ABSTRACT
                After defining the terms to be discussed (coalition
and negotiation), this paper considers in detail some of the kinds of
coalition most relevant to the ComField model. The kinds of
coalitions include those in professional education, such as
professional associations and consortia; nonprofessional coalitions
of citizen groups and student groups; and mixed coalitions such as
union and management, parochial and public schools, federally
stimulated coalitions, multi-level educational coalitions, and public
and private coalitions. Implications for the ComField model, which is
to include college students, college faculty members, educational
specialists, public school personnel, state and federal officers,
parents, and other community members are examined. A survey of
related literature is grouped around a set of topics, which include
1) New York City decentralization and the Ocean Hill-Brownsville
strike of 1968; 2) politicians and education on the local and state
levels; 3) professionalism and unionism; 4) black teachers; 5)
community-based coalitions involving teacher education, high school
students private schools, and alternative public schools; and 6)
government-industry-university coalitions. Related documents are SP
004 155 to SP 004 158 and SP 004 160 to SP 004 166. (MBM)

APPENDIX E

COALITIONS, NEGOTIATIONS AND THE COMFIELD MODEL

Helen L. K. Farr

Teaching Research

PART I: Summary and Interpretation

A Consideration of Terms

Until recently, words like "coalition" and "negotiation" were
rarely found in education journals. Most educators encountered such
words in the popular press only, and there mainly in connection with
labor unions and industrial firms or from time to time in connection
with foreign government crises. During the past 15 years, however, the
words have begun to appear more and more frequently in connection with
education and educators. The ComField model, for example, provides for
a coalition among college faculties, public school staff and adminis-
trators, educational specialists, students, and community members. Fur-
ther, it provides for negotiation, particularly between students in
teacher education and their faculty sponsors.

Sometime the connotative meanings of words outweigh their denota-
tive meanings and confuse discussion. Therefore, it may be worthwhile
to note the definitions given in Webster's Seventh for these two words,
newly transposed to educational contexts. According to the dictionary,
a coalition is a temporary alliance of distinct parties, persons, or
states for joint action. Negotiation, as defined by Webster, is the
act of conferring with another so as to arrive at the settlement of
some matter.

Having reviewed the exact definitions of the words "coalition"
and "negotiation," one more point might be made about implications in
those definitions. Both definitions deal with the concept of working
together to achieve a goal. And both imply that there are recognized
differences between those who work together to achieve the goal. In
short, both words have fundamentally democratic connotations, and one
wonders at the fact that they have only recently been used in the con-
text of American education.

Just as it is important to check the definitions of the words
"coalition" and "negotiation" it is also important to note how certain
other words and constructs often used in connection with "coalition"
and "negotiation" are defined by some of their users. For example, the
words "authority" and "power" are often used as if they had the same
meaning. By definition, however, "authority" refers to legal or right-
ful power, or the right to command or act. "Power," on the other hand,
refers to the ability to act; no dimension of rightfulness is implied.
Thus, a policeman has the authority to arrest a criminal, but if the
criminal has a loaded gun in his hand and the policeman does not, the
policeman lacks the power to carry out the arrest. Certainly, sometimes
authority and power coexist in the same person, group, or office, but
not always. When they do not reside in the same locus, it is evident
that power has the greater influence. Sloppy usage of the terms "power"
and "authority" not only confuses discussion, it can distort it.

Similarily, the word "control" is often used to mean either power or authority, depending on whichever meaning the user himself has in mind. Hence, in the review of literature below, the reader needs to be alert to the fact that context tends to define "control," just as it does the words "politics" and "political." In some cases, the political actions referred to are concerned with "guiding or influencing governmental policy." In others, however, political actions are those dealing with the contest between competing interest groups or individuals for power and leadership, regardless of whether a governmental body is involved or not.

Kinds of Coalitions

It is impossible in a single article, to deal fully with all of the kinds of coalitions which can be identified today--let alone with those which are likely to emerge in the near future. Therefore, a few of the coalitions most relevant to the ComField model have Leen selected and will be dealt with in detail. Nevertheless, the other active coalitions should be identified briefly for at least two reasons: 1) they do exist; and 2) although their primary impacts may be on parts of the educational system that are--or seem--remote from the concerns of a ComField model, their activities affect the model simply because what affects one part of a system affects other parts. Arbitrarily, coalitions are here designated as professional, nonprofessional, and mixed. That is, membership is the basis for grouping, since by definition a coalition shares a goal (and that goal determines coalition membership).

Coalitions in Professional Education

Organizations of Teachers

Until the 1950's, there was really only one professional education organization: The National Education Association (NEA), with its network of state and local affiliates. The NEA could hardly be called a coalition, however, since few who belonged had a particular goal in mind (other than the vague one of promoting "good" education) and despite its shifting membership, it was a permanent, not a temporary alliance of teachers, supervisors, and administrators. Recently, however, the NEA has begun to act more like a coalition, setting specific goals and rather reluctantly recognizing the distinct interests of its diverse membership. For example, the supervisors and administrators in NEA have increasingly separated themselves from the parent organization and identified more strongly with their long-standing affiliate, the American Association of Supervisors and Administrators (AASA).

These NEA shifts have been undeniably prompted by the fact that the American Federation of Teachers (AFT), an affiliate of the AFL-CIO, has been very active in fighting for improved salaries and working condi-

tions for teachers and professors, particularly in large cities and industrialized areas. Because supervisors and administrators represent management rather than labor, the AFT has excluded them from membership in the teachers' union.

Especially in the late 1960's the NEA membership growth rate has been declining, but it has been rising in the AFT. After years of discussion, a few local factions of the NEA and AFT are just beginning to merge into single organizations. The merged locals (and the national merger which is likely to follow in time) do more nearly represent a coalition in the usual sense, except that presumably they are not temporary alliances. The general sumption is that union philosophies and emphases rather than professional ones will prevail in the merged units (although this assumption is based on how "professional" is defined and on which aspects of professionalism are judged as the basic ones).

Although certain other school personnel are not generally classified as professionals, they do operate in the professional education setting, so they are included here. Custodial, clerical, and cafeteria employees are already unionized in many places. And according to the plans of AFT leaders, paraprofessional and subprofessional employees soon will be, along with supervisors and administrators. When all the segments of the professional education system have their own unions (as is quite probable in urban America), the potential for an educational workers' coalition is astounding. Furthermore, the implications for coalitions which educational workers may from time to time form with other workers' unions is awesome.

Consortia

Another kind of professional coalition is the consortium, an association of colleges and universities formed for their mutual benefit. The Committee on Institutional Cooperation (CIC), for instance, was formed in 1958 by the Big Ten Midwestern Universities and was later joined by the University of Chicago. The purpose of this consortium is to stimulate and share learning, staff, and facilities, as well as to avoid costly duplication. Faculty and students may work at a member university other than their own, while receiving compensation or course credit for one term's work at their own institution. Thus, through voluntary cooperation, each consortium participant is able to expand student offerings and promote the pursuit of knowledge among scholars, especially those in highly specialized fields of study. Salwak (1966) reports that this "academic common market" is so structured that institutions are free to decide which of the CIC programs they will participate in; thus, institutional autonomy is maintained. Since this prototype was formed, other consortia have been established for various purposes, e.g., in Appalachia, sometimes linking higher education with other levels of education.

Nonprofessional Coalitions

Two nonprofessional groups have also formed highly visible coali-
tions: citizens and students. Starting in the 1950's when the postwar
population explosion led to a greatly expanded school system with its
increased costs, citizens began to form coalitions either to support or
defeat school programs and plans. As time went on the educational
profession faced criticism for what it did and did not do, and it also
eventually faced taxpayer revolts. Thus, both professionals and citi-
zens began to form coalitions at about the same period.

Citizen Groups

Most of the early citizen coalitions were active in the suburban
areas where young families had predominantly settled after World War II.
Later, in the 1960's, the urban citizens emerged as coalition members,
particularly in what has been called "the inner city" or ghetto areas,
where the population had also been swelled by an influx of new resi-
dents. To a large extent, urban coalitions have been formed along
racial or ethnic lines and they also have been critical of school pro-
grams and plans. However, in contrast to the suburban citizens, they
have sought an increase rather than a decrease in school expenditures.
Both suburban and urban parents (at least the vocal segments of them)
have striven to influence the curricula in their schools.

Two other groups of citizens have also begun to form more or less
militant coalitions along ethnic lines: the Mexican-Americans and the
American-Indians. Both these groups have been less dramatic in their
activities than most of the other coalitions, and both of them are more
prevalent in specific parts of the country, often in rural areas.
Nevertheless, both are seeking to influence their children's education.
The Indians, across the country for example, are exhibiting a renewed
pride in their heritage and a reemergence of a desire for autonomy.
On a national level, these trends are already affecting the content of
history and social studies programs. The Mexican-American influences
are, as yet, largely local and include such matters as the language of
instruction and cultural modifications in the school's interaction with
students and parents.

Student Groups

In the last half of the 1960's the students who had been the basic
cause for so much of the citizen activity in the 1950's and early
1960's, began to be active themselves. Student coalitions, largely
focusing on social as well as educational issues, were formed in col-
leges and universities. Although each student coalition had local goals,
many had goals of wider scope, and some coalitions were racially orien-
ted. Like the citizen coalitions, the student ones criticized higher

education for what it did and did not do, and they advocated massive curricular, policy, and structural change. However, in regard to fis-cal matters, the student coalitions sought both a decrease and an in-crease in university financing. That is, they called for a cessation of military research funding and the institution of extensive financial aid to minority group students.

High school (and occasionally junior high or intermediate school) students also formed coalitions to achieve their goals. For the most part, they were most active in urban centers, were often racially or ethnically oriented, and were concerned with curricular and policy matters.

Mixed Coalitions

Union and Management

As the term is used here, a "mixed coalition" is one in which at least two different kinds of coalitions join together to achieve a special goal. (Each coalition, of course, is itself made up of distinct individuals and/or groups.) The membership of mixed coalitions is often unique to a goal at a particular point in time. That is, depending on the state of events at a given moment, old coalitions dissolve or re-align, and new ones emerge. For instance, the American Federation of Teachers (AFT) had traditionally championed the causes of Negro teachers and consequently had (in proportion to the number of American teachers who are Negro) a fairly sizeable membership among them. When, in New York City, a black community school board dismissed 19 white teachers, the United Federation of Teachers (UFT) struck because the board refused to rehire the teachers (which the local union claimed they had no right to fire in the first place). As a result, black teachers throughout the city had to decide whether to join forces with their union or with their community and/or racial group. The situation was further complicated by the fact that many of the white teachers in New York are Jewish, and so some of them were among those fired which added an ethnic or religious tinge to the strike.

