

Review Essay

School Reform, Professionalism, and Control

Maeroff, G.I. (1988). *The empowerment of teachers: Overcoming the crisis of confidence*. New York: Teachers College Press, 152 pp., \$11.95 (softcover).

Connelly, E.M. & Clandinin, D.J. (1988). *Teachers as curriculum planners: Narratives of experience*. New York: Teachers College Press, 248 pp., \$15.95 (softcover), \$26.95 (hardcover).

Lieberman, A. (Ed.). (1988). *Building a professional culture in schools*. New York: Teachers College Press, 264 pp., \$15.95 (softcover), \$27.95 (hardcover).

Lawn, M. (1987). *Servants of the state: The contested control of teaching, 1900-1930*. Philadelphia: The Falmer Press, 172 pp., \$18.00 (softcover).

The first wave of educational reform to strike during the 1980s concentrated on the curriculum in the naive view that changing the curriculum could lead to reform of the whole educational system. One of the earliest and best known is *The Paideia Proposal* (Adler, 1982) which calls for a national core curriculum for all students and the pedagogy that will enable these students to master skills and specific understandings as they acquire the knowledge predetermined by academic experts and tradition. *A Nation at Risk: The Imperative for Educational Reform* (U.S. Department of Education, 1983) outlined many of the problems that American education faced and set out various reforms of the surface structure of schools such as a longer school day and year, time allocations to particular subjects, etc. These works did not take into account the needs of minority students and women or the experiences of teachers.

The second wave of reform writings can be characterized by two documents, both focussed on teachers and teaching, released in 1986: *A Nation Prepared: Teachers for the 21st Century* (Carnegie Forum on Education and the Economy, 1986) and *What Next? More Leverage for Teachers* (Education Commission of the States, 1986). The second wave stimulated a number of projects, one of

which is described and discussed in Gene Maeroff's, *The Empowerment of Teachers: Overcoming the Crisis of Confidence* which is under review in this essay. Maeroff was a consultant to the CHART (Collaboratives for Humanities and Arts Teaching) education projects mounted by the Rockefeller Foundation. In *The Empowerment of Teachers* he draws on the experiences of the CHART projects to argue "that changing teachers' lives will change the schools" (p.ix). He identifies three interdependent areas of teachers' lives which need attention: status, knowledge, participation in decision-making, and promises that "once teachers are raised in status, made more competent at their craft, and given entré to the decision-making process, the rest [improvement to the educational system] will follow" (p. xiii).

The two factors that affect the status of teachers are working conditions which include autonomy, dignity, and recognition, and salaries. He notes that most teachers don't have autonomy to determine what will happen in their classrooms, spend 10-15% of their time on noninstructional tasks that do not require a professional teacher (e.g., collecting lunch money, supervising children disembarking from buses), don't have access to the materials and equipment which will help them do their jobs better, and seldom have any control over the course of their careers (e.g., which school and/or program they will work in) or how they will spend their time during the day. He notes that teachers' salaries are indeed low and one of the factors that keep many people from entering teaching. However, he argues that salary isn't the primary factor affecting teacher morale, citing the motivational research of Herzberg and comparing the salaries of beginning and experienced newspaper reporters and teachers which differ little.

Maeroff defines knowledgeable teachers as those who not only have a firm knowledge base in their subject(s) but who know where to find the information they require and how to continue learning throughout their careers. A knowledgeable teacher will use materials more wisely and be able to involve and excite students in learning. He argues that there is a desperate need to improve the education of teachers from preservice through inservice programs and to allow teachers time to keep up in their fields of knowledge. He discusses the issue of transfer of knowledge to the classroom, and acknowledges that there are problems. He suggests that the transfer problem can be dealt with by having veteran teachers work with novice teachers. Maeroff doesn't ignore the influence of social factors on what teachers will be able to do with better knowledge except to say that teachers will be better able to teach minority students when they combine their heightened status and wider knowledge base.

To be fully effective and professional, teachers need to have access to decision making. Maeroff restricts the teacher's role here to decision making in the classroom and to working in collaboration with other professionals within and without the school to improve that school. He notes that the research on

effective/successful schools shows that professional interaction and collaboration was a significant factor in their success/effectiveness.

Raised status, a firmer knowledge base, and some measure of control will be the factors that will empower teachers who in turn, through improved classroom performance and better schools, will empower students beginning a new and positive cycle in the history of American education.

