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PREFACE

This is a collection of documents that I prepared for two closely related sessions at professional meetings in philosophy of education. On November 13, 1992, I presented an address entitled "Analytical Philosophy and the Discourse of Institutional Democracy" to a session of the Midwest Philosophy of Education Society at Loyola University Chicago. On March 6, 1993, I chaired a session entitled "B. Othanel Smith and the Origins of Analytical Philosophy of Education" at the meeting of the Middle Atlantic States Philosophy of Education Society (MASPES) at the State University of New York at Binghamton.

Both of these presentations dealt with Analytical Philosophy of Education (APE) and its history. APE was the dominant approach to philosophy of education during the 1960s and 1970s; it is no longer fashionable. The Midwest PES paper sketches the history of APE and attempts to show its relevance to the idea of "Institutional Democracy," a popular topic among members of the Midwest PES. APE is applied to former Midwest PES President Arthur Brown's Presidential Address on "Institutional Democracy" which draws upon the work of the famed management theorist Douglas McGregor. I conclude that the use of the methods of APE on Brown's and McGregor's texts shows that McGregor's use of the word "democracy" is much less clear than Brown's; McGregor's research may not support
Brown's more Deweyan views. The Midwest PES address is accompanied by an outline of McGregor's thought and career and a short bibliography.

The MASPES session -- which I chaired and organized with the help of MASPES President Edward G. Rozycki -- consisted of a presentation on historical factors that contributed to the development of APE by Eugenie Potter and a panel discussion on the contributions of B. Othanel Smith at the University of Illinois at Urbana and the continuation of his work by faculty at Temple University. The panel included Potter and three students of Smith: Robert Holtzman, Myron Lieberman, and Terry Lindenberg. This document includes the notes that were prepared for that session, an extensive three-part bibliography, and a shorter bibliography on the relationship of APE to Critical Thinking. The organizing of the MASPES session involved quite a few people. In addition to the participants, I would like to thank Joe Devitis, Linda Devitis, Harry Farnon, Bob Leone, Ron Szoke, Maggie Yaure, my wife Marjory Oliker, and my mother Lilyan G. Oliker. A videotape of the MASPES session is available from the author.

Finally, I would like to dedicate this document to the memory of Kenneth D. Benne who died October 8, 1992 at age 84. Ken was the student of John Dewey, the colleague of both B. Othanel Smith and Douglas McGregor, and the teacher of my teachers. His understanding of the educational conflicts of the 1950s cannot be replaced. Ken helped.
I. Analytical Philosophy of Education: Wanted Dead or Alive?

In his introduction to the 1986 Proceedings of the national Philosophy of Education Society, the editor, Nicholas C. Burbules, pronounced Analytical Philosophy of Education (APE) dead.1 As an inveterate fan of Bela Lugosi's appearances as Count Dracula, I was not sure whether or not to take this seriously. Only a few years before, the historian of American philosophy Bruce Kuklick had sarcastically compared American philosophy as a whole to an “undead vampire . . . parasitic on really living organisms.”2 While this was not intended to be praise, Kuklick overlooks one positive characteristic of vampires: they come back. When, in the classic lowbrow comedy Abbott and Costello meet Frankenstein, Abbott tells Costello that the legend of Dracula is “bunk” we know that it is just a matter of time before Bela Lugosi emerges from that coffin.

So APE may be dead for the moment. There are those in the audience who no doubt cheered at this announcement. But there is a younger generation who may know nothing of APE or may only have heard of APE from professors who have contempt for it. So instead of repeating Burbules's attempt to collect a bounty on the corpse of APE, let me tell
you of its life. Then I will try to show you what an APE is capable of.

II. The Living and the Dead in APE.

Textbook writers usually portray APE as a single viewpoint, but even if we restrict our discussion to the American version of APE, we are still faced with two versions of APE. The first was developed by B. Othanel Smith at the University of Illinois during the 1940s. The second and somewhat better known version of APE in the US emerged from the work of Israel Scheffler at Harvard University during the 1950s. Smith was a product of Teachers College, Columbia University who taught solely in Colleges of Education. Scheffler holds a doctorate in philosophy from the University of Pennsylvania and teaches in both Education and Philosophy at Harvard.