Thus, one coalition in the strikes of 1967-68 was made up largely of black community groups, teachers, and students (with a few non-blacks in each category). And the opposing coalition was made up of the union teachers (almost entirely whites in this case) and the central board of education for the city. In other words, the union sided against a tra-ditional ally (i.e., the black union members) and with a traditional opponent (i.e., the city board of education, in short, management). Various explanations for the realignment have been given (see below), but all of them involve a concern with what group, body, or agency shall hold the controlling power (both overt and covert).

Parochical and Public Schools

Although the practice is being challenged, in some states parochial and public schools have formed a coalition. The coalition goals and the means for attaining them vary from place to place, but essentially they center around economic issues. Parochial schools (because of internal changes as well as inflation) often cannot support a full educational program of the kind parents want for their children. On the other hand, very few communities could--without severe handicap--afford to instantly absorb all the parochial school students into the public schools if the parochial schools were suddenly closed. Hence, a coalition for mutual benefit in which facilities and services are shared.

Federally Evoked or Stimulated

The federal government, through a series of legislative acts and judicial decisions in the 1950's and 1960's, has provided the basis for a whole variety of coalitions. The Elementary and Secondary Education Act of 1964, for example, provided some incentive for the parochial-public school coalition.

Multi-Level Educational Coalitions

The Educational Professions Development Act fostered direct cooperation between colleges and universities and public schools, since funding for higher education projects was often made contingent upon an identified school linkage. The Department of Labor, the Office of Economic Opportunity, the Peace Corps, Teacher Corps, VISTA and AID Programs, as well as United States Office of Education funding for research and development, linked universities vith communities in a number of new ways.

Other federal agencies and offices such as the National Science Foundation, the National Institute for Mental Health, the National Endowment for the Humanities and the Arts also stimulated university research which involved or overlapped with the activities of the school and community.

Public and Private Coalitions

These same federal thrusts also brought the private industrial-business se:tor into new coalitions with communities and educational institutions, and also with other industries and businesses. That is, a learning-teaching problem might, for example, be identified by some federal unit, and a university together with private corporations might be invited to solve it. Solution usually required involving students, so schools and teachers were also brought in. Almost simultaneously, a large number of coalitions or mergers began to occur among business and industrial enterprises. That is, a newly formed commercial conglo-

merate might be vertically integrated to provide a complete instructional package from diagnosis to evaluation, including of course the material and equipment necessary for the job.

Not only did private firms become linked with educational institutions as such, but they contracted extensively with special federal programs like the Peace Corps, the Job Corps and the military. The military has, for many years, had its own instructional programs, ranging from its academies to special skills courses. Recently, however, the joint tasks aimed at selected populations and problems has intensified the relationships between federal and private organizations, affecting the operations of both. At the present time, concepts, procedures, techniques, and even materials produced by and/or for federal use are being transferred to and are influencing public school programs.

Private schools and nonpublic coalitions.--The number of private schools in the United States has greatly increased during the past decade and a half. Some of these are private in the traditional sense of the word, charging rather high tuition and promising to provide an exceptionally high quality of education to a thoroughly screened student body. Most of these are located in or near urban centers where parents are dissatisfied with conditions in public schools, and with the caliber of education offered there. These private schools enroll a minute number of school-age children and they are not, in fact, a coalition. Nevertheless, since they represent a trend (especially within the upper middle class), the movement may be interpreted as having some of the effects of a coalition in opposing public education.

The same is certainly true of the private school systems set up by the white groups in southern states. These schools do, however, enroll large numbers of white students, charging in some cases, only token tuition. They are, for the most part, selective only on the basis of race, and they make no claims for offering their students programs that are appreciably different from those they received in public schools. The private white school systems are classic coalitions, since although their tenure may span a number of years, it is unlikely that they will become permanent. The economy of the South, as well as federal policy, make their future less viable for instance than that of the parochial schools when they were established on a broad scale.

Implications for the ComField Model

The ComField model explicitly stipulates the formation of a broad coalition comprised of all those social segments which have a direct interest in the preparation of those who undertake the education of young children. Those segments are the following: college students, college faculty members, educational specialists, public school personnel, state and federal officers, parents and other community members, and, vicariously, young children.

It can be assumed that if representatives of all these social seg-
ments form a ComField coalition they share at least one major goal:
The assurance that those who are formally entrusted with the education
of the young are competent to fulfill their task. It can also be as-
sumed, however, that not all of the coalition members will share a sin-
gle view of how that goal will be accomplished. Furthermore, it can be
assumed that a number of goals will not be shared by coalition members;
in fact, some unshared goals may be incompatible. Therefore, if demo-
cratic procedures are to prevail, members of the coalition can be ex-
pected to engage in an exchange of views, discussion, argument, and
eventually some kind of agreement. In other words, even within the
ComField coalition, negotiation will almost certainly occur, and it will
probably occur in many contexts.

One of the contexts in which the ComField model formally provides
for negotiation is the teacher preparation program per se. Here a stu-
dent and college sponsor are mandated to negotiate differences involving
part(s) or all of the student's program. Because it is how own program
that is being negotiated it can be assumed that the student will nego-
tiate earnestly. From such earnest negotiation we can further assume a
student will develop a skill in the negotiating process. The prevalence
of negotiation--formal and informal--in educational contexts is exten-
sively illustrated in the literature reviewed below. Hence, the Com-
Field model supplies opportunity for students to acquire an essential
skill.

Regardless of its value in providing a student with a desirable
skill, the provision for negotiation does other things which are crucial
to the success of a ComField program. The negotiation process per se,
irrespective of its focus, relates to the four basic tenets on which the
ComField model is based. Each of those tenets is repeated here, to-
gether with a clarification of how the negotiation process relates to
it.

    1.   Prospective teachers should be able to demonstrate,
         prior to certification, that they can perform the
         functions for which they will be held responsible
         subsequent to certification.

Throughout the literature on coalitions and negotiation in educa-
tion, the charge is made in various ways that public education is not
accomplishing its purpose(s). Although the charge is most often and
most caustically made against urban school systems, it is not limited
to them. Many concerned critics (both professionals and nonprofession-
als) are demanding that the schools, and especially teachers, be held
accountable for the jobs they are supposed to do. The coalition favor-
ing what are called "the knowledge industries" is a strong advocate of
instructional accountability, and it proposes means for establishing
and assessing that accountability. Neighborhood and student coalitions,
although sometimes inconsistent in defining the scope of teacher account-
ability, nevertheless, are demanding it. Furthermore, many of them are

demanding that teachers be held accountable directly to them or to their representatives.

The emphasis which the ComField model places on the identification and mastery of instructional management and support competencies is sig-nificant. Those competencies, growing out of program objectives as they do, could be used in specifying exactly what teachers are to be held accountable for. That is, the ComField model intrinsically incorporates a means for obtaining what many coalitions are actively seeking: a clear locus of accountability, both in terms of the personnel involved and the functions of that personnel.

> 2. An educational program should be personally appro-priate to those going through it.

One of the most recurrent words in educational literature during the past decade has been "relevance." From elementary school through graduate school, the charge has been made that the education offered and/or imposed on learners has not had relevance for their lives. Con-sequently, many argue that frequently what has been taught has not been learned, and that serious harm has been done to the potential develop-ment of the learners.

By establishing that a prospective teacher's educational program will be personally appropriate, the ComField model anticipates that the teacher will learn what is relevant to him, and further, that if he does, the full potential of his own development as a person will be enhanced. Given such a set of circumstances, it is inconceivable that a teacher who has demonstrated the kinds of competencies inherent in the ComField model could, as a teacher, function irrelevantly in regard to any learners--regardless of how the learners defined relevance. The teacher's own preparation (both in content and method) should sensitize him to the needs and goals of his pupils. And his own experience in negotiating point; during his own preparation should train him to con-stantly question the relevance of what is to be learned, and the way(s) in which it is to be learned.

Hence, his response to pupils' questions about the relevance of education to them can undoubtedly be both more logical and more truly responsive to the affect of those questions. Similarly, when the teacher has to negotiate on the topic of relevant education--wither with pupils or with adults (both professionals and nonprofessionals)--his ComField experiences are almost certain to serve him well, and to lead to results that are mutually fruitful--and relevant.

> 3. Educational institutions and agencies should join in full partnership with the public schools in the professional education of teachers.

A large portion of recent educational research literature, nearly all of the literature about program and curriculum development, and the

bulk of the literature on in-service training for teachers would probably not have been published without the assistance of the federal government. That is, if federal agencies had not formed coalitions with the public schools, institutions of higher education, and with the state educational agencies, the activities reported either would not have happened or they would have been far fewer in number and smaller in scope. In quite a number of cases, the government's funding of a project was contingent upon the formation of a coalition between the public school and a college or university.

In short, the heavy federal funding for education in the last 10 years or so, has been designed to foster interaction among the members of a triad which directly affects teachers: the colleges and universities, by preparing them; the state agencies, by certifying them; and the public schools, by employing them. Undoubtedly, the federal agencies had several purposes in promoting interactions among the triad members. Surely, among those purposes were the following: 1) to make the institutions of higher education more acutely cognizant of situations and problems in the public schools; 2) to make the public schools more keenly aware of what higher education might contribute to the alleviation (if not the solution) of school problems; and 3) to make state and regional agencies more sharply alert to the special needs and assets of the other two, as well as to the ways in which they could facilitate educational efforts within the state or region.

Having heightened the perceptions of all three groups, and having forced a somewhat different pattern of interaction among them, the federal agencies probably hoped that the symbiotic relationships would be maintained. If they were maintained, then not only would teachers and their pupils benefit directly, but the triad's potential for synergism would be enhanced.

The third tenet of the ComField model provides for maintenance of the triad; and the model, as a whole, does more. A survey of the literature on educational coalitions and negotiations shows that despite the federal thrust for cooperation among the triad members, the triad seldom functions synergistically. Schoolmen rail against the colleges of education; the professors revile the schoolmen; and both of them attack the state and regional bureaucracies. Since the authorized power of the state outweighs--and directly affects--the other two members of the triad, it rarely enters the debate.