There is no doubt that the teachers who participated in the CHART project benefitted. Maeroff cites testimonials from teachers attesting to their raised sense of self-esteem, newly found confidence, increased knowledge and extended and improved teaching skills. There is also no doubt that many teachers transferred these benefits to their classrooms and schools. Maeroff cites many examples of teachers who, as a result of involvement in CHART, prepared, alone or in groups, curricular units for their classrooms or schools. While some of these projects were mere reorganizations of existing curricula, others were more extensive, involving new conceptions such as cross-disciplinary approaches to the organization of material. These outcomes can be celebrated.

However, Maeroff claims that teachers were empowered as a result of participating in CHART. This is a claim that needs examination. Because Maeroff doesn't define the term "empowerment," it is necessary to examine the characteristics of teachers and what teachers were able to achieve after CHART in order to understand its meaning.

Increased self-esteem, confidence and motivation were personal manifestations of being empowered by CHART. These personal attributes allowed the teacher to reorganize the existing curriculum. This reorganization could be as simple a task as changing the sequence as did one teacher who reorganized her world history curriculum from chronological order to an order by continents, or as complex as the group of teachers who organized a cross-disciplinary curriculum on the theme of slavery. These attributes also allowed the teacher to implement a rewritten curricula and, when necessary, to secure permission for that implementation. The teacher who changed the sequence of her world history course was careful to report that she implemented it only after she asked for and received permission from her school principal. Using these attributes, teachers could reorganize curriculum to suit their own interests as did the teacher who integrated her new interest in Africa into her composition units, or, more rarely, to suit some vaguely defined characteristic of students, like the world history teacher who, after deciding on an order by continents, decided to begin with Africa "... because that's where mankind began and also because it was good for the kids I teach. They are all black" (p.41).

This isn't much in terms of power. It appears that projects like CHART may have empowerment of teachers as one of their goals but the power that is

bestowed is illusory. Real power motivates its holders to question structures and experiences and enables people to challenge them when appropriate, knowing that the power they hold allows them to influence those events and structures. Illusory power, like a hologram, often looks like the real thing. However, it needs an external power-source to maintain and direct its illusion. Power remains with the external source.

In the CHART project, knowledge and skill are seen to be the possessions of academic, cultural, or business experts. The project removes teachers from their schools where they enjoy some status and control, transforms them into students, inferior nonexperts who are to learn from the experts, and gives them knowledge and skills to apply to curriculum writing. Knowledge and skills are portrayed and treated as something that experts have and which teachers can “get” only from these experts. And, the “getting” doesn’t make the receiver an expert — the knowledge and skills still belong to the expert. It is not surprising, then, that the teachers who participated in CHART saw their roles as one of reorganizing or rewriting curriculum instead of creating it. In such a top-down project, teachers don’t see themselves as experts, as knowledge creators, as questioners of knowledge; their role is to receive what more powerful others consider to be knowledge and skills. They are not given power over knowledge, limiting them to being receivers and reproducers of knowledge rather than producers of it.

Not having power over knowledge also limits teachers’ views of students as learners. Instead of students being perceived as creators or sources of knowledge, they are seen as receivers of it. This raises the question of where curriculum should originate. In CHART, it begins in a place external to the classroom, far separated from the students who will be its recipients. CHART removes teachers from their schools, arguing that teacher self-esteem will be enhanced in an environment more business-like and adult than schools can provide, and that from a nonschool environment connected to business, cultural, and academic institutions, teachers can get a wider perspective on curriculum and teaching. This wider perspective, unfortunately, focuses attention away from students. Curriculum comes to be created not for students, but to meet the requirements of business, cultural, and academic institutions. In such a context, curriculum does not start with and grow from the experiences and knowledge of students or of their communities, nor with the community of the classroom which includes the teacher.

Because projects like CHART are initiated by agencies outside the school system, they reinforce the idea that schools and schooling cannot change except through external interference, and they reinforce teachers’ views that they are powerless to initiate change. Teachers see that real change requires large sums of money as well as the power held by outsiders and upper-level school administrators. They learn to think of the changes they make in their classrooms

as being unimportant in the large scale of things. Worse, they may not be motivated to make any changes at all unless those changes are initiated externally.

Most externally motivated projects like CHART do not continue beyond the short-term of administrative support and funding. Various reasons have been put forward to account for this fact, such as lack of institutionalization of the project, lack of leadership preparation for local takeover, lack of local administrative commitment and support in terms of both leadership and funding. It is likely that all of these reasons play a role. However, to the list can be added that they give teachers who are the implementors only illusory power, power conferred, that disappears as its external source disappears.

