It is also of interest to point out the word "program" related to "train" vs. "educate" or "learn." The difference in

concepts are fundamental and self evident but so often not mentioned. Goodman would only favor a school that would result in educating students for a valuable and worthwhile existence as opposed to training them to fit that which is already acknowledged as bad.

Goodman's position is that we need to find alternative ways of educating people. His major points deal with not only what is taught; i.e., how it relates to the real world, but also how it is taught, how the student is involved in the learning process. Education, for Goodman and Dewey, is achieved when one has learned how to learn. Goodman is concerned with the nature of man and the development of the same. He finds in human nature potentiality. Goodman finds defining human nature a difficult task, as have others before him, but he is addressing a spirit such as the one that was with this nation and people during the Golden Age of Enlightenment. Men were encouraged to experiment, to invent, to develop to the fullest in a non-regimented fashion. Goodman speaks of human nature as it referred

"to man's naturally sympathetic sentiments, his communicative faculties, and unalienable dignity. . . . Human nature unmistakably demanded liberty, equality, and fraternity--and every man a philosopher and a poet."⁹

Goodman is speaking to the age of revolution as well in the above reflection but he does not define revolution in violent terms but rather in terms of honest change. He refers to Karl Marx to help express his position on the nature of man in that he, with Marx, finds man as a maker, that man must use his productive capacity or he will be miserable. Goodman finds both society and its

schools guilty of violating this type of human nature. Workers and students alike are blocked from experiment and positive "free" growth.

Goodman believes that as society is now structured and as schools are presently modeled after society, young people have no respectable models to follow. Presthus broke society into three stereotypes; the upward mobile, the ambivalent and the indifferent--all representing the strata of our organizational society. And all lacking in real opportunity for self-fulfillment, save for the upward mobiles' accumulation of material goods and shoddy status symbols. Life of the "Organizational Man" is empty. Our schools follow this pattern even to the point of developing the three groupings in elementary schools; e.g., the redbirds, bluebirds and yellowbirds, or more honestly, the fruits, nuts and vegetables. Goodman posits that the models are bad; thus, to change the system, we need to identify new models. He contrasts any sampling of present day governors and presidents with those public men serving in the Washington era--"Adams, Jefferson, Madison, Henry, Franklin, Hamilton, Jay . . . a fair sampling of the good spirits in the country, humane, literate, brave, not self-seeking."¹⁰ It was a day that the best were called to serve. Goodman's fear is that given the static and stifling educating process now in effect we do all but insure the non-development of the best--for if they are ambivalent they are likely to resign before their opportunity comes. Human nature needs an opportunity

to experiment, to grow, to question. Goodman puts it in the framework of a positive challenge as he states "It is not a 'psychological' question of poor influences and bad attitudes, but an objective question of real opportunities for worthwhile experiences."¹¹

Goodman argues that if schools are going to continue to be compulsory, and every indication is that they are, they then must be placed in a position to justify their usefulness. To do that, it is his belief that new and alternative units and methods need to be developed. In particular, schools must incorporate a means to help those who do not make it in the present model. He states that research has shown that 75% of the students who have dropped out and returned, drop out again. This, coupled with the career educator's position that schools are not educating 80% of the student population for meaningful employment or advanced training would seem to suggest to even the most conservative educator, in favor of the status quo, the need for rethinking the position. Goodman posits, in line with Goldhammer:

"The curriculum is only superficially what 'a man ought to know'; it is more fundamentally how to become a man-in-the-world . . . not to teach the whole curriculum is to give up on the whole man."¹²

Thus we cannot be satisfied to educate to employment, or leisure, or citizenry, or family living, or community life, or an understanding of the arts, or appreciation of religion--we must educate to include all elements of life to produce whole human beings capable of developing a positive human nature.

Goodman holds that the type of education that could attain the goals above, and those that would follow in accepting Goldhammer's and Hoyt's concept of career education, is the one that never was given an honest chance; i.e., progressive education.

Goodman states

"... progressive education is nothing but the attempt to naturalize, to humanize, each new social and technical development that is making traditional education irrelevant. It is not a reform of education, but a reconstruction in terms of the new era."¹³

He adds to this viewpoint that

"what must be taught are the underlying ideas of scientific thought, continuous with the substance of the youngster's feelings and experience. In short, the theory is Deweyan Progressive Education."¹⁴

Much needs to be explored in greater detail to bring out more fully Goodman's meaning but it may prove important at this point to examine ways and reasons to educate the less gifted members of society. One could readily admit success with Conant's 15% of the student population and others could find success with a greater percentage utilizing a Deweyan progressive educational program, and yet one might question its success with the less gifted or the bottom one-third of society. However, Dewey would assert success with all levels.

Paulo Freire, in the Pedagogy of the Oppressed, reviews the educational practices and theory that he found successful in educating the illiterates in various parts of South America. Freire worked with the poor, lethargic, dispossessed people whom he came to refer to as the "culture of silence." It was with these

groups that he came to view education as a positive dynamic concept; i.e., where you do not follow the "banking system" or "traditional system," in which the teacher has all the knowledge and deposits it into the minds of students. He discovered that the process that worked was an active and reflective dialogue with the learners, one in which the teacher was also a learner in that he re-reflected on his ideas and mediated them with other men to arrive at a point of agreement. Robert Shaul said of Freire that his conviction is

"that every human being, no matter how 'ignorant' or submerged in the 'culture of silence' he may be, is capable of looking critically at his world in a dialogical encounter with others."¹⁵

In essence, no man nor woman need to be excluded from living a productive, contributing and self-justifying life in that they are all capable of interacting with their environment and working to transform it--via action and reflection--praxis.

Shaul, in discussing Freire's position, posits that though Latin America has significantly different problems than the United States, the problems faced by its poor and youth may offer certain parallels that carry meaning. He, in particular, refers to our society's increasingly making objects of people by requiring conformity to the system, and to the degree this happens he posits, we too are becoming a "culture of silence." He sums Freire's position on education well in stating that:

"Education either functions as an instrument which is used to facilitate the integration of the younger generation into the logic of the present system and bring about conformity

to it, or it becomes 'the practice of freedom,' the means by which men and women deal critically and creatively with reality and discover how to participate in the transformation of their world."¹⁶

Freire argues that people who make up the "culture of silence" represent a society's oppressed people who are afraid of freedom. They have not developed what Freire labels "conscientizacao," which involves the ability to perceive the world as it is around you, socially, politically, and economically, as well as the contradictions that are contained within that society. Further, it involves the base from which to take positive action to change for the betterment of all. The position is much like that discussed by C. W. Mills, in The Power Elite, related to the 19th Century "public" that he described. People who are placed in a position to see their environment clearly are in a position to transform it. Freire argues that people fear this freedom and it is up to the educational system to assist them to find it, so that people can critically deal with their world and contribute to the good of the whole by transforming it. He also brings out the lack of humanism and self worth of the oppressors of society--those who make up the power elite, for they, perhaps more than the oppressed, are fearful of examining their position.

Historically, the illiterates have been kept in darkness or have been like the cave dwellers of Plato's "Cave Allegory," in that they were not given the tools to see, understand and participate in society as full citizens. If we examine the involvement of American citizens in voting patterns, serving in

public office, volunteer work for the community, etc., we readily observe that many do not participate. Freire argues that this pattern was evident in South America because people were excluded due to the dehumanizing environment; but, once given a means to knowingly and actively participate, his students did become active; also, they became literate and developed dignity. It was obviously a humanist approach that produced human results. These people were not written off or merely given a menial salable skill and sold on the market place. They were given a means to participate actively in all aspects of their lives and a means to work to transform the former oppressed state into an increasingly human one. The lesson for career education is evident; it must be for all citizens and for all aspects of their lives. Goodman would also emphasize the need to be equally concerned that the young also experience feelings of self-worth and actively participate as they grow. That is, he believes they need opportunities to fulfill themselves as they develop, not to be left in a void until high school graduation.

Freire's major tenet is

"that man's ontological vocation (as he calls it) is to be a subject who acts and transform his world, and in so doing moves toward ever new possibilities of fuller and richer life individually and collectively. This world to which he relates is not a static and closed order . . . it is a problem to be worked on and solved."¹⁷

This transformation is to take place by a liberating education that develops a balanced freedom utilizing the concepts of dialogue and praxis. Freire views dialogue as the encounter between men and

the world and it is to include the teacher and student. A humanist teacher under this model would not "deposit" "knowledge" into the heads of students but rather join them at their point of development and interact with them to develop a base from which to grow. Freire uses the "problem-posing" method to implement dialogical interaction. Its counterpart in this country would be the "inquiry-method" or Dewey's scientific method. His added contribution is in the development of praxis within the educational program. Praxis for Freire is "reflection and action upon the world in order to transform it."¹⁸ Praxis requires that students reflect on their world and then take steps to improve upon its condition. Freire does not address a time frame but rather views this transformation as an ongoing project to continually improve man's environment. Its goal is to develop a society that exists without oppression of one man by another and a social organization that works to resolve other forms of oppression resultant from the environment, in essence a life-long project.

The educational plan developed by Freire does address the problem American educators have forgotten or given up on; i.e., the student who is not able or willing to do what is asked of them. Freire clearly addresses the social reasons for withdrawal or resignation and in addition he offers a viable model with which to address the solution of developing a positive educational plan for this group. He requires a different, or basically untried, teaching method-humanism-and adds the concept of praxis. He found that when people came to adequately perceive their world they lost

their fear and were willing to address their own and their world's problems. He gave them a base by becoming involved with them, a requirement that is not presently in our schools. Conant states 15% do well as we now operate; the question asked by Goodman and Freire is obvious; i.e., given a new approach, what would the percentage become? Freire's success was high with what would be considered, in America, society's lowest educational strata. Career educators must be open to new and varied approaches if their ambitious goal is to be attained, unless they intend to settle for a "salable skill" and do not care to deal with the whole person, a position Goodman and Freire both require for an act to be labeled educative.

Paul Goodman, as Freire, believes that we waste immeasurable human resources and skills, which result in a society being less than what it is presently capable of becoming. He argues that the schools tend to perpetuate this condition but need not do so. Schools, in Goodman's view, ought to encourage independent thought and expression instead of conformity. Related to the compelling nature of school systems, he responds; "on the whole, . . . education must be voluntary rather than compulsory, for no growth to freedom occurs except by intrinsic motivation. Therefore, educational opportunities must be various and variously administered."¹⁹ Simply, there is not "A" model to be developed or "A" means to an end but there are many models, means and ends and it is the obligation of the schools to adjust to meet the needs of young

people. Education that is forced is training at best and tends to have terminal qualities. Progressive education, as viewed by Goodman, is intrinsic in nature and incorporates worthwhile educative experiences involving the whole person--body and mind.

Relating Goodman's perspective to career education opens a new and deeper concept of career to many and adds support to the basic position put forth by Hoyt and Goldhammer. They all view work as more than an activity that produces income, they hold the view that work, career, or vocation ought to be useful, meaningful, worthwhile and provide dignity and a positive sense of accomplishment for those involved. Goodman, in reviewing present school practices, suggests that, given some students' progress at various rates and their differing interests, the schools need to be more flexible in exit and reentry. Students need an opportunity to accomplish, to work, to create in the world before they graduate. Goodman posits this would reduce the feelings of uselessness on the part of youth and allow them to become involved as they mature. He suggests projects that could be undertaken; e.g., town improvement, community service, construction etc. that could be funded from public and private sources. This is very much in concert with the career education movement's idea of students getting actual experience. The experience would need to add the qualifications outlined above by Goodman to insure a non-alienating work environment, a point not often made in career education literature.

Goodman, though critical, views school and society with positive potential and what is most needed is for us to utilize the human resources we have, both socially and educationally. He outlined many approaches that have now become stock career educational practices; e.g., industrial and community educational experiences, but most importantly addresses the need to educate to the whole person and develop "human nature." His utopia is a society where:

"A premium is placed on technical improvement and on the engineering style of functional simplicity and clarity. Where the community is planned as a whole, with an organic integration of work, living and play . . . (where) money is spent for public goods. Where workers are technically educated and have a say in management. Where nobody drops out of society and there is easy mobility of classes. Where production is primarily for use. Where social groups are laboratories for solving their own problems experimentally . . . (where) there is pride in the Republic . . . where people are not afraid to make friends. Where races are factually equal. Where vocation is sought out and cultivated as God-given capacity, to be conserved and embellished, and where the Church is the spirit of its congregation. . . . Where children can make themselves useful and earn their own money. . . . And where education is concerned with fostering human powers as they develop in the growing child."²⁰

Goodman is seeking a non-alienating society in which its citizens are given the opportunity and encouragement to develop their talents and interests to their fullest. Career education offers great potential to resolve much of what Goodman criticizes in schools and society. However, it must concern itself with the "human qualities" addressed by Goodman and Freire and involve all students and citizens in the continuous development of "careers" in a sense beyond the concept of "a salable skill."