The ComField model redefines roles and calls for "full partnership" among the triad members in the professional education of teachers. A partnership is, technically speaking, a legal relation between contractually associated persons. This, then, implies a much stronger commitment than has traditionally prevailed, for example, between colleges of education and the public schools. "Full" partnership, however, does not imply "equal" partnership. So, even in the ComField model, the state may ultimately outweigh the other two members in authorized power. Nevertheless, the model does grant full partnership to all three members,

and that is a basis for interaction which has seldom existed in the
past--except euphemistically.

By seeking educational objectives for children from their parents,
the ComField model adds community members to the state-college-school
triad, since the objectives for the teacher program are based on the
objectives set for their pupils. In discussing tenets one and two,
some advantages of this provision were mentioned. Similar advantages
also apply to tenet three, since there is ample evidence in the litera-
ture on coalitions that some parents feel eminently qualified to decide
who is "prepared" to teach their children. If, in fact, the teacher
program objectives do evolve from pupil objectives, then not only can
parents like this be accommodated, but so too can other solicitous
but less outspoken parents.

At this stage of the model's development, community members are not
admitted to full partnership in the triad of professional teacher pre-
paration. However, a formal channel for their input is established:
the Instructional Objectives mechanism. Furthermore, by definition,
in areas where there is direct and comprehensive control of schools by
local boards, parents, and community members will comprise one unit of
the triad. In such cases (particularly if the parents are militant),
the ComField college sponsors may themselves be grateful for having ac-
quired negotiation skills through dealing with their students.

> 4. The component parts as well as the total program
> should be systematically designed to: a) bring
> about specific, assessable outcomes; b) provide
> continuous evidence as to the efficiency and effec-
> tiveness with which those outcomes are achieved;
> c) be adaptable on the basis of that evidence.

Although tenet four has obvious pertinence for the expanding lite-
rature about and from the coalitions encouraging behavioristic systems,
and cost/benefit approaches to education, it also is appropriate to the
aims of the coalitions which have most often been labeled by their op-
ponents as irrational or unreasonable: teachers unions and militant
ghetto parents and students.

Goaded into protest by anger and frustration, ghetto parents are
often astonishingly precise in specifying educational outcomes they
seek for their children. The coalition literature is full of specific
desired outcomes which present school programs are not achieving. Like-
wise, the coalitions cite continous evidence of the inefficiency and in-
effectiveness which prevents the achievement of the desired outcomes.
And finally, those coalitions name concrete adaptations--if not replace-
ments--which must be in their schools' programs. In short, the fourth
tenet of the ComField model would probably be highly acceptable to mili-
tant parents and their children, if the massive literature on the com-
plaints and demands of those coalitions is accurate. The fact that sys-
tematic attention to the components and to the program is provided is

93

likely to appeal strongly to groups that are used to being ignored or
noticed only at election time. Even those whose culture seems not to
tolerate easily the usual American notion of "systematic" could (and
undoubtedly would) modify the model to fit their own notion of the
term--if the program outcomes were what they regarded as the "right"
ones.

As for teachers unions, tenet four may seem to smack of a time-study
or efficiency approach, and hence, likely to be repugnant to union mem-
bers. However, the fundamental importance of negotiation in union func-
tioning must not be forgotten. Therefore, the more precisely outcomes
can be specified, the greater the opportunity for bargaining--an im-
portant aspect of negotiation. The same principle applies in negotiat-
ing the criteria by which the evidence of achievement is to be judged--
efficiency and effectiveness. Finally, the stipulation that the com-
ponent parts as well as the total program shall be adaptable on the
basis of the evidence just mentioned assures that negotiation almost
certainly must be an on-going, iterative process. Thus, the potential
for favorable bargaining is multiplied if tenet four is adhered to.
In other words, there is little for a teachers' union to quarrel with
here. In another sense, there is a plethora of possibilities.

A survey of the literature on coalitions and negotiation in educa-
tion indicates that a student who has, as a member of a ComField coali-
tion, completed a ComField program should be well prepared not only to
be a continuing member of that coalition but to negotiate with other
coalitions as well. Coalitions are formed because a group of people
have a goal; and negotiation takes place because people with different
views want to reach an agreement. The same premises which motivate
the formation of coalitions and negotiation underlie the ComField model,
but especially its personalization element which, indeed, cannot be
separated from the other elements. Put concisely, the ComField model
requires that goals be set by committed people who are willing to exa-
mine what they do, how, and why; who are willing to be responsible for
their own decisions and acts; who are willing to change when conditions
warrant it; and who are sensitive and responsive to these characteris-
tics in other human beings.

PART II: A Survey of Related Literature

Coalitions formed, and actions taken by them, have varied from areas
covering a single neighborhood to whole counties. For example, Prince
Edward County in Virginia closed its public school system for five years
to avoid integration (and recently faced an unexpected consequence when
hippie communities began to move in and set up schools satisfactory to
them and their views of education). Residents of the Ocean-Hill Browns-
ville section of New York City, participating in a local community con-
trol experiment, supported their local board's dismissal of nine teachers
and thereby precipitated a strike called by the United Federation of

Teachers (UFT) which closed the New York City schools to more than one million students.

Students in colleges, universities, and high schools have succeeded in closing institutions, bringing about changes in curricula, faculty, and regulations. Some have been admitted to seats on governing bodies of institutions.

On the other hand, certain colleges and/or universities have formed consortia to permit the sharing of faculties and facilities for mutual advantage. Members of what has been called the "knowledge industry" have nearly all formed their own coalitions of educational technologies, covering such activities as publishing, production of audio-visual equipment, and computer usage. The industrial coalitions have then joined with public and nonpublic organizations to form other coalitions.

All sorts of personnel in education have been joining organizations to foster their particular goals. Such organizations range from the old but newly militant National Education Association (NEA) to the frankly militant American Federation of Teachers (AFT), an arm of the AFL-CIO. Administrators and supervisory personnel (excluded from AFT) are focusing on their own organization in the NEA and gradually disassociating themselves from the larger body which includes teachers. Paraprofessionals, according to AFT spokesmen, will soon be organized.

Sometimes these coalitions negotiate with the authorized officials involved. Sometimes they do not; submitting instead lists of nonnegotiable demands. Naturally, this latter kind of action generates much more publicity, both among laymen and scholars. Although much of the following literature was prompted by situations found in urban ghettos, its relevance to other situations is--or soon will be--self-evident. It is important to remember, however, that much of what emerges is dissatisfaction with other systems in the society as well. This is not mentioned as an excuse or justification for education's obvious failures with an appaling number of students. But it is essential to remember that public education, together with its practitioners and clients, are all interacting not only with each other, but with a multitude of other people, events, and circumstances as well. The ComField model seems to take that fact into account, not only with its emphasis on competencies and its field based orientation, but also with its "second order" outcomes aimed at developing independent, self-directed, continuing learners who transfer to the education of their young pupils the systematization and personalization of instruction so prevalent in their own professional preparation. Future teachers are almost certain to participate in coalitions and in negotiation. Their experiences in a ComField based program can prepare them to understand and maximize that participation in a way that few of today's teachers--or their professors--have been able to.

In discussing the kinds of coalitions alone, it was possible to deal with each one separately by focusing on its membership. In writing

about the _activities_ of coalitions however, it is nearly impossible to deal with each type of coalition separately--if their activities are to be meaningfully presented. There are two main reasons for this: 1) coalitions often interact in the same context or event; 2) the activities of the coalitions are often carried out simultaneously (or nearly so). Consequently in order to understand the significance of one set of coalition activities it is necessary to know another set at almost the same time. Therefore, the literature reviewed here is grouped : round a set of topics, even though that means that several kinds of coalitions may be covered in the same section.

The reader is reminded that the words "power," "authority," and "politics" take their meanings from the context in which they are used. As a result, depending on the user's frame of reference and his purpose, the same word is often used to mean quite different things.

New York City Decentralization

The most prominent recent context for using the terms "coalition" and "negotiation" has been the literature reporting and discussing the issues of decentralization and community control of New York City schools. Although the conflicts of the nation's largest city may seem quite un-related to the issues of concern to the educators and citizens of es-sentially rural and small town Oregon, they are not. The pervasiveness of the mass media and the persistent mobility of the population make it impossible for any part of the country to remain untouched by signifi-cant developments in other parts of the country. Behaviors and their consequences are seen, and if the circumstances are deemed comparable, those behaviors are imitated or modified elsewhere to achieve similar--or even quite different--results. Such patterns can be dismissed as a case of "monkey-see-monkey-do." Or they can be taken as evidence that many kinds of people in many places are displeased with current educa-tional situations and distressed by their inability to produce, through other means, the changes they regard as necessary. At any rate, events in New York City have provided a series of types of actions, decisions, definitions, and precedents that can and probably will be cited by all sorts of coalitions in other parts of the country as time goes on.

In 1967, Mayor John Lindsay received the Bundy Report which he had commissioned. It advocated the decentralization of New York's public school system and recommended the establishment of some experimental community school systems in which local community boards would be given greatly increased control over their schools. Both recommendations were implemented, but it was primarily the issue of community control that provoked the subsequent furor and led to teachers' strikes which closed the schools to more than a million students during several inter-vals in 1967 and 1968.

Decentralization, as recommended by the Bundy Report, provided for

additional local school boards to run the more than 900 public schools, but essentially it left them ultimately responsible to the city's Central Board of Education. The move was intended to reduce the unwieldy giant to a more manageable size, leading to less bureaucracy, and hence, to more prompt attention to local district matters. However, since the plan also gave district boards the power to hire and grant tenure, it meant that the United Federation of Teachers (UFT), the New York City branch of the American Federation of Teachers (AFT), instead of negotiating a single contract for all the teachers in the city, might have to negotiate separate contracts with each of the decentralized districts. As this would weaken UFT's bargaining strength, and possibly lead to a drop in membership, the UFT is opposed to decentralization.

Albert Shanker (1968), President of UFT, for example, claimed that decentralization is "a political bluff rather than an educational one." He declared: "I regard decentralization as a kind of opium. It gives people the trappings of power and local control without really giving them the ability to do anything...The notion of local control is wrong because, basically, it is aimed not at solving a problem but at giving temporary satisfaction to people while their problem continues to grow" (p. 25).

