ED 244 729   PS 014 288

AUTHOR	Acland, Henry
TITLE	On Structure.
SPONS AGENCY	National Inst. of Education (ED), Washington, DC.
PUB DATE	Mar 81
NOTE	29p.
PUB TYPE	Viewpoints (120)

EDRS PRICE	MF01/PC02 Plus Postage.
DESCRIPTORS	Classroom Environment; Early Childhood Education; *Educational Change; *Educational Environment; Educational Research; Higher Education; *Organizational Climate; Playgrounds; School Effectiveness
IDENTIFIERS	Project Follow Through; *Structural Change

ABSTRACT

        Structure as an aspect of educational setting is discussed and illustrated in the course of an argument indicating that efforts to change schools, including Project Follow Through, should aim to change structures rather than people. It is asserted that educational reform in America usually attempts to change people, especially children, and that this tendency is evident in Follow Through programs. Subsequent discussion illustrates the idea and importance of structure by describing an observational study of playgrounds. Specifically, playground structures appeared to (1) have strong, but not uniform, effects; (2) be designed into systems that can be modified but not radically changed; (3) reflect several goals and half-resolved compromises among those goals; and (4) be designed for adults as well as children. Other aspects of structure are delineated in a discussion of attempts to change the structure of a university sociology class. Concluding sections of the paper critique the mainstream of classroom research, provide suggestions for changing educational structures, and highlight three studies that illuminate the nature of school and classroom structure at the elementary level. (RH)

ON STRUCTURE

March 1981

Henry Acland

School of Education
University of Southern California
Los Angeles

Classrooms, schools and school districts are
organized places; they have structures. For now I shall
use this word -- and be warned that I use it often -- in
an inclusive way. In this paper, structure means that
which is regular or predictable or which is felt and
seen to be essential to the integrity of the system.
For example, the daily schedule of events is one aspect
of classroom structure which helps the teacher and
students organize their day. Equally obvious is the
teacher's predictable role as the person who stops and
starts these activities. Less apparent is the nature
of the evaluation system and its customary uncertainties.

My case is that some structures help people --
administrators, teachers and students -- to think and
learn while other structures discourage and deter thinking
and learning. I shall argue that efforts to change
schools, including Follow Through (FT), should aim to
change structures rather than people, a distinction
I shall elaborate shortly. I shall also present the case
that classroom structure means more than seating arrangements
and grouping patterns, important as these may be for
some purposes. I take the position that the origins
of classroom structure lie beyond the classroom and,
to a considerable extent, are beyond the teacher's control.
I assert that structure originates in the institutional
solution to the problem of engagement. All schools need
to justify school attendance; they must create an incentive
for an engagement. There are several possible solutions

3

to this problem, though I believe schools in late 20th
C. America have adopted a uniform response to it. This
solution has a powerful effect on school and classroom
structures. Regretably, these structures are not ones
which provide much opportunity or create a strong need
for students to learn or to think. Of course, learning
and thinking occur in schools; my point is these qualities
are not fostered by the typical school structure. It
follows that radical changes in classroom structure will
require new solutions to the problems of engagement.

Educational reform in America is usually directed
at changing people rather than changing structures. For
example, an inservice will be held for teachers to make
them more sensitive to cultural differences among students
or a workshop will be held for administrators to make
them knowledgeable about the guidelines of the federal
law for the handicapped. One aims to alter attitudes,
the other to transmit information. Typically the inservice
will not examine the origins of cultural differences
in the power relations of ethnic groups in society nor
will the workshop discuss the law in terms of its structural
implications for the division of responsibility among
teachers, parents and administrators.

The tendency to equate school reform with people
reform is most clearly seen in the emphasis on changing
children. The vocabulary of school change is the
vocabulary of children's cognitive and affective needs,
their growth and mastery, their self-image and autonomy.