Both Smith and Scheffler would address questions of philosophy by addressing the philosophers’ use of language and the logic of their arguments. But the similarity ends there. Smith’s lifelong concern was with problems in the education of educators. Scheffler, by contrast, is primarily concerned with attempting to show the relevance of general philosophy to issues in education. Both advocate the professionalization of philosophy of education but Scheffler is more concerned with the problems of professional philosophers while Smith was concerned with the problems of professional educators.
APE took hold during the 1950s when university professors retreated from the advocacy of political ideology into a defense of professional expertise. By the 1960s, practitioners of APE had begun to take controversial stands. A student of Smith, James E. McClellan, published two books that joined the skills of APE to a neo-Marxist critique of educational policy. Richard Pratte of Ohio State University published three books during the 1970s that attempted to synthesize APE with a Deweyan liberalism. These books and other more technical works were favorably received by professionals in philosophy of education. From 1975 to 1984, APEs controlled the presidency of the national PES with McClellan running unsuccessfully in 1976 and Pratte being elected in 1980. But the writings of the APEs proved difficult reading for students. By the mid-1980s, Burbules could pronounce APE dead and be relatively correct. Let me briefly conclude this section by simply asserting some strengths and weaknesses of APE.

A. Weaknesses

1. A tendency to address technical issues that are of interest only to other APEs.

2. The claim to be able to establish criteria of true statements on any field of expertise. (English, history, math, etc.)
3. The view that a representational view of language can enable APEs to identify "meaningless" statements or "bullshit" in educational discourse.

4. The view that educational researchers should ignore value questions and confine themselves to establishing facts.

B. Strengths

1. The view that APE can serve as the basis for a critique of educational ideology and practice.

2. The view that educational language must be studied in its institutional context and in terms of its function.

3. The view that critical thinking is central to any theory of teaching.

4. The view that questions of value can be the subject of rational argument.

III. APE and Political Discourse

One difficulty in presenting APE to introductory students is that APEs, when they are writing for each other, often employ a technical terminology and utilize highly rigorous argumentation. Authors of textbooks who are not sympathetic to APE often will utilize the most technical discussions of APE as being typical and overlook those works that are either written for larger audiences or address issues that are of
broader interest. In addition, critics of APE often attack APE as addressing technical issues that are detached from the real world of politics and ideology. In his 1983 book *Understanding Education* the Marxist philosopher Walter Feinberg makes this kind of criticism of APE. He concludes a chapter criticizing some papers by British APEs with the complaint that APE "fails to capture the significance of concepts in a total system of practice." Feinberg goes on to generalize that APE deals only with "crystallized concepts" and fails to discuss "struggles over meaning." Feinberg has a legitimate complaint against certain APEs but he seems to want to defend the position that APE *cannot* address such issues. But fact is that certain that certain APEs *have* addressed the political functions of language. In 1971, B. Paul Komisar published a paper entitled "Language of Education" in the *Encyclopedia of Education* - a publication obviously intended for educators in general and not just philosophers. Komisar distinguishes between the language of teachers in the classroom and the language of educators in general and then describes four kinds of discourse under "educator talk"; 1. school routine; 2. subject matter; 3. scientific; and 4. political. We will be concerned here with "Political Discourse." For Komisar, when educators use Political Discourse they are attempting to persuade an audience by using language that may be vague or
elusive in meaning or have new meanings that are intended to show their audience that old events can be looked at in a new way. Political Discourse takes three forms. The first is philosophy of education itself which Komisar sees as creative or innovative uses of language that are intended to stimulate new ideas. Second is policy discourse. This is the vague language used by administrators and policy makers in an attempt to build consensus and avoid being pinned down to a controversial position. The third and final form of Political Discourse is publicity discourse. This is educational discourse at its most vague and elusive. It is the kind of ceremonial and celebrative language that one finds in commencement addresses, goals statements in college catalogs, and in the writings of school public relations specialists. Unbelievers in education are quick to dismiss publicity discourse -- and sometimes all political discourse -- as bullshit. But this is exactly the sort of language that can be the battleground in the "struggles over meaning" that Feinberg thinks that APEs cannot address.11

IV. The APE goes to work: Brown and McGregor on "Democracy."

One of the most discussed papers ever presented at the Midwest PES is Arthur Brown's 1978 Presidential Address on "Institutional Democracy." In that Address, Brown leans on the work of Douglas McGregor (1906-1964) a famed industrial psychologist who served as
President of Ohio's Antioch college from 1948-1954. Brown treats McGregor's work as providing considerable evidence that "Institutional Democracy" can be a successful approach to the management of educational organizations. It will be my contention in the remainder of this paper that a close examination of McGregor's language will show that McGregor is employing a form of political discourse that may not be congenial to Brown's ideal of institutional democracy and that an examination of McGregor's years at Antioch College casts doubt on claims that his approach to management was successful. In the course of my discussion, I will raise some questions that are typical of an APE:

1. What are the key definitions and are they adequate?
2. Are vague or ambiguous claims used and how those claims function?
3. What sorts of examples are used to illustrate the claims?
4. What kinds of arguments are used?