Leslie Campbell (1968) is a leader in the Afro-American Teachers Association, a coalition which was formed after the UFT failed to support a massive school boycott to promote integration in 1964. Campbell was suspended from his job at Intermediate School 271 (I.S. 271) in the Ocean Hill-Brownsville section pending disposition of charges that he had harrassed and intimidated union teachers. I.S. 271 was one of the three experimental schools set up (following the Bundy Report) in which community control--as distinct from simply decentralization--was to be in effect. One of the control measures exercised by the local board was the dismissal (after requests for their transfer had been refused) of 19 teachers on the grounds that they were hostile to the goals of the local school. It was their defense by the UFT that led to the crippling strike of 1968. They were subsequently reinstated--together with two police guards in each of their classrooms. The Bundy Report clearly stipulated that hiring and tenure policies should be set by local boards, but it omitted mentioning who has authority to fire. The Central Board of Education and the UFT held that the Central Board alone had that authority; the local board for I.S. 271 claimed that the authority rested with them. The Central Board and the UFT won that negotiation.

Campbell, who was also a leader of a student coalition during and after the fall strike, agreed in part with Shanker's statement about decentralization. He said in 1968: "The conflict is racial, pure and simple. Decentralization is just a name...meant to placate the community...it's not distribution of power" (p. 191). He declared that real peace could be restored to schools only by "a shift in the balance of power from the school board to the communities, and we mean power in every sphere: hiring, firing, curriculum, the allocation of funds--

everything. That is our immediate aim...Blacks have never been put in
control of their own destinies, and now they're demanding it...We've
said it before. Community control by any means necessary" (p. 192).
Shanker had already urged his union members to "develop our own type of
guerrilla war" against militant students (Spiegel, 1968).

There are a number of observations which can be made about the re-
marks of both Shanker and Campbell: 1) both speakers express agreement
about the ultimate ineffectiveness of decentralization as it was pro-
rosed; 2) both speakers focus on the possession of power as the most
important goal; and 3) their opposing positions on the matter of local
control and the subsequent strike indicates that coalitions can cross
professional lines. Although both are teachers, Shanker and the
teachers union joined with the Central Board (administration-management)
against the Ocean Hill-Brownsville teachers. Furthermore, the tempo-
rary nature of coalitions should be remembered, for as goals are rede-
fined and as power loci shift, so the membership and identities of co-
alitions shift. In other words, in a negotiation process it is as im-
portant to know when a quotation was uttered as to know who made the
statement.

For example, David Selden (1969), the AFT President, argues for
"a moderate dose of decentralization." In presenting his "positive
approach," Selden states: "There are five distinct interest groups
which have legitimate power claims in the educational enterprise....
In reconstructing the governmental or operational structure of the
school system, each group should have the means to exercise its appro-
priate measure of authority" (p. 86). In other words, Selden implies
that "legitimate power claims" carry with them "appropriate measure(s)
of authority."

From such a linkage, another noteworthy linguistic distinction
emerges--a "legitimate" claim is not necessarily a "legitimated" (or
"legitimatized") claim. That is, each party enters negotiation with
what it considers to be a legitimate claim or position: one which is
genuine and in conformity with a recognized set of principles or accep-
ted rules and standards. It is not until negotiation is completed,
however, that one of the claims or positions (or an accepted modifica-
tion of it) is legitimatized, i.e., given legal status or authorization.
A legitimate claim seeking legitimatization can be influenced by many
factors and must be considered realistically. The next few paragraphs
illustrate some of those influences.

Politicians and Education

The Local Level

Writing about the role of the urban mayor in education, Mackler
and Bord (1968) observe that there are massive insufficiencies in re-
search about politics and education. Therefore, they call for "the

whole story" of how politicians do--or do not--"effect (sic.) school issues" (p. 539). According to their interpretation of a Midwest study of state politics and public schools (Masters, Salisbury, and Eliot, 1964), "the intricate relationship between schoolmen and the rank and file point to how public education is interwoven into the political fabric" (p. 538). Mackler and Bord (1969), pleading for more research, report that politicians (both state and local) are involved in educational issues, but say they are not; and educators say that they "want no interference from politicians." However, Mackler and Bord observe that educators "are always ready to accommodate political pressures" (p. 539).

Robert H. Salisbury (1967), reviews briefly the history of politics and education and discusses "the myth of the unitary community." The myth, he demonstrates, was useful in many ways, but was a particularly important element in the context of school politics. For example, in the muckraker era, the institutional separation of the schools from the rest of the political community was easily justified-- even though many school boards were selected by wards or by the city council. Nevertheless, Salisbury notes, such arrangements did result in school boards that were highly sensitive to neighborhood pressures. Later, the myth was useful in justifying the election of an at-large school board for the community, since it was an "organic whole" with a single public interest in education. Thus, its under-writing of equalitarian educational programs helped to validate middle-class control of the schools. The myth also, Salisbury says, was "a useful adjunct" to the emergence of professional expertise, which rested on the assumption that valid ways and means to run the schools existed. And these ways and means were independent of the particular interests and values of particular groups; hence, expertise was not to be questioned.

Business interests have dominated the socio-economic interests of the community, and the schools operating independently have been both weak and vulnerable. Since the schools have been independent systems, they have no long established reciprocal arrangements, no favors owed for favors done. Furthermore, there is little elapsed time between a tax referendum and the time the taxes are raised. Consequently, there is not the opportunity for voters to forget why the taxes went up (as there usually is between city elections and subsequent tax hikes).

Salisbury observes, however, that the myth is no longer believed-- even though it is still used as a defense of the schools by the schoolmen and by the lay supporters. He adds that it is modified into an attempt to achieve and maintain consensus among all those engaged in the educational enterprise. This myth of consensus is also sought at the state level, a serious handicap for big city schools, in Salisbury's eyes, because it lessens their getting sufficient funds to meet their special needs. Sometimes, he reports, city legislators (through sub-rosa deals) align themselves with state legislators to defeat school goals--an understandable result of the school's independent status.

Salisbury mentions the naivete of city lay board members in the art of getting a program through the state legislature. He maintains that it is their righteous unwillingness to "trade," and not opposing rural interests (as newspapers report), that leads to their inability to get what they want from the Capitol. Therefore, Salisbury cautions that city school systems cannot count on reapportionment to solve their problems if they still remain apart from city politics. Writing in 1967, he stresses, however, that urban interests have "for years" done much better at the federal level because of the "strong, warm, and skillfully administered relationship between city political leaders and federal officials" (p. 420). In conclusion, Salisbury muses that in their isolation (lacking political allies), the urban schools and educational issues--already laden with affect--"may come more and more to resemble floridation as a focus of manifold discontents of the city" (p. 423). Without the protection of the broader political process to defend them, the schools may become the "community's battlefield" for all sorts of encounters.

LaNoue (1968), after a survey of some political questions in the next decade of urban education, predicts that because education is the city's "most important task and its largest operation in personnel and expenditures," the mayor will emerge as the chief arbiter and policy maker for city education. Then, he and his party will have to defend the condition of the schools at election time. Like Salisbury, LaNoue notes that "the public school establishment" has not had the strength to protect the urban public schools because it has been isolated from the sources of political influence in the city. Therefore, unless there is a "radical injection of political energy," he believes that the educational system will "fly apart" as decentralization expands and as pressure groups become increasingly sophisticated and disruptive.

Wilder (1969) raises two related questions: Where is the voice of the community during negotiations between school boards and teachers? Who protects the vital interests and concerns of parents and students? Since he finds them unrepresented in negotiation, he pleads that the citizens (especially the poor and the black) organize and develop effective community power which could neutralize and diminish the power now held by teachers' unions and top-level school officials. Furthermore, he advocates that the citizen coalition hold the administrators and teachers accountable for the jobs they do and the ways they do them. What would happen to the balance of power is not discussed, if, as Wilder proposes, the school personnel saw themselves as part of the community, rather than "merely working in it."

On the other hand, arguing against the Bundy Report and its recommendations, Yevish (1968) proposes that New York City could really innovate if it sought to establish a basis of "educational literacy" for school board members by devising a means for accrediting and certifying board members. Such a step would, he claims, provide professional control of education for the first time (and, he reasons, would therefore provide quality education). Yevish attacks the Report's recommen-

dation for parental control, a construct which "does not and cannot exist." He declares that the moment parents join a community pressure group, they "are no longer parents but politicians...and like most politicians, they become self-seeking ard do things in concert which they would never dream of doing as responsible individuals" (p. 181).

Green (1969), in contrast, claims that a local, concerned public "seeking some institutional avenue" through which to express its interests in its children "can find no appropriate local political body" through which to act. He observes that especially in urban areas, a local concerned public is "deflected, diluted, and rendered inconsequential" as that public appeals to the representatives of a larger and often unresponsive public to bring about change.

He uses the phrase, "the policy of education," which he defines as "that set of institutions and social arrangements whereby power and authority are distributed, and within which debates on policy and procedures are carried on, and through which decisions are implemented and enforced" (p. 223). He identifies the following as participants in the education polity: portions of the federal government, state government, local boards of education, professional organizations, local associations of students, publishing firms and some industries. Green holds that this polity of education distributes power and authority "widely and without much clarity." Thus, he claims that questions of the structure of the school system, the distribution of authority, the roles of the profession and of the community, as well as of the purpose of the schools are questions not of policy (as many today claim them to be). Rather, he declares, they are questions of polity. That is, they are much more fundamental than policy questions since they deal with the question of reshaping the educational polity in such a way as to permit the social order to build a new system of schools.

Zeluck (1969), proposes a means to the new system. He calls for "a powerful coalition of teachers, civil rights groups, and the labor movement" to force Americans "to take the demands for educational change seriously" (p. 251). He maintains that the responsibility for the failures of the schools lies with the people who determine the social priorities and allocation of resources, the "real decision makers in our society," for whom the teachers are the front men, the "operational instrument of _their_ indifference" (p. 251). According to Zeluck (and, it might be added, to Green as well), the American establishment sees education mainly as training, providing necessary skills for managing and maintaining the economy; hence, it is "an enormous subsidy to business." He illustrates why none of the three groups--nor any two of them--can bring about the needed changes. The coalition must be made up of all three groups. Furthermore, he points out how self-interested actions by each of these groups not only inhibit change, but also have the potential for weakening those groups and destroying their opportunity to shift the balance of power.