Unlike top-down projects such as CHART which begin with the assumption that teachers lack power and knowledge, bottom-up approaches like that described by Connelly and Clandinin in *Teachers as Curriculum Planners: Narratives of Experience* begin with the assumption that teachers possess both—that they just need to learn how to take advantage of what they already possess in the case of personal practical knowledge or of what they have access to in the case of inservice sessions, pedagogical and research literature, other teachers, academics, and experts. Teachers already possess power so the authors make no claim to be “empowering” teachers. This power is real in that the teacher determines, after experience and reflection, the curriculum for his/her classroom.

Connelly and Clandinin credit Dewey for their belief that experience is fundamental to all education and argue that there is “tremendous power and potential [for reform of schooling] in the experience of classroom teachers” (p. xv). Not only do the personal and professional experiences of teachers give shape to the classroom curriculum, but they have the potential to transform classroom practice. They say, “We understand how spirited teachers may revolutionize their practices through reflection on their own experiences and new ideas, and how they can transform new ideas into powerful curriculum programs through this reflective process” (p.xv). The book is written for teachers (preservice, novice, experienced) and its purpose is to give teachers the understandings and tools they will need to reflect on their experiences.

After an introductory Part I which briefly develops the idea that curriculum is what is experienced in the classroom, Connelly and Clandinin present the narrative approach to understanding curriculum. Part II prepares teachers for reflecting on their experiences. It presents a critical review of the literature that deals with teachers’ knowledge, values, and beliefs (the personal) as a means of introducing the idea that narrative is the embodiment of personal practical knowledge. The rest of Part II is devoted to teaching teachers how to reflect on their personal knowledge, discussing the various means of recording experience for private reflection (journal, biography, picture and document analysis) and for recording experience for shared reflection (storytelling, letter writing,

interviews, participant observation). It also presents a number of aspects for teachers to examine in order for them to understand their personal curricula: images, rules or maxims, principles, personal philosophy, metaphors, narrative unity, rhythm.

The authors include numerous examples which they examine for the reader, supposedly to illustrate the understanding that can be achieved from reflection on experience. The problem with the examples is that the authors discuss and handle them superficially. Instead of dealing with them in terms of a teacher's understanding, they are presented in terms of an observer's (an expert's) understanding. They include no example of a teacher achieving an understanding of personal curriculum.

In the forward, Eisner claims that one of the strongest aspects of *Narratives of Experience* is its inclusion of teacher narratives. However, inclusion is not enough. In a book devoted to teaching teachers how to analyze their narratives so that they can achieve understanding and influence curriculum, at least some of the examples need to be illustrative of teachers doing this — readers need to see how others have reached understanding using these methods and how they have made use of that understanding in preparing curriculum for their classrooms. For example, Connelly and Clandinin include a piece, "Teaching as Mountaineering," written by a Calgary teacher. They say, "Reflecting on the metaphor has helped this teacher examine her curricular practices, because it is part of her particular language of practice. It is part of her experience" (p.71). However, they do not show the reader the teacher's examination of her narrative or the effect that reflection had on her curricular practices. If teachers are to be convinced that the time-consuming examination of experience is valuable, they need to be shown rather than told how it has been valuable for others in their classrooms.

Part III is designed to help teachers understand factors that influence curriculum: theory and practice, research findings, pedagogical literature, stakeholders, and curriculum materials. The authors' purpose in this part is to take teachers beyond their own narrative experiences into the experiences of others, experts, researchers, stakeholders, and give teachers the critical tools necessary for this journey. To this end they discuss the relationship between theory and practice, present eight "rules" for reading pedagogical literature, present questions to ask when reading research and ways to categorize research, describe the perspectives of various stakeholders, and show ways of organizing curriculum and integrating curricular materials.

Experience gained indirectly doesn't become part of one's personal practical knowledge until it is tried and that trial is reflected upon. This is the subject of Part IV where the authors present some case studies which show teachers reflecting on and understanding their professional experiences. Again, the authors appear content if the teachers reach mere awareness of or a superficial

understanding of patterns, or note a few connections between experiences. In one example, a teacher, motivated by experiences of others and by reflection on her present curriculum, attempts to integrate Big Books and Uninterrupted Sustained Silent Reading (USSR) into her language arts curriculum. The authors show that the teacher carefully planned the integration and that she did so in keeping with her personal practical knowledge. Eventually, though, she discontinued USSR. The authors appear content to accept that the discontinuance of USSR maintains some sort of coherence in the teacher's personal curriculum. They don't reflect on or show the teacher reflecting on the possibility that lack of coherence has been created.

