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The purpose of this study was to identify and describe the purposes, plans, activities, and programs of the National Education Association that focused upon instruction. To carry out this purpose, guideline questions were developed. Answers to the questions were sought through leads obtained from a study of the volumes of *Addresses and Proceedings* for the years since the first NTA meeting in 1857 through the 1976 NEA Convention and editions of the NEA *Handbook* from the first in 1945 through the 1976 edition. Findings were presented in a six-chapter historical-descriptive narrative.

The 1857 call for the forming of a National Teachers' Association was issued by ten state education leaders with a desire to collate and share ideas for the improvement of public education by increasing the quantity and the quality of teachers and schools. The improvement-of-instruction concern voiced frequently at convention/gatherings became an implementation of Association purposes stated in the Preamble to the NTA/NEA Constitution: "To elevate the character and advance the interests of the profession of teaching and to promote the cause of education in the United States."
From 1870 to 1970, the departmentalization of instruction concerns into subject-centered and service-centered sections of the NEA carried forward the implementation of the Association's stated purposes. Simultaneously with the development of departmental organization for curriculum-instruction emphases, Association unity was maintained through a spotlight on "the whole child" in whose behalf Association activities/functions were accelerated. Voiced at Association meetings and recorded in official publications, needs relative to instruction were stated in the forms of addresses, committee reports, action resolutions, professional negotiations, and, finally, collective bargaining.

The secondary purpose of this study was to explore reasons for and consequences of the controversies that existed both inside and outside the NEA concerning the Association's role in instruction. The predicted merger of the National Education Association and the American Federation of Teachers (AFT) and the proliferation of splinter groups/other education organizations were interpreted by critics of NEA to be outcomes of a lessening of emphasis on instruction by the NEA. The findings of this study, however, support the NEA's claim of a continuous emphasis on instruction throughout its 120-year history. From 1857 to the present, Association Addresses and Proceedings confirm this emphasis. Beginning with the NEA Journal in 1921, a variety of Association publications increasingly reflect both specialized and general
emphases on instruction. Finally, mid-twentieth century projects on instruction that crossed departmental lines gave impetus to the evolvement of the NEA Division of Instruction and Professional Development (IPD), which synthesized the Association's thrust in instruction.

Although interest in instruction is not an exclusive concern held only by professional associations, the findings of this study do suggest that instruction has been a fortunate focus for the NEA in two respects. First, the times of NEA's more obvious emphasis on instruction have been relatively free of criticism of Association activity. Secondly, emphasis on instruction has emerged as a thread to unify the National Education Association with diverse organizations and with classic human institutions--the home, the church, the school, and governmental agencies--throughout the world.

Recommendations for further study include studies of the following: ideologies of formative personalities relative to the NEA's emphases on instruction; various emphases on instruction reflected in the NEA Journal/other Association organs; impact of the collective bargaining process on NEA's emphasis on instruction; and the historical role of AFT/other organizations regarding instruction.
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CHAPTER I

INTRODUCTION

A trend toward formal group organization of individuals sharing common interests developed early in the nineteenth century in the United States. By the 1850's, several attempts had been made to organize a national association of educators. As early as 1830, the American Institute of Instruction was formed in Boston; and 1831 is considered the beginning date for both the Western College of Professional Teachers in Cincinnati and the American Lyceum Association in New York. Two organizations closer to interests in public education were formed in 1849: the Convention of Teachers and Superintendents of Public Schools and the American Association for the Advancement of Education. Finally, in 1857, the National Teachers' Association was organized in Philadelphia (11, pp. 457-475; 516).

Going through many changes of structure, including the gradual attraction and absorption of other organizations, the National Teachers' Association of 1857 became, in 1870, the National Educational Association and finally, in 1907, the National Education Association of the United States (11, pp. 516; 521; 534). Outlasting all other national professional associations of educators, the NTA/NEA approached the completion of the first quarter of its second century in the year of the celebration of the nation's bicentennial with the
claim of an unchanged purpose, which was stated in the original Preamble of the Association's Constitution:

To elevate the character and advance the interests of the profession of teaching and to promote the cause of popular education in the United States (9, p. 1).

A frequent claim of NEA leaders that emphasis on instruction has been a continuous implementation of the Association's stated purpose has been counted a plus by these spokesmen, some of whom have contrasted the professional association with the labor-affiliated American Federation of Teachers. Speaking to convention delegates in 1966, for example, NEA Executive Secretary Carr exhorted:

As future legislation is developed, let us seek procedures that will, in the words of the NEA Charter, "advance the interests of the profession of teaching" and "promote the cause of popular education." These ends are not attainable by merely copying procedures designed to regulate traditional labor-management controversy.

There is a vast difference, I am happy to say, between a school and a factory. We must continue to seek solutions which respect the unique functions of the school and promote productive relationships among school personnel. The quality of these relationships has an important bearing on the quality of instruction (8, p. 22).

Implying the failure of the NEA to move forward in the manner suggested for its distinction as a professional association, education critic Myron Lieberman, predicting a merger of the National Education Association with the American Federation of Teachers in the 1970's, cited as a development in that direction on the part of NEA "a tendency to avoid substantial organizational expenditure for curriculum,
teacher education, and other activities not central to negotiation. . . ." (5, p. 216).

Whether such activities named by Mr. Lieberman were "central to negotiation," however, appeared to be an open question which was confronted in a doctoral dissertation by Russell H. Ziemer at Milwaukee's Marquette University. Titled "An Identification and Analysis of Curriculum Components Negotiated by Selected Affiliates of the National Education Association and the American Federation of Teachers," the study, completed in December, 1972, included ninety-six curriculum-instruction items which the affiliates were to rate according to their priority as negotiable items. A panel of judges--teachers, university professors of teacher education, curriculum personnel, supervisors, and authors of educational articles--rated the ninety-six items as a primary or as a secondary component in curriculum-instruction or as irrelevant. Also, NEA and AFT leadership whose contracts were being analyzed rated each item relative to its importance in negotiations. Ziemer's findings were more favorable to AFT: (1) The fourteen AFT affiliate contracts referred to ninety-six curriculum-instruction items more often than did the fourteen NEA affiliate contracts; (2) AFT affiliate leadership rated a greater number of the ninety-six items as being of primary importance to negotiations than did NEA affiliate leadership (16, p. 110).
NEA's rebuttal to Ziemer's conclusions refuted their significance:

The study by Ziemer provides no conclusive evidence that AFT affiliates place a greater emphasis on the negotiating of curriculum-instruction items than do affiliates of NEA. . . . "Words" in contracts are no measure of emphasis; they alone do not measure substance. . . . The number of items NEA affiliate leadership rated as being of primary-secondary importance was more consistent with "expert" opinion than were ratings of AFT affiliate leadership. . . . NEA affiliates should question the biases evident in his study as well as its design (7, pp. 3-4).

Thus, NEA defenders continued the claim that the NEA was second to none in its role in instruction. Emphasis on instruction and its improvement noted in early Addresses and Proceedings was linked more than a century later to efforts to establish instruction as a continuous priority concern:

From the beginning NEA's charter has called for improvement of the quality of education. From 1857 through the present, Association leaders have been concerned with the improvement of instruction. Throughout its history, the conventions of the National Education Association have been a forum for the discussion of old and new ideas affecting instruction, the beginnings of some of the most vital elements in curriculum revision and school service, the reflection of passing trends . . . (10, pp. 28-29).

To determine precisely the substance and meaning of these claims of National Education Association spokesmen concerning the Association's emphases on instruction was the challenge of this study.

Statements of Purpose and Delimitation

The purpose of this study was to identify and describe the purposes, plans, activities, and programs of the National
Education Association that focused upon instruction. From various purposes and program content alluded to in the annual (1) Addresses and Proceedings and (2) Handbook of the NEA, only references to instruction, defined as teaching-learning activities, were considered. Regarding various committees, departments, councils, commissions, affiliates, and publications functioning as organs of the National Education Association, only those that were highlighted in the published official annual records of the parent organization in connection with the Association emphases on instruction were noted; subsequently, some of those were selected as types representing particular divisions of the total organization.

Definitions of Terms

1. Emphases.--Without quantitative or qualitative analysis in relation to other Association activities, emphases, as used in the title of this study refers to what was done by the National Education Association relative to instruction.

2. Instruction.--Although the definition of instruction was usually taken for granted, an attempt toward definition in a report at the annual NEA Convention in 1884 by the Committee on Elementary Education was an example of efforts to be explicit. Distinguished from education, a broader term, and teaching, a more narrow term, instruction, considered a link between these two, was defined as that "mental activity and knowledge which produce education" (12, Part III, p. 13).
Again, in 1886, this same committee, by that time a continuing committee of the NEA National Council of Education, explained:

Education implies instruction, which is, on the part of the child, a constant building in of power and knowledge in his mind by the exertion of all his powers; and on the part of the instructor it is the intelligent direction and control of the activities of the child with a view to his education.

Instruction implies teaching, which is exciting right activity and knowledge in the mind of the learner (13, p. 268).

Continuing clear-cut definitions one century after the founding of the National Teachers' Association/National Education Association, the 1957 Yearbook of the American Association of School Administrators of the NEA suggested that "experiences and content of instruction (curriculum) are not to be confused with teaching and providing learning experiences (instruction) . . . the upgrading of teaching and the instructional program" (1, p. 26).

Throughout this study, any intentional omission of curriculum-instruction emphases was on the side of the what (curriculum); principal observation was of the how--with the result that instruction was defined for the purposes of this study, as those activities engaged in by teachers that are designed to produce learning.

Summarily, consideration of teaching-learning activities assumed many forms and many labels within the NEA; therefore, to the extent that the definition of instruction is relative, there were differences of opinion about NEA concerns in this
area, which the following typical Association statement in support of instruction as a continuous priority sought to reconcile:

Whereas early conventions demonstrated and discussed pedagogical procedures, today's conventions improve instruction by dealing with the process of strengthening the profession and increasing teachers' influence (10, p. 29).

Questions of the Study

1. The primary question of this study of National Education Association emphases on instruction dealt with a search for evidence that instruction was a continuing priority concern of the Association.

   a. How was instruction included in purposes, plans, programs, and activities of the National Education Association?

   b. What were sources and/or rationales of ideas for Association emphases on particular areas, levels, and kinds of instruction?

   c. What were resources for implementing plans to promote improvement of instruction?

   d. How was it assumed that individual Association members might be involved in the implementation of instructional improvement projects?

2. The secondary question of this study centered upon exploring reasons for and consequences of the controversy that existed both inside and outside the NEA concerning the Association's role in instruction.
a. Did the drifting in and out of the NEA of various segments of the profession result from and/or affect Association focus on instruction?

b. Was competition and/or proposed merger with the American Federation of Teachers accompanied by consistent references to the professional association's focus on instruction?

c. Was the formation of parallel or splinter groups associated frequently with emphasis on instruction and/or suggested similarities or differences in the NEA and AFT?

In summary, the question giving impetus to this study was: Is there a discernible thread of emphasis on instruction by the National Education Association from its beginning in 1857 to the present?

Finally, what forces came to bear—negatively or positively—on the Association's role in instruction, and to what end? That is, does a current study of the historical role of the NEA regarding instruction establish interest in instruction as an essential element to the survival of the professional association?

Background and Significance

Reportedly seeking a more practical approach to educational problems than was exhibited by earlier semi-classical organizations, the presidents of ten state teachers' associations issued a call in 1857 for a convention to organize the
National Teachers' Association inviting all practical teachers . . . to unite in a general effort to promote the educational welfare of our country by concentrating the wisdom and power of numerous minds and by distributing among all the accumulated experience of all (9, p. 517).

That the practical intentions were not at first obvious is suggested by a direct quotation exchange preserved in NEA History (Fenner):

"How long before you advanced from high-hat meetings to the practical improvement of teaching?"

"Gradually. There was, at the start, too much why, not enough what, and hardly any how at all. Even the most practical schoolmen when asked to prepare addresses suffered an attack of pedantry and soared to cloudland" (4, p. 17).

Nevertheless, through annual meetings, the Association began to provide "a stimulus to professional growth of teachers, an impetus to certain educational trends, and, via Proceedings, a record of contemporary education" (4, p. 17).

Continuing the emphasis on "practical teacher" members, the National Teachers' Association was joined in 1870 by the American Normal School Association, organized in 1858, and the National Association of School Superintendents, organized in 1865 (9, p. 524). From 1870 to 1906, a period of increasing specialized educational interests, the Association was known as the National Educational Association. On June 30, 1906, President Theodore Roosevelt signed the bill of incorporation for the "National Education Association of the United States," an action which was implemented by the Association at the 1907 Annual Convention (9, p. 1).
The outward appearance of growth toward unity of segments of the education profession was not without internal strife. As controversy developed within the NEA in the early twentieth century, a new organization, the American Federation of Teachers, emerged. While some critics expressed opinions to the effect that there was little difference in the National Education Association and the more recent American Federation of Teachers, emphasis on instruction was used as a plus for the NEA by Association leaders who challenged the NEA to be more representative of the professional concerns of educators (2, 3, 8). Yet, late in 1971, twenty-four national associations, affiliated with the NEA, organized the Alliance of Associations for the Advancement of Education for the stated purpose of emphasizing instruction, an area that, in the opinion of this new Alliance representing 400,000 members, NEA had abandoned in pursuit of the union-type practice of placing greater emphasis on the welfare of its members (6, p. 1). The resultant conflict and fragmentation of purpose within the National Education Association caused by such splinter groups strengthened Myron Lieberman's prediction of a merger of the NEA and the AFT in the 1970's (5), and raised questions relative to instruction emphases which were confronted subsequently in Russell Ziemer's comparative analysis of AFT and NEA negotiation contracts (15).

Earlier, two theses at North Texas State University touched on the general purposes of NEA and AFT: (1) "An
Evaluation of the Aims, Methods, and Accomplishments of Certain Teacher Organizations" by Richard G. Reddy, 1952, and (2) "An Analysis of Teacher Militancy and Its Impact on the National Education Association and American Federation of Teachers" by Joe D. Shamblin, 1970. Later, Marshall O. Donley, Jr., of the NEA editorial staff, completed studies which he developed into a dissertation at American University, titled "A Study of the Roots, Causes, and Directions of Teacher Militancy in the United States (1850-1968)," and then published in 1976 as a book, Power to the Teacher: How America's Educators Became Militant.

Before the AFT emerged as a part of the organization spectrum, "Present Aspects of the Work of Teachers' Voluntary Associations," among which was included NEA, was developed for publication by Carter Alexander at Columbia University in 1910. Later, in 1931, an unpublished dissertation, "Association Origins of the NEA," was contributed by Jacob A. Baer at Johns Hopkins University. In the later 1930's, at George Washington University, "The Department of Superintendents and the Teaching of English, 1865-1937" by Theo C. Hartman and "Elementary Science: Historical Background as Revealed in the Proceedings of the National Educational Association, 1857-1895" by Mary V. N. Knowlden were presented, the latter receiving an update, in 1940, in Joseph E. Glackin's "Department of Science Instruction of the National Education Association, 1895-1939." In 1939, Eva Hughes Lee, at the University of
North Carolina, developed "Trends in Education as Shown by Topics Discussed in the National Education Association," and Ella Mable Ford, at George Washington, developed a more limited topic, "The Spelling Reform Movement." In 1955, at the University of Michigan, Albertina Abrams completed a dissertation titled "The Policy of the National Education Association Toward Federal Aid to Education." Finally, a more recent use of the Proceedings of the NEA can be seen in Mary C. Roberts' "Art Education in the United States, 1883-1910," a study completed in 1974 at North Texas State University.

For her thesis at George Washington University, Mildred Sandison Fenner concentrated on the early years of NEA to 1892; and her dissertation, "The National Education Association, 1892-1942," expanded and updated that thesis. Following Fenner's studies, the NEA, in 1945, published her NEA History: The National Education Association, Its Development and Program (1857-1945), a more general treatment than the university volumes of the Association history to 1945.

Fenner's research was drawn on for several centennial writings in 1957. T. D. Martin, for example, in Building A Teaching Profession: A Century of Progress (1857-1957), combined research with impressions gained through twenty-five years (1925-50) as Director of the NEA Membership Division.

NEA Centennial Historian E. B. Wesley, in a five-part, thirty-three chapter book, NEA: The First Hundred Years, cut across years in such chapters as "Departments of the NEA,"
"Democratizing the Association," and "The NEA and Teacher Welfare" to show historical trends of the Association in specific areas. Several of Wesley's chapters deal with instruction (5).

Finally, Michael J. Schultz also utilized the historical/exploratory method of research in his The NEA and the Black Teacher, published in 1970.

Although the NEA and its affiliates engaged in many areas of research and although historical accounts and interpretations of the functions of the Association were available from many sources close to the NEA, there remained a void of research which focused on the Association from the outside, the presence of which was needed "to fill a gap in research" (4). A response to this challenge, this present study of NEA emphasizes on instruction should be significant for educators concerned about the improvement of instruction and the National Education Association's role in that area. A synthesis of performances that focused upon instruction should point out both strengths and limitations of the NEA as a source of aid in the improvement of instruction.

Organization of the Study

Syntheses of diverse plans, projects, and activities that were observed in official records of the NEA as implementations of that Association's purpose to devote a major portion of its resources to instruction furnished the substance for the organization of this historical exploratory study.
Chapter II, "An Organization of 'Practical Teachers,' 1857-70," shows beginning interests in instruction which were expressed in committees, demonstrations, and resolutions of the NTA and recorded in the earliest brief Proceedings.

Chapter III, "A Century of Departmentalization, 1870-1970," advances through some of the many changes of structure of the national parent association of educators. Showing the organization to move full circle from four departments in 1870, reaching a high of thirty-four departments before going back to four (different) departments and other associated organizations in 1970, this chapter underscores that dissatisfaction with structure often developed from a concern for instructional matters and a desire for a better vehicle for confronting them.

Chapter IV, "Forum for Expanding Conceptions of Teaching," deals more fully with the role of controversy relative to Association growth and presents in greater detail than Chapter III some NEA activities of the early twentieth century that paved the way for a clearer focus on instruction.

Chapter V, "Instruction as a Thread for Unity," overlapping in time the two previous chapters, shows the National Education Association synthesizing a variety of emphases on instruction, even though problems of structure and threats to the Association's existence increased from both without and within. Finally, instruction-related concerns provide a common tie for both friends and foes of the NEA.
Chapter VI, "Resolving the Questions of the Study," represents the highlights of preceding chapters in an attempt to answer the questions that furnished the impetus for this study. Interpretations, conclusions, and recommendations complete this historical-descriptive presentation of some aspects of the NEA's emphases on instruction.
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CHAPTER II

AN ORGANIZATION OF "PRACTICAL TEACHERS," 1857-70

Introduction

Of the thirty-one states comprising the United States in 1857, approximately one-half had organized state teachers' associations. The presidents of ten state organizations—New York, Massachusetts, New Hampshire, Vermont, Pennsylvania, Indiana, Illinois, Wisconsin, Iowa and Missouri—had signed a call for a national organizational meeting of "practical teachers" to be held in Philadelphia on August 26, 1857:

TO THE TEACHERS OF THE UNITED STATES:

The eminent success which has attended the establishment and operations of the several teachers' associations in the states of this country is the source of mutual congratulations among all friends of popular education. To the direct agency and diffused influence of these associations, more, perhaps than to any other cause, are due the manifest improvement of schools in all their relations, the rapid intellectual and social elevation of teachers as a class, and the vast development of public interest in all that concerns the education of the young.

That the state associations have already accomplished great good, and that they are destined to exert a still broader and more beneficial influence, no wise observer will deny.

Believing that what has been accomplished for the states by state associations may be done for the whole country by a National Association, we the undersigned, invite our fellow-teachers throughout the United States to assemble in Philadelphia on the 26th day of August next, for the purpose of organizing a NATIONAL TEACHERS' ASSOCIATION.
We cordially extend this invitation to all practical teachers in the North, the South, the East, and the West, who are willing to unite in a general effort to promote the general welfare of our country by concentrating the wisdom and power of numerous minds, and distributing among all the accumulated experiences of all; who are ready to devote their energies and their means to advance the dignity, respectability, and usefulness of their calling; and who, in fine, believe that the time has come when the teachers of the nation should gather into one great educational brotherhood.

As the permanent success of any association depends very much upon the auspices attending its establishment, and the character of the organic laws it adopts, it is hoped that all parts of the Union will be largely represented at the inauguration of the proposed enterprises (3, p. 17).

A sense of mission, of responsibility, of patriotism, of ambition—and, above all, a desire for national unity of purpose—may be observed in the call and its elaboration in the opening remarks of that one-day meeting in 1857. By formal resolution, discussion, and approval, the name NATIONAL TEACHERS' ASSOCIATION was advanced by D. B. Hagar and accepted by those present (3, p. 19). Next, a committee prepared for discussion in the afternoon session a brief constitution beginning with this preamble:

To elevate the character and advance the interests of the profession of teaching, and to promote the cause of popular education in the United States, we whose names are subjoined, agree to adopt the following constitution (3, p. 47).

The NTA Constitution was adopted in the afternoon session of August 26. Forty-three educators signed the Constitution in Philadelphia, and new members in the Association's early years continued to add their signatures to the document (3, pp. 20, 23, 32).
An address interpreting "to elevate the character and advance the interests of the profession of teaching" had been prepared as the closing charge of NTA's first day. "The Professional Organization of the Teachers of the United States" by William Russell, whose illness prevented his presence, was read by T. W. Valentine. Russell envisioned a teaching profession with authority to make its own determinations, to set its own standards, and to license and discipline its own members. All of this was to take more time than the eminent educator's words suggested, but the vehicle to accomplish it--complete with precedent-setting resolutions, discussions, committees, and speeches--had been organized in one day, August 26, 1857 (3, p. 19).

Russell had delineated the benefits of the new organization under two separate, but interrelated headings:

Every teacher who respects himself, and whose heart is in his work, will respond, we think, with alacrity to the call which the establishment of such an association as we propose makes upon him for his best efforts in its aid.

From the formation of a NATIONAL ASSOCIATION OF TEACHERS, we expect great NATIONAL BENEFITS:

1. As regards wider and juster views of education, and corresponding methods of instruction.

In a progressive community like ours, amid the vast and rapid developments of science . . . to imagine that we have already attained to perfection in our modes of education, would be absurd . . . .

The teacher, in our large cities, at least, daily finds himself compelled to limit his intellectual requirements to the condition of many minds incapable of sustaining lengthened or vigorous application, or of retaining the rudimental germs which it is his desire to implant. Of our acknowledged defective moral education, it is unnecessary to speak. Throughout our country, the parent is appealing to
the teacher, and the teacher to the parent, for efficient efforts which may bring about a better state of things. Who will venture, in such circumstances, the assertion that we are already perfect?

The whole ground of education needs a thorough survey and revision, with a view to much more extensive changes and reforms than have yet been attempted.

But it is high time that the broad experience and observation of teachers should unite to claim a hearing on the great subject of their daily duties and endeavors. A harmonious cooperation of educational skill with scientific progress and parental interests, may thus be fully secured for the enlargement and fertilizing of the whole field of mental and moral culture.

2. From the establishment of a national society of teachers, we may justly expect a large amount of professional benefit to its members. Fellow teachers! We are not assembled to boast of the dignity of our vocation, or of the intellectual eminence of those who pursue it; but rather, in the spirit of faithful and earnest endeavors, to do what we can to render ourselves individually and collectively, more worthy of its honors, by becoming more capable of fulfilling its duties (3, pp. 8-10).

Implementation of Purpose

At Cincinnati, in 1858, President Zalmon Richards' inaugural address, "The Work of the Teacher and the Agency of the National Teachers' Association in Elevating the Character and Advancing the Interests of the Profession of Teaching," continuing in the vein of Russell's challenges, urged the NTA to take the lead in securing an adequate number of good teachers.

Now, what organization can be so readily instrumental as this Association, in drawing out, and in bringing into the educational field, the best talent, and in securing the highest qualifications necessary, thus making the people sure that their highest interests will be most economically secured, by employing those teachers, whose abilities and qualifications are of the highest order, and who at the same time
have entered the profession as a permanent business . . . . While we endeavor to give our profession a distinct character, we must not forget that our support is from the public . . . . But it is important also, . . . to secure, as far as possible, the sympathy and cooperation of all within the profession, of every grade (2, pp. 51-52).

Next, Professor Daniel Read, while enumerating the educational progress of his generation, emphasized that progress consisted in the diffusion of knowledge and that it was the function of the teacher to transform motives into action.

Give me the profession of the teacher; give me his power for good; give me his pleasures; above all, give me his material to work upon, mind--more precious than marble or brass, or anything of the material universe. It may be great to be the statesman, to be the divine, to be the scholar, to be the ruler among men; but to mold, to form, to create these, is our greater work (2, p. 81).

The minutes of 1858 also listed an address on "Moral Education" by John D. Philbrick, Superintendent of Public Schools, Boston, Massachusetts, and a lecture on "The Laws of Nature" by Professor John Young of the North Western Christian University, Indiana (3, p. 22). Continuing the idea of the nobility of teaching, Young said:

Let others trace inscriptions on the rocks and learn the age of time. Let others read of wars, of battles, and of crime, but let me become thoroughly acquainted with the working of my own spirit, and I am satisfied.

The true educator must be a poet and enthusiast. When matters become dull to him, they are doubly so to the student; but if his own mind dwells with rapture on the scene, their hearts will speedily catch the inspiration . . . . We can cultivate especially the reason and the moral nature and by shedding the light of science and revelation upon human life, we
can give him a way like the path of life, shining brighter and brighter into the perfect day (2, pp. 102-106).

A critical discussion of sectarianism in parochial schools on the second morning of the 1858 meeting, was finally resolved in empathy after it was pointed out that parochial schools existed because the public schools neglected moral instruction (2, pp. 35-38). A resolution concluded that private schools were a "most valuable and indispensable aid" and "that all teachers whether in colleges, academies, public, private, or parochial schools, in every part of our land be regarded by us as brethren and fellow laborers in a common cause." It should be the duty of the State, however, "to provide the full and free education of all youth within its borders," a final resolution stated (2, p. 38).

Horace Mann, opposing any school that prevented inquiry and discussion, took part in the discussion of parochial schools, following which he delivered the main evening address of the Cincinnati Convention, "The Teacher's Motives." Mann suggested that a teacher should secure as large a salary as possible, but then should forget money and concentrate on becoming a master teacher, dignifying his calling, improving old methods and devising new ones. In conclusion, Mann glowingly predicted:

A brighter day is dawning, and education is its day-star. The honor of ushering in this day is reserved for those who train up children in the way they should go. Through this divinely appointed instrumentality, more than by all other agencies,
the night of ignorance and superstition is to be dispelled (2, p. 134).

Also at Cincinnati, a resolution was heard that a committee be appointed to prepare a paper on the subject "Combination of the Mental, Mechanical, Ideal and Positive in the Education of Youth" (2, p. 40); and committees were appointed to develop a "Course of Study for the Public High Schools of the United States" and to evolve plans for keeping "School Registers" and making "Annual Reports" that could be "adapted to the wants of teachers and school officers throughout the country" (2, p. 41).

At the 1859 NTA Convention in Washington, the first Association resolution of tribute occasioned by the death of a member was passed in memory of Horace Mann, who had died on August 2, 1859. The resolution stated, in part:

That as members of this Association, we shall ever cherish a lively recollection of the interest which our departed friend took in the welfare and prosperity of this body; and that as the highest respect we can show for his memory, we will endeavor to follow his example and imitate his many virtues (3, p. 27).

"Suggestions on Popular Instruction" was the title of a lecture by H. L. Stuart of New York (3, p. 25), and reports answering the following questions were made by spokesmen from seventeen states:

Have you a State System of Free Public Instruction, and how far does it meet the wants of the people? Have you Normal Schools? Teachers' Institutes? and a State Association? To what extent does the graded system of Schools extend in your State? Have you Public Libraries established by State authority?
What educational progress have you made during the past year (3, p.26)?

A committee was appointed to cooperate with the federal government and to urge the establishment therein of an agency to collect and disseminate the statistics of schools and education in the states and territories (3, p. 27).

"The Place Christianity Should Occupy in American Education," a lecture by Elbridge Smith, Principal, Free Academy, Norwich, Connecticut (3, p. 25), led to a resolution, in 1859, concerning qualified teachers:

Resolved. That the inculcation of the Christian religion is necessary to the happiness of the people and the perpetuity of our institutions, and we should be pleased to see every teacher in our broad land imbued with its spirit; yet we would not shut the doors of our school-houses upon well qualified and apt teachers because they do not hold membership in any religious denomination (3, p.27).

Immediate Past President Zalmon Richards moved that committees be appointed on the several subjects suggested in the President's address, and a resolution to that effect was adopted (3, p. 27). Committees on "Common Things," "Appointment of Cadets," "Pedagogy," and "Reformatory Schools" were then appointed in line with subjects suggested by 1859 President Andrew Rickoff (2, p. 143). Later during the 1859 Convention, resolutions by Richards for the appointment of committees on Adult Education and on a Phonetic Alphabet, and by Rev. Dr. Turner for the appointment of a committee to report on the best methods of teaching the Latin and Greek languages, were referred to the Committee on Modes of Instruction (2, p. 151).
Other committee assignments growing out of discussions and resolutions included "School Discipline," "School Books," and "Present Condition of Public Schools in the United States" (2, p. 151).

Suggested Additions and Improvements

Suggesting the need for earlier preparation and improved organization of subsequent convention programs, 1859 President Andrew Rickoff submitted the following resolutions, which were adopted:

Resolved. That Elbridge Smith of Norwich, Connecticut, be a committee to draw up questions upon the theory and practice of teaching for the consideration of the pedagogic section of the Association, at its next meeting; and that he be instructed to transmit said list to the President, on or before the 1st of December next, and further that he, himself be requested to communicate a paper upon some one of the said topics.

Resolved. That Professor Daniel Read, of Wisconsin University, be a committee to draw up questions for the consideration of the general section of the National Teachers' Association . . .

Resolved. That a committee of three, of which the President shall be chairman, be appointed to prepare a programme of exercises for the next meeting which shall be adapted to two departments, into which the Association shall be divided—-the Pedagogic and the General (2, pp. 159-160).

President Rickoff had chided, and a closing general resolution apologized for, the committees who had failed to do their homework for the 1859 sessions of NTA; but the extra-curricular activities enjoyed in the nation's capital with President Buchanan as host and the U. S. President's subsequent presence in meetings that appeared to suffer but little, if at all, from poor homework impressed upon a casual observer
that the fledgling national association could provide adequate alternate resources (3, pp. 26-27). Those closer to the inner workings, however, were joined by perceptive Association critics in challenging the organization to greater effectiveness. Of the failure of the 1859 Convention delegates to approve a periodical, which had been carefully outlined by Committee Chairman Valentine, NEA historian E. B. Wesley said:

A committee had proposed the immediate establishment of an official magazine, The National Teacher, and made recommendations as to its policy, size, frequency, and cost. After careful debate, however, the board of directors laid the proposal on the table—and there it lay until 1920. One can only speculate how the history of the National Education Association would have been changed had the board of directors in 1859 decided to establish at once a magazine that would bridge the gap between the national organization and the individual member (5, p. 31).

The shorter of vision among those of the NTA inner circle, on the other hand, were unaware of a communication gap. Early resolutions of the Association endorsed and promoted Barnard's American Journal of Education, which was generous in its reportings of NTA proceedings and lectures during those early years (2, pp. 28, 40, 152, 182). Even closer at hand was the Association Proceedings, first published by the Office of the American Journal of Education and subsidized by collections from members attending the summer conventions (2, pp. 29, 140, 184).

Minutes of the 1860 NTA Convention at Buffalo referred to the taking up of "the regular subject for discussion"—"Oral Instruction and the Proper Use of Text Books"—and to
additional discussions on the subjects of Adult Education, lyceums, public lectures, evening and night schools, the heating and ventilating of school buildings, and physical education. A standing committee to study a Phonetic Alphabet was also appointed (2, pp. 182-183).

Contrasting the roles of state and national education associations, John W. Bulkley, 1860 President, explained how the NTA proposed to build on the foundations laid by the state associations.

Now, this Association proposes to take up this whole subject for the entire country, and by careful study, examination, comparison, and discussion, ascertain all that is truly excellent, and adapted to the ends sought, and expose whatever is not of this character.

It is by creating and diffusing an intelligent public sentiment in relation to our cause, first in our own immediate locality, enlarging from day to day, till the circumference shall embrace the circuit of the states individually and the still more glorious circle of the Union. With such a public sentiment as this, we may, with confidence of success, present our cause to Congress, and ask for the inauguration of a Department of National Public Instruction (2, pp. 206-211).

In a portion of his address, titled "Objects and Mission of the National Teachers' Association," President Bulkley spoke more directly of the teacher's responsibility, reminding his audience that intellectual culture and the physical development of men are not of themselves sufficient to prepare for the mission of life. He spoke of the culture of the heart and the education of the moral and religious elements of the human being (2, pp. 213-216).
At the conclusion of the presidential address, the committee that had been appointed to summarize and cite for action various topics alluded to by the annual convention leader began their summation with the following resolution:

Resolved. That we recognize in the principle of association, an element of power and influence and that in its application to the purposes of educational reform and progress, as understood by this Association, we confidently anticipate great good to the cause of sound learning throughout the country (2, p. 183).

Unity and Expansion Through Civil War Years

While the tensions of the nation's disunity were voiced in the 1860 meeting at Buffalo (particularly by Superintendent J. N. McJilton of Baltimore, Maryland) they were voiced within the framework of education. In an address, "The Importance of a Teacher's Profession in a National View"/"Preparation of Pupils for Citizenship," McJilton suggested that the nation had been remiss in not establishing a national system of public instruction, which might have averted the crises of the time.

To draw out the intelligence, the experience and power that are now obscured, and to concentrate them for action in the service of the nation is the great work that now lies before the National Teachers' Association.

Besides the labor of working out a general system of interchange and correspondence in relation to plans of instruction, both public and private, it may be expected of the Association that it shall improve and systematize the work of education itself, which is very irregular in its operation, and altogether uncertain in its effects (2, pp. 260-261).

Examples of other addresses of 1860, dealing with traditional subjects of nineteenth century teacher organizations
and containing no hints of civil strife in their titles, were:

"The Scholarship of Shakespeare." By Prof. Edward North, of Hamilton College, Clinton, New York.
"The Teacher and His Work." By John Kneeland, Principal of High School, Roxbury, Massachusetts.
"The Special Educational Wants of Our Country." By J. W. Hoyt, Editor of Wisconsin Farmer, Madison, Wisconsin.

Finally, "Our Professional Ancestry," a lengthy address by Richard Edwards, Principal of the St. Louis Normal School, stressed the high opinion that many early American teachers had of their vocation:

Education, so far as history makes us acquainted with its origin and progress, appears to have begun in the family. The patriarchs of old, who were kings, priests, and instructors in their own households, were the first teachers of whom we have a record. . . . In the Mosaic Law, we find it continually enjoined upon every householder, that he should instruct his children in the law and in the history of the nation,—in the Statutes of the Lord, and in the story of the deliverance of his people . . . . So that by divine appointment, the sons of Israel were a nation of schoolmasters (2, pp. 220-221).

Even more ambitious than the 1860 program were the projected topics for the next meeting. These included: free schools in all states, a professor of education in colleges and universities, the necessity of professional reading, educational men for educational positions, improvement of military
education, and, again, a national bureau of education. The "next meeting," however, during that decade of civil crises, was delayed until 1863, when a record attendance in Chicago devoted one afternoon session to the program of the American Normal School Association.

Reviewing the purposes of the Association, 1863 NTA President John D. Philbrick spoke of the "National Teachers' Association, Its Nature and Objects"—characterizing it as both national and professional and the only education association of a "truly national character now existing in America." He called for continuous effective teaching from the first grade until "they go out into the world," accompanied by continuous self-improvement efforts on the part of teachers. He promoted better salaries for teachers and the legal recognition of teaching as a profession. The diffusion of useful information on the subject of education, the study of the science and art of education, and the reading of educational literature were essential to the enhancement of teaching, Philbrick continued, concluding with:

I have spoken of only one of the objects of our Association—that of elevating the character and advancing the interests of the profession of teaching. The other great object of our efforts is "to promote the cause of popular education in the United States" . . . Whatever tends to elevate and improve the character and qualifications of teachers contributes also to the progress of education; and, on the other hand, whatever tends to advance the cause of education, must at the same time, promote the interests, and improve the character of teachers. The two objects, therefore, . . . are essentially one and the same (3, p. 58).
Five-minute reports of the status of education were given by representatives of various states and territories. Resolutions approved object teaching, the teaching of music, history, and civics and called for better teaching conditions and continuous self-improvement of teachers. One additional resolution was introduced:

Resolved. That a committee of three be appointed to report at the next meeting of the Association upon the comparative merits of what is termed theoretical or general and practical or specific instruction (3, p. 40).

Professor E. A. Grant of Louisville, Kentucky, read a paper titled "The Causes of Failure and Success Among Those Who Assume the Office of Teachers" (3, p. 36), and the Honorable J. M. Gregory, Michigan Superintendent of Public Instruction, delivered a lecture on "The Philosophy and Methods of Education" (3, p. 37).

Zalmon Richards, in an address titled "The Teacher as an Artist," spoke of "distinguished teachers who have given character to their age through their influence as instructors of youth." The artist-teacher, Richards elaborated, should "first consider the subject, which is to furnish the theme for his consideration and skill; next, the kind and variety of material, which is to be used in the production of his work; again, the instrumentalities necessary to be used; finally, the object to be secured in the completion of his work" (3, pp. 69-80).
In another address, "The Powers to Be Educated," Harvard President Thomas Hill suggested arranging courses of instruction after consideration of "(1) . . . the field of human activity; the duties for which the pupil is to be prepared, (2) . . . the whole field of things which can be imparted by teaching, (3) . . . the powers which can be improved by training" (3, pp. 81-91).