Let me assure my reader that my purpose is neither to attack Art Brown personally nor to attack the idea of "Institutional Democracy." In a choice between Institutional Democracy and Ellwood P. Cubberley's notorious "factory model of schooling," I stand firmly with Art Brown. My point is that a close scrutiny of Douglas McGregor's arguments shows that McGregor might not stand with Art Brown.
Brown makes four points about McGregor utilizing McGregor's famous dichotomy between two theories of human motivation: Theory X (a mechanistic cause-and-effect viewpoint) and Theory Y (a functional needs-assessment viewpoint).

1. McGregor is correct to claim that Theory X is an inadequate basis for motivation toward organizational goals.
2. McGregor's Theory Y can be equated with democratic management.
3. Theory Y is an adequate explanation of the conditions under which people will in fact direct their efforts toward organizational goals.
4. McGregor's work demonstrates that Institutional Democracy is the more efficient management system.14

First, consider McGregor's claim that Theory Y is an adequate basis for motivation toward organizational goals while Theory X is not. Notice that both Theory X and Theory Y assume that organizations universally have goals. The underlying logic of McGregor's view of management theory is the logic of means-end reasoning.15 In recent years, James G. March has raised serious questions about means-ends rationality as an adequate basis for organization and management theory.16 Ironically, Art Brown himself published a paper in 1974 that attacks the emphasis on educational goals. In that paper, Brown leans on the work of the British
Second, consider McGregor's use of the term "democracy." In his essays on education, McGregor utilizes a distinction between "democratic" and "authoritarian" organizations that is roughly parallel to the later dichotomy between "Theory Y" and "Theory X." But McGregor's view of the relationship between students and administration also parallels his view of the relationship between labor and management. He is opposed to students having a vote on policy questions. While students should have more power over student affairs and faculty should have greater responsibility for dealing with students, administration is not expected to treat anyone as equal and should have more power to make subordinates feel involved without actually being involved.

Third, it is not all that obvious that Theory Y actually has the results that McGregor claims for it. Surely Douglas McGregor was one of the most popular presidents Antioch College ever had. But does McGregor have the right to confidently claim that "Policy A causes Outcome B?" The usual assessment of McGregor's years at Antioch is that his policies had unintended consequences that were near disasters for the school. McGregor adopted a policy of participative management at a time when the school was under attack as a hotbed of Communist subversion. During the early 1950s a professional informer by the name of Harvey Matusow was
able to gain access to the Antioch campus and concoct accounts of subversion that impressed Congressional committees and made national headlines. Only when Matusow publicly confessed to being a liar did the controversy at Antioch die down. In addition sociological accounts of the McGregor Administration describe a sort of social disorganization on campus that resulted in a breakdown of student discipline and a growing tension between faculty and administration.20

Finally, there is Brown’s use of McGregor’s work. Brown clearly cites McGregor because he believes that McGregor’s work shows that “Institutional Democracy” is efficient. While Brown is quick to reject a “quantitative” notion of efficiency and to declare that he stands “with Rawls against the utilitarians” he has opened himself to the charge that McGregor’s years at Antioch prove that “Institutional Democracy” is “inefficient.”21 Here I sense a curious convergence of Brown and the more hardboiled APEs who would have questions of value be determined entirely by “the facts.” Like Dewey, I would hold that while it is appropriate to inquire into any problem, there are some solutions that are simply not open to consideration.22 The critic who proposes that “Institutional Democracy” should be abandoned on the grounds of “inefficiency” is proposing that institutions abandon any pretense of being educational and simply seek to achieve goals no matter what the cost.23 This is an
interesting topic for the classroom, but in the real world individuals who SERIOUSLY work for the abandonment of democracy usually belong in one of those notorious basement rooms in Marion, Illinois, not in a lecture hall in Chicago. Even philosophical analysis must stop somewhere.124