In another example, the authors describe the temporal rhythm of the school year that they observed in a teacher's classroom. This particular teacher organized most of her curricular activities and her planning around the various holidays. Once they recognize the pattern and understand how such an organization relates to her life history (she is Jewish), they end the reflection process. However, awareness should be only a first step. A further step would be to examine the limitations and possibilities of a temporal organization by asking, What does a temporal organization that emphasizes major religious and secular holidays allow the teacher to do or block the teacher from doing in the classroom? A further step would be to consider what such an organization teaches children about the relation of school and society, or about social institutions. Or, to ask what beliefs and values are embodied in such a curricular organization. At yet another level one could investigate the political and economic implications of this organization.

That *Teachers as Curriculum Planners* doesn't present examples or appear to encourage teachers to reflect beyond the level of awareness is a criticism both of the book and of the narrative method which focusses on personal experience. Focus on the personal and on practice does not appear to lead practitioners or researchers/writers to analyze practice as theory, as social structure, or as a manifestation of political and economic systems. This limitation of vision implicit in the narrative approach serves as a constraint on curriculum reform. Teachers will, as did the teachers cited by Connelly and Clandinin, make changes in their own classroom curricula but will not perform the questioning and challenging of theory, structure, and ideology that will lead to radical and extensive curriculum reform.

It can be argued that the challenge of running a classroom fully occupies the teachers and that questions of theory, structure, and ideology don't affect the everyday lives (practical knowledges) of teachers and are relegated to "experts." However, there are many dangers in separating practice from these other questions. First, as Connelly and Clandinin point out, it ignores the dynamic relationship of theory and practice. Second, it ignores the fact that schools are intricately and inextricably part of the social fabric and of the political and

economic system which dominates. Third, because curriculum reform is implemented in the classroom by teachers, separating teachers from these other aspects might negatively affect radical and widespread curriculum reform. To avoid these dangers, either the narrative method will have to be extended, or it will need to be supplemented with a process that encourages teachers to look beyond the personal, similar to what Norman Fairclough attempts to do in *Language and Power* (1989).

Both Maeroff and Connelly and Clandinin are concerned with teachers and their role in classroom curriculum, with ensuring that teachers have the power (knowledge and skills) necessary to be more effective in the classroom. This is one kind of professional power, which I will call personal professional power. Both authors recognize that there are organizational factors that affect a teacher's effectiveness: Connelly and Clandinin describe the various stakeholders who constrain the curriculum decisions that teachers make; Maeroff notes that teachers are removed from the decision-making process. To participate in decision making, to have influence outside of the classroom, is another kind of power which I will call institutional professional power. This is the type of power which is explored in the articles which comprise *Building a Professional Culture in the Schools*, edited by Ann Lieberman.

Lieberman divides the book into two parts. In the first part, five articles are presented in which the authors argue for and/or assess the prospects for a professional community of teachers. They are united in their agreement that teachers need to take control of their profession, and in their belief that such control is possible.

In their contribution to the volume, Devaney and Sykes do not take a stand on the form of professionalism suitable for teachers, only that it will be "expensive and [that] the powers [and teachers] will need convincing" (p.3). They also take no stand on how teaching should be organized to facilitate professionalism, showing instead that whether the organization is one of delivery (controlled by a central agency) or personal (controlled locally), teachers will need to operate as a professional community. This professional culture would highlight service, performance, and leadership; be able to prepare students for a modern economic world; and incorporate what is known about how people learn and develop.

McLaughlin and Yee examine teaching as a career. They argue that teachers don't conceive of career satisfaction in objective terms such as advancing hierarchically in an organization but in subjective terms such as "making a difference, sharing a discipline they love ... advancement is framed in terms of an ongoing process of professional growth, and success means effectiveness in the teaching role" (p.26). The factors that influence this subjective view of career are level of opportunity to develop competence, receive stimulation and challenge and support for efforts, and level of capacity which is affected by

access to resources and tools to do the job and ability to influence their institutions. They list five school environments that support such a career: resource-adequate (not resource-deprived), integrated (not segmented), collegial (not isolated), problem-solving (not problem-hiding), investment-centered (not payoff-focused).