Henry Barnard called for better qualified students to match the buildings, equipment, and "faithful teachers" at West Point. Particularly, he pointed out the need for raising admissions requirements so that instructors would not find it necessary to provide elementary instruction.

- No matter how appropriate may be the location, how complete the buildings and equipment, and how skillful and faithful the teachers, unless there is a constant and sufficient supply of pupils of the right age, character, bodily and mental vigor and aptitude, as well as aspirations for a military career, the public will be disappointed in the practical workings of the institution (3, p. 104).

In defense of Pestalozzian object teaching, E. A. Sheldon warned that these lessons were often clumsily taught by those who violated correct principles, thereby bringing the whole system into disrepute; furthermore, he had observed that book speculators were making use of the term as a "catch-word" (3, pp. 93-102).

At the next annual meeting in 1864, Dr. H. B. Wilbur of Syracuse read a paper that was very critical of object teaching as it was being carried on in Sheldon's Oswego Normal and Training School. Particularly, Wilbur criticized Sheldon's
adoption of Generation-old English methods and denied that the Oswego system was as true to Pestalozzi as it was claimed to be (1, pp. 189-208). Not yet, however, was object teaching to languish under the threats of one scathing criticism. A committee would report on it at the next meeting.

Also, in 1864, President W. H. Wells had made some complimentary references to object teaching potentialities in his address on the National Teachers' Association in general and "Methods of Teaching English Grammar" in particular (1, p. 149). In his introductory remarks, Wells first reviewed suggestions from members for improvement of the NTA. A desire that convention sessions be devoted to practical educational papers and discussions had guided the planning of the 1864 program, he explained. It had been suggested further that some convention sessions be devoted to common concerns of all educators and that other time be set aside for sectional meetings for specialized interests such as educational journals, college problems, superintendence, high school teaching, grammar school teaching, and primary teaching (1, pp. 145-147). Finally, Wells mentioned that a request for biennial meetings had again come to his attention and that, indeed, everyone was so busy with so many other meetings it seemed a very good idea for the NTA to meet every two years instead of annually (1, p. 147); nevertheless, he, like other presidents and participants in those early meetings,
voiced soul-searching inquiries and challenges concerning national education association purposes.

"The most important object of the National Association," the President said, "is educational advancement" (I, p. 147). Merely to bring to a national meeting the best from local associations was inadequate and unworthy of the high purposes of the NTA, Mr. Wells reminded his contemporaries.

We live in an age of educational progress. Greater improvements have been made in educational methods since the establishment of the American Journal of Education in 1826 by William Russell, than during any ten previous centuries combined... But the field of improvement is by no means exhausted... We must devise, originate, invent... Standing on the high platform of all the experiences and improvements of the past, it is our privilege and duty to rise still higher, and unless we do this, our Association fails to accomplish its highest mission (I, pp. 147-148).

Wells then used the teaching of English grammar as an example of the need to advance in educational methods. Grammar should be taught, he explained and illustrated, not as an end unto itself, but as a means of achieving adequate and appropriate language in real-life situations. "We need to spend more time," President Wells said, "in cultivating a command of language; the power of expression; the ability to speak and write with correctness and ease." (I, p. 148).

An analysis of "Liberal Education" by Samuel P. Bates, Deputy Superintendent of Public Schools in Pennsylvania, began with a warning against becoming slaves to the printed word, textbooks in particular. He spoke of the power of
early Greek teachers and of the Master Teacher before the present-day emphasis on printed lessons. A great need for the improvement of teachers could be met, Superintendent Bates thought, in an institution "giving instruction of an exclusively professional character" (1, pp. 155-176).

The field is ample, and promises rich and abundant fruits. Neither Kant nor Herbert Spencer, in their distributions of mental phenomena, has viewed the subject of mental development from the true educational standpoint, nor has either fairly interpreted nature. It remains in the last half of the nineteenth century to read well a science of Education, and to train a truly liberal Profession of Teaching (1, p. 176).

"Remarks on the Study of Didactics in College" was the title of an address by Harvard President Thomas Hill, who said that education was of two kinds: general, or liberal, and special, or professional. Both the university and the Normal School for teachers should be professional schools, and though the university might include a Normal School, Hill said that a pupil preparing to teach should have had a good foundation of general education before enrolling in specialized courses (1, pp. 177-179). He concluded:

I say the Normal School is a professional school. There is however a sense in which the study of didactics may be called a liberal study; it is, that every child may be considered prospectively as the head of a family, and that the art of teaching is therefore of universal utility.

But the establishment of a Normal School in a University and of a special course for Bachelors of Arts in a Normal School, would be steps calculated to raise the standard of excellence required of teachers, and would lift toward its proper dignity the high profession of teaching (1, pp. 178-179).
S. H. White delivered the 1864 address urging the establishment of a national bureau of education. From the first meetings, NTA leaders spoke of national concerns, particularly of national unity; furthermore, because they were state leaders, they did not neglect state concerns. Speakers, in 1864, also reminded their fellow educators of their local beginnings; first, President Wells spoke of combining the best of local associations on the national level. Finally, John Bulkley, Brooklyn Superintendent of Public Instruction, implying that good organization should begin at home, had a more inclusive title, "Town, County and State Associations for Educational Purposes" (1, pp. 185-188). Bulkley, who as 1860 NTA President had carefully drawn the distinction between state and national associations, began this time with the following declaration:

The great principle of association was first enunciated by the Creator in Eden, when the Lord God said, "It is not good that man should be alone"

... In educational reform, this principle is indispensable to success. Isolated effort has accomplished much in every department of life. But what is individual compared with Association effort?" (1, p. 185).

Before the 1865 meeting, a committee of seven had the responsibility to do an objective study of object teaching at Oswego. To that end, Samuel S. Greene, 1865 NTA President and one of the seven committee members, spent a week at Oswego, where he began the preparation of a report on the psychology of the learning process that was being implemented
in the Oswego system. By the time of his Convention Report on behalf of the committee, Greene was ready with illustrations of successful teaching.

Would you really know whether a candidate for the teacher's office is a good teacher or not? You need not examine him with difficult questions in Arithmetic, in Algebra, in Geography, or in History. You need not examine him at all. But put him in the school-room, take from it every printed page for the use of the teacher or the pupil. Give him blackboards—give them slates. Let him have ears of corn, pine cones, shells, and as many other objects as he chooses to collect, and then require him to give lessons in reading, spelling, arithmetic, geography, and the English language. If the children come home full of curious questions, if they love to talk of what they do at school, if at the end of the week you find them thinking earnestly of their occupation at school—deeply interested—intent upon their school exercises—then employ him, employ him at the University, the Academy, or even the Normal School. Whenever needed, allow him or the children books. You are sure of a good school (4, p. 258).

Following Greene's report, a Miss Cooper, with a group of children from Oswego, gave a demonstration of object teaching; and Lowell Mason demonstrated the object technique in public school music. President Greene, Miss Cooper, and Professor Mason were highly acclaimed, thereby bringing object teaching into increasing favor as an effective method in elementary instruction (4, p. 223).

For higher instruction, a paper, "The Best Method of Teaching the Classics," was presented by Professor Albert Harkness of Brown University and later discussed by members present (4, pp. 221-222). Professor Richard Edwards, Normal
University, Illinois, provoked animated debate with his plea for each state to establish and maintain at public expense, "Normal Schools with their distinctive characteristics."

The "distinctive characteristics" of a Normal School cited by Edwards were: (1) its exaltation of teaching, (2) its development of methods courses, and (3) its emphasis on the science of education and the art of teaching (4, pp. 271-282).

Running through Edwards' plea, as well as through most of the addresses of 1865, was a concern for the social role of education in the nation's reconstruction period. Later, another eloquent justification by Andrew Rickoff for a national bureau of education to stand equal to the Department of Agriculture expressed the NTA's continuing desire for a unifying governmental agency of education with which the Association would work cooperatively to guarantee "a good common school education to every boy and girl in the land, white and black" (4, pp. 299-310). Calling for the establishment of public school systems in the states where they did not exist and reiterating demands for a national bureau of education, the educators meeting in Harrisburg were sensitive and responsive to the needs of their hour (4, p. 220).

President Greene's presidential address, "The Educational Duties of the Hour," had set the tone for Convention emphases (4, pp. 229-243), and President-Elect J. P. Wickersham's "Education As an Element in Reconstruction" reinforced in conclusion:
American educators hold in their hands the destinies of this nation. Their task is not like that of the dashing soldier or the popular statesman at whom all the world gazes; but in the unobtrusive quiet of the school-room, though no eye, save that of God, witness the work, they may infuse such a love of our country and its institutions into the hearts of the coming generations of children, that the Republic, on its secure foundations will stand as firmly as the Egyptian pyramids (4, p. 297).

Beginning at the first anniversary meeting in 1858, National Teachers' Association Conventions had been scheduled for three days during the month of August with some time during those three days set aside for excursions to places of interest. In 1865, a second-day recess from business sessions was devoted to an excursion to the Gettysburg battlefield (4, p. 221). Congruous though the solemn proceedings were on that occasion, so near in time to the actual battle and the subsequent address by the now fallen President Abraham Lincoln, the increasingly long convention programs led to the adoption of the following resolutions on the closing day:

Resolved. That the proper authority of this Association be requested so to arrange the programme of the exercises for next meeting as to give the prominence to those educational topics which the exigencies of the time and the progress of educational development shall indicate; and that a reasonable amount of discussion for each topic shall be provided and secured.

Resolved. That while excursions and visits by the Association to noted places and institutions are felt to be pleasant and beneficial, and therefore to be encouraged, it is the sentiment of this meeting that their postponement, till after the final adjournment, will promote the efficiency of our proceedings (4, p. 224).

In the introductory remarks of his address at the last session of the seventh meeting, 1865, Andrew J. Rickoff
challenged his fellow educators thus:

Do you come to catch a brand from the great flame of enthusiasm that here burns, with which you may kindle a like flame in your own state and neighborhood? . . . Happy the state or nation which has a body of teachers so anxious to preserve and spread the sacred fire . . . .

But what of these addresses--what will you do with them? . . . What of these discussions? . . . In what will these discussions eventuate? . . . Do you propose to stop there? Not in an American assembly, where the fruit of a discussion is said to be resolution . . .

. . . . . . . . . . . . . . . . . . . . . . . . . . . .

In the first place, then, it is the duty of this National Teachers' Association to labor for the extension of an opportunity to acquire a good common school education to every boy and girl . . . (4, pp. 299-301).

Finally, it was Rickoff's opinion, a link in the chain of consistent Association efforts in that direction, that as a first step toward the guarantee of equal educational opportunity through state public school systems, a national bureau of education was needed (4, p. 303).

At Indianapolis, in 1866, the topics of 1865 were updated with resolutions extending to include (1) a letter of thanks to Congressman James A. Garfield for his bill to establish a national department of education and (2) a proposal for a world convention promoting the cause of education.

A one-word change in the Constitution of the Association--"gentlemen" yielding to "persons"--granted to women the advantages of full membership in 1866 (2, p. 579). In the beginning years of NTA, though women had always been present, and even signers of the Constitution, they had been considered
honorary members, and the papers they had prepared had been read by the gentlemen.

The sentiment of the year 1866 was voiced in the address "An American Education for the American People" by James Wickersham:

We must maintain our systems of common schools . . . . for by their influence alone can the Union be organically restored, and the whole country be made one, for by their influence alone can each American citizen be made a watchman to guard with eternal vigilance the sacred shrine of liberty (2, p. 608).

When the national agency, first called the Department of Education and later the Office of Education, became a reality on March 2, 1867, the NTA claimed a victory--and future historians have referred to it as a crowning achievement of the young Association (5, p. 52). Enjoined by Congress to collect and disseminate information and to promote the cause of education throughout the United States, the new agency went into immediate operation with Henry Barnard, editor of the American Journal of Education, serving as the first Commissioner of Education (2, pp. 564, 776).

The NTA failed to meet in 1867. To revitalize Association meetings and to promote attendance in Nashville in 1868, John Eaton, Superintendent of Public Instruction in Tennessee, announced combined meetings of the Tennessee State Teachers' Association, the National Teachers' Association, the American Normal School Association, and informally, the county superintendents of Tennessee! In numbers, attendance was unequal to
the planning and hospitality, but the scope and depth of activities and discussions continued to advance (5, p. 41). The delegates in Nashville discussed such topics as the function of Normal Schools, the nature of colleges, normal departments in colleges, teacher institutes, educational periodicals, the importance of the classics, and coeducation (2, pp. 642-690). Among the participants promoting the preparation of teachers, W. H. McGuffey declared, "It requires more skill to teach an infant school than to occupy a chair of moral philosophy in a great college" (2, p. 658).

At Trenton, New Jersey, in 1869, the last meeting of the turbulent sixties was well attended by teachers from twenty-eight states, the territory of Colorado, the District of Columbia, and Canada. Religious instruction in the public schools was debated, ending with an endorsement of the reading and teaching of the Bible in schools (2, p. 725).

Leading to that endorsement related to the place of religion in the schools, two addresses on the 1869 program had set the stage for debate. First, from New Jersey, Judge Richard S. Field, President of State Normal School Board and Vice President of the Board of Education, read his paper on the "Obligations of Christianity to Learning" (2, p. 699). Honorable Joseph White, Secretary of the Massachusetts Board of Education, followed with an address on "Christianity in the Public Schools" (2, p. 716). Discussion was then initiated by Judge Field, who called for common-ground Christian
principles without "technical religious instruction" (2, p. 717). Finally, directing his remarks to the character of the teacher, Rev. Samuel Lockwood, of Trenton, concluded forcefully,

I am entirely in the accord with Judge Field. . . . But I do insist that we need in every teacher a person of deep religious sensibility; and where that is found, there is very little difficulty. Example and tone of character go a great ways (2, p. 719).

Sharing prominence with concerns for moral instruction, education in the South was the subject of various addresses, appeals, and resolutions in 1869 (2, pp. 702-713). General O. O. Howard of Washington, D. C., testified that "a wonderful change has taken place in Southern Society wherever schools have been established" (2, p. 705). Howard, head of the Freedmen's Bureau, concluded with an appeal for a broader view of practical education which would include Christian education:

But in this work of education, we must not subordinate man to his uses. It seems to me sometimes that I hear nothing but "Practical! Practical!" But education is truly practical only when it gives a man life-power, and a man will make a better blacksmith who knows something else besides blacksmithing. A true man must be a little, at least, above and beyond the work in which he is engaged. You are all teachers, employed in a noble work, and going forth to exert a vast influence . . . What the country needs is the Christian training, the Christian education of the people. The teachers who have gone South with infidel principles or demoralizing habits have utterly failed and have been repudiated by the people (2, p. 705).

Reports of progress and appeals for aid were heard from representatives of the states of Maryland, North Carolina,
and Arkansas after which the following preamble and resolutions were proposed and adopted:

Whereas, the work of education in the Southern States, especially among the colored people, has been prosecuted to a commendable degree of success by the Freedmen's Bureau, and the various benevolent associations, thus preparing the way for free schools for all the people; and

Whereas, Many of the Southern States, stimulated by these noble efforts, have already begun to move in this matter; therefore,

Resolved. That we, as a body of teachers representing the national idea of education, hereby express our hearty sympathy with our co-laborers at the South, and tender to them our cordial support in their labors of love and mercy.

Resolved. That in Gen. O. O. Howard we recognize the Christian soldier, scholar, and gentleman, and in his noble work the true policy for the reconstruction and education of all the people of the South (2, pp. 712-713).

Superintendent of Washington, D. C. Schools, Zalmon Richards, read a paper titled "Elementary Schools--Radical Defects and Radical Remedies," which was discussed by the 1869 NTA session audience (2, p. 699). Regarding other instructional areas, minutes of the Trenton meeting recorded the following:

Miss Minnie Swayze, teacher of elocution in the New Jersey State Normal School, then gave an interesting exercise in vocal culture, with an admirably trained class. Miss Lizzie Johnson, one of her pupils, followed with a recitation of Poe's "Raven."

Dr. Edwin Leigh, of New York, gave an instruction of his method of phonetic vocal training, illustrated by the use of Leigh's Sound Charts.

Professor E. Brooks, of Pennsylvania, moved that a committee be appointed to form a temporary educational bureau for the purpose of furnishing teachers to those desiring them, and also of supplying teachers with situations (2, p. 698).
Two resolutions regarding the teaching of citizenship as an emphasis of improved instruction in United States History were also introduced for consideration in 1869:

Resolved. That the National Teachers' Association considers it a part of the duty of all institutions of learning to inculcate the principles of an intelligent citizenship, and to this end they earnestly recommend the more extensive introduction into our Public Schools of the study of United States History, especially with reference to the principles, the structure, and the history of our political institutions.

Resolved. That in the opinion of the Association, the introduction of this study into all our Schools would be greatly stimulated if Colleges should require a fair knowledge of it as a condition of admission, and they respectfully suggest the subject to College authorities for their consideration (2, p. 701).

An indication of extended national-mindedness of some of the early organizers, a call for the establishment of a national university was initiated formally, in 1869, by John Hoyt of Wisconsin. Hoyt was subsequently appointed chairman of a committee to continue his promotional efforts to that end (2, p. 724), or, as it turned out, to lead the positive side of that controversial issue, which served as a focus for pro and con forces on the subject of nationalization of institutions.

Meeting in the hall of the model-school building connected with the New Jersey State Normal School at Trenton, the 1869 Convention participants were presented with increasing variations from traditional programming. Recitation of poetry and singing served to alleviate the intensity of concentration required by such ponderous addresses as the following:
"The State and Its Relation to Higher Education"
by J. P. Wickersham, Pennsylvania

"Natural Reading"
by Mrs. Randall, New York

"The School and the Workshop"
by J. D. Philbrick, Boston, Massachusetts

"The Criterion of School Education"
by E. E. White, Editor of Ohio Educational Monthly

"Popular Science"
by Mrs. Lincoln Phelps, read by Professor W. F. Phelps

"Human Voice and Its Training"
by Professor Lewis B. Monroe, Boston, Massachusetts
(2, pp. 700-715).

Other 1869 speakers furnished their own diversions from the sound of the lecturing human voice: The address on "physiology" by Professor James McClintock, of Philadelphia, was illustrated by McClintock's use of paper and wax models and diagrams; and Dartmouth's Professor Woodman interspersed his lecture on "Drawing as a Branch of Elementary Education" with "illustrations on the black board" (2, p. 701).

Though early membership dues were inadequate to cover the cost of printing copies of Association Proceedings, a vote of the members in 1869 forbade the Board to accept money from textbook publishers for that cause (2, p. 714). Evidently, feeling no hurtful rebuff, representatives of both publishing firms and school-furniture houses thanked the Convention for the space provided them for their exhibits at Trenton (2, pp. 715-716).

With the 1869 meeting over, ten annual meetings of the National Teachers' Association had passed into history. During the Civil War years, preceded and followed by intense
sectional strife, educators, searching for a common cause and
shouldering their share of blame for the nation's dilemma had
cemented the ties and laid the foundation for a potentially
strong national professional association.

Summary

The National Teachers' Association, organized in 1857
by forty-three "practical teachers" answering the call of
presidents of ten state education associations of the United
States, was an association committed to the development of
a common school education for all citizens. Urging all
states to provide at least an elementary school education
and, then, whenever possible, adult education, the teachers
set for themselves the tasks of self-improvement and of in-
creasing their number through Normal Schools, Normal depart-
ments in universities, and teaching institutes. To these
ends, NTA served as a forum for the exchange of ideas among
those concerned about their colleagues, the preparation of
new teachers, and the extension of learning opportunities in
general. Having assumed in most cases the additional titles
of "superintendent of instruction," "principal" of Normal
Schools, "professor" of teachers, or "president" of college-
level institutions, the "practical teachers" were also states-
men of vision with an eagerness to lift the nation above the
sectional strife of the Civil War years.

The National Teachers' Association was a summer conven-
tion organization, meeting annually except in crisis years,
(The NTA did not meet in 1861, 1862, and 1867). The president for the year planned the convention program, a task of such scope that it led to frequent suggestions for biennial, rather than annual, meetings. The only publication of the Association was the annual convention record, of interest primarily to those in attendance, which was sent to the major libraries and promoted for sale to individuals. An organization without a staff and without a home base, the NTA took pride in moving its summer sessions into increasingly more distant sections of the growing nation; however, the failure of the organization to meet in 1867 probably provided more activity from its leaders in connection with the launching of the services of the Department of Education in Washington, a frequently promoted project of the NTA.

With a dedication to retain from the past all that was valid to an "American education for American people," the organizers of teachers during the nineteenth century set themselves the task of updating education and moving the profession of teaching forward. To that end, unity, which they felt should begin in the National Teachers' Association, seemed to them to be the indispensable ingredient which their time in history demanded of them. Yet, coming together only a few times convinced those early leaders that a kind of division of their house into classified interests would further enhance their progress. An 1859 resolution called for the separation of the convention programs into two sections, the
"pedagogic" and the "general." In 1863, an afternoon session of the NTA was devoted to meetings of the American Normal School Association. The 1869 Convention assembled in the model-school building of a Normal School, and most of the program was slanted toward instructional concerns, which were becoming, even at that early date, too varied and numerous to be profitably handled by the total group; but the overriding interrupting concerns of the war years had delayed the division of the Convention into sections.
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CHAPTER III

A CENTURY OF DEPARTMENTALIZATION, 1870-1970

Introduction

To increase and improve free common elementary schools in the United States, more and better teachers had been needed; to secure these, the mid-nineteenth century "practical teacher" organizers had deemed essential the development of more effective Normal Schools. D. B. Hagar, principal of State Normal, Salem, Massachusetts, who with T. W. Valentine had issued the original call for the National Teachers' Association, presided as the Association's tenth president in 1870 at Cleveland. That year, the American Normal School Association, which had formally organized in 1858, met two days in advance of the NTA Convention. Subsequently, with three other groups at Cleveland in 1870--Superintendence, organized in 1865; Central College Association, established in 1869; and elementary educators, within the NTA from its beginning--the Normal Association became one of the original four departments of the newly named National Educational Association, parent organization for an increasing variety of educational interests.

Of the original departmental structure finally realized in 1870, President Hagar had said that year in his
opening remarks:

We can preserve the advantages of each, and at the same time, establish on a broad foundation grand in its proportions, comprehensive in its objects, and powerful in its operations (40, p. 95).

On the other hand, former President Zalmon Richards cautiously observed that a decade had passed since the first suggestion that the NTA divide into sections, and it seemed to him unwise to attempt implementation of such a plan.

It seems to me this division into sections will prove to be an elephant on our hands... certain sections will draw most of those in attendance and as a matter of course other sections will be very thinly attended... I would much prefer that we have all our exercises in one general meeting (40, pp. 101-102).

Hagar had conceded that "working in sections" was not a new idea; nor was it an untried practice. Increased attendance had resulted on the state level, he had observed, when the Massachusetts Association changed to departmental organization, thereby proving, he suggested, "that the interest which teachers feel in an Association depends largely upon the amount of thought and information which they expect to get therefrom applicable to their individual wants" (40, p. 95).

Even though colleagues held different opinions concerning the new structure, a trend was established for the NEA. In 1876, a Department of Manual Training (later Industrial Arts) emerged, with its first president, Professor S. R. Thompson, remarking:
The design of breaking up the general Association into sections during a part of the sessions is obvious. By this means we unite more closely those engaged in the same line of work, and provide for the discussion of subjects and methods which would not be equally interesting to others (28, p. 237).

In 1879, NEA President John Hancock, reviewing the first twenty-one years of existence of the Association, remarked of the departmental structure: "This division into departments has enabled our Association to do vastly more work, and to do it better than could be possible, acting as a single body" (30, p. 13).

In the last two decades of the nineteenth century, a dozen additional special interest groups were confirmed as departments: 1884--Art (Art Education, 1933); 1885--Kindergarten; Music (merged with Music Educators National Conference, 1940); 1887--Secondary Education; 1894--Business Education; National Science Instruction (later National Science Teachers Association); 1895--Child Study; Physical Education (both later merging with the 1885 American Physical Education Association to become the American Association of Health, Physical Education, and Recreation, 1937); 1896--Administration; 1897--Library; 1898--Special Education (International Council for Exceptional Children, 1930); 1900--Industrial Education (Vocational Education, 1919).

The 1907 Department of Rural and Agricultural Education was organized in 1919 as the Department of Rural Education. Cutting across subject-matter lines, Classroom Teachers became a separate NEA Department in 1913. The
National Association of Deans of Women, The National Association of Elementary Principals, and the Department of Audio-Visual Instruction became separate departments in 1918, 1921, and 1923, respectively. The Department of Immigrant Education established in 1921 later became the Department of Adult Education. The National Council of Social Studies and the American Association of Teachers Colleges became departments in 1925; and a Department of Lip Reading was established in 1926.

Formed in 1915, as the National Association of Directors of Educational Research, the American Educational Research Association became a department of NEA in 1930. Organized in 1921 as the National Conference in Educational Method, the Association of Supervision and Curriculum Development, NEA, dates from 1929; and the National Association of Secondary School Principals became a department of NEA in 1927.

Other departments established by the mid-twentieth century were: Department of Home Economics--1930; National Council of Administrative Women in Education--1932; Department of Garden Education (met with NEA from 1911 as School Garden Association of America; absorbed by National Science Teachers Association in 1946); National Association of Teachers of Speech; National Association of Journalism Directors--1939; American Industrial Arts Association--1942; National Association of Educational Secretaries--1946; National Council of Teachers of Mathematics; National School
Public Relations Association--1950; National Retired Teachers Association--1951; and National Association of Public School Adult Education--1955.

The 1960's began with the addition of the American Association of School Librarians ("Library," as a special interest, first appeared in 1897) and American Driver Education Association, the latter becoming the American Driver and Traffic Safety Education Association in 1963. "Foreign Languages" was approved as a department of the NEA in 1961; and finally, in 1968, the Association for Student Teaching and Department of School Nurses were added.

By 1957, NEA Centennial Historian E. B. Wesley estimated, there had been "about fifty" departments of the NEA. Using the 1957 names of the thirty departments of that year, Wesley divided them into four categories as follows:

ADMINISTRATION

American Association of School Administrators
Department of Elementary School Principals
National Association of Women Deans and Counselors
National Association of Secondary-School Principals
National Council of Administrative Women in Education

CURRICULUM AREAS

American Association for Health, Physical Education and Recreation
American Industrial Arts Association
Association for Supervision and Curriculum Development
Department of Home Economics
Department of Vocational Education
Music Educators National Conference
National Art Education Association
National Association of Journalism Directors
National Council for the Social Studies
National Council of Teachers of Mathematics
Regarding the importance of the developing departmental structure of the NEA, Historian Wesley concluded:

...
Approximately one-half of the NEA departments evolved out of basic curriculum concerns and were referred to congruously as "subject-matter departments." Their organizers were seeking to establish the subjects of their interest at appropriate levels in the increasingly crowded public school curriculum. Discussion time at meetings of the NEA was devoted to: (1) what should be taught; (2) why it should be taught; and (3) how much of it could be taught in the short time that might be allotted to a given subject during the potential years of schooling. These concerns, and particularly the concern of supplying teachers with appropriate preparation, were shared with service-oriented departments and with the parent association.

Some Highlights of Department Growth Years

Relationships of departments to the parent association were various and flexible, ranging from independence to a seeming oneness of purpose and program. Beginning in the 1870's, general sessions of the conventions were held in the mornings and evenings, and afternoon sessions were devoted to meetings of the departments. The Department of School Superintendence, in 1873, passed a resolution to meet when other departments were not in session (27, p. 270), and though they usually held a brief meeting during summer conventions, the superintendents began to meet during the winter, a practice that was continued when the Department of
Superintendence became the American Association of School Administrators. The 1877 Addresses and Proceedings had a note to the effect that the Department of Superintendence "adjourned" that year "in view of the fact that the pro-
grame of the General Association had embraced the topics" of concern to superintendents (29, p. 261). In 1880, according to Addresses and Proceedings for that year, the Normal Department discussed papers of the General Assembly (31, p. 176); moreover, continuing through the last two decades of the nineteenth century, the lines dividing the departments from each other and from the general association were barely visible--if the topics of concern may be used as an indication. An opinion, in 1909, that the formation of new depart-
ments within the NEA should be curtailed was apparently ignored (23, pp. 42-46), since the number of departments continued to increase. The establishment of permanent NEA headquarters, in 1917, brought about closer cooperation be-
tween the departments and the parent association as they, individually and collectively, sought more productive roles within the framework of education on the national level in cooperation with state and local education organizations. Maintaining an open-ended structure, the NEA facilitated the creation, co-existence, departure and return of various special interest groups without loss to its continuous basic image as the oldest and largest professional association of teachers.
Individual, Department, and Association Assertions

Addressing the Convention in Topeka, Kansas, in 1886, President N. A. Calkins reminded his audience that the "General Association" was "to consider educational matters of broad and national character, and to furnish more favorable opportunity for full discussion than has been usual." For "Department meetings," the president promised that special attention had been given to "schoolroom work." Teachers were to "be able to see and hear much that may be of practical use in their own schoolrooms" (34, p. 70).

Speaking on the topic "What the Average Teacher Can Do in Musical Instruction" to the Department of Music section in 1886, Sara L. Dunning stated that she was "most thankful that the day has come when not only our great-minded educators but the average teachers throughout our country are attending these associations . . . seeking to lift themselves . . . in this most noble work of all--teaching" (34, p. 574).

Continuing the vein of thought advanced several times that year in Topeka, N. Coe Stewart, also of the Department of Music, urged each colleague to improve his own musical ability by "looking out and not in, by continuing to attend the National and other Associations . . . and when there to give the Association the best of his experience and advice, . . ." (34, p. 589).
Richard Edwards, Illinois Superintendent of Public Instruction, challenged the Convention meeting again in Chicago in 1887, to exchange views that had been developed in widely scattered states and territories: "Remote from each other and greatly differing from each other in educational facilities, we are here to take counsel in respect to the most momentous enterprise now carried forward in this country . . ." (35, p. 65).

Later, at the Normal Schools Department meeting in Chicago, Department President A. R. Taylor carried Edwards' challenge forward, suggesting a broader and more lasting professional sharing and preservation of information gained at convention gatherings:

What teacher attended the great meeting last night or visited the exposition by the lake-side yesterday, who does not thrill with an enlarged conception of his work and long for a better command of it?

The departmental organization affords an unequalled opportunity for the free exchange of views on specific topics. Such a gathering becomes valuable by virtue of the wide experience and mature wisdom of those who speak . . .

... ...

We meet and talk and resolve, but do we accomplish what we might for the humbler toilers in the two hundred and fifty thousand schoolhouses in our land? . . . Some individuals or some organization ought now to take the magnificent series of papers and reports which make up the fruitage of our national association, much of which has received its sanction, and put the material in such shape that every teacher can utilize it. . . .

... ...

How much of this material has come to stay? How much of it comes from our training schools and receives their approval? How largely are they in accord with each other? To what extent are they
awake and leading, or do they follow passively along? The profession looks to the Normal Schools (35, pp. 170-171).

Offering a broader analysis of Association/Department purposes and practices, W. T. Harris, who had served as 1875 NEA President, appeared before the Department of Superinten-

dence February, 1891, meeting in Philadelphia:

The general work of the Association, as a whole, should go on in deep ruts, but the special work of the departments should be specialized and always fresh and new. . . .

We wish to produce as many growing teachers as possible—as many as possible who each year have found fresh leads and have distanced their former selves. . . .

If I have studied aright this problem, it is not the general association that is in need of reform, but only the departments. These depart-

ments instead of breaking away from the type of the general association, as they should do, are imitating its organization when they ought to de-

vote themselves to developing and fostering voluntary subcommittees or round tables devoted to special work (38, p. 450).

By the time of the 1891 Summer Convention of the whole, however, Zalmon Richards, who in 1870 had feared the depart-

ments would become "an elephant on our hands," rallied to their defense:

[D]uring these later years, the officers have taken special care to let nothing but new and original matter be presented to the various departments. As the authors of these papers are generally selected from the large number of first-class educators in our growing coun-

try, the papers are becoming more and more elevated and valuable, and contain the best and ripest thoughts of this educational era. The same may be said in regard to the charac-

ter of the discussions in these various de-

partments, . . .
This Association has been, and now is, the body guard of public school instruction in our country (38, pp. 130-131).

Among those who shared their ideas informally in NEA Convention discussions was A. Bronson Alcott, who reacted to John Swett's "The Examination of Teachers," a General Session address of 1872, by saying that it was his opinion that "temperament" goes further toward citing the qualification of a teacher than anything else. "Magnetism . . . . Whoever can draw out what is in us and make us feel that we know something is the best teacher," Alcott suggested (26, p. 84).

Other addresses of the 1872 General Session that Alcott may have heard were: "Methods of Moral Instruction in Common Schools" by Chairman W. F. Phelps; "Educational Lessons on Statistics" by John Eaton; "Compulsory School Attendance" by Newton Bateman; and "Drawing . . . . What to Teach and How to Teach It" (26).

Moving from the General Convention to the sessions of the Elementary Department, Alcott heard Department President Delia A. Lathrop declare:

It is not necessary to make any comparison between our work and that of other departments. We understand that our work is just as important and just as honorable; that the work of the primary school teacher is just as noble as that in any other department of education (26, p. 125).

Following Miss Lathrop, Zalmon Richards and N. A. Calkins spoke of the adaptation of objective teaching to school
instruction and of teaching and learning in general. Next, Alcott reminisced that "forty years ago" in Boston he had enjoyed the most delightful experience in instruction. "If I have learned anything, I learned it from the children; they were my professors," he recalled; "and in addition to myself, the teachers were Margaret Fuller and Elizabeth Peabody, who has introduced, and is introducing, the Kindergarten into this country" (26, p. 134).

Miss Peabody was also cited as a discussion participant responding to W. N. Hailmann's address on the "Adaptation of Froebel's System of Education to American Institutions" (26, p. 148). Following the discussion of Hailmann's address, C. O. Thompson presented a paper on "The Scope and Method of Physical Science in the Common School"; and two addresses concerning instruction in English completed the program of the Elementary Department: "English Grammar in Elementary Schools: by M. A. Newell and "English Literature and Its Place in Popular Education" (26).

Finally, in Normal Department sessions of 1872, Bronson Alcott heard discussions of J. C. Greenough's "The Proper Work of Normal Schools" and of T. W. Harvey's "Professional Instruction in Normal Schools." The heated discussion of the latter two papers ended with remarks by Alcott.

A. B. Alcott of Concord, Massachusetts, said he doubted if the American system of education was equal to that of Ancient Greece. He would go to Athens for a model rather than to Germany. He
believed in idealists as well as practical men. Men must be up in the clouds to see what is going on. Common sense was valuable, but uncommon sense was more so (26, p. 214).

Only one address was recorded following the summary of Alcott's remarks in the 1872 Proceedings of the Normal Department. Beginning with the assertion, "The end and aim of all genuine normal instruction is the realization of the highest possible type of the true teacher," George P. Beard spoke of "The Relation Between Matter and Method in Normal Instruction" (26, p. 214).

Also at the NEA Convention of 1872, F. A. March addressed the Department of Higher Instruction regarding "Methods of Teaching English in the High School"; and the Department of Superintendence heard H. F. Harrington expound "The Extent, Methods, and Value of Supervision in a System of Schools" (26). The 1872 program of the NEA and its departments was typical of the first-generation programs of that Association; and the presence of idealists among the "practical teachers" contributed to the typicality.

As subjects continued to be added to the curriculum, as educational roles and services increased, and as grade levels--kindergarten through higher education--became the structure of American education, the National Education Association structure and program both promoted and reflected those advances. Whether the Association led or followed those movements would be subject to questions similar to those raised by Professor W. R. Barrett of Tennessee in his
1877 Convention address, "The Limits of Education: Shall educators yield to popular demands? Shall they not rather rise above the clamor of the hour and educate public sentiment to loftier standards? . . . but popular demands must be respected." (29, p. 37).

The thrust of Garrett's address was to the limits of time and money--the educators' time and the public's money--and to the teacher's problem of devoting "his accumulating experience to devise improved methods for imparting again the same instruction."

Public sentiment demands for popular education that its limits be respected. . . . true citizenship comprehends everything; it is above every profession and every accomplishment. . . . To effect this end, it demands in the school-room moral, intellectual, and aesthetic development, and an elimination from its course of all that retards this result, or exceeds its proper limits (29, p. 39).

An elective system of courses and an emphasis on principles rather than the mere acquisition of facts were discussed as time-saving methods to be employed in school instruction. A study of human nature and psychology in an enlarged Normal School curriculum encompassing model or practice schools and chairs of pedagogy in higher institutions also evolved as possible enhancements to improved instruction. Finally, the 1877 discussion of problems related to instruction set off a brief outburst which, though quickly turned aside as off the subject, was to be echoed through the century ahead. Exclaimed J. M. Harley of Indian Territory:
How can you expect a man of ability to remain in a profession in which he could hardly hope to make a respectable living for himself and his family? Could you engage a first-class lawyer, a first-class physician for the amount paid to teachers? The profession must be elevated by increasing the compensation for teachers (29, p. 172).

Getting back to the subject ("A Few Queries Concerning Some of the Details of Normal School Work") S. H. White of Illinois concluded that "if children are to suffer from the frequent change of teachers which does certainly occur, then by all means let us attempt to make this change as little detrimental as may be by making the teachers as competent as possible" (29, p. 172).

