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Editor’s Commentary
Kenneth Mitchell, EdD

Tanner on Piaget & Dewey

In the lead article, Rutgers University Professor Emeritus Daniel Tanner’s provocative commentary, “Jean Piaget’s Debt to John Dewey,” begins with an exploration of the origins of Piaget’s Developmental Stage Theory, guides the reader through the Deweyan view on the relationship between the nature of the learner and the school’s response, and concludes with concerns of how today’s reformers have failed to consider these elements as demonstrated by an emphasis on assessment-determined achievement: “From the work of Dewey and Piaget, we should know that any reform in education is destined for failure if it neglects or violates the nature and needs of the learner.”

The piece is a must-read for today’s educational leaders, especially those who lack a background in developmental-stage theory or have had limited experience with John Dewey’s ideas – ideas that should resonate with every educator with a heart and a brain. Tanner appears baffled by the departure from the ideas of these iconic thinkers: “Even more of a mystery is the failure of the profession to recognize, reveal, and build upon the Deweyan and Piagetian connection.”

While Tanner, past-president of the John Dewey Society, raises questions (and provides evidence) about Piaget’s failure to acknowledge Dewey’s influence, he masterfully juxtaposes their ideas to lead us toward a renewed understanding of their importance:

From developmental-stage theory, educators should know that to assess a child’s or adolescent’s growth in achievement by results principally on external, standardized, high-stakes, multiple-choice tests only raises points of conflict with the nature and needs of the learner and the structure and function of the curriculum.

Tanner’s piece comes at a time when school leadership in America is changing. Rhode Island’s recently appointed commissioner of education offered a narrow and concrete interpretation of developmental-stage theory and its relationship to the learner and educational practice: This idea that students are somehow stuck in discrete developmental stages has changed, this idea has changed in the half century since Piaget was writing about developmental psychology. This leader’s dismissal of fundamental principles of human development exemplifies the gap between an established science of learning and the blind ambition of reformers operating without an empirical foundation.
In other places dilettantes with political agendas, profit-seeking entrepreneurs, and inexperienced but well-intentioned school officials have hijacked public education by imposing models of learning, based not on the nature and needs of learners, but instead on Draconian and undemocratic principles and strategies that appeal to base instincts for command and control. Examples include ‘no excuses’ charter schools that can breed intolerant and insensitive teachers, as revealed in the recent case in New York City’s Success Academy where a first grade teacher berated a six year old for failing to comprehend a task and then tore up her paper in front of the other children. Teachers in such schools would benefit from the author’s exploration of the question, “What is a child?”

Daniel Tanner’s review of Dewey and Piaget, albeit sparked with controversy, should be an inspiration to leaders who strive to make schools places that consider the nature and needs of the child. He brings us ‘back to the basics’ and makes a connection to ideas that must be re-examined before they are lost.
Jean Piaget’s Debt to John Dewey

Daniel Tanner, PhD
Professor Emeritus
Graduate School of Education
Rutgers University
New Brunswick, NJ

Abstract

Jean Piaget became a veritable institution unto himself in education and psychology, largely as the result of his developmental-stage theory advanced over the second quarter of the twentieth century. Not until Piaget was 73 did he make mention of John Dewey’s work at Dewey’s laboratory school, founded in 1894 at the University of Chicago. But here he made no mention of Dewey’s findings on thinking as a maturational growth process marked by distinctive sequential stages, as explicated by Dewey (1899, 1902, 1910, 1933). This article examines the powerful and unmistakable isomorphism between Piaget’s and Dewey’s stage theory and the mystery of why Piaget never gave recognition to Dewey’s seminal work.
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Virtually any comprehensive analysis of thinking as a growth or developmental process invariably invokes the name of the Swiss psychologist Jean Piaget (1896-1980).

From his work with Binet in 1919, Piaget developed interest in why children make mistakes. He went on to investigate how the child develops mental structures from experience.

Working with individual children in what he called the clinical method, Piaget proceeded to ask specific questions as to their perceptions of and relations to natural phenomena, environment, physical objects, physical causality, and relations to others (1928, 1929, 1936; Evans, 1973).

Piaget’s Developmental Stages
From his investigations with individual children, Piaget developed his theory of maturational thinking, namely thinking as a process of growth, progressing through specifically identifiable stages.

Piaget’s work is so widely known to the readership of this journal that only the briefest summary is presented here in terms of stages of thinking linked to sequential periods of cognitive development:

(1) the sensory-motor stage (the first two years of life) when the infant learns to control perception and motor responses in dealing with physical objects and responding to language;

(2) the preoperational or representational stage in which the child learns to extract concepts from experience and later to make perceptual and intuitive judgments (to about age 6 or 7);

(3) the stage of concrete operations in which the child learns to solve basic physical problems by anticipating consequences perceptually (age 7-11); and

(4) the stage of formal operations (late childhood or early adolescence) in which the individual learns to think hypothetically and to theorize and experiment (Piaget, 1950, pp. 87-158; 1970, pp. 170-173; Piaget & Inhelder, 1969).

Earlier explications of Piaget’s work may be drawn from The Language and Thought of the Child (1926), The Child’s Conception of the World (1929), The Child’s Conception of Physical Causality (1930), The Origins of Intelligence in Children (1952; originally published in French, 1936), The Psychology of Intelligence (1950); and The Construction of Reality in the Child (1954).

Although aspects of Piaget’s work have been met with controversy (Piatelli-Pelmarini, 1980), his developmental stage theory has had a marked impact on the field of psychology; and although he never claimed to answer the curriculum question (what knowledge is of most worth, and how knowledge should be organized and taught), he has had a profound influence on the world of education.
The Deweyan Legacy
In his assessment of the experimentalist-progressive movement in education as orchestrated by John Dewey (1859-1952), James B. Conant held that the movement was inescapably an expression of the uniquely American experience. In Conant’s words, “I had the feeling that, like the Austro-Hungarian Empire of the nineteenth century, if John Dewey hadn’t existed he would have had to be invented” (1959, p. 94).

Two years after the opening of the University of Chicago in 1892, President William Rainey Harper brought John Dewey to Chicago to establish the Department of Pedagogy and the Department of Philosophy; and only two years after Dewey’s arrival, the University Elementary School was opened as a laboratory school in the Department of Pedagogy.

Following a falling out with Harper, Dewey moved to Columbia in 1903 (Dykhuizen, 1973). Although Dewey’s tenure and work in the University Elementary School was short lived, he nevertheless was able to develop his theory of thinking as a growth or sequential-maturational process expressed in stages of human development.

And whereas Piaget decades later appropriately characterized his own methodology with individual children as clinical, Dewey’s observations and insights were focused on the cognitive growth of the child in classroom and school-wide learning situations with compeers – extending into social, emotional and artistic expression and development.

In 1899, from a series of lectures to parents and others interested in Dewey’s University of Chicago Elementary School, Dewey authored *The School and Society*. This was followed by *The Child and the Curriculum* in 1902. In these two works, Dewey examined the nature of the learner in the context of the structure and function of the school curriculum, and life in and for a democratic society.

With his focus on the school years, Dewey had relatively little to say about infancy, although he trenchantly pointed out that in coming to the traditional school, the child “does not bring both his body and mind with him; he has to leave his mind behind, because there is no way to use it in the school. If he had a purely abstract mind, he could bring it to school with him, but his is a concrete one, interested in concrete things, and unless these things get over into school life he cannot take his mind with him” (1899, p. 80). Dewey was to elaborate extensively on the concrete stage of infancy and early childhood in *How We Think* (1910, 1933).

Mind as Growth
In *The School and Society*, Dewey likened the new findings on the nature of the learner as a veritable Copernican revolution (1899, p. 34). “Now we believe in the mind as a growing affair, and hence as essentially changing, presenting distinctive phases of capacity and interest at different periods,” he hypothesized, as he went on to point to the profound implications for the needed curriculum transformation:

If once more we are in earnest with the idea of mind as growth carrying with it typical features distinctive of its various stages, it is clear that an educational transformation is again indicated. It is clear that the selection and grading of material in the course of study must be done with
reference to proper nutrition of the dominant directions of activity in a given period … (p. 104).

Dewey’s Sequential Stages of Growth: Maturational Thinking

Beyond the stage of infancy and preschool childhood, Dewey explicitly posited his psychological hypotheses “from the matter of stages of growth:"

Stage I: ages 4 to 8

The first stage (found in the child, say of from four to eight years of age) is characterized by directness of social and personal interest and by directness and promptness of relationship between impressions, ideas, and action. The demand for a motor outlet for expression is urgent and immediate. Hence the subject-matter for these years is selected from phases of life entering into the child’s own social surroundings, and, as far as may be, capable of reproduction by him in something approaching social form—in play, games, occupations, or miniature industrial arts, stories, pictorial imagination, and conversation (1899, pp. 105-106).

At this stage, continued Dewey, the vague unity of experience is transformed by the need for the child to learn to secure “practical and intellectual control of such methods of work and inquiry as will enable him to realize results for himself” (p. 107). Here Dewey held that the school is not to be conceived as a place apart, but as intimately connected to child life or experience outside of school. The school must then link child life and school life to enlarge, enrich and extend learning experience (p. 106).

Stage II: after child enters school

From this first stage beyond infancy and earliest childhood, Dewey turned to the second stage of development after the child enters school.

In the second period, extending from eight or nine to eleven or twelve, the aim is to recognize and respond to the change which comes into the child from his growing sense of the possibility of more permanent and objective results and of the necessity for the control of agencies for the skill necessary to reach these results. When the child recognizes distinct and enduring ends which stand out and demand attention on their own account, the previous vague and fluid unity of life is broken up. The mere play of activity no longer directly satisfies. It must accomplish something—to lead up to a definite and abiding outcome, hence the recognition of rules of action (pp. 106-107).

Thus the child learns to command the basic skills not as mere symbolics or ends, but as tools for the uses and pursuit of knowledge by necessitating recourse to books for satisfaction, solution and growth (pp. 111-112).

Stage III: follows first two developmental periods

In the third period following the first two developmental periods of the school years, the child is engaged in a transition to the power of reflective attention whereby solutions to questions or problems are sought investigatively, held Dewey.