Footnotes--Chapter IV

¹Paul Goodman, Growing Up Absurd (New York: Vintage Books, 1960), p. 142.

²Ibid., p. 227.

³Ibid., p. 228.

⁴Ibid., p. 12.

⁵Ibid., p. 21.

⁶Jack Hruska, "An Analysis of Paul Goodman's Conception of the Nature of Man as a Perspective on His Educational Proposals: A Study in the Philosophical Foundations of Radical Thought" (unpublished Ph.D. dissertation, 1969), p. 105.

⁷Paul Goodman, Compulsory Mis-Education (New York: Vintage Books, 1960), p. 23.

⁸Ibid., p. 80.

⁹Paul Goodman, Growing Up Absurd (New York: Vintage Books, 1960), pp. 6, 7.

¹⁰Ibid., p. 106.

¹¹Ibid., p. 12.

¹²Ibid., p. 83.

¹³Paul Goodman, Compulsory Mis-Education (New York: Vintage Books, 1964), p. 40.

¹⁴Ibid., p. 44.

¹⁵Paulo Freire, Pedagogy of the Oppressed (New York: The Seaburg Press, 1970), p. 13.

¹⁶Ibid., p. 15.

¹⁷Ibid., p. 12.

¹⁸Ibid., p. 36. Freire also addresses this point on page 91 as he states "the praxis which, as the reflection and action truly transform reality, is the course of knowledge and creation. Animal activity, which occurs without praxis, is not creative; man's transforming activity is. It is as transforming and creative beings that men, in their permanent relations with reality, produce not only material goods--tangible objects but also social institutions, ideas, and concepts. Through their continuing praxis, men simultaneously create history and become historical-social beings."

¹⁹Paul Goodman, Compulsory Mis-Education (New York: Vintage Books, 1964), p. 61.

²⁰Paul Goodman, Growing Up Absurd (New York: Vintage Books, 1960), pp. 227 and 228. Goodman in this quote refers to "mobility of classes," and could be viewed by some as supporting a class society. However, the general trend of his thought and writing would speak against such a position. It would be fair to state that Goodman does not always use "philosopher's care" with words, and therefore, does not actually oppose Dewey or Marx on their respective views of society.

CHAPTER V

KARL MARX ON SOCIETY AND ALIENATION

Career education as it is generally conceived today has been justified by its claim to educate all students to the end result of each having attained a "salable skill." It is argued that with such a skill all students may then enter the world of work and become fulfilled and participating members of the American community. The gross naivete of such a position is self-evident. Fortunately, there are practitioners of career education who do realize that to posit the above argument would result in only examining the end result of career education at its most superficial level. The entire concept of quality is not even addressed by such a position; it assumes that all work/labor is equal and achieving the ability to perform a task to a level of proficiency that results in one becoming employed is the essence of the movement. The number of States and organizations that in fact posit this position is alarming (see Appendix). It is almost incomprehensible to believe that departments of education, school districts, educational leaders and legislators would readily accept such a shallow and incomplete goal for the movement of career education. The logical extension of "salable skill" results in educators turning human beings into salable commodities or things for the

market place. What is needed, at minimum, is a career concept that addresses the worthiness of "X" career to mankind, and its worth to each "self." The idea of salability in the context of realistic probability of such careers being available and needed by society is one point, but to view salability as product marketing is a totally different one.

The most basic concept related to job fulfillment or satisfaction has to do with the perceived worth of performing the duties and responsibilities related to a particular job by the worker and "others." Work that does not offer positive worth from the perspective of the worker and "others" would be alienating and destructive to the idea of humanism and "growth," both of the individual and society. Karl Marx's work in the general field of labor and alienation is yet unparalleled and will be utilized in this study to examine some of the more basic tenets of working environments that do not require a dehumanized working relationship. The need for the application of Marx's major positions involving man's role in productive activity in a career education program will become increasingly evident as his beliefs are reviewed.

This study fully acknowledges the difficulty in separating economic, political and social aspects of Marxian Theory. It is also to be noted that the type of capitalistic society Marx addressed in his writings in the 1850's--1900's is no longer in existence. Marx addressed the type of capitalism which existed in the United States in the last half of the 19th Century and

whether or not his theories are correct remains speculative. The application or mis-application of his theories in the East have not offered any proof that his political theory is correct. It is not the intent of this study to project the validity of Marxian political theory, but rather to examine social conditions that could have positive influence on our working and social life. It will be assumed that Marx's social theories could be operative in the U.S. under our modified democratic structure as it now exists.

Herbert Marcuse, a Marxian scholar of present time, has examined the two major governmental systems; i.e., democracy and communism, and has found that the basic position of the worker could be the same under either system. Marcuse is of course stating his position after "Communism" has been tried. He found that it is not so much the question of private vs. public ownership that created domination, but rather the choice of the powers in either system that determined the quality of life for the society. Marx did hold for the dissolution of government in the final stage of development, an end that did not fulfill itself, and thus in practice, one would find Marx's political position in error. However, it does not follow that his social theory would also fall, it would only question the possibility of its becoming fact in his political system. Marcuse states that the possibility of improved life; i.e., a Marxian position of life's productivity, could be achieved under other systems as well as a communist one. He stated:

"Thus, within the framework of a given situation, industrialization can proceed in different ways, under collective or private control, and even under private control, in different directions of progress and with different aims. The choice is primarily (but only primarily!) the privilege of those groups which have attained control over the productive process. Their control projects the way of life for the whole, and the ensuing and enslaving necessity is the result of their freedom. And the possible abolition of this necessity depends on a new ingression of freedom--not any freedom, but that of men who comprehend the given necessity as insufferable pain, and as unnecessary."¹

Related to governmental systems, Marcuse remarked:

"The fateful interdependence of the only two 'sovereign' social systems in the contemporary world is expressive of the fact that the conflict between progress and politics, between man and his masters has become total. When capitalism meets the challenge of communism, it meets its own capabilities: spectacular development of all productive forces after the subordination of the private interests in profitability which arrest such forces. When communism meets the challenge of capitalism, it too meets its own capabilities: spectacular comforts, liberties, and alleviation of the burden of life. Both systems have these capabilities distorted beyond recognition and, in both cases, the reason is in the last analysis the same--the struggle against a form of life which would dissolve the basis for domination."²

The point is, given Marcuse's position, Marx's political beliefs could be altered in contemporary society without necessarily altering the heart of Marxian theory. It is clear that the welfare state has gravely altered the capitalist society and socialism is becoming a viable governing concept in a quasi-democratic state. Further, absolute lack of private ownership has been found counterproductive in communist countries; e.g., the Russian agricultural production rate on private land vs. cooperative when compared on a percentage basis. Marcuse has allowed for Marx's basic concern; i.e., domination of man by the productive process to be eliminated

as easily in one governmental form as the other. This study does not intend to go into greater depth into Marx's political system; its purpose is only to offer the logical possibility of Marx's social theory related to alienation and quality of life being applied to the American society as it should exist. Marcuse does posit the logical possibility above.

Career education as it is now generally viewed has been created to help resolve our nation's unemployment problem and to allow each person to lead a productive life. Kenneth Hoyt goes beyond this by stating "the word work is distinguished from the word labor by the fact that it represents a purpose chosen by the individual."³ This statement does move in the direction of addressing the concept of alienation in the context of work but it is not developed beyond this point. If career education is only to deal with unemployment it would be failing to meet what is likely the most important problem in our work oriented society today; i.e., alienation. However, it must be noted that our alienation does not just apply to our working environments, but it has expanded to include our social relationships. Humans are not producing goods and services to meet the needs of others in any large extent but are more often performing tasks of "labor" without being involved in the activity as a human being. Marx addressed three types of alienation "(1) alienation from the object of one's labor, (2) self-alienation, and (3) alienation of man from man, of man from mankind."⁴

Marx's concept of alienation has been difficult to comprehend in a simplistic manner; however, I. Mészáros has represented it well in the following manner:

"Marx's concept of alienation has four main aspects which are as follows:

- (a) man is alienated from nature;
- (b) he is alienated from himself (from his own activity)
- (c) from his 'species-being' (from his being as a member of the human species)
- (d) man is alienated from man (from other men)."⁵

Mészáros details the above by explaining that alienated labor in the first case above involves the relationship of man to his product and adds that for Marx this also involved man's relationship to the sensuous external world and products of nature. The second aspect deals with the productive act itself, "the worker's relation to his own activity as alien activity, which does not offer satisfaction to him in and by itself. . . ."⁶ The third component above

"is related to the conception according to which the object of labor is the objectification of man's species life, for man duplicates himself not only, as in consciousness, intellectually, but also actively in reality, and therefore he contemplates himself in a world that he created."⁷

Here man is alienated from mankind in general; i.e., humanism is debased by the process in the general sense. The final aspect deals with the particular; i.e., man's alienation from other men, his contemporaries. Mészáros expressed it by stating that "What applies to man's relation to his work, to the product of his labour and to himself, also holds of man's relation to the other man, and to the other man's labour and object of labor."⁸ Thus,

given that one man is performing alienating labor, he has lost meaning himself, the product has lost human worth, generic man has suffered and because this product does not carry human worth it means nothing to "other men," leaving the labor meaningless socially. Such labor is of course caused by the demand for profit via economic production. The key is found to be incorporated in the concept of "economic production" as opposed to "human production." They both involve the process and the product of production.

Exploring the negative aspects of labor is enlightening to a point but the question that logically follows is, "What type of production would be acceptable and non-alienating according to Marx?" Marx expressed it this way:

- "1. In my production I would have objectified my individuality and its particularity, and in the course of the activity I would have enjoyed an individual life; in viewing the object I would have experienced the individual joy of knowing my personality as an objective, sensuously perceptible, and indubitable power.
2. In your satisfaction and your use of my product I would have had the direct and conscious satisfaction that my work satisfied a human need, that it objectified human nature, and that it created an object appropriate to the need of another human being.
3. I would have been the mediator between you and the species and you would have experienced me as a reintegration of your own nature and a necessary part of yourself; I would have been affirmed in your thoughts as well as your love.
4. In my individual life I would have directly created your life; in my individual activity I would have immediately confirmed and realized my true human and social nature."⁹

Simply, man in a "working" vs. "labor" environment as described by Marx is dealing with honest human needs, not those artificially created to result in profit with the side effect of an alienated

worker, society and species. It would be the position of this dissertation that career education must be working toward the type of work world that would allow each individual to realize the satisfaction outlined above; anything less would be increasingly alienating and wrong socially and morally. Further, if career takes on Goldhammer's and Hoyt's meaning then career education will be obligated to remove alienating activity from man's relationship with other men.

Marx holds that man by nature must be active and be involved in producing objects. Man produces himself by his activity and by following Marx's concept of production above one would find oneself self-fulfilled and a member of a "social" environment where humans are positively involved with each other. He expressed this view in the following way:

"As individuals express their life, so they are. What they are, therefore, coincides with their production, both with what they produce and with how they produce it."¹⁰

"What applies to a man's relation to his work, to the product of his labor and to himself, also holds of a man's relation to the other man, and to the other man's labor and object of labor."¹¹

"Activity in direct association with others, etc., has become an organ for expressing my own life, and a mode of approximating human life."¹²

Marx clearly saw production as the basis of all social life. He recognized the need for interdependence for survival, and labor associated with production of the basic needs. Beyond that point labor was to be viewed more as "work;" i.e., those activities that advanced human life without alienating it. Activity of this

type would be selected by the worker, he would be internally and externally involved with the production and be fully aware of his work to other men and the human race in general. This is opposed to one working under the conditions described by Schiller:

" . . . enjoyment is separated from labor, the means from the end, exertion from recompense. Eternally fettered only to a single little fragment of the whole, man fashions himself only as a fragment; ever hearing only the monotonous whirl of the wheel which he turns, he never develops the harmony of his being, and instead of shaping the humanity that lies in his nature, he becomes a mere imprint of his occupation, his science."¹³

Marx also stated that production and economic production are not necessarily the same thing. However, both will result in a society with particular and given social relations. Marx held that alien labor would result in an estranged social system and he has been increasingly supported by social scientists of present day.