S. Alan Cohen (1969), advocating local control of New York City

schools, labels as "hogwash" what he calls "the cultural deprivation
fallacy" as an explanation for illiteracy in the schools. He argues
that the action of concerned parents "is more liable to bring about
changes in the relevancy of the curriculum and in the pedagogy prac-
ticed in those schools than is the present system, which has been con-
trolled by absentee landlords who work at the Board of Education offices
miles away" (p. 258). Citing a series of projects in which educational
changes have been demonstrated, Cohen declares that those projects have
not been widely implemented because "the system is controlled by this
angry administrator who...does not really know how, or he does not want
to" (p. 258) implement them. In support of his claim, he relates how a
project that he submitted on behalf of and for the Ocean Hill-Brownsville
schools was delayed, while the iden.ical project submitted (by two of
his doctoral students) for the South Bronx schools was readily accepted.
Thus, he believes that the Board of Education was able to sabotage the
decentralization experiment because of the diffused power situation in
a large urban bureaucracy, where the "points of indecision" are invisi-
ble, and therefore, cannot be held responsible for their indecision.
With local control, Cohen states, the points of decision are more vul-
nerable to public influence because they are visible. Therefore, he
predicts that local control represents a "mild political revolution
that wil- loosen up the present system enough to engineer some change"
(p. 258). In conclusion, he claims that the real issues of the Ocean
Hill-Brownsville dispute with the UFT and the New York City Board of
Education were not educational. Rather, according to Cohen, the real
issues (clouded by the cultural deprivation fallacy) are: "the union
chief's play for power and the agency shop, unionism and the union-
construction company conspiracy to keep New York's $172 million school
construction and maintenance plum in white pockets, fear of adminis-
trators for their job security, and, of course, white racism" (p. 259).

The State Level

The targets of most of the strikes in the spring of 1968 were not
local school boards, even where walkouts were confined to single cities.
Rather, Robinson (1968) reports, the targets were state legislatures and
governors, because in all 50 states, the state legislatures, not any
local school district, has the plenary authority and power over educa-
tional policy in its state. Further, as Scher (1969) points out, every
state legislature is a political arena anu every legislator is a politi-
cian. As such, legislators (as well as local politicians) "perceive
issues not so much in substantive terms as in political terms." That
is, officials are likely to "reinterpret the substance in terms of its
political implications for the body politic as a whole, their own con-
stituents in particular, and their own political careers most immedi-
ately" (p. 14). Politicians, Scher notes, are "interested in power,
in who is able to allocate values and resources." Therefore, he re-
ports, in 1969 they ruled against the degree of local control that
Ocean Hill-Brownsville residents had exercised. That ruling was pro-
bably partly due to strong and prolonged UFT lobbying in the New York

99

State Legislature, but also partly due to the fact that some of the
state's power in controlling the policies for certification of schools
and school personnel was threatened by community action.

Scher cites and explains three particularly persuasive elements
to which those legislators--and presumably any legislators--would be
responsive: 1) the tremendous controversy and conflict emanating from
the city. Legislators strive for consensus on almost all matters be-
cause intense social controversy "hardens positions and makes bargain-
ing difficult, thereby interfering with the legislative process"; 2)
the question of the legitimacy of the Central Board of Education.
Since all political office-holders generally tend to be supportive of
existing governmental structures and institutions, defiance of author-
ity (almost irrespective of the moral or legal rights involved) is
frowned upon; and 3) the issue of due process. Regardless of the de-
gree of reality of the issue in this matter, the concept of due pro-
cess involves a fundamental American right which "lends itself to
rhetoric, catch-phrases, and the polarization of attitudes." It pro-
vides a "revered symbol" for rallying support and doing it quickly.

The importance of these elements, Scher points out, rests on their
implications for the basic questions "legislators always ask: what is
possible, what is feasible, under given political conditions?" (p. 19)
For them, the already familiar is judged to be politically safe and
attractive because it permits legislation to be passed without requir-
ing commitment to something untried and unfamiliar. Once the new be-
comes familiar, it can be expanded; if it doesn't, the legislation is
left to fall away. Knowing the questions legislators ask about a ques-
tion, and knowing something about their orientations and tendencies,
Scher believes, is crucial when educational coalitions attempt to in-
fluence the members of political bodies.

Professionalism and Unionism

Like many of the other words frequently used in this literature,
"professionalism" and "unionism" seem to be redefined by nearly every
author. The failure to accept a common definition indicates that these
two are likely to continue to be at the center of continuing conflict
as teacher militancy increases.

Salz (1969), considering the topic of local control versus profes-
sionalism, sees the situation this way. He regards as a "major break-
through" the fact that the UFT negotiated policy for the whole of the
New York City School System. According to Salz's analysis, this is a
significant step toward professionalism since it was a step toward
autonomy. Only a step, however, because in the Ocean Hill-Brownsville
dispute, he points out, the question revolved around whether the central
board or the local board "had the power to remove the teachers." No one
raised the question of whether any lay board could remove a profes-

sional. He predicts that other steps toward teacher professionalism will follow and that they will inevitably lead to conflict with community goals. From that conflict, he holds, a new form of relationship will be "hammered out" between the lay and professional coalitions.

Parker (1968), however, proposes that teachers achieve autonomy by another route. He suggests that the NEA per se be abolished and that its major affiliates and departments become completely autonomous. Further, Parker would classify the new groups as mutual benefit organizations; i.e., ones in which the primary beneficiaries are the members. In Parker's words: "The whole idea of a mutual benefit association is that the members democratically commit themselves to collective activity designed to achieve benefits for themselves" (p. 570). Among the possible activities he mentions is seeking "more effective means for influencing legislatures and governors than have yet been employed" (p. 570). He adds: "Teachers may ultimately recognize that coordinated application of pressure through negotiation in key localities throughout a state may be a more effective approach to preserving state governments than the direct but cumbersome tactics now being used" (p. 570).

Unionization among teachers has, of course, been questioned by some from time to time. Janssen (1967), education editor of Newsweek, observes that the AFT has been most successful (both in recruiting members and in negotiating benefits) "in those school systems which look and operate as factories" (p. 66). He points out "the traditional union aims--shorter hours, more pay, activities of teachers, including teaching competence, curriculum determination and staff selection" (p. 573). Whereas school managers, exercising administrative authority, would be responsible "for such matters as plant maintenance, schedules, budget, administration, and supervision of nonprofessional personnel (p. 573). Such an arrangement, in Williams' view permits those "most qualified" to make decisions in their area of competence (for even when administrators must pass on faculty selection and promotions, the alternatives from which they select are initially determined by the faculty). It also reduces the "institutionalization of conflict" which is generally regarded as inherent in the industrial relations approach.

Williams notes that teachers already possess the first three components, and they are rapidly acquiring the last two of the five components considered in estimating the economic power potential of any group of employees. Any group possessing all of the components is said to have "enormous bargaining power." In fact, Williams avers that in a dispute, "the question of whether the group has the legal right to bring their collective power to bear on a situation through the use or threatened use of a strike or sanction becomes largely academic" (p. 571). As evidence, he reveals that although the right to strike is consistently denied to public employees in every state, few teacher organizations have been effectively punished for strikes.

The most predominant influences contributing to teacher coalitions are summarized by Cass and Birnbaum (1968). They note that many occu-

pational groups have learned that increased salaries and higher status are won, not by the justice of the demands made, but by the economic and political power of organized groups, and until they began joining unions--albeit with some reluctance--teachers were outside the center of local political power.

The authors point out that traditionally inactive teachers became militant in the past decade, perhaps because the "etiquette of social protest" changed radically: given a just cause, direct action--even civil disobedience--is acceptable. They also mention that teachers have always occupied an equivocal position in our society, and that society has always been ambivalent about its teachers. With the complexity of life today, however, it is more difficult than ever to define the unique role of the classroom teacher, let alone to define the relationship among "good teaching," high pupil achievement, and high salaries. Ungainly, inept, and untrained teachers in life and literature have often been accepted as representatives of the profession-- apparently by the public and by teachers. So, as enrollments soared and the school itself became larger and more impersonal, Cass and Birnbaum say that teachers have been undergoing a "process of progressive alienation from both the school as an institution and from the community it serves" (p. 56). The increased ease of mobility and the fact that many teachers no longer live in the community where they teach has led to a loss of the sense of belonging to the community.

Furthermore, the authors bring out, Americans have made massive-- and sometimes unrealistic--demands on the schools, regarding them as cure-all institutions. A new wave of such demands is being made, and although they vary somewhat from community to community, they are all demands that teachers are expected to meet. Realizing that they have a professional competence, today's teachers are, the authors say, less "dedicated" and more pragmatic than their predecessors. They resent assignment to nonprofessional duties and have less patience with "traditional inadequacies of time, facilities, and administrative support." Yet, since they feel threatened--figuratively and literally-- by new demands for which they are unprepared by training or experience, Cass and Birnbaum say teachers are "turning inward," seeking support and security from their own group. Citing Harvey Cox's view, i.e., that urbanization leads to a type of impersonality in which "functional relationships" multiply and replace traditional relations), the authors remark that teachers are seeking new, functional relationships with administrators, school boards, and even with parents. Cass and Birnbaum predict that teacher alienation and militancy has only just begun and is likely to go on for some time, not only in the city where it began, but into the suburbs--and beyond.

Black Teachers

Susan Jacoby (1969) writes about a new power in the schools:

black teachers. Her remarks to some extent are in conflict with those
of Cass and Birnbaum, for she cites events in a number of large cities
where black teachers do live in the community where they teach, and
where they are active participants in community life. Rather than
experiencing a sense of alienation and a quest for functional relation-
ships, she illustrates how black teachers and administrators are real-
izing their importance as "success models" for black students. She
dismisses as "nonsense" the idea that only black teachers can effec-
tively teach black students; but she does acknowledge that black
teachers have the unique ability to bolster the self-image of black
students, i.e., demonstrating by their presence that they "have
achieved."

Jacoby also comments on the New Caucus, a dissident group of black
and young white teachers within the AFT who sought a strong union en-
dorsement for community control of schools at the 1968 national con-
vention. Only a considerably revised version passed, however, because
the AFT anticipated that the Ocean Hill-Brownsville situation would
lead to a strike. Although the community control issue was a threat
to the solidarity of the union, neither the union leaders nor the dis-
sidents "want to see an outright split between black and white union
teacher." She reports that while not all black teachers wholeheartedly
favor community control, they are "less hostile to it than their white
counterparts" (p. 60). Quoting Keith Baird, a curriculum consultant to
Ocean Hill-Brownsville schools, she writes: "Community control simply
means that blacks and Puerto Ricans will have the same say in running
their schools that whites have always had. Naturally, that prospect
doesn't frighten black teachers" (p. 60).

Jacoby also quotes William H. Simon, a militant black and presi-
dent of the Washington (D.C.) Teachers Union. Simon stated: "At the
heart of the really violent opposition to community control, there is
the assumption that a black neighborhood governing board must be by
nature irrational and extremist. If you start with this assumption,
then naturally there is no potential for negotiation" (p. 60). As evi-
dence that such assumption is wrong, she reports that all of the
teachers fired by the Ocean Hill-Brownsville governing board were
white. But the fact that more than two-thirds of the new teachers
hired by the board were also white was largely ignored.