Stage IV: intervening stage

“In the intervening stage (in the child from eight to, say, eleven or twelve),” continued Dewey, problems may be addressed for practical or tangible results rather than to
answer an intellectual question. But when the power of reflective attention is realized, intellectually speaking, the person becomes educated with the power of self-directed inquiry, personal interest and insight (pp. 145-149).

And what of the teacher? In Dewey’s words, “it is the teacher’s business to know what powers are striving for utterance at a given period in the child’s development, and what sorts of activity will bring them to helpful expression, in order then to supply the requisite stimuli and needed materials” (p. 130).

**Fivefold Activities in Child Development**

Throughout all four stages, Dewey posited that the child’s drive for activity or engagement develops in the following realms beyond physical activity: (1) social activity – through conversation and interpersonal relationships, (2) investigative activity (e.g., taking things apart to see how they work – as distinguished from investigation or reflection through hypothetical thinking for problem solving, which is developed in the more matured child), (3) constructive activity – building or making things and putting them together to make them work, and (4) artistic activity (1899, pp. 43-62).

“All life is the great thing after all, the life of the child at its time and in its measure no less than the life of the adult,” wrote Dewey in pointing out that it would be strange indeed if the child’s needs for a rich, expanding and growing life should somehow conflict with growth into the possibilities of later, adult life (p. 60).

**From Curiosity to Reflective Thinking**

In *How We Think*, published in 1910 (revised ed., 1933), Dewey offered teachers a comprehensive explication of growth in the process of thinking, from the concrete or most elemental level to the complete act of thought or reflection. Beginning in infancy, the first manifestation of curiosity is characterized by “a vital overflow, an expression of an abundant organic energy. A physiological uneasiness leads a child to get into everything – to be reaching, poking, pounding, prying” (1910, p. 31).

In this period of infancy and earliest childhood, the individual learns to master the body through interactions with the physical and social environment. “The child has to learn to do almost everything: to see, to hear, to creep, to walk, and so on” (1910, p. 157). In effect, all of the child’s senses are forward-reaching and out-reaching, “ceaselessly active in enlarging the range of experience” (1910, p. 313).

Dewey then offers Wordsworth’s stanza as germane particularly to infancy and childhood (1910, p. 31):

> The eye—it cannot choose but see;  
> We cannot bid the ear be still;  
> Our bodies feel, where’er they be,  
> Against or with our will.

“All our sense and motor organs are, when we are awake, acting and being acted upon by something in the environment,” Dewey continued, as he went on to expand on how this curiosity of interaction with the environment grows and becomes intellectual as well as instrumental (1933, pp. 36-39).

As with the stages of cognitive development, curiosity is manifested in the infant as organic energy or an organic stage; this stage is followed by a growing social engagement or social stage of development, “as the child learns that he can appeal to others” and then when the child begins to realize “that the facts which directly meet the senses are not the whole story, that there is more behind them
and more to come from them, lies the germ of intellectual curiosity” (1910, p. 32).

From this stage, curiosity “becomes intellectual in the degree to which it is transformed into interest in finding out for oneself the answers to questions that are aroused by contact with persons and things” (1933, p. 39). The purposeful and hypothetical mode of thinking at this sequential stage is expressed, “To the degree that a distant end controls a sequence of inquiries and observations and binds them together as means to an end, just to that degree does curiosity assume a definitely intellectual character” (1933, p. 39).

Dewey proceeded to address the significance of attitudes and appreciations in this process of growth in thinking right up through self-directed reflection for problem solving through the testing of hypotheses in the complete act of thought (1933, pp. 106-118).

Isomorphism: From Dewey to Piaget

It is unlikely that Dewey’s developmental stage theory was largely unrecognized or ignored on the ground that Dewey’s credentials in psychology lacked standing. In fact, his book on psychology, published in 1887 was hailed in many quarters as the “new psychology” for showing the emergent influences of biology on psychology and other fields, and the essential role of experimental method in advancing the field of psychology (Dykhuizen, 1973, p.37).

To Dewey psychology is philosophic method (Early Works of Dewey, 1, pp. 153-167). Dewey, of course, was to go on to advance and orchestrate the American born philosophy of pragmatism or experimentalism into an educational/social theory revealing how the structure and function of the school curriculum must be in harmony with the very nature of the learner in and for a democratic society (1916). Hence, for example, the problem method or method of intelligence – the power of hypothetical thinking in action – signals the great transformation for productive membership in a free society. In this connection, the school must be a designed environment for the social and intellectual transformation of the rising generation.

In the Preface to Piaget’s The Language and Thought of the Child, Edouard Claparede (1873-1940) identifies several notables whose research was most influential for Piaget (1955, p. 13; original French edition, 1923).

As a disciple of Claparede, Piaget succeeded Claparede as director of the Institute Rousseau, founded by Claparede in 1912, which became the Institute of Educational Sciences at the University of Geneva. Claparede also founded the International Bureau of Education which became an organ of the United Nations with Piaget as successor to Paparede (Hamelme, D., 1998, pp.159-171).

In this Preface to Piaget’s The Language and Thought of the Child, Claparede also points out that Piaget was “lucky enough” to be initiated into psychology at a young age when “vistas were opening out before our science” and, “for James, Flournoy and Dewey it was the dynamic and pragmatic tendency that counted; for Freud, psycho-analysis; for Durkheim (no matter whether his doctrine was sound or not) the recognition of the role played by social life in the formation of the individual mind; for Hall, Groos, Binet and the rest, genetic psychology propped up by a biological conception of the child. By a stroke of genius, M. Piaget having assimilated these new theories, or rather having extracted the good from each, has made them all converge on to an interpretation of the child’s mentality” (1955, p. 13).
Claparede was a great admirer of Dewey and openly drew upon Dewey in advancing his own research on intelligence as growth through stages of development (1967). In his Introduction to Piaget’s *Language and Thought of the Child*, Claparede specifically points out that Piaget had indeed “assimilated” new theories from Dewey and others on the interpretation of the child’s mental development (1955, p. 13; originally 1915).

Although Piaget’s maturational theory of cognitive growth most closely matched Dewey’s theory and structural framework, stage-by-stage (Dewey, 1899, 1910, 1916), Piaget never cited Dewey’s contributions in this connection (see Table I).

Piaget was to go on to construct the most detailed map or conceptual framework for cognitive development as a maturational sequence or progression, but he left the curriculum question to Dewey and to Dewey’s fellow experimentalists.

The developmental-stage theory of Piaget is so unmistakably and powerfully isomorphic with Dewey’s categorical developmental-stage theory that it is a mystery as to why Piaget, in his “clinical” research, chose not to give recognition to Dewey’s earlier unique and enduring work from studying children in naturalistic social interactions in the environment of the classroom, school, and playground—in contrast to Piaget’s method of eliciting answers to calibrated questions posed sequentially to the individual child and classifying the responses.

Even more of a mystery is the failure of the profession to recognize, reveal, and build upon the Deweyan and Piagetian connection. The creation of a science of education, as in the case of all science, is based on building conceptual connections through problematic ideas in the testing of hypotheses for the advancement of knowledge.

Not until 1969 did Piaget acknowledge Dewey’s contributions to education science. But although Piaget reviewed his own work on the significance of developmental stages to education science, he still made no acknowledgment of Dewey’s developmental-stage theory as formulated from Dewey’s studies of children in his laboratory school in Chicago (1970, pp. 170-173).

Piaget’s *Science of Education and the Psychology of the Child*, published in French in 1969 and translated into English in 1970 appeared when Piaget was 73 years of age. In essence it was an effort to sum up his lifetime contributions to child psychology and to evaluate the historic advances in education science. But the book is conspicuous for having made no reference whatsoever to Dewey’s developmental stage theory and Dewey’s classic, *The Sources of a Science of Education*, published in 1929.

Table I presents summary descriptions and abbreviated quotations on the four principal developmental stages, contrasting Piaget’s formulations with those identified by Dewey a half century earlier.
Table I

*Developmental Stages of Thinking*

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>All sensory and motor organs ceaselessly active in vital overflow of an abundant organic energy; objects are sucked and fingered with forward-reaching and outreaching activity to make new contacts with new objects. Such activities are not conceptual, but are vital to development of intellectual operations (1910, pp. 30-32; 1933, pp. 36-37).</td>
<td></td>
<td>Preconceptual coordination of successive perceptions and overt physical movements linked by brief anticipation and reconstruction, but not arriving at an all-embracing representation of continuous vision and fusion necessary for understanding the whole. From uttering sounds to imitating sounds and certain words with vague meaning (to end of 2nd year) followed by beginning of systematic conceptual learning of language (“symbolic function”) linking meanings of relations between symbols/signs and reality of social life (1950, pp. 120-129).</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Adaptation of sounds to making sounds becomes the great instrument of social adaptation with the development of speech (1910, p. 159).</td>
<td>People afford the greatest pleasure known to the child’s limited experience (1950, p. 158).</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Soon distinguishes persons as the most important and interesting of all objects. Childhood play and games in developing perceptions, concepts, intelligence and social growth (1933, p. 210).</td>
<td>From simple symbolic play to assimilation of reality into activity proper (1969, pp. 156-157). “Playing with dolls does not serve solely to develop the maternal instinct but also provides a symbolic representation of all the realities the child has so far experienced but not yet assimilated in a form that it (sic) can relive and therefore vary according to its needs. So that in this respect symbolic play, like exercise play, is also to be explained as an assimilation of reality into the self….the symbol in play is to the individual what the verbal sign is to society.” (1950, pp. 156-157).</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
toys, children are living not with physical things, but in the large world of meanings, natural and social, evoked by these things….they are subordinating the physically present to the ideally signified. In this way, a world of meanings, a store of concepts (so fundamental to all intellectual achievement), is defined and built up….not only do meanings thus become familiar acquaintance but they are organized, arranged in groups, made to cohere in connected ways” (1910, pp. 161-162).