Competence of teachers, however, was not to be exhibited by their assuming more than their share of classroom activity. Speaking on the frequent topic "Oral Instruction," Larkin Dunton underscored in a General Session address of 1882 that teachers should not do the thinking for their pupils. Furthermore, he concluded, "If I must take my choice between all talk and all text-book, give me the text-book, and I will trust to future experience to make it comprehensible" (32, p. 76).

Enlarging the idea of the active pupil, Professor John W. Glenn of Jefferson, Georgia, addressing the NEA Department of Higher Instruction in 1882, spoke to the question "Man the Machine, or Man the Inventor; Which?"

Again, the world is now in a great hurry, seeking short and easy methods to success. . . .
It is so much easier to educate a man down to automatism than to raise him to the lofty platform of philosophy and invention. It will be a sad day for humanity, but a glad day for the boys and girls, when we commence the process of making machines rather than thinkers.

Every teacher knows how difficult it is to compel his pupils to the mastery of principles and rules; while the child will voluntarily repeat the formulae of parsing as he would an old song, and "work sums," as he calls it, day after day.

Such a system of education would degrade the profession of a teacher to that of master mechanic; for he would no longer build immortal spirit and unmeasured mind, but waste his energies in making machines which any trained specialist might do as well.

We would not have the world return to the old Platonian philosophy, which divorced science from labor and regarded knowledge as degraded when applied to the useful arts; but we would hesitate long before accepting the theory that human power is to be estimated only by the number of dollars and cents which it may produce.

The civilization is noblest which carries man farthest from instinct and his animal nature; that education is best which gives the broadest reach to the mental vision, and arouses most perfectly the activities of intelligent will and links us most closely to the spiritual nature from which we emanated.

Continuing the challenge to teachers and their pupils, John W. Dickinson, speaking to an audience at the 1884 NEA Convention in Madison, Wisconsin, emphasized that the teacher of the "Synthetic method" who solved problems and discovered truth for his pupils presented "no occasions for the cultivation of active power, nor the acquisition of that method of study which gives to them the ability to help themselves" (33, p. 187). Later in the 1884 Convention program, particularly in the Normal Department, a knowledge
of psychology was again advocated as a complement to correct teaching methods (33, p. 237).

While an understanding of human nature and an appreciation for the needs of the child were increasingly advocated for teachers, the American child of the last decades of the nineteenth century and the early decades of the twentieth century was subjected to a "melting pot" education. The Normal School sought to educate teachers according to normal standards, and although the general opinion that a child could be taught best by members of his own culture prevailed, (34, p. 227), the English language was considered necessary for the Americanization of all pupils (34, p. 226). Differences in opportunities for teachers or learners occasioned national concern for which the NEA sought to be the leading voice, and progress in equalization became a praiseworthy note at Convention gatherings. In 1886, a spokesman for educational achievements within his culture, W. H. Bartholomew, of Kentucky, shared his pleasure with NEA colleagues:

The Negro, in the beginning, thought all he had to do was to sit passively by and receive, without any activity on his part, that which had been so lavishly prepared for him. He had to be taught that he was under a responsibility; that there was something for him to do; . . . (34, p. 231).

In NEA discussions of teacher training, the reading of professional literature, the establishment of libraries, and attendance at teaching institutes and other educational meetings shared prominence with discussions relating to
normal training. Particularly, community-wide teachers' institutes, often held on Saturdays or in the summers, provided an exchange of ideas among teachers and advanced the cause of education among citizens of the community, who also frequently shared in the activities. "The interchange of opinions among those engaged in any calling is always recognized as of great value," said Superintendent D. C. Tillotson at the Topeka Convention in 1886 (34, p. 347).

Also in 1886, NEA Art Department President W. S. Goodnough underscored the need for teachers' institutes with an additional comment to the effect that instructors at such brief meetings should not attempt too much, nor talk too much. "Anything the class is able to do will be remembered. That which they are only told about they may forget," Goodnough concluded (34, p. 431).

While a lessening of discussion and a decrease in the number of addresses devoted to a specific aspect of education might indicate the end of a lost cause, more often in the NEA it probably meant that acceptance and implementation of a needed reform had been achieved. That it often seemed a long road from the first to the last word was understood by D. L. Kiehle in his discussion of "The True Place of a Normal School in the Educational System," a paper presented to the 1882 session of the Normal Department.

The true place of an institution, as of an individual, is found, theoretically by discussion; but practically it is found by asserting itself
in its ability to take and to hold the position it claims, "possession being nine points of the law."

Discussion is then, both profitable and natural at the time of or preceding the practical demonstration of the power of the institution to settle questions not at the outset anticipated. It would not, however, be to the credit of the responsible advocates of normal schools, not to the advantage of the schools themselves, that this question of the true place should too long be a matter of controversy; for if the representatives of education do not yet agree upon the place the normal school should fill, it will not be a surprise if the people, who know more of their cost than their profit, should be in doubt whether, indeed, there is any legitimate place for them (32, p. 175).

Normal School advocates championed a flourishing cause, and as city, county, and state Normal Schools increased in number, some of their proponents resisted the sharing of the teacher training role with other institutions. Assuming the role of peacemaker, Joseph Baldwin, one of the early authors of psychology textbooks, had stated in the early controversy surrounding professional versus academic courses of study that the country's need for efficient teachers had given rise to Normal Schools; therefore, the courses of study that would produce such teachers should make up the Normal School curriculum (36, p. 476). Later, Baldwin asserted that chairs of pedagogy should be established in colleges and universities, since some prospective teachers did not attend Normal Schools (37, p. 569). These chairs became a bridge toward the proliferation of teacher training, and teacher training became a cycle in the development of higher education. Normal Schools became state teachers colleges; state
teachers colleges became state colleges and, finally, state universities. Thus, from various approaches, courses of study for the preparation of teachers found a place and brought completeness to higher education, and the NEA and its departments served as a forum for the expression of ideas through the many stages of controversy from which new structures evolved.

Although it is difficult to determine the effectiveness of the various endeavors of the NEA and its departments, scattered references trace the success of a cause to NEA's support. In 1906, J. L. Meriam credited developments in the study of psychology "to the pressure brought to bear by the Normal School Department of the National Educational Association." Meriam cited NEA speakers spanning the decade 1863-1874 that had emphasized "the value of psychology in the preparation of teachers": 1863--Dr. Sheldon of Oswego Normal School; 1864--President Hill of Harvard; 1865--President Edwards of Illinois Normal University; 1866--W. F. Phelps of Winona Normal School (Wisconsin); 1871--J. W. Dickinson, principal of Westfield Normal School (Massachusetts); 1874--L. Dunton of Bridgewater Normal School (Massachusetts) and John Ogden of Ohio (3). Finally, Meriam credited the work of three NEA committees--the Chicago Committee of 1885-89, the Denver Committee of 1895-99, and a sub-committee of the 1893-95 Committee of Fifteen--with the
establishment of psychology as a fundamental and important study for teachers (3, pp. 35-36).

Although the NEA originated and continued as a field-service organization taking its programs to members on regional, state, and local levels, the employment of a full-time secretary provided a more stable address for the Association. Irwin Shepard, the first secretary, set up headquarters at his home in Winona, Minnesota, for the term of his service, 1898-1912. From 1912 to 1917, Ann Arbor, Michigan, the home of Secretary Durand W. Springer, was NEA Headquarters. Finally, in 1917, Secretary J. W. Crabtree established permanent headquarters for NEA in Washington, D. C., acquiring the address, 1201 Sixteenth Street, in 1919, and thereby facilitating the coordination of Association and Department activities.

Speaking of problems and possibilities of improved services provided by a permanent headquarters staff, Executive Secretary J. W. Crabtree made the following recommendations concerning Departments-Association relations in his 1922 report:

The relation of the departments to the Association has not been fully determined. The amendments to the By-Laws, which were adopted at the Des Moines meeting, giving broader powers and responsibilities to the departments are considered adequate, but the departments have not yet worked out satisfactory plans and regulations under the new code.

Members of staff as department secretaries--It is believed that few, if any of the departments
will be able permanently to support a full-time secretary and also do enough research work to satisfy its members. The Department of Superintendence is perhaps the only one which could hope to do so at the present time. A feasible plan would be for a member of the Headquarters Staff to serve as secretary or assistant secretary of each department. Inasmuch as the work of no one department will require all the time of a secretary, the same person might easily serve as the secretary of two departments and also do much other work for the Association.

A department might similarly have its regular officers—president, vice-president, executive committee and secretary—and have in addition a member of the Headquarters' Staff assigned to it to serve as assistant secretary. The assistant secretary would do the work which should be done at the Central Office. One member of the Headquarters' Staff might be made the secretary or assistant secretary of the department even though acting in the same capacity for other departments.

By having all this work brought together and done by the general office force, thus avoiding the wide duplication of work caused by departments working separately, there would be a saving of at least $50,000 a year. This saving could be used to advantage for important investigational and research work and for special attractions for meetings. An outstanding advantage of having this work in the Central Office, besides the saving in funds, would be the contact of the departments with the work of the Association as a whole.

I, therefore, recommend that the Executive Committee and Representative Assembly authorize the Secretary to provide the necessary secretarial help at the Central Office for each department desiring such help, and to do so at the expense of the general Association. I make the recommendation in the interest of economy and efficiency in the departments. I make it because the department needs its own fees for special research work and because I believe the expense of this phase of work belongs properly to the general Association (4, pp. 99-100).

While the Department of Superintendence was cited by Crabtree for its capability for independent service in 1922,
the three other original departments of the NEA, dating from 1870, had divided their forces to the extent that they were not visible in their original structural forms in the 1920's. In 1924, the Elementary Department merged with the Department of Classroom Teachers; the Department of Normal Schools was in the process of joining with the American Association of Teachers Colleges to become the Department of Teachers Colleges of the NEA; and the Higher Education Department, having noted that its field was "adequately covered by other National organizations," (5, p. 565), was discontinued as a department of the NEA from 1924 to 1942.

A Department's Search for Functional Structure

As early as 1892, "Minutes" of the Department of Higher Education began: "None of the officers being present, the meeting was called to order by Dr. Nicholas Murray Butler, of Columbia College" (39, p. 377). Later, Dr. Butler, presenting the "Report of Committee on Nominations" remarked:

In view of the fact that the Department has been permitted to run down during the last two or three years, it seems to be absolutely necessary that no person shall be elected to responsible office at the present time who will not agree, at the time of his acceptance, to be present at the next meeting of the Department, and labor earnestly for its success (39, p. 379).

In 1911, Department of Higher Education President James H. Baker, who had been chosen acting chairman when no officers were present in 1892 "deplored the poor attendance, and urged a consideration of what could be done to make the
department contribute most to the work it represents" (24, p. 659). Members suggested the appointment of a Committee on Policy of the Department of Higher Education (24, p. 660).

Letters were sent by the Higher Education Committee "to 135 active members of the National Education Association prominent in college or university administration" (25, p. 804). Some of their replies, reported in 1912, follow:

The attendance has been poor because the program was weak. The program has been weak because the attendance was slim. Reorganization, in respect to time and place, seems to me fundamental. The colleges should meet with the superintendents.

The National Education Association is made up of public-school teachers--grade teachers. The Association of American Universities; National Association of Universities; the American Association of Agricultural Colleges and Experiment Stations interest more college and university people. More interest might be had to meet with the superintendents.

The perfunctory reading of papers about any subject that happens along by anyone who happens to be willing to function will not produce very important results.

I have been prevented from attending the meetings for ten years on account of summer-school work. Too many departments divide the interest. Different institutions should be represented by delegates.

Make a live program. Hold meeting when there is least conflict, on first days of the National Education Association. Have colleges send delegates or representatives.

Give education or pedagogy a proper place and an adequate development in higher education. The disposition of the department is to settle problems rather than to discuss them.
Unite with the many formed societies for the study of college and university administration. There is not a permanent membership. The attendance changes almost completely each year. This destroys interest. To meet with the superintendents would be better.

A more suitable time for the meeting is in February with the superintendents. The gray matter of the brain works better then.

I find at the meetings little or nothing of value. The National Education Association is too large and unwieldy. It is not attractive to men who have real problems to solve and work to do.

There is need of a definite program dealing with college issues—a program running thru several years considering large and vital problems. Men tend to become fixated in methods and thought and do not care to change or to know the new. Hence not many are interested in the work of these meetings.

The general meetings of the National Education Association are decorative rather than informational. Change to superintendents' meeting.

The National Education Association does not arouse my enthusiasm. I am not interested in the squabbles they furnish and the unwholesome atmosphere for the right kind of work.

It is a bad time of year for college people. The crowds of the National Education Association are not conducive to comfort or pleasure. Other university societies and superintendents' meeting more attractive.

Change time to the meeting of superintendents. Put on program the professional training of high-school teachers.

Keep politics out. Put educators and not wire-pullers on the program.

Too many diverting interests. Association has grown too large (25, pp. 804-806).

At the 1922 meeting of the Department of Higher Education, "Advantages Involved in Extending the Scope of Faculty Participation" was the title of an address by Joseph A.
Professor Leighton, a philosophy professor at Ohio State University and Chairman of the Committee on Functions of Faculties in University Administration, views the involvement of faculties in a decision-making role as essential to their growth. Professor Leighton challenged his colleagues with the following remarks:

We all need, for our own soul's health, and for the health of the university, to think individually, and to debate collectively, on the philosophy of education. We all need to be challenged, and awakened frequently, to consider and reconsider educational policies in the light of principles. It is the duty of every university professor to think on these things. He will be stimulated to do so by having a more effective part in the determination and execution of educational policies.

We have been passing, in this country, from the traditional Yankee who could teach anything, to the narrow specialist who knows one thing and neither knows nor cares for anything else. It may be that I am prejudiced since, as a philosopher, my only specialty is the universe; but I feel strongly that much of our specialized teaching and research is being done on too narrow a basis—that a specialty begun in callow youth, built up on shallow and narrow foundations, and pursued without regard to its relations to the whole universe of knowledge, is pursued blindly and ineptly; and that it tends to turn its practitioners into mere mechanical fragments of men. As for the poor students upon whom your partisan and blind specialists operate, I can only say, God help them! I have come into contact with specialists who seem to be injuring the minds of their students and injuring the cause of higher education. Society has the good right to ask, as it is asking, what is the human good, the social value, the use to civilization of your specialists?

The third advantage of more faculty participation arises from the second. We are servants of society. Our special service is to be the agents in transmitting, to the generation that is to carry on the work of civilization, those social principles, scientific methods, spiritual insights and values, ideals of social conduct, by which
society is perpetually renewed and advanced, through the transmutation of the natural man into socialized, rational and spiritual personality. We can serve as transmitters of culture, only in so far as we become awakeners and quickeners of the living spirit—the intelligence, the feelings, and dynamic impulses of youth. Every method and content of liberalizing education is part of the process. Education is the continuous process of spiritual regeneration, of mental and moral new birth. We are engaged in our American democracy, in the high and hazardous adventure of educating every son and daughter of man, in order that they may become fit participants in the cooperative effort to carry on and improve civilization. In no other time or state has this immense enterprise been undertaken on so universal a scale as here and now (4, pp. 898-899).

There was the suggestion, in Leighton's remarks, that the tendency toward specialization and independence on the part of higher education faculty members made group associations not directly related to their academic specializations undesirable to them. In a sense, then Leighton explained some of the comments of his colleagues regarding their perceptions of the value of the NEA Department of Higher Education, which was subsequently discontinued. After the Department of Higher Education was discontinued in 1924, some of the topics that had been its province were considered in National Council discussion sessions, and in the Department of Teachers Colleges of the NEA. In 1926, the National Council heard six addresses related to higher education:

"Registrars Office in Schools for Training Teachers"—F. B. O'Rear, State Teachers College, Springfield, Missouri
"Criteria for the Construction of Teachers College Curricula"—E. S. Evenden, Teachers College, Columbia
"Extension Work in Teachers Colleges"—Charles McKenny, State Teachers College, Ypsilanti, Michigan

"Preliminary Report on Extension Activities in Colleges and Universities"—V. A. C. Hennon, University of Wisconsin, Madison

"The Training of Teachers in Service"—Thomas W. Butcher, Kansas State Teachers College, Emporia


The Teachers College Department also heard Evenden and McKenny after the address by their president, Robert H. Wright of Greenville, North Carolina, in that first year of the restructured department. The recently adopted standards for accrediting teachers' colleges, the preparation of teachers for teachers' colleges, desirable courses in education for the preparation of teachers, the content and method of subject-matter courses in teachers' colleges, and the problem of certification in relation to teacher training were other issues confronted in addresses and discussions within the American Association of Teachers Colleges in 1926 (6, pp. 840-947).

In the 1930's, indications of a greater desire to fill a gap that had developed between high schools and institutions of higher education emerged. J. B. Edmonson, Dean of the School of Education, University of Michigan, Ann Arbor, admitted to superintendents, in 1934:

"Until recently it has been very unusual for a discussion of plans for higher education to be included in the same program with papers on plans for elementary and secondary education."
The former separation reflected our dispositions to treat colleges and universities as institutions that have little in common with the public schools. We are now convinced that this view has been most unfortunate and that it has tended to create an unfortunate and costly gap between public education and higher education. It has tended to encourage the idea that the two were inherently different and were, at best, friendly enemies.

The recent unpleasant experiences in securing funds for education on all levels have convinced many leaders that we need a philosophy of American education that is all-embracing. Recent developments have pointed to the necessity of treating education on all levels as part of a unified whole, and to the importance of a well-planned program for the promotion of the general welfare of our social order thru education. It is therefore desirable that public-school representatives feel a real obligation to aid our institutions of higher education in finding their place in the general scheme of education and in planning for its fulfillment, and that the higher institutions should aid the public schools in a similar undertaking (8, p. 616).

Continuing this vein of thought, a committee on higher education was developed within the NEA in 1936 and was expanded in 1937 to fifty-one members representing each state in the Union (11, p. 857). In its first report, the new committee presented an open question concerning the revival of the old NEA Department of Higher Education, but they were convinced of the following:

Some great organization should be devoted to the operation of education as a whole. College faculties need to know more of the schools thru which their college freshmen come and the elementary-secondary schools should know more of the colleges to which their graduates go.

The NEA is the logical organization for united action. The Committee on Higher Education was given the task of devising ways and means to promote a closer liaison between the faculties of colleges and
universities and the NEA, believing that an interchange of counsels and closer cooperation would be mutually helpful.

Education is not free from the common fault of overorganization. The separating out of highly specialized groups generate centrifugal forces which disrupt, disintegrate, and weaken the centripetal forces which tend toward unity and power. Too many independent, special, exclusive class organizations will ultimately produce confusion, generate conflicting aims, and dissipate the power of education as a whole (10, p. 864).

The old Department of Higher Education was re-established by action of the NEA Representative Assembly in July, 1942 (12, p. 257). A decade later, a name change—to the Association of Higher Education—was effected because of the connotation of "department" relationship to the NEA among higher education constituents (13, p. 272). In the 1960's growing discontent from the higher education sector culminated in the AHE assuming the name American Association of Higher Education (AAHE) and withdrawing from close association with NEA (16, p. 375; 19, p. 520). Simultaneously, the NEA stepped up efforts to establish the National Higher Education Association (NHEA) to distinguish the NEA unit from the independent AAHE (15, p. 301; 18, p. 93).

Thus though higher education contributed outstanding individual leaders—among them, several NEA presidents—their contribution, as a group, to the parent association seemed less substantive than the parent association's solicitation of their interest and participation. To a greater degree than members of the other three original departments
of NEA, performance of members of the Department of Higher Instruction antedated the trend toward a national organization of teachers. That fact, with the addition of Leighton's characterization of his co-workers (1922) and Edmonson's description of the separateness of instruction levels (1930) seemed to explain the lack of a continuous felt need, on the part of higher education personnel, for an association like the National Education Association.

Council, Committee, and Commission Contributions

For the development and implementation of its priorities, the NEA and its various departments had many committees and other sub-structures. Dating from 1880, and serving more than half a century, the National Council for Education, for example, at first consisted of fifty-one members chosen cooperatively by NEA Departments, Board of Directors, and the Council itself "to consider educational questions of general interest and public importance." For the preparation of reports to be forwarded to the parent organization, which the Council almost surpassed in the business of creating committees, the National Council, in 1884, created its own sub-structure of twelve committees:

Committee on State School Systems
Committee on City School Systems
Committee on Higher Education
Committee on Secondary Education
Committee on Elementary Education
Committee on Normal Education
Committee on Technological Education
Committee on Pedagogics
Committee on Education of Girls
Committee on Hygiene in Education
Committee on Educational Literature
Committee on Educational Statistics (33, Part II, p. 8)

An amendment to the new Constitution in 1908 increased Council membership to 120; and finally, in 1940, with 178 members, the Council was recognized in the constitution as an entity of more than 120 but less than 200 members. Serving primarily as a discussion group, a purpose of the Council—to hold its membership to a number that could participate in discussions—prevailed; topics discussed either reflected or directed topics of interest to the larger NEA.

An early note of disenchantment with the Council appeared in 1912 when the constitution was changed to read: "The powers and duties of the Council may be changed or the Council abolished upon a two-thirds vote of the Association" (25, p. 50). However, the unique national discussion group survived to co-exist with the Representative Assembly form of governance for NEA General Sessions, which began in 1920: the NEA Research Division, established in 1922; and the Educational Policies Commission, formed in 1935. Finally, in 1946, the NEA Representative Assembly stipulated that the work for which the Council had been created was being performed by the Research Division and the Policies Commission and that the Council should be discontinued, which it was—by a final vote in 1947.
While councils and commissions working between and linking the NEA and its departments served as channels for discussion and reaction in setting Association policies and priorities, special committees of the departments and parent organization were largely responsible for the implementation of Association goals and programs. From the inception of NTA/NEA in 1857, committees provided information for discussion within the Association and its departments, researched and recorded the facts of lives of educational leaders (delivering these as memorial tributes), planned and evaluated educational exhibits, studied and assessed various innovations in education, and expressed the resolutions of the Association concerning these and other matters.

Beginning with the centennial exhibit of 1876, which received a low evaluation for its educational quality, efforts to present educational progress through this medium of display became a part of NEA conventions. The first exhibits representing the NEA and its departments, though none could "claim to be national in its extent" (35, p. 674), were sponsored annually by local/state committees of the convention city for that particular year. Products involving manual skills could be displayed convincingly and attractively; on the other hand, the educational product referred to variously as "character," "mind," and "quality of life" did not lend itself to measurement or display; therefore, exhibits, a continuing convention activity, were gradually
transferred to commercial companies such as publishers of textbooks and distributors of other instructional aids, who paid for the additional space required for them.

The NEA, however, continued to utilize space for the promotion of its own instructional aids. Concluding an informational report of various Association instructional services, Executive Secretary Carr cited for Representative Assembly delegates in 1960:

Other examples of NEA services for instructional improvement will be on display all week at Booth 235 in the convention exhibits.

Your evaluation of the practical values of this entire aspect of NEA services is most important. You can help direct this part of the NEA program this week during the numerous sectional and departmental discussion groups (14, p. 57).

Referring to the numerous and significant NEA committees, a summary note in the first *NEA Handbook, 1945*, stated that the Association depended on committees from its very first meeting but that the great era of committee contribution did not start until the appointment of the Committee of Ten on Secondary Education in 1892 (20). The idea for this committee originated in the National Council and expanded to include ninety additional persons in nine subcommittees of ten members each. With college personnel dominating the committee, the direction for the secondary curriculum shifted away from the trend toward practical courses such as manual training and commercial subjects, since they were considered to be of no disciplinary value. Moreover, although inconsistent with earlier and parallel developments in child study and
psychology, a general opinion prevailed that it would be wiser for high school students to have thorough in-depth studies of a few basic courses rather than to cut the time spent on some of them in order to make room for additional courses like art and music. Thus, although an incongruous observation at the beginning of the report had noted that secondary schools did not exist for the purpose of preparing youth for college, the college leaders held sway, their conclusions publicized through the wide distribution of the Committee of Ten report in 1893 (43, pp. 73-74).

The implementation of the philosophy that the high school was to be an independent entity, though a link in a chain of continuing education, provided work for several succeeding committees, some of which were already in existence at the time of the 1893 report. The Department of Superintendence, in 1893, initiated a study of elementary education by a Committee of Fifteen, a group closer to the operation of public schools, who proposed a "Correlation of Studies" (43, pp. 296-297).

Concerning the Committees of Ten and Fifteen, Charles DeGarmo, a frequent participant in NEA sessions, offered the following analysis:

That the rational articulation of studies is a pressing problem in American education cannot be doubted. It is a consummation everywhere demanded but nowhere achieved by the celebrated Report of the Committee of Ten on Secondary Education. Why there is no coordination in this Report it is not difficult to see. Nine independent bodies of
specialists meeting in different places and having no correspondence could not be expected to produce a course of study in which the various branches should be organically connected. . . . The problems arising from the attempt at rational articulation being so difficult, it would be a cause of astonishment, had these independent conferences been able by intuition to do at a stroke what can only be effected by much reflection and experiment. The central committee did not attempt to modify the reports of the specialists except to the extent of diminishing the time demanded, so that a workable program might be obtained. But though the final work of coordination remains a pious wish so far as the Report is concerned, it must not be inferred that the conferences have made no progress in this direction. . . . And it may easily be conceded that a rational unity of treatment for each branch is preferable to a crude, one-sided, or visionary concentration of all subjects. . . .

That the importance of coordination is seen also in the Department of Elementary Education may be inferred from the questions put to hundreds of leading superintendents and teachers by the Committee of Fifteen from the Department of Superintendence of the National Educational Association (2, pp. 15-16).

In 1895, the National Council appointed a Committee of Twelve on Rural Schools which, reporting in 1897, called for improvements in education to be achieved through the transportation of students to consolidated schools that could provide better facilities, offer broader programs, employ better teachers, and provide supervision toward the maintenance of those desired goals (43, p. 297). Later, in 1899, three principal committees formed within NEA were: Committee on College Entrance Requirements, Committee on Normal Schools, and Committee on Relations of Public Libraries to Public Schools. Examples of other major committees at the turn of the century were: in 1903, Committee on Contemporary Education
Doctrine; Committee on Salaries, Tenure of Office, and Pensions of Teachers; in 1904, Committee on National Bureau of Education; in 1905, Committee on Industrial Education in Rural Schools; in 1906, Committee on Instruction in the United States in Library Administration; in 1907, Committee of Seventeen on the Preparation of High School Teachers; and, for several years, various committees on Economy of Time.

Typical of appraisals that might have been given early twentieth century NEA committees was Historian Wesley's comment concerning the Committee of Seventeen, which emphasized for secondary teachers broad academic preparation, courses in the history of education, the principles of education, educational adolescent psychology, special methods in subject areas of preparation, and practice teaching with high school students. Wesley said,

Because of the reasonableness of the recommendations and the high status of the members of the committee, it set standards which in essence are still in effect fifty years after the report was given (43, p. 298).

The growing concern that secondary schools were too rigidly dominated by colleges was also expressed throughout NEA departments. In 1911, the NEA Department of Secondary Education Committee of Nine on the Articulation of High School and College voiced that concern in a call for an enriched program for secondary schools without college censure (24, pp. 564–565). In the same year, the Manual Training
Department's Committee on College Entrance Requirements reported progress toward college recognition and acceptance of the practical courses of their department as entrance subjects (24, p. 731). On a larger scale, in 1913, the Department of Secondary Education-recommended, NEA-appointed Commission on the Reorganization of Secondary Education, evolving from two decades of committee groundwork, took up the task of putting into practice an American high school curriculum to satisfy the needs of the growing school population. The work of this committee, continuing until 1921, was recorded in fifteen bulletins published by the U. S. Bureau of Education, among which were the 1916 Social Studies in American Education, calling for a twelfth grade Problems of Democracy course, and the 1918 Cardinal Principles of Secondary Education. Later, in the Depression of the 1930's, the Committee on Social-Economic Goals for America enlarged the Seven Cardinal Principles to eleven objectives; and the Educational Policies Commission, in a 1938 volume, The Purposes of Education in American Democracy, grouped similar objectives under four general headings: Self-Realization, Human Relationship, Economic Efficiency, and Civic Responsibility (43, p. 299).

World War I brought to light the illiteracy of many draftees and the inability of many immigrants to understand English. Education was advanced as the answer to the country's need for a better quality of life and a more intelligent
citizenry; but teachers were cited as too overworked and underpaid to measure up to their responsibility for bringing about the conditions necessary for the improvement of American society. The NEA appointed a Committee on Racial Well-Being in 1917, which served until 1925, but it was overshadowed by the more successful Commission on the Emergency in Education, which began its work in 1918 and was succeeded by the permanent Legislative Commission in 1920 (43, p. 300).

In 1933, the NEA and Department of Superintendence Joint Commission on the Emergency in Education, continuing in the vein of the 1918 Commission and cooperating with the Legislative Commission, took up the banner of education to see it through the Depression years (7, p. 182). In its concluding report, the Joint Commission prevailed on the NEA to establish the Educational Policies Commission which would prepare, publish, and disseminate statements of proposed policy regarding the conduct of education in the United States and the international relationships of American education (9, pp. 166-167).

The Educational Policies Commission conducted a re-examination of the role of education in a democracy, a study yielding a six-volume expanded statement of policy under the titles The Unique Function of Education in American Democracy (1937), The Purposes of Education in American Democracy (1938), Learning the Ways of Democracy (1940), Education for ALL American Youth (1944), Education for ALL American Children (1948), and Education of the Gifted (1950).
Serving the education profession for a generation spanning the Depression, World War II, the quiet 1950's, and the turbulent 1960's, the Educational Policies Commission answered other questions confronting national education in the United States with the following publications:

Moral and Spiritual Values in the Public Schools - 1951
School Athletics: Problems and Policies - 1954
Higher Education in a Decade of Decision - 1957
Mass Communication and Education - 1958
An Essay on Quality in Public Education - 1959
Contemporary Issues in Elementary Education - 1960
The Central Purpose of American Education - 1961
Education and the Disadvantaged American - 1962
Social Responsibility in a Free Society - 1963
Universal Opportunity for Education Beyond the High School - 1964
Educational Responsibilities of the Federal Government - 1964
The Public Interest in How Teachers Organize - 1964
The Unique Role of the Superintendent of Schools - 1965
American Education and the Search for Equal Opportunity - 1965
Universal Opportunity for Early Childhood Education - 1966
Education and the Spirit of Science - 1966 (15, pp. 390-391)

The last paragraph of the 1967 EPC Summary Report contained no hint that the Commission would present no future reports.

Current projects deal with the role of the teacher, the control of education, and the role of the arts in education. In addition, the Commission is seeking, through travel and correspondence, to promote world-wide interest in Education and the Spirit of Science, which it believes to have relevance in virtually all countries (16, p. 412).
Nevertheless, the Educational Policies Commission was terminated, by a decision of the NEA Executive Committee and the joint-sponsoring American Association of School Administrators (AASA) Executive Committee, effective June 30, 1968. The NEA Board of Directors, meeting that day in Dallas, Texas, at the Annual Convention, stated their approval of the Executive Committee action with the following additional clarifying and forward-looking resolutions:

That to develop long-range educational policies and programs in critical areas of educational concern, the Board endorse the use of Association task forces and ad hoc groups and explore the potentialities of organizing an annual educators' conference and project. Policies thus developed would be in harmony with the Association's overall policies and afford maximum latitude in marshalling the skills and resources of the profession.

That the Board clarify that the decision to formulate educational policies through the Association's structure in no way precludes dialogue with groups and individuals outside the Association influencing educational decision making.

That the Board clearly enunciate the responsibility of the NEA Representative Assembly to establish Association policies, a role which cannot be delegated to or shared with an agency independent of the Association (17, p. 327).

Serving as NEA sub-structures basically on one of three levels--(1) connecting links between the parent association and departments, (2) departmental level, or (3) sub-structure of the departmental level--councils, committees, and commissions performed the main functional role of the National Education Association and its departments. An aggregation of the studies and recommendations of such sub-structures,
at any given time, formed the image of the NEA. Instructional concerns of the NEA and its departments were either first expressed by committees, or they were channeled to committees for study and recommendations for action.

Early NEA records referred to a "committee of one" while membership of the larger councils and commissions later numbered into the hundreds. While the National Council was guarded from exerting undue influence, the Educational Policies Commission, dissolved at the height of its power, evoked a censure from the NEA Representative Assembly of any "group," "individual," or "agency" that threatened the Assembly's policy-making role.

Restructuring of the National Education Association

The departure of the EPC from the NEA organizational structure was but the beginning of a sweeping restructuring that also involved the relationship of the thirty-four departments to the parent organization. In the century that had passed after the beginnings of this decentralized approach to national educational issues, the departments, many of them requiring NEA membership of their officers only, had become increasingly distant from the general association. For the policy-making NEA Representative Assembly, July 4, 1968, was an important day for discussion and decision concerning a structure that had existed long enough to be taken for granted, although, in fact, it was simply unknown to many NEA members, who viewed the parent organization from
membership in a local and/or state organization (which usually likewise provided little acquaintance with national ties) or from the more recently organized Urban Education Association, a caucus within the NEA.

Spokesmen from these various vantage points presented the case for a proposed new structure to an emotionally drained, sparsely attended Independence Day audience in Dallas. (Delegates to conventions—educators being no exception to the rule—are not above taking a personal holiday; and a racial incident in this convention city, where an ethnically integrated national meeting of educators was a new event, had catapulted the NEA into a momentary headline news position.) That the homework for the presentation of the organizational restructuring case had exceeded the demands of the out-of-tune Representative Assembly became evident as the speakers proceeded to change their own proposed amendment to the NEA Bylaws. First, an individual state delegate explained:

In our original proposal, we, the signers, felt strongly that every professional person has the responsibility to identify with and support the programs of the total profession. We believe that educators who join only a department or departments of special interest are not carrying out their parts of responsibility to the related profession.

We contend that nonmembership in the NEA has allowed nonmembers to receive benefits from the NEA without the attendant responsibilities. We have been aware that there are non-NEA members and even opponents of NEA who hold membership in these affiliate departments.
We were aware when we made the original proposal that many departmental members would be strongly opposed to mandatory membership in the NEA. The conflicts that have arisen this year in seeking an alternative method have been welcomed.

Having observed this conflict and having kept abreast of the thinking of the task force, I am now a strong advocate of substituting the report of the task force for our original proposal. The task force report and this substitute amendment propose to change the present departmental setup so that we would have three different categories of relationships.

They would be named departments, national affiliates, and associated organizations. The ties between each of these categories and NEA are strongest for departments and weakest for associated organizations. Those departments which prefer to remain in the category of closest affiliation would require NEA memberships of all their members (17, p. 100).

Representing the Urban Education Association, another proponent of this structural change continued:

I would like to point out that under our present structure, most of the departments now housed at the NEA Headquarters receive rent-free office space; local telephone service; press, radio, and TV assistance; basic accounting, including all payroll operations; some legal counsel; and the use of many meeting rooms, the library and cafeteria, duplicating services, publication-sales, art and editorial work, and a few other services that are available to all NEA units and all departments on the same simple cost-recovery basis.

We who sought a change believe that this is a very costly expense for NEA not covered through membership in the departments. Under the proposal of the task force, this close affiliation will remain only with the departments. They will continue to have their principal offices at NEA and will enjoy office space and services on the same basis as they are enjoyed by the NEA units themselves.

National affiliates and associated organizations may negotiate the amount and cost of space and other services of NEA. National affiliates will be expected to continue their offices at NEA unless they are authorized to do otherwise by the NEA Board of Directors.
Mr. President, my primary concern in seeking a change in departmental relations is based on the very firm belief that teachers of subject matter are first of all teachers of children and should lend their support to the total educational effort. I believe that those departments which choose to remain in the full category of department will meet this qualification (17, p. 100).

Responding to the address of the Chair, NEA President Braulio Alonso pointed out that the sixteen following departments had indicated their wishes to be recorded officially as supporting the proposed change:

- Association of Supervision and Curriculum Development
- Department of Home Economics
- American Association of School Administrators
- American Industrial Arts Association
- National Art Education Association
- Department of Elementary School Principals
- Department of Elementary/Kindergarten/Nursery Education
- National Council for the Social Studies
- Department of Audiovisual Instruction
- Department of Rural Education
- National Association for Public School Adult Education
- American Association for Health, Physical Education, and Recreation
- National Council of Teachers of Mathematics
- American Driver and Traffic Safety Education Association
- Association of Classroom Teachers
- American Association for Higher Education (17, p. 101)

The President added that he also had the endorsement of at least fifteen other departments, after which a subject matter spokesman left little doubt that the proposed change had adequate support:

Mr. President, Donovan Johnson, Minnesota, speaking as a delegate for the National Council of Teachers of Mathematics, a department of the NEA. The Board of Directors of the National
Council voted unanimously to support the task force proposal. We are sure the great majority of our 80,000 members and subscribers join us in endorsement.

We have found that our association with the NEA has been mutually advantageous to NEA and to the National Council of Teachers of Mathematics. As a department of the NEA, we have participated in many joint projects with other departments in the NEA. In an area such as mathematics that tends to be disoriented, we need continued association with the NEA so that we will not lose sight of the general goals of education for the needs of all the children in our schools (17, p. 101).

The 1968 Representative Assembly action and the immediate resulting changes were referred to briefly in the 1969 report of NEA Executive Secretary Sam Lambert to the Representative Assembly convening in Philadelphia:

Now, in regard to horizontal relationships. The situation is not good, but I will say that it's improved considerably. You will recall that last year in Dallas we acted on a special task force report that offered NEA departments a little more freedom and flexibility in exchange for their carrying a fair share of the expenses of operating and maintaining the Headquarters Building and all the services that go with it.