Herbert Marcuse has shown Marx's basic tenets to be very much the case today and in his review of alienation he has added or explained in a different way the effect of such labor on mankind, society and the individual. Further, he, with Marx but with added history, projects how society can and ought to become less alienating.

Marcuse approaches his interpretation of alienation by examining the concepts of the pleasure principle, the reality principle, the performance principle, and surplus repression. Briefly he describes the pleasure principle as basically self-evident, in that, humans by nature seek out the most satisfying activities; the reality principle acts to hold the pleasure

principle in check to defer some immediate pleasure for a later activity that would be of more value and protect against self-destructive activity; the performance principle acts as an extension of the reality principle as applied to organized production under a form of domination; surplus repression represents self inflicted repression by the individual to gain "things" at the expense of humanity. For society and the individual, surplus repression results where "the individual pays by sacrificing his time, his consciousness, his dreams; similarly, civilization pays by sacrificing its own promises of liberty, justice, and peace for all."¹⁴ Marcuse uses Freud as a vehicle to arrive at his conclusion that society is alienated and its members often elect surplus repression due to their environing circumstances, but it is unnecessary, given today's technology. He holds that most "labor" can be performed by machines leaving people free to "work."

Marcuse describes present day alienation in the same form as Marx before him. He holds that as societies advanced the role of the performance principle in organizing labor and producing a dominant class, it was, as with Marx, necessary to develop to higher levels. However, at our present stage of technology the performance principle no longer plays the role it historically did and is not viable. Labor need not be controlled by others, but now can be guided by the individual. Marcuse reviews labor stating that for the vast majority of the people labor determines their satisfaction with themselves:

". . . their labor is work for an apparatus which they do not control, which operates as an independent power to which individuals must submit if they want to live. . . . Men do not live their own lives but perform pre-established functions. While they work they do not fulfill their own needs and faculties but work in alienation . . . labor time, which is the largest part of the individuals's life time, is painful time, for alienated labor is absence of gratification, negation of the pleasure principle."¹⁵

The individual is working for an alien apparatus and meeting its external needs while at the same time denying himself the opportunity to produce to meet his needs and desires. Surplus repression would become operative if the individual would elect to give up more of his time to labor for goods that are not needed to fulfill or develop "humanness;" e.g., work overtime for a fourth snowmobile rather than spend time getting to "know" others in an honest encounter. He ultimately attacks our society's materialistic value system.

Marcuse holds that given our mature stage of industrialization there is no real need for members of our society to suffer because of scarcity of goods needed for survival. If the society chose to reorganize its ends to result in greater human satisfactions as opposed to the end of higher profit, it would be moving toward a non-alienating working society. He, with Marx, believes that the effect of a non-alienating work force would permeate man's social relations with others and thus open the door for people to have honest and sincere encounters with each other. The value shift would be one from self-advancement motivated by profit or advancement of a similar nature, to one that

openly recognized that advancement of the self is dependent on the advancement of others. Further, by all advancing in social ability and humanness there is greater growth for each individual than would be possible by any single individual alone. The significant feature of reviewing alienation by Marx and Marcuse is the realization of the potential that becomes operative in the social world. The advancement of man after being freed from unnecessary and wasteful domination is unlimited. Marcuse states:

"The technological process of mechanization and standardization might release individual energy into a yet uncharted realm of freedom beyond necessity. The very structure of human existence would be altered; the individual would be liberated from the work world's imposing upon him alien needs and alien possibilities. The individual would be free to exert autonomy over a life that would be his own. If the productive apparatus could be organized and directed toward the satisfaction of vital needs, its control might well be centralized; such control would not prevent individual autonomy, but renders it possible."¹⁶

Today our society has the potential to develop increasingly non-alienating working environments with the greatest change being from one of producing for profit at whatever the human costs to producing to meet human and social needs. Given our new problems related to environment, energy, etc. the possibilities for productive employment that satisfy social needs appear endless.

It is difficult to detail what is meant by the term non-alienating in any absolute sense but I. Mészáros has described it quite well. He sees as the basic elements that man be recognized as a natural being, and as such has natural needs and powers to satisfy them: Man

"lives in a society and produces the conditions necessary for his existence in an inherently social way; as a productive social being he acquires new needs ('needs created through social partnership') and new powers for their gratification;"¹⁷

Man in essence creates himself with the world and society in his productive activity. Productive activity must not be viewed as only that activity associated with producing durable goods but it is to include all that man creates or produces; e.g., art, ideas, conceptions, social organization, etc. Man is not limited but rather limits himself by creating systems of domination that prevent his and society's growth. The type of production mentioned above, as described by Marx as the ideal, is the kind that frees man to be the social being he is.

The key understandings that are necessary to grasp Marx's concept of an alienating and non-alienating society include the following: (a) Man is a social being, (b) Man needs to be involved in productive activity, (c) Man can produce under the conditions of domination-repression or he can produce socially useful items as a being involved in the process internally and externally. The latter would simply represent the non-alienated state, (d) The powers that govern the society must select the values that its people will follow and they seem to be one of two: (1) profitability--with high alienation in labor and social arrangements, or (2) social needs--with a corresponding low alienation in working and social settings. This represents a gross over-simplification but it does bring out the key issues that career education leaders must begin to discuss and resolve.

Alienation in the American society has become a very important concern to social scientists and captains of industry. However, it is an issue that has not received much if any attention in the field of education in general, but more surprisingly, it has been given little attention by career educators. Under this movement, which in most cases purports to be an educational program beginning in the elementary schools and continuing throughout one's life, it is hard to imagine the designers not addressing this issue. It appears to be very clear given the position of Marx that alienation must be one of the central features of any educational design attempting to educate people to "right or worthwhile" employment. Our society has seen the results of student alienation within the already operative vocational educational programs in that students involved in such programs are rendered "second-class" students by their peers and guidance counselors as well. These students learn how it feels to be socially alienated because they are learning a skill or trade taught only to those considered to be inferior to the majority classified as "the others." It seems logical to posit that what has been the result of vocational education has not been necessarily an attainment of a skill, but rather the development of social alienation as well as that dissatisfaction associated with labor. The attitude so often expressed for these students is represented by the statement "What else can we do with them, they are too dumb to take any courses of merit--all we can do is push them in there and hope they don't tear the place up and, if all goes

well, they will get a job in a local factory." This attitude is not an isolated one, though one might find it expressed in a more positive way; in reality, it represents a public relations move by the guidance department.

The point to be explored is first, should the schools, within the bounds of what is called career education, deal with the concept of alienation? Secondly, if schools should deal with alienation, "how ought they approach that concept?" If career education is to be more than vocational education, and it appears that it is, and if it is to be defined along the lines of Hoyt and Goldhammer, then it follows that schools must deal with alienation. There are two basic types of alienation that students can experience: (1) that titled student alienation by Hoyt, and (2) alienation of the work world which could be grasped vicariously or first hand by students. The important point to remember is that this concept must be dealt with at the earliest years of education. If schools are going to instruct as to the value of productive activity related to social needs, that will have to begin with the elementary student and be taught throughout the program. This represents no major shift in educational values of our present system but it does represent a new emphasis that usually goes unexplored.

It appears that career education must deal with alienation, and it would seem to be a logical move to deal with it in the way that it has been done by Karl Marx. Teachers, administrators,

boards of education and the public in general all need to become aware of the way alienation is affecting their lives. It also seems apparent that more research is needed in the field of social science to point out the way in which social relationships are affected by a working environment judged alienated. One need only look at recent divorce statistics to get a feeling for how social relationships are working in our society, but clearly more hard data is needed. However, schools do have enough data and theory related to alienation in the working world to address that issue head on.

Students, in learning about "self," "others," working careers, and socially related careers, as identified by Goldhammer, must be given the background to realize the overall importance and satisfaction a particular "work career" will give them. Money and status have become the two most important symbols of success in our society but it appears that those values are rapidly being questioned at all levels of society. It would follow that students must understand what worthwhileness and satisfaction will come to them and be perceived by others with each working career they select. Further, they ought to be exposed to the social relations that are likely to result with their occupational choice. It seems obvious that schools are going to have to restructure or add social science courses related to sociology, psychology, social-psychology, etc. that deal with careers--both working and those of social interaction. To follow the concept of "growth" so

well developed by John Dewey schools would require that they deal with alienation as a central concern to allow for its transcendence to a higher level of social and individual growth. Given the fact that futurists are predicting up to eight out of ten jobs will be of service to individuals rather than the production of goods, it seems the time for addressing and resolving alienation in work and social interaction has arrived. Further, given the general outline of what career education is to be, according to Goldhammer, Hoyt and others, it follows that the subject of alienation ought to be a vital part of that curriculum.

Footnotes--Chapter V

¹Herbert Marcuse, One Dimensional Man (Boston: Beacon Press, 1968), p. 222.

²Ibid., p. 55.

³Kenneth B. Hoyt, Career Education: Contributions to an Evolving Concept (Salt Lake City, Utah: Olympus Publishing Company, 1975), p. 156.

⁴Karl Marx and Dirk J. Struck, ed., The Economic and Philosophic Manuscripts of 1844 (New York: International Publishers, 1971), p. 47. It should be noted here that Marx's view of alienation in this study refers to capitalist alienation as opposed to a general theory of alienation.

⁵I. Mészáros, Marx's Theory of Alienation (London: The Merlin Press, 1970), p. 14.

⁶Ibid., p. 14.

⁷Ibid., p. 14.

⁸Ibid., p. 14.

⁹L. D. Easton and Guddat, ed. and trans., Writings of the Young Marx on Philosophy and Society (New York: Anchor Books, 1967), p. 281.

¹⁰Karl Marx and C. J. Arthur, ed., The German Ideology (New York: International Publishers, 1970), p. 42.

¹¹Karl Marx and Dirk J. Struck, ed., The Economic and Philosophic Manuscripts of 1844 (New York: International Publishers, 1971), p. 114.

¹²Ibid., p. 140.

¹³Herbert Marcuse, Eros and Civilization (New York: Vintage Books, 1962), pp. 169-170.

¹⁴Ibid., p. 91.

¹⁵Ibid., p. 41.

¹⁶Herbert Marcuse, One Dimensional Man (Boston: Beacon Press, 1968), p. 2.

¹⁷I. Mészáros, Marx's Theory of Alienation (London: The Merlin Press, 1970), p. 173.

CHAPTER VI

THE SOCIAL AND PRACTICAL UNITY OF DEWEY, GOODMAN, AND MARX RELATED TO CAREER EDUCATION

The preceding chapters appear to dispel the prevailing notion that no unity in social thought could exist between men such as Dewey, Goodman and Marx. The converse seems to be the case, especially when the political statements and overtones that often color social ideology are removed. It is quite apparent that the three social thinkers shared many beliefs relating to mankind, society and individuals within social organizations. It is the intent here to explore more closely the commonality of their social views with the intent of applying their shared thoughts to career education. Their views will be related to career education along three general lines of thought: (a) that there exists a developmental and progressive social view in their positions; i.e., praxis, which when applied to career education would provide a logical and developmental social base; (b) that teachers giving instruction in career education should know why it is important to our given society, thus enabling them to work from a position of "knowledge" rather than a simple performance base, and; (c) to develop, in harmony with (a), the idea that career education does need a social base to be justified as an

educational concept and that given such a position, the movement would be more complete. Further, the views of these men will reinforce the idea that career education must deal with perhaps our society's most serious problem; i.e., alienation, rather than addressing what is now held to be the major motivating force-- "a salable skill." It is to be noted that the unity of thought of Dewey, Goodman, and Marx related to society and career education in this study assumes the generic definition of Goldhammer and Hoyt. The philosophical views of the three men will also be reviewed briefly but again the societal organization this study espouses is that described by John Dewey in Democracy and Education.