Cooper examines the issue of power in schools, arguing that empowerment is received power and that much of the discussion regarding teacher power is hegemonic. Then she abandons this line of thought to argue that schools are more like families than corporate structures, appearing to mean that the issue isn't establishing a professional culture in schools but removing organizational and mechanical overlay in schools so that teachers can receive fulfillment from "positive relationships with children and the sense of efficacy drawn from helping children grow and succeed" (p. 51).

Darling-Hammond examines professionalism from a policy point of view. She examines the forces that operated during the 1970s and 1980s which made schools more bureaucratic and standardized. She points out that governments are exerting more and more control and that the term professional is changing meaning and being applied to someone who complies with government policies rather than to someone who exerts control. The dilemma that she sees is that distrust of teachers' levels of ability and knowledge is so widespread that it serves as a barrier to policies that would give teachers the control they need to become more professional. She argues that teachers need to establish high standards governing who can enter the profession, to define the knowledge base for acceptable practice, and to define standards for practice. These standards would lead to teachers being seen as professionals, eventually resulting in a loosening of bureaucratic control.

In a chapter on teacher leadership, Little assesses whether teachers will accept leadership from their peers. She notes that there is little or no leadership (even from the principal) apparent in most schools, and that the forces that keep teachers from assuming leadership are fierce:

Teachers are far less likely to defer to another teacher's view of curriculum or instruction than to rely upon habit and personal preference. There is rarely anything in the immediate professional environment that overcomes the effect of other influences on teachers' decisions. Such influences range from the teachers' own experiences as a student ... to students' attempts to "bargain" the curriculum, to teachers' interpretations of parental interests, to personal predilections regarding curriculum content, instructional method, or the social organization of students for learning. (p. 83)

She suggests that the situation isn't completely bleak and thinks that implementation of Devaney's six principles for leadership might be a positive influence. She also notes that both teachers and principals oppose leadership by colleagues. But when teaching and decision making in a school are already public and when teachers recognize the natural leaders among themselves, that

opposition is lessened. She notes, too, that when teacher leaders take their positions, there is "strain" on them and on the system which wasn't designed to include them. Despite these negatives, Little thinks that teacher leadership is possible but will require that teachers be educated as leaders and that the support of school boards be gained.

The five papers in the second part describe how a professional community can be established. Houston describes the factors that determined success in the restructuring of selected secondary schools which participated in the Coalition of Essential Schools network: The scale of restructuring was large enough to permit role flexibility, a variety of people became leaders, and a system of checks and balances was established.

Barth looks at teacher leadership from a principal's viewpoint arguing that everyone benefits when teachers become leaders.

In short, the opportunity to engage in school leadership is attractive ... because it offers possibilities for improving teaching conditions; it replaces the solitary authority of the principal with a collective authority; it provides a constructive format in which adults can interact that overcomes daily classroom isolation; it helps transform schools into contexts for adults' as well as children's learning. (p.136)

He concludes his article with a list of guidelines that will help principals to encourage teacher leadership.

Leiberman, Saxl, and Miles describe the results of their study of 17 teacher leaders and the skills that they brought to or developed during their leadership. They found that these leaders brought previous involvement in curriculum development and/or implementation, extensive and impressive academic backgrounds, administrative and organizational experience, and interpersonal skills. On the job, they learned from their new perspective about school culture. They also learned how to gain acceptance by their peers and how to get others involved and motivated.

Miller examines the district office as a catalyst for developing a professional culture by describing a district-initiated curriculum development project. She concludes that effective professionalization can occur from the top down as well as from the bottom up.

Schlechty extracts eight important conclusions about how to manage change from his participation in a project which implemented a career ladder system in a local school district: formulation of the problem to be addressed and widespread understanding of it, developing functions to carry out the change, early institutionalization of the change, those charged with implementation having enough authority, involvement in planning of those affected by the change, not separating planning and implementation; devising a clear strategy, taking action.

The authors in *Professional Culture* construct a strong argument in favor of reform that will restructure aspects of the educational system to give teachers more control. Leiberman refers to restructuring as the next wave of reform and it appears that she may be correct since a number of large city school systems are experimenting with decentralizing the management of schools. For example, in Miami, some schools are run by management teams composed of teachers, principals, and, in some cases, community representatives and parents. This kind of local control has the potential to create schools and curricula which are responsive to the needs of the children and communities of which they are a part.