**Stage II  Pre-operational/representational (from ages 4-7 or 8)**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th></th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Directness of social and personal interest and promptness of relationship between impressions, ideas and action; urgent and immediate demand for a motor outlet. Transforming vague meaning of experience to secure practical and intellectual control of methods of activity and inquiry approaching social form as will enable the child to realize results for himself in play, games, pictorial imagination, conversation, and occupations (1899, pp. 105-106).</td>
<td>From initial egocentricity into a system of relations that are decentralized with respect to self, intellectually and socially. A gradual coordination of representative relations and thus a growing conceptualization which leads from the symbolic or pre-conceptual/prelogical phase to beginnings of intuitive reasoning with perceptual sensorimotor adjustments (1950, pp. 120-139).</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Child’s incessant questioning of “What is that?” “Why?” – not for technical explanation, but for social engagement through language and to expand acquaintance with mysteries of the environment, setting the germ for intellectual activity (1910, p. 32).</td>
<td>“The earliest ‘whys’ seem more affective than intellectual in character…. But we have yet to ascertain how the child passes from that affective curiosity… to curiosity in general, and finally to the more subtle forms of intellectual interest such as the search of causes” (1955, p. 173).</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>The passage of play into work through work as play (1910, pp. 164-167).</td>
<td>Play transformed into adapted constructions of work (1969, p. 157).</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
### Stage III  Concrete operations (from 7-8 to 11-12 years)

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th></th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Mere play of activity no longer satisfies but must accomplish something – leading to a definite outcome. Hence the recognition of rules in games and actions. A growing sense of possible results of activities and necessity for control of agencies for the skill necessary to reach the results. Command of basic skills not as mere symbolics but as tools for uses in the pursuit of knowledge for solution and growth (1899, pp. 106-112).</td>
<td>Rules in games are the result of negotiation, compromise, agreement (1969, p. 127). Development of organized/operational groupings of thought that can be manipulated or known through the senses in solving basic physical problems by anticipating consequences. Progressive development of intuitive thought (1950, pp. 139-147).</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

### Stage IV  Formal operations (from late childhood through adolescence)

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th></th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Development in the power of reflective thought, defined as “active, persistent and careful consideration of any belief or supposed form of knowledge in the light of the grounds that support it, and the further conclusions to which it tends.” From a state of perplexity, controversy, doubt concerning a problem, the adolescent becomes capable of setting the problem to be solved by formulating ideas/hypotheses to be tested for possible solution, based upon the best available evidence, by means of appropriate methods, materials and procedures (1910, pp. 3-115; 1916, pp. 169-178; 192; 1933, pp. 107-118).</td>
<td>Hypothetico-deductive and inferential thinking. Thinking beyond the present and forming “theories” about everything. Reflective thought when the adolescent relies on the necessary validity of inferences. Formal thought is perfected and its groupings characterize reflective intelligence (1950, pp. 123, 142-150).</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Here we find that Piaget not only posits identical stages that had been formulated by Dewey more than a generation earlier, but that Piaget uses and paraphrases Dewey’s expressions, examples and descriptions in explicating the progressive cognitive growth of the learner through the developmental stages. And, as shown in Table I, we find this expressed first by Dewey and later by Piaget, such as in relating how the child’s interactions with the doll represent manifestations of the process of transforming physical play into symbolic meaning; or in how children learn to recognize the necessity of rules in the conduct...
of games (no rules, no game); or in how the child’s incessant use of “whys” is not an expression of the need for technical explanation, but for social engagement; or in how the power of hypothetical or reflective thinking is expressed in the formulation of systematic evidence for problem solving.

In building upon the seminal work of Dewey, it would seem clear that Piaget owed a debt to Dewey. But no less important in the conduct and advance of scientific inquiry is the obligation of attribution in connecting the genesis and transformation of ideas from one investigator to another.

Again, as shown in Table I, Piaget’s framework marking the distinctive stages of cognitive development corresponds with that of Dewey’s, along with the sequential behavioral descriptions and examples manifested by the learner at each stage.

At the sensory–motor stage (infancy to age 4), Dewey and Piaget provide descriptions and examples of the infant’s growth from pre-conceptual perceptions and overflow of organic or physical energy to transforming the utterance of sounds to imitation and then to social and conceptual adaptation through the learning of language.

Piaget, as with Dewey, relates how at this stage the infant soon distinguishes persons as the most important and interesting of all objects. And both Dewey and Piaget single out the significance of play and games in developing perceptions, concepts and social growth – from simple symbolic play to assimilation of reality and the organization and connection of meanings.

At the pre-operational or representational level (ages 4-7 or 8), Dewey and Piaget describe the transformation of vague meaning of experience from the pre-conceptual to conceptual control of activity in social form through imagination and conversation, with the transformation of play into work and work as play. Here both Dewey and Piaget point out that at this stage the child’s incessant questioning of “Why?” or “What is that?” is not for intellectual explanation, but is affectively motivated for social engagement through language, thereby setting the germ for intellectual growth.

At the stage of concrete operations (from 7-8 to 11-12 years), as shown in the table, Dewey and Piaget point out that here mere play no longer satisfies, but must accomplish something; hence the need for agreed-upon rules. Activities are regarded as consequential, and basic skills are no longer merely symbolic, but become tools for use in learning.

Finally, at the stage of formal operations (late childhood through early adolescence), the power of reflective thought becomes manifested. Through hypothetical thinking, problems are tested for validity, reliability and possibilities for solution and application by devising appropriate means and material resources. This development, of course, bears profound consequences for the individual, the school curriculum and society.

Dewey repeatedly pointed to the significance of ideas as indispensable constituents of inference and in the formal operations of thinking. “Without a guiding idea, facts would be heaped up like grains of sand; they would not be organized into intellectual unity,” commented Dewey (1933, p. 133). Considering that the examination of ideas tends to stimulate and hold adolescent interest, to open possibilities for inquiry in the formulation of hypotheses, and to the uses of factual knowledge as evidence, it is puzzling...
that so much teaching and testing in school remain traditionally factual and error-oriented rather than idea-oriented and problem-centered.

Returning to the mystery of why in his writings Piaget chose not to connect his work with the earlier work of Dewey on developmental stage theory, we might ask: was Piaget in a race for the prize? Was he so imbued with his own clinical methodology that he sought not to give recognition to Dewey’s methodology of direct observation of children in natural situations of the classroom, school and playground?

Then there is the mystery of why Dewey’s early and powerful work on maturational stage theory of cognitive development was so massively overlooked by the profession. This may be best explained, at least partially, by the contrasting lifetime careers of the two men.

The twentieth century ushered in a rising tide of knowledge eclosion and specialism. Dewey was to go on to transform the uniquely American theory of pragmatism into an experimentalist theory of education for democracy—what Gunnar Myrdal called “the most perfected educational theory developed in modern times” (1962, p. 883; originally published in 1944).

Whereas Dewey was to become America’s leading philosopher, Piaget in Europe concentrated his work on developmental/cognitive psychology, and built an international reputation in his chosen specialized areas of research over his lifetime.

The Curriculum Connection
Developmental-stage theory informs educators on the nature of the learner and the conditions necessary for the full growth of intelligence at critical periods of the lifespan—which, in turn presents profound implications for the structure and function of the school curriculum.

As noted earlier, Piaget never purported to connect developmental-stage theory to the needed systematic transformation of the school curriculum and to the social development of the child and adolescent. Such work was to be undertaken by Dewey from the time he established his laboratory school through his entire professional life.

In Democracy and Education (1916), Dewey held that “the school must itself be a community life in all which that implies” and that, “Social perceptions can be developed only in a genuinely social medium—one where there is give and take in the building up of a common experience…continuous with that out of school” (p. 416). Here Dewey forged the connection between the curriculum and cognitive and social growth for democratic living, in that democracy requires schools that employ reflective thinking as method in the education of adolescents.

In Democracy and Education, Dewey not only devoted entire chapters titled “Education as a Social Function,” “Education as Growth,” “Thinking in Education,” and “The Nature of Subject Matter,” but also chapters on each of the broad fields of the curriculum. It is indeed puzzling that many students in the social and philosophical foundations of education who are assigned to read Democracy and Education fail to fully recognize the power of Dewey’s curriculum connection.

Over the years, the present author asked students who had just completed a philosophy of education course at Rutgers, in which John Dewey’s Democracy and Education was required reading, to describe Dewey’s
organizational framework for the curriculum as presented in the book. They invariably expressed surprise when I pointed out that the book contains separate chapters under such titles as “The Significance of Geography and History,” “Science in the Course of Study,” “Intellectual and Practical Studies,” “Physical and Social Studies,” and “Vocational Aspects of Education.” And it is doubtful that very many teachers of educational philosophy realize that *Democracy and Education* was originally published as a Macmillan textbook.

**Toward a Science of Education**

Dewey contended that the sources of a science of education are to be determined by educational problems, with educational practices providing the data or subject matter which forms the problems for inquiry and solution. Psychology and other social sciences may be drawn upon, but the sources of the problems must stem from educational practices which are also the ultimate test of the validity and value of the research findings.

As for philosophy, its value as a source is determined only by the extent to which it provides working hypotheses of comprehensive application. To which Dewey added, “But if a philosophy starts to reason out its conclusions without definite and constant regard to the concrete experiences that define the problems of thought, it becomes speculative in a way that justifies contempt” (1929, p.56).

Dewey’s conviction that educational practices provide the problems for investigation and solution, and consequently are the sources for the building of a science of education (1929, pp.35-36) find expression and validation in the work he conducted in his laboratory school at the University of Chicago.

In 1969, Piaget offered some belated recognition of Dewey’s work in his laboratory school before the opening of the twentieth century. In a chapter titled “The Genesis of the New Methods” in *Science of Education and the Psychology of the Child* Piaget notes:

In the United States, the reaction against the static nature of nineteenth century psychology made itself apparent in two ways. On the one hand the work of the pragmatists had revealed the role of action in the constitution of all mental operations, and of thought in particular; on the other, the science of mental development, of genetic psychology, had increased considerably in scope … These two trends found their exact point of intersection in John Dewey, who in 1896 was already creating an experimental school in which the work of the students was centered upon the interests or the needs characteristic of each age group (1970, p. 147; originally published in French in 1969).

Of course, Dewey’s findings from work in his laboratory school were far greater than being centered on the interests and needs of students (Dewey, 1899, 1902; Mayhew & Edwards, 1936; Tanner and Tanner, 1990; Tanner, L., 1997).