Philosophically, the two thinkers who on the surface appear diametrically opposed, are Dewey and Marx. However, if one examines their respective views of a good or just social order it becomes clear that their differences are sharply reduced. Marx never had occasion to write on Dewey's thoughts; however, Dewey had addressed Marx in broad form in his book Freedom and Culture. In this text, Dewey spoke strongly against extremes and absolute positions which in his view were held by the Marxists. After careful review of his chapter "Totalitarian Economics and Democracy" one can see that his strongest attack was against the followers of Marx more than Marx himself. Dewey positively commented on Marx's work on property relations, forces of production related to the actual state of production, and the fact that the disparity between the two are due to political and legal causes.

Few books or articles have been written comparing John Dewey and Karl Marx, for reasons obvious at the surface; however, Sidney Hook and Jim Cork have related the two men on many common grounds. Hook stated the following:

" . . . their fundamental logical and metaphysical positions are the same . . . it seems to me that, were realistic Marxists prepared to submit their methods of achieving democratic socialism to serious scientific criticism, and were Dewey prepared to work out a more detailed program of political action with reference to the social and economic relations of the current scene, their positions would converge on a set of common hypotheses leading to common activities."¹

This quote points out clearly that the two men differed not so much in what the end was to be, but on the means. Marx was very active politically and was a strong critic of economic relations existent under capitalism. Dewey was also very active in criticizing the economic and social structure of the United States, but rather than looking toward revolution as the means to change, he elected an evolutionary approach to correct the social ills via education. Both men spoke to the importance of the other's major motivating force; i.e., economics, politics and education, respectively, and acknowledged the critical role those factors played, but again the means selected by both differed more than the end.²

Jim Cork, in reviewing both major thinkers, points out very well the problem Dewey and other pragmatists have had with Marx. He also succinctly reviews the major errors of the socialist beliefs related to a balanced pragmatic-social position. He expresses it this way:

". . . in spite of Dewey's criticisms of Marx and the opacity of the socialists (Marxist or otherwise) to Dewey, the movement for ideological rapprochement between democratic socialism and the philosophy of John Dewey is decidedly worth furthering. If the pragmatists would stop confusing Marx with some Marxists, recognize the hard, ineradicable, humanistic-democratic core of Marx's thinking as akin to their own, and implement their praiseworthy, general value judgements with concrete instrumentalities applied to political and social questions; and if the socialists, on their part, would drop overboard the ludicrous excess baggage of the dialectic, rid themselves of the remaining shreds of inevitabilism, abandon their narrow class conception of democratic values, and learn to think experimentally in politics, there would seem to remain no major obstacles in the way of realizing . . . their positions converging on a set of common hypotheses leading to common activities."³

Cork does see a unity in the goals of Dewey and Marx and has actually gone to the point of suggesting the strong possibility of their uniting in social and political action. He does point out that the idea is not so unbalanced given that Marx did not conceive of the possibility of socialism and democracy operating within the same system. Further, he finds, as does Hook, great commonality in the social views of the two men.⁴ Philosophically the writings of Paul Goodman are also found to be in the general pattern of Dewey and Marx. Goodman has drawn freely from both writers in the development of his position. He has addressed his concern to the current society and the problems he sees as a direct result of the educational and social patterns of our society.

The one concept that best details the unity of the educational and social progression of Dewey, Goodman and Marx is that of "praxis." Praxis, most simply explained, is the unity of theory and practice, a concept absolutely central to the thinking of all

three. All three thinkers held praxis to be a transforming and active process, but from somewhat differing vantage points. The relationship to career education should become clear after a brief digression into the central thrusts of each man. The point of this study is to demonstrate that although career education is addressing schooling, it is doing so in a very narrow and unfulfilling manner and by incorporating the ideas and suggested practices of Dewey, Goodman and Marx, the movement will be operating from a more sound social and educational base.

John Dewey, more than Marx or Goodman, addresses his theoretical and practical work to education in an identifiable society. Career educators have only stated that their ideas should be carried out in schools and have not defined what schools should be nor what society should become. Dewey best addresses these weaknesses with his type of "praxis." He held experimentalism central to uniting his theory and practice, thus allowing for constant and continuous adjustment of the two components to represent the reality that was being dealt with. His work related to society began from an examination of the type of education that is possible in given social structures. The result of his study lead him to conclude that only an open and growing society could allow for the type of education he believed could be labelled "education"; i.e., a democratic society. From this conclusion, which was reviewed in greater detail in a preceding chapter, Dewey then turned most of his attention to the educational process itself.

That is, given the social state, a developing and growing democracy, he was able to develop educational theories and practices that insured the continuation and progression of that type of society. Dewey's thrust was not primarily on the development of society, but rather on the development of a proper educational setting that would allow or would insure the evolution of proper society. He never could, nor did he try to separate the two, but his emphasis was clearly on education. He believed that education was a social change agent and to change society one had to change the education of the young to come into line with the desired end. Schools must mirror society; i.e., be a realistic representation of social life as it is, and to experiment with alternatives to improve the present state.

Dewey held that schools must exist as laboratories in that they would be constantly experimenting. Such experimentation would of course involve the scientific method which in and of itself demonstrates Dewey's "praxis." The philosophy of pragmatism is all but identical to "praxis" with only the means selected to reach the ends differing. And, as Dewey is viewed as one of pragmatism's leaders, his belief in praxis is given. He viewed present society as the base from which to start development; i.e., one begins with what exists, subjects it to objective criticism, projects what society should become, and then develops the means for attaining that goal. Dewey sought to correct social problems via a democratic system of education.

Paul Goodman, utilizing his conception of "praxis," takes career education one step further in its social and philosophical development. Goodman, as Dewey, also perceived the interrelationship of society and education. He has spent the greater portion of his studies reviewing the recent past and on-going aspects of education, and he also serves as a contemporary critic of both society and its educational institutions. Dewey's major contribution to a fully developed career education concept is that of a sound educational philosophy within a given social system. Goodman's role in contributing to a career education base is that of criticizing present society and educational practices and offering a rationale for a "progressive" educational plan as Dewey did before him. Further, he in current times squarely attacks alienation and debasement of human nature relative to societal and educational institutions.

Goodman's concept of praxis has a natural element in that he is questioning the difference between what should be and what is, and then offering a realistic theory which is attainable in our present state. His approach has been best exemplified by the recent work of Paulo Freire in South America. Goodman also serves in this study to bridge the "praxis" of both Dewey and Marx in that they respectively concern themselves primarily with education and social structure; whereas Goodman, in dealing with the present state, is analyzing the past theories and their respective results, both educational and social. Further, Goodman acts to update the

the theories of Dewey and Marx in that he has taken the major thrusts of both and integrated those ideas into his own theory.

Related to career education, the "praxis" of Goodman is of significant importance. He more than other educators addresses "man's vocation" and very cogently reviews why it has not come to pass in practice and how, given certain human conditions, it can become a reality. Goodman's social and educational criticisms go directly to the center of our present society and his analysis is correct; our society is not fashioned to accommodate the needs of its citizens, the contrary is the case. Man is, according to Goodman, a maker and he (man) therefore requires an environment and background to allow him to fulfill this need. Man must be able to transform his present state, as it was described by Goodman in a preceding chapter, into a state that allows him to become involved in useful and meaningful work that carries with it a sense of dignity. If one utilizes the theory of social evolution as posited by Goodman and Freire, the reality practice that would result would exemplify in modern times the works of Dewey and Marx. Goodman best and most clearly expresses in contemporary society the idea and need for "praxis" in social and educational settings.

Karl Marx approached "praxis" from yet another perspective-- that of social structure. He held that education was of vital importance and so was the present state of society, but that what was crucial to the advancement of both was the social structure. It is by altering the structure that one alters the society. It

is apparent that invoking a program as all-encompassing as career education in a social system will greatly alter its structure. It therefore becomes important for career educators to address themselves to this topic as well as those of Dewey and Goodman. It should be noted that Dewey, Goodman and Marx differ on their central thrust related to society and education, but they are all in agreement as to the type of society that should result.

Marx held that for man to advance to achieving higher stages of social humanity, it would be necessary for the basic structure of society to change. He found the values and process of economic production to be anti-human and the only way in which to progress beyond such a state was by a reconstruction of society. Society had to begin to meet the needs of all humans, not just the selfish desires of those in positions of political or monetary power. He also held that even those in such perceived positions of wealth were not achieving human worth; they were simply alienated in a more comfortable environment. The point remained that the society was not meeting human needs and all were suffering. Marx centered his criticism on the economic relations of production and detailed the non-human results of such a social system. Practically, the system he was criticizing could not be altered to resolve its problems given its values. Marx agreed that until such a time came to enable all to have their basic needs satisfied, such an economic society was needed; however, that time had passed

and society could restructure its goals and attain a higher level of human life.

Marx believed that society must change by uniting the present social system with his theories of production and alienation in practical activity, praxis, to transform the society into a human-centered way of life. Man, according to Marx, cannot lead a human life in an alienated state, nor can society or mankind advance in such an environment. Marx addressed the entire social structure and held that due to the means of production utilized in an alienating society the social relations of men are greatly affected. They are limited to mechanical and distant interactions which prevent social growth and understanding and leave both the society and its individual members unfulfilled. Therefore it becomes necessary to alter the productive capacities of society based on economic values to a productive base utilizing the advancement of humanity and social relations as its overall value. In such a state "labor" would increasingly become "work." The parallel for career education is quite evident. Marx is demanding a life for all that has worth, dignity, and human understanding. It requires a productive structure that encourages social interaction and freedom of the exchange of ideas rather than what presently exists.

Praxis acts to unify the thoughts of Dewey, Goodman and Marx in that all three held that one must begin with the present state, extract its good, and then transform the society into what

is needed to provide a fulfilled, non-alienating social environment. The unity of theory and practice into transforming action is held by each. Dewey addressed the educational setting primarily to achieve his praxis;⁵ Goodman utilizes the roles of social-psychologist, sociologist and educator to express his interpretation of praxis in contemporary society; and Marx viewed the restructuring of society's productive forces and related social interactions as his vehicle of "praxis." Career education, which as a concept had only looked at its attainment in schools, now can utilize the logical and progressive views of Dewey, Goodman and Marx related to praxis. Career education now must examine the educational settings, present stage of society and educational development and their respective results along with the structure of society. By uniting the theories and directions of these three men related to praxis, career educators will be able to present a unified and thorough educational and social plan for restructuring society.

In comparing Dewey, Goodman and Marx further, it is of interest to examine Dewey's idea of experience in relation to Marx's position on alienating activity and Goodman's view of "Man's work" or worthwhile experience. Dewey's concept of experience is, of course, part of his more encompassing idea of growth; however, it may help to tie together some views of the other men. Experience for Dewey requires that it be growing; i.e., the person involved understands the cause and effect and has been involved in

its process internally and externally. This general outline can be contrasted to what Dewey calls a "mis-educative experience;" i.e., an activity in which the person did not become involved internally and externally; it was simply an event to him/her. A happening or "mis-educative event" corresponds very highly to Marx and Goodman's description of an alienating activity.

Marx and Goodman hold that if man is not actively and freely involved in his production (note that production is not to be viewed in the narrow economic sense, but to be all encompassing of man's activity), he/she is alienated and denied the right to a full life. Such activity would be mechanical in that the mind and the body are operating in separate domains. In such activity man is unable to excel or be creative; he is rendered to the position of a machine and his labor is a commodity. Dewey stated that one of the major goals of scientific management is to discover the relation of men to their work, other men and active intelligence. He added:

"Efficiency in production often demands division of labor, but it is reduced to a mechanical routine unless workers see the technical, intellectual, and social relationships involved in what they do, and engage in their work because of the motivation furnished by such perceptions."⁶

Dewey continues in this vein, stating:

"We lose rather than gain in the change from serfdom to free citizenship if the most prized result of the change is simply an increase in the mechanical efficiency of the human tools of production."⁷

These remarks would be representative of an activity that Dewey would label a "happening" or "mis-educative experience" and Marx

and Goodman's concept of an alienating action. The principles operative in a social action appear almost identical for all three men. The "good society" for all three thinkers involves a life of active participation by all of its members in a positive, non-alienating and growing direction. All would be willing to submit their respective ideas to the test of actual experience, thus removing the former problematic question of truth. Further, all view man's progress as dependent upon free interchange of ideas, actions and interaction among a society's citizens.