In some detail, Jacoby shows that "on issues not related to race,
most black teachers think and behave exactly like most white teachers"
(p. 60). They are inclined to do things as they have done them in the
past, for instance, and they are as fearful of "parent interference"
in the classroom as anyone else.

Community Based Coalitions

Up to this point, the review has focused mainly on literature

103

about coalitions and negotiations which have involved professional educators. Other coalitions will now be considered, some of which involve professional educators. In these coalitions, however, the role of the professionals is secondary to some other role, such as that of parent, community, neighborhood, or racial group member, or even business man or military official. Negotiations are less commonly mentioned in this nonprofessional literature, partly because some of the coalitions are structured differently and have a different relationship to other groups than teachers do, but mainly because the negotiations of the less dramatic have not been so fully publicized and the most prominent nonprofessional groups have been less inclined to negotiate. Instead, they have often issued ultimatums and lists of demands which they designated as nonnegotiable. Thus, the community and/or racial coalitions and the student coalitions have been, in general, protest or rebellion coalitions; whereas the business and military coalitions have also sought change, and have done so, ironically, with a decidedly less hostile or militant orientation.

Many of the most active and visible coalitions have resulted from socio-economic conditions and people's reactions to them. The schools may, in fact, be as unsatisfactory as some of their critics claim, but certainly they must also be regarded as especially vulnerable targets for a variety of frustrations and disappointments. Most of the schools, after all, existed long before they were tagged "ghetto schools."

Teacher Education

Cuban (1969), for example, claims that as it has been used among teachers, "'professionalism' is a code word for keeping parents at arm's length, for resisting the development of any meaningful face-to-face contact between school and parent, between teacher and community" (p. 254). Like Wilder, he holds that the "code" can be broken only by expanding "the vision of teachers to see that their role requires active involvement with parents and participation in community life" (p. 255). Cuban presents a model for teacher education in which the schools have a much more prominent role than has been traditional. In the model, teachers have much more interaction with the community members, and they have that interaction outside the school. One of the purposes of that provision is to compel teachers to "look outward toward the community" and to help them see that "it is their job" to be concerned about how parents feel about the schools.

The coalition about which Cuban writes links both the school and the community more closely with the university, and it specifies certain responsibilities to each component member of the coalition. Community demands on the schools have, admittedly, received a great deal of publicity recently. However, Cuban specifies that unless the motives for community control of education are accompanied by a commitment to restructure the role of teachers and to increase the time available to them to work in the community, there is no guarantee

that the "professionals in community operated schools will be more
responsive to parents and community than they are in conventionally
operated schools" (p. 255). He says that if the teacher is to become
more effective, he must be permitted to play these three roles:
instructor, curriculum developer, and liasion with the community.
The training institutions can prepare teachers for the roles, but only
the communities themselves can provide the opportunities for teachers
to fulfill the roles in their schools.

Berlin (1964) points out some unrealities in teacher education
and proposes a coalition in which urban teachers and parents can work
together for the benefit of children. Speaking as a psychiatrist,
Berlin reports that many urban parents of "problem children" were
themselves not helped to learn easily or effectively in school. Con-
sequently, they may feel quite frustrated at the thought of being asked
to help their children learn, and angered when their children seem to
need more than they (as defeated, helpless parents) are able to provide.
Berlin offers specific methods a teacher can use in dealing fruitfully
with such parents and with their children.

In addition, he calls on the teacher-education institutions to
help their students cope with such parents by making the students aware
of the realities in present-day schools so that as a result of their
"realistic awareness" the teachers can use teachers' and citizens'
organizations more effectively to obtain the kind of "conditions neces-
sary for effective teaching and learning so important to our way of
life and to our nation" (p. 65). Although Berlin's words may seem to
foster a monolithic socio-cultural arrangement (a view not likely to
be popular among urban groups today), that is not the only interpre-
tation that can be given to what he says. He declares, for example,
that the schools have failed the parents and he writes: "Even cursory
investigation reveals these parents to be angry and helpless about many
aspects of their living" (p. 58). Pointing out that beginning to learn
academic material is one way of beginning to deal with the real world,
Berlin says that success in mastering subject matter means a great deal
to a child's concept of himself--especially if the child is antisocial,
aggressive, or hostile as a result of his earlier experiences. Berlin
presents, in somewhat different words, a solution to the problem that
critics have repeatedly faulted the schools for and toward which the
ComField model directs itself. He says: "I would, therefore, again
emphasize that the teacher expect of herself that she learn to teach
as effectively and as skillfully as possible and that, in teaching,
she is performing an important mental health task" (p. 58). In short,
Berlin argues that children taught by teachers who have realistic ex-
pectations of themselves, of their pupils, of parents, and of their
communities--those children will not be taught to fail, or will they
die at an early age.

Daniel U. Levine (1969) also advocates a coalition between the
schools and their communities, especially where segregation exists. He
put the burden for initiating action on the educators, both those in

public schools and those in teacher training institutions. He argues
for the creation, in every segregated community, of "major programs for
intergroup relations education for adults," and for "support to organi-
zations and groups which are attempting to build a unified power base
among the masses of people in the inner city" (p. 268). He holds that
the "fundamental imperative" for preserving national unity in a time of
racial crisis is to work in every way possible to bring youngsters
with differing background into frequent contact in the schools. Fur-
thermore, he states that to do so is "good politics," the politics of
the future. Otherwise, he says, we're finished as a nation.

Beck, Krumbein, and Erickson (1969), on the other hand, argue that
desegregation does not automatically assure equality. Hence, they de-
scribe three conditions which must be present concurrently with, or
prior to, physical desegregation of pupils and school facilities if
educational equality is to be achieved. These conditions deal with
personnel recruitment, employment, and training; curriculum revision;
and an examination and modification of the school social system. As
a part of the modification procedure in the last condition, the authors
propose that after all existing extracurricular and noncurricular acti-
vities are abolished, a new "coalition of power" be set up, and on the
basis of that coalition, the whole social system could be organized on
a unit-of-power basis as distinct from a one-man, one-vote majority rule
concept. In their plan (which they liken to that operating in the Uni-
ted States Senate), since each member of the school society would have
a vote equal in importance and stature to every other member, racial
minority group votes would not be sacrificed because a racial group
represented only a small percentage of the voters. Similarly, discus-
sion (i.e., negotiation) would take place "not on the basis of external
status but on the basis of equal units of power" (p. 283). That is,
"a student vote would equal an administrator's vote, a parent vote
would be equal to a teacher vote" (p. 283). According to the plan of
Beck et al., the units would be assigned to specific interest groups
regardless of their numerical size "so long as the outcomes have a
specific bearing on these groups." Thus, they say, that to be elected
to a school post or to have a policy item considered, a person or an
organization would have to be responsive to everyone's interest because
he would have to have minority support.

The authors fail to clarify several critical points in the plan,
however. For example, on what is it decided that all existing activi-
ties in a school will be abolished? In a school social system, what
constitutes "external status?" That is, to what is the status external?
In a situation where parental vote is appropriate, how many parents may
vote? That is, does a widowed mother have one unit-of-power, whereas,
two parents married to each other (but disagreeing on the question) have,
between them, two units-of-power? By whom and through what process is
it determined that an "outcome" does, in fact, "have a specific be. ing"
on a petitioner? Does a unit-of-power plan assure "responsiveness" to
everyone's interest? Or does it merely assure that attention will have
to be paid to the bookkeeping details of vote swapping?

Beck, et al., may have answers to these questions, but they are not provided in the article. Raising questions like these is not meant to discredit the article nor the plan. After all, details on how the other coalitions cited are to be operative were neither provided nor their absence noted. Rather, the questions may have arisen here because the authors did provide 1) a promising new idea, and 2) enough details about that idea to whet the appetite for more. One thing that is illustrated, nevertheless, is that it is much simpler to propose coalitions and negotiations than it is to establish them at an operational level.

David Cooperman (1969), using a set of University of Minnesota programs as examples, describes a recent urban coalition: the "comm-university," a means for making the components of learning in higher education more responsive to the needs of the metropolis "than has previously been the case." He reports on storefront projects in Minneapolis and St. Paul that provide such services as teaching academic subjects, providing counseling and tutoring, and in general, supplying information about the purposes, offerings, and accessibility of the University for a variety of "ethnic groups and deprived populations." The scope of the individual programs reported by Cooperman as being a part of the total program of teaching, research, and service of the Center for Urban and Regional Affairs "does represent a new coalition between the University and what is often called the "inner city" and its residents. The structure and functioning of the coalition represents an attempt "to try out different formats within which education may proceed in styles compatible with the culture patterns of students" (p. 284). Although Cooperman makes no mention of it, reading his brief report on storefront programs somehow evoked the image of land grant colleges and universities with their extension programs and services for rural Americans as they have emerged over a century or so. That is, storefront programs seem to be serving many of the same functions for urban dwellers that 4-H clubs, county extension agencies, and other governmental and educational organizations have long provided for rural and small town dwellers.

High School Students

Since the coalitions among college students have been so extensively reported in all of the media, it hardly seems necessary to do more than mention their most common emphases. Depending on their locations and memberships, the goals of college and university coalitions have, for the most part, included greater student autonomy (both personal and academic); changes in curriculum, policies, faculty, and administration; social reforms; and a decrease in military activities and support.

Some of the same goals have been held by junior and senior high school coalitions, but as yet, relatively little has been reported about their activities. In most places where high school students operated as cialitions (as distinct from operating as individuals,

albeit in the same general way), their action has focused on or echoed the goals of adult coalitions with which they sympathize.

For example, Hunt (1969), reporting a survey of high school principals on the topic of student protest, finds that "protest" is as likely to occur in junior high school as in senior high, and that principals anticipate that the trend will increase. In Florida schools, as in other places where teachers have been on strike, students have rejected the substitute teachers hired to break the strike. On the other hand, Wasserman (1969) recounts how, in New York's Intermediate School 201 (which had been the site of "the first guerrilla engagement in the battle for the schools" in 1966), the students attended classes regularly during the long strike when the local governing board used volunteers or teachers locked out of other schools.