4

FT illustrates this tendency. Models are typically
discussed in terms of their intended effects on children's
cognitive and affective development.[1] The official
research reinforces the point by its emphasis on test
score changes. By contrast, very little has been written
about the structural changes associated with FT models.
Haney says that out of 7,000 pages of the major reports
only 100 "give direct description of what goes on in
FT classrooms."[2] A recent monograph on FT, written by
the sponsors, similarly emphasizes test score changes
while paying little attention to the structural changes
associated with the FT models.[3]

An important reason for this emphasis is that FT
treatments were once believed to be simple and fixed,
and therefore easy to describe. It was assumed sponsors'
plans would correspond with changes in the classrooms
and that these changes would be reliably reproduced from
site to site and from one year to the next. The FT
evaluation is built on the notions of fixed and constant
treatments. Dissemination, the ultimate goals of FT,
is impossible unless models can be reproduced. But now
we know better. The only research finding about FT
which is not disputed is that FT models have different
effects on different tests in different places at different
times. It has been inferred, wisely or not, that the
variation in effects reflects variable implementation.
"Unmeasured local circumstances, including those associated

with implementation, still have had more influence on results than have the philosophies of the sponsors."[4] The frustration is we know so little about the nature of local variatons. The evidence that exists suggest how hard it is to get good information about what models look like.[5] Researchers disagree about what to look for, they have difficulty observing consistently and getting agreement from different sources. These problems reflect the defects of social science but they also stem from the sponsors' descriptions of their models. As I have said, models are usually defined in terms of their effects on student outcome. Classroom and school structure are given secondary importance. These environments, or settings, are often described simplistically and the reader is left short of knowing the essence of the model. For example, classroom organization often translates into a discussion of the ratio of students to teachers. Materials boil down to questions about kits and workbooks. The teachers' role is defined by intentions such as; "teach appropriate skills"; "be sensitive to unique learning styles", and "develop children's ability to work with others". There is nothing wrong with these accounts of models, but they don't convey a coherent feeling for what the model is like. Naturally, it is hard to describe complex evolutionary experiences on paper. But this problem may be compounded if we lack a vocabulary for talking about the structural qualities of classrooms or if these are overlooked in the attempt to describe models. Some of the available language is coarse (eg. traditional v. open). Much of it is highly

elaborate, especially the instruments and specifications used by social scientists to describe classroom environments. On the one hand they are represented too simply, on the other in detail that is hard to manage. Possibly this confusion arises because we have either taken classroom structure for granted or misunderstood the reason it exists. In the next sections I shall develop some simple thoughts about structures.

The first illustration

I shall illustrate the idea and importance of structure by first describing a project on playgrounds. I wanted to develop my ideas in two directions. First I wanted to look at the effects of playground structures on the way children behaved and second I sought to analyse the origins of these structures. I searched out a variety of places where children play in downtown Los Angeles. One of these, the Children's Museum, provided the opportunity to look at the effects of structure on behaviour. The museum is a museum only by name. Rather than glass-cased collections, the place consists of many rooms which give children the chance to play with a truckload of Leggo, try one fireman's gear, make moving cartoons, paint their faces or act a TV news show among other things. One padded room, Sticky City, is filled with 200 foam rubber blocks of varied shapes and sizes. The structure of the room is best described by its size, its contents and the influence of the responsible adult. Its message to children is clear - (See Figure 1) They build and tear down towers and houses. They run and throw

themselves at piles of blocks and then throw blocks at
one another. Blocks get used as weapons and at this point
the grownup usually steps in. After watching for a while,
you see the same patterns of behaviour repeated; the
structure dictates what children do. At the same time,
children do a variety of things in the room. They tend
to act wild, but they do this a dozen ways and some don't
do it at all. Since children aren't forced to use the
room, the uniformity of their behaviour is increased
because kids who like that kind of thing will be drawn
to it. So the first point is that the structure influences
behaviour, but that the effect is not uniform. The
second is that structure can be changed, but only within
limits. The adults work shifts and with the changes
come changes in the structure. For example, one adult
allowed almost anything to happen. She spent most of her
time protecting the strong from the weak. The room was
a fast moving scene of building, destruction, sneak attacks
and counterattacks. She was replaced with someone with
different ideas. The new person first built an adult's
version of a tunnel, 10 feet long right across the middle
of the floor, squared off and complete. Then she carefully
watched and controlled the children as they came into
the room. Each was encouraged to crawl through the tunnel.
In minutes the room was empty and lifeless except for
one obedient girl who used the new setup the proper way.
But before long two boys did what could be predicted; they
destroyed the tunnel and started their own games. The
original structure reasserted itself; the adult took her

8

rest against a comfortable cushion. The observation, then, is that structure can be altered but within limits. The most important constraints and possibilities are a function of the design rather than the choices made by the adult.