The beliefs of these three social thinkers have direct application to the education of a society and even more so to the educational plan addressing careers. The combination of ideas expressed in the definitions of Goldhammer and Hoyt find strong support in the concepts discussed by Dewey, Goodman and Marx. Goldhammer and Hoyt both place work at the center of career education and admit the importance of other social relationships as well; e.g., citizenship, family life, community involvement, etc. In examining all three of the social theorists, it is apparent that productive activity is at the heart of their beliefs. They add the idea of productive activity permeating all aspects of life, but all admit the importance of work as central. Their expanded view of productive activity would encompass Goldhammer's "careers" and Hoyt's "meaningful activity," and all positions require that the action or thoughts be socially useful. Therefore, rather than Goldhammer and Hoyt being in the position of projecting a new or

revolutionary social movement, they are found to be supported by excellent and critical social thought. Also found in the works of Dewey, Goodman and Marx are criteria necessary to appraise the worth of a career educational program; i.e., that it shows evidence of non-alienating, socially useful and a personally satisfying activity. Hoyt's brief discussion related to student alienation would be strongly supported and enhanced by the theory, and enactment of the same; i.e., educational pragmatism. If a student is internally and externally involved in an educative experience (with all of the conditions expressed by Dewey), it would not be logically possible for the student to experience alienation within that activity.

Educators, to be effective in the instruction of career education concepts, must have in mind the type of society they wish their students to enter and help create. If they are not aware of such an end, one must question if what they do is in fact education because without a meaningful end in view they could only be showing students unrelated skills and processes. If their instruction does not demonstrate the social worth and application of the material being "taught," the instructional activity itself must be alienating to the student and teacher. If on the other hand, the educator has a clear perception of the society for which he/she is educating the young and includes that in the instruction, the students then have the opportunity to conceive of the social worth of the material rather than to simply

be presented with unrelated and meaningless (socially) instructional material. It clearly is not enough for the educator to have an idea of the society toward which he/she is directing the young. Added to this must be the conditions that the society is just, open, non-alienating, allows for the free exchange of ideas, allows for free and continuous interaction of its people, and in essence is one where all can achieve to the fullest extent of their capabilities. The criteria for judging actions that would encourage or discourage such a society could be summarized in Dewey's explanations of growth and experience with Goodman's and Marx's view of non-alienation and socially worthwhile activities. Thus an instructor could examine the material to be presented and weigh it against these views and project its possibility of enhancing such a society. Given this social perspective, the educator would be in a position of knowledge (pragmatic) and be able to justify his/her actions in a socially meaningful way. The instructor would not need to operate from the Platonic position of "right belief;" i.e., one does not understand why it is right but simply accepts that it is right, but could rather more closely operate from a position of "knowledge;" i.e., could explain why "X" is good according to valid social criteria.

It would appear ridiculous to ask educators to instruct career education concepts without first arriving at agreement on the type of society that should exist. However, this has been and continues to be done. Presently our society is suffering from

many social ills, but to address only the ideas of a "salable skill" and unemployment is ludicrous, especially for a movement that readily admits to affecting almost all aspects of adult lives. It therefore appears absolutely necessary for career educators to be required to posit the type of society for which they are preparing the young. Anything less along social lines would be immoral and non-educative. It is not possible for career education to be successful by continuing aimless and capricious instructional activity toward a narrow and questionable end. If the goal is "participating, productive, fulfilled citizens," as it claims, then educators are in need of describing and defending a social base that is in agreement with the values of the society and goals of career education. If this is so, and it logically follows that it is, then the ideas in the definition of Goldhammer and Hoyt find strong support socially from the works of Dewey, Goodman and Marx. The work of these three social thinkers could become fully operative and because of the concept of experimentalism, could continually adapt to meet new conditions of society. The social base they have developed allows an educator to develop career lessons in a meaningful and justifiable manner with an end in view. Such would be a fine addition to a now fumbling system of career education.

Given a social base; i.e., a clear idea of the society toward which one is directing students, the function of developing curricula to meet the goals and demands of the social base is

greatly enhanced. Departments of education, administrators, members of the public and teachers would be given criteria to assess the worthiness of proceeding with a particular course of action related to career education. Given such criteria, it follows that curricula can become experimental and subject to continuous scrutiny, thereby developing the base from which to improve and develop career education with knowledge as opposed to whim, caprice or accident. The application of the precepts for a just society outlined above from the thoughts of Dewey, Goodman and Marx would also serve at the school level to serve as criteria for judging "A" curriculum over "B" curriculum, given the conditions that exist. Simply, educators would be able to intelligently develop curricula to meet the goals of career education. It would also appear reasonable for school environments to be established utilizing the same guidelines that they are projecting for society. Dewey has stated often the idea that schools ought to mirror society with the added concept that they should also develop ways to improve its failings. Schools would be required to practice the ideas and values they espouse for future citizens as they educate students for the future according to the students' ability to handle given conditions.

The ideas stated in the generic definition of Goldhammer and Hoyt are fine and ideal in themselves, but are not operative as such. What is required is the social base toward which career education is aiming; simply a logical and consistent form of

socially developed criteria. Dewey, Goodman and Marx do provide "a" criterion that meets those needs and at the same time finds itself compatible with our present society and its expressed goals. If the ideas of career education are to become fact in our society, educators will need to know and apply the criteria contained in the combined thoughts of the three social theorists or a like system. Hook and Cork have certainly demonstrated the compatibility of the thoughts of Dewey and Marx, and Goodman has in his own writing shown his general agreement with the other two related to society. Further, all three have developed a commonality in the idea of "praxis." Thus it follows that socially the three men are united and by applying their social beliefs to an educational setting one would find agreement in educational practices. Such a setting would require students to be "growing," "experiencing worthwhile activities" in a "non-alienating" positive social and educational environment. All agree that it is vital that such concepts as "productive activity" begin in the earliest educational years. The application of their ideas to career education at the theoretical and practical levels would serve to complete an educational idea that is lacking a social base.

Footnotes--Chapter VI

¹Sidney Hook, ed., John Dewey: Philosopher of Science and Freedom (New York: The Dial Press, 1950), p. 334.

²John Dewey, Freedom and Culture (New York: Capricorn Books, 1963), (for a further discussion of Dewey's criticism of the Marxist position, refer to pages 76, 84 and 86).

³Sidney Hook, ed., John Dewey: Philosopher of Science and Freedom (New York: The Dial Press, 1950), p. 350.

⁴For a further review of the philosophic views of Dewey and Marx as compatible positions, see Jim Cork's chapter "John Dewey and Karl Marx" in Sidney Hook's book: John Dewey: Philosopher of Science and Freedom. It should also be noted that remarks made in the context of this study addressing Marx's view of democracy refer to bourgeois democracy as opposed to democracy in general, i.e., it is bourgeois democracy and socialism that Marx saw as incompatible.

⁵It should be clearly understood that Dewey believed social change would occur concomitantly with educational change.

⁶John Dewey, Democracy and Education (New York: The Free Press, 1916), p. 85.

⁷*Ibid.*, p. 256.

CHAPTER VII

CONCLUSION

Career education remains an unclear concept that is open to virtually all interpretations that can be related to present or future employment. Educationally it is without a coherent philosophy and socially it does not identify with a particular social system. It has been defined to mean anything from vocational training for a salable skill to education involving all aspects of one's life. Yet even with this confusion, it continues to be one of the most accepted and perhaps practiced educational innovations in our country. It is clear that as a concept it is addressing a crucial need in our society, especially given its acceptance under such muddled conditions. Further, it is also apparent that educational practitioners are not given the proper tools to develop and critically analyze the present movement. It is understood that career education is to center on the world of work but what that environment is to include and in turn what other environments it affects is not properly addressed. To resolve this and related dilemmas what is needed is: (a) a viable generic definition of what is to be included as career education and what would remain general education; (b) a clear and easily understood description of the type of society that should exist

for the best possible enactment of career education; (c) a coherent philosophy of education to enable proper critiquing of career education both theoretically and in practice; and (d) a general description of teaching methods and educational environments that would be conducive to a successful implementation of a career education program. Presently none of these things exist in any unified way; each school system or state is left to develop what they want, and these varied results are labeled as career education.

The first hypothesis of this study dealt with the issue of a proper definition for career education, and it has been demonstrated in the Appendix that no single unifying statement is in existence. It is also recognized that an absolute single definition would not be in the best interests of the movement as posited by many major authors of career education. However, it is not true that "a" definition containing major components and remaining open to future adjustments, given new evidence, is not in the best interests of the continuing development of career education. The contrary is held to be true. A given generic definition or position open to modification based on experience is considered by this study to be in the best interests of the movement. Again it is not to be viewed as "the" definition, nor is it to be viewed in any way as absolute and unchanging, rather, as a starting point from which to describe the general outline of the types of learning experiences that should properly be contained in the career education concept. In order to begin resolving this problem; i.e., a clear concept of

what career education should be, the following description will attempt to highlight major components that should be included, given the issues raised by this study.

In the beginning of this study the statement was made that if career education is a new and innovative approach to education, then it must by necessity be different than what is presently being practiced. Examples were cited demonstrating that some definitions of career education require no more than the training for a skill or vocation; i.e., those developed by the states of Texas and Washington. Such positions result, if carried to their logical end, in no more than restatements of vocational education curricula as practiced in the first half of the 19th century. The point is that such definitions do not create a new or innovative educational concept and to be labeled with a term that implies such is in error. Therefore, it follows that, at minimum, career education is to be more than vocational education, which would require such education to involve more than developing a marketable or salable skill. The question then becomes, how much more?

Given our complex and interdependent social system, it becomes apparent very quickly that to educate people to "careers" in the sense of marketable skill alone is naive and actually immoral in that such an education is only for the present and only for a small aspect of a person's life. The fact that a person's way of life and life chances evolve around one's career

choice ought to logically dictate the need for career education to involve those aspects of life in addition to the focus on work. The definition that comes closest to dealing with this reality is that developed by Keith Goldhammer and the description by Kenneth Hoyt addresses the aspect of work itself as well as has been done. However, even in combining the thoughts of both men, one is left with significant questions which need to be answered. Both authors' major statements related to career education can be reviewed in Chapter I. In reviewing their statements one can see that Hoyt is mainly addressing values and conditions related to work; i.e., the individual is to fit the work oriented society rather than the work oriented society fitting and adapting to incoming individuals. Hoyt does, however, bring out significant points related to personal satisfaction in describing work itself. The problem may be that his particular wording implies strongly the idea of individuals being externally forced to accept pre-determined values. He does not address the development of such values which would take away from his statements on alienation. He does view career education as a total community responsibility and in practice that seems very sound. Thus the key components of a career program that Hoyt offers appear to include: (a) a working environment that provides tasks that are meaningful and satisfying to the worker in that the worker can see that benefits flow to himself and/or others; (b) that the entire community is to be involved in a career education program and, (c) that

individuals have meaningful choices in selecting their work, thus eliminating what Hoyt calls "labor."

Goldhammer's statement is much more exacting and clearly encompasses more aspects of life than Hoyt. However, Hoyt does give more attention to what is meant by the word "work." In comparing Goldhammer's statement to the realities of our society, it is apparent that he has captured most of what is needed in a viable definition of career education. He has recognized the interdependent nature of our society as well as the central role a working career plays. He has also recognized the fact that man plays many different roles; e.g., economic, family, community, etc., that are all involved very directly with one's working role. Goldhammer does have some problems in his definition; e.g., that of separating career education from general or basic education; he fails to address the type of working environments toward which career education should educate; he does not address alienation; and also believes his concept to be operative in most societies. However, he has developed one of the best guideline statements. If we could take Goldhammer's statement and assimilate the features addressed by Hoyt along with the areas missing in both, we would then have a beginning position from which career education could develop, as well as a position clear enough to assist in attaching a proper philosophic and social base. Perhaps to clarify, it would be beneficial to first restate Goldhammer's position, and then to cite the conditions necessary to cover the

problems that are apparent, as well as to add Hoyt's points related to work. Goldhammer describes career education as a:

"Curriculum to be systemic--an integrated and cumulative series of experiences designed to help each student achieve (1) increased power to make relevant decisions about his life, and (2) increased skill in the performance of his roles. Specifically, career education is designed to capacitate individuals for their several life roles: economic, community, home, avocational, religious and aesthetic. It recognizes the centrality of careers in shaping our lives by determining or limiting where we work, where we live, our associates, and other dimensions that are significant in defining our life style. Designed for all students, career education should be viewed as lifelong and pervasive, permeating the entire school program and even extending beyond it."