I might report that two departments--American Educational Research Association and American Association of Colleges for Teacher Education--have departed the scene. . . .

The effect on total membership of NEA, in my opinion, will not be noticed.

Apparently, all the others are staying: 4 as full-fledged departments, 16 as national affiliates and 11 as associated organizations, with the latter two groups beginning to pay into the NEA treasury $250,000 per year as their share of operating the Headquarters Building. I think this has been an achievement.

Our big failure in this area of horizontal relationships has been our inability to create a mechanism, a design, a plan that gives real meaning to our common interests of improving education in this country. Some way or another we should be able to form a partnership with these units for
the purpose of attacking problems that are big enough for all of us. This job has not been accomplished and it remains a major challenge to the future (18, p. 20).

The 1969 NEA Addresses and Proceedings listed the following thirty-four departments:

American Association of Colleges for Teacher Education
American Association of Health, Physical Education, and Recreation
American Association for Higher Education
American Association of School Administrators
American Association of School Librarians
American Driver and Traffic Safety Education Association
American Industrial Arts Association
Association of Classroom Teachers
Association for Student Teaching
Association for Supervision and Curriculum Development
Council for Exceptional Children
Department of Audiovisual Instruction
Department of Elementary/Kindergarten/Nursery Education
Department of Elementary School Principals
Department of Foreign Languages
Department of Home Economics
Department of Rural Education
Department of School Nurses
Department of Vocational Education
Journalism Education Association
Music Educators National Conference
National Art Education Association
National Association of Educational Secretaries
National Association of Public School Adult Education
National Association of Secondary School Principals
National Association of Women Deans and Counselors
National Business Education Association
National Council of Administrative Women in Education
National Council for the Social Studies
National Council of Teachers of Mathematics
National Retired Teachers Association
National School Public Relations Association
National Science Teachers Association
Speech Association of America (18, pp. 5-6)

In contrast, suggesting a dramatic change in structure and underscoring the organizational turmoil with which NEA
faced the 1970's, the 1970 Addresses and Proceedings listed only four departments:

American Driver and Traffic Safety Education Association
Association of Classroom Teachers
Department of Rural Education
Department of School Nurses (19, p. 5)

Thus, if not in the exact sense that Zalmon Richards had predicted, the department structure, including such prestigious links between it and the parent association as the Educational Policies Commission, finally became "an elephant on our [NEA's] hands." The great national education movement, nevertheless, held on to the "elephant" until a stronger parallel structure of state associations requiring unified local, state, and national membership of individuals desirous of and qualified for professional membership was well on its way to reality. In 1970, Executive Secretary Lambert reported to the Representative Assembly meeting in San Francisco:

First to the field of membership and unification. One sure sign of NEA's health and vitality is the size of its membership. At the end of the 1969-70 membership year which was May 31, the official total of the NEA membership was 1,100,155. This was a gain of 85,000 over last year, and this is the largest total and the largest annual gain in the entire history of the National Education Association.

We not only picked up the loss of last year occasioned by the $5 increase in dues, but moved forward with a full head of steam.

Now, the real drama this year was in the states operating their first year under a unification agreement, and this, fellow delegates, was a real parade.

Affiliates now unified total 28 and a half or 28.6. Within three to five years the unification
movement will be complete, and we shall have 2 million to 2 1/2 million solid members at all three levels (19, pp. 18-20).

In 1974, in Chicago, NEA Executive Secretary Terry Herndon reported to the Annual Convention: "Four states have yet to unify" (21, p. 8). Before the 1975 Convention in Los Angeles, members in Tennessee, Arkansas, and Texas had voted to unify with the National Education Association; finally, unification of affiliates was declared complete by the NEA "when the Asociacion de Maestros de Puerto Rico (AMPR) voted in December 1975 to unify" (22, p. 8).

Regarding emphasis on instruction-related concerns, it may be noted that a state association tardy in the unification ranks was quick to acclaim the resourcefulness of NEA "for teachers who want to know more about what is available to help them do a better job in the classroom" (42). In a 1975 bulletin of the Texas State Teachers Association, the National Education Association is cited as follows:

NEA's Departments, National Affiliates, and Associated Organizations provide materials which deal with curricular and instructional improvement. Requests in a specific content area should be addressed to the appropriate organization at NEA ... American Association for Health, Physical Education, and Recreation American Association of Elementary-Kindergarten-Nursery Educators American Association of School Librarians American Driver and Traffic Safety Education Association American Industrial Arts Association Association for Educational Communications and Technology Association for Educational Data Systems Association of Teacher Educators Council for Exceptional Children
While the Texas Classroom Teachers Association (TCTA) maintained an active instructional services program (41, pp. 2-4) TSTA Bulletin #91375 offered evidence that unification with the National Education Association enhanced the resourcefulness of the instructional services division of the Texas State Teachers Association, and activity in that division subsequently increased proportionately.

With the achievement of this United Teaching Profession (UTP) structure, educators in the United States had reached, in one sense, a new level of maturity enabling them to see their efforts as a part of a local, state, and national involvement. In another sense, they had propelled national educational efforts full circle, discovering anew for themselves in the late twentieth century the vision of the mid-nineteenth century founders of NTA/NEA, who had sought a national scope to link, to multiply, and to improve their state education organizational successes. For the moment of intense organizational rebirth, the purpose, the driving
force, impelling such an organization to new life was as lost to the casual observer as the structural movement itself was lost to the reader of the ethnically disturbing headlines of the 1968 NEA Convention (17).

A few years earlier, in 1957, as NEA completed its first century, the Yearbook of the American Association of School Administrators, which focused on the Superintendent of Schools as instructional leader, also incidentally paid tribute to NEA organizational structure in general for its contribution to instructional improvement:

Observable in the processes of organization of the National Education Association, its departments and affiliates, are efforts toward centralization, decentralization and cooperation that might be expected to accompany an organization of such ambitious scope, the United States being a vast and diversified territory to encompass under one umbrella.

Organization is the act of putting into systematic relationship those elements and activities essential to achieving a purpose. Purpose, then precedes and is the reason for organization. In a practical sense, organization facilitates the achievement of a purpose. The common characteristics of organization--structure, form, agents, agencies, and activities--will vary, of course, according to the purpose to be achieved.

It follows that the educational process requires organizational structure and framework. Without them, the whole process becomes fruitless. Therefore, a sound organization, well-planned and functional, is of prime importance in this process of instructional improvement. It may well spell the difference between success and failure of the entire venture.

Organization, then, is more than just framework. It becomes clothed with life and spirit. It becomes a living, moving force easily recognized by the staff as a vehicle for progress in instructional improvement.
The centralized approach focuses on the common problems and concerns of the whole. . . . It is based on the premise that what constitutes successful practices in one situation will necessarily prove successful elsewhere.

The decentralized approach focuses on specific problems. . . .

The centrally coordinated position implies that there is need for both general authority and individual responsibility (1, pp. 20, 163, 170, 171, 178).

The original "practical teacher" organizers of NTA/NEA, in 1857, sought a functional, centralized organization, as defined by AASA in 1957. In 1870, with the beginning of departmentalization, the first official move toward decentralization of the growing organization was initiated. Ten years later, in 1880, the National Council began its service as a sub-coordinating agency with the general convention, fulfilling that role until the Research Department and Policies Commission were declared to be more functional. The vastness of the territory encompassed within the boundaries of the United States, as well as the infinite scope of a national educational organization serving that territory, required frequent returns to the original centralized role, which, regardless of the perception of organization purpose, seemed more appropriate for the organization often characterized as the largest professional organization in the world.

Summary

For the century from 1870 to 1970, the NEA provided a super-structure, an umbrella-like framework for an evolving,
flexible democratic experiment in the promotion and discussion of American education. Special interest groups, particularly curriculum/subject-area specialists, formed departments in search of the most functional organization to meet their needs. Sub-structures—councils, committees, and commissions—served as connecting links between the departments and the parent organization, and individuals moved freely within the structure, crossing lines that divided the various sections. Along the way, demonstrations, exhibits, and technological aids enhanced individual and group presentations that served as learning experiences for Association members, and different sections of the country provided educational experiences for convention delegates. The securing of a paid secretary and the move to permanent headquarters increased the efficiency of the Association, and the additional staff acquired in the years following World War I led to the gradual expansion of services.

At NEA conventions, in general sessions and department meetings, emphasis was placed on the preparation of teachers. First, in Normal Schools, seeking a normal standard, and in such gatherings as teacher institutes, remedial academic work and methods for teaching basic subject matter to children comprised the curriculum for aspiring teachers. Later, teachers' colleges and departments of education in universities, with accompanying model schools for practice teaching, gradually enlarged the curricula of teacher education.
to include studies in psychology, philosophy, history, and methods—in addition to subject matter. Citizenship education with emphasis on education for democracy was acquiring a world-view, and the perception of wholes—"the whole child," the total curriculum, and the national organization—continued to be a challenge. The NEA, providing a forum for discussion and decision making and the machinery for educational research and publication, was either pushing toward or on top of these various developments in education.

The departments of NEA shifted from subject-matter emphasis to service-oriented activities with some departments finding more satisfying roles than others within the NEA structure. Both the parent association and the departments functioned primarily through the council-committee-commission sub-structure comprised of Association members. Finally, when the departmental structure was perceived to be a framework only, having over-stayed its usefulness to the national education movement, the staves of the umbrella-like framework were strengthened by state education association membership. The "practical teacher" constituency that had originated the national education movement remained basically unchanged throughout many organization structural changes, but the commitment to the centralized function of the NEA was reinforced by the realignment of forces and the stipulation of required membership in the parent organization. Since the regrouping underscored that responsibility should
accompany benefits, some educators viewed the revised structure of NEA as more binding. Others assumed required membership to be the price of organization—the surrendering of some individual freedom to gain the benefits of belonging to a group. Moreover, a major benefit of belonging to the National Education Association was still purported to result in the improvement of instruction to the end that American democracy would be the creation of an educated citizenry at the same time that individuals therein would realize their greatest potentialities.
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CHAPTER IV

FORUM FOR EXPANDING CONCEPTIONS OF TEACHING

Introduction

To be practical and to become professional and, in that process, to provide the best education for a distinctive American society were the main objectives of NTA/NEA organizers in 1857. Other organizations in existence at the time were thought to be too lofty and idealistic in purpose or too provincial in outreach or too passive in conduct to meet the rigorous demands of building a profession of American education to serve the diverse population of such a vast territory. Although their practical goals likewise exceeded the grasp of those early educational statesmen, the NEA kept the goals, which were carried forward by the unique interpretation, dedication, and determination of each succeeding generation of educators. Multiple organizations continued, but NTA survived the strife of the Civil War years with a commitment to grow through a more widely structured organization which attracted parallel organizations to the common aspects permeating education at all levels. Greater growth, in the 1880's, was the result of spectacular efforts to open the organization more convincingly to all ethnic groups and to women and to establish a sound financial base.
With the acceleration of organization activities, interest centered on efforts to provide kindergarten-through-university teachers and curricula adequate to the needs of the "whole child" on each of these levels. Seeking scientific methods of organizing, presenting, supervising, and evaluating "courses of study" along the lines of the German Herbartian philosophy, American educators gradually accepted the John Dewey interpretation and elaboration of that philosophy, which spotlighted the child, rather than the teacher or the subject matter, as the pivot for the correlation of life-interest studies. Though these milestones were not without acclaim, the involvement of more people and the acquisition of new ideas with the accompanying increased publicity for NEA often led to criticism of innovative programs, causing a threat to funds required for testing their practicality.

Organization Strife

General unrest in the early twentieth century resulted in a scurrying about of administrator and teacher groups in search of a more satisfying organizational structure both within and outside the NEA. Administrators of Normal Schools formed a separate organization in 1902; Classroom Teachers organized a department within the NEA in 1913; and the rivaling American Federation of Teachers was established in 1916. The constant reminders of the professional organization's difference from the union organization kept the Department of
Classroom Teachers, later the Association of Classroom Teachers, of the NEA from the extreme militancy characteristic of the AFT. Simultaneously, however, the same attitude of suspicion toward administrators that kept the AFT a pure organization of "teachers only" pervaded the ranks of NEA, injecting an unfriendly divisiveness that stayed around to become a family quarrel renewed in each succeeding generation of the education family. A part of the larger question concerning the type of organization that could best serve the interests of American education, this controversy, having both positive and negative effects, served as a catalyst for change in NEA structure, philosophy, program, and membership from the dawn of the twentieth century.

In 1904 Margaret Haley, President of the National Federation of Teachers, Chicago, Illinois, quoted John Dewey as her main authority when she addressed the General Session of the NEA on the subject "Why Teachers should Organize."

The narrow conception of education . . . produces the unthinking, mechanical mind in teacher and pupil, and prevents the public school as an institution, and the public-school teachers as a body, from becoming conscious of their relation to society and its problems, and from meeting their responsibilities. . . . How shall the public school and the industrial workers, in their struggle to secure the rights of humanity thru a more just and equitable distribution of the products of their labor, meet their mutual responsibility to each other and to society? Whether the work of coordinating these two great education agencies, manual and mental labor, with each other and with the social organism, shall be accomplished through the affiliation of the organizations of brain and manual workers is a mere matter
of detail and method to be decided by the exigen-
cies in each case. The essential thing is that the
public-school teachers recognize the fact that their
struggle to maintain the efficiency of the schools
thru better conditions for themselves is a part of
the same great struggle which the manual workers . . .
have been making for humanity (39, p. 151).

That all persons did not accept connections between
labor goals and teacher roles was apparent in the response
to Miss Haley from Denver Superintendent of Schools Aaron
Gove (39, p. 152); and that the controversy was a continuing
subject for discussion in NEA meetings was apparent, in 1916,
when Chicago Board of Education President Jacob M. Loeb
addressed a meeting of the Department of School Adminis-
trators.

I have no quarrel with trades-unions, properly
conducted and in their proper place, but a trades-
union in the public school is intolerable. Teach-
ing is not a trade. It is a profession and one of
the noblest professions. In principle and in prac-
tice trades-unionism is inconsistent with, and un-
necessary to, a professional career. In the schools
it makes for a divided allegiance; it breeds suspi-
cion and discontent; it destroys harmony and creates
strife; it interferes with discipline and halts
efficiency.

. . . . . . . . . . . . . . . . . . . . . . . . . . . . . . . . . . . . .
By all means let us have a teacher's organization.
But let the leadership go to the best teachers, not
to the most astute politicians. Let the organiza-
tions discuss problems of education, not the prob-
lems of self (6, pp. 353-354).

Next on the program of the Administrators' Department
after Mr. Loeb was Dr. Ella Flagg Young, former teacher in
Dewey's Laboratory School and former Superintendent of
Chicago Schools, who, in 1910-1911, had served as the first
woman president of the NEA. Dr. Young upheld the Chicago
teachers, whom she understood to be the target of references in Loeb's address.

As a district superintendent I saw the beginnings of the Chicago Teachers' Federation, and I felt very uneasy; ... I was not large enough in the beginning to see, I had not the insight to see, that these women were realizing that they had not the freedom, the power, which people should have who are to train the minds of the children. ... They found that in order to get anything done they must have voting power behind them. And they found that the people, the men, in their own station and rank in life, the college-bred men, were not ready to do anything for them; therefore they were compelled to go in with those who had felt the oppression and the grind of the power of riches. That is why they went into the Federation of Labor (6, pp. 357-358).

The conditions in American life that were reflected in American education and the various organizations of education were described by Robert C. Moore, Secretary of the Illinois State Teachers' Association, in an address before the Department of Classroom Teachers at the NEA Convention in 1922.

The present era is one of organizations and organized effort by classes and groups with common interests; for instance, Big Business with its gigantic trusts and corporations, labor unions, religious denominations, professional associations, and a complicated multiplicity of lodges, leagues, federations, etc.

This is a step forward in socialization, but it is still "group individualism," or organized effort to promote the interests and ideas of certain classes and groups, sometimes at the expense of other classes or groups.

But these group associations and organized activities suggest the idea and inspire the hope that some day we shall discover the great common interests in all humanity, and that all the human race will cooperate harmoniously to promote these common interests (7, p. 789).
Indicating degrees of common interest, officers of the AFT and the NEA continued to exchange speakers for their respective annual conventions, and the two organizations established cooperative efforts on education bills before Congress. Differences in terminology for the same interests became a source of debate in the 1960's when the NEA chose the phrase "professional negotiation," showing at that time, an aversion to the union's "collective bargaining." Russell Ziemer referred to this semantic difference in his 1972 dissertation, "An Identification and Analysis of Curriculum-Components Negotiated by Selected Affiliates of the National Education Association and the American Federation of Teachers" (41).

AFT took pride in Ziemer's conclusion that a comparison of contract analyses and leadership data indicated that "greater emphasis is placed on the negotiation of curriculum-instruction components by AFT affiliates than by NEA affiliates." Although NEA declared the conclusions biased, an important element of the study for students of education in general and of AFT and NEA in particular was the recognition of so many areas of interest common to the professional association and the union (3).

In the early 1970's, the two national organizations for education entered into serious discussions related to merging their forces; however, the discussions were called off, the NEA leadership explaining the impasse:
NEA seeks to unite all educators into a single national organization provided that (a) there is no affiliation with the AFL-CIO and no obligation to the institutional positions and objectives of the AFL-CIO, (b) there is guaranteed minority group participation in the governance and operation of the new organization, and (c) a secret ballot is used to elect the governing documents of the new organization. NEA will not equivocate on this matter. Our position provides a vehicle for unity—all teachers in a single, independent national organization.

The NEA theme, "Helping Teachers Teach," points up the fact that, although NEA is an advocate organization that speaks, lobbies, and bargains for teachers, it is also a service organization. NEA will continue to promote the professional interests of teachers even as it seeks to advance their economic security and consolidate their political power.

Some would attempt to separate professionalism and militance, contending that NEA cannot be both an advocate organization and a professional society. Professional classroom teachers must convince the public that it is very right and very professional for them to stand up for what is best for education and for students.

We must work together to improve teaching conditions so that we do effectively what we are prepared to do--teach (29, pp. 6-7).

NEA's Teacher Image

There is abundant evidence that "teachers" and "teaching" were high on the NTA/NEA priority list from the beginning. Speaking of NEA resolutions, Historian Wesley commented by way of summary:

At the early meetings the topic which occasioned the greatest number of resolutions was the role of the Federal government in education.

Second in frequency to the area of Federal participation are those resolutions which dealt with the teacher--his training, standards of certification, and personal welfare. The NEA has shown a consistent
solicitude for the establishment and maintenance of normal schools, teachers' colleges, schools of education within universities, and other institutions that train teachers. Many resolutions called for more professional courses and stricter certification requirements. As the schools increased in size and the curriculum in complexity, the necessity of training in content and methods became more apparent. In many resolutions the NEA proclaimed minimum standards. In 1898, for example, a high school education plus one year of professional training was set as the desirable standard. As the years passed the standards rose, and the NEA was pronouncedly in favor of such progress.

The NEA was slow to develop a program of teacher welfare. . . . No really vigorous program of teacher welfare was inaugurated until after the First World War. Since that period the NEA has proclaimed repeatedly, and usually in the name of and for the sake of the pupils, in favor of higher salaries, tenure, retirement pensions, reasonable teaching loads, community status, and freedom for the teacher (40. pp. 367-369).

The idea of "helping teachers teach" was indeed ingrained into the operations of NTA/NEA from the outset. Although the American Normal Association organized formally in 1858, its initial meetings as early as 1855 pre-dated the NTA organization date of 1857. Moreover, Normal Association members were the first to conduct section meetings of their constituents at NTA Conventions; therefore, among the four original departments of NEA in 1870, the Normal Department possessed the oldest roots. Yielding to a name change that reflected the trend of the day, the Normal Department was absorbed in 1925 by the American Association of Teachers Colleges Department of NEA. In 1948, the American Association of Teachers Colleges (AATC) merged with two other groups, the National Association of Colleges and Departments of
Education and the National Association of Teacher Education Institutions in Metropolitan Districts, to become the American Association of Colleges for Teacher Education (AACTE).

Although NEA as a general association, through various committees, expressed concern about teacher preparation, certification, and professional standards, deficiencies in these areas, which became more apparent during World War II, resulted in the June, 1946, calling of the National Emergency Conference on Teacher Preparation and Supply. Approximately four hundred national professional and lay leaders, meeting at Chautauqua, New York, conducted studies of problems related to recruitment, guidance, selection, pre-service education, certification, placement, employment, induction, inservice education, personal satisfaction in teaching, working conditions, tenure, retirement, public recognition for teaching, professional standards for teaching preparation institutions, finances to maintain teacher supply, and research to upgrade the profession (22, p. 188).

As a result of a recommendation of the 1946 National Emergency Conference the National Commission on Teacher Education and Professional Standards (NCTEPS) was created as a commission of nine members with three-year terms for each member. The TEPS movement--through national, state, local, and regional conferences, activities, and publications--became a vital culminating channel for the recognition of teaching as a profession. In 1952, the TEPS Commission was
the prime mover in the establishment of the National Council for Accreditation of Teacher Education (NCATE), which developed, by 1975, to a nineteen-member council consisting of eight NEA members, eight AACTE members, and one member each from the Council of Chief State School Officers, the National School Boards Association, and the National Association of State Directors of Teacher Education and Certification (30, p. 24).

Facets of Instruction

At the same time that teacher education, certification, and professional standards were being spurred to new heights through the leadership and cooperative activities of the national TEPS movement, a parallel renewal and concentration of interest in the improvement of instruction surfaced in NEA leadership discussions. If the background ideology of the TEPS movement pre-dated NEA history and was present in the thinking of the original organizers of that Association, it was also accompanied, in those pre-dawn hours by its ally, "instruction." Although the American Institute of Instruction, organized in 1830, was attended by NTA leaders, who frequently referred to its achievements, it was considered too provincial and too passive for the purposes of the "practical teachers." A good share of lofty idealism was present in all of the organizations of the mid-nineteenth century, but from the observations of addresses, discussions, resolutions, demonstrations, exhibits, committees, and
departments that followed in the "practical teacher" organization, it could be deduced that "instruction" was second only to "teacher" in the thinking of the original NTA planners.

A major part of the discussion time of the first three decades of NTA/NEA history was devoted to reaching a satisfying definition of "instruction." In 1860, "oral instruction" was referred to as "a regular subject for discussion." "Object teaching" and the "use of text books" soon became a part of "instruction" discussions, and it was decided that "methods" of instruction or teaching might be classified as a "science of pedagogy." "Moral instruction" was never overlooked for long, but too much discussion of "method" finally led one reactor to say that "methods alone are evil" (31, p. 50). Methods, like manners, were thought to be as numerous as teachers, their subjects, and the situations involving them combined. A search for underlying "principles" involved in methods led to a study of the mind--"psychology"--and then to a study of "the whole child."

By 1897, when John Dewey was invited to address the NEA National Council on the subject, "The Aesthetic Elements in Education," he cautioned against extremes in philosophies of education.

Modern theory and practice in education have laid relatively too much stress upon the volitional training in practical control of intellectual training in the acquisition of information and too little upon the training of responsiveness. We need to return more to the Greek conception, which defined education as the attaching of
pleasure and pain to the right objects and ideals in the right way. This ideal overemphasized the emotional element, but we have gone to the opposite extreme (35, p. 330).

Moving from the National Council Session to the Kindergarten Department, Dewey, at that time from the University of Chicago, spoke of the perennial techniques of child-study as especially appropriate to the kindergarten, which emphasized play and the constructive, artistic, and aesthetic elements of education.

While the child-study movement in name is a recent affair, and while in many of its superficial features it deserved the name sometimes given it--that of a fad--in its underlying reality it represents the culmination of educational and social forces which have been at work for generations, and presents itself as a factor which must be permanently reckoned with. It is a part of the psychological movement. It represents the attempt to state experience in terms of individual instead of the class, and to adopt training in individual needs and powers of service.

To put psychology into kindergarten practice means to make it more vital and more personal (35, pp. 585-586).

To a Child-Study Department audience in 1897, Dewey further explained that Child-Study was not a new revolution that was to be pursued with complete abandonment of practices that had been producing results. Teachers needed the wisdom to distinguish scientific information from techniques that might be implemented in instructional practices without the complete separation from science that resulted in "quackery," Dewey pointed out to the practitioners who should have been the first to recognize that "mere general
theories and mere facts about children are no substitutes for insight into children" (35, pp. 867-868).

Presenting a "Plan for a Report on Elementary Education" to the Department of Superintendence, in 1898, Dewey, as Chairman of the Committee, which outlined the detailed plan, emphasized the need to base the work of the school upon the pupil's experience. Both ascertaining the knowledge and skills of the child on entering school and cooperating with parents and the child's total community were important factors in "utilizing the gains of previous studies in succeeding lessons" for the child's continuous growth. Finally, Dewey suggested, that a test of growth would be "evidence that strong individuality coupled with a practically and intelligently benevolent attitude" had developed to the end that "social tastes and tendencies of the community, or, at least, the younger members of the community" would improve (36, pp. 335-343).

In 1901, Dewey observed, in "The Situation as Regards the Course of Study," an address before the Department of Superintendence, that the American people had not granted acceptance to the innovative courses--drawing, music, nature study, and manual training--which were essential to the education of the whole person. The key to the resistance, Dewey suggested, might be found in attention to external matters.

The studies of the symbolic and formal sort represented the aims and material of education for
a sufficiently long time to call into existence a 
machinery of administration and of instruction 
thoroughly adapted to themselves. This machinery 
constituted the actual working scheme of administra-
and instruction. The conditions thus consti-
tuted persist long after the studies to which they 
are well adapted have lost their theoretical suprem-
acv. . .

It is easy to fall into the habit of regarding 
the mechanics of school organization and administra-
tion as something comparatively external and in-
different to educational purposes and ideals. We 
think of the grouping of children in classes, the 
arrangement of grades, the machinery by which the 
course of study is made out and laid down, the meth-
od by which it is carried into effect, the system 
of selecting teachers, and of assigning them to 
their work, . . . as . . . matters of mere practical 
convenience and expediency. We forget that it is 
precisely such things as these that really control 
the whole system, even on its distinctively educa-
tional side. . . . [T]he reality of education is 
found in the personal and face-to-face contact of 
teacher and child. The conditions that underlie 
and regulate this contact dominate the educational 
situation.

. . . . . . . . . . . . . . . . . . . . .

Unless the teacher has opportunity and occasion 
to study the educative process as a whole, not as 
divided into eight or twelve or sixteen parts, it is 
impossible to see how he can deal effectively with 
the problem of the complete development of the child. 
The restriction of outlook to one limited year of 
the child's growth will inevitably tend in one of 
two directions: . . . [T]he teacher's work becomes 
mechanical . . . or else local and transitive phases 
of the child's development are seized upon--phases 
which too often go by the name of the interests of 
the child--and these are exaggerated out of all due 
bounds. . . . [T]he cause of the difficulty lies in 
the isolation and restriction of the work of the 
teacher which practically forbids his considering 
the significance of art, music, and nature study in 
the light of continuity and completeness of growth.

. . . . . . . . . . . . . . . . . . . . .

We get exactly the same result when we consider the 
way in which the course of study is determined. 
The fact that this is fixed . . . by a power out-
side the teacher in the class-room who alone can 
make that course of study a living reality, is a 
fact too obvious to be concealed. . . . As long as
the teacher, who is after all the only real educator in the school system, has no definite and authoritative position in shaping the course of study, that is likely to remain an external thing to be externally applied to the child (37, pp. 337-341).

Dewey explained that the newer studies gave rise to departmental teaching because of the inadequacies of teacher preparation, and although he supported specialization in subject matter for the purposes of getting at the whole truth of a subject and presenting it to the child—he deplored the limitations of most departmental teaching he had observed.

We exchange an ignorant and superficial teaching for a vigorous but one-sided, because over-specialized, mode of instruction. The special teacher in manual training or what not, having no philosophy of education--having, that is, no view of the whole of which his own subject is a part--isolates that study and works it out wholly in terms of itself. . . . This may give technical facility, but it is not (save incidentally) education (37, p. 343).

Addressing the NEA National Council, in 1902, on "The School as Social Center," Dewey intimated some progress toward unity in social life from which the school might profit.

We are feeling everywhere the organic unity of the different modes of social life, and consequently demand that the school shall be related more widely, shall receive from more quarters, and shall give in more directions.

As I have already intimated, the older idea of the school was that its primary concern was with the inculcation of certain facts and truths from the intellectual point of view, and the acquisition of certain forms of skill . . . to prepare the pupil for citizenship. . . . To my mind the demand
for the school as a social center bears the same ratio to the situation that confronts us today, as the movement for civics bore to the conditions of half a generation ago. . . . We have lost a good deal of our faith in the efficiency of purely intellectual instruction (38, pp. 375-376).

Apparently missing some meetings of the years of increasing disunity within the National Education Association, in 1916 Dewey was back, discussing with members of the Department of Science Instruction "Method in Science-Teaching."

"Method" means a way to a result, a means to an end, a path to a goal. . . .

My point may perhaps be stated by saying that the right course lies between two erroneous courses. One method is the scrappy one of picking up isolated materials just because they happen to be familiar objects within the pupil's experience, and solely extending and deepening the range of the pupil's familiarity, and then passing on to something else. No amount of this process will make an introduction to science, to say nothing of science, for an introduction leads or draws into a subject, while the scrappy method never, save by accident, gets the pupil within range of the problems and explanatory methods of science. The other erroneous course is taken when the teacher's imagination is so limited that he cannot conceive of science existing except in the definitely segregated areas, concepts and terms which are found in books under the heads of "physics," "chemistry," etc., and who is thus restricted to moving within these boundaries. Such a person forgets that there is no material in existence which is physical or chemical or botanical, but that a certain ordinary subject-matter becomes physical or chemical or botanical when it is subjected to certain modes of inquiry. What is desired of the pupil is that, starting from the ordinary material of experience, he shall acquire command of the points of view, the ideas and methods, which make it physical or chemical or whatever.
I believe there are scores, if not hundreds, of boys, for example, who now go from courses of abstract physics into automobile factories and the like, who if they had begun with the automobile under a teacher who realized its scientific possibilities, might have gone into abstract physics.

I can sum up by saying that our present methods too largely put the cart before the horse; . . . (6, pp. 729-733).

In 1926, Professor of Education Guy M. Wilson, speaking on "Imrovement of Instruction" before the NEA Department of Classroom Teachers, reviewed progress in instruction:

At the present time, the better teachers are trying to make the child, his interests and problems, the real center of the school work. This means no neglect of subject matter, but it means that all subject-matter handled has meaning behind it, and that it is connected up with the child's experience and previous thinking in such a way that it has meaning at the time and the high probability of more permanent retention for later use (9, p. 407).

Mr. Wilson was with the Classroom Teacher Department for the purpose of presenting a scale for rating teachers that had been developed over a period of three years through his work with Classroom Teacher officers in their efforts to set up "objective standards" to help the individual teacher conduct a self-appraisal in line with the expectations of supervisors. Moreover, the scales were intended to provide authoritative judgments that would enable teacher and supervisor to meet on a higher level of objectivity in their search for "the best analysis of the teaching process" (9, pp. 408-409).

Addressing the Department of Superintendence of the NEA, Charles H. Judd of the University of Chicago School of
Education spoke in 1930 on "Achievements of American Education--Instruction."

The expansion in the curriculum and the changes in methods of teaching would never have come to pass if American schools had not been led to adopt an attitude of frank objective criticism of the results which they were securing.

Our American habit of open criticism of one another and of our public institutions has made this country the home of a unique creation, namely, the science of education. In Europe, schools are official. They cannot be reconstructed except with the consent of the ruling classes. . . .

In the last decade and a half of the nineteenth century, a number of leaders directed the attention of school people to the possibility of substituting scientifically established principles for the trial and error method which up to that time had been employed in directing school practices. . . . G. Stanley Hall, J. M. Rice, and above all, John Dewey started America on a career of scientific study of education. . . .

The new spirit of scientific inquiry and evaluation of results has reached and inspired many teachers even in the remotest and most isolated school districts in our land. We see that progress of instruction has not been alone in concrete additions to the curriculum and changes in methods as important as these are. The chief change in American schools is in the temper in which they organize their teaching. That temper is one of candid devotion to continual improvement. . . . The highest achievement of American schools in the field of instruction is in the adoption, then, of a program of scientific study which will lead to further improvements of the methods of administering contents of instruction (11, pp. 667-668).

Hall, Rice, and Dewey--the three educators credited by Judd with the scientific progress of American education--had been frequent NEA speakers. Dewey, who was named to serve as NEA Honorary President from 1932 (13, p. 843)
until his death in 1952 (25, p. 382), had, like Judd, paid tribute to the uniqueness of the position of American education. In his 1929 address, "General Principles of Educational Articulation," Dewey had said that "in our American system of diffused control, in the absence of any central directive body, our sole guarantee of constant improvement is the method of cooperative voluntary inquiry and mutual conference" (10, p. 683).

"The Improvement of College Teaching" was the 1931 project of the NEA Department of Educational Research with representatives from Columbia University, George Peabody College for Teachers, and the University of Chicago contributing to the subject. Dean M. E. Haggerty, College of Education, University of Minnesota, concluded:

The weighty consequences of faculty competence forbid us to surrender our efforts to clarify our minds about the qualifications of a college instructor. . . . We have yet to develop the adequate program for the education of teachers of education. We have enjoyed an encouraging advance in the technical equipment of our more recently trained men. It is easy to locate individuals who can discourse with a show of learning upon the standard deviation, cost accounting, the project method, or the factor. Far less frequently does one find the young man, the product of recent study, to whom such technics appear as they should, the useful tools of erudition and of a broadly cultivated mind (12, p. 429).

The superintendents, in 1931, were concerned with "diagnosis" and "treatment" of instructional problems and toward the "improvement of teachers inservice" (12, pp.
Further, they discussed the importance of democracy as a contributing factor to the growth of teachers' inservice, suggesting that it might be instituted in the selection of textbooks:

No topic connected with the schools has been the subject of a more heated discussion than the question of textbooks. Only a short time ago school books were examined in great detail to discover some evidence of propaganda that might be construed as pro-German, pro-British or pro-something else.

The one plan to which the least objection is, or can be, raised places the main responsibility for the selection of texts upon a group representing those who are to use the books in the classroom.

Competent teachers who are in close touch with the pupils into whose hands these new books will be placed should know better than anyone else what the class needs are, and for that reason should be consulted when a choice of texts is under consideration (12, p. 782).

Also, in 1931, the superintendents heard a clarification of the purposes of "progressive education" as this movement applied to the training of teachers. First, Charles Judd explained:

The orderly systematic curriculum is in full accord with nature's methods of achieving complete development of the individual. Mistakes which have been made in the past in organizing the curriculum supply no justification for rejecting the whole idea of an orderly system of instruction. Instead of abandoning the curriculum, all who are interested in teaching pupils or in training those who are to teach should devote their time and energy to the better formulation of the curriculum (12, p. 791).

Next, Jesse H. Newlon, Columbia University Professor of Education, charged schools of education with the
responsibility for a broader philosophy for training teachers.

The study of education must be based on a study of society. We cannot hope to fit youth for participation in the new world unless education be remade. Teachers who are unconcerned about the problems of contemporary life, who are not students of the basic problems, purposes, and principles of education, who themselves are not thinkers, cannot teach others to think (12, p. 792).

Finally, a student and colleague of John Dewey, William H. Kilpatrick of Columbia, summarized briefly his viewpoint of "progressive education."

"Progressive education" of the present stage is a conscious and determined effort to care for the "whole child" and to put the child above subject-matter and its learning. Traditional education and even many scientific measures care more for teaching the child subject-matter than they do for the child and his getting what he needs. Care for the whole child is the paramount duty of the school.

The teacher should understand the "what" and "why" of his work in order that he may seek intelligently to attain it. We tend too much to "train" teachers into some pre-arranged ways of thinking and doing, with the result that only the exceptional teacher can recover. "Train" is a hateful word when applied to humans. We train dogs to do our bidding, but we ought not to treat persons in this way.

Only the teacher who has richness and fineness of living can be expected to help children to grow into richness and fineness of living (12, p. 793).

By 1931, "the whole child" had been the cry for more than a generation. Addressing a session of the Department of Classroom Teachers, in 1932, Mildred Goldberg reviewed the beginning of "the child-centered school":

---

(References and specific page numbers are not included in this transcription.)
The matter of the child-centered school is a comparatively recent one. It originated in 1896 when John Dewey organized his laboratory school. In this school John Dewey would have the child say not "I know" but "I have experienced"; for the key word of the new education is experience. Perhaps the best description of the new school is expressed in the words "a child's world in a child's size environment." Its educational aim is the all-around growth of the child, but it also has two great goals. These are maximum growth in creative self-expression and tolerant understanding of self and society (13, p. 318).

Respect for the child had been given a boost, in 1915, when Maria Montessori, M. D., from Rome, Italy, addressed the NEA General Session and the Kindergarten, Elementary, and School Patrons Departments on "My System of Education," "Education in Relation to Imagination of the Little Child," "The Organization of Intellectual Work in School," and "The Mother and the Child," respectively.

Explaining her system of education that had been scientifically tested with children from three to ten years of age, Dr. Montessori told the General Session audience that it was "not a simple theory."

The fact on which it was possible to establish my system is the psychologic fact of the "attention" of the child, intensively chained to any exterior object or fact, which proves in the child a spontaneous, altho complex activity of its entire little personality.

Of the qualities of the objects one must be picked out which stimulates principally the highest activities of the intelligence; this is the quality that enables the child to verify mistakes. In order to create a process of auto-education, it is not sufficient that the stimulus arouses an activity, it must at the same time direct it;
the child must not only be occupied for a long
time on the exercise, but it must continue on
it without making mistakes.