By comparison, school playgrounds are stark places. (Figure 2) I used these to think about the origins and purposes of structure. The rhetoric is familiar. Children use them to let off steam; energy pent up after confinement to classrooms. Most elaborately, they are places children develop their physical ability and develop social skills with other children. Yet, without denying that school yards allow all kinds of development, it is hard to see that the structure is organized for more than the simplest purposes. They are large, barren expanses of hardtop, surrounded by ten foot cyclone fences. They are relieved by the marks of organized games: a baseball diamond, tetherball poles and a backboard. Of course, children invent all kinds of games in the yard, few having to do with the formal structure, and these games may succeed in reaching the loftier intentions of the people who designed playgrounds. So my third observation was that there is often a loose fit between designed structure and intended purposes.

Because I felt the fit between the official purposes and the setup was vague, I looked at the unstated purposes. I saw that playgrounds are not only set up for children; they are also organized for adults. Specifically, playgrounds are designed to be safe because teachers are responsible for children's safety. Parents of damaged

children are a vivid reminder of this responsibility.
Safety engenders dullness. Hardtop ensures children won't
get muddied knees, and makes it easier to keep the area
free from things they would fall over. The sensible
climbing frame is designed to prevent falls and pinched
fingers. The fence restrains children from running into
the street and keeps strangers away. The uncluttered
space allows teachers to keep a protective eye on all the
children at the same time. Of course, the design is not
entirely successful. Children fall over benches, they
climb through holes in the fence and crash into walls.
The fence is an imperfect barrier to outsiders. Despite
its imperfections, I was led to see that playground
structure served the interests of adults as well as those
of children. In summary, the effects of structure are
strong, but they are not uniform. Accordingly, it is
difficult to draw simple conclusions about its effects.
Second, structure is designed into systems and while these
can be modified they cannot be changed radically. Third,
structures typically reflect several goals and the half-
resolved compromises among those goals. As a result the
relationship between purpose and structure is seldom
coherent and self-evident. Fourth, structures are designed
for adults as well as for children.

The second illustration

I developed these ideas about structure using the
university and my classes as the object of attention. The
structure of my classes would be familiar to all of us.
I lectured. You would have taken some of the obvious

facts for granted. Students sat while I talked. The
course was paced by a reading list and assignments of my
chosing. In class I would refine the content of the course
by differentiating between the relevant and the trivial,
and by interpreting and giving weight to the material.
I was the expert, my position legitmated by my degree
and title and reinforced in the dozens of ways I treated
my students and they me. The first important aspect of
structure was that I controlled and managed the content
of the course.

The second aspect was that I evaluated studen.s
performance using the standard grading system. Though
there was no failing grade, so no fear of repetition or
rejection, the students had a firm understanding that A's
would help them through their graduate work. It was not
clear why the grade mattered, students were not thrown
out for bad grades nor were these considered in qualifying
exams. However, students also took the class to prepare
for a multiple choice exam which constituted one of several
hurdles they had to overcome in their journey toward
the doctorate. The exam was graded in quintiles and
their score was taken into serious account in an interview
which would decide their continued presence in the program.

These two features of the class--definition of relevance
and grading--determined our behaviour. Student
involvement was low and gradually drifted toward apathy
as the semester progressed. They took notes, asked
clarifying questions and tactfully suggested alternative
points of view. Their passivity meant I often finished

the semester knowing only those who regularly talked in class; many remained invisible to me. There was no reason for them to disturb the situation, and every reason for them to keep the course as closely related to the content as possible. Quite early on in the semester we had colluded in our desire to get through the material and to minimize its difficulty.