It is clear that Piaget was well aware of Dewey’s research at the University of Chicago Elementary School. And although Piaget reviewed here the value of his own developmental-stage theory to education science, he made no mention of Dewey in this connection (1970, pp. 170-173), but went on to discuss briefly the early experiments by Dewey in his experimental school whereby the children were allotted an essential place in the social life with compers in the classroom and school by learning to collaborate in intellectual activity as well as establishing self-governing moral discipline (p. 174).
At the outset, Piaget made note that over the period from 1935 to 1965, advances were made by “great writers” in most of the natural and social sciences, but no great pedagogue had emerged (1970, p. 9). He proceeded to dismiss Dewey in this connection on the ground that Dewey was a philosopher, but nevertheless cited Dewey with Durkheim as founders of a sociology of education as a discipline through the systematic study of the school and classroom (p. 19), and listed Dewey among the great names in psychology (p. 145).

Clearly, Piaget revealed that he was well aware of Dewey’s orchestral contributions to education and social thought, and more specifically to psychology. And he did credit the theorists of the new school with developing the school curriculum “in forms assimilable to children of different ages in accordance with their mental structure and the various stages of their development” (p. 153).

Returning to Piaget’s contention that no great pedagogue had emerged over the historic period from 1935 to 1965, he apparently failed to recognize that the term pedagogy, came to be discarded by experimentalist-progressive educators for reducing education methods to mechanical procedures and devices that reciprocally treat subject matter as fixed bodies of ready-made content to be reproduced by rote for the recitation and examination (Dewey, 1933, p. 81). For Dewey, education is the process of “reconstruction of experience which adds to the meaning of experience and which increases ability to direct the course of subsequent experience” (1916, pp. 89-90).

The great deficiency of pedagogical theory since the time of Herbart, continued Dewey, “lies in ignoring the existence in a living being of active and specific functions which are developed in the redirection and combination which occur as they are occupied with their environment” (1916, p. 83). As Dewey continued with regard to Herbartian theory,

The theory represents the Schoolmaster come to his own. The philosophy is eloquent about the duty of the teacher in instructing pupils; it is almost silent regarding his privilege in learning. It emphasizes the influence of intellectual environment upon the mind; it slurs over the fact that the environment involves a personal sharing in common experience. It exaggerates beyond reason the possibilities of consciously formulated and used methods, and understates the role of vital, unconscious attitudes…. It takes, in brief, everything educational into account save its essence…. (1916, pp. 83-84).

For Dewey, the essentials of method are embodied in the complete act of thought or method of intelligence. Hence the teaching-learning process becomes truly educational and not merely instructional. In Democracy and Education (1916), Dewey orchestrated his thoughts on democratic theory and education into his experimentalist philosophy based on the idea of progress for the individual and society.

In his summing up of the modern developments in psychology and pedagogy, Piaget pointed out, as did Dewey decades before him, that as the child progresses to the stage of hypothetico-deducitorial operations, “the child becomes capable both of combining those hypotheses and of verifying them experimentally, then it goes without saying that our schools owe it to themselves to develop and to direct such capacities in order to use them in
the development of the experimental attitude of mind and of methods of teaching” (1970, pp. 52-53).

**What is Childhood?**

Piaget goes on to ask, “What is childhood then? And how are we to adjust our educational technique to beings at once so like and yet so unlike us?” (p. 153). He refers to the view of childhood by the theorists of the new school led by Dewey and fellow experimentalists.

In Piaget’s words: “Childhood, for the theorists of the new school is not a necessary evil; it is a biologically useful phase whose significance is that of a progressive adaptation to a physical and social environment” (p. 153), to which we might add, a necessary phase in development. “The traditional school reduced all socialization whether intellectual or moral, to a mechanism of constraint,” observed Piaget, whereas cooperation and collaboration are most apt to encourage real exchange of thought and discussion, which is to say, all the forms of behavior capable of developing the critical attitude of mind, objectivity, and discursive reflection” (p. 180).

Perhaps the best expression of “what is childhood” and the development of children’s thinking may be found in the following interchange as recorded by a mother of five children upon standing on the edge of a large urban construction site:

- Three-year old: “Look! Sand!”
- Four-year old: “I wonder how it got there?”
- Six-year old: “I guess a man put it there, but I don’t know how he could be so tall to reach the top of it.”
- Seven-year old: “They pick it up in a steam shovel and a dump truck delivers it.”
- Nine year-old: “Oh, everybody knows that.”

(Brandes, May 26, 1963, p. 22).

In his autobiography, Max Planck, Nobel Laureate in physics, addresses the same phenomenon and its profound significance—namely the loss of wonderment as the child grows up:

The more the child matures, and the more complete his world picture becomes, the less frequently he finds reason to wonder. And when he has grown up, and his world picture has solidified and taken on a certain form, he accepts this picture as a matter of course and ceases to wonder. Is this because the adult has fully fathomed the correlations and the necessity of the structure of his world picture?

Nothing could be more erroneous than this idea.

No! The reason why the adult no longer wonders is not because he has solved the riddle of life, but because he has grown accustomed to the laws governing his world picture. But the problem of why these particular laws and no others hold, remains for him just as amazing and inexplicable as for the child. He who does not comprehend this situation, misconstrues its profound significance, and he who has reached
the stage where he no longer wonders about anything, merely demonstrates that he has lost the art of reflective reasoning (1949, pp. 92-93).

This loss in wonderment with maturity is not necessarily inevitable. With every new discovery or insight one’s world picture is expanded, deepened and enriched, thereby advancing the wondrous in the structure of the world picture (p. 93).

The Darwinian Influence: What Would Darwin Think?
Both Dewey and Piaget were profoundly influenced by Darwin (Dewey, 1910, p. 127; Boring, 1950, pp. 272-278; Piaget, 1950, p. 12). From Darwin to Dewey to Piaget, human development was seen as encompassing three inexorably interdependent growth processes: physical, social and cognitive. For Dewey, the rising generation requires the power of problem solving in coping with a precarious and changing environment. Consequently, education should be the means of learning to think, and hypothetical thinking opens the door to problem solutions and progress for the individual and society.

For Dewey, this meant that the school curriculum must engage the learner in growth in the capability of dealing with the emergent problems of life through the method of intelligence (1933, 1938). But the curriculum of the traditional school was focused principally on established-convergent learning regularities as opposed to emergent learning.

The exemplar of established-convergent learning is the multiple-choice test which requires the student to select the correct pre-constructed answer from the other (incorrect) pre-fabricated answers. In contrast is the short-answer test item or short essay item which asks the student to construct a correct answer in his own words, such as defining a problem or formulating one or more hypotheses for solving a given problem.

The latter represents emergent learning to the extent that it engages the learner in reformulating and applying knowledge for solving a heretofore unseen problem situation, as opposed to simple recall or reproduction of information. In the first instance, the answer is prefabricated for the student; in the second instance, the answer is constructed by the student. The former may be answered correctly by simple recall; the latter evokes evidence of critical thinking.

In contemporary times it is a strange state of affairs that the worth of the learner, the teacher and the school is measured by student scores on external, high-stakes, computer-scored, multiple choice, standardized tests focused on established-convergent learning to the neglect of emergent learning.

Considering that the power of hypothetical thinking is the exalted stage of evolution of the human mind, one is left to ponder what Charles Darwin would think of the multiple-choice test as the measure of mind. And whereas teaching-to-the test was long considered to be cheating, it is now regarded as a pedagogical best practice.

Adolescence and Reflective Thinking
During the era of progressive education in the United States, experimentalist educators embarked on large-scale and intensive research studies and efforts in reconstructing the high-school curriculum so as to connect the curriculum with the emerging potential power of reflective intelligence or hypothetical thinking in adolescence (Aikin, 1942; French & Associates, 1957).
“Adolescence is not a synonym for magic,” observed Dewey (1933), but “affords an opportunity for thinking of a more comprehensive and abstract type,” to which he added: “Only by making the most of the thought factor already active in the experiences of childhood, is there any promise or warrant for the emergence of superior reflective power at adolescence or at any later time period” (p. 89).

In effect, the school, by means of the curriculum, must constitute a designed environment and experience for the growth of the powers of reflective thinking with the stage of adolescence. The transformation will not happen magically or spontaneously.

In the United States during the progressive era and extending through mid-twentieth century, extraordinary efforts were undertaken to create instruments for measuring growth in critical or hypothetical thinking in evaluating outcomes of the new problem-focused curricula of the high school (Smith & Tyler, 1942; French & Associates, 1957). Similar efforts followed in higher education around mid-twentieth century (Dressel & Mayhew, 1954).

The findings clearly revealed that the new curricula were yielding significant gains in critical thinking and problem-solving capabilities on the part of adolescents (Aikin, 1942). The tests or evaluative instruments were determined by the curriculum, whereas the high-stakes tests of today are designed largely as measures of efficiency in knowledge transmission, subject-by-subject, with rankings and ratings of students, teachers and schools.

**Why Reforms Often Fail**

From the work of Dewey and Piaget, we should know that any reform in education is destined for failure if it neglects or violates the nature and needs of the learner.

Consequently, it is indeed puzzling that no less a figure in cognitive psychology than Jerome Bruner, responding to what he referred to as “a long-range crisis in national security,” brought on by the Cold War and space race (1960, p. 1) would declare that “intellectual activity anywhere is the same, whether at the frontier of knowledge or in a third-grade classroom,” and that, “The schoolboy learning physics is a physicist, and it is easier for him to learn physics behaving like a physicist than doing something else” (p. 14).

Bruner’s reconceptualization of the nature of the learner apparently was made opportunistically to fit the federally financed national discipline-centered curriculum reforms in science and mathematics led by university scholar-specialists who had no interest in or concern for the nature of the learner, nor for the socio-civic democratizing function of the curriculum.

Bruner’s pronouncement was made through his position as chair and author of the report of a national conference of university scholars and leaders convened in an air of national emergency.

Interestingly, on the tenth anniversary of the publication of *The Process of Education* Jerome Bruner recanted his doctrine of disciplinary structure and of the child scholar,
and stressed the need to connect the curriculum to the problems of our society and educational opportunity including vocation (1971).

The current nationalistic foray for school reform in the United States, “Race to the Top,” also gives priority to the sciences and mathematics.

But whereas in the earlier reform movement, the public schools were to blame for the alleged American lag in the space race, the current crisis and national school-reform movement, Race to the Top, holds the public schools to blame for the alleged decline of America’s hegemonic dominance over the global economic marketplace.