In the second series of objects used to edu-
cate the eye to dimensions, the control of the
error is not mechanical but psychological. The
child himself, since his eye is already taught
to recognize differences of dimension, will see
the error if only the objects are of fixed dimen-
sions and highly colored. For this reason the
succeeding objects contain a control of error in
their very size and vivid colorings. A control
of error of quite a different sort and of a much
higher order is found in the material used for
the multiplication table where the control con-
sists in comparing the work itself with the an-
swer, a comparison which necessitates a marked
effort of the child's intellect and will and
which henceforth places him amid true conditions
of a conscious auto-education. The seeming dis-
traction is revealed in its real essence by the
happy expression of the children's serious faces
animated by the keenest joy. The child, to all
appearances, does nothing but only for a minute;
shortly, he will speak and will tell us what is
taking place within him and then an outburst of
activity will carry him on a round of continuous
explorations and discoveries (5, pp. 65-70).

To the Kindergarten Department, the Italian doctor
continued:

Education should not follow the path toward
credulity but rather that of intelligence. The
experience and maturity of the mind cause credul-
ity to disappear little by little, and instruc-
tion is a help in this. Be it in peoples or in
individuals, the evolution of civilization and
of the mind tends to lessen the state of credu-
ility. Wisdom, as is often said, dissipates the
error of ignorance. In this void, which is igno-
orance, fantasy easily wanders about, just be-
cause it lacks that support which permists of
attaining greater heights. Thus the Pillars of
Hercules disappeared when the Straits of Gibral-
tar became the passageway of the oceans.

In like order in which the body seeks the elements
which satisfy its hunger and then transforms them
in the inanimate workings of assimilation, so the child nourishes himself with truth, organizing within himself the constructions of the imagination which create the beautiful and the good. Thus we will help his intellect, which, tends to organize itself to go on, to experiment, to acquire knowledge until he can more easily and more perfectly accomplish the effort of intellectual growth. He is destined, therefore, not to represent our inferior humanity, but to surpass us (5, pp. 664-667).

Dr. Montessori emphasized, as she addressed the Elementary Department audience, that she had reference not to schools in general but to her own school in particular in the following remarks:

The children enter the classroom, each one chooses some work, selects some object, and works with it at his own pleasure without ever being interrupted by the teacher. There are practically no collective lessons, but instead short individual lessons, which is sufficient for the teacher to start the child in a long work which he can finish by himself. The work which each pupil does when it is not the direct command of the teacher is a free, spontaneous labor. The process thus developed is a process of intellectual auto-education—of auto-instruction (5, p. 717).

In her concluding remarks to school patrons, Dr. Montessori was both reprimanding and encouraging.

We deceive ourselves in thinking that we give all to the child when we give him air and food. Indeed, we do not give even this; food and air are not enough for man's body; all the physiological functions depend on the well-being, and that is the only key to the whole of life. So, also the child's body lives by the freedom of the soul.

A new hour is about to strike for the relations between mother and child. The modern mother who is prepared to care perfectly for the physical life, and who for such a mission has only yesterday opened her mind to new studies and new ideas and has accepted new responsibilities, is about to take a step forward. Like care, dictated by
science, will be demanded of her tomorrow for the intellectual hygiene of the child and for the health of his inner life.

No longer will medicine alone furnish her the necessary teachings, but also a renewed pedagogy based on the positive facts of science. The girls who yesterday, in order to be better mothers, took hospital training, will tomorrow go to children's schools to learn the art of protecting the new lives which are about to be entrusted to them by nature. Then the maternal mission will become complete and woman will turn her steps toward motherhood with open eyes and with the dignity of one who is no longer only a creator but also a protector of posterity, one who guards and saves the body and mind of the new humanity (5, pp. 1129-1130).

Before Dr. Montessori attended the sessions of the NEA Convention and department meetings in 1915, educators from the United States had observed her work in Italy and reported on it in 1912 NEA Convention meetings. A reference to loss of meaning in the effort to transfer an idea through reports had concluded "The Presentation of Montessori Material" by Carl Byoir, President of the House of Childhood, New York.

The teacher must be not only a well-trained teacher, but a well-trained observer. An analysis of the method from this point of view indicates how much misapprehension has been brought about by Dr. Montessori's use of the term "auto-educational." A large and imaginative American public is prepared for a system that requires no teaching, and expectantly awaits the phenomenon of a convenient room, supplied with blocks and sandpaper letters, incubating child prodigies, who, at the age of four, will come forth with a knowledge of many languages and complete understanding of higher mathematics. If there is any method which requires well-trained teachers, it is the physiological method of sense-training (4, p. 618).

A step beyond "no teaching" was a "limited teaching," characterized by Ella Flagg Young in a 1915 NEA General
Session address, "Industrial Training," which represented an effort to bring a concern from the industrial world to the "part of the American public" that Dr. Young felt should respond "sympathetically" and "effectually."

While granted that we have our definite work, we all believe that it must comprehend a larger and greater aim than that which is covered by performance of duties assigned us. "Teacher" is too inclusive a term for activity in prescribed lines. The aim of teaching is striving to form character. Then teachers must influence conditions so positively that those children whom they teach and whose characters they aim to help form shall not be trained for labor that blights the powers, labor utterly lacking the broadening influence of activity that develops and strengthens character. We as teachers should be constrained to come out from our narrow academic fields and see to it that the early education of those children and their vocational training shall not be a preparation for life which reduces the human being to the level of an automatic mechanism.

Is it true that some teachers spend years teaching the same little reach of learning, teaching reading, the beginnings, getting no farther than the symbols, never knowing to what their efforts lead? Is it true that often in high schools men and women teach subjects—pieces of a subject—algebra, for example, year after year and year after year, never taking pupils beyond the elementary operations, never knowing to what their instruction leads, and whether it leads to anything (5, p. 126)?

The complaint of the labor people that had been brought to Dr. Young's attention as she served in an advisory capacity to a committee of the Illinois State Federation of Labor was directed to over-specialization in education that resulted in the preparation of young people for "work carried on in limited areas of space and restricted to a few automatic movements" (5, p. 125).
Courses in industrial arts/manual training and business education--representing a long-standing drive of their proponents to forge a place in the American school curriculum on an equal basis with traditional subject teachers--had developed from the 1870's as "the new education." Industrial arts/manual training teachers had stated practical objectives for their various courses, had detailed plans for instruction, and had stated a philosophy of education that included a broad program of studies for all students. They were criticized by traditionalists for seeking to use the schools for such practical pursuits as learning how to make a living. To that "the new educators" replied that they desired for all youth the advantages of both a general and a special education. One spokesman wished for city youth an education that would impart to them the vigorous competitive spirit of country youth (32, p. 544). Finally, attempts were made to correlate industrial and business courses with art and other curriculum areas and to institute an emphasis on preparing teachers for vocational instruction (33, pp. 503-504).

Apparently, the division between education and labor that found expression in the debates of professional association and union leaders filtered down to the curriculum-instruction level of NEA sessions. Vocational education spokesmen, wearying of making the concessions, asserted themselves more positively and preeminently during the economic crisis of the early 1930's. Addressing a General Session
audience of the NEA, in 1932, Superintendent of Schools Willis A. Sutton, Atlanta, Georgia spoke forcefully:

The making of a living is absolutely necessary to the making of a life. Bread and meat must precede sonnets, pictures, or sculpture. Vocational education is therefore the primary need in the whole field of education...

The complexity of life in itself makes vocational education a necessity, but the mobility of population and the radical and swift changes in ways and means of living, the inventions and discoveries which were in their prime yesterday—obsolete today—bring on a need for a different type of vocational education and make it a necessity for schools to plan vocational courses in such a way that they will re-educate, retrain, and redirect the energies of people into new vocations and new channels (13, p. 176).

NEA Honorary President John Dewey, appearing before the Department of Supervisors and Directors of Instruction in 1933, declared:

The relation of education to social problems is not external and academic. It resides first of all in the community of interest of educators with all workers who are genuine producers of social necessities...

The second step which follows naturally upon realization of community of interest is, of course, an alliance in sympathy and in action...

As long as educators think of their work as something apart from that of other workers and of their interests as separate, this state of affairs is practically sure to persist...

A great deal is now said about the importance of social planning in order to secure the integration and coordination which our sick society so badly needs...

Teachers will not have even a modest share in building a new social order unless they have broken down personal remoteness and indifference as to the things they have in common with farmers, factory workers, the white collar class generally, and have ceased to think of their interests as being separate or exclusively linked with those of purely professional groups (14, pp. 687-688).
Beginning in 1933, the report of the Department of Vocational Education in NEA Addresses and Proceedings became shorter than in previous years, and though it continued as a department of the NEA, references to relationship with the American Vocational Association were more apparent (14, p. 798; p. 675; 25, p. 287). Finally, in 1970, a Representative Assembly move, at the NEA Convention meeting in San Francisco, to discontinue the Vocational Education-NEA relationship revived the century-old controversy concerning the step-child position of the vocational group.

[Eva Firra, New York, speaking as an individual and as a business educator and a vocational teacher.] It is appalling to find when you are talking about unity and at the same time when it is very important that all phases of education be recognized, that such an important division as vocational education should be considered as being dropped.

This, to me, begins to show why NEA needs some restructuring. I speak very strongly against this action. To me it speaks of parochialism. I feel this is contrary to what we have been saying is the goal of the National Education Association, as one which does have unity, which is recognizing all of the phases of education, in elementary, secondary, and the vocational or worker-oriented students, as well as the college-bound.

I speak very strongly against this action. I can see why perhaps it was kind of a dead duck because there wasn't enough grass-roots involvement. As a business educator, I would have been very happy to have seen some constructive action taken in vocational education. If we are going to have a united profession, let's not drop any part of this very important structure, but let's revitalize it (26, pp. 65-66).

Ms. Firra was followed at another microphone by a colleague from her state, who supported her sentiment, but nevertheless urged the disbandment of the NEA department.
[James Cullen from New York.] I appreciate what the last lady has said about this situation, but I have been familiar with it now for 25 years or so, and I realize that under the present leadership and under the present programs, there is little hope of getting this vitalized and effective.

There have, as you have said, Mr. President, been luncheon meetings at the conventions, but these do not give leadership to the local associations of the local school districts, and I think as a recommendation that I would suggest that the staff and the Board of Directors look into the possibility of developing a program of vocational education that is going to be a real challenge to the young people of America.

As it is now, we do not have the challenge and we have not had a challenge in this field over a period of at least 20 years, as you remarked. I am in favor of this proposal that has been announced here to disband this Department. And I hope that we will put new leadership into the field of vocational education, because this is all to the advancement of the young people in our schools (26, p. 66).

The result of the 1970 discussion regarding vocational education issues was that the recommendation to discontinue that NEA department was tabled, and the delegates' plea for revitalization of concern for that segment of education prevailed (25, pp. 314-315). Later, in September, 1970, NEA Executive Committee Member Wilson remarked that "the fact that an organization with no members and no dues structure could muster enough backing to get the item tabled should indicate the force of the potential membership" (27, p. 544). A year later, recommendations from the NEA Task Force on Vocational Education were presented by Executive Secretary Sam Lambert to the NEA Executive Committee and Board of Directors as a "plan for implementation."
1. A staff position at an appropriate level be authorized in the Division of Instruction and Professional Development. Recruitment for the position should begin immediately, with employment at such time as the reorganization of DIPD takes place—now scheduled no later than February 1, 1972.

2. The staff member so employed become a part of the new staff organization responsible for implementing all NEA programs in the field of instruction and professional development.

3. An invitation be extended to the American Vocational Association to name a committee of three to meet with a similar committee from NEA to explore—
   a. Promising areas for cooperation and joint action by the two organizations, and
   b. The organization of an appropriate structural mechanism to coordinate the efforts of NEA and AVA for the achievement of common goals and objectives for vocational education.

4. The appointment of an advisory committee on vocational education be delayed until further consideration can be given to the nature and function of such a committee by a joint committee of NEA and AVA and the recommended reorganization of DIPD now being carried out by James Becker (28, pp. 383; 499).

The 1971 placing of vocational education issues in the Division of Instruction and Professional Development was an indication that one year of reconsideration had moved vocational education from a position of no priority to a position of highest priority in NEA programming. Executive Secretary Lambert had said to delegates of the 1971 Representative Assembly, concerning NEA internal reorganization:

The major internal reorganization this year will encompass the area of professional development and instruction. This is the big sweep for the current year. I have recommended and the Executive Committee has approved a plan calling for the consolidation of the separate staffs of
the Division of Adult Education, the Division of Educational Technology, the Center for the Study of Instruction, and the Commission on Teacher Education and Professional Standards. The purpose of this reorganization, fellow delegates, is to build a capability for instruction comparable to that of our present Field Services program. This new unit will be called the Division of Instruction and Professional Development, and it will be headed by an assistant executive secretary. Its staff will total 40 full-time persons, plus an undetermined number of part-time personnel and consultants. And this is just a beginning in this important field.

The mission of this new unit will be to provide instructional services to state and local education associations, to monitor and evaluate for all of us all the new developments in education, to lend leadership and assistance in negotiating for instructional improvement, to force the upgrading of teacher education programs, and finally and perhaps most important, to provide the leadership the teaching profession so badly needs to get control of its own destiny. And what I am talking about is the control of licensing, the control of admission to the profession, the control of standards of practice and standards of elimination of malpractice. (Applause) This new unit will give us what we need to move ahead in the control of things the profession should control (27, pp. 17-18).

Toward A Clearer Focus on Instruction

NEA Convention audiences had heard phrases like Mr. Lambert's 1971 remarks since the first organization meeting in 1857. Both subject-matter and service-centered departments had been committed in different degrees to the implementation of professional standards and the improvement of instruction from the beginning of NEA departmental structure in 1870. Discussions in the early decades of Association history had focused on defining instruction and determining curriculum.
As the profession approached the twentieth century, **improving instruction** and **changing the curriculum** had become the focus of discussion and activity. In 1893, when NEA combined its annual convention with the International Congress of Education, meeting that year in Chicago, **improvement of instruction** was beginning to be the dominant phraseology in "instruction" discussions. Among "theses" listed in the preliminary program for consideration by the International Congress of Education were:

\[\text{Thesis: Ought a distinction to be maintained between collegiate and university methods of instruction? Discussion.}\]

\[\text{Thesis: Improvement in methods of teaching geography in the public schools. Discussion.}\]

\[\text{Thesis: Is it possible to separate religious and moral instruction? Should religious instruction be introduced into the public or common schools, and taught either by the regular teacher or by clergymen? Should the Bible be read as a religious exercise? In how far can the discipline of the school be relied upon to secure moral habits? Discussion.}\]

\[\text{Thesis: (1) The organic union of kindergarten and primary school. (2) What modifications in the primary school are necessary or desirable in order to adapt it to continue the work of the kindergarten and reap the advantages of the training already received? (3) What are the essential differences in discipline and instruction that should characterize the primary school and distinguish it from the kindergarten? Discussion.}\]

\[\text{Thesis: Teachers' examinations, certificates, and licenses. What scholastic knowledge should be required from teachers before being permitted to enter on a term of probationary service--In English? In languages other than English? In natural science? In physics and chemistry? In mathematics? In art? Discussion.}\]
Thesis: How to improve the work of poor teachers. Discussion.

Thesis: How to interest a corps of teachers in the study of psychology and its application to the work of the schoolroom. Discussion.

Thesis: (1) Should such requirements be confined to scholastic instruction? What should be required in the way of teaching ability, experience, and skill? (2) Should original investigation be required in some branch of child study? (3) Or in some phase of the history of education? (4) Or in some branch of experimental psychology with a view to determine questions in regard to the educational value of some branch or branches in the curriculum of elementary or secondary schools? Discussion.

Thesis: What value should be attached to the formal study of children in the training of teachers? Discussion.

Thesis: How far do the technological schools, as they are at present organized, accomplish the training of men for the scientific professions, and how far and for what reasons do they fail to accomplish their primary purpose? Discussion.

Thesis: Since all industrial products involve form, it follows that all industrial instruction should have an aesthetic basis, or the study of the general principles which underlie all tasteful and graceful forms, and this study should be regarded and ranked as of equal educational value with the mechanic art processes. Discussion.

Thesis: Primary Schools—Into what grades and with what subjects should industrial and manual instruction be introduced? Discussion.

Thesis: Grammar Schools—Should boys and girls have the same industrial and manual instruction in all the grades? If not, what should the difference be? Discussion.

Thesis: Mechanic Art High Schools—The place such schools hold in a public educational system. If they are regarded as special technical schools, to what extent may they be used as fitting schools for industrial pursuits? Discussion.

Thesis: Teaching morals and manners through shorthand instruction. Discussion.

Thesis: What stenographers and the business community demand of business colleges in shorthand
and typewriting instruction. Discussion. (34, pp. 6-11).

One of several efforts through the years to define "instruction" was alluded to at the 1893 International Congress of Education by Delegate Kovalevsky of the Russian Ministry of Public Instruction in his review of American progress in instruction.

The great French writer, Victor Hugo, once uttered this beautiful sentence: "To instruct is to construct." Nothing is more true. Pedagogues and all persons connected with public instruction will easily understand the grand truth conveyed in these words, so simple and yet so significant. The idea of universal and compulsory instruction was proclaimed in America for the first time in the year 1642, in the place where now is the State of Massachusetts. These two hundred and fifty years have not been lost. Thanks to the liberal subsidy of the Congress which granted a large amount of land, worth so many millions of dollars today, and for private and liberal contributions, in money and labor, by means of which public instruction has now attained brilliant results in the United States. Everyone will be convinced of this after having visited the splendid Columbian Exposition. This exposition is a great suggestive school for those who visit it; and at the same time, so to say, a universal academy in which they will find a variety of precious and interesting information. It is an inexhaustible source of practical knowledge, by which all can profit according to their inclination. Certainly it is beyond contradiction that there is little resemblance between this grand institution and the log-schools built in the seventeenth century; but if it had not been for these humble primary schools, for these secondary and professional schools, for these universities, could we have had the opportunity to assist at the show of all these treasures of science which are so intensely attractive? No. An illiterate man is a blind man, and with the blind there can be no progress.

Having visited the American schools and studied the marvels of the Columbian Exposition,
we cannot sufficiently express our admiration for the valiant efforts of American pedagogues, these spiritual builders of modern progress in the United States (34, pp. 55-56).

At the time of the International Congress of Education and for a generation following it, the NEA's progress toward the improvement of instruction was noted principally in the outstanding committee activity which was sponsored individually by departments, jointly by two or more departments, and collectively by the General Association, its affiliates, councils, and commissions. By the end of the 1920's, organization for the improvement of instruction was evident in the various NEA departments of administration, supervision, and instruction. Side-by-side with these organization advances in behalf of instruction, NEA victories over economic crises strengthened the organization's capability to deal with more serious setbacks during the Depression and World War II.

Increasingly, the concerns of education-instruction were served by the NEA and its departments through issue-oriented publications. From its first meeting, the Association's *Addresses and Proceedings* included references to concern for the teacher in the classroom. In 1924, Joy Elmer Morgan, director of the NEA Division of Publications, cited *The Journal*, in its fourth year of existence, as "the organ of a great and responsible national association, whose primary duty is to deal with the broader problems of education which affect all teachers alike and which are vitally connected to the welfare of the Nation and its
children." Responding to suggestions "that The Journal should be departmentalized," Morgan underscored that this publication would include only that material which would "appeal to the profession as a whole," thereby circumventing the "division and weakness" that would result from assigning space "to superintendents, or principals, or classroom teachers as such" (8, pp. 121-123). Each department then assumed responsibility for separate yearbooks and other publications which served both to distinguish the specialization of each department and to broaden the outreach of the parent association.

A 1929 report from Executive Committee Member Eula F. Hunter of the NEA Department of Classroom Teachers indicated that department's striving toward organization strength for the improvement of conditions which teachers considered a part of the climate essential to the improvement of instruction.

What is the work of the Department of Classroom Teachers of the National Education Association? Frequently was this question asked only a few years ago by teachers themselves. Today throughout the whole of the United States this organization is regarded by both classroom teachers and administrators as being one of the greatest departments of our national organization. Teachers are deeply appreciative of the work of the department and of the opportunities which it affords for the study of all of the problems which confront the teachers which must be solved if teaching is to become the great profession which classroom instructors would have it be.

Many subjects are being discussed in the various regional conferences. Among those subjects which I have most frequently found to be of interest are the following: The improvement of teacher
certification laws, retirement remunerations, teacher tenure, the place of the classroom teacher in state and national teacher organization, publications of local teacher organizations, the basis for representation in the delegate assembly of National Education Association, and the improvement of the rural school.

This year my first conferences were held among groups of rural teachers who were meeting for the week of "teachers institute" which is held annually in some sections of Texas and Oklahoma. Early in November I was invited to talk to the teachers of Amarillo, Texas, where I found an enthusiastic group of teachers who already had planned to form an organization and who were waiting for someone to help in working out the details of the organization. In connection with the annual meeting of the Texas State Teachers Association which was held in San Antonio the new Texas Classroom Teachers Association held its first meeting. This was a luncheon followed by a conference. Much of the interest of the meeting centered in the topic of how to gain more representation for the classroom teachers in matters pertaining to the state association. It was largely through the efforts of this association and the results of this conference that a classroom teacher was at that meeting elected president of the Texas State Teachers Association.

Other conferences have been held in Fort Worth, Dallas, and New Orleans. In each of these cities I found large well-organized groups, each with its specific problems and each interested in those larger professional problems which concern all people who would make of teaching a great profession (10, pp. 361-362).

The Department of Classroom Teachers, as Miss Hunter pointed out, was concerned with establishing organization strength and equitable representation on the local, state, and national levels. In their concern with this goal, the teachers were not peculiar—except perhaps in the length of time devoted to such concerns. The following example of preoccupation with organizational matters had been
reported in 1901 by E. E. White of the Department of Super-
intendence:

In the first twenty years nearly half of the meetings were held in Washington in February or March, the special purpose being first the organization and subsequently the defense and strengthening of the Bureau of Education, and also the securing of national aid to education in the South (37, p. 235).

In 1940, annual summer study conferences for the dual purpose of organizational training and classroom teacher improvement were initiated by the Department of Classroom Teachers (DCT). In 1943, when DCT held its first delegate convention, organization strength became more apparent from a structural viewpoint; but two decades later, with classroom teachers comprising ninety percent of NEA's membership, it was not uncommon for endorsements of the DCT delegate assembly to be voted down at the same gathering when the delegate assembly of the parent association convened.

In the meantime, members of NEA departments that were more secure in their organizational strength called for cooperation to advance the cause of education. Addressing the Department of Superintendence in 1930, Susan Dorsey, Superintendent Emeritus of the Schools of Los Angeles, and later an honorary president of the NEA, characterized an atmosphere conducive to effective instruction as "friendly and flexible."

In passing, it may not be amiss to call atten-
tion to the fact that for a superintendent to be
anything but cooperative and friendly with teachers is incongruous, because the teacher long antedated the superintendent; that in fact the superintendent was ordained for the one purpose of aiding the teacher by relieving him of various details not of an instructional character, so that he might the more completely devote himself to the real business of teaching.

A friendly superintendent will encourage his teachers to improve themselves, to enlarge their personality through further study.

The most kindly-disposed superintendent cannot of himself achieve the friendly spirit in school relationships; teachers must do their part; they need to adopt approvingly the social concept of education and stand ready to make their contribution in reciprocal helpfulness toward the common undertaking even though it require an occasional change of attitude and constant re-adjustments of instruction, activities, and school relationships. Inflexibility and growth cannot coexist; education is expanding; teachers and superintendents alike will do well to be observant, flexible of mind, and ready to make adaptations in order to meet the needs of a growing civilization that must have a friendly world for its ultimate realization.

Perhaps it is not too much to say that on public education rests the supreme responsibility of making and keeping the world friendly. To accomplish that, education must provide instruction and varied experiences in social living to a far greater degree than at present, and a friendly spirit must pervade all school relationships (11, pp. 630-633).

Closer to the classroom than general superintendents, supervisors of instruction were charged with more specific responsibilities for facilitating teaching and learning. "Effective Instructional Leadership," the sixth yearbook of the NEA Department of Supervisors and Directors of Instruction, was the resultant volume of a committee effort to confront the problem of creating a climate of freedom for teachers and learners:
How may we secure that cooperation which makes for effectiveness in action and yet preserves variation in thinking and practice? How may we safeguard individuality, insure intellectual integrity, provide new ideas for reconstructing our beliefs, plans, and procedures, and yet maintain that degree of harmony necessary to group living and group work?

The answer here would seem to lie in the widespread adoption of the democratic spirit and the scientific attitude broadly conceived. These two terms are purposely joined. At base they are one, for democracy implies "fair dealing with all peoples concerned," while the scientific attitude means "fair dealing with all pertinent facts."

If such an attitude governed our consideration of differences, conferences would replace debates. Each proponent would be a seeker after a larger and more inclusive truth rather than after converts to his own position, each would be concerned in determining "what" is right rather than "who" is right. Compromise would be unnecessary, for no entrenched interests would need propitiating. The opinions and interests of all would be justly and democratically considered as impersonally and impartially as a scientist regards his numerous data. This scientific attitude and method is indispensable in educational leadership and especially in those aspects where human contacts are numerous and intimate. We want to achieve this quality in children. It is the essence of an ever expanding life. To secure it in children, teachers must possess it themselves.

This calls for faith on the part of educational leaders--faith in the teacher's intelligence to cope with educational problems. If all of us were to proceed whole-heartedly on the principle that liberating intelligence, increasing self-respect and mutual confidence, and releasing pent-up energies make for maximum growth, there would indeed be a renaissance in American education.

Lacking this faith, however, professional living stagnates and proceeds at a foot pace; it becomes meaningless, uncritical of values, satisfied with routine solutions, timorous, half-hearted, and sterile. And what becomes of our boasted efficiency when the very thing for which we lay out our money, i. e., the intelligence of teachers, is largely unused because we dare not use it?
Given this faith . . . there still remains the problem of how to organize our educational activities so that this faith may result in teacher initiative and so that other characteristics of the good life may emerge. This is, of course, not primarily a matter of the form which the organization takes—"straight line," "line and staff," or some other form of organization—but rather of the spirit which animates the organization and determines personal relationships (2, pp. 98-100; 132-134).

Citing the need for teachers to be leaders in the American democratic system of education, John Dewey, addressing the Department of Teachers Colleges, in 1934, on the topic, "Education for a Changing Social Order," called for inquiry-centered teacher preparation that would "enable the minds of students and teachers alike to think in a straight-forward and competent way and reach their own conclusions."

It would be absurd for me to attempt to lay down even in outline a program for an education for teachers that would put them in a position where they would in turn enable students to do their part in directing the changes that are going on, so that we would move to a more just, more humane, and more secure social order. But it is pertinent to point out certain facts. In the first place, the material for developing such a program is at hand in more abundant measure than at any previous time. There is much material conservatively presented in reports of the Commission on Social Trends. The National Education Association has a Committee on Social and Economic Goals of America. An American Committee on Economic Policy has been formed as a clearing-house and distributing center of information. While aimed more directly at adult education, the material will be significant for any educational reorganization. A committee for the reorganization of secondary education has been formed and is at work. The Commission on Social Studies will soon make a report and it is understood that it will contain an analysis of present social conditions and forces.
These are a few of the high spots with reference to available material (15, pp. 751-752).

Finally, by 1939, classroom teachers were calling on their organized peers for more specific instructional service as well as welfare aid, and the Department of Classroom Teachers sponsored jointly with the American Educational Research Association of the NEA "The Implications of Research for the Classroom Teacher," the tenth yearbook for DCT and the first for AERA. The "Foreword" from Presidents Myrtle Hooper Dahl, DCT, and William A. Brownell, AERA, included the following explanations and guidelines:

The Department of Classroom Teachers of the National Education Association has published nine yearbooks. These yearbooks were concerned primarily with the problems of teachers and secondarily with the problems of teaching. During the past several years there has been a growing demand from classroom teachers that the Department give more consideration to actual teaching problems.

The American Educational Research Association, a department of the National Education Association, has never published a yearbook. Its publications include an annual volume of proceedings of the conferences held at the winter meeting, and a periodic publication, the Review of Educational Research. This Department, however, has been greatly interested in making the findings of research available in such form as to affect instructional practices.

The present yearbook, therefore, is the result of a common interest of the two departments. . . .

Teachers will find in this volume a summary of the results of educational research that have a bearing on classroom procedures. This book should enable them to examine and to improve their practices in the light of relevant research. Furthermore, it is hoped that teachers will use increasingly the technics of research in the solution of the many problems which arise in the classroom. Classroom teachers have much to offer to the advancement of education through improvement of teaching procedures. We believe that this yearbook will help them increase their contribution.
To the teachers of the nation we dedicate this volume with the hope that they will find it a significant response to their request for help with their problems of teaching (1, pp. 5-6).

Eighteen chapters in the DCT-AERA volume presented, in the opinion of the joint committee, a synthesis of the best educational thought in America on the following aspects of instruction:

The Effective Teacher at Work
The Value of Research to Teachers
The Interpretation and Evaluation of Research
The Application of the Scientific Method
Child Development
The Organization of Schools and Classes
The Learning Process
The Language Arts
   English
   Reading
   Literature
   Handwriting
   Spelling
   Modern Foreign Languages
Social Studies
Mathematics
   Arithmetic
   Secondary-School Mathematics
Science
Healthful Living
   Health Education
   Physical Education
   Safety Education
The Appreciational Arts
   Art
   Music
The Practical Arts
   Home Economics
   Business Education
   Industrial Education
Visual and Auditory Aids to Learning
Guidance
Extracurriculum Activities
The Aims and Objectives of Education (1, pp. 7-8).

Filling "the gap between the laboratory and the classroom" was the goal of the DCT-AERA Joint Yearbook of 1939.
(1, p. 9), which stood as a published assertion of the authority of teachers in the role that they were fulfilling. Each group of teachers and administrators was finding it difficult to adjust to complementary positions without trespassing on the other's jurisdiction. Addressing the American Association of School Administrators in 1939, George D. Strayer, Professor of Education, Columbia University, said that "the most severe test that can be put upon the work of the administrator is to ask in what degree all persons associated with him have realized their highest possibilities under his leadership" (18, p. 247).

AASA President John A. Sexson, Superintendent of Schools, Pasadena, California, remarked to the 1939 Convention audience:

Those of us who have worked in administration and have noticed changing conditions and changing situations, have been somewhat amazed, I believe, to find a growing amount of questioning regarding relationships that should prevail between those who teach and those who administer. I believe that every superintendent of schools and every teacher in America desires not to take the duties from each other but to arrive at a solution and adjustment of our relationships that shall permit a maximum contribution.

In looking over this country for the voice that might speak most authoritatively with respect to the relation between those who administer and those who teach, my attention was called to the work of the distinguished state superintendent of public instruction of Virginia. It was my honor to invite him to speak on that topic, and it is my privilege to present to you at this time, Mr. Hall (18, p. 248).

Mr. Sidney B. Hall then proceeded to trace the history of administration.
Administration grew out of instruction. In the earliest schools in this country there were no administrative employees, only pupils and teachers. In the town meetings the people selected their teachers, agreed upon their salaries, decided what subjects were to be taught, arranged for the repair of the school buildings and the purchase of supplies, and settled all matters of policy.

About 1880, municipal reformers, dissatisfied with the inefficient management of school affairs wherein politics commonly played an overly-important role, had turned to business for a model for the reorganization of school administration.

There is no disputing that school administration needed a thorough overhauling, but whether business was the best model to follow is at least open to question, for there are fundamental differences between education and business. Business is concerned with profit and efficiency. It deals with material objects and its transactions can be measured in dollars and cents. The schools took over the business criterion of efficiency and tried to apply it indiscriminately to education. Intelligence tests and scientific measuring instruments were developed, based upon the practice of industry. All this contributed to a sort of mass production idea of education. Education was conceived of as a body of facts to be gained from books. The attempt to require all children to learn the same data in a specified amount of time in factory style often led to autocratic methods of supervision and administration, and a disregard of the abilities, interests, and personalities of the individual children for whose benefit the schools were presumably operated. They were merely cogs in the vast educational machine and had to adjust themselves as well as they could to the system. Thus, over-emphasis on efficiency led to regimentation and autocracy, and administration forgot that it was the servant of instruction.

If pupils are to learn how to think for themselves in this day when independent thinking is so necessary, then there must be democracy in the classroom; and before we can achieve democracy in the classroom, we must have democracy in administration.

What then seems to be the responsibility of administration for instruction today? It is no longer
to prescribe what is to be taught, or how, or when; but to provide the environment most conducive to maximum pupil growth and to work cooperatively with pupils, teachers, and community to provide a broad and flexible instructional program adapted to the present and future needs of all of the children in the community which the school serves (18, pp. 248-252).

That administrators and teachers were a long way from cooperative planning had been pointed out the previous year by Robert K. Speer, New York University Professor of Education. Addressing a Department of Kindergarten-Primary Education audience, Speer spoke from the teacher's viewpoint.

Educational administration, as commonly practiced today, is direct antithesis of democratic social planning. The same conflict that is evident between management and employee is evident between educational administrators and teacher-workers. The average administrator gives orders and expects teachers to obey. More recently, they have invented the word cooperation—but, as commonly practiced, the word "cooperate" means you coo while I operate.

I am getting a little tired of the literature which constantly describes the job of administrators and supervisors to be to improve teachers in service. This concept of administration—to improve teachers in service—grew up in the old days when teachers might be certified with little or no professional training. Teachers generally are as competent now as supervisors were years ago.

They say that the job of administrator and supervisor is to improve teachers in service. I am proposing that one of the very important jobs of teachers is to individually and collectively improve administrators and supervisors in educational service. Actually the time has come for us, together, to democratically improve the educational services to the boys and girls of this country (17, pp. 470-471).

Labels for separation into classes of leadership often became fighting words which led away from the real issues to
personality tugs-of-war. Teachers resented being "trained" or "improved," and their antagonism toward token cooperation bids stifled progress. AASA speaker Worth McClure, Superintendent of Schools, Seattle, Washington, addressing a 1940 Convention audience on the topic "The Principal and the Teacher," suggested more rewarding leadership approaches.

Here I would remind you that successful learning whether by children or by teachers is just about directly proportional to the cooperation of the learner. Supervision with its microscope trained on the teacher may get only defensive reactions but the "standing by" attitude of the principal with his "let's study it together" gets that cooperation.

Visits to classrooms are for the purpose of observing children—not teachers. The principal comes to help the teacher isolate and break down difficulties that afflict children, to bring additional resources to bear upon the solution. When he comes in this spirit and talks to this point, visits will cease to be visitations.

Bulletins in this picture become a means of recording plans for study or of summarizing the results of previous study for convenient reference.

Supervision in the old sense with its ex cathedra approach, its ponderous ritual of meetings, bulletins, visits, and the like was too often the "bogeyman"—the "little man who wasn't there"—in the old school for childhood. Cooperative study involving principal, teachers, and sometimes pupils, parents, and community is the genius of the new.

In this new school, the principal's job is essentially that of teaching. He is a vicarious teacher of pupils; a teacher of teachers, of parents, of the public. He will do well to bring to his leadership the best teaching method that he knows; to remember that teaching is the cultivation of growth, not a stuffing process; that his main contribution is to capitalize the latent resources of his school community; that he must be humble enough to learn from pupils, teachers, and patrons; strong enough to lead (19, pp. 306-307).
"Self-Supervision by Teachers, A Practical Way Out" had been the suggestion-topic of William T. Melchior, Professor of Educational Supervision, to Directors of Instruction (section meeting) at the NEA Convention in 1934. At a time when supervisors were being called upon to account for their stewardship to the end that it might be determined whether supervision should be "considered an indispensable science and art in the learning-teacher process," Melchior suggested that self-supervision offered the most lasting results.

Supervision will reach its highest levels when it challenges teachers to solve their own instructional problems in the light of the best scientific information available. Supervision of the immediate present and future must liberate each teacher in his school, aid each one to become efficient in self-analysis, self-criticism, and self improvement.

Every week I linger for a day in schoolrooms where calmness does prevail, where teachers and pupils are living happily in the assurance of certain creative endeavors. These teachers are rich in philosophy, rich in hopes, ideals, beliefs, in culture, and understandings; they are rich in improved methods and improved management.

Back of this is a self-supervisory program, based on the democratic and creative philosophy of modern education. This emancipating philosophy is gradually filtering thru an antagonistic attitude toward supervision and is destined to change the entire life of teacher and pupil within the classroom. How can supervision, curtailed as it is now, help teachers to help themselves make good in the immediate present? The first direct challenge is that supervisors and teachers study, work, and improve, actuated by the scientific spirit of inquiry and diligent application and by the artist's creative genius and unrequited toil.

Beyond self-supervision, the teacher in a co-equal participatory role with the superteacher/supervisor was
presented by Dale Zeller, Professor of Education from Emporia, Kansas, in an address "The Role of the Teacher in Supervision."

In his discussion with supervisors and instructional leaders at the 1940 NEA Convention, the Kansas State Teachers College professor concluded:

Briefly in summary, the role of the teacher in supervision is to evolve the curriculum in the classroom. Upon his growth and development depend the progress of curriculum development which is at the heart of all improvement of instruction. He must participate in formulating plans and policies but his participation must grow out of insight into the problems of education. Means for his participation must be provided by a supervisory program that offers opportunity for action based on group discussion and decision in which teachers and supervisors are mutually concerned. Evaluation becomes an integral part of the effort to act on decisions so arrived at (19, p. 751).