Wasserman and Reimann (1969), writing about the student movement of 1968-69 in New York City schools, state that the roots of the movement are in the school social system, and that it is, "in reality, a political movement." They report, however, that within each school, individual groups are suspicious of coalitions with other schools' groups and with other groups in their own school. Only tentatively toward the end of the year, and on specific issues and actions, did black and white groups begin to come together at the individual level as well as at the interschool or supraschool level. There are, nevertheless, a few student organizations (directly supported by some adult groups) which have sought to coordinate and encourage the students' uprisings.

The authors conclude that gradually, as the "adult defenders of the system were coalessing in a way that blurred the distinctions between liberal and conservative, Jew and Gentile, teacher and policeman, the young rebels were beginning to seriously challenge the figures of authority in a way that blurred the old American distinctions between black and white, school success and school failure, adult and teenager, and, in the face of ruthless opposition, to seek to turn the schools from a status-reinforcing institution to an educational institution" (p. 17).

Harrington (1968), reporting on student walkouts from Los Angeles high schools, notes that demands ranged from calls for sweeping educational change to revisions in the dress code for students. He points out that Los Angeles has the largest concentration of citizens of Mexican descent (i.e., 600,000) outside Mexico itself, as well as a large black population. Thus, within the student coalition, there are special interest groups based on racial and ethnic orientations, as well as neighborhood goals. Harrington maintains that the Los Angeles student "blowout" simply illustrated dramatically the flaws (especially poor communication between schools and community) which have existed for a long time, and on which the teachers had sought action in the past.

Private Schools

Although they cannot be said to be an organized coalition, the operators and patrons of private schools (in the traditional sense of the term) form an additional educational coalition. Their purposes range from attempts to show "what education at its best can be like." The Hechingers (1968), discussing the "panic among the privileged" in New York City emphasize that the panic exists because, despite a 50 percent expansion, there aren't enough private schools to accommodate the applicants. They maintain that this imbalance exists because parents (even those who may have sent older children to public schools) have lost confidence in the quality of public education. The authors point out that the parents who send their children to private schools (as distinct from parish parochial schools) live in neighborhoods which have been and still are almost completely white and affluent. Therefore, they brand as misleading the claim that parents seek private schools for their children to avoid racial and/or social integration. Woodring (1965), advocating the decentralization of urban school systems, remarks that many New York parents send their children to "independent schools where the instruction may be no better, but communication with those in charge is possible" (p. 51). In other words, advantaged parents, along with ghetto parents, find the bureaucracy an intolerable incubus.

Perhaps the most bizarre private school coalition was the one which closed the public schools of Prince Edward County, Virginia from 1959 to 1964. By an act of legislature, the public school system was dissolved to avoid compliance with a federal court order to desegregate. The schools were then reopened as private schools for white students. But for four years, the Negro students in the county received no schooling at all. (Ironically, a generation before their time, in 1951, the Negro students in Prince Edward County had received national publicity when they organized and executed a strike to protest the conditions in their high school).

Reviewing Bob Smith's book on the subject, Johnson (1965), reports that although public schools have been reestablished, they are still segregated because almost all of the white children continue to go to their private schools which are financed through special legislative arrangements. Thus, unlike the situation in the North, it is the white coalition in this nonurban Southern county which advocates local control of their schools.*

---

*The State of Mississippi, in January, 1970 facing federal orders to integrate its public schools is taking another tack. Public schools are operating but in many communities white parents are establishing private schools. The result, of course, is that in the main public schools are now black schools.

Alternative Public Schools

As has already been mentioned, merely to propose a coalition doesn't establish it. Nevertheless, one form of proposed coalition should be mentioned since it does occur occasionally in the literature. The motives and anticipated advantages for the coalitions vary with those proposing the alte::natives. Nevertheless the example below is a reasonable likeness to most of the alternatives suggested.

Attacking the present form of public education as a monopoly, Clark (1968), proposes alternative public school systems as "possible, realistic, and practical competitors." Among his alternatives are most of the kinds of coalitions already mentioned and at least two rather different ones: industrial demonstration schools to be financed by industrial, business, and commercial firms for their employees and selected members of the public; and labor union sponsored schools to be financed and sponsored by labor unions largely, but not exclusively, for the children of their members.

Clark calls for the provision of "meaningful ways of involving the parents and the community in the activities of the school" (p. 112), during the period until the alternative school systems are established. Yet, he seems not to include any provision for them in the parallel competitive alternatives in which "quality control and professional accountability would be maintained and determined by Federal and State educational standards and supervision" (p. 113). Thus, while his latter specifications are somewhat similar to the accountability aspect of the ComField model, little else is similar.

In his proposal, Clark leaves unexplained many points of structure and function in his alternatives. Yet, that may have been deliberate for he mentions: "Even the public discussion of these possibilities might clear away some of the dank stagnation, which seems to be suffocating urban education today" (p. 113). In other words, he hopes that merely talking about possible competition may be enough to stir the present urban public schools to the level of "vitality and dynamism which are now clearly missing" (p. 113).

Government-Industry-University Coalitions

Opposition and Modification

It is generally agreed that the federal government has been more actively participating in education during the last decade or so than it ever did before. As was pointed out above, financial support as well as legislative and judicial actions have been responsible for linking together in quite new wyas both public and private organizations. Nevertheless, some do not see all the new government linkages as benign. Both Schrag (1968) and Ridgevay (1968) question the wisdom of the universities' becoming so enmeshed in government support for

research, particularly when the support comes from the military and espionage branches. They also challenge the strong trend toward accepting the university as an institution which exists mainly to serve the "demands of industry and the standards of the market place." Within the past two years, a number of universities have reexamined their ties with industry and government, and some have announced, or begun, plans to change them.

Similarly, Newmann and Oliver (1967) are suspicious and disapproving of the emergence of national super-corporations venturing into educational production. They write: "The great society evidently assumes that since the government-industry-university coalition seems to have solved problems of economic affluence and defense, it should therefore be able to solve educational problems...we seriously question that assumption" (p. 6d).

Schrag (1969) observes that American education is becoming increasingly a "hybrid of organizations supported--and in a sense, controlled-- by a combination of public and private individuals and agencies, federal, industrial, and philanthropic...the distinctions will be blurred even further" (p. 60). Holton (1967) claims that the fundamental pattern for the relationship between industry and education is being invented as the two interact. He recommends that it be a partnership in "a very complex consortium in which the teaching profession, the academic subject-matter specialists, the industries, the regional laboratories, the financial granting agencies, and the schools of education-- above all the last--have to be full and strong partners" (p. 113).

Allowing that the suggestion is "politically naive," Jason Epstein (1969), Vic-president of Random House Publishers, proposes that the public and private sectors must become involved in the ghetto by subsidizing all kinds of business and educational enterprises, and by encouraging "black capitalism." This is being done in a number of cities, mainly through loans and other assistance to black business and training programs. (It is not, however, being done to the extent that Epstein mentions, i.e., "handing over" state or metropolitan businesses to the poor blacks.) Some claim that American education has always primarily served business community, and thereby subsidized it, (See Green, 1969; Schrag, 1967 above). So while Epstein's proposed coalition is not new, its relationship and interaction pattern would be, since business would be the subsidizing agent.

The Knowledge Industries

As the private corporations began to work on educational and social problems, they began to sense advantages in forming coalitions of people and resources from the various technologies involved. Thus, already large corporations began acquiring other related corporations and establishing new corporations which came to be popularly referred to as "the knowledge industry." The period from 1962 through 1967 especially

111

saw organizations like Xerox, IBM, McGraw-Hill, Raytheon, Litton, ITT,
RCA, Bell & Howell, Scott Foresman, and Time, Inc. buying established
publishing houses and educational facilities and services at a great
rate (Schrag, 1967). Since 1967, expansion has slowed down, although
growth in most forms of educational technology is still steady (Kaplan,
1969).

Black, author of The American Schoolbook, states that by 1968 the
federal government had spent more than $40 million dollars for the
development of new textbooks and teaching tools--a vital point, says
Black because that cuts the risk taken by a textbook publisher when he
brings out a new schoolbook. Benefits like this, for instance, pro-
vided much of the impetus for private industry's large scale entrance
into education.

However, totally new technologies and procedures were added to
the well established textbook. Several of the most distinctive are
discussed here because aside from the fact that they illustrate some of
the outcomes of corporate mergers, they also illustrate coalitions with
educational institutions, both colleges and public schools. Moreover,
some of them show how industries go about their work in quite a differ-
ent manner from most educators.

Blaschke (1969), writing about computer-assisted instruction (CAI)
points out that education is the last of the manual trades and that the
increased unionization is institutionalizing that tradition. Like
Clark, he argues that public education has been a 200-year monopoly
which never was "efficiency oriented." He charges that the schools are
concerned only with input and they assume no responsibility for quality
control. Although Blaschke says that CAI can be used as "an enabling
technology to foster change toward an output-oriented system, that
represents a new market which "has to be largely created."

Therefore, he describes three kinds of organizations to operate
with or between coalitions if CAI is to have "a meaningful impact on
the quality of public education we need to create" (p. 28):

1) "Buffer" organizations functioning between would-be
   innovative industrial suppliers and serious, imaginative
   school officials to minimize the political and marketing
   blackeyes which could easily arise during experimenting
   with computer technology;

2) Disinterested, objective, and knowledgeable management
   groups which operate as "honest brokers" between over-
   zealous manufacturers and managerially deficient school
   officials, and well-meaning but "politically hamstrung"
   USOE officials; and

3) Catalytic groups which can lay political and other ground-
   work in the community and assist the schools in initiating
   action.

112

The creation of mechanisms which can—concurrent with the development of technology—direct attention to the political and managerial problems in education is, Blaschke says, "a prerequisite to the effective and creative application of technology in education" (p. 28).

Blaschke never defines the kind of education we need, but his proposal does seem to support the view of Newmann and Oliver (1967) who say: "We predict that new talent will not be directed toward such innovations [i.e., ones which 'deliberately distrub the questionable assumptions which underlie the very concept of specialized fields of educational experts], because the new breed of specialist has no particular stake in viewing problems broadly."

There are other facets to the industry-education coalition besides the preparation and sale of instructional materials and devices. One is the design and/or supply of information management systems such as the ComField model provides through the use of a computer. Another is the extensive training and educational programs that both private industry and the Department of Defense (DOD) operate for their personnel. Katzenbach (1967) notes that out of $70 billion total spent on education, business, industry, and government spent more than $21 billion dollars. The DOD alone maintains a staff of 300,000 full-time teachers and instructors. General Motors has its own degree-granting institution as well as a wide variety of other programs and institutes. IBM, long known for its training programs, spends nearly as much on in-house education as the District of Columbia does on public education. These are alternative educational systems, but they are not public, as the ones advocated by Clark basically are.