The second quality I associate with the structure was a mild but persistent state of uncertainty. However much my students listened, they could not be sure they had captured all the right pieces of information or detected the nuances that make the difference between a right and wrong answer on a multiple choice test. Their uncertainty can also be attributed to the grading system for the class and for the exam. Even if they were certain of the content of the exam and of their preparation, their score would always reflect the performances of other students which were beyond their control. There was no way they could satisfactorily relate their effort to the outcome of the exam. Nevertheless, they were always prepared to take on themselves the responsibility for improving their exam result. They had begun the course in ignorance, they had to continually prove they could remember the content of the material and they knew failure to reproduce this material was their responsibility. I believe that this state of mind limited students' opportunity to think for themselves and the structure of the course certainly did not require it.

As I shall show later, I could modify this structure. But important aspects of the class structure can be associated with the institution's solution to the problem of engagement. The University of Southern California is a private school which derives a substantial fraction of its income from tuition which now costs $205 a unit. This sharpens a problem all schools face; finding a basis for attracting and holding students. A school without students, though professors often joke about it, is not a school. Students must be attracted to join and stay, and to stay for predictable periods of time. Certainty allows planning and stability which are consistent with the university's needs and the principle of tenure.

The most obvious way students are drawn and held to the university is through the management of the curriculum. The school sets out a sequence of courses which constitute a program and specifies the variety of fields that must be studied. The university smoothes the flow of students through the system and determines in advance how the distance to the degree will be travelled. Students can accurately predict when they will finish and measure their progress by courses completed. Their object at the school is to complete the courses which are defined to make up the program. The school has full control of the process for defining the boundaries of knowledge. That is not to say there is a precise curriculum; what is precise is the professors' power to define its limits. In fact, professors vary considerably in their interpretations, but not at all in their protection of their right to define the curriculum,

Because the school determines what the students have to know, they are implicitly defining what they do not know when they start school, when they start a new class or a new program. Their state of ignorance clings to them. They are never completely sure they have reached the point where they can stop, where they have done enough, where they have reached a satisfactory level of competence. Students' lives are characterized by this uncertainty and this is most clearly revealed through the traditional grading system. Professors may indicate the qualities they use to assign grades but they will seldom be completely explicit to the point a student can reliably predict the relationship between performance and grade. But more important than the secrecy of grading is the fact that grades / rationed and therefore measure the distribution of performances in the class rather than the student's competence judged against a standard of proficiency. That is, no matter how well a student performs, his grade will reflect how well others' performed too. Since these performances are beyond his control, the grade must itself be unpredictable. An analogy is appropriate here; education is comparable to a religion that sees man born first in a state of sin yet able to attain grace through diligent and frequent religious observance. This kind of religion sees people in need of spiritual rescue, it indicates how salvation / be reached but promises nothing because however hard man may try salvation is ultimately beyond his control. Similarly, schools believe students are ignorant and presents them with a long series of challenges such that

even the best students cannot be certain they have escaped

their ignornace. They must keep trying with the result

they are locked in a persistent relationship with the system.

My analysis of the class can be summarized this way:

University problem	—	ensuring engagement
General solution	—	control of the curriculum
	—	evaluation of performance that sustains uncertainty
Classroom structure	—	professors control definition or relevance
	—	uncertain grading system
Related student behaviour	—	passivity
	—	anxiety .

Let me re-emphasize that learning and thinking take place in this environment. However, they are not fostered by it. In addition I have some admiration for the design of the system. Other solutions to the problem of engagement are more costly and less certain. For example, an alternative solution is to promise students a better job if they graduate. This belief sustains many of my students. But from the school's point of view, this solution is precarious because it cannot control the job market. It also requires a great deal of effort to create an honest relationship between job skills and the school curriculum. It is much easier to create a self-contained, self-justifying curriculum. The advantage of the existing solution is that all its aspects are tightly controlled by the school. I would add that this solution likely works best when good jobs are growing in number, and employers are ready to use educational credentials to ration access. In these circumstances, students really can get better jobs which are apparently related to what they have learned in school. Even when jobs are not expanding, the system will work to the extent educational credentials are trusted and can be limited in number. In other words, the school's solution to the engagement problem itself depends on the labor market. This market is changing quickly in southern California and it is interesting to note that we have recently called into

question some of the basic institutional beliefs and justifications that have sustained the school for so long.