By 1941, Harold Spears, at that time Director of Research and Secondary Education for Evansville, Indiana Public Schools acknowledged, as a result of his study and observation, that instructional leadership had been for years unified on paper. Speaking in reprimanding tones to the leaders at the NEA Convention section meeting, Spears reminded the group that "unified instructional leadership calls for something more than the delegation of authority and the distinction of responsibility" (20, p. 601). Calling for an end to conflict over position and looking beyond the issues that had been stated repetitiously, Spears claimed his turn to cite the child at the center of all concerns:

The answer to this problem, if found at all, will be found near the classroom and not in a conference of instructional leaders meeting in the
central office to determine the limits of their work and authority. . . . Let us keep close to the pupil—no master-minding, no remote control, no curriculum editors, no curriculum office boys. The effectiveness of instructional leadership perhaps bears a direct relationship to the amount of time spent out on the learning front. And when it is asked who is to unify instructional leadership, perhaps the most sensible answer is—the child (20, p. 607).

Although the Depression of the Thirties and World War II of the Forties slowed progress on some educational fronts, the NEA through its annual conventions (no meeting in 1945, only), department activities, commission projects, and other study group actions, kept in step with, if not ahead of, the issues. Particularly, efforts were increased to bring the world into the classroom through the many audio-visual aids of the growing technological age. The NEA Department of Audio-Visual Instruction was active in joint projects with other departments, and frequent Convention addresses reflected the increasing opportunities for the enhancement of classroom instruction through the media of press, radio, films, and television. With increasing opportunities came additional responsibilities, the 1949 NEA Convention participants were reminded by NEA's Joy Elmer Morgan:

Time was when home and church and school together could almost completely control the forces that played upon the child. Today the comic book, the movie, the radio, and television are filling children's minds with the trivial and the unreal. In most cases the primary motive is not the perfecting of child life, but the making of money. It is an axiom of psychology that what goes into the mind comes out in the life. We shall find the task of the schools in developing a sound sense of values
and right habits of learning and life, made harder by this commercial exploitation and violation of the child mind.

We, who are in this hall at this moment, have a special responsibility. For every one who is here, there are 300 American teachers who are not here. Our achievements during the year ahead will depend upon our ability to take home to the teaching profession as a whole, the inspiration and vision of these days. It is not enough to go home and make a report or write an article for the paper. Our presence in this assembly creates a moral obligation to go home and to lead effectively day by day, week by week, and month by month for our chosen goals (23, pp. 35-36).

Morgan led his audience, in 1949, through a backward and forward look in time in an effort to connect the National Education Association of the United States with advancements in American—and world—civilization. First, he attributed the growth of science, the rise of democracy, and the growth of the free public school to the spread of Christianity with its emphasis on the search for truth, the worth of the individual personality, and the power of love. "I like to think of the free public school—serving all the children of all the people, trying to bring out the best in each boy or girl—as the greatest expression of Christian love the world has seen," Morgan said (23, p. 33).

Crediting the National Education Association with major contributions to the growth of the American free public schools, the veteran NEA staff member characterized the "40-foot shelf of NEA publications" as a survey of "the history of American education." Finally, to the selfless service of
"tens of thousands of men and women through generation after generation" Morgan attributed the gradual expansion of NEA services.

The development was slow at first. Not until 1870 did teachers, superintendents, and normal schools unite into one body. Not until 1884 was there a truly national meeting. Not until the 1890's did the Association come to grips with concrete problems of high school and college. The great gains have come within the lifetime of persons now living. During 29 years in your service, it has been my privilege to see most of them.

The moving of NEA Headquarters to Washington in 1917 under Executive Secretary J. W. Crabtree symbolized the new importance of education in the life of the nation. The establishment of the Representative Assembly at Salt Lake City in 1920 laid the foundation for democratic action and control. The establishment of The Journal in 1921 marked the beginning of a better informed and more united profession. The establishment of the Research Division in 1922 greatly increased our strength. The growth of departments--Superintendents, Elementary Principals, Highschool Principals, and others--during the 1920's and 1930's brought the Association increasingly to grips with the concrete problems of the schools. The growth of our Department of Classroom Teachers particularly during the 1940's under the gifted leadership of its secretary, Hilda Maehling, and a series of outstanding presidents, has added immeasurably to the strength of our profession (23, p. 33).

Recalling the revelations brought to light through the experiences of two world wars and a depression, Morgan reviewed the growth of the conviction on the part of the NEA leaders that "there must be a new approach to the problems of peace--an educational approach." From idea to implementation, the wartime and postwar activities of the colleagues of the speaker were described and their far-reaching effects were praised.
It was then--during the winter of 1942-43--in the minds of men like George D. Strayer, Willard E. Givens, A. J. Stoddard, A. C. Flora, and S. D. Shankland--that the War and Peace Fund was conceived. The response of American teachers to that campaign was magnificent. It brought new vision to our profession. It gave teachers a sense of opportunity and responsibility. It enabled NEA Defense, Legislative, and Policies Commissions to go forward with much needed work, particularly with the campaign for a place for education in the peace. It is no exaggeration to say that had it not been for the War and Peace Fund there would have been no place for education in the United Nations charter--no Unesco to carry forward the cause of education in the world. Hundreds of people labored on behalf of a place for education in the United Nations but without the funds given by the teachers in this country the battle would have been lost. Had the NEA done nothing during its entire history but to aid in the establishment of Unesco, it would have been worth more than all that has been invested in it.

After the war our Association took the lead in calling the conference which formed the World Organization of the Teaching Profession. Our Associate Secretary William G. Carr, also Secretary General of WOTP, is representing us this summer at its meeting in Berne, Switzerland. Our Secretary, Willard E. Givens, is now overseas in connection with a world-wide educational project. It means much to our Association and to the cause of education throughout the world to have NEA officers of such experience and vision in contact with educational leaders of other countries (23, p. 34).

As editor of The Journal of the National Education Association, Morgan made these remarks in 1949 at the Second General Assembly of the NEA Convention, under the title "Building the Teaching Profession." It was his opinion that "teaching, and teaching alone--in home, school, and church--had distinguished Americans from other nations of people." Other nations might compare favorably with America
in the possession of "natural resources" and "good human stock"; but, in the opinion of the editor, America excelled in "ideals and purposes combined with the education of the people." With obvious pride in the NEA's contribution to--or connection with--characteristics that had made a difference in the quality of the Nation's life, Morgan said, "We have had high ideals and great teachers" (23, p. 32).

"New Tools for Better Teaching" was a subtitle for one section of an illustrated "Annual Report of the Executive Secretary of the National Education Association of the United States" in which appeared the statement: "Of all inquiries answered by the NEA, 32 percent were for information on teaching methods and materials" (21, p. 315). Seven years later, a similar report by Secretary Willard E. Givens included a section titled "Schools for our Times . . . Must Be Taught by Professionally Prepared Teachers," which called for professional preparation, certification, graduate study, and in-service education for teachers for the purpose of "elevating teaching in general to an occupation above the level of mere technical skill" (24, p. 317). Givens concluded:

The teacher is the heart of the school. Within the teacher lies the greatest weakness or the greatest strength of American education. Those who would improve educational opportunity must look first to the teacher. They can do no less than demand that those who serve in this position be professional in their preparation, professional in their conduct, professional in their vision (24, p. 317).
The NEA had reached a time of reflection on the achievements of the century that had passed since the promotion of teacher preparation by Horace Mann. A three-act drama, "Testament of Faith," written by the faculty of Antioch College, which Mann served as first president, climaxed the 1937 NEA tribute to the statesman-educator. Mann's final challenge to Antioch students a few weeks before his death—that one should be afraid to die unless some victory for humanity had been won—was a description of his own fearless transition from mortality to immortality as portrayed in the centennial honors bestowed upon him by his beneficiaries in the National Education Association. The NEA Horace Mann Centennial Committee of 1937 initiated a celebration that continued "during the next twelve years, paralleling the years of Horace Mann's secretaryship--1837-1848--including the centennial of the Normal School in 1939." Citing the tremendous appeal of Horace Mann to both educators and laymen, the Committee recommended, among other suggestions: (1) publication of materials relating to Horace Mann, including suggestions for American Education Week, 1937; (2) special events in all 1937 summer schools to commemorate Horace Mann's services toward preparation of teachers; and (3) as an extension of Mann's work, the establishment of "Future Teachers of America" groups which would seek to interest the most promising young people in teaching as a career (16, pp. 858-860).
Summary

The National Education Association of the United States, one of many organizations established in the organization era beginning in the mid-nineteenth century, developed a national forum approach to instruction which emphasized teacher preparation. Not the first nor the last organization devoted to instruction, the NEA gradually enlarged its focus on instruction to include the child and, in fact, to accord the child the position of primary concern. When categories and materials for instruction were developed, concern in that area evolved toward specialization which was reflected in the National Education Association by the establishment of a departmental structure corresponding to public school system patterns of departmentalization. Meanwhile, as the organization moved toward greater unity in one sense, the reluctance of traditional educators to embrace the need for, and goals of, industrial training courses paralleled the reluctance of some professional association leaders to employ tactics of union organization leaders in behalf of education. While the resulting gap between NEA and other organizations appeared to grow wider, in reality, dichotomous ideologies developed side by side under the umbrella of the National Education Association. At the same time, power struggles developed between departments of the Association, but the crisis-hour needs of two world wars and a depression
served to preserve some unity of purpose surrounding traditional concerns for the child and the teacher.

Thus, the ideas that had given rise to the Normal School movement and the first organizations of teachers continued one century later to dominate NEA programs. The goals of improvement of instruction and professionalization of teaching claimed the attention of individual speakers and committees and were reflected in the NEA Journal and other publications of the NEA and its departments. At first utilizing the departmental structure, and later, crossing departmental lines for the development of joint projects, the NEA increasingly spotlighted instruction issues as a focal point of organization concern.
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CHAPTER V

INSTRUCTION AS A THREAD FOR UNITY

Toward Inclusive Unity Through Instruction Issues

From the trend toward the dichotomization of child needs and teacher welfare, the NEA turned to a focus on instruction which served to direct the total educational effort into a unified, issue-oriented program. The report of 1951 NEA President Corma Mowrey indicated that the Association was pursuing new avenues toward the improvement of instruction as well as continuing earlier successful ventures. To Representative Assembly delegates, she said:

Our Association is more than a means of paying dues to employ a staff in Washington. Membership in the NEA is professional, a way in which to receive help and give help. One of the most important methods for giving help of this kind is thru the numerous conferences held by our departments, committees and other agencies.

Two recent conferences will serve as illustrations. Last July about 400 leaders of the NEA Department of Classroom Teachers met at St. Charles, Missouri. They came from classrooms across the United States and returned there to apply and develop what they had learned. Experts from the Department of State and other agencies led briefing sessions on current international issues. Forty guest teachers from overseas enriched the cooperative studies. The functions of the NEA and its affiliated associations were carefully studied. Experience was given in group dynamics with how-to-do-it demonstrations.

One other conference that must be mentioned is the Regional Conference on Instruction held
at Toledo in April and cooperatively sponsored by the NEA and its departments.

The National Education Association gives leadership for better instruction as well as for teacher welfare. The Toledo Conference, by bringing together the unique instructional resources of the NEA departments, produced a result which none of them working separately could achieve. The 18 work groups cut across subject-matter fields and school levels.

Such comment as this suggests what took place: "Everyone who participated seems likely to be dissatisfied with any other sort of conference. The NEA has come to life for me" (16, pp. 11-12).

The Regional Instructional Conference of 1951, the first of its kind, had been planned for the purposes of (1) bringing together teachers of various levels and subjects, (2) dealing with the interrelationships of various levels and fields of instruction, and (3) helping the participants narrow the gap between research findings and school practices (16, p. 198).

In the year of the first NEA Regional Conference on Instruction, the Association of Supervision and Curriculum Development (ASCD), formerly the Department of Supervisors and Directors of Instruction, held its sixth annual convention which was attended by 1800 persons interested in working on problems involving instructional improvement (16, p. 234). The ASCD, a department of the NEA, had initiated independent study-group-type conventions in 1946 and had, since that time, conducted studies on instruction-related problems such as (1) "the role of the department head in the secondary-school"--1948 (14, p. 289) and (2) "basic issues in teacher rating"--(15, p. 248).
Also noteworthy in the area of teacher concerns, in 1951, was the setting aside of NEA Convention time, under the leadership of Assistant Secretary for Professional Relations Lyle W. Ashby, for meetings of study groups interested in (1) instructional problems, (2) teacher welfare, (3) local organization problems, and (4) public relations and school criticism (16, p. 157). A panel presentation at an afternoon business session of the 1951 Representative Assembly provided those in attendance with a summary of conclusions reached by the groups. Dr. Lavone Hanna of San Francisco State College reported that the fifteen groups participating in the discussion of instructional problems had cited the need for (1) a common school philosophy, (2) broad involvement of different groups in curriculum development, (3) attention to individual differences, and (4) the recognition of studies with social, emotional, and physical, as well as intellectual, emphases. Teacher loads, departmentalized programs, segmented teaching-learning activities, inadequate equipment, out-of-date buildings, and lack of understanding of administrator roles in instruction were listed by teachers in the discussion groups as obstacles to their improvement (16, pp. 158-164).

At the conclusion of their reports, Virgil Rogers, moderator for the panel of discussion leaders, thanked them and the 1951 Convention planners for their part in "placing the issues and the problems in the field of classroom work before the teaching profession" (16, p. 164).
Mr. Rogers emphasized, and NEA President Mowrey underscored in her report later in the evening, the importance of sharing information and inspiration gained at the NEA Convention with colleagues and fellow citizens at meetings during the school year following the summer convention. Said the President, "When you plan a conference, don't start with a long list of speakers who come long distances at great expense to lecture about the NEA. You are the NEA" (16, p. 12).

Recommendation for a second regional conference on instruction was approved at the NEA Executive Committee meeting immediately following the 1951 Convention in San Francisco. At the same time, NEA sponsorship and staff assistance to conduct a conference on instruction with the Southern Section of the California Teachers Association was granted (16, p. 221). NEA Addresses and Proceedings for 1952 showed no progress beyond repetition of approval for additional similar conferences (17, pp. 233, 250-251). The 1953 Proceedings revealed plans for a regional conference to be held in Minneapolis, in April, 1954 (18, p. 227). "Working Together for Better Teaching," the theme of the Toledo Conference, was also the theme of the Minneapolis Conference; in Minneapolis, three-fourths of the participants were classroom teachers (19, p. 203).

The third conference on instruction was held in Denver, Colorado, in 1955, with a total registration of 670, from
nine states, attending. The program, with seventy-five percent classroom teacher participation, "cut across all levels and areas of instruction from kindergarten through university" (20, p. 219). The fourth conference, held in Boston, in 1956, failed to generate the enthusiasm that had surrounded the first three conferences on instruction (21, p. 227); and a fifth conference that had been scheduled for Louisville, Kentucky, in 1957, was cancelled (21, p. 234). The inclusion of emphasis on the improvement of instruction in the NEA Centennial Action Program (CAP) had served as an enhancement to the regional conferences on instruction, but other matters apparently took precedence over instruction during the actual time of the Centennial observance. A further indication of neglect of matters related to instruction in the mid-1950's was recorded in "Minutes of the NEA Executive Committee," February 17, 1956, as follows:

PROPOSED COMMISSION ON INSTRUCTION: A request of September 18, 1954, from the Ohio Education Association's Commission for the Improvement of Education, that the NEA establish a commission on instruction was postponed pending the reorganization of the headquarters staff. A commission on instruction is included in the proposed "adequate program" for consideration by the Board of Directors.

It was moved by Mr. Roberson, seconded by Miss Linford and carried, that the OEA's Commission for the Improvement of Education be notified that present resources do not permit the NEA to establish a commission on instruction. The matter will remain under active consideration if funds for the further development of the Association's program in this field are received (21, p. 227).
It had been pointed out, however, during 1952 Executive Committee discussions related to conferences on instruction, that twenty-seven departments had participated in the Toledo Conference and that continuing conferences of the departments were carrying instructional concerns forward (18, p. 211). Not only in the independent fashion of the ASCD, but also through joint projects and continuing mergers of departments with similar concerns, there was evidence of integrated approaches to instructional problems. At the outset of increased Association emphasis on instruction, in 1951, the concerns of the Department of Lip Reading were transferred to the International Council of Exceptional Children (16, p. 241); then the Department of Secondary Teachers merged with the Department of Classroom Teachers. Cooperative undertakings of these groups with the American Educational Research Association, the Audio-Visual Instruction Department, and others continued to lend breadth and depth to the scope of instructional concerns (16, p. 249). The NEA Department of Adult Education joined forces with the Adult Education Association of the United States concurrent with that Association's move into the ranks of NEA (16, p. 229), thereby uniting and strengthening the major groups that had worked separately in that field.

The Executive Committee, meeting in Philadelphia during June, 1957, NEA Centennial observances, heard from Lyle Ashby a report representing NEA divisions and departments in
which the growing idea of emphasis on the improvement of instruction had led to suggestions for the establishment of an over-all NEA Commission on Instruction. Ashby's remarks reflected the concern that NEA should provide national leadership for the instructional issues faced in America's schools—a leadership that would result in the Association's becoming "as well and as favorably known for its concern about instructional service as it is in the field of teacher welfare" (22, p. 305). At a 1958 spring meeting of the Executive Committee, the Exploratory Committee on Instruction that had been appointed by NEA President Ginger subsequent to Ashby's plea, made recommendations:

(1) that a Staff Council on Instruction be established; (2) that the Staff Council elect its own officers and that a staff member in the office of the assistant executive secretary for educational services assume full-time responsibility of the Council's business; (3) that the Staff Council's activities be financed by the NEA until June 1959 at which time the cost be supplemented by contributions from constituent units; (4) that the Staff Council would not operate in specialized areas where the units are more proficient than a general body would be, but would deal with problems of general concern to all units, or several units, using the competencies of specialized units (23, pp. 268-269).

The general tone of the 1958 NEA Convention from the outset was one of more support for education-instruction concerns. Welcoming participants on the first day of the Convention, Cleveland Superintendent of Schools Mark C. Schinnerer, repeating a story that he said was going around, also welcomed the prospect of catching up with Russia:
It will be interesting to read the history of the post-Sputnik discussion. When Russia launched the satellite, beating us to it, people in this country began looking for someone to blame. Did they blame the scientists? Why not? Didn't they know about such things and shouldn't they have been on their toes? No, they didn't blame the scientists or the military. Instead, they blamed the seventh grade. I might add that when we were able to get a satellite into orbit, it took a lot of heat off the seventh grade. We school teachers seem to be sitting ducks when anything goes wrong and a goat is sought.

In the long pull, however, I believe that this discussion will be for the good. All sorts of people are now saying what we have been advocating for a long time, that education in this country must be improved all along the line. The layman is coming to accept what we have been urging him to accept for years. We are going to have more support from the public and we will respond by doing a better quality job of education than we have ever done before (23, pp. 27-28).

In February, 1958, the NEA had sponsored, in cooperation with Northwest leaders, two regional conferences on instruction—at Boise, Idaho, and at Portland, Oregon (23, p. 271). Also, during the same month, at Washington, D. C., James B. Conant was chairman for a conference on "The Academically Talented Pupil," sponsored by the NEA and the Carnegie Corporation (23, pp. 190-192). Additional progress made possible by the Expanded Program for educational services was reported by NEA Executive Secretary Carr to the 1958 Representative Assembly:

For the first full year, a consultant in elementary education has been employed.

NEA began to make awards for distinguished college teaching.
A special consultant was added to the staff for exceptional children.

The Expanded Program in social studies is helping a three-year project to improve teaching of world affairs.

Funds were provided for two workshops in television education.

Four leaflets for rural teachers have been written. The Expanded Program will bring more rural teachers to regional meetings. NEA Conferences on Rural Life and Education, suspended in 1954 for lack of funds, have been reactivated (23, p. 88).

The sixth Regional Instructional Conference under NEA sponsorship was held in Oklahoma City in February, 1959, with "600 selected teachers and other educational leaders" attending from Oklahoma, Arkansas, Texas, Kansas, and Missouri. "Focus on Quality Teaching of All Children" was the theme of the conference which "consisted of major addresses, large group participation, laboratory sessions, and informal chats dealing with the problems of instruction" (25, p. 258). The seventh and eighth conferences on instruction were held during 1959-60 in Louisville, Kentucky, and Minneapolis, Minnesota. Two further similar conferences were scheduled for Hartford, Connecticut, and Tucson, Arizona, during 1960-61 (26, p. 279).

A 1959 spring meeting in Cincinnati under the leadership of the Association of Supervisors and Curriculum Development served "the teachers in that area in lieu of an NEA regional conference" (24, pp. 251; 283). Congruently, the 1959 and 1960 yearbooks of ASCD were Learning and the Teacher and Leadership and the Improvement of Instruction (24, p. 284).
The ASCD, as well as the Department of Classroom Teachers and others, had studied before its presentation to the 1959 Representative Assembly a proposed merit rating for teachers, a resolution with implications for instruction:

The National Education Association believes that it is a major responsibility of the teaching profession, as of other professions, to evaluate the quality of its services. To enable educators to meet this responsibility more effectively, the Association calls for continued research to discover means of objective evaluation of the performance of all professional personnel and their interrelationships for the purpose of improving instruction.

The Association further believes that use of subjective methods of judging the quality of teaching performance in setting salaries has a deleterious effect on the educational process. The making of such judgments (commonly known as merit ratings) creates dissension which upsets the school. It destroys professional relationships and morale, causes strife between teachers and administrators, and leads to deterioration in the quality of education of children. Plans which base teachers' salaries upon such subjective ratings are to be vigorously opposed (24, p. 183).

The publication of "How Good Are Our Schools?"--a document proposed to be useful to both lay people and school people toward the process of evaluating school programs--was the result of the first project of the informal NEA Council on Instruction. The document consisted of a series of questions which parents and professionals were asking about the schools (24, p. 251).

The 1960 report of NEA Executive Secretary Carr to the Representative Assembly included reference to an additional step directed to the improvement of instruction:
The NEA Special Project on the International Program was authorized by the 1959 Delegate Assembly. New forces, ranging from the splitting of the atom to the exploration of space, play upon education with great intensity. Thorough appraisal is needed to meet problems created by the critical world situation, the explosion of knowledge, cleavages in educational philosophy, and attendant criticism of the schools. Many voices are heard with varying definitions of a sound program of elementary and secondary education. Some call for a return of the so-called solid subjects. Some would dictate the same program for all pupils, regardless of individual differences. Some ignore what we know about the profession itself to examine current changes in school programs and to recommend curriculum and organization of subject matter.

The Special Project hopes to build upon two basic statements now being developed by the Educational Policies Commission. These include a new statement, which will be ready in a few weeks, of controlling purposes in education and a review of such contemporary issues in elementary education as: reading in the kindergarten, foreign language teaching, departmentalization, promotion policies, homework, programs for talented children, and special services in support of the classroom teacher (25, p. 56).

The NEA Department of Elementary School Principals, the National Association of Secondary School Principals, the National Council of Teachers of Mathematics, and the National Science Teachers Association, among other groups, continued to be active in efforts directed toward the improvement of instruction in their respective areas of responsibility. "Instructional Technology and the Teacher" and "Interrelationships of Pupils and Teachers Within the Classroom" were examples of 1960 NEA Convention Sectional Meeting topics (25, pp. 212-213). Explaining the background for the presentation of NEA programs, President W. W. Eshelman stated:
Most of the actual work in improving the educational program of the nation, raising professional standards, developing public understandings, and fostering a favorable climate for the support of public education is done by the various commissions and committees. A number of committees have been set up jointly, with other lay and professional organizations. These commissions and committees work throughout the year, each on specific aspects of the total professional program. The personnel of these commissions and committees are members of the profession who accept a national responsibility in addition to a full-time job and professional responsibilities at home. They give unstintingly of themselves in time, thought, and energy as a contribution to the profession.

May we suggest that each member of the Representative Assembly give careful attention to these brief summary reports, participate in one or more of the various open meetings during the convention, and serve as a liaison person with the groups he represents at the state and local level, to increase the effectiveness of the work of the NEA commissions and committees (25, p. 33).

The Committee of the NEA Special Project on the Instructional Program met in 1960 and decided to study (1) recent and evolving trends, (2) forces which bear upon the instructional program of the public schools, (3) decision making in the school program, and (4) major substantive areas in the curriculum. From these areas of focus, the Special Project Committee, with Dr. Ole Sand from Wayne State University in the position of NEA staff director, planned to build upon statements of the Educational Policies Commission (26, p. 279). Ideas in their developing stages were presented by a panel consisting of the Project Committee, the NEA staff, and guest educators at the 1962 Convention in Denver, Colorado (27, p. 227). In 1963, a major part of NEA President Hazel
Blanchard's address to the Representative Assembly meeting in Detroit was devoted to a summary of the achievements of the Special Project on Instruction.

After the Russians orbited their first Sputnik, you will recall that education was chosen as the scapegoat for our failure to "out-hustle" the Soviets into space. Many voices rose in this criticism and many of them claimed to have the solution, too. "Return to the 3 R's." "More science." "Get tough." "Teach them to read."

All of these voices had a right to be heard. But one voice should be heard above them all. This is the voice of the teaching profession itself. With this firm belief, the NEA established in 1959 the Project on Instruction.

Schools for the Sixties, the overview volume, is the official report of the Project on Instruction. The report is directed to school board members, to other interested citizens who influence decisions about education, and to our colleagues in the teaching profession. The three supporting volumes are directed more particularly to the teaching profession.

The reports of the Project on Instruction will not provide easy answers to difficult educational problems. They will, however, suggest sound guidelines which can provide the basis for a national conversation on what to teach and how to organize our schools. The Michigan Education Association already has a state-wide program underway which is based upon the Project on Instruction. The Roanoke, Virginia, public schools already have utilized some preliminary findings of the Project in their program.

Activity by local and state associations in utilizing these recommendations and materials as the focus for study by the teaching profession and large numbers of laymen can do much not only to improve education but also to give the organized profession a stronger image of concern about better education as well as salaries and working conditions (28, pp. 14-16).

The supporting volumes of Schools for Sixties, which President Blanchard had cited as particularly appropriate for
the teaching profession, were these: Deciding What to Teach, Education in a Changing Society, and Planning and Organizing for Teaching, all of which were published in the Fall, 1963 (28, p. 15). Later, two sound-color filmstrips, narrated by Ole Sand and Howard K. Smith, were produced to accompany the volumes, Deciding What to Teach and Planning and Organizing for Teaching (45, p. 75).

Increasing evidence of the contagion of projects on instruction could be observed in most of the NEA departments, as well as in the growing number of state association projects cited by the NEA President in 1963. The American Educational Research Association and the Department of Classroom Teachers, cooperating through the NEA Research Division, reported, in 1963, the distribution of a total of approximately one million instructional pamphlets on "What Research Says to the Teacher" (28, p. 343). First published in 1953, the pamphlets included the findings of research in all subject areas and levels of study and in related areas such as parent-teacher relations, homework, pupil progress reports, the learning process, creativity, the gifted, mental health, mental retardation, juvenile delinquency, and class organization for instruction (23, pp. 301; 305). AERA's concluding paragraph in the 1963 Proceedings attests to the devotion of a major portion of time to teaching concerns:

AERA sponsored the 1,218-page Handbook of Research on Teaching, published by Rand McNally and Company in February 1963. As for the third
edition of the Encyclopedia of Educational Research published in 1960 by the Macmillan Company, AERA members are authors of most of the contributions (23, p. 343).

Utilizing the combined resources of groups that were interested in the same issues was the purpose of the Association for Supervision and Curriculum Development in its work with the American Association of School Administrators, the Department of Elementary School Principals, the National Association of Secondary School Principals, and the Rural Education Department, all of the NEA, on the Individual and the School, the conclusions of which were published under the title, "Fostering Individuality." The ASCD and the AASA also initiated, in 1963, a Cooperative Project on Instructional Leadership for the purpose of preparing "proposals to illustrate types of organization for instructional leadership in various sized school systems" (28, p. 347).

Through the leadership of the American Association of Colleges for Teacher Education, the Associated Organizations for Teacher Education was formed, in 1960, for a continuing study of the following concerns: (1) improvement of instruction in scholarly fields, (2) design for quality of preservice teacher education, (3) teaching value commitments, (4) National Council for the Accreditation of Teacher Education (NCATE), (5) cooperative research, (6) international understanding, and (7) placement of elementary, secondary, and College teachers (25, p. 304; 27, p. 271). AACTE also reported in 1963, (1) the completion of a seminar under the
leadership of the Subcommittee on Improvement of Instruction, "as a part of the Association's ongoing effort in improvement of instruction" and (2) the publication of a volume titled Improvement of Instruction in Higher Education (28, pp. 339-340).

The 1963 report of the Association for Higher Education included the following instruction-related paragraphs:

Special Projects--Meet the Professor, the national television series, was continued as a major project of AHE to provide a better public understanding of all higher education and of the teaching profession as well as to attract capable young people to the college teaching profession. Twenty-six weekly programs were produced by the ABC-TV Public Affairs Department in cooperation with AHE and NEA and were telecast by more than 90 stations and broadcast by more than 100 radio stations of the ABC network. Programs featured individual professors from various institutions and disciplines. . . .

Committee Activities--The Committee on Teaching in Colleges and Universities continued a long-term project for improving the quality of instruction in colleges and universities. Conferences are being held with the leadership of several of the learned societies belonging to the American Council of Learned Societies, and with a number of regional accrediting organizations looking toward cooperative action among the groups.

The Committee on General Education directed its attention to preparing special issues of the College and University Bulletin and cooperating with other organizations and institutions in improving general education programs (28, p. 345).

"From Bookshelves to Action: Using the Recommendations of the NEA Project on Instruction" was the listing for a "Current Topic" meeting at the 1964 NEA Convention in Seattle (29, p. 239). Ole Sand, NEA staff director, and Robert M. McClure, associate director, explained at that meeting that
the completion of the Project on Instruction had led to the creation of the NEA Center for the Study of Instruction, which would provide for a continuing study of educational issues and act as an information clearinghouse for new ideas. The initial project of the Center was to assist "selected public and private schools and colleges, state departments of education, and state and local education associations" in the implementation of Project on Instruction recommendations (29, pp. 380-381). Of these new developments NEA Executive Secretary Carr spoke approvingly to Seattle delegates:

The Center and other activities of the NEA and its departments have contributed materially to clarifying the public image of the NEA, particularly among those who have regarded the association solely as a welfare and lobbying organization (29, p. 18).

Attaching related activities to the Project on Instruction, 1964 NEA President Robert H. Wyatt, who had called for "a national policy of support for public education" to replace the image of "continually fighting a national rear guard action to defeat an enemy or outdo a neighboring nation," added appreciative remarks regarding the Association's progress in his address to the Representative Assembly in Seattle:

The vast array of documents and pronouncements that emerge year by year from the many departments, commissions, and other agencies of NEA constitute a monumental source of strength to educators and education. The new, virile, aggressive agencies of the NEA of the past five years, referred to as "projects" are typical of the youthful and imaginative approach that the National Education Association takes toward the problems as
they arise. I refer to the projects on Dropouts, Automation, Technology in Teaching, English Instruction, Academically Talented, Teaching of the Deaf, and, in addition, the giant Urban Project (29, p. 8).

Organization Outreach Through Emphasis on Instruction

President-Elect Lois V. Edinger, speaking at the closing session of the Seattle Convention, also lauded the Project on Instruction as she announced her theme for 1964-65 NEA program emphasis:

As background for my choice of a theme for the year, I reviewed many of the achievements and accomplishments and contributions of this Association. In my estimation, the Project on Instruction completed last year is one of the greatest contributions NEA has made to the cause of universal public education. Bringing into focus as it did the myriad changes we face in a complex, highly industrial and urban society, it afforded the professional practitioner and layman alike the opportunity to take an in-depth look at how social forces in American life affect the schools and how the schools can affect society.

As changes occur in society, the role of education must change. A review of the history of education in this country attests to this need. If the Project on Instruction says anything to us, it says that public education must now adapt to meet conditions in a changing society. We face problems at home and abroad that demand of every citizen the greatest individual skill and achievement.

One of the recommendations growing out of the study called for an intensification of efforts in the area of international competence. We must adapt education to meet changes in the broader world society as well as the changes in our domestic society.

In this country we have traditionally thought of education as the undergirding of democracy. We must expand this concept to think of education as preparation for world responsibility.

To give meaning and direction to our work for the coming year, I have, therefore, chosen as the
theme, "Education for World Responsibility (29, pp. 48-49).

Miss Edinger was "a social studies teacher and the first television teacher of American history in North Carolina" (28, p. 98) who transferred her first-hand knowledge of the classroom to her later work with student teachers in the School of Education in the University of North Carolina at Greensboro. For the 1965 NEA Convention in New York City, she planned with the Center for the Study of Instruction (CSI) and some of the subject matter departments a day devoted to "New Dynamics in the School Curriculum." Introducing Jerome S. Bruner, Director of Cognitive Studies, Graduate School of Education, Harvard University, President Edinger said:

We are indeed fortunate to have with us this morning the eminent psychologist, educator, and author, Jerome S. Bruner, who will keynote our discussion and our activities.

There is surely no teacher in this country who is not familiar with the work and the writings of Mr. Bruner. His landmark research on the nature of perception, learning, and thinking as affected by motives and personality has materially affected the educational process at every level (30, p. 146).

That the 1965 Convention program was a different type of NEA program from his viewpoint was evident from Mr. Bruner's opening remarks:

I am delighted to be with you. I am also astonished to be here. Only the astonishment needs explaining. I had always been given to understand that the National Education Association was the home of the hard-nosed professionals in education--the people who run the schools, man the classrooms, produce the coin that gets circulated in the lessons. . . . Yet, I have spent
this year on leave from Harvard teaching 10-year-olds an experimental curriculum, and I am here on a day's leave from an elementary summer school. . . . So I know about your jobs and your anxieties, even if I don't know them like a pro (30, pp. 37-38).

In a lengthy but concise keynote address, Bruner reviewed for his 1965 NEA audience the development of his own thinking as he raised questions which had led him to at least partial conclusions. First, he cited the search for new ideas concerning the nature of human intelligence that were directed toward finding better ways to assist in its growth:

Perhaps the most important thing that we can do for a growing child from the intellectual point of view, if I may state one conclusion, is to design curriculum for him that permits him to achieve skill in at least one area of knowledge, to experience the self-rewarding and confidence-giving pleasure of going deeply into something.

What I am proposing suggests that we should cut down drastically on the coverage in what we teach to any one child and concentrate instead upon a multiple approach to a few basic ideas, attitudes, and skills in order that we may keep alive a sustained satisfaction in mastery. And that leads immediately to the next general issue that must concern us.

Have we learned anything about the nature of knowledge and knowing that alters our conceptions of how best to organize it for learning, retention, and use? . . .

In a word, knowledge has a structure, a hierarchy, in which some of what is known is more significant than the rest of what is known about some aspect of life or nature. It is more significant because armed with the significant knowledge and armed with the theory and operations for putting the significant knowledge together and for going beyond it, one can reconstruct with reasonable approximation the less significant knowledge and the multitude of stray items that constitute the whole body of knowledge.

The task of the curriculum maker and of the teacher is to give to the student a grasp of this
underlying structure along with a highly discriminating sense of its importance so that he may be saved from that most common blight on human thinking: clutter.

The working solution to the knowledge explosion is to cultivate the arts of connecting things that are akin, connecting them into the structures that give them significance. If one needed a single argument for reemphasizing concepts and structure in the design of a curriculum, this one would, I think, suffice (30, pp. 42-44).

Having referred to his educational venture with ten-year-olds in his opening remarks, Harvard Professor Bruner closed his address to the NEA Representative Assembly with the recounting of a learning experience of his own that he credited to an informal outing with fourteen-year-olds:

For all our deep worry over helplessness in the city and suburban provincialism outside, neither seems to blunt one particular human capacity that overrides both: the sense of drama, the mysterious device by which we represent most vividly the range of human condition. I took a group of 14-year-olds to see Peter Ustinov's Billy Budd on film. The intensity of the discussion of moral philosophy on the way home convinced me that we have overlooked one of our most powerful allies in keeping alive our engagement in history, in the range of human life, in philosophy. Drama, the novel, history rendered with dramatic aids of her patron goddess Clio are all built on the paradox of human choice, on the resolution of alternatives.

Perhaps in teaching our humane traditions and introducing pupils to the sensibility of our culture, we would do well to examine afresh in what manner drama can serve as a more powerful vehicle of instruction (30, pp. 45-46).

Bruner's speech entitled "How Can the Schools Provide a Liberal Education for All Youth?" was one of three major addresses of the "New Dynamics in the School Curriculum"
In concurrent afternoon sessions, Leland B. Jacobs, Professor of Education, Columbia University, spoke on "What Can the Arts and Humanities Contribute to the Liberal Education of All Children and Youth?" and Morris Kline, Professor of Mathematics at New York University, spoke on "The Liberal Educational Value of Mathematics, Science and Technology for Youth" (30, pp. 47-67). Of their contributions to educational thought at the 1965 NEA Convention, Dr. Edinger said in her presidential address:

If we are to educate for world responsibility, and if education is to fulfill its responsibility as one of the forces shaping human destiny, the teaching profession must meet a number of broad conditions. . . . In the first place . . . teachers themselves must be aware of changing societal forces and adapt to meet them. Some have wondered if our present liberal arts programs are losing touch with reality. The addresses by Dr. Bruner, Dr. Jacobs, and Dr. Kline and the discussions that followed in our afternoon program were designed to help us evaluate our liberal arts programs in light of societal forces and new dynamics in instruction (30, p. 13).