This statement can well serve as a guide, in that it does recognize the multifaceted nature of our society and the various life roles that one will be called to play; and, as with Marx, he understands that social relations in work will affect all other aspects of one's life. However, in this statement, the idea of what work is to consist of is not adequately dealt with. Therefore, in the generic position of describing career education, the concept of work must be detailed. Hoyt's statement comes very close to accomplishing such a description, if it is understood that in performing work vs. labor, in his concept, that alienation is to be eliminated as much as is possible. Hoyt defines work by stating:

"Work is a conscious effort, other than activities whose primary purpose is either coping or relaxation, aimed at producing benefits for oneself or for oneself and others. In this context, the word 'work' is distinguished from the word 'labor' by the fact that it represents a purpose chosen by the individual. This definition can be used to cover the world of paid employment. It also applies to work of the

full-time homemaker, the volunteer worker, work performed as part of one's leisure time, and the work of students as a learner. Its four key words are: conscious, effort, producing, and benefits."²

This description would generally be agreeable to the conditions of positive productive activity as established by Marx in a preceding chapter, thereby educating students to work in various life roles that are non-alienating, a key problem not adequately addressed by the movement.

In combining the above two positions we move toward a generic position relevant to what career education should be. Another significant problem centers on the difficulty of stating curriculum "X" is career education and curriculum "Y" is general or basic education. Given Goldhammer's position, one could leap to the conclusion that all education is in fact career education, but that would seem a bit extreme. Career does relate to the classic word "vocation" and does take into account what one does in life, yet, there are knowledges that have particular or general application. It is in making this distinction that one can adequately judge what educational act belongs to which curriculum. It is understood that all education could be rationally applied after the fact, but not before; i.e., if one became a lawyer one could go back and relate all educational experiences to that preparation; however, if the same person became an engineer, writer, painter, or entertainer the same could be done. The point is that educative experiences that have wide application; e.g., reading, math skills, introductory music, etc., can hardly be

labeled career education though they will likely find a place in one of a person's "careers." It seems logical to classify educative experiences that have a direct or particular application to a "career" (or role) as a part of a career education curriculum; e.g., math for engineering students, math for computer operations, or techniques on playing a classical guitar for a professional career in music. Thus an educator could defend his teaching of a lesson by demonstrating that it either had application to a general field of experience in a "growing" concept or that it applies to career education in that it has a direct application to a particular "career" or "role" of the student's life. The educator would be able to describe the means and the end in the proper curriculum.

The major problems that remain to be outlined are (a) describing the types of working environments for which schools should educate students, and (b) the type of society necessary for career education under the above stated positions to become a reality. The descriptions of a proper environment have been well outlined by Dewey, Goodman and Marx in the preceding chapter. The key points are that such an environment is one where free interaction and exchange of ideas are possible; where human dignity prevails; where the productive acts are perceived as valuable and worthwhile by those involved in the production and others in society; where the workers are involved in their production both externally and internally; where a person does not feel that he

is alienated in any of the senses described by Marx; and where a person has the opportunity to "grow" in that or related work experiences. Such an environment is ideal, but that is what ought to be worked toward and accomplished as much as is possible. It is also true that if students are educated for that type of environment and understand why it is good individually and collectively for society, the likelihood of it becoming reality is greatly enhanced. The second problem not addressed in the generic statement is the type of social system that is needed for career education to be successful. It is clear, given the above position, that only an open and free society could allow the logical extension of the goals of career education. Therefore, a democratic society is required for full success; the less democratic the less fulfilled the goals of career education would be.

The type of society that is necessary for career education to be most successful requires more than a brief statement. The type of society is best described by re-examining the social positions of Dewey, Marx and Goodman. All hold that a worthwhile society is one in which all members would be able to contribute to the overall good and participate in society's continual development to the fullest extent of their individual capacities. In such a social order, each individual would recognize his own self worth in his various life roles. Alienation would be eliminated to the fullest extent possible. Man would be able

and encouraged to consistently seek ways to better his lot both individually and collectively. Dewey has described best the conditions necessary for such a society when he states:

"The two points selected by which to measure the worth of a form of social life are the extent in which the interests of a group are shared by all its members, and the fullness and freedom with which it interacts with other groups. . . . A society which makes provision for participation in its good of all its members on equal terms and which secures flexible readjustment of its institutions through interaction of the different forms of associated life is in so far democratic. Such a society must have a type of education which gives individuals a personal interest in social relationships and control, and the habits of mind which secure social changes without introducing disorder."³

Dewey here brings out the idea that a good society must be open and encourage all of its members to be actively involved in its institutions. He points out the importance of education in a "growing" society. Dewey has also examined democracy from a social perspective rather than a political one as he stated:

"A democracy is more than a form of government; it is primarily a mode of associated living, of conjoint communicated experience. The extension in space of the number of individuals who participate in an interest so that each has to refer his own action to that of others, and to consider the action of others to give point and direction to his own, is equivalent to the breaking down of those barriers of class, race, and national territory which kept men from perceiving the full import of their activity."⁴

Thus what is demanded by an educational program that calls for contributing, participating and fulfilled citizens is a social system that allows for the accomplishment of those goals for all its members. An individual member must be free to pursue his/her interests in a positive and productive way. This freedom would be tempered, in Dewey's view, to prevent acts or experiences that

do not result in positive growth; i.e., the experiences must be good for the individual and society. The control factor is not viewed as one that prevents experiment, but one that seeks to have experiment follow after careful examination as opposed to whim or caprice. The only form of government in existence that approaches the form of social order that is logically demanded by career education is a democratic state. Our country presently has the form of social system that is conducive to a successful career education program, but it is also in need of change toward eliminating alienation and continuing to expand opportunity for all.

The second hypothesis of this study stated in essence that career education, as it exists today, is without a theoretical base; i.e., it exists as an scattered group of practices and ideas. Tied closely with this is the third hypothesis which posited that, without a generic position as to what career education is to consist of, a coherent educational philosophy, consideration of alienation and a defined social organization, career education would lack necessary and sufficient grounds for enactment. It is true that unemployment, and underemployment caused by many circumstances, including miseducation, is good cause for a re-evaluation of our educational system. However, these reasons alone are not sufficient to justify an educational movement that is as encompassing as career education. Both hypotheses will be re-examined in light of the positions developed by Dewey, Marx and Goodman.

One can readily discover by reviewing the literature that career education does not have an educational philosophy to guide its development. One can review the sample definitions in the Appendix and clearly perceive that as a movement the views are too widespread to even be considered under the same label. The models developed in various parts of the nation offer fine ideas for implementing the idea of shifting education from a general background to that coupled with practical life application; i.e., centering around occupations. This is fine but it is not enough. If career education is to develop further it must be identified; e.g., the generic position posited above in this chapter. Further, it must have a philosophy that can criticize the existing state of the movement and project its development in future society. A philosophy that is coherent would enable practitioners of career education to develop curricula in a systematic manner. A teacher would have a ground to work from rather than what now exists; i.e., a list of practices. Dewey stated the role of philosophy well when he remarked:

"Philosophy was stated to be a form of thinking, which, like all thinking, finds its origin in what is uncertain in the subject matter of experience which aims . . . to frame hypotheses for its clearing up to be tested in action. Philosophic thinking has for its differentia the fact that the uncertainties with which it deals are found in widespread social conditions and aims, consisting in a conflict of organized interests and institutional claims . . . philosophy is at once an explicit formulation of the various interests of life and a propounding of points of view and methods through which a better balance of interests may be effected."⁵

It is this balancing of interests into an organized whole that career education is missing. It has not identified a social or philosophic base and is therefore difficult to analyze at this juncture. If career education could begin with the generic position above, or a like one, and identify a social and philosophic base, it then could be subjected to critical analysis and have the potential to grow in a meaningful and progressive manner. Presently, the means and the ends of career education are in disarray. Further, its justification for existence resting on unemployment, underemployment and miseducation is not in and of itself sufficient rationale. What is needed is a clear idea of the type of society that is desired and then a corresponding philosophy to guide its attainment.

The third hypothesis of this study posited that given the social and philosophic position of John Dewey and the social positions of Karl Marx and Paul Goodman, one would be able to offer valid reasons for career education and a philosophy that could guide its development. The reasons presently offered for career education's justification are simply inadequate. The more serious problem has to do with the one common perceived end of the movement; i.e., a salable skill. This end is problematic because it is not seen as a lifelong skill, much less does it take into consideration all related social relationships. One could exit school with a salable skill and five years later find that skill no longer needed. Given the generic position above,

one does have a clear end in view that is justifiable as has been demonstrated in the chapters on Dewey, Marx and Goodman. It is to be noted that the position of this hypothesis does not exclude others from being as or more meaningful but rather that a society, careers, a philosophy and an educational system must be identified and be able to be developed into a coherent unity in practice. What is offered by this examination of Dewey, Marx and Goodman is "a" single system in which the end is justified and a system to justify the means to that end is in existence. One might develop a unified concept around utilitarianism or existentialism as well. However, for this study the philosophy that seems most compatible with career education is that of pragmatism, particularly pragmatism as posited by John Dewey.

To restate the social positions of all three thinkers would be redundant; however, it might be of assistance to highlight some of their positions. All three viewed the idea of praxis as instrumental to any social relationship; i.e., the idea that theory and practice must correspond to each other or be reworked until that is accomplished. The importance of this point must be emphasized if one intends to critically analyze the movement in a serious fashion. The idea of "praxis" is simply stated by Paulo Freire:

"The praxis which, as the reflection and action truly transform reality, is the course of knowledge and creation. Animal activity, which occurs without praxis, is not creative; man's transforming activity is. It is as transforming and creative beings that men, in their permanent relations with reality, produce not only material goods--tangible objects

but also social institutions, ideas, and concepts. Through their continuing praxis, men simultaneously create history and become historical--social beings."⁶

Freire has captured the heart of the thinking of Dewey, Marx and Goodman related to theory and practice. Thus what is occurring in the real world will be the material of the schools related to careers, with the added aspect of social experiment.

Goodman and Marx both lay solid foundation for the type of social relations that ought to exist in a just society. Both view Man as a maker and agree that his productive activities are to be socially worthwhile and provide dignity to the producer. One can examine the quote by Marx on production as he views it and compare his thoughts with those of Goodman in his statement on the utopian social arrangement. Both offer an end that can be justified, in that all would be doing something perceived to be important to the individual as well as by others. Further, each would develop his capacities and utilize them to better society. The social institutions these men require could not prevent growth of individual abilities that are conducive to the person and his social world. Alienation would become one of the most important issues of social interaction but by re-examining values presently popular; e.g., money and false status, the road to conquer it should not be difficult. Such social arrangements, as posited by these men, provide a meaningful and worthwhile social base that would, by definition, resolve the present problems of unemployment, underemployment, and miseducation for future living.

John Dewey is in strong agreement with Marx and Goodman related to what social life and social institutions ought to do, as was demonstrated in the last chapter. He does offer more by providing an overall pragmatic philosophy which can correspond directly to the generic outline of career education. His social and education views, as demonstrated in the chapter examining his positions, have direct and unifying application to the career concept put forth above. Dewey's educational philosophy does offer to the movement a clear and identifiable criterion for analyzing the overall curricula.

Dewey's philosophy provides the concepts of educative experience, growth and continuity. By application of the criteria he posits, as discussed in an earlier chapter, for each of these concepts, career education could be developed into a complete educational program. Practitioners would be able to assess their lessons in terms of whether or not they provide a growing experience that contains within it the ground for continued experiences of a positive social nature. Also within Dewey's educational pragmatism is the ability to change to meet new and varied needs of the present and the future. His philosophy is based on reasoned experimentation and due to this position his philosophy is a living one that has the ability to change, actually the obligation to, if growth is not present. Practitioners could review their instruction and decide which lessons were educative and which ones were miseducative and then plan future lessons with Dewey's

criteria in mind. The result would be positive educational experiences that were well planned, with the potential to create future interest. The student would have to be involved in the learning experience internally and externally, thus arresting student alienation.