No matter what form restructuring takes, it is a direct challenge to ever-increasing centralized control over education manifested in teacher-proof materials, standardized testing of students and teachers, and standardized curricula. It is too soon to be able to predict whether restructuring will be more than a temporary phenomenon to be abandoned when results aren't immediately forthcoming. This is a danger. There is a tone of desperation apparent in current reform efforts. While desperation and crisis situations create an environment in which change can happen, they also create a mentality that wants a quick-fix so that the heightened stress from the crisis can disappear. In such a climate the danger exists that restructuring experiments will not be given the time they need to show success. As some of the articles in *Professional Culture* point out, it takes time to train leaders and to create decision makers of those who have not been allowed to make decisions.

The Leiberman volume includes the points of view on restructuring of curriculum project managers, principals, individual teachers, academics, school district administrators, and politicians. Missing, notably, is the point of view of teacher organizations who are and who have always been among the major stakeholders in educational reform. It is through teacher federations that teachers have influence at the political level through which they are able to exercise another type of professional power, namely of the political sort.

Martin Lawn's *Servants of the State: The Contested Control of Teaching, 1900-1930* gives a historical account of elementary school teachers in Britain as they struggled for professional recognition and against both centralized control of education in the form of a national curriculum and schooling conditions that were not encouraging to learning. In his careful tracing of history, Lawn shows that the struggle for control is a dynamic in Michael Apple's (1988) sense:

It [struggle for control] involves a complex interplay among the ideological and material structures of control of gendered labor that arise from bureaucratic management, the forms of resistance and self-organization of teachers, and then employer counter-pressures, which once again produce a response by teachers themselves. (p.77)

As a result of such an interplay, Lawn maintains, teachers in Britain came to see themselves as workers:

If they [teachers] were to be treated as servants then they would organize, if their pay was low then they would strike, if they were penalized and wished to renew their fight for a new education then they would vote for or join the Labour Party. (p.xi)

Teacher unions/federations have been critical factors in the working lives of teachers. They have won important salary, benefits, and working conditions packages for teachers, protecting them from firings by including due cause and seniority clauses in contracts, and protecting the profession by insisting that the unqualified not be allowed to teach. They have also operated in the larger political arena by responding to educational policies on behalf of teachers.

The interplay of past contemporary forces shown by Lawn led to the formation of these unions/federations; the present contemporary interplay may lead to their restructuring just as it seems to be leading to a restructuring of the educational system. The professionalization of teachers may create a different role for teacher union/federations, a more professional role, one where they become protectors of the profession, of membership, professional practice, and professional standards.

At the same time as books such as these being reviewed here are being written, read, reviewed, and their contents discussed and argued about, the education system is responding — devising solutions and implementing changes. Because it is a system connected to all other systems and, as such, in a constant state of change, it cannot be rationally planned. Instead, it can be influenced. However, to influence requires power. The issue is the same one it has always been: control of education. This time there is a chance for teachers to emerge as professionals able to exercise personal, institutional, and professional power. These powers will not come easily and will require that teachers and their organizations engage in struggle. They will have to move quickly not only because reform initiatives move quickly but because new influences like the well-publicized impending teacher shortage have the potential to divert the struggle from one over control of education to one of control over professional qualifications. This is a struggle that teachers might better engage in from a position of some control.

What is not adequately dealt with in any of the books reviewed here is that the educational system is part of a political and economic system. In the case of modern industrial societies, it is a system which is characterized by inadequate health care for some segments of the population, overcrowded jails, the jailing of Blacks (one in four American Black males in their twenties undergoes incarceration), Hispanics and North American Natives, economic opportunity unevenly distributed by race, sex, and socioeconomic status, a growing gap between the haves and the have nots, overcrowded cities, a drug problem of crisis proportions, a growing number of homeless, etc. Although social problems like these receive media attention, none of them (except perhaps the drug problem) has received the solution-intense attention that the educational system

has received. Surely these social problems are as serious as any problems displayed in education. Reform initiatives will only be successful to the extent that they involve all who have a stake in the outcomes and to the extent that they are viewed within social, political, and economic matters.

Salina Shrofel
University of Regina

References

- Adler, M.J. (1982). *The Paideia proposal*. New York: Macmillan.
Apple, M. (1988). *Teachers and texts: A political economy of class and gender relations in education*. New York: Routledge.
Fairclough, N.(1989). *Language and Power*. London: Copp Clark Pitman.