If 1964-65 NEA activity differed from the activity of previous years in its concern for educational matters, it apparently differed in the degree of intensity placed on these matters by the President, who perceived these concerns to be in the NEA tradition. Calling the 1965 Convention to a concentrated devotion to educational issues, Miss Edinger cautiously observed:

There is a sense in which everything that happens, every event, every issue is related to education. However, a reasonably close concentration on the
crucial needs for the improvement of the public schools is the wise policy for a professional association. If we fail to achieve this amount of concentration, society risks failure in all fields. The school, at whatever level, is the only agency charged by society with the formal education of young people, and the National Education Association is the professional organization charged by Congress with the promotion of popular education. If, in the 1930's, when problems in our society were very severe indeed, this great organization had deflected from its purpose of improving educational opportunity, the generation now in leadership roles would be seriously handicapped. Although other social and economic problems clamored for solution, the National Education Association concentrated on the task of adapting a curriculum and a school system to meet the exigencies of the period.

Down through history the record shows that many there are who call attention to problems; few there are who help resolve them. . . . You and I are in the business that does more to help resolve problems than any other. Our efforts are not always spectacular, but they are lasting and vastly rewarding (30, pp. 17-18).

Calling attention to the broader horizon of "education for world responsibility," President Edinger informed the 1965 Representative Assembly of the participation of teachers in international efforts to improve instruction through the NEA Teach Corps in its third year of operation:

Over 50 NEA members, all experienced teachers, and each chosen for a particular skill and specialty, will be serving this summer in activities including workshops for elementary teachers in Sierra Leone; an all-inclusive workshop involving elementary, secondary, and college personnel in Venezuela; a workshop for educational administrators and supervisors in Colombia; and the pilot project in Kenya, where 150 Kenyan teachers are being prepared to instruct all of their classes in English for the first time. In Kenya, this is known as the New Primary approach. The NEA has also had requests to send an experienced school librarian to assist in training in Cameroon.
With the continued cooperation of the host country in providing logistical support while on location, the desire of the American teacher to share his skills with his colleagues in far-off lands, and the financial support of the Agency for International Development, the NEA Teach Corps will pursue its goal of upgrading the professional qualifications of the teachers of developing nations while affording American teachers an opportunity to participate in an international experience to enrich their teaching at home (30, p. 15).

"Education for World Responsibility" received a final boost at the last session of the 1965 NEA Convention in New York City in the form of an address by Harlan Cleveland, Assistant Secretary of State for International Organization Affairs, who was on his way to a new post, Ambassador to NATO, in Paris, France.

There is a long and growing list of things to do cooperatively, because science has shown us how, and technology has made the tools, and common sense impels us to the conclusion that they can best be done cooperatively, and often cannot be done in any other way.

In the course of it all, knowledge is diffused and technology spreads by contagion, indifferent to cultural differences. Standards are set, and regulations are published, and international law, this new kind of international law, which is the practice of international organizations, is growing in the way law grows best, organically.

The center of this emerging community, this sprawling international workshop of the world, is that busy band of organizations that cluster about the United Nations which is, in turn, one of the 53 international organizations which you and I as Americans belong to; spawning some of the 550 international conferences at which you and I as Americans are represented this year (30, p. 72).

Speaking out of his own experience, Cleveland reminded his audience of educators that in the preceding two years the United States has attended more international conferences
at the governmental level than "in the entire history of
the Republic from 1789 until the Hot Springs Conference of
1943, which was essentially the beginning of the UN system."
In the 1800's, Cleveland recalled, the United States at-
tended an average of one international conference a year
in contrast to "two new international conferences every day
of the week, every week of the year" in the third quarter of
the twentieth century (30, p. 72). Finally, trying to en-
vision what he would try to teach children under the heading
of "education for world responsibility" if he "were back in
teaching now," Cleveland said there were "seven things" he
would ask children "to learn . . . as they grow up, citizens
. . . of the world's most responsible power":

First, and above all, learn to love diver-
sity. . . .
Second, learn to beware of labels and cate-
gories. . . .
Third, learn to choose between sharply
different shades of grey. . . .
Fourth, I would say, learn that power is a
many-sided thing, to be used with enormous
care. . . .
Fifth, learn to watch the deeper trends of
world events. The surface is subject to quick
storms and sudden calms, neither of which tells
us much of tomorrow. So, I would say, keep a
close eye on the mainstreams and on the quiet,
lesser currents. . . .
Sixth, learn not to worry too much about
what other people say of us. . . .
Finally, I would say to the children of to-
day, learn to enlighten your judgment with a
healthy touch of optimism, . . . time and change
alter the contours of every dispute. . . .
Just open the minds of the young Americans
in your charge and stand back. They will prove,
in their time, even if we do not fully prove in
ours, that our Declaration of Independence was indeed written for all men (30, pp. 76-77).

Characterizing Mr. Cleveland as "teacher, author, administrator, humanitarian, statesman, citizen of the world, distinguished American," the NEA President thanked him "for setting our sights much higher as we seek to instruct the child . . . and to educate for world responsibility" (30, p. 221). Thus, the 1965 Convention in the city of the United Nations Headquarters ended on a note which linked it, ideologically and philosophically, with the 1916 NEA Convention in the same city. In 1916, the participation of Dr. John Dewey from Columbia University had climaxed with his address, "Nationalizing Education," the last session's appeal of that year's Convention. Forty-nine years earlier, Dewey had envisioned the spirit of NEA-1965.

Unless our education is nationalized in a way which recognizes that the peculiarity of our nationalism is its internationalism, we shall breed enmity and division in our frantic efforts to secure unity. The teachers of this country know this fact much better than do many of its politicians. . . . The teacher . . . will never become a party to a conception of America as a nation which conceives of its history and its hopes as less broad than those of humanity--let politicians clamor for their own ends as they will (9, p. 186).

Although politicians and teachers were never far apart, political power was probably not uppermost in the minds of teachers in 1916. (The American Federation of Teachers was in its first year as an organization and the Department of Classroom Teachers was holding its third session that year
at the NEA Convention). In any case, John Dewey's tribute to teachers was typical of his high expectations of them.

The 1965 NEA Convention was honored, in the session preceding Harlan Cleveland's presentation, by the appearance of President and Mrs. Lyndon B. Johnson (30, pp. 7; 206). Though it was a year of successful education legislation which President Johnson--also a teacher--used to advantage in his address to Convention delegates, the presence of the Nation's leader served as a reminder of earlier presidential appearances.

In 1938, Mrs. Franklin D. Roosevelt, having been introduced to the NEA Convention as a teacher, presided as Honorary Chairman of the International Program Session which featured her husband as guest speaker. Said Chairman Roosevelt: "I know that it is the privilege of a presiding officer to make speeches in introducing each speaker. We are late today, and so I am not going to avail myself of that privilege. Ladies and gentlemen, I present to you the President of the United States!" (12, p. 102).

Roosevelt, happy to be introduced by his wife (for the first time in his life) and "glad to come here today to this great meeting" also referred to himself as a teacher--striving to inculcate in the youth of America a greater knowledge of and interest in the problems which, with such force, strike the whole world in the face today. In these recent years we have taught the prudent husbandry of our national estate--our rivers, our soil, our forests, our phosphates, our oils, our minerals, and our wild life.
Along these lines we have made mighty strides--come further than in all the years before in knowledge of how to grapple with the problems of maintaining the estate that our forefathers handed down to us (12, pp. 102-103).

Showing concern for the "difficult problem of keeping education intellectually free," President Roosevelt's remarks underscored the thesis of John Dewey's 1934 address, "Education for a Changing Social Order." Dewey had said, "Freedom to learn is the first necessity of guaranteeing that man himself shall be self-reliant enough to be free" (11, pp. 744-752).

After the President's address, his wife, Honorary Chairman Roosevelt, presented three additional speakers--an Ambassador from France, a Minister from Colombia, and World Federation of Education Associations President Paul Munroe from Columbia University. While Munroe's main thrust was directed to the spirit of internationalism, he also included the ideas suggesting that the pendulum had swung too far in one direction in the Nation's schools.

To recapitulate in a few words--What can education contribute to the solution of world conflicts? I would suggest the following:

1. The extension of acquaintance among teachers; the dissemination of information regarding educational ideals, institutions, and experiences, both of which will lead to a greater international understanding.

2. The creation of world citizenship which will make for toleration and also appreciation of others.

3. The emphasis on an education of ideas and ideals instead of upon one of activities.

4. The emphasis on an education based on reason rather than on emotions.
5. An insistence on the importance of principles and ideals which are the product of long experience and a return to an education of reason based on knowledge rather than on one of emotions based on a one-sided presentation of the situation.

To the realization of all of these the teachers of the National Education Association may contribute by an interest in your committee on international relations and its creature, the World Federation of Education Associations (12, pp. 121-122).

Another step taken by the National Education Association in the late 1930's that, after a quarter of a century, was established as a hallmark of the teaching profession was the creation of a committee to develop a national code of ethics for the profession (13, p. 885). In 1965, President Edinger reported to the delegates in New York:

I am happy to announce to you that all 50 states have adopted the Unified Code of Ethics for the Education Profession, the first time in our history that there has been a common code (30, p. 17).

Finally, the 1965 NEA President shared the democratic concern for academic freedom and the professional association emphasis on an independent profession of teaching:

America's teachers must retain control of their profession, and American schools must be kept free from undue influence from any one group. Every boy and girl in America deserves the right to all the facts. Teachers have a very special responsibility in our society to illuminate all sides of questions. Teachers, school administrators, and boards of education share this responsibility. By their common dedication, the integrity of the American public school system may be preserved--must be preserved (30, p. 17).

As Past President, Lois Edinger assumed, among other roles, the position of adviser to the NEA Center for the
Study of Instruction. Before the 1966 Convention in Miami, she assisted her successor, President Richard D. Batchelder, in securing the authority from the NEA Executive Committee to establish as the basic symbol of the United Teaching Profession the design that had been developed as the symbol of the Project on Instruction (65, p. 37; 31, p. 322). Pi, the sixteenth letter of the Greek word for education, provided the background symbol over which was superimposed an aerodynamic dart indicating CSI's forward thrust for education; the UTP design was completed by a spherical triangular enclosure representing the support of local, state, and national education associations for the advancement of education (49, p. 237). With that symbol and the words of his theme, "Free to Teach," furnishing the backdrop for his presidential year (31, pp. 124-125), Batchelder proceeded in a manner suggested by his initial remarks to the Representative Assembly in New York, to take for granted NEA's growth in instructional services and to devote his energies to welfare concerns of teachers (30, p. 80).

After presiding at a 1966 Convention "Current Issues" meeting, which featured CSI Director Ole Sand in the presentation of a new project, Schools for the Seventies (31, p. 270), NEA Past President Lois Edinger took the theme of the section meeting back to state and local education association meetings in North Carolina. In a presentation that was taped at the North Carolina Education Association Leadership
Conference on August 11, 1966, Dr. Edinger, regretting that the national level association might be growing lax in that regard, urged the supporting local and state associations to "magnify the E in education associations." Responding to the question for consideration at the meeting in North Carolina--"Should a local association be concerned with the improvement of instruction?"--the former president and continuing local, state, and national leader stated emphatically:

My answer is really even stronger than yes; the local association had better be concerned with improving instruction or in a few years there will be no professional association for teachers. . . . Teachers will not only have lost the respect which the community reserves for professional people, they may not be considered capable or competent to speak on any subjects other than salaries; hours of work; fringe benefits; and structural problems.

Consider the recent NEA Convention. . . . In an opening address, Dr. John Gardner outlined ten major societal issues which have implications for education. This was a most provocative address, but the issues which he discussed were never discussed (at least in public) by the delegates who represented the people responsible for the educational system in this country. Had it not been for the subject matter departments and the efforts of the Center for the Study of Instruction, the delegates would have had little indication of great educational movements in the country today.

This is not intended as an overly critical appraisal of the efforts of professional associations in education. These are cautions we must take; these are facts we must consider as we assess the activities of our local, state, or national associations. Edward J. Meade, Jr., in a speech delivered in Seattle at the convention, put the matter in focus: "Certainly teachers deserve a decent salary, adequate working conditions, and the respect of society. Nonetheless, our attention to these matters should not turn us from an obvious fact. As teachers, we exist for the improvement of
learning in others, not merely for the improvement of our own well-being" (5, pp. 1-2).

Enhancing the work of subject matter departments and the Center for the Study of Instruction, the NEA Publications Division, assisted from 1958 to 1966 by Carl Purcell, director of photography, recorded highlights of classroom teaching-learning activities in the United States. TEACH ME, Purcell's 1966 "photographic essay on the joys and challenges of teaching and learning," focused on moments of breakthrough learning experiences in the lives of elementary, high school, and college students and their teachers. "Representative of countless programs and thousands of publications designed to provide ever more effective responses to the eternal plea, TEACH ME," the author's text-photography was rendered more captivating by the following poem:

There is a child
And he says, "Teach me."
The wondering, curious, discovering child--
Awed at the beauty, the rhythm, the process.
Teach me to know
How and where is my world, and why am I me,
Where do I end and all others begin?
Teach me.

There is a youth
And he says, "Teach me."
The reaching, unfolding, surging youth.
Teach me to understand
What and why is the universe,
    what is my part of the joy and the toil,
How do I join with all others?
Teach me.

There is a man
And he says, "Teach me."
The seeking, searching, uncertain man.
Teach me to question, to probe, and to find.
Teach me so that
When a child comes forth
I will know what to do when he says,
"Teach me."

Carol B. Epstein (64, p. 127).

At the 1967 NEA Convention in Minneapolis, Dr. Irvamae Applegate, Dean of Education from St. Cloud, Minnesota, referred in her presidential address to a project developed by the advisers and staff in the NEA Center for the Study of Instruction as one of the "most exciting" developments of her year. Working on the problems of comprehensive curriculum development and the improvement of instruction, the CSI had obtained a grant to carry on a three-year project in cooperation with the staffs of school districts in Anniston, Alabama, and in Montgomery County, Maryland (32, p. 13).

Also, in Minneapolis, the first classified resolution directed to the improvement of instruction was presented by the Committee on Resolutions to the Representative Assembly, which, after amendment and prolonged discussion, adopted the following wording:

The National Education Association recognizes that a prime responsibility of professional associations is to stimulate significant improvements in the quality of instruction. The Association further believes that motivation for improvement is effective when it comes from one's peers. The Association, recognizing that much of the responsibility to make educational changes should lie with the teachers through their influence and involvement in democratic decision making in and out of the school, invites its state affiliates to join in a cooperative endeavor to provide services to local associations to improve instruction.

The Association further recognizes that the expanding technological advancements in the areas
of educational TV, computerized instruction, and programmed learning offer teachers an unprecedented challenge for innovation and improvement in teaching techniques.

So that the profession will be more fully prepared to ensure that these new technological advances will be used for the greater benefit of students and the improvement of education in general, we urge the Association to take leadership in surveying the directions and stage of development that this new technology is taking, so that we as educators will exercise guidance in its development and implementation (32, p. 498).

As Past President, Dr. Applegate, Chairman of the NEA Task Force on Urban Education, with Ole Sand, Director of CSI, and George W. Jones and Joseph Devlin, S. J., of the NEA Urban Education Staff, conducted, at the 1968 Convention in Dallas, an "Open Forum" for those interested in urban education issues (33, p. 274). Concurrent with the Urban Education Forum, another open forum confronting the question "What Will American Education Be Like in 1984?" was also conducted under CSI leadership. Evelyn Carswell, CSI program specialist; Robert M. McClure, CSI Associate Director; James Olivero, Associate Secretary, National Commission on Teacher Education and Professional Standards; and Bernard Kessler, teacher, representing Olivette Underwood Company, were the seminar leaders for the future-oriented education forum (33, p. 275).

The thrust of specialization in instruction by the National Education Association had been guided from the inception of the Project on Instruction through Schools for the Seventies projects by Professor of Education Dr. Ole Sand,
on leave from Wayne State University, Detroit, Michigan. Sand, a teacher with varied international experience, never returned to the institutional university role. After his unexpected death in New Orleans, Louisiana, where he was representing NEA at the Spring, 1973, Convention of the American Educational Research Association, his NEA colleagues established the "Ole Sand Program Improvement Award" to encourage research in instruction through "scholars in residence" studies utilizing facilities and materials at NEA Headquarters.

Ole Sand was a gifted teacher and a valuable and dedicated staff member of the National Education Association. Friends and colleagues have chosen to perpetuate his abiding faith in the profession to which he was dedicated by establishing a fund in his name to help teachers enrich their programs for students. As he said in his last book, On Staying Awake: Talks with Teachers:

But make no mistake about it, it will still be the teacher who can move a child to the edge of his seat, eyes shining, hand raised before the question is completed. Seeing children that eager to learn is one way to determine if a school is any good.

This award of $1,500 demonstrates a commitment to a belief long held by Ole Sand—that the teacher, given the opportunity and time, can bring great zest and substance to his or her classroom. It is time, he often urged, that we enhance the teacher's capacity to enrich the school's program—to free it from the constraints of sterile courses of study or uninspired direction.

The Ole Sand Memorial Fund is administered by Robert McClure, Committee Chairman, Program Coordinator, Instruction and Professional Development,... Paul Houts, Editor, National Elementary Principal,... Anna Hyer, Program Coordinator, Instruction and Professional Development, ... Frances Quinto, Professional Associate, Instruction and Professional Development, and Thomas
One of the last Sand achievements for NEA as director of the Center for the Study of Instruction was the securing of a $24,705 Ford Foundation grant to assist him as chairman in the planning of a Fourth International Curriculum Conference. The Ontario Institute for Studies in Education in Canada and the Schools Council in the United Kingdom participated with NEA/CSI in the 1969 conference near Mohonk Lake, New Platz, New York. The occasion, including visits to American schools, provided an opportunity for British and Canadian representatives "to see at first hand the moves Americans are making toward curriculum design and implementation." The goal of achieving "a more permanent framework for worldwide cooperation in curriculum and instruction" underlined International Curriculum Conference purposes (51, p. 1).

Meanwhile, a $65,000 grant from the U. S. Office of Education aided a National Science Teachers Association project on educational technology in the preparation of materials for an institute for science supervisors. Supervisors then used the packaged materials containing "programed sequences, filmstrips, slides, and scripts, as well as specifications and procedures of instruction" in their teacher in-service programs (54, p. 3).
Another NEA department, the American Driver and Traffic Safety Education Association, and the NEA National Commission on Safety Education projected plans for motorcycle safety instruction in schools. Because school-age youngsters were "turning more and more to the two-wheeled vehicle for transportation and pleasure," NEA, with the support of the Motorcycle, Scooter, and Allied Trades Association, deemed it advisable in the name of relevance to include "two-wheeled instruction" in driver/safety education courses for youth of the 1970's (62, p. 3).

NEA's Concentrated Instruction and Professional Development Program

While the Center for the Study of Instruction continued development of Schools for Seventies publications and other curriculum-instruction projects, a new NEA staff office designated as Professional Development and Instructional Services was given the responsibility for administrative coordination of units whose "primary concern was professional development and the improvement of instruction." In addition to CSI, some of those units were: AAHE (American Association for Higher Education); the Commission on Safety Education; NCTEPS (National Commission on Teacher Education and Professional Standards); the Committee on International Relations; the Student NEA; the Joint Commission of the NEA and AMA (American Medical Association); the Division of Adult Education Service; and the Department of Educational Technology.
(formerly the Department of Audio-Visual Instruction). Program coordinators of the NEA-PDIS staff provided field and conference service with a focus on pilot centers for the development of the role of local professional associations in the improvement of instruction (46, pp. 31-32).

With the coming together of the Teacher Education and Professional Standards Commission and the Center for the Study of Instruction, along with other units, under Professional Development and Instructional Services, the major NEA segments concerned with instruction moved toward a closer organizational relationship. Having worked parallel to each other on related projects for two decades, TEPS and CSI completed jointly, before the establishment of PDIS, the publication *The Teacher and His Staff: Man, Media, and Machines*. A further step toward NEA instructional staff solidarity came, in 1971, with the creation of a Division of Instruction and Professional Development. Next, the 1971 Representative Assembly established a twelve-member Council on Instruction and Professional Development to be appointed by the NEA President with the approval of the Executive Committee (36, pp. 143-146).

The purposes of the Council on Instruction and Professional Development are to identify the needs of NEA members with respect to instruction and professional development, to recommend programs and procedures to meet these needs, and to advise the governing bodies (Executive Committee, Board of Directors, and Representative Assembly) on policies in the area of instruction and professional development (48, p. 108).
The continuing NEA Resolution for the Improvement of Instruction, which was first stated at the 1967 Convention, was developed through annual minor changes in wording to the following five-paragraph length in 1971:

The National Education Association believes that a prime responsibility of professional associations is to stimulate significant improvements in the quality of instruction. Much of the responsibility to make educational changes should lie with the teachers through their influence and involvement in democratic decision making in and out of the school.

The Association supports the principle of involving its National Affiliates, Associated Organizations, and Departments in efforts to improve instruction in our schools.

The Association urges local affiliates to involve members and those affected in the development and implementation of programs for instructional improvement, curriculum development, and individualization of instruction relevant to the needs of the students.

The Association recommends that professional educators enter into active collaboration with research and development specialists, both in regional educational laboratories and in industry, to promote technology's potential contribution to education by guiding the development of technology in the most educationally sound directions. It encourages school systems to establish learning material centers.

The Association further recommends that the profession, in cooperation with other interested groups, establish standards for educational materials (36, pp. 756-757).

With the Improvement of Instruction Resolution serving as the first resolution under the heading "Advance the Cause of Education for All Individuals," the resolutions adopted by the 1975 Representative Assembly were categorized as follows:
A. National Advocate for Education
B. Advance the Cause of Education for All Individuals
C. Promote Professional Excellence Among Educators
D. Recognition of the Basic Importance of the Teacher in the Learning Process
E. Protect the Rights of Educators and Advance Interests and Welfare
F. Secure Professional Autonomy
G. Unite Educators for Effective Citizenship
H. Promote and Protect Human and Civil Rights
I. The Benefits of an Independent, United Teaching Profession (49, pp. 185-219).

 Classified "B-1," the continuing Improvement of Instruction Resolution was couched in the following phraseology for its ninth (1975) appearance:

The National Education Association believes that a prime responsibility of professional associations is to stimulate significant improvements in the quality of instruction. The primary authority to make educational changes should lie with the teachers through their influence and involvement in democratic decision making in and out of school.

The Association endorses affirmative action plans that establish procedures and timetables for eliminating racism and sexism in the curriculum.

The Association recommends that professional educators enter into active collaboration with research and development specialists, both in regional educational laboratories and in industry, to promote technology's potential contribution to education by guiding the development of technology in the most educationally sound directions. It encourages school systems to establish learning material centers.

The Association urges that the profession, in cooperation with other interested groups, establish standards for educational materials, and insist that publishers and producers use the services of a competent educational institution or facility to field test, in actual classroom situations, such materials, and publish the results of their effectiveness.
The Association believes that one of its instructional goals is functional proficiency in English, with emphasis on the development of those basic reading skills essential to the successful pursuit of all other disciplines (49, pp. 189-190).

The years of the development and refinement of the resolution on the improvement of instruction and of the continuing activities of Schools for Seventies' projects paralleled the end of a decade of student unrest and the beginning of a decade of intensified effort to involve youth in the search for solutions to educational problems. On this subject, in February, 1970, the NEA Board of Directors received counsel from J. Lloyd Trump, Associate Executive Secretary of the National Association of Secondary School Principals, in an address titled "Antidotes for Student Unrest in American High Schools." Urging educators to accept the fact of student unrest and to channel it into positive activity, Trump offered his assessment of some of the problems, concluding with some suggestions toward solutions.

Student unrest, as you know, concerns almost all aspects of school life: regulations . . . publications . . . race relations; teachers and the instructional program; faculty affairs . . .

We dare not ignore student extremists. . . . Above all, we need to talk to them to establish dialogue. . . . Typically, the majority of pupils attend school mainly to get a job or to get into college. Usually they complain little, but too many also have little enthusiasm for what they are doing.

. . . . . . . . . . . . . . . . . . . . . . . . . .

The conventional school program inhibits motivation. The typical teacher's goals are too much in a make-believe world, too little in the real
world of the present time and space that pupils live in. Motivation requires that learning materials be right for each pupil, neither too difficult nor too easy, fresh rather than stale, with clearly understood directions that are self-pacing and self-evaluating. Motivation requires individual scheduling tailored to each pupil's interests, needs, and talents. Motivation requires adult supervision and pupil accountability under a competent person, not necessarily a certificated teacher in the conventional sense. Educational settings different from conventional classes of 30 are required for teachers to motivate pupils and for pupils to motivate each other. Motivation requires individualized evaluation of progress with appropriate feedback.

Presently the NASSP, under my direction, is working with about 30 schools to develop the program I have outlined today. We call it the NASSP Model Schools Project.

Our school programs can help restless youth to find avenues for constructive expression of their ideas and can show them how they can undertake the action they desire. . . (35, pp. 435-443).

Another effort to enlist purposeful involvement of student groups was reported by Association of Classroom Teachers Executive Secretary Margaret Stevenson in the 1970 ACT Officers' Report.

ACT, like other segments of the profession, has long been concerned about the quality of the student teaching experience and about the frustrations of the cooperating teacher. . .

Some 50 classroom teachers and approximately 20 representatives of other groups, including representatives of the Student National Education Association and the Future Teachers of America participated in the study conference held in November in Washington, D. C. The report of the conference, Classroom Teachers Speak on the Classroom Teacher in the Student Teaching Program, focuses on the functions of the cooperating teacher and the responsibilities of the professional associations to ensure his status as a coequal partner in the student teaching program (66, p. 12).
In April, 1970, another NEA Conference, "The Professional Association Looks At Its Role in Instruction" was held under the sponsorship of the Office of Professional Development and Instructional Services, Center for the Study of Instruction, Commission on Safety Education, Commission on Teacher Education and Professional Standards, Committee on International Relations, Division of Adult Education Service, Division of Educational Technology, and Project Urban (59).

Arthur F. Corey, Executive Secretary Emeritus of the California Teachers Association, cited his decade of interest in the conference topic and the inclusion of his five-year-old speech, "The Responsibility of the Organized Profession for the Improvement of Instruction," among the 1970 conference materials as evidences of his pleasure that "all the agencies in the NEA having to do with instruction . . . co-operated in a single project" (59, pp. 25-32).

Offering an "observation aside" concerning professional association and union organizational differences, Corey explained:

One of the advantages the union has had in some of the conflicts we have known with them over ideology and philosophy has been merely a matter of type of organization. Their strength was at the local level rather than at the state or national level. Conversely, our strength consistently has been at the state and national level. . . . Not that we need less programs at the national and state level, but that these programs have to be geared now so that the focus of action is . . . where teachers work (59, pp. 27-28).
Moving from emphasis on the local association to the teacher-instructional level, Corey made a further point about structure and goals:

There is no guarantee that when you negotiate reduction of class size from 30 to 25, improved teaching will automatically follow, because there are some teachers who won't teach differently or better. But the condition negotiated certainly is a guarantee that it will invite improved teaching and will make it possible. When we negotiate for better teaching conditions, we act in good faith that on the average the new conditions will work out for the better.

Let me . . . emphasize again . . . In moving toward an increased activism for instructional improvement, we are not making apologies for the welfare goals of the past. No defense of that is called for, because it was absolutely necessary to rescue teachers from economic oblivion before you could begin to talk about higher professional matters. This program front will not be abandoned but we must now prove that the teaching profession can be effective in solving problems of instruction or we must give up our dream of professionalism (59, pp. 28-29).

In the discussion-interchange of the Conference on Instruction, relative to local-state-national relationships, concern was voiced that associations should focus attention "on a genuine student-centered desire to improve instruction" not on association-image-centered campaigns (59, pp. 40-43). The report of the conference also reflected a broad interpretation of instruction-related concerns on the part of conference.

The difference between the problems of curriculum development, on the one hand, and the removal of barriers and restrictions to quality instruction, on the other, was pointed out. Steps that can be taken to relieve the classroom teacher's problems of over-crowding, too many preparations
per day and no time to do them, improper assignment, and disruptive children are not curricular, but may be vital factors in achieving quality teaching (59, p. 43).

Conference Director Thelma W. Horacek paid tribute to Arthur Corey and to Sam Lambert and Allan West of the NEA for generating and sustaining a spirit of interest and enthusiasm throughout the 1970 "landmark conference of local, state, and national leaders."

Although the real success of this experience will be determined by the degree to which participants apply it to their own situations, returns . . . indicate that the zeal evidenced was . . . a growth experience which may serve as a catalyst for expanded association activity in the areas of curriculum and instruction. It should be added that the conference design may have simplified the process, but only the thoughtful awareness and insightful contributions of the participants could have produced the final result (59, p. 12).

Meanwhile, as various segments of the National Education Association moved toward a closer working relationship in instruction-related activities, a Committee on Planning and Organization Development (CPOD) evolved a statement of long-range goals for the NEA that would make it possible to plan, program, budget, and evaluate the priorities of the Association. Presented to the Board of Directors and the Representative Assembly for adoption, in 1970, the six goals which follow were listed as an elaboration of the original (1857) and continuous purpose of the Association:

To elevate the character and advance the interests of the profession of teaching and to promote the cause of popular education in the United States.
Goals of the National Education Association shall be to achieve--

1. An independent, united teaching profession.
2. Professional excellence.
3. Economic security for all educators.
4. Adequate financing for public education.
5. Human and civil rights for all educators and children.

Within this grouping, instruction-related objectives of the NEA were categorized primarily under the goal, "Professional Excellence." Of the culminating movements that had led to the coordination of instruction-related activities, a report credited to the 1971 Board of Directors included the following under the heading, "Professional Excellence":

NEA's force for action toward increased professional excellence involved many of its officers, divisions, committees, boards, task forces, departments, and affiliates. The major effort, however, stemmed from the work done in the NEA Center for the Study of Instruction, the Office of Professional Development and Instructional Services, the National Commission on Teacher Education and Professional Standards, the Association of Classroom Teachers, and through the instructional articles in NEA's official journal, Today's Education.

Throughout the year, the Center for the Study of Instruction pressed forward its Schools for the 70's program. The major purpose of this program is to make available the knowledge and skills necessary for a competent educator to perform his duties. The theme underlying Schools for the 70's is that instruction will be improved if teachers have the authority to make instructional decisions, that they are the best qualified persons to make them.

In addition, CSI this year launched a plan for instructional "town meetings." In February, the NEA Board of Directors called on teachers throughout the nation to take the lead in holding these
meetings, using for discussion purposes CSI's volume, Schools for the 70's and Beyond: A Call to Action. The volume is accompanied by a discussion-starter library of audio tapes, leaders' guides, and response sheets. These will be used in the town meetings as well as by other groups concerned with education.

Another breakthrough for teacher participation in professional excellence this year was the decision by members of the National Council for Accreditation of Teacher Education to add at least two practitioners to every team that visits an institution seeking accreditation for programs of teacher education.

Lois Williams, chairman of the National Commission of Teacher Education and Professional Standards, commented: "The council's action moves toward the goal of substantial participation of elementary and secondary practitioners on NCATE visiting teams. . . .

The Association of Classroom Teachers took its charge for action on professional excellence from the words of the president during the 1970 ACT meeting in San Francisco. "We now recognize that we are the experts in the teaching-learning process and that, more often than not, we have greater expertise than the so-called experts," ACT President Betty I. Buford said at that time. Following this belief, and the mandate of ACT's Assembly calling for grass-roots involvement of classroom teachers in Association programs, ACT plunged itself into the Grass Roots Involvement Program (GRIP) seminars . . . seven in all . . . held in every section of the nation . . . brought thousands of teachers together during the year to take a close look at NEA goals and objectives in workshops dealing with educational technology, schools for the 70's, television programming for the classroom teacher . . . and governance of the profession.

The GRIP seminars provided for a consolidation and expansion of general conferences of the NEA and its units. The major objective of GRIP was to provide two-way communication between the NEA and its members by carrying information about existing NEA programs to teachers and by channeling their concerns and opinions about future programs to NEA.
NEA periodicals and publications continued in 1970-71 to provide a vast yield of instructional material to help teachers improve themselves in the classroom. During the year, Today's Education, NEA's official journal and one of the Association's major sources of instructional materials, published some 40 articles directly bearing on the improvement of instruction. The articles ranged from a special feature on Homework (September, 1970, issue) to an article on the laboratory approach to elementary mathematics (February, 1971) to a special section on the chronically ill pupil (May, 1971).

NEA's teacher-members took yet another challenging direction this year in their search for professional excellence. Responding to the growing public concern about accountability of the teacher, they met at the annual ACT study conference for a fuller look at this new concern.

Participants acknowledged that classroom teachers are accountable to themselves, the teaching profession, their professional peers, their professional association, students, the public, the school administration, and college personnel.

Participants stipulated, however, that certain conditions must exist if classroom teachers are to be held accountable.

Other highlights of NEA action toward professional excellence during 1970-71 included:

* A conference--planned by the NEA Office of Supervisory-Administrative Services.
* An Urban Institute in Des Moines, Iowa
* Project Urban Upswing, an Indianapolis-based program.
* Establishment of a Research and Demonstration Center in Child Care and Teaching. A personal project of NEA President Helen Bain, the Washington, D. C., center specialized in innovative early childhood curriculum development.

Objectives for the PPBS (plan, program, budget system) goals were developed in detail at the Fall, 1970, NEA Board of Directors session which included input from the Association of Classroom Teachers, the National Council for State Education...
Associations, National Council of Urban Education Associations, and Student National Education Associations. The most extensive input, from ACT President Donald F. Wilson, showed agreement with the basic original order of the goals (page 218 of this study) with only Goals 3 and 4 at variance with the priorities that were finally established for the NEA (36, pp. 433-435). Objectives for Goal 2, "Professional Excellence," applied primarily to the coordinated Association activity under the responsibility of the Council on Instruction and Professional Development, which, to implement the NEA Constitution adopted in 1973, was changed, in September, 1975, to Standing Committee on Instruction and Professional Development. For the attention of that division of Association work, resolutions adopted by NEA Representative Assemblies were categorized "Instruction and Professional Development, Professional Excellence." Thirty-nine such resolutions plus two new business items under the following titles were classified "Goal 2" by NEA governance bodies after the 1975 Representative Assembly discussions and resolutions:

- Educational Opportunity for All
- Improvement of Instruction
- Bilingual-Multicultural Education
- Health of Children
- Pupil Personnel Services
- Conversion to the Metric System
- Moral and Ethical Values
- Education in Correctional and Rehabilitation Agencies
- A Certified Educator in Every Professional Position
- Evaluation and Subjective Ratings
- Accreditation of Teacher Preparation Institutions
- Time to Teach
- Paraprofessional and Auxiliary Personnel
Selection of Material
Cultural Diversity and Instructional Materials
Physical Environment for Learning
Privileged Communications
Professional Autonomy
Human Relations in the School
Deleterious Programs
World Peace
Cable Television
Planned Program Budgeting Systems
Sex Education
Vocational and Career Education
Exceptional Student Needs
Child Care Services
The Sensory Impaired Student
Communication with the Deaf
Teacher Education
Teacher Centers
Competency-Based Programs
Teacher Exchange Programs
Access to Copyrighted Instructional Materials
Accountability and Assessment
Recording Devices in Schools
Differentiated Staffing
Standardized Tests
Athletic Programs
Studying of Nationwide Educational Cable Television Network
Policy on Performance-Based Teacher Education Programs (43, pp. 19-35; 56).

A "Progress Toward Implementation" column included a statement with each of the above items, indicating NEA's action pursuant to the substance of each resolution and new business item. In 1974, with "Professional Excellence" as the heading of Goal 2 area, a majority of the statements had implicated IPD as the responsible agency for implementation (42, pp. 15-27). With the change of title, in 1975, to "Instruction and Professional Development, Professional Excellence," the unnecessary repetitious reference to IPD in the implementation column was revised.
The achievements of IPD had convinced those working in that goal area of NEA that (1) giving adequate attention to professional development programs improved the public and professional climate for collective bargaining, (2) concerted efforts for educational improvement heightened the perceived value of teachers, and (3) organized efforts to realign national priorities are interrelated and must be seen in the same context (44, p. 25). The 1975 IPD report lauded NEA's authoritative voice "for teachers' broad instructional interests such as in-service education, teacher training, bilingual/multicultural education, and testing" (44, pp. 25-27). Nevertheless, this apparent achievement of the ultimate unified approach to instructional problems was not without reminders of other abandoned efforts. The 1975 IPD report concluded:

However, NEA has not organized its member talents and inner resources in specialized instructional areas such as reading, mathematics, social studies, science, English, . . . NEA should speak with authority for the profession in all areas of instruction (44, p. 27).

Renewed Challenges to NEA and the Continuing Thread

The assertion by the Council on Instruction and Professional Development, in their 1975 report, that the Association's thrust in instruction should be strengthened by departmentalization of subject areas was an echo of NEA Department voices, spanning a century of professional development, and
of John Dewey's reference to departmental teaching, and, more recently, of President Don Morrison's challenge to NEA as he assumed Association leadership at the 1971 Convention in Detroit. Morrison charged:

I have said that the teachers of this country do not have the kind of control and the power to make decisions, and I think one way of demonstrating that is to note that with all of the sophisticated communications devices and means that we have today, the NEA is not able to communicate with you other than "member." The NEA cannot communicate with you as a member who teaches English. . . . And because we have not given that kind of priority, I think it is a recognition that we have not considered the teacher as the person who is going to set the direction for instruction in this country (36, pp. 359-360).

Of the time devoted to Association re-structuring problems, Morrison was equally critical.

We have made a god out of structure. We have put that first, and we have sacrificed our ability to work together on mutual goals to a lesser position. And in my opinion, if we do not come up with a new definition of unity—that of simply being able to achieve mutual goals—and put that above structure, we are going to continue to spend more money in conflict among ourselves than we are on program (36, p. 359).