NOTES


9. See Ozmon and Craver, 270-308.

10. Walter Feinberg, *Understanding Education* (Cambridge, England:


DOUGLAS MCGREGOR AND THE PHILOSOPHY OF MANAGEMENT

I. Biographical Notes on Douglas McGregor (1906-1964)

1935: Ph.D. in Psychology, Harvard University
1937-48: Faculty, Industrial Relations, Massachusetts Institute of Technology. (First Psychologist on MIT faculty).
1948-54: President, Antioch College, Yellow Springs, Ohio
1954: Return to MIT as Professor of Industrial Management.
1962: Named Sloan Fellows Professor of Industrial Management at MIT
1967: Posthumous publication of The Professional Manager (McGraw-Hill)

II. McGregor's Main Idea: The Manager's Philosophy is the Key to Successful Management.

A. Two Philosophies of Management: Theory X and Theory Y.

1. Theory X: a common view of management.
   a. People dislike work.
   b. People will only work toward organizational goals if they are controlled or threatened with punishment.
   c. People lack ambition, but seek security; they prefer to be directed and will avoid responsibility if they can.

   a. It is natural for people to make an effort at work.
   b. People have the capacity for self-direction.
   c. Given the proper rewards, people will make a commitment to organizational goals.
   d. People can learn to accept and seek responsibility.
   e. Many (not few) people have the capacity for creativity and imagination at work.
   f. Most industrial organizations do not utilize human potential.

B. McGregor also contrasted Theory X and Theory Y in more theoretical terms:

1. Theory X.
   b. Not based upon scientific measurement.
   c. Fails to recognize that human behavior is governed by "natural law."
   d. A mechanistic view: sees human behavior as the result of "force on object" (a dependent variable?).

2. Theory Y.
   a. A scientific viewpoint.
   b. Based on the scientific measurement of human behavior.
   c. A view that recognizes that human behavior can be controlled by complying with natural law.
   d. A functionalist view: human behavior is the result of interaction between personality and social/organizational environment.

CONTINUED
III. McGregor on the Principles of Management.
   A. A Theory Y viewpoint will help maintain the free enterprise system.
      1. It gives managers more control over workers.
      2. It can help managers avoid the evils of either government
         regulation of industry or a worker takeover of industry.
   B. Organizations exist to achieve goals.
   C. Most people can find meaningful work in goal-oriented organizations.
   D. People seek intrinsic rewards through their work: the achievement of
      objectives that are part of a larger activity.
   E. Managers should give workers the opportunity to integrate their
      personal goals with organizational goals.
   F. Worker participation in management decision-making means giving
      workers the opportunity to influence management decisions, NOT
      turning management decisions over to workers. (NOT "abdicating
      authority.")
   G. The personal needs of managers should be consistent with the goals
      of their organizations.

IV. McGregor on Problem areas in Management.
   A. Leadership.
      1. There are no universal characteristics of leadership; nor are
         there any "born leaders."
      2. Any definition of leadership will be functional: the result of
         the combination of the characteristics of: the leader's personality,
         the followers, the organization, the social environment.
   B. Union-management relations.
      1. The good of the organization must take priority over the good
         of the union.
      2. Unions and collective bargaining should be accepted, not opposed.
      3. Unions are not goal-oriented (like management); they are democratic
         and political.
      4. Management can educate workers about organizational goals.
      5. Management should be concerned about worker welfare, but
         ambiguous policies can be useful in dealing with workers.
   C. Staff-line relations. (NOTE: The "line" is the vertical hierarchy in
      any organization. "Staff" are those personnel who have management
      responsibilities but are not part of the "line.")
      1. Staff officers should serve as consultants to line management; they
         should not be given authority over any part of the line.
      2. Personnel policies should be the responsibilities of line officers;
         they should not be delegated to staff personnel.
      3. Line management should be involved in management training with
         staff management training personnel serving as consultants.
      4. Management information personnel should serve solely as consultants
         to line management.
   D. Other problem areas.
      1. McGregor rejects an emphasis on accountability as being a
         preoccupation with fault-finding.
      2. Workers should participate in performance appraisal and have the
         opportunity to set their own performance objectives.
      3. Management must retain:
         a. Veto power over worker decisions.
         b. The right to dismiss unproductive workers.
V. Some possible criticisms of McGregor's viewpoint.
   A. He is not explicit about the proper limits of either management's or labor's commitment to their jobs. It often seems that McGregor's ideal worker would have no private life.
   B. McGregor takes no position on the limits of the proper control of management over the worker. At times he gives the impression that so long as management is clear and open about their objectives, they may make any demand on labor.
   C. He is inconsistent in his position on the "manipulation" of workers by management: sometimes he seems to favor it, sometimes he opposes it. McGregor is strongly opposed to the use of personality tests by management, however, on the grounds that their use is a form of "manipulation."