And this time the cure is to be driven by external high-stakes testing. As in the school-reform movement of the space race, Race to the Top is fueled by international comparisons on achievement tests with no corrections made for the incommensurate pupil populations, nation by nation.

From developmental-stage theory, educators should know that to assess a child’s or adolescent’s growth in achievement by results principally on external, standardized, high-stakes, multiple-choice tests only raises points of conflict with the nature and needs of the learner and the structure and function of the curriculum.

Learning activities that children love and that develop the “mind’s eye” such as the studio arts (the visual arts and music) and shop classes, once ubiquitous in the elementary school, have been cut back vastly for purposes of economy and priority favoring traditional academics in the cause of American economic-industrial hegemony in the global marketplace.

The school life of the learner and the structure of the curriculum must be attuned to the kind of society the people believe in. Democracy requires an enlightened citizenry, and this in turn requires that the rising generation commands the powers of reflective thinking, as individuals and as citizens.

According to Dewey, the fundamental factors in the education process are (1) the learner as a developing being, (2) the curriculum as a functioning and developing structure of knowledge and know-how (methodology) for teaching and growth in learning, and (3) society as an emerging environment for constantly expanding lifelong learning (Dewey, 1902, p.4).

In short, any education reform will fail if the curriculum conflicts with the nature and needs of the learner. And any education reform will fail if it is not attuned to the democratic prospect and if it conflicts with life in a free society. The three fundamental factors must be seen and treated in interdependence and not in conflict if the problems of education are to be solved and progress is to be made (pp. 4-5). And, for both the individual and society, progress is far better than reform. Reform has an end. Progress has no end beyond itself.

The Child, The Teacher and The Curriculum
The conceptual framework for developmental stage theory constructed by Dewey from his observations of children in his laboratory school during the short period of 1896 to 1904 marked the opening of a new era—the Century of the Child.

No longer was the child to be construed as an unformed being on a waiting list toward adult maturity. Now the case was
the child authentically as “Child” who engages his present capacities, attitudes and powers in the experience of learning as a process of growth. The teacher knows full well that she cannot set the destiny of the child; nor can she know how those capacities, attitudes and powers will be realized through the school curriculum.

In Dewey’s words:

The case is of Child. It is his present powers which are to assert themselves: his present capacities which are to be exercised; his present attitudes which are to be realized. But save as the teacher knows, knows wisely and thoroughly, the race expression which is embodied in that thing we call the Curriculum, the teacher knows neither what the present power, capacity, or attitude is, nor how it is to be asserted, exercised and realized (1902, p.31).

From Dewey and Piaget we learn that the work of the child is never done. It is always in the making.
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Abstract

This paper was prepared as a response to:

1. A national trend towards lessening the requirements to become a public school superintendent and hiring non-traditional superintendents. State and national approaches to alternative licensure for public school superintendents are reviewed, including the lessening or abolition of standards. This is of concern to those aware of the need for highly qualified school leaders.

2. A national trend linking effective practices of school district leaders to improvements in student achievement. Well-prepared superintendents have been tied to high student achievement. A key part of this response involved pairing Educational Leadership Constituent Council’s (ELCC) “District Level Standards,” with five key responsibilities Tim Waters and Robert Marzano (2006) fulfilled by superintendents who positively impacted student test scores (p. 11-13). Profiles from the Wallace Foundation, national groups, and district level studies are cited to establish a foundation regarding the impact of highly trained on student success.
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When a superintendent with a strong reputation as an educational leader was dismissed by his school board and replaced by a principal who had no certification as a superintendent, it attracted the attention of the chairman of one of the largest manufacturing companies in the United States, which was located near the district. The chairman asked some area superintendents and educators an understandable question: How can a board hire someone to serve as a superintendent without the proper certification?

The group he questioned—two superintendents, including the one impacted by this action; two university representatives who work with superintendent preparation programs, including this author; the state association director who represents superintendents and central office administrators; and a company attorney—pointed out that the trend in hiring unlicensed superintendents is by no means unique to our state. About 40 states have provided for the hiring of superintendents from outside of education (Thompson, Thompson, & Knight, 2013, p. 61). Florida, Indiana, Michigan, North Carolina, Delaware, South Dakota, Utah, Washington, and Wyoming were among the early states to eliminate certification for superintendents.

Michigan’s elimination of superintendent certification since 1993 has been a subject of study to identify whether a more diverse applicant pool has been attracted to the role (Smith, 2008). The study noted “Perceived and projected gaps between supply, demand, and effectiveness have driven the matter on to political and professional agendas (p. 31).”

The 2013 Thompson, Thompson, & Knight study surveyed experienced educators and found, “participants did not trust, respect, support, or accept nontraditional superintendents” as compared to traditionally trained and licensed superintendents (p. 60). Smith (2008) summarized the quest of the above study succinctly: “Michigan threw an educational leadership party … did anyone come” (p. 36)?

Out of over 600 school districts, the study found only four “out-of-field” superintendents hired as of 2008 (p. 41). Dr. William Mays, the Michigan Association of School Administrator’s Executive Director, stated in my conversation with him in early 2012 that of the “four originally hired, only one remained.”

In 2013, the Indiana General Assembly joined the bandwagon, passing Public Law 167, which states that a superintendent hired by a school district “is not required to hold a teacher's license” but “is required to have obtained at least a master's degree from an accredited postsecondary educational institution” (p. 1706). This master's degree is not limited to education, but may be earned in any area.

As the executive who had called our meeting began to grasp the possible consequences of this licensing trend, he voiced concern that this lack of required licensing may lead some school boards to employ less than the best of candidates. The group also discussed the concern that in some areas this could lead to cronyism in hiring. Brian, one of the educators, posed the question “What happens to ‘highly qualified’ as a standard if there are no standards?”
The chairman left the group with a challenge and a promise. First, he challenged us to “build support around what it takes to be a successful superintendent.” Second, he cautioned us to be able to respond to the question: Why not allow boards to make a choice between alternative or traditionally trained candidates? Finally, if there is a need for highly trained superintendents, “get the right people to push that point as a perceived need.”

The chairman made a commitment to the group: Get good information to me, and I’ll get it out there. Two members of the majority party of the state’s General Assembly had agreed to author and carry a bill to again require certification above a master’s degree for a superintendent’s licensure and eligibility for appointment. Now came the challenge to get good information.

I chose to develop my response to the chairman in terms of how a highly qualified and professionally trained superintendent, according to a preponderance of research, is the point person in improving student learning and performance. As I continually stress to my graduate students working toward administrative licensure, “If what you are doing does not add to the improvement of student learning, why are you doing it?”

Literature Review
The following review of literature surrounding this topic suggests that the need for highly trained educators, successful in completing advanced licensure programs, may never have been greater than it is today. At the same time, national trends show licensing requirements for superintendents are actually declining. By 2011, nine states had no licensure requirement for superintendents, while 22 states had developed waivers for licensure and 18 states had developed alternative routes to licensure (Kowalski, 2013).

What does it take to be a successful superintendent, and why is advanced, specialized degree work a necessary part of preparing our superintendents and central office leaders? As noted by Allan Odden and Lawrence Picus (2014), “The goal is to have teachers use data to inform their instructional practice, identify students who need interventions, and improve student performance” (p.115).

In order to assist teachers in becoming proficient, the leader of a school district must be well trained in instructional practices, interventions, tracking student learning, establishing procedures to deal with problems when noted, and providing enriched learning opportunities for students identified as proficient.

Research connecting the superintendent to improving student achievement has been strong, thanks to studies commissioned by the Wallace Foundation (Louis, Leithwood, Wahlstrom & Anderson, 2010), and a definitive study in 2006 by Robert Marzano and Tim Waters. The book Leaders of Learning: How District, School, and Classroom Leaders Improve Student Achievement states it this way, “Leadership from the central office matters—both in terms of raising student achievement and in terms of creating the conditions for adult learning that lead to higher levels of achievement” (DuFour & Marzano, 2011, p. 46).

The challenge remains how to best make sure those filling positions as superintendents are prepared to maximize such potential impact once in the position.
Research from diverse organizations emphasizes the need for preparing superintendents to impact student improvement by focusing on performance standards. The Southern Regional Education Board, in its 2007 Illinois Benchmarking Report: Executive Summary noted, “the capacity of states to improve the quality of schools is greatly diminished when the whole leadership system is neither in place nor effective to meet the leadership challenges in its schools” (p. 5).

The summary suggested superintendents insist that the basis for standards and student performance should be the underpinning for how instruction is delivered, assessed, and used to determine the success of candidates in preparation programs. Such criteria are also noted to be integral to employment decisions, future professional development, and expectations for performance during employment.

The need for highly trained educators certified in school leadership is summarized within the opening comments from the Executive Summary of a 2010 study commissioned by the Wallace Foundation entitled Central Office Transformation for District-wide Teaching and Learning Improvement:

Our findings reveal that leaders in these systems, first and foremost, understood what decades of experience and research have shown [and that is] that districts generally do not see district-wide improvements in teaching and learning without substantial engagement by their central offices in helping all schools build their capacity for improvement. Central offices and the people who work in them are not simply part of the background noise in school improvement. Rather, school district central office administrators exercise essential leadership, in partnership with school leaders, to build capacity throughout public educational systems for teaching and learning improvements. (Honig, Copland, Rainey, Lorton, & Newton, p. iii)

Another research report to the Wallace Foundation (Louis, Leithwood, Wahlstrom, & Anderson, 2010) noted that effective superintendents understand the “critical importance of patience and sustained, continual efforts aimed at improvement” (p. 212), emphasizing that district "leaders need to take steps to monitor and sustain high-level student performance wherever it is found and to set ambitious goals for student learning that go beyond proficiency levels on standardized tests.

Focusing improvement efforts solely on low-performing schools and students is not a productive strategy for continual improvement in a district" (p. 214).

The Council of Chief School State Officers’ State Consortium on Education Leadership noted in Standard 2 of its 2010 SCEL Toolkit for SEAS to Increase District Leadership Capacity the need for educational leadership to advocate, nurture, and maintain a culture encouraging a culture of student and staff growth and improvement. Indicators suggested included "a comprehensive, rigorous, and coherent curricular program” (p. 11).