Though I believe that classroom structures are largely pre-determined by their institutional environments,[6] I also believe that teachers have some discretion and control. Last fall, I redesigned the structure of one class with the intention of changing students' motivation for partipation. I was unsuccessful because I still taught the material for the exam, and retained the grading practices consistent with that exam. The institution's influence did not disappear. Students quickly saw that this was the real material and several waited impatiently for me to get to it. Therefore, the traditional structure persisted in the second half of the course when I and my students behaved in the ways with which I was now familiar. In the first half I changed the premises and structure of the class and with them the behaviour of the students.

The first premise was that all the students had the capacity to be competent, and creative. While I would describe the sociological enterprise, it was their responsibility to give meaning to the tradition. The old goal of the course was to get past the exam. The new goal was expressed by a mission: doing sociology. The mission did not have a predetermined destination, nor was it structureless. The object was to make sociology in the class without assuming that there was a single form or expression that this could take.

The second premise was that learning occurs in
counterpart to direct experience and involvement with the
ideas and words of sociology. Therefore, students had
to be exposed to some of the main ideas of the discipline
while evolving their own interpretations of their significance.

To illustrate the difference in approach I shall
describe a well-known simulation: Starpower.[7] Starpower
begins as a trading game among individuals with the object
of accumulating 'wealth'. As the game progresses, players
are put in groups which work to improve their collective
position. One of these, the 'wealthiest', is later allowed
to determine trading rules and their purpose than becomes
that of balancing the need to secure their position without
alienating the other players. The lower groups balance
their opportunity for advancement through continuing to
play the top group's game against strategies which will
secure their self-respect, such as going on strike, but
which disrupt the game and thus the possibility of advance-
ment. Students experience the influence of the relationship
among the groups in personal behaviour. They see that
structure of the groups exposes people to abuse power and
creates strong feelings of helplessness and hostility.
Rules that are fair to one group are unfair to another
even when they are created to help them.

While the simulation has a mission, it does not have an
outcome, still less a correct outcome. The mission is to
experience and interpret the effects of the structure of

the simulation on personal behaviour. All students'
experiences have validity and combined, create a collective
analysis of the simulation. My role is to explain how
the game is organized and to reflect on past experiences
with Starpower. I do not define relevance for the students.
Each class creates its own story of the relationship
between group and individual behaviour. This is easily
said, but for it to be an honest part of the class work,
several conditions must be met.

One condition is that students learn to tolerate
uncertainty and with it, the possibility that an exercise
or project won't 'work out'. Failure is associated with
shame and guilt in schools; it is the essence of the
motivating principle which I described earlier. Failure
is anathema and a sign of incompetence and possible rejection.
It is striking how miserable Starpower players feel when
they are not winning in trading even when it is evident to
them that they were crippled by the unstated rules which
ensured they would be consigned to their low position in
the game. Since the shame of failure is a powerful under-
current of the traditional classroom it is necessary to
build students' self-confidence that they can take risks
that might embarrass them, or put them in situations where
they would have been seen as inadequate. They have to be
trained to make fools of themselves.[8] And they have to
develop the trust that their interpretations and experiences
have legitimacy.

I found students took time to develop this sense.
For example, I had asked students one evening to watch

the TV news program and next day bring to class their
analysis of the structure of the program. I wanted them
to watch it with fresh eyes to see how the organization
of the program conveyed an important part of the message.
Several failed to do this. One said he had seen the news
so many times he knew it backwards. I had not convinced
him that he could see something new through watching the
familiar event.

I also found that students are used to denigrating
each other's work. They had to be trained to respect other
students' efforts. For example, in class presentation of
the main project, one student expressed her withdrawal
from the class by publicly sorting through her purse while
other students presented their work. Other students would
ask questions to score points rather than aiming to
strengthen the idea under discussion.