The thoughts of Dewey, Goodman and Marx which surround the concept of "praxis" have a definite place in the restructuring of career education. The movement itself addresses education only in a peripheral sense that is not very specific. Dewey's work is very specific as to the proper conditions necessary for an "educative act" to take place. His theory is of vital importance to any educational concept and is very much in concert with the goals of career education. Marx adds the component of an indepth view of production and alienation. Marx understands that the structure and direction of society must change if the quality of human life is to advance. His work on alienation cannot be ignored by the career education concept. Paul Goodman unites the general thoughts of Dewey and Marx and addresses actual social conditions to bring out the obvious need to restructure our social and educational life. He, as Freire, examines society and concludes with Marx that social structures exist as an important source of alienation. The "praxis" of all three offer a coherent and logical progression of social and educational thought for career educators to incorporate into their unified concept: Dewey's praxis related to schools, Goodman's related to present society and

structure and Marx's related to production and alienation. The uniting of their thoughts supplies the needed social, educational and philosophical base that career education lacks.

The works of Dewey, Marx and Goodman do offer a solid and unified rationale for an educational program such as career education. Together their thoughts provide the necessary conditions for a just society. They describe what type of work is needed to develop a growing society. Their thoughts provide criteria that can be used to analyze society and its educational programs. Such a foundation is necessary for the future development of career education. If it is left in its present form, it will become a fragmented and untenable concept. The rationale for the growth of career education is strongly and logically supported in the work of Dewey, Marx and Goodman. Further, they provide criteria for the successful implementation and future development of career education. They provide necessary and sufficient reasons for career education to exist from a social and philosophic perspective. Thus by applying their beliefs and system to the career education concept, one has developed a complete educational program with a theoretical base, justifiable ends and a criterion from which to develop justified means to the attainment of the end--a capacitated and fulfilled citizenry.

The final aspect of this study involves projecting the changes our schools must undergo in order to achieve the successful implementation of career education as described in this study.

It is clear that the change would range from evolution to revolution depending on the present state of affairs in given school systems. Not only would the ideology need to change, but so would the entire daily operation for all aspects of education from state departments to students. The results, if based on reasoned logic, would greatly enhance the lives of our people and would therefore be worth the effort.

The most fundamental change that is absolutely necessary is to require school personnel at all levels to shift from a traditional to a progressive perspective. Traditional here is understood to be teaching concepts that have "always" been taught because it has been assumed the lessons are good. Certainly some of the traditional ideas are good, but to continue teaching all of them on the assumption that they are presently good is simply not intelligent behavior. It must be remembered that schools are not educating people for a past civilization but rather for the present and future and given that, courses, concepts and lessons that have been taught in the past must be re-examined as to their usefulness in the present and projected society. Those concepts still considered valuable would be retained and the others laid to rest. The idea of "The Saber Tooth Tiger Curriculum" can no longer be practiced. Progressive education does not mean a swing to the opposite end of the spectrum either, but rather, a balanced viewpoint. Progressivism has, by many, been identified to mean "anything goes" or "if it feels good, do it"

curricula. This certainly is not the case nor is it logically possible given Dewey's conception of educational pragmatism, in which all acts are subject to experience and continual evaluation. Progressivism, under Dewey, results in educators deciding on the type of society they are educating toward; i.e., the ends, and then a review of the present teachings to decide which ideas are to be maintained and which are to be replaced. Basic to the concept is to utilize the good of the past in balance with the present, with the end to be based on all valuable knowledge; i.e., a society able to meet the demands of the future. Progressivism simply becomes a utilization of both past and present ideas that demonstrates the greatest potential to be helpful in the future with such assertions to be adjusted on the basis of experience. For educators to shift to this perspective would, in and of itself, be remarkable, for it requires a thoughtful and social scientific approach by all educators.

Further, after progressivism, the next change would be in educators becoming knowledgeable in their practice; i.e., they would be required to shift from the platonic position of "silver" to "gold." Educators need to be required to demonstrate how and why their projected lessons are likely to produce positive growth for their students. In actuality they would be required to "know" why and how their instruction would be beneficial, as opposed to "believing" their lessons to be good. If educators were required to know pragmatically what their instruction would do, the overall

quality of schools would jump dramatically. However, for such a thing to become possible, the educational leaders and educational power elite must also become as or more knowledgeable about progressive educational pragmatism in the vein of John Dewey.

Certainly the above ideas ring of lofty idealism so often heralded, but with a very significant difference given proper background and instruction for educators, it is workable both logically and practically. The unique feature is that it allows for positive social means to an identified end with the added condition that the end itself can change given a "warranted assertion" or significant rationale. Dewey requires that education have a justifiable end in view; in this case, a fulfilled, capacitated and participating citizenry, in which each is doing what he/she is capable and desiring of doing, utilizing their abilities to the fullest. Such a goal is admittedly ideal, but its attainment will not come about by setting less as the end. It also must be mentioned that the end, when attained, becomes the means for a future end; thus, the growth process never ceases.

Educators, to make the above practical, must come to know, understand and practice the concepts of educative experience, continuity and growth as detailed by John Dewey. This would, in most cases, require retraining of present instructors via in-service training or course work, and require teacher training institutions to instruct these concepts to the point where the prospective educator can confidently apply them. Thus the educator would

have the basic criteria to develop a lesson by asking if (a) this lesson will allow the student to understand, by being involved actively and passively, the significance of this idea to his/her present or future life; i.e., will the student be aware of its significance; (b) this lesson, as an end, becomes the means for the accomplishment of future ends or if the lesson has continuity--the possibility, if elected, to provide further development along this or related learnings; (c) the lesson provides for growth, that is, does it become a growing experience that opens the student to many and varied future experiences vs. limiting or closing future options; and (d) the lesson involves a positive social development, and work toward the end of a student becoming a fulfilling, capacitating and participating citizen? Such thoughtful examination and adjustment on the part of educators would add a firm social and philosophic base to career education.

Teaching methodologies and techniques would also be affected by the practicing of progressive education pragmatism. Educators would be required to develop justified means to the attainment of the ends they have developed. This absolutely recognizes that multi-methods exist for the attainment of an end and many may need to be used to attain the end; also that different students and educational settings will often demand a multi-approach. Dewey's pragmatism calls for education to follow the scientific method to assure that the student understands the entire process.

In line with the basic methodological approach is the idea that all educative experiences do not occur within an institution called school, but that these experiences often take place outside of school. Career education is certainly a field that has rich opportunities for "outside experience." Yet, such educational plans need not nor should they be left to chance; the same criteria must be applied for such "outside school experience" as for "inside experiences." If career education is to have success, it must have direction in all of its applications. Goodman's ideas of storefront and employment related experiences are excellent and have been suggested by many authors in the career education field, but as he posits, Dewey's progressive education must be the control of those experiences. Students working will have experiences, but these will not necessarily be positive socially and educationally unless planned and guided. Also of basic importance is Dewey's concept to change plans (means and ends) if evidence shows the completion of the plan would not be productive; this leaves lessons and methods open-ended. Therefore, by utilizing Dewey's concepts, alternative programs and schools are very possible and would be required in many career education programs, and a meaningful and practical criteria is included for application to these alternatives.

Schools and school environments would also have to change in most cases in order to provide settings that encourage the development of fulfilling, capacitating and participating

individuals. Schools would be in the position of having to practice the concepts that they espouse. If they are to educate for a democratic society with its members to be productive, in Marx's positive sense, then the schools themselves will have to provide such an environment. Students will need to practice and apply these concepts as they become capable to do so. School environments would also be required to be non-alienating to the greatest extent possible. This does not suggest open classrooms or a Summerhill concept but it does require the removal of unnecessary obstacles that prevent growth. Rules that are needed for control are excellent, but rules that prevent development for their own sake become another matter. A non-alienating environment, for Marx and Goodman, would be one in which all surplus repression is removed, and the students are internally and externally involved in the learning process and are able to understand the social and individual benefit of the instruction given. Dewey adds that schools should mirror present society as closely as possible and also should correct society's ills in the school setting. Schools must be open, flexible, reflective, and also provide educational growth in line with the educational and social end in view. Thus they must be growing in Dewey's sense and non-alienating in Marx' sense--both ideas require a great change.

Many of the ideas on "how to do" career education are very well developed, however, they lack a context in which to

operate. What is needed is an end-in-view of the type of society for which we are educating; i.e., a democratic society as described by Dewey; and of the type of individual we intend to produce--non-alienated, in Goodman's and Marx's sense, productive, as described by Marx, participating, capacitating and becoming fulfilled as expressed by Goldhammer. This end will require a similar means. The means will need to be democratic, productive, non-alienating and provide practice in the process of developing the ends projected. Such a means will also require that educators operate from a social and philosophic base that provides the guidelines and criteria to accomplish the end.

Career education, in order to become viable and lasting, will need to accept a generic position as provided in the beginning of this chapter. Further, it will need to incorporate into its overall development an identifiable social and philosophic position that provides criteria to analyze the developments made and to project future ones. It is the position of this study that the social views of Dewey, Marx and Goodman provide a solid and united social concept that is compatible and applicable to our present state, and further, that with an understanding of these views by educators would come a shift from a position of "right belief" to one of "knowledge." It is also posited that Dewey's progressive educational pragmatism does provide a workable and practical philosophic base for the goals and aspirations of the career education movement, and if practiced in conjunction with the

social base, the movement would become a full and meaningful educational design. Career education can neither remain stagnant nor continue to be haphazardly approached and because of its very nature and subjectability to change in the future, the ideas John Dewey expresses below best show why his or a like position is needed. Dewey has provided for and recognizes the need for continual change; however, he asks that it meet his conditions for growth. In the following statement Dewey was speaking of life and experiences but its application to career education is quite evident: "The most notable distinction between living and inanimate things is that the former maintain themselves by renewal."⁷ If career education is a living concept to develop living beings, then its mandate is self evident.

Footnotes--Chapter VII

¹Keith Goldhammer and Robert Taylor, Career Education--Perspective and Promise (Columbus, Ohio: Charles E. Merrill Publishing Company, 1972), p. 6.

²Kenneth B. Hoyt, Career Education: Contributions to an Evolving Concept (Salt Lake City, Utah: Olympus Publishing Company, 1975), p. 156.

³John Dewey, Democracy and Education (New York: The Free Press, 1944), p. 99.

⁴*Ibid.*, p. 87.

⁵*Ibid.*, p. 332.

⁶Paulo Freire, Pedagogy of the Oppressed (New York: The Seaburg Press, 1970), p. 91.

⁷John Dewey, Democracy and Education (New York: The Free Press, 1944), p. 1.

BIBLIOGRAPHY

BIBLIOGRAPHY

- "An Approach--Career Education in Michigan," Michigan Career Education, Michigan Department of Education, 1974.
- Bayles, Michael D., ed. Contemporary Utilitarianism. Garden City, New York: Anchor Books, 1968.
- Berger, Peter L., and Luckmann, Thomas. The Social Construction of Reality. New York: Anchor Books, 1967.
- "Career Development Model." Career Development Curriculum Project. Coloma, Michigan Community Schools.
- "Career Education." Chamber of Commerce of the United States, 1975.
- Cornford, Francis M., Trans. The Republic of Plato. New York: Oxford University Press, 1945.
- Coser, Lewis A. Men of Ideas. New York: The Free Press, 1970.
- Dennes, Celia. Career Perspective: Your Choice of Work. New York: Charles A. Jones Publishing Company, 1972.
- Dewey, John. Art as Experience. New York: Capricorn Books, 1934.
- _____. Democracy and Education. New York: The Free Press, 1944.
- _____. Experience and Education. New York: Collier Books, 1963.
- _____. Experience and Nature. New York: Dover Publications, Inc., 1958.
- _____. Freedom and Culture. New York: Capricorn Books, 1939.
- _____. How We Think. Chicago: Henry Regnery Company, 1933.
- _____. Philosophy of Education. Totawa, New Jersey: Littlefield, Adams and Co., 1958.
- _____. The Public and Its Problems. New York: H. Holt and Company, 1927.

Dewey, John. Reconstruction in Philosophy. Boston: Beacon Press, 1948.

_____. Theory of the Moral Life. New York: Holt, Rinehart and Winston, 1960.

Easton, L. D., and Guddat, ed. and trans. Writings of the Young Marx on Philosophy and Society. New York: Anchor Books, 1967.