Nationwide there is ground-roots recognition of the need for school administrators who are educational leaders. Stephen Fink and Max Silverman, of the University of Washington's Center for Educational Leadership, reported that school districts in Seattle, Washington; Pittsburg, Pennsylvania; Denver, Colorado; Albany, New York; Tulsa, Oklahoma; and Hillsborough
County, Florida, are all endeavoring to utilize the central office as a support system for developing instructional leadership in their building level administrative staff (2014). A study of 12 high achieving school districts in California (Murphy and Hallinger, 1988) paired district effectiveness with a superintendent’s ability to actively provide leadership in curriculum and instruction.

Working to improve its educational delivery system, the school corporation of Highline, Washington, focused on how superintendents and their leadership teams transformed “the central office into a support system to help all schools improve the quality of teaching and learning” (Enfield & Spicciati, 2014, p. 28). The district developed two primary beliefs:

1. They agreed that the central office adds value not merely through efficiency "but also through a more active role in strengthening school leadership. … The central office now must play a pivotal role in ensuring a strong system of schools … for the strategic work of transformation."

2. There must be an emphasis to “develop a clearer organizational focus on how everything we do is in service of supporting student achievement” (p 28).

The Education Direction firm consults with school corporations to prepare mentors with positive educational experiences to coach building principals, especially in the area of effectively using a data-driven inquiry cycle to improve teaching and learning. One of their clients, the Chandler Unified School District in the suburbs of Phoenix, AZ, has invested a great deal in professional development to ensure each of its schools implements the critical elements of the inquiry cycle including:

- developing a focus on the instructional core [which is] “the intersection of content, the teacher and the student” (Kaufman, Grimm & Doty, 2014, p. 21),
- expanding the definition of data to include student work and instructional practices, and
- continuously monitor progress.

Regular, meaningful coaching of teachers and principals is a major component of central office/superintendent leadership that the Education Direction firm finds leads to systemic school improvement.

The need for highly trained district leaders who understand the relationship between effective teaching and learning has become even more evident as educational standards have evolved throughout the last few decades. Odden and Picus (2004) note that “For most of the 20th century, school finance policy focused on equity. … In the 1990s, new attention began to focus on education adequacy and productivity—the linkages among level and use of funds, and linkages to student achievement" (p. 1).

With the transition from equity to adequacy in school systems, the 2001 federal No Child Left Behind (NCLB) mandate created a performance demand unprecedented in education. Now, instead of measuring student performance in terms of means or medians, success for each public school and school district in the United States began to be measured by how each of the federally designated 37 sub-groups identified by No Child Left Behind met predefined targets, with the goal of all students testing within the “proficient” level by 2014.

Waters and Marzano's 2006 working paper for McREL, School District Leadership
that Works: The Effect of Superintendent Leadership on Student Achievement, is quoted frequently by researchers exploring superintendents’ impact on student achievement.

Their research found that the computed correlation between district leadership and student achievement was .24. Based upon this figure, consider the case of a superintendent at the 50th percentile in terms of leadership abilities who leads a district where average student achievement is also at the 50th percentile. "Now, assume that the superintendent improves his or her leadership abilities by one standard deviation … we would predict that average student achievement in the district would rise to the 59.5th percentile" (p. 10).

The authors found district-level leadership that statistically provided a significant impact on student test scores required competency in five key responsibilities:

- Collaborative goal setting,
- Establishing non-negotiable goals for achievement and instruction,
- (School) Board alignment with support of district goals,
- Monitoring achievement and instructional goals (interpreting any differences noted between stated goals and current practice), and
- Using resources to support the goals for instruction and achievement.

The preceding research supports the premise that effective district leadership positively influences student achievement. Subsequent research demonstrates that Educational Leadership Constituent Council (ELCC) standards are addressing the needs to develop such leadership.

The National Policy Board documents the research support for the ELCC District Level Standards for Educational Administration (NPBEA). In the organization’s 2011 examination of the ELCC “District Level Standards,” each standard discussed is followed by a review of relevant literature under the section Research Support for ELCC Standard. Throughout the document, ELCC standards are supported by the research of many experts, the 2006 research on school district leadership done by Waters, Marzano, and McNulty.

The Council of Chief State School Officers (CCSSO) also noted the relationship between the ELCC/ISLLC Standards and the 2006 Waters and Marzano research concerning the link between specific school district leadership practices and student performance.

This analysis of the leadership standards includes a call for district administrators to “align and focus their work in all these areas" identified within the standards (Canole & Young, 2013, p. 27), the key rationale being that, “when district leaders align and focus their work in all these areas, they have a strongly positive effect on student learning.” The same study developed charts comparing “Model Teacher Leader Standards” with the 2008 ISLLC/ELCC district leadership standards (pp. 117-118).

Building Support Around What It Takes to Be A Successful Superintendent

Universities provide programs leading to superintendent licensure, primarily by becoming accredited as part of the Educational Leadership Constituent Council (ELCC). In order to become accredited, universities must demonstrate their course work incorporates an awareness, understanding, and application of seven program standards that are broken down into many more detailed sub-skills. The first
assumption embedded within the 2011 ELCC leadership standards is that “improving student achievement is the central responsibility of district leadership” (p. 5).

The ELCC 2011 standards for leaders of school districts are research based and were updated from the earlier Interstate School Leaders Licensure Consortium (ISLLC) standards using current research and documentation from scholarly resources regarding district leadership preparation for those training to lead school districts through transitional times (Young and Mawhinney, p. 1).

According to the research driving the ELCC Standards, “district-level standards are meant to be used for advanced programs at the master, specialist, or doctoral level that prepare assistant superintendents, superintendents, curriculum directors, and supervisors and/or other programs that prepare educational leaders for a school district environment” (Young and Mawhinney, 2012, p.42).

The earlier 2008 Educational Leadership Policy Standards: ISLLC 2008, had already asserted that, due to a wealth of information about school and school district leaders available at that time, national discourse had advanced from whether leadership makes a difference for students to how to prepare “high-quality leaders” to assume roles that can, indeed, contribute to raising student achievement. To get there, the report states that:

One of the clearest lessons from this research is that the states that are using leadership standards are on the right track. According to an extensive review of the research literature, funded by the Wallace Foundation, goal-and vision-setting articulated in the standards are areas in which education leaders have the most impact. (Council of Chief State School Officers, 2008, p. 3)

How clearly are the ELCC standards based upon research? One way to test this is to compare them to the highly acclaimed research of Waters and Marzano. To demonstrate which of Waters’ and Marzano’s key responsibilities are explored in each of the ELCC program standards, I created Table 1.
Table 1

*Alignment Between ELLC and Five Key Responsibilities for Superintendents Noted by Waters and Marzano (2006)*

| Key Responsibilities Proven Statistically Significant in Impact on Student Test Scores |
|---|---|---|---|---|
| Numbered and underlined portions of ELLC Standards are aligned with Five Key Responsibilities for Superintendents at right | Responsibility 1: The goal-setting process | Responsibility 2: Non-negotiable goals for achievement and instruction | Responsibility 3: Board alignment with and support of district goals | Responsibility 4: Monitoring the goals for achievement and instruction | Responsibility 5: Use of resources to support the goals for achievement and instruction |
| ELCC Standard 1.0: 1. facilitating the development, articulation, implementation, and stewardship of a shared district vision of learning through the collection and use of data to identify district goals, 2. assess organizational effectiveness, and implement district plans to achieve district goals; promotion of continual and sustainable district improvement; and 3. evaluation of district progress and revision of district plans supported by district stakeholders | Standard 1 – Category 1 | Standard 1 – Category 2 | Standard 1 – Category 3 |  |
| ELCC Standard 2.0: 2. promotes the success of every student by sustaining a district culture conducive to collaboration, trust, and a personalized learning environment with high expectations for students; creating and evaluating a comprehensive, rigorous, and coherent curricular and | Standard 2 – Category 2 | Standard 2 – Category 4 | Standard 2 – Category 5 |  |
instructional district program; 4. developing and supervising the instructional and leadership capacity across the district; and 5. promoting the most effective and appropriate technologies to support teaching and learning within the district.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Standard 3.0: 5. promotes the success of every student by ensuring the management of the district’s organization, operation, and resources through 1. monitoring and evaluating district management and operational systems; efficiently using human, fiscal, and technological resources within the district; promoting district-level policies and procedures that protect the welfare and safety of students and staff across the district; developing district capacity for distributed leadership; and 2. ensuring that district time focuses on high-quality instruction and student learning</th>
<th>Standard 3 – Category 1</th>
<th>Standard 3 – Category 2</th>
<th>Standard 3 – Category 5</th>
</tr>
</thead>
</table>

| ELCC Standard 4.0: A district-level education leader 4. applies knowledge that promotes the success of every student by collaborating with faculty and community members, responding to diverse community interests and needs, and 5. mobilizing community resources for the district by collecting and analyzing information pertinent to improvement of the district’s educational environment; promoting an | Standard 4 – Category 4 | Standard 4 – Category 5 |
understanding, appreciation, and use of the community’s diverse cultural, social, and intellectual resources throughout the district; building and sustaining positive district relationships with families and caregivers; and cultivating productive district relationships with community partners.

ELCC Standard 5.0: promotes the success of every student by 2. acting with integrity, fairness, and in an ethical manner to ensure a district system of accountability for every student’s academic and social success by modeling district principles of self-awareness, reflective practice, transparency, and ethical behavior as related to their roles within the district; safeguarding the values of democracy, equity, and diversity within the district; evaluating the potential moral and legal consequences of decision making in the district; and promoting social justice within the district to ensure individual student needs inform all aspects of schooling.

ELCC Standard 6.0: promotes the success of every student by 5. understanding, responding to, and influencing the larger political, social, economic, legal, and cultural context within the

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Standard 5 – Category 2</th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Standard 6 – Category 2</th>
<th>Standard 6 – Category 5</th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
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district through advocating for district students, families, and caregivers; 2. acting to influence local, district, state, and national decisions affecting student learning; and anticipating and assessing emerging trends and initiatives in order to adapt district-level leadership strategies.

| ELCC Standard 7.0: A district-level education leader applies knowledge that promotes the success of every student in a substantial and sustained educational leadership internship experience that has district-based field experiences and clinical practice within a district setting and is monitored by a qualified, on-site mentor. (See first paragraph, page 14.) | NA | NA | NA | NA | NA |

Across the top of the table to the right are listed the five responsibilities described on page 11 of *School District Leadership that Works*. Down the left side of the page are listed the seven *ELCC Educational Leadership Program Recognition Standards* for the district level.