A second condition associated with the premises
of the new class is contained in the idea of evolutionary
structure. The class had structure, but it was a structure
that shifted and evolved. This is because students' energy
is the propellant of the class and this cannot be channeled
predictably. In the old structure, I could specify the
class' direction with accuracy. Now, students brought
originality and variety to the class which influenced
what we did and how we did it. For example, several made
very direct assessments of the value of some of the activities
I planned and this led to periodic discussions about what
was going on and how it could be justified. The class
itself was the object of self-conscious attention. In

general, I continually challenged and revised my own
intellectual positions and my role in the class. The
course became a guided dialog and this involved challenge
and change and with these, the evolution of the design
itself.

Finally, I found I got to know students. I differ
from the accepted view that this makes teaching easier.
The more aware I became of their differences and of how
my perceptions of them changed, the more occupied I
became with them and the variety of their purposes and
styles which often conflicted.

I said the experiment failed because I employed the
old structure, in the second half of the course, and fell
back on the familiar institutional solution to the engage-
ment problem. At the beginning, I had naively thought
simple changes could be made to the surface structure of
the class. In addition to the institutional investment
in the old solution, which I accepted, most of my students
have, through their work, heavy involvement in the familiar
methods. I underestimated what it would take for them
to consider a new approach.

Research on classroom structure in the early grades

I have used examples of structure which are not apparently related to Follow Through classrooms. I have talked about playgrounds, a museum and a university classroom because these are situations I can talk about from my own experience. In addition, their unfamiliarity may help others see their immediate situation a new way because it is safer to think a new thought using examples removed from their immediate arena. But I may have implied little research has been done on the relationship between classroom structure and behaviour and this is not the case. Educational researchers have put years of effort into understanding how classrooms work. I have read a portion of this work and it would therefore be misleading to summarize it all, however, I shall not pass it by.

Before I complain about the mainstream of this work I want to highlight three studies which I think illuminate the nature of school and classroom structure at the elementary level. The first, by Lortie[9], is an analysis of how teachers approach their work, seek satisfaction in it and cope with the distance between their expectations and experiences. I chose this work because of its emphasis on the way teachers define what they do and why they do it. Lortie enlarges our understanding of what it is like to face a classroom of students, how a teacher connects his priorities to the organization of the classroom and suggests that teachers may not be primarily concerned with the official goals of transmitting the curriculum. As a result, teachers are characterized as isolated from one another; schools appear

as loose federations of watchful and relatively insecure pro-
fessionals rather than being tightly controlled systems pro-
gressing toward well-defined, collective goals. I pick this
work not for what it says about the way to change classroom
structure but for providing insight into the nature of the
existing system. Lortie reveals important characteristics of
the structure that must be encountered by people who seek to
change it.

Like Lortie's work, Sharp and Green's[10] intimate study of
one school in England emphasizes how teachers make sense of
their world of work. The school in question avowed an open
approach to education. Yet the three teachers who are the focus
of the researchers' attention interpret this philosophy in
ways which subvert it. The book expands understanding of
teachers' priorities, the relationship of these to classroom
practice and the ways their priorities take precedence over
the intentions of the prinicpal. Sharp and Green show how
the origins of structure should be traced from the larger
system and show the discrepancy between intentions and reality
in schools.

Wolcott[11] looked in detail at the tensions that grew between
teachers and administrators as a result of the introduction of
a new management system in a school district. Wolcott maps the
cultures of teachers and administrators and indicates why the
two groups face one another in a cold war. Their tension persists
without resolution; each side using the other as a foil for
the protection of their own concerns. Like the other studies,
Wolcott presents a startling new basis for understanding the

place teachers fit in the school structure and the effects
this has on the way they approach their work.

I have isolated these examples because they expand my
understanding of the mechanics of schools. By contrast, the
mainstream of classrom research has not led me very far and
I think this is for four major reasons. First, psychologists
have set the tone of this work placing heavy emphasis on
attitudes and personality characteristics at the expense of
describing the underlying rules of the game and its structure.
In addition, their methodology fosters the search for particular
relationships between discrete variables which also draws att-
ention from the large picture.

Second, researchers have taken classroom structure for granted
and focussed on the effects of variations within the basic rules
of the game. For example, quantitative research overwhelmingly
concentrates on the relationship between classroom environments
and standardized achievement scores. This takes achievement tests
for granted and further enhances their signifiance; it does not
begin with a question about the part the tests play in setting
the conditions of classroom work.