Etzioni, Amitar. Modern Organizations. Englewood Cliffs, New Jersey: Prentice-Hall, Inc., 1967.

Freire, Paulo. Pedagogy of the Oppressed. New York: The Seaburg Press, 1970.

Galbraith, John Kenneth. American Capitalism. Boston: Houghton Mifflin Company, 1956.

_____. The New Industrial State. New York: New American Library, 1967.

Gerth, H. H., and Mills, C. Wright, ed. and trans. From Max Weber: Essays in Sociology. New York: Oxford University Press, 1946.

Gibbs, Dr. Foster B. "The Nature, Status, and Scope of Career Education Programs in the School Districts of the State of Michigan--An Overview." Michigan Department of Education, Office of Career Education, May 1977.

Gibson, Robert L. Career Development in the Elementary School. Columbus, Ohio: Charles E. Merrill Publishing Company, 1972.

Gysbers, Norman C.; Miller, Wilbur; and Moore, Earl J.; editors. Developing Careers in the Elementary School.

Goldhammer, Keith. "Career Education." Michigan School Board Journal (October, 1973).

_____, and Taylor, Robert. Career Education--Perspective and Promise. Columbus, Ohio: Charles E. Merrill Publishing Company, 1972.

Goodman, Paul. Compulsory Mis-education and The Community of Scholars. New York: Vintage Books, 1960.

_____. Growing Up Absurd. New York: Vintage Books, 1960.

Hansen, Lorraine Sundal. Career Guidance Practices in School and Community. National Vocational Guidance Association, 1970.

Haworth, Lawrence. The Good City. Bloomington, Indiana: Indiana University Press, 1963.

Hook, Sidney. Education for Modern Man: A New Perspective. New York: Alfred A. Knopf, 1966.

_____, ed. John Dewey: Philosopher of Science and Freedom. New York: The Dial Press, 1950.

Hoyt, Kenneth B. Career Education: Contributions to an Evolving Concept. Salt Lake City, Utah: Olympus Publishing Company, 1975.

_____, et al. Career Education: What It Is and How to Do It. Salt Lake City, Utah: Olympus Publishing Company, 1972.

Hruska, Jack. "An Analysis of Paul Goodman's Conception of the Nature of Man as a Perspective on His Educational Proposals: A Study in the Philosophical Foundations of Radical Thought. Unpublished Ph.D. dissertation, Michigan State University, 1969.

Hughes, H. Stuart. Consciousness and Society. New York: Vintage Books, 1958.

Marcuse, Herbert. Eros and Civilization. New York: Vintage Books, 1962.

_____. An Essay on Liberation. Boston: Beacon Press, 1969.

_____. One Dimensional Man. Boston: Beacon Press, 1968.

Marx, Karl. The Economic and Philosophic Manuscripts of 1844. Edited by Kirk J. Struck. New York: International Publishers, 1971.

_____. The German Ideology. Edited by C. J. Arthur. New York: International Publishers, 1970.

_____. Grundrisse. New York: Vintage Books, 1973.

_____. Selected Writings in Sociology and Social Philosophy. Translated by T. B. Bottomore. London: McGraw-Hill Book Company, 1956.

Merton, Robert K. Social Theory and Social Structure. New York: The Free Press, 1968.

- Mézsáros, I. Marx's Theory of Alienation. London: The Merlin Press, 1970.
- Nettleship, R. L. The Theory of Education in Plato's Republic. London: Oxford University Press, 1966.
- Potter, Robert E. The Stream of American Education. New York: American Book Company, 1967.
- Presthus, Robert. The Organizational Society. New York: Vintage Books, 1962.
- Pucinski, Roman C., and Hirsh, Sharlen P. The Courage to Change: New Directions for Education. Englewood Cliffs, New Jersey: Prentice-Hall, Inc., 1971.
- Schutz, Alfred. The Phenomenology of the Social World. Evanston: Northwestern University Press, 1967.
- Thorson, Thomas Landon. Plato: Totalitarian or Democrat? Englewood Cliffs, New Jersey: Prentice-Hall, Inc., 1963.
- Tumin, Melvin M. Social Stratification. Englewood Cliffs, New Jersey: Prentice-Hall, Inc., 1967.
- Wilensky, Harold L. Organizational Intelligence. New York: Basic Books, Inc., 1967.
- Zeitlin, Irving M. Ideology and the Development of Sociological Theory. Englewood Cliffs, New Jersey: Prentice-Hall, Inc., 1968.

APPENDIX

A SAMPLE OF CURRENT CAREER EDUCATION DEFINITIONS

This appendix is to serve the purpose of reviewing major definitions operative in education units throughout the nation. Those followed by a "+" sign are viewed as being toward a "whole life" career education concept; those marked with a "0" sign are viewed as neutral; those with the definitions marked with a "-" sign are viewed as primarily vocational education in the narrow sense of the word, and are therefore not considered for this study. It is felt that the definitions outlined in the discussion in the main text are more complete and compatible with the direction of career education as it "ought to be," if it is to be considered a separate and distinct educational concept.

Arizona

- 0 In Arizona, we have defined career education as combining the academic world with the world of work. It must be available at all levels of education . . . career education is not an add-on . . . it is a blending of the vocational, the general, and the college preparatory education. . . . Synonymous with "all education," "career education" must become the term. When we say "education," we must mean "career education."¹

California

- Through . . . career education, each student will develop positive attitudes about himself and others, make sound decisions regarding alternative and changing careers, acquire skills leading to employment, and pursue a life-style which provides self-fulfillment and contributes to the society in which he lives.²

Maine

- 0 Career education . . . signifies a concerted effort to educate youth as early as kindergarten in exploring careers and acquiring the skills necessary for transition to a job. Career education is a melding of diverse curriculum efforts into a unified whole that requires the academic, vocational, and guidance specialists to plan integrated learning events. In summary, it is a planned, sequential, orderly curriculum effort.³

Michigan

- + . . . the system which delivers the skills and knowledge people need to explore, understand and perform their various life roles--as student, worker, family member and citizen.⁴

Minnesota

- 0 Career education is an integral part of education. It provides purposefully planned and meaningfully taught experiences for all persons, which contribute to self-development as it relates to various career patterns. Career education takes place at . . . (all) levels of education. Emphasis is placed on career awareness, orientation, and exploration of the world of work, decision making relative to additional education, preparation for career proficiency . . . and understanding the interrelationships between a career and one's life-style.⁵

Nevada

- 0 Career education is a comprehensive educational program focused on careers and an educational process where people gain knowledge, attitudes, awareness, and skills necessary for success in the world of work (career success).⁶

New Hampshire

- + Career education is a concept of relevant and accountable education centered on the individual which provides the opportunities for educational experiences, curriculum, instructions, and counseling leading to preparation for economic independence. The development of this concept is a lifelong process which involves a series of experiences, decisions, and interactions that provide the means through

which one's self-understanding can be implemented, both vocationally and avocationally.⁷

New Jersey

- 0 Career education is an integral dimension of the nursery through adult curriculum which provides for all students a sequential continuum of experiences through which each individual may develop a more realistic perception of his capabilities and prepare him for entry and reentry into employment and/or continuing education.⁸

North Dakota

- 0 Career education is an integral part of education. It is a concept that includes as its main thrust the preparation of all students for a successful life of work by increasing their options for occupational choice and attainment of job skills, and by enhancing learning achievement in all subject matter areas . . . a total effort of the home, school, and community to help all individuals become familiar with the values of a work-oriented society, to integrate these values in their lives in a way that work becomes useful, meaningful, and satisfying.⁹

Tennessee

- + Career education is all the learning experiences through which a student progresses in an educational program regardless of the length of the program . . . not an additional or separate phase of the educational program. . . . A comprehensive, dynamic, programmatic and integrative educational program . . . it must utilize the common and unique contributions of all educators and the resources of home, school, and community.¹⁰

Texas

- Career education is coordinated instruction, integrated into the entire curriculum, K-12, and designed to assist students in (a) understanding both the world of work and attitudes toward it, (b) understanding the relationships which exist between education and career opportunity, (c) understanding the economic and social structures of our society and how they influence the ways people support themselves, (d) making informed decisions concerning how they will earn a living and

taking responsibility for making those decisions, and (e) acquiring marketable skills as preparation for earning a living.¹¹

Utah

- + Career education is defined as a comprehensive, correlated educational system . . . focused on individual career needs. . . . (It) begins in grade one or earlier and continues through the adult years (and) is not separate and apart from total life education. . . . (It) calls for a united effort of the school and community to help all individuals become familiar with the values of a work-oriented society, to integrate these values into their lives, and to implement them in such a way that work becomes useful, meaningful, and satisfying.¹²

Washington

- Career education is a term currently used to describe a sequentially developed education program offering career orientation, exploration, and job preparation for all students. Programs begin in the first grade, or earlier, and continue through adult life.¹³

Wyoming

- + Career education is one of the key purposes of education. It is a concept through which we instill a sense of self-identity and self-awareness within each student. It is individualized and geared to the 168-hour living week, not just the 40-hour work week. This concept motivates children to want to learn and makes them capable of economically supporting themselves and their families.¹⁴

American Vocational Association

- Career education is needed by and intended for all people. . . . It is a lifelong process which extends from early childhood through adulthood, (is) based upon the premise that all honest work and purposeful study is respectable, provides the means by which the educational system can focus on career development, (and) provides a unifying core for the total educational enterprise with intensive occupational preparation as a significant aspect. . . . It will be necessary to utilize the

common and unique contributions of all educators and the resources of home, community and school. . . .¹⁵

Rupert Evans

- 0 Career education is the total effort of the community to develop a personally satisfying succession of opportunities for service through work, paid or unpaid, extending throughout life.¹⁶

Wesley Smith

- Career education is a comprehensive, systematic, and cohesive plan of learning organized in such a manner that youth at all grade levels in the public schools will have continuous and abundant opportunity to acquire useful information about the occupational structure of the economy, the alternatives of career choice, the obligations of individual and productive involvement in the total work force, the intelligent determination of personal capabilities and aspirations, the requisites of all occupations, and opportunities to prepare for gainful employment. . . . It is a priority objective of public education, with achievement measured by employability in occupations, both gainful and useful, that are a reasonable match of both talent and the ambition of every citizen.¹⁷

Coloma Community Schools

- + A career is the combination of a person's continually changing occupational, family, civic, and leisure life-roles.¹⁸

A Policy Paper of the U.S. Office of Education

- Career education is the totality of experiences through which one learns about and prepares to engage in work as part of her or his way of living.¹⁹

Chamber of Commerce of the United States

- 0 In summary, career education is the total effort of education and the community to help all individuals become familiar with the values of a work-oriented society, to integrate such values into their personal value systems, and to implement those values in their lives in such a way that work becomes possible, meaningful, and satisfying to each individual.²⁰

Footnotes--Appendix

¹Kenneth B. Hoyt, Career Education: Contributions to an Evolving Concept (Salt Lake City, Utah: Olympus Publishing Company, 1975), p. 53.

²Ibid., p. 53.

³Ibid., p. 54.

⁴"An Approach--Career Education in Michigan," Michigan Career Education, Michigan Department of Education, 1974.

⁵Kenneth B. Hoyt, Career Education: Contributions to an Evolving Concept (Salt Lake City, Utah: Olympus Publishing Company, 1975), p. 54.

⁶Ibid., p. 54.

⁷Ibid., p. 54.

⁸Ibid., p. 55.

⁹Ibid., p. 55.

¹⁰Ibid., p. 55.

¹¹Ibid., p. 55.

¹²Ibid., p. 55.

¹³Ibid., p. 56.

¹⁴Ibid., p. 56.

¹⁵Ibid., p. 56.

¹⁶Ibid., p. 57.

¹⁷Ibid., p. 57.

¹⁸"Career Development Model," Career Development Curriculum Project, Coloma, Michigan Community Schools.

¹⁹Kenneth B. Hoyt, "An Introduction to Career Education--A Policy Paper of the U.S. Office of Education, Publication Number: (OE) 75-00504, p. 4.

²⁰"Career Education," Chamber of Commerce of the United States, 1975, p. 4.

MICHIGAN STATE UNIV. LIBRARIES



31293101979718