In order to identify commonalities between the ELCC Standards and Waters and Marzano’s five responsibilities for superintendents, I isolated key words and concepts from each and aligned those that intersected. Key words and phrases within each of the ELCC standards listed on the left of the table are underlined and numbered to identify and isolate which part of the standard was connected to which of the five “Key Responsibilities,” as most standards linked to more than one of the responsibilities.

As can be seen, the 2011 ELCC district level standards incorporate the five key responsibilities noted by Waters and Marzano as well as the needs discussed in the reports commissioned by the Wallace Foundation noted in this paper. Conversely, support for Waters and Marzano’s five key responsibilities for district-level leaders is found in each of the ELCC program standards.

The alignments noted in Table 1 create the foundation for the program protocols for university training programs in district leadership. It should be noted that of the ELCC standards that address preparation for addressing district leadership experiences, there are 14 references to district or individual student performance standards that fall under those five key responsibilities referenced.
above. Standard 7 relates only to district level internships for students of educational leadership and is not directly applicable to Waters and Marzano’s responsibilities, although internship experiences I have mentored as both a superintendent and a university mentorship supervisor have required interaction with all five responsibilities.

The linkage noted in Table 1 identify key responsibilities supported by the ELCC Standards. Those sections within the first six ELCC Standards that can be linked to the corresponding “Responsibilities” noted above have been underlined on Table 1 for ease of identification. Notice the intersect between these two powerful national impacts on superintendent preparation. Crucial responsibilities identified by Waters and Marzano in 2006 can be supported by the ELCC Standards, as presented in Table 1 noted by Waters and Marzano (2006). The numbered sections within the ELCC Standards correspond with the number associated with the key responsibilities across the top of the page.

Table 1 examines the overlap of ELCC Standards 1-6 with the 2006 Waters and Marzano research linking specific school district leadership practices and student performance. For example, Responsibility 1 identified by Waters and Marzano (p. 7) include “The goal-setting process,” which aligns on the chart with the underlined ELCC Standard 1 comments: “facilitating the development, articulation, implementation, and stewardship of a shared district vision of learning through the collection and use of data to identify district goals, assess organizational effectiveness, and implement district plans to achieve district goals; evaluation of district progress and revision of district plans supported by district stakeholders.” It was interesting to note that ELCC Standard 2 (p. 10) requires skills noted under Waters and Marzano Responsibilities 2, 4, and 5. Standard 3 incorporates three of these key responsibilities.

Conclusions
A businessperson with an MBA might be very capable of handling the finances of a school corporation, but he or she may not know how to invest the resources in education to get the highest learning results from his funds. CEO’s may have an understanding of high performing organizations, but are they aware of how to link instructional practices to student achievement? A teacher with a master’s degree in education might well understand how to enhance education reform but not how to negotiate and maintain a legal teachers’ contract. Highly trained, certified superintendents have a well-rounded education that will prepare them for all aspects of leading a school corporation.

Advanced degree programs for superintendents aligned through the ELCC network incorporate priorities that support what noted research has shown to be the five most important characteristics of highly successful superintendents.

Highly successful superintendents not only efficiently manage resources, they must be highly effective in directing resources into such areas as instructional coaching and sharing opportunities to constantly improve the delivery of daily instruction across a wide range of ages and abilities so all students can achieve at higher levels of academic performance.

Patrons, including board members charged with the responsibility of school district governance and policy-making, often have knowledge of and possibly even day-to-day neighborhood visibility of their local school. When in school, many of these patrons only had personal contact with the
superintendent at commencement. This limits their understanding of what the position entails. It is small wonder that they are unaware of the preparation program necessary to become a superintendent and why it is important.

Given the dramatic impact our superintendents are having on student achievement, superintendents should not be allowed to become the best-kept secret in the community.

District leaders need to launch a campaign with their service organizations, clubs, and local Chambers of Commerce to emphasize that, not only can student achievement be improved, but also a strong wealth of research demonstrates that:

1. District leadership not only counts but is at the foundation of student success.

2. A highly qualified and professionally trained superintendent is the point person in improving student learning and performance.

3. We can demonstrate both why and how training of district leaders makes a difference in student learning.

4. Boards should not have the flexibility to ignore the impact that a certificated and highly qualified superintendent has for the betterment of their school district’s student achievement when a hiring decision is made.

5. Legislators should be educated as to how advanced course work in educational leadership prepares district leaders through the standards they meet, and how those standards directly impact, as a wealth of research demonstrates, improvements in student performance and achievement.
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Abstract

The purpose of this study is to determine the impact of collective bargaining on teacher pay satisfaction and offer knowledge of the factors contributing to the pay satisfaction of public elementary school teachers. The study focuses on how human capital, occupational characteristics, and job related characteristics impact the pay satisfaction of teachers. The results of our regression analysis suggest that teachers represented by a labor union have higher levels of pay satisfaction than teachers who are not (b=.32, p=.02, p < 0.05). This study’s unique contribution is that we focus not only on the public K-12 school industry, but also we examine the relationship between the presence of collective bargaining and teacher pay satisfaction in school districts across two states.
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Introduction

The presence of unions in public education is a highly contentious issue. Critics have “accused these unions of simultaneously raising the cost and lowering the quality of American public schools” (Coulson, 2010, p. 155). They note that rigid union-established salary schedules stymie education pay reform endeavors such as performance pay. Critics also argue that unions are against such reforms.

While unions have been found to encourage teacher bonuses based on additional duties, for the most part, they do not support bonuses based on improvement of student test scores, which they feel are not valid proxies for teacher performance (West & Mykerezi, 2011). In fact, the largest teacher union in the nation, the National Association of Education (NEA), states in their 2014-15 resolution that they believe “performance pay schedules, such as merit pay or any other system of compensation based on an evaluation of an education employee’s performance, are inappropriate” (National Education Association, 2014, p. 64).

Notwithstanding criticisms, one of the widely accepted benefits of being part of a union is the ability to raise salaries for union members. For instance, West and Mykerezi (2011) found that collective bargaining has a significant positive impact on salary schedules. Similarly, Coxby (1996) found that collective bargaining raises public school districts’ spending, which were primarily reserved for smaller classes (i.e., more teachers) and higher salaries.

However, not everyone agrees that unions have an additive effect on pay. Some researchers have found no relationship between the presence of unions and teacher wages in public school districts (Lovenheim, 2009; Kasper, 1970). Despite these findings, the general “ingrained” perception is that unions are beneficial for wages (Mitchell, 1978) and consequently, individuals in unions may feel more satisfied with their pay. This affective reaction to pay (pay satisfaction) may represent a benefit of unions irrespective of any salary gains (or lack thereof).

In spite of the potential impact of unions on teachers’ pay satisfaction, there has been surprisingly little research that has been conducted on the topic. Consequently, this study was conducted to examine the relationship between the presence of a union and the pay satisfaction of teachers. We control for other predictors of pay satisfaction that have been previously identified, including salary.

Salary Determination Process

In an environment without collective bargaining, a single authority, such as the school board, determines fixed-pay teacher salaries; whereas in a collective bargaining environment, salaries are determined through negotiations, where teachers are represented by a bargaining agent (Tran & Young, 2013).

When pay is collectively bargained, “actual dollar amounts allocated within fixed-rate teacher salary schedule are a fundamental mandatory item of bargaining in all public sector laws” (p. 143). As a result, school boards and union representatives must meet in agreement on the actual dollar amount before a final fixed-rate salary schedule is determined for teachers.

Union Membership and Pay Satisfaction

Even with the general perception that unions increase employee wages and benefits, researchers have found that unionization reduces job satisfaction (Bryson, Cappellari & Lucifora, 2004; Hammer & Avgar, 2005).
Bryson et al. studied the effect of union membership on job satisfaction and satisfaction with pay. This study found union members reported lower satisfaction levels than non-union members. When comparing pay satisfaction to other forms of job facets, union members’ levels of dissatisfaction with their job were not statistically significant for pay.

However, there is also evidence indicating unionization has a strong positive effect on pay satisfaction (Evans & Ondrack, 1990; Nelson, Stone, Frye, & Chown, 2008). Evans and Ondrack (1990) found this relationship in a blue collar setting. Similarly, Currall, Towler, Judge, and Kohn (2005) found that satisfaction with unions was positively related to pay satisfaction; however, their study was limited because they did not compare unionized school districts to nonunionized school districts.

Given that Nelson, Stone, Frye, and Chown’s (2008) review of the literature found mixed results for the effects of union membership on pay satisfaction, this suggests that we do not have a complete understanding of the topic and that much work is still needed.

Review of the literature found mixed results for the effects of union membership on pay satisfaction; this suggests that we do not have a complete understanding of the topic and that much work is still needed.

Gomez-Mejia and Balkin (1984) examined the relationship between the presence and absence of university faculty union membership and their pay satisfaction.

The study consisted of faculty members listed as either liberal arts or business administration at a unionized university system (Minnesota) and a nonunionized university system (Wisconsin).

Similar to the results of the Currall et al. (2005) study, Gomez-Mejia and Balkin (1984) found that unions were positively related to pay satisfaction.

**Theoretical Framework**

This study is based on the framework established by Freeman and Medoff’s (1979) Collective Voice/Exit theory. Bryson, et al., (2004) to interpret their findings concerning higher pay satisfaction in collective bargaining environments, used this theory.

According to the theory, employee’s dissatisfaction can be reduced when they have a voice in the organizational decision making process. Voice refers to the communication used by employees in an effort to receive their desired work conditions. In the collective bargaining environment, unions are typically the vocal representatives of the employees.

In addition, the reduction of satisfaction is theorized to decrease turnover. Similarly, in our study, we posit that collective bargaining results in higher pay satisfaction, which in turn has been found to be related to lower turnover intentions (Tran, 2015) and those intentions have been found to predict actual turnover (Lee & Mowday, 1978).