Third, classroom research is not very bold or imaginative
in its search for comparisons which constitute the basis of most
studies. For example, a typical study might compare the relative
effectiveness of teachers with and without exposure to a new
inservice training program. Researchers have persisted in looking
at variations on the surface of the structure. Some studies
work with more dramatic contrasts. For example, some researchers

have experimentally manipulated the rules of competition and success in classrooms[12]. Another author has compared the relationship of a teacher and an actor to their respective audiences[13] A study which I believe remains to be done might concentrate on what happens when classroom stop functioning with the aim of analysing the essential features of classroom structure. In sum, researchers have not sought to reveal the fundamental regularities of classroom work.

Fourth, most research gives pride of place to the teacher implying the teacher has broad discretion to change the way classrooms are organized. In other words, little research examines the relationship between the system outside the class-room and the organization within.

This may seem discouraging. But it leads me to suggesting that the construction of new Follow Through models begins by abandoning much of the legacy of educational writing and res-earch. I believe the work should begin by looking at the basis of engagement in schools and I propose that the proper starting point is the evaluation of academic work.

In my tentative experiment my major failing was
to devise a method of evaluation consistent with the rest
of the class structure. I adopted the traditional practice
but this only revealed the clash between standard grading
and learning. At first it seemed that grading had to be
abandoned altogether. But I now believe the solution lies
in developing students' capacity to appreciate quality in
their work. I sense this is what craft apprentices learn
as a counterpart to developing their skills. They become
their own judge. The best description of this process I
know is Herrigel's account of a very particular and personal
learning experience.[14] But it is hard even to contemplate
an internalized method of evaluation in the context of
schools. The word evaluation means something which is
done to some one by someone else; it is the juice of power
in schools.

Therefore I would start looking outside the public
schools for different methods of engaging students in
learning and for the structures associated with the methods.
I would be especially interested in the methods used in
corporations, in the military, in the multitude of commercial
ventures which teach people how to alter themselves and their
lives and in the unimaginable variety of places where
learning takes place informally, on the job, in playgrounds
and at home. Many of these would be inappropriate for

institutionalized learning of the kind I expect to continue in America for the foreseeable future. But the purpose would be to expand upon the existing repertoire of solutions to the basic problem I have made the center of my attention here. My vision is that alternative solutions would not be proven by one or two years' trial; they would gain their support by displacing the existing structure. Over twenty years however, there is every reason that Follow Through could play an exciting part in starting this slow ball rolling.

Footnotes

1. For example, E.J. Cherian (A guide to Follow Through Washington, D.C.: 1973)

2. Walt Haney The Follow Through Planned Variation Experiment Volume V: A technical history of the National Follow Through Evaluation, Cambridge, Mass.: Huron Institute, 1977.

3. Walter Hodges et al. Forces for change in the primary schools, Ypsilanti, Mich.: The High/Scope Press, 1980.

4. Stebbins L.B. et al. Education as experimentation: A planned variation model, Volume IV-A, An evaluation of Follow Through. Cambridge, Mass.: Abt Associates, 1977.

5. Haney, op cit.

6. The best account of this I know is Rachel Sharp and Anthony Green's work on the character of classroom in an open English school (Schooling and Social Control. London: Routlege, 1978)

7. Starpower was devised by Garry Shirts and is copyrighted by the Western Behavioural Sciences Institute, La Jolla, California, 1969.

8. This idea was pointed out to me by Chuck Edelstein.

9. Dan Lortie Schoolteacher. Chicago: University of Chicago Press, 1975.

10. Rachel Sharp and Anthony Green Education and Social Control. London: Routledge and Kegan Paul, 1975

11. Harry F. Wolcott Teachers Versus Technocrats. Eugene, Oregon: Center for Educational Policy and Management, 1977

12. For example, the work done at Johns Hopkins organized under the theme of Teams, Games and Tournaments.

•13. Lortie, op cit.

14. Eugen Herrigel Zen and the Art of Archery. New York: Vintage Books, 1971