Morrison was applauded; he had sounded a familiar cry; but his administration, too, confronted the AFT-NEA merger issue as well as other structural diversions from both without and within the NEA. Coming in the middle of NEA's Constitutional Convention (Con Con) controversy of the early 1970's, Morrison's period of service also afforded a hearing (on the Executive Committee level) to a group who took advantage of the vacuum brought about by the "conflict among ourselves."
In January, 1972, the NEA Executive Committee was visited by officers of the recently established Alliance of Associations for the Advancement of Education (AAAE). Membership fees for the new organization were $200.00 for each member organization which would receive one vote and be represented by three of its officers. Lloyd R. Bell, President, and Jack R. Frymier, President-Elect, discussed purposes of AAAE and its upcoming national conference "focusing on instruction and publications to share information among the groups involved on topics such as the purposes of education, the future of education, teacher centers, and renewal programs." Stressing the main purpose of the organization, "to improve instruction," the AAAE representatives explained that details of agreement and/or disagreement with NEA policy would "be worked out in the next few months as the policies and procedures become more defined" (37, pp. 530-531).

Meeting in Dallas, Texas, in 1973, with Sam Lambert, former NEA Executive Secretary as the keynote speaker, but showing little agreement with NEA, the AAAE listed the following organization members, a majority of which were former NEA departments:

- American Association of Elementary-Kindergarten-Nursery Educators
- American Association for Health, Physical Education, and Recreation
- American Association of School Administrators
- American Association of School Librarians
- American Driver and Traffic Safety Education Association
American Industrial Arts Association
American School Counselor Association
American Vocational Association, Inc.
Association for Childhood Education International
Association for Educational Communications and Technology
Association for Supervision and Curriculum Development
Association of Teacher Educators
Council for Exceptional Children
Department of School Nurses, NEA
Music Educators National Conference
National Art Education Association
National Association of Educational Secretaries
National Association of Elementary School Principals
National Association for Public Continuing and Adult Education
National Association of Secondary School Principals
National Business Education Association
National Council of Administrative Women in Education
National Council for the Social Studies
National Council of Teachers of Mathematics
National Home Economics Education Association
National School Public Relations Association
Speech Communication Association (1)

Described in 1975 as an organization in financial difficulties, the AAAE planned for publication a book on "crucial issues in education" in addition to the continuation of annual conferences (6). The book, *Personal Liberty and Education*, was published, but the number of member organizations had dropped markedly by 1976 (7). While the AAAE struggled to get off the ground, the NEA continued to meet the challenges of competing organizations through the growing local, state, regional, and national outreach of the United Teaching Profession.

Urging the NEA to imitate the organization and negotiation skill that had become characteristic of AFT, 1971-72 NEA President Morrison, a social studies teacher from San
Diego, California, observed that NEA had never--throughout its confrontation with AFT--lessened its emphasis on instruction. Praising beginning emphases on instruction, from 1857 to 1870, Morrison was less pleased with the influencing viewpoint of the Department of Superintendence/American Association of School Administrators, which he discerned to be concerned with management and control of content and environment of instruction (36, pp. 358-359). Although Morrison's open confrontation with this long-standing administrator-teacher issue heightened the "conflict among ourselves," it served a purpose similar to Russell Ziemer's dissertation study in progress at the same time (see pages 3; 117 of this study). The examination and recognition of conflicting and/or similar viewpoints was an educational experience for those involved, and the outreach of the effect of that experience cannot be determined.

Another chapter in the case of Ziemer's study of AFT and NEA negotiations in behalf of curriculum-instruction occurred, in 1975, when the National School Board Association requested the assistance of Ziemer and his mentor, A. Gray Thompson, in determining the opinions of school board members in the twenty-eight school districts of Ziemer's 1972 study. NSBA reported an incredible lack of understanding of the issues involved on the part of the board members. To the NSBA researchers it was "a disturbing paradox" that the majority of board members were opposed to negotiation of curriculum-instruction components
and yet participated, in their own districts, in such negotiations. Furthermore, board members exhibited "no clear direction as to who is responsible for making decisions relative to curriculum-instruction." A final implication expressed the difficulty of rationalizing "the fact that the majority of board members agree that working conditions are clearly negotiable but deny the negotiability of other curriculum-instruction components inextricably tied to the working conditions surrounding teaching-learning tasks." A tentative conclusion was reached that paradoxes existed because of different interpretations relative to curriculum-instruction items from the different viewpoints of the board/public, the administrators, and the teachers (67).

At a time when confusion seemed the order of the day, "Let's get it all together" became the rallying cry of 1972-73 NEA President Catharine Barrett from Syracuse, New York. Addressing the Convention in Portland, Oregon, Mrs. Barrett exhorted: "We must settle our internal differences and move out united to deal with the larger problems which confront us. For, as educators, we have a common cause (38, p. 11).

Offering an appropriate structure for "getting it all together," a Critical Issues Conference at the Portland Convention featured leading figures in the fields of education and politics and sought to provide greater interchange of opinion among those attending (38, p. 9; 41). The constituents were present to "get together," and divisiveness had run its
full course; unity—or the periodic rally around the educa-
tional Tower of Babel—was the order of the day for the NEA in the mid-1970's.

With frequent references to Jonathan Livingston Seagull, a popular book during her term of service, President Barrett called on her fellow teachers to use the "first-hand know-
ledge of needs of education and causes of educational fail-
ure" to "show the way in seeking out realistic and humanistic remedies for today's social ills" (38, pp. 7-13). Transferring her desire for greater harmony within the education association to a larger purpose and quoting Bertrand Russell's characterization of selfless, issue-oriented service, Mrs. Barrett concluded her presidential address with her greatest challenge:

I would urge you to use this power for another purpose, too—we must become agents for peace.

For after all, if waging war required pro-
fessional skills, it is only reasonable to believe that peace-keeping—a task the world has yet to accomplish—requires professional skills of a higher order (38, pp. 11-12).

Again, in 1973, an issue for education echoed John Dewey's "Nationalizing Education," the closing session address of 1916:

I have taken this part of your time to remind you of the fact that our nation and democracy are equivalent terms; that our democracy means amity and good will to all humanity (including those beyond our borders), and equal opportunity for all within. Since as a nation we are composed of representatives of all nations who have come here
to live in peace with one another and to escape the enmities and jealousies which characterize old-world nations, to nationalize our education means to make it an instrument in the active and constant suppression of the war spirit and in the positive cultivation of sentiments of respect and friendship for all men and women, wherever they live. . . . If we can get our education nationalized in spirit in these directions, the nationalizing of the administrative machinery will in the end take care of itself (9, p. 188).

In somewhat the same vein, although he did not cast his philosophy with Dewey's at the time, Dr. Reinhold Niebuhr addressed the NEA Department of Superintendence, in 1930, on "The Spirit of Life":

To create a world in which man will understand his brother, . . . to create a world in which differences of social, national, and cultural background will not lead inevitably to conflict--this is the task which confronts our generation. . . .

. . . . . . . . . . . . . . . . . . . . . . . . . . .

To bring order out of this confusion, to make this new social complexity sufferable for man--that is a problem which invites the application of the highest intelligence to the greatest degree of social imagination. . . .

. . . . . . . . . . . . . . . . . . . . . . . . . . .

We are to a certain degree becoming a nation of undereducated experts who know some little area of life but have no sense of responsibility for the whole of life. . . .

. . . . . . . . . . . . . . . . . . . . . . . . . . .

Happily whenever we reach bottom in a spirit of intellectual sophistication which destroys all goals and enervates all energies, there is usually a new influx of feeling, energy, irrational goals, and higher religious purpose.

. . . . . . . . . . . . . . . . . . . . . . . . . . .

To discipline life without destroying its energies, to refine the impulses of life without enervating them, to create the union between life's highest rational and its highest irrational forces--that seems to me the most challenging of all the problems which face those of us who are guiding each new generation (10, pp. 612-618).
Thus, "guiding each new generation"/instruction, which the National School Board Association defined, in a report on curriculum-instruction components in collective bargaining contracts, as "those organized procedures utilized to involve students in the transmission of what is to be learned," was NTA/NEA's thread for unity within the Association where teaching and administration became one and where philosopher, psychologist, preacher, politician, parent, professor, and professional-aspiring practitioner alternately expounded various interpretations of the inborn inclination as old as life and as new as the latest ideology infusing it or the latest technique systematizing it. Also exhibiting the potential to become a priority "common cause" of educators with divergent organization ideologies, emphasis on instruction was the frequent focus of splinter groups of the NEA and of rivaling organizations, particularly the American Federation of Teachers Union. Pre-dating all organizations of educators and providing connections for them with all areas of life, instructional concerns became a primary factor in the recognition of teaching as a profession—and in the recognition by all teachers of their common bond with all humanity.

William Van Til in Issues in **Secondary Education**, 1976 Yearbook of the National Society for the Study of Education (originally the National Herbart Society) likened the modern realization of a common cause in the educational process of
instruction to Jimmy Durante's expressive "Everybody wants to get into the act."

Administrators are better trained and belie the old stereotype of the coach promoted into administration. Teachers see themselves as professionals rather than as people "keeping school"; their organizations, whether the National Education Association or the American Federation of Teachers, move beyond welfare concerns into curriculum. In crisis periods in our national life, the voices of students are raised demanding a say over their lives, . . . People of the community are being recruited to play a new role in schools as assistants and para-professionals and in communities as helpers and instructors. . . .

Obviously, a possibility for the profession is to close ranks and fend off the "outsiders" in the name of professional expertise and leadership. But this has not worked in the past and there is no likelihood that it will work in the future. . . . It ignores the American assumptions that the schools belong to the people and that the professionals are their representatives. . . .

It behooves all who are genuinely concerned for education to keep the process of administration, supervision, and improvement from becoming a giant version of the street game of "king of the hill," in which all attempt to clamber to the top and pull down any who succeed. . . . Behind the struggles over accountability, decentralization, student revolt, financing, union power, arbitrary administration, lie the questions of the proper roles of varied groups with respect to the administration, supervision, and improvement of secondary education (68, pp. 28-29).

Distinguished Educator/Historian Henry Steele Commager, speaking of the limitations of "the school as surrogate conscience," said that it is "part of our task--to enlist all educational agencies in an enterprise of education that shall embrace the whole of society";

to make clear that education is not something we hand over to schools and then forget about (except at football or basketball games or graduation exercises) but is the responsibility of the family,
the government, the church, television, newspapers and magazines, business (which might profitably begin the enterprise by using advertising for purposes of enlightenment instead of purposes of deception) and labor, the great educational organizations, such as the Office of Education, the National Education Association, and the scores or even hundreds of private voluntary associations ranging from the Parent-Teachers Association to the League of Women Voters, the Masons and the Elks, the Rotary and Kiwanis, the American Legion and the Veterans of Foreign Wars . . . . Perhaps the only way of achieving that integration is to turn the whole university into a school of education—what else is a university? And does not the division within the university between learning and education mirror the division in our society between education and schooling? Should not the functions of schools of education be absorbed in all the branches of the university? (3, p. 57).

Addressing the 1974 Critical Issues Conference preceding the Chicago NEA Convention, Commager urged educators to throw off the scapegoat role for society's ills and join with the public in a cooperative venture toward a single standard of morality. The basic problem posed by "Watergate and all its attendant horrors is neither constitutional or political; it is moral," Commager emphasized (58, p. 10).

"NEA's second annual Critical Issues Conference, focusing on values and moral issues in Post-Watergate America, was designed to bring together teachers and authorities in many fields for an exchange of ideas on societal problems as they affect the schools and as schools and teachers are asked to solve them," said 1974 President Helen Wise. "I trust this wide-ranging national forum has stimulated your thinking as it has mine and that you will take home fruitful ideas and
approaches to use as you assume leadership roles in the nation's quest for a new moral consciousness" (58, p. 8).

To help teachers act on the challenge of the day, NEA Instruction and Professional Development was ready with four field-tested teaching units about the Watergate crisis: (1) "What is Playing Fair" for K-4, (2) "Learning to Govern" for 5-8, (3) "The Individual and the Constitution" for "focusing on the Constitution, social contract, and impeachment," and (4) "Morality and Ethics in Government," developed from "Bill Moyers' Journals" of the Public Broadcasting Service (58, p. 14).

**Values and the Search for Self**, a fourteen-chapter book designed to help the classroom teacher "become a more effective facilitator of learning," was published by the National Education Association in 1975. Emphasizing the importance of self-knowledge and self-evaluation to both instructor and learner, author James Bellanca presented role-playing and meditation activities to aid in the development of a creative search for individual and group values.

In developing the idea of process, the author leads the reader to realize that, in addition to helping the learner function independently, the teacher-facilitator also helps individuals function effectively in groups by guiding them to engage to synergetic effort--the cooperative use of their individual skills toward specific goals agreed on by the groups. By building a support climate, the facilitator can lead students to an understanding of the difficult roles individuals play in a group and how to vary those roles for effective action. . . . It is clear that this very ability is vitally needed at a time when our future--both immediate and distant--requires not only
realistic prediction, but also ingenious problem-solving that may not have much in the way of tradition to support it (2, Preface).

The National Education Association also published Drama as a Learning Medium, a twenty-chapter book about drama instructor Dorothy Heathcote by one of her student teachers, Betty Jane Wagner. Heathcote suggested that teachers should analyze and clarify their personal values, determine and understand where their students are, and then devise dramatic-incident-type plans for the purpose of involving students in an active thinking process that should enable them to progress toward higher levels of maturity (69, p. 230).

Illustrating the implementation of theories suggested in publications, after the 1975 NEA Convention, NEA-IPD conducted a conference at Huntington Beach, California, on "Teacher-Centered Inservice Education." Using NEA's 1974 publication, Organizational Aspects of Inservice Education, conferees practiced state and local association leadership roles directed toward the realization of more productive inservice education programs. The terminology appropriate to "contract language" was emphasized with the assumption that "local education associations must make it their business to bargain for--to negotiate for--to be an advocate for--teacher rights in the inservice field (50).

In an editorial on "the role of professional associations in the improvement of instruction," 1975 NEA President James A. Harris said:
The NEA has a major objective to establish publicly financed and practitioner-designed in-service programs. To obtain such programs will require new contract rights in the case of most local associations. Nationwide planning by teachers is also essential so that organizational roles will be clearly established to avoid duplication and conflict.

To bring about instructional improvement involves specific information, knowledge, and power to undertake educational reform. Because our school systems are a part of a larger social system, little or no reform is likely to take place unless national priorities are geared to the necessity of changing the teaching and learning environments (8, p. 5).

NEA's continuing and increasingly cooperative role in instruction-related activities was reflected in the September-October, 1976 issue of *Today's Education* (NEA Journal), official journal of the National Education Association and the main publication-arm of the Instruction and Professional Development Division. The eleven "continuing features" of that issue offered a balance of informative, inspirational, and inquiry-oriented content related to classroom instruction. "Research Clues," for example, provided answers from recent research to such questions as: "Do standardized tests guarantee objective evaluation of students? . . . What generalizations seem true about the way handicapped children learn? . . . Can immediate feedback of performance results increase learning? . . . Do student athletes have better self-concepts than other students?" (60).

Encompassing a wide scope of education issues and indicating a shared approach to the solution of problems, the
twenty-three articles in Today's Education, September-
October, 1976, included the following titles:

"What's Wrong with Research in Education?"
"Teaching for Thinking: A Piagetian Perspective"
"Teaching About Death"
"Success Story of an Inner-City School"
"Understanding the Anoretic Student"
"The Myth of the Royal Road" [to learning]
"The Seven Cardinal Principles Revisited"
"Teachers and Parents Together"
"Easing the Stress of Parent-Teacher Conferences"
"Where Have All the Innovations Gone?"
"Turning Students On to Active Citizenship"
"Classroom Discipline: A Negotiable Item"
"Students' Learning Styles"
"Peripatetic Pupils"
"Third-Culture Kids"
"Education for a Global Community" (60)

Editor Walter A. Graves credited member-contributors to the "largest issue" of the official journal of the NEA "ever published" with the success of their magazine. "Over the past 20 years," the editor concluded, "your magazine has won more than 30 educational journalism awards. But we editors obviously didn't do it alone. . . . So continue to send us your ideas, reactions, and manuscripts, and your magazine will continue to help teachers teach" (60, p. 5A).

The November, 1976, NEA Reporter, reflecting a reordering of Association priorities which moved "Leadership in Solving Social Problems" from last to first place among the six NEA goals (p. 218 this study), included a list of NEA instructional materials to "help all educators humanize our schools." Designed for preservice and inservice training, school-community activities, education associations, and
classroom use, the various materials emphasized "a total approach to education" (52, p. 10).

In the fields of vocational and higher education, 1976 victories were claimed as a result of sustained lobbying efforts on the part of NEA and its affiliates for a period of more than two years:

In keeping with policies adopted by its Representative Assembly, NEA zeroed in on greater involvement of teachers, administrators, school boards, and postsecondary institutions—people who carry out local programs—in developing state plans for vocational education. NEA brought together, for the first time, interest groups in higher and vocational education to work for legislation that will lead to the establishment of better coordinated vocational and adult education programs.

NEA scored a significant victory in the authorization of funds for teacher centers.

NEA argued that the true purpose of a teacher center is to serve teachers at the grassroots level, providing practical and realistic inservice training. Resources should be available to enable teachers to evaluate education needs in their own communities, call in consultants if necessary to help develop programs, and receive the necessary training to carry out these programs effectively.

The omnibus higher education bill provides that at least ten percent of the $75 million annual authorization for a group of teacher training and retraining programs be made available for teacher centers. Such centers would operate under the supervision of policy boards, the majority membership of which would consist of teachers in all disciplines, including vocational and special education (56, pp. 8-9).

Growing discontent with lack of national leadership sympathetic to education provided the NEA with greater justification for the Association's first endorsement of candidates for President and Vice President of the United States in 1976.
"We must have a team in the White House which is committed to making education a top national priority, and that team is Gov. Jimmy Carter and Sen. Walter Mondale," said 1976 NEA President John Ryor (40, p. 8). "A staunch supporter of education," a colleague to NEA leaders in Washington, Senator Mondale had addressed the 1971 NEA Convention audience and other Association conference sessions (36, pp. 39; 147-148).

Adding distinction to NEA's Washington, D. C. links, the former home of first Association President Zalmon Richards was designated as a National Historic Landmark in 1976. Representing the NEA at the September ceremonies, Treasurer John McGarigal noted that Richards had organized the first teachers' association in the nation's capital and had played a leading role in the establishment of the Department of Education/Office of Education in addition to his more than forty years of service with the NTA/NEA. The organization's growth to a membership of nearly two million would have been incredible to Richards, McGarigal surmised (63, p. 12).

The November-December, 1976, issue of Today's Education carried a report of the NEA's "third biennial survey of teachers' instructional problems," the results of the first priority of the 1975 Council of Instruction and Professional Development. A review of this Association service preceding the statistical report presented by staff members Bernard R. Bartholomew and Lois Schaeffer Karasik included the following information concerning procedures and content:
The Association asked a nationwide sample of its members to indicate on the Survey of Instructional Problems reprinted on these two pages the degree to which certain problems affect their work. Part I--Instructional Problems--asked the degree to which problems that trouble some teachers in some schools affect teachers in their current assignment; Part II--Special Problems--asked questions about four special issues of national concern: class size, discipline, mainstreaming, and in-service education (57, p. 81).

That NEA leaders considered teacher needs to be symptoms of societal inadequacies was evidenced by the 1976-77 planning of regional conferences that served as Association inservice workshops directed toward the involvement of parents as partners in meeting the needs of students. Under the leadership of Donald Carothers, staff member, and Donald Blakeslee, chairman, the conferences were budgeted through the Division of Instruction and Professional Development for participants representing state affiliates (55).

Underscoring further the trend toward world unity evolving from the search for solutions to problems common to all members of the teaching profession and to all cultural groups throughout the world, the 1976 November-December Today's Education included for the first time a special insert in Spanish for Puerto Rican readers (61, p. 2) and featured remarks from a world teacher organization leader. Thoughts from "World Teacher Power," an address by William Ebert, President of Bavarian Teachers Association and of the World Confederation of Organizations of the Teaching Profession, indicated "a new level of disillusionment with
international maneuvering" and a renewed yearning for instruction to carry over to the actions of citizens in communities throughout the world.

We as teachers deplore that every conceivable excuse is tolerated for not granting the basic human rights in many countries. We as teachers witness with deepest concern the United Nations, in which similar actions are condemned in some countries but ignored in others. It seems that some diplomats are just persons lying for the state, following the principle: Get the formalities right and forget about the moralities.

Let there be no mistake. Reforms in education, innovations in methods and techniques, new systems of administration all will fail to make the desired impact on the education of today's young people if teachers are not actively involved in their elaboration and committed to their execution.

Let's look at the other side of this coin as well. If we are to demand such rights, teachers' organizations must emphasize to their members that teachers are responsible for their own professional development. When our organizations demand rights, it must be for competent teachers serving the community, not for unconcerned teachers pursuing their own self-interest. Our responsibilities and our rights are equally important to us.

We teachers of the world have a long list of very complicated problems. In every case, they are the same problems that are faced by the communities we serve.

We need an interested and informed public if we are to produce solutions. Only in this way can we hope to build a better world at the national level and to promote the global community we seek (4, p. 36).

Ebert's call for the independence and interdependence of instructional leaders throughout the world reinforced NEA's resolutions of support to organizations of other nations and of commitment to world peace. Finally, the focus by the President of the World Confederation of Organizations
of the Teaching Profession on teacher-instruction issues served to highlight the universal appeal of instruction as a thread for unity.

Summary

Both subject-centered and service-centered departments of the National Education Association cooperated through joint committees with the parent association and with other departments on projects of common concern. Finally, in 1951, all departments interested in instruction joined the parent association in the sponsorship of a regional instruction conference. That conference, which was held in the Midwest United States, initiated a pattern for emphasis on instruction in the 1950's. Supporting action by the NEA Executive Committee and reports of conference activities by presidents and executive secretaries underlined the early popularity of the regional instructional sessions. Later, the momentum of interest in instructional improvement was enhanced by increased interest in schools arising from the Soviet challenge to America's space technology.

By the 1960's, the NEA was advancing through a concentrated instructional improvement program under the leadership of a university professor of education (on leave) as staff director. The first Project on Instruction led to the establishment of the Center for the Study of Instruction for the purpose of implementing the Project, which was publicized under the title Schools for the Sixties. Next, Schools for
The Seventies and Beyond was the culmination of an attempt to develop the idea of progressing "from bookshelves to action"; and a staff reorganization within the NEA led the way for the coordination of the Teacher Education and Professional Standards Commission (TEPS) objectives with the interests of the Center for the Study of Instruction (CSI). Labeled "Professional Development and Instructional Services," the new staff was advised by a Council on Instruction representing the NEA membership. Finally, the staff and a standing committee of NEA members assumed the more concise title, Instruction and Professional Development (IPD).

*Today's Education/The NEA Journal* was utilized as the main publication-arm of the instruction division.

The flexible expanding and contracting structure of the National Education Association of the United States provided a stage for individual and group spotlighting of developing perceptions of instruction. With a doors-open-to-the-world approach, NEA achieved within its own structure some of the freedom sought by the organization in behalf of the child and the teacher. Furthermore, during a period of organization discord and fragmentation that developed after the NEA completed its first century, instructional concerns, while not an exclusive concern of the National Education Association, emerged as a thread to unify the NEA with diverse organizations and with classic human
institutions--the home, the church, the school, and governmental agencies--throughout the world.


7. , Letter from Ohio State University, Columbus, August 12, 1976.


43. Educational Actions: Report on Implementation of Actions of the 1974 Representative Assembly (July 2-8, 1975), NEA.
44. Educational Issues: Reports on Committees, Councils, and Task Forces, 1974-75 (July 2-8, 1975), NEA.
60. Today's Education, Vol. 65 (September-October, 1976), NEA.


CHAPTER VI

RESOLVING THE QUESTIONS OF THE STUDY

Summary, Interpretations, and Conclusions

The purpose of this study was to identify and describe the purposes, plans, activities, and programs of the National Education Association that focused upon instruction. To carry out this purpose, guideline questions were developed. Answers to the questions were sought through leads obtained from a study of the volumes of *Addresses and Proceedings* for the years since the first NTA meeting in 1857 through the 1976 NEA Convention and editions of the NEA *Handbook* from the first in 1945 through the 1976 edition. The questions, together with answers and supporting findings derived from the study, follow.

1. First, a search for indications that instruction was a continuous priority concern included in purposes, plans, activities, and programs of the NEA was carried out by pursuing four leading questions which served to categorize the findings related to different aspects of Association emphases on instruction.

   a. How was instruction included in purposes, plans, programs, and activities of the National Education Association?
The 1857 call for the forming of a National Teachers Association issued to "practical teachers" by leaders of ten state educational associations evolved from a desire to share and collate ideas for the improvement of public education by increasing the quantity and the quality of teachers and schools. The preparation of teachers and the improvement of instruction were understood to be an implementation of Association purposes stated in the Preamble to the NTA/NEA Constitution: "To elevate the character and advance the interests of the profession of teaching and to promote the cause of education in the United States."

b. What were sources and/or rationales of ideas for Association emphases on particular areas, levels, and kinds of instruction?

Association presidents and other convention speakers selected by the presidents bridged the gap between Association statements of purpose and school practices through papers delivered to convention audiences; furthermore, the implementation of these purposes was reflected in follow-up discussions by convention participants from all sections of the United States. World-renowned educators contributed to and shared in convention programs. Consideration was given to, and some American practices were developed from successful instructional practices in other countries, but the NTA/NEA sought to provide
national educational leadership of a distinctly American variety. Emphasis on American citizenship replaced earlier religious emphasis and took a firmer hold on curriculum development than did vocational courses, which also vied for attention in the forum of ideas of which NTA/NEA convention programs were a part. Later, just as the religious emphasis had suffered, so did the citizenship emphasis fall behind when vocational courses gained greater acceptance.

The American goal for the attainment of higher levels of education for all citizens contributed to the perpetuation of academic courses as a practical curriculum for American schools notwithstanding continuous debates concerning what should be taught and how it should be taught. Discussions of psychology, philosophy, and methods of instruction focused on teacher-centered and child-centered activities. The Child Study Movement initiated a trend that led to focus on "the whole child" as justification for the existence of the National Education Association and as reason for the expansion of its programs/functions. Convention lectures, round-table discussions, committee studies, and resolutions for action provided delegates—participating through a representative assembly form of governance (from 1920)—with information and inspiration to be shared with their educational constituents and implemented in appropriate classroom activities.
c. What were resources for implementing plans to promote improvement of instruction?

The 1870 division of the NEA convention participants into four sections for a part of the scheduled program time established a century-long Association trend of emphasis on specialization in various aspects of education. The two oldest sections, the American Normal School Association and the Department of Superintendence, respectively, were service-oriented sections interested in the preparation of teachers and the improvement of conditions for teaching. Focusing attention on levels of education, sections emphasizing higher instruction and elementary instruction completed the 1870 departmental structure after which a third category—subject-matter emphasis—evolved as the predominant category of developing departments for several decades.

Increasing concern for teaching conditions and the methods and processes of instruction finally resulted in a return to service-oriented departments and to the merger of some departments with others of similar interest. Crossing subject-matter lines, councils, committees, commissions, and other sub-structures served to unify departmental activities with the purpose of the parent association. One such effort directed toward the greater participation of individual NEA members resulted in the regional instruction conferences of the
1950's. Continuing the cooperative approach, the nationwide Project on Instruction and its successor, the Center for the Study of Instruction (CSI), provided leadership and direction for instructional improvement in the 1960's. Finally, at the outset of the 1970's, emphasis on instruction was officially tied to professional development, culminating in the establishment of the NEA Division of Instruction and Professional Development, which carried forward the implementation of the original Association purposes "to elevate the character and advance the interests of the profession of teaching and to promote the cause of education in the United States."

Functioning in cooperation with state affiliates, the Division of Instruction and Professional Development (IPD) extended the national network of instructional program emphasis to the grass-roots membership of the NEA. Utilizing the publications arm of the Association, IPD strengthened the instructional content of the NEA Journal: Today's Education. Other NEA publications--Bellanca's Values and the Search for Self and Wagner's Drama as a Learning Medium--carried forward the Association tradition of "helping teachers teach" that had been established by the publication of the 1893 Committee of Ten Report, the 1918 Seven Cardinal Principles, the "What Research Says to the Teacher" series of the American Educational Research
Association and the Department of Classroom Teachers, and the extended Educational Policies Commission essays on the importance of the inculcation of democracy and the spirit of scientific inquiry through classroom teaching-learning situations. The outreach of the 1857 "practical teacher" organization could be viewed as completing a full circle in the realization of purposes to share, to collate, and to implement the best ideas on instruction to the end that society's responsibility to youth and through youth to the world would realize its highest potential.

d. How was it assumed that individual Association members might be involved in the implementation of instructional improvement projects?

From the formation of NTA in 1857 to the beginning of representative assembly conventions in 1920, all members--educators and friends of education--were expected to attend Association meetings or to be informed by those who did attend. Speeches, studies, and other Association activities were published from the time of the first meeting; the variety of publications increased rapidly after 1920. All members of NEA were expected to view themselves as the NEA; those best able to assume that attitude in unison with a group (organized as a section, department, or affiliate) advanced their special-interest causes; but they did not go unchallenged.
Democratic give-and-take Association procedures served
to alternate successes that were attributed to power
plays of special interest groups. Furthermore, the
publicity accompanying a department's dissatisfaction
with parent association priorities usually resulted in
the strengthening of Association programs in question.

2. The secondary question of this study centered on
exploring reasons for and consequences of the controversies
that existed both inside and outside the National Education
Association concerning the Association's role in instruction.
The sub-divisions of the second guideline question, together
with answers and supporting findings derived from this study,
follow.

a. Did the drifting in and out of the NEA of various
segments of the profession result from and/or affect
Association focus on instruction?

Departmentalization increased and intensified special-
ization to the extent that the purposes of the whole
organization were prevented from materializing or cer-
tainly were not realized by all department members. The
fact that the needs of some groups, at a particular stage
of development, were more pressing than others did con-
tribute to seeming lack of balance in continuous emphasis
on instruction at all levels; moreover, the absence of
a department for a period of years, as in the case of
Higher Education, resulted in the carrying forward of
the concerns of that department by committees or other segments of the parent association.

b. Was competition and/or proposed merger with the American Federation of Teachers accompanied by consistent references to the professional association's focus on instruction?

In the heated discussion of the 1960's, the professional association's role in instruction was underscored by NEA; however, the labor union organization, AFT, also demonstrated interest in instruction--strengthened by collective bargaining in its behalf. The outcome of the power struggle between the two competitors for teacher membership might be viewed as a re-discovery of the importance of instruction as a unifying element among educators of different ideologies. As the NEA and AFT were observed to have more projects and procedures in common and merger talks were held between leaders of the two organizations, emphasis on instruction was discussed and researched by observers; nevertheless, emphasis on instruction did not emerge as a deciding-factor difference between the two. Rather, AFL-CIO affiliation, organizational voting procedures, and lack of minority leadership quotas were cited by NEA as reasons for halting proposed-merger talks with AFT.
c. Was the formation of parallel or splinter groups associated frequently with emphasis on instruction and/or suggested similarities or differences in the NEA and AFT?

The flexible departmental structure of the NEA that may have given impetus to the formation of splinter groups was gradually replaced by a stronger affiliate relationship of state and local associations with the National Education Association. Altercations within the NEA, however, did make the Association more vulnerable to competition for members from various other groups. In the case of the American Association for the Advancement of Education (AAAE), the appeal for membership was accompanied by the criticism that NEA was placing less emphasis on instruction and was becoming like a labor union with more emphasis on teacher welfare issues. The AAAE, nevertheless, failed to achieve a more convincing image than the NEA in the realm of instruction. Summarily, the question giving impetus to this study was: Is there a discernible thread of emphasis on instruction by the National Education Association from its beginning in 1857 to the present?

Added to the original purposes of the National Teachers' Association to provide more and better instruction for American students and the continuous updating of efforts to improve instruction, the fact that the Association was not
deterred from those purposes by various changes and controversies does prove instruction to be a continuous thread running through NEA priorities from the first meeting in 1857 through the time of the present writing. Of the forces furnishing impetus to NTA/NEA emphasis on instruction, the Normal School Movement and its successors, the teachers' colleges and the schools of education in universities influenced Association purposes and projects. Courses of study for preschool, elementary, high school, college and continuing instruction for all Americans claimed much of convention discussion time.

Various subject matter areas constituting curricula for mental, physical, aesthetic, and vocational development also vied for Association attention, particularly in the form of petitions to become special interest departments of the parent association, thereby establishing a century-long trend toward specialization of emphasis on instruction. Citizenship goals and cultural awareness could be noted in NEA resolutions relative to instruction, and emphasis on instruction was increasingly reflected in Association publications. Finally, the Association's cooperative projects extending to the community-at-large underscored a renewed realization that instruction was a common concern furnishing a thread for unity with all of life and, thus, probably the National Education Association's main life thread extending to a much broader constituency than the current membership of any one generation of educators.
Finally, a corollary two-part summary question was:
What forces came to bear—negatively or positively—on the Association's role in instruction, and to what end? That is, does a current study of the historical role of the NEA regarding instruction establish interest in instruction as an essential element to the survival of the professional association?

Whether the NEA led or reflected national trends in education, the Association did serve as a forum for discussion of leading educational questions from which policy statements and resolutions for action emerged. Attention given to the pressing issues of any given time was prompted frequently by national crises affecting curriculum-instruction needs of a diverse population. Support of needs often developed to be a welfare issue extending to teachers' salaries, and efforts to gain public support led to the advocacy of collective bargaining. When the process of collective bargaining embraced curriculum-instruction issues, the NEA's life-long dichotomy between professional issues and teacher-welfare issues, incongruous though they seemed to some observers, could be viewed as one more clearly than in the past. Thus, through competition, challenge, and change, as well as through continuing cooperative departmental projects and unified approaches, the NEA maintained a credible image of an organization concerned about instruction.

The decade of the 1960's was a period of growing dissatisfaction with the NEA on the part of many traditionalists,
who did not accept NEA's declaration of a continuous emphasis on instruction throughout the Association's history. Regarding this dissatisfaction surrounding NEA's structure and flexible priorities affecting Association emphasis on instruction, the viewpoint, focus, and purpose of each critic--along with his own response to changing conditions--should be taken into consideration.

In this age of protest, teachers found themselves in the midst of conditions which called for leadership of a type that their position in society made many of them feel qualified to fulfill. Though their leadership experience was limited, such organizations as the NEA provided a vehicle for that role and the resources to enhance leadership qualities. Moreover, varieties of technological aids and innovative courses of study enabled teachers to meet the needs and increasing demands of students/citizens in a changing society.

The NEA, cognizant of the demands of changing times, proved as flexible as its membership. Indeed, there is perhaps no better illustration of the NEA leadership's insistent "You [members] are the NEA!" than the Association's gradual militant stance following the growing militance of the members of the teaching profession. Those unable to associate emphasis on instruction with this militant stance asserted that NEA had abandoned instruction for the pursuit of teacher union tactics. The findings of this study, however, support NEA's claim of a continuous emphasis on instruction. Additionally,
the findings of this historical study reveal history to be on the side of NEA's claim in that the longevity of the Association's concern in this area prove emphasis on instruction to be a deep-rooted priority, which is so much a part of NTA/NEA fabric that it has withstood periods of waning interest and emerged in the form of more obvious Association activity in the realm of instruction.

Although interest in instruction is not an exclusive concern held only by professional associations, the findings of this study do suggest that instruction has been a fortunate focus for the NEA in two respects. First, the times of NEA's more obvious emphasis on instruction have been relatively free of criticism of Association activity. Secondly, emphasis on instruction has emerged as a thread to unify the National Education Association with diverse organizations and with classic human institutions--the home, the church, the school, and governmental agencies--throughout the world.

Whether or not merger of the NEA with AFT does finally occur, the findings of this study support the idea that increased emphasis on instruction by both organizations has been a positive result of their confrontations. At the time of the present writing, organizations have reached a fragmented state. Confrontations have brought about a proliferation of organizations. It remains to be seen whether many of them can become deep-rooted. Diversity may triumph with the
result that NEA, AFT, and other organizations will continue to reflect organizational preferences of American educators.

Recommendations for Further Study

The breadth of this study of National Education Association emphases on instruction offers many open doors for studies of greater depth.

1. Studies of formative personalities--Association presidents and/or frequent discussion leaders--and their particular educational ideologies relative to the NEA's role in instruction might be rewarding.

2. Instruction emphases of any NEA department, affiliate, or associated organization might be researched.

3. Emphases on instruction in the NEA Journal/other NEA publications would be an inexhaustible study.

4. The impact of collective bargaining (as Association process) on instruction emphases would be a timely study.

5. While the dichotomy of Association concerns with professional issues and teacher welfare issues at opposite poles is generally considered to be resolved, a study from the teacher welfare emphasis viewpoint would likewise be an informative study.

6. A study of the historical role of the AFT regarding emphases on instruction is needed to determine the longevity and depth of the teacher union's involvement in these concerns.
7. Although the American Association for the Advancement of Education was used in this study as a type of an increasing number of splinter or parallel education associations competing with the NEA for membership, each of these associations has unique claims which are deserving of in-depth studies.

While this study has sought the unchanging (if differently labeled) purposes of the National Education Association of the United States, this one-hundred-twenty-year-old professional association is a many-faceted, ever-changing organization offering innumerable opportunities for research.
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