Aside from the fact that the military and private business are themselves, undeniably long-standing and large coalitions in education, some of their techniques, such as programmed instruction, have already been assimilated into public education, and others are likely to be. For example, Braddock (1967), writing in an issue of Phi Delta Kappan wholely devoted to the military and education, tells about Project 100,000. That project was developed to train 100,000 men accepted into the armed forces who would have formerly been rejected as physically and/or mentally unfit. As the result of using "radical new materials and methods," Braddock reports that only 4.5 percent of the men in the school fail to graduate.

In a Saturday Review editorial, Cass (1968) writes about a sociologist's analysis of Project 100,000 for basic education. Roger W. Little, the sociologist, attributed the outstanding success of the project to the fact that it operates on the assumptions that everyone has the potential for success and that those who run the program can teach almost anyone. Cass specifically declares that if the armed forces can succeed where civilian institutions fail, "we need desperately to know more about how they do it, and why it works" (p. 59).

Yet, another pattern of business-education coalitions is that of

113

contracting with a supplier for a total instructional "package" as dis-
inct from a single course or topic. The Job Corps, for instance, pro-·
vided the prototype for this approach to education. In that case, the
urban Job Corps training center was financed by the federal government
which contracted with private corporations to recruit staff, refurbish
physical facilities, and manage the centers. Industry then turned to
the universities to help train personnel, and to advise and evaluate
the operation.

More recently, this kind of approach has been undertaken with a
public school potential dropout population in Texarkana on the Texas-
Arkansas border. There, the public schools (under an ESEA Title VIII
grant) contracted with a relatively unknown firm (Dorsett Educational
Systems of Norman, Oklahoma) which is to provide academic instruction
on a performance-contracting basis (i.e., if the students do not learn
or learn slower than anticipated, according to the terms of the con-
tract, the money due the firm decreases). The contract also provides
for a management support group to work on program development, planning,
and project management, including information on the cost/effectiveness
of the educational technology approaches and the integration of proven
techniques into the school's curriculum. This Texarkana program thus,
shares many characteı stics with the ComField model.

According to Educational Technology (August, 1969), although the
contractor was given considerable leeway about how the task should be
accomplished (e.g., restricted only in that the instructional process
be nonlabor intensive, with decreasing costs), three other stipulations
were originally made in the request for proposals. They were that the
conceptual proposal meet "the political and social criteria for accep-
tance of groups which: 1) desire non-disruptive racial integration,
2) demand effective community control, and 3) desire to rationalize the
teachers' union/school administration negotiating process" (p. 5).
Thus the strands of existing coalitions in Texarkana were identified
and accommodated from the very beginning of the undertaking, just as
they are in the ComField model.

This contract's basic principle is accountability for results,
which according to Leon Lessinger, an Associate Commissioner of Educa-
tion, is "a profoundly new principle for education." (Although the
context is different and the accountable party is not a private com-
pany, the principle of accountability is also basic to the demands of
inner city parent coalitions). Lessinger and Allen (1969) advocate a
new approach to federal funding for education. Listing a dozen exam-
ples of performance criteria for which incentive payments might be pro-
ductive, the authors argue that educational objectives pinned to pre-
dictable, measurable student performance offer a basis for measuring
program cost against program effectiveness. That kind of cost account-
ing can promote more effective allocation of existing resources among
competing educational programs. Such a procedure, they predict will
permit a "renaissance in education."

114

PART III: Summary and Conclusions

The literature on coalitions and negotiations just reviewed indicates that the ComField model of elementary teacher education has or provides for most of the elements necessary for survival and fulfillment in the present and future educational contexts. Specifically, it offers opportunity for expression and influence to the three most disgruntled and troubled groups in education: students, local citizens, and professional educators. By including them in a ComField coalition the model provides optimal promise for success in achieving the goal of a competency-based, field-centered education for teachers of young children. In addition, by clearly identifying the component responsibilities of all concerned and by systematically and recurrently analyzing the input and output for each of those responsibilities, the model makes it possible to do a great many recommended tasks. It is also possible, for example, to use or adapt it to a strict principle of accountability in the educational process. From the statement of educational objectives for the children to be taught by the prospective teachers, to the evaluation of the teachers' accomplishments with those children, the ComField model provides a framework of specificity and flexibility.

BIBLIOGRAPHY

Beck, A., Krumbein, E., and Erickson, F. D. Strategies for Change:
   Conditions for School Desegregation. Phi Delta Kappan, 1969, L,
   280-283.

Berlin, I. N. Unrealities in Teacher Education. Saturday Review.
   December 19, 1964; 56-58 and 65.

Blaschke, C. L. Computers in Education: Interesting, but How Relevant?
   Educational Technology, 1969, 9:5, 24-28.

Braddock, C. Project 100,000. Phi Delta Kappan, 1967, XLVIII, 425-427.

Campbell, L. In Citizen Participation in Urban Development.
   H.B.C. Spiegel (Ed.). Washington, D. C.: National Education
   Association, 1968.

Cass, J. The Armed Services as Educator. Saturday Review. October 19,
   1968; 59.

Cass, J. and Birnbaum, M. What Makes Teachers Militant. Saturday Review.
   January 20, 1968; 54-56.

Clark, K. B. Alternative Public School Systems. Harvard Educational
   Review, 1968, 38, 100-113.

Cohen, S. A. Local Control and the Culturally Deprivation Fallacy.
   Phi Delta Kappan, 1969, L, 255-259.

Cooperman, D. The Storefront Program in the Twin Cities. Phi Delta
   Kappan, 1969, L, 284-285.

Cuban, L. Teacher and Community. Harvard Educational Review, 1969, 39,
   253-272.

Educational Technology. Performance Contracting as Catalyst for Reform.
   1969, 9:8, 5-9.

Epstein, J. Quoted in Barth, R. S. The University and Urban Education.
   Phi Delta Kappan, LI, 36-40.

Green, T. F. Schools and Communities: A Look Forward. Harvard
   Educational Review, 1969, 39, 221-252.

Harrington, J. H. L. A.'s Student Blowout. Phi Delta Kappan, 1968,
   L, 74-79.

Hechinger, G. and F. M. Panic Among the Priviloged. Saturday Review. March 16, 1968; 70-72 and 81.

Holton, G. Discussion of the Educational Industries. Harvard Educational Review, 1967, 37, 113-119.

Hunt, J. Principals Report on Student Protest. American Education, 1969, 5:8, 4-5.

Jacoby, S. New Power in the Schools. Saturday Review. January 18, 1969; 59-60 and 70-72.

Janssen, P. The Union Response to Academic Mass Production. Saturday Review. October 21, 1967; 64-66 and 86-88.

Johnson, P. What Did it Mean? Saturday Review. July 17, 1965; 67-68.

Kaplan, R. The Knowledge Industry: Learning the Hard Way. The Center Forum, 1969, 3:5, 20-21.

Katzenbach, E. L. Discussion of the Educational Industries. Harvard Educational Review, 1967, 37, 119-124.

La Noue, G. R. Political Questions in the Next Decade of Urban Education. The Record, 1968, 69, 517-528.

Lessinger, L. M. and Allen, D. H. Performance Proposals for Educational Funding: A New Approach to Federal Resource Allocation. Phi Delta Kappan, 1969, LI, 136-137.

Levine, D. U. The Segregated Society: What Must be Done. Phi Delta Kappan, 1969, L, 264-269.

Mackler, B. and Bord, N. The Role of the Urban Mayor in Education. The Record, 1968, 69, 531-539.

Masters, N. A., Salisbury, R. H., and Eliot, T. H. State Politics and the Public Schools: An Exploratory Analysis. New York: Knopf, 1964.

Munger, F. J. Changing Politics of Aid to Education. Trans-action, 4, 7, 11-16.

Newmann, F. M., and Oliver, D. W. Education and Community. Harvard Educational Review, 1967, 37, 61-106.

Parker, J. F. Let's Abolish the NEA. Phi Delta Kappan, 1968, XLIX, 567-571.

Phi Delta Kappan. Students Reject Substitutes. 1968, XLIX, 560.

Ridgeway, James. The Closed Corporation. New York: Random House, 1968.

Robinson, D. Scraps From a Teacher's Notebook. Phi Delta Kappan, 1968, XLIX, 618.

Salisbury, R. H. Schools and Politics in the Big City. Harvard Educational Review, 1967, 37, 408-424.

Salivak, S. F. Academic Common Market. Saturday Review. June 18, 1966; 72-73 and 78.

Salz, A. E. Local Control vs. Professionalism. Phi Delta Kappan, 1969, L, 332-334.

Scher, R. K. Decentralization and the New York State Legislature. The Urban Review, 1969, 4:1, 13-19.

Schrag, P. Who Controls Education? Saturday Review. March 18, 1967; 60.(a)

Schrag, P. Kids, Computers, and Corporations. Saturday Review. May 20, 1967; 78-80 and 93-96.(b)

Schrag, P. The University: Power and Innocence. Saturday Review. October 21, 1967; 68-69 and 85-86.(c)

Schrag, P. The Decloistered Academy. Saturday Review. October 19, 1968; 74-75.

Selden, D. School Decentralization: A Positive Approach. The Record, 1969, 71, 85-92.

Shanker, A. See: Covello, L. An Interview with Albert Shanker. The Urban Review, 1968, 3:2, 18-27.

Spiegel, H. B. C. (Ed.) Citizen Participation in Urban Development. Washington, D. C.: National Education Association, 1968.

Wasserman, M. The I.S. 201 Story/One Observer's Version. The Urban Review, 1969, 3:6, 3-15.

Wasserman, M., and Reimann, J. Student Rebels vs. School Defenders... a Partisan Account. The Urban Review, 1969, 4:2, 9-17.

Wilder, A. Client Criticism of Urban Schools: How Valid? Phi Delta Kappan, 1969, LI, 129-130.

Williams, R. C. An Academic Alternative to Collective Negotiations. Phi Delta Kappan, 1968, XLIX, 571-574.

Woodring, P. Breaking up the Big Systems. <u>Saturday Review</u>. July 17, 1965; 51-52.

Yevish, I. A. Decentralization, Discipline, and the Disadvantaged Teacher. <u>Phi Delta Kappan</u>, 1968, <u>L</u>, 137-138, and 178-181.

Zeluck, S. The UFT Strike: Will it Destroy the AFT? <u>Phi Delta Kappan</u>, 1969, <u>L</u>, 250-254.