VI. McGregor's views on education.
   A. President of Antioch College, 1948-1954. (His only experience as chief executive of an organization.)
      1. During McGregor's administration Antioch was strongly attacked for harboring Communist students and faculty. McGregor denied a Communist presence at Antioch.
      2. There was evidence of widespread student misbehavior during McGregor's presidency including a sharp rise in thefts of library books.
      3. The Antioch faculty became very hostile toward McGregor, although he remained popular among students.
   B. He took the following positions on education:
      1. Schools should carry out the wishes of industry and "society." (McGregor started an ROTC program at Antioch.)
      2. Schools should teach "democracy." (He held large-scale meetings on campus--open to all--to discuss campus policy.)
      3. He stated publicly that both teachers and students should have "realistic experience" and attempted to extend Antioch's famous "work-study" program to the faculty in a "teach plus work" program.
      4. He took the position that the faculty are part of management and that students are in a position analogous to labor.
      5. He argued that a college faculty should give up their authority over students and treat students "democratically."
   C. And when McGregor left Antioch, he made the statement:

      I thought that maybe I could operate so that everyone would like me--that "good human relations" would eliminate all discord and disagreement.
      I could not have been more wrong. It took a couple of years but I finally began to realize that a leader cannot avoid the exercise of authority any more than he can avoid responsibility for what happens in his organization.
SUPPLEMENTAL BIBLIOGRAPHY ON DOUGLAS McCGRGOR.

Books by McGregor

The Theory X/Theory Y distinction elaborated fully with extensive discussion of applications.

Available in paperback, this is a collection of McGregor's best-known articles including "The Human Side of Enterprise" and "On Leadership." Contains a bibliography, but not as extensive as the one in Oliker, 1976 (See below). Worth buying.

A manuscript which was found among McGregor's papers and published posthumously.

Selected articles by McGregor.

The fullest statement of McGregor's views on education.

On the role of the information professional in industry. This book contains another article by McGregor entitled "Introduction: Perspectives on Organization and the Manager's Role."

Secondary sources.


Describes a confrontation between McGregor and his critics.
3 - 5 PM, Saturday, 6 March 1993
Middle Atlantic States Philosophy of Education Society
SUNY Binghamton

"A. Othanel Smith and the Origins of Analytical Philosophy of Education."
Introduction: Michael A. Oliker, Midwest Philosophy of Education Society.
Presentation: "THE LINGUISTIC TURN IN PHILOSOPHY OF EDUCATION: AN HISTORICAL ANALYSIS."
Eugenie Potter, University of Pittsburgh.
Discussion and Recollection by students of B.O. Smith:
   Robert H. Holtzman, Emeritus, Temple University
   Myron Lieberman, Formerly of University of Pennsylvania
   Terry Lindenberg, State University of New York College at Oswego

QUESTIONS FOR DISCUSSION
1. Arthur Bestor charged in 1953 that courses in philosophy of education at the University of Illinois were based solely on the works of John Dewey. Was this true? Where did you encounter the works of Analytical Philosophers?

2. The emphasis on "professionalism" in colleges of education is now under attack. Do you see the works of Myron Lieberman, B.O. Smith and Israel Scheffler as attempts to "professionalize" philosophy of education (in the 1950's)?

3. B.O. Smith wrote a great deal on "critical thinking" and the "logic of teaching." What sort of impact did this work have on your own graduate study and teaching?

4. Jim McClellan asserts that the motto of grad students in philosophy of education at Illinois in the 1950's could be stated as "No More Bullshit!" Do you agree? What exactly should be regarded as bullshit?

5. During the 1960's the Foundations Department at Temple University was staffed primarily by Smith's students. Students were often required to master the books by Lieberman, Kimball and McClellan, Smith and Ennis, Komisar and Macmillan, and Macmillan and Nelson. In the terminology of Thomas Kuhn was there a distinct "paradigm" of philosophy of education instituted at Temple in those years?

My thanks to another Temple alum-- Lawrence Santoro-- for his help in preparing this material.

Michael A. Oliker
5006 W. Grace St.
Chicago, Illinois 60641
(312) 202-9280
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