**Significance and Purpose**

The purpose of this study is to contribute to the body of literature concerning the potential impacts of the presence of collective bargaining on teacher pay satisfaction. This study differs from prior studies in that we not only focus on the public K-12 school industry, but we explore the relationship between the presence of collective bargaining and teacher pay satisfaction in multiple school districts across two states. Thus, the following research question guided the present study:
Does the presence of collective bargaining influence pay satisfaction of elementary school teachers?

In the following section, the survey method used to answer this research question is presented.

**Methodology**

The population of interest for this study is all traditional (non-charter) elementary public school teachers (grades K-5) in the states of Ohio and South Carolina. Data from the Ohio Department of Education (ODE) and the South Carolina Department of Education (SCDE) were used to define a population of teachers from public non-charter schools and obtain school district salary schedules for each participant. MCH Strategic Data (MCH), a sales and marketing company, provided contact information for all of the teachers.

To identify the teachers of different labor forces (i.e., union vs. non-union), the states of Ohio and South Carolina were chosen for comparison purposes.

Ohio was chosen because it is a unionized state and uses union representatives to bargain personnel concerns in a bilateral decision making system.

In contrast, South Carolina was chosen because it is a non-collective bargaining state and practices Right-to-Work laws in a unilateral decision making system. In this study, Ohio and South Carolina respectively represent proxies for collective bargaining and its absence in the decision making process.

In order to accurately represent the decision making process, both Ohio and South Carolina should be closely matched in characteristics other than the presence of collective bargaining. Using 2013 U.S. Census data, we found that while Ohio’s overall population is larger than South Carolina (e.g., OH- 11.5 million; SC- 4.7 million), which translates into a larger number of teachers (OH- 80,705; SC- 53,328), the percentage of the total population that are teachers for both states are similar (OH-.07%; SC -1%; ODE, 2013; SC, 2013).

The two states were also comparable in per capita income (OH- $25,857; SC- $23,906), high school graduation rates (OH- 88.2%; SC- 84%), unemployment rates (OH- 6.2%; SC- 6.8%) and geographic size (OH- 40,860 mi^2; SC- 30,060 mi^2) (U.S. Census Bureau, 2013). High comparability between the states on factors other than the presence of collective bargaining provides further confidence that differences in outcomes between the states are likely contributable to their decision making model.

**Procedure**

We collected personal and occupational characteristics, as well as pay satisfaction information from respondents via survey. Cohen’s (1988) power analysis was used to identify the sample size needed to detect any potential effects of collective bargaining.

This study involved 11 covariates, one independent and one dependent variable, a medium effect size (\(f^2 = .13\)), an alpha level of .05, and a specific power of .80. Based on these parameters, the power analysis recommended a sample size of 149. Our achieved sample was 244 and therefore the requirement was met. Districts’ per pupil expenditure and class size were obtained from each of the state’s corresponding state department of education.

**Variables**

**Covariates.** We controlled for the following variables in our study: a) education level, b) teaching experience, c) sex, d) race, e) age, f)
contractual work days, g) region adjusted base salary, h) supplementary income, i) loan debt, j) district student teacher ratio, k) officer of a professional organization, and l) district per pupil expenditure, based on research that suggests their potential influence on pay satisfaction (Castetter and Young, 2000; Klein & Maher, 1966; Lawler, 1971; Penzer, 1969; Tang & Tang, 2012; Tran & Young, 2013; Young, 1999).

To illustrate the importance of some of these variables, we provide a rationale for their inclusion. Specifically, researchers identified the following as relevant human capital endowments that may potentially influence pay satisfaction: a) education level (Klein & Maher, 1966; Penzer, 1969) and b) Years of Experience (Tang and Tang, 2012).

As it relates to the relationship between education and pay satisfaction, Klein and Maher (1966) found that higher education level produced higher levels of pay dissatisfaction after accounting for actual pay, and they posit that this was due to individuals with higher levels of education having elevated perceptions of self-worth and therefore may feel less positively about their pay.

In addition, teacher education level in school systems is often used as a determinant of teacher pay in public school systems. School district fixed salary schedules offer increases in teacher pay status by attaining higher education levels.

Because of the highly qualified teacher requirements of NCLB (2001), certified teachers salary education requirements generally begin with a bachelor’s degree, and pay increases occur at the master’s, master’s + 30 credit hours, and doctorate levels (education requirements differ in certain school districts).

In this study, highest degree is defined by the aforementioned degree categories, and they were each dummy coded, with bachelor’s degree serving as the reference in our analysis.

Experience based on the number of years serving as a teacher is another determinant of teacher pay in public school systems. Tang and Tang (2012) found that years of experience produced higher levels of pay satisfaction when studying educators.

In addition, the fixed based teacher salary schedule provided by the school district provides teachers step increases in pay as determined by each year of service. Teachers are provided incremental increases in pay each year until they reach the maximum compensable number of years of service allowed by the school district for their particular educational level.

In our study, teaching experience is defined as the reported number of years the respondents served as teachers.

Occupational characteristics may also impact pay satisfaction. These features are typically found within the employee contract and provide details pertaining to their pay. Important occupational characteristic that were accounted for in this study are: a) contractual work days and b) annual base salary.

Teachers are typically contracted for 180 days in Ohio (ODE), 190 days in South Carolina (SCDE), and teaching position with longer contracts are paid more. In addition, salaries of teachers with labor union memberships have been found to be higher than salaries of teachers with no labor union membership (Bryson, Cappellari, & Lucifora, 2004; Evans & Ondrack, 1990; Gomez-Mejia & Balkin, 1984; Nelson et al., 2008) and
research has identified that changes in pay level significantly predicts how satisfied individuals are with their income (Berkowitz, Fraser, Treasure, & Cochran, 1987).

However, past findings have suggested that relative pay (e.g., teacher’s pay relative to their peers) may be more important than absolute dollar amount when it comes to how individuals feel about their pay (Baker, Punwick & Belt, 2010).

Indeed, past research has found that educator’s pay satisfaction are influenced by the pay of relevant others (Young, Young, Okhremtchouk, & Castaneda, 2009; Tran, 2015). Consequently, we control for relative pay by dividing teacher’s reported salary by their regional comparable wage index (CWI) (Taylor, 2006). The CWI takes into consideration the fact that different regions exert different amount of financial pressure for salary levels. For instance, an area with a high cost of living or a lack of amenities may require higher absolute salary levels to attract employees and accounting for this allows absolute dollar amounts to be adjusted for appropriate comparisons across regions.

Because the 2014 CWI has not been made available at the time of our analysis, we estimated the 2014 CWI with the average comparable cost index for the previous four years (i.e., 2013, 2012, 2011, 2010). Near perfect correlations between the four comparable cost indexes (r≥.99, p<.0001) provides further evidence that the four year average was an appropriate substitute for the 2014 CWI as the variation in wage pressure between districts remained mostly consistent across time.

In addition to the aforementioned variables, we also accounted for teacher’s racial background (coded as white or not white), age, whether the teacher worked in a professional organization, and district average student teacher ratios.

Student teacher ratios were incorporated because Adams’s Equity theory (1963) would suggest that pay satisfaction is influenced by the balance of employee’s input and outcome (e.g., pay) and larger class sizes may serve as increased input (more work).

Most of our respondents operated in environments that did not have collective bargaining (65.92%), held Master’s degrees (41.34%) and were white (88.83%) and female (62.57%). Further descriptive statistics for the sample used in our analysis (i.e., those with complete data) are provided in Table 1.
Table 1

Descriptive Statistics (n=179)

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Variable</th>
<th>Mean</th>
<th>Std. Dev.</th>
<th>Min</th>
<th>Max</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Pay Satisfaction</td>
<td>2.41</td>
<td>0.69</td>
<td>0.5</td>
<td>4.36842</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Teaching Experience</td>
<td>13.15</td>
<td>9.53</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>42</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Age</td>
<td>42.27</td>
<td>11.14</td>
<td>24</td>
<td>68</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Contractual Workdays</td>
<td>304.12</td>
<td>1415.13</td>
<td>80</td>
<td>190.56</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Region Adjusted Base Salary</td>
<td>36,409.4</td>
<td>10,228.2</td>
<td>28,69.22</td>
<td>64,979.8</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>District Student Teacher Ratio</td>
<td>20.46</td>
<td>3.31</td>
<td>4.4</td>
<td>26.8</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>District Per Pupil Expenditure</td>
<td>97,47.61</td>
<td>17,00.04</td>
<td>7,765.86</td>
<td>20,669.3</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**Independent variable.**
The independent variable manipulated in the study is the presence of collective bargaining. Collective bargaining may increase pay satisfaction because labor unions can negotiate higher pay for teachers and a lack of collective bargaining does not provide opportunities for teachers or their representatives to negotiate teacher pay. Consequently, in this study, we seek to identify if there is a difference in pay satisfaction among elementary teachers operating in a collective bargaining environment as compared to their counterparts in a non-collective environment.
Dependent variable. The dependent variable for this study is pay satisfaction as assessed by the Pay Satisfaction Questionnaire (PSQ). Participants were asked to complete the PSQ, which provided a composite pay satisfaction score used for analysis. Heneman and Schwab’s (1985) PSQ includes 18 items describing various facets of one’s pay (pay level, pay benefits, pay raises and pay administration/structure).

Some example of these items included questions inquiring about respondents’ degree of content with current salary, fringe benefits package, recent pay and the amount of control that the supervisor has over respondents’ pay (Heneman & Schwab, 1985).

The items are rated on a five-point, Likert-type scale ranging from Very Dissatisfied to Very Satisfied. Higher ratings on the scale signify more positive reactions to a particular facet in the form of satisfaction, while, lower ratings signify a more negative response to the particular facet in the form of dissatisfaction.

This study used the PSQ because it is one of the main surveys for measuring the constructs of pay satisfaction and has been found to have high levels of reliability and validity (Judge & Welbourne, 1994; Lievens, Anseel, Harris & Eisenberg, 2007; Mulvey, Miceli & Near, 1991).

In terms of reliability, Fields (2002) reviewed the psychometric properties of numerous administrations of the PSQ and reported that the coefficient alpha for the composite measure of pay satisfaction varied from .77 to .88. Similarly, we conducted an internal reliability assessment for the PSQ with our sample and found support of its reliability (α=.93).

Judge (1993) provided validation evidence of the PSQ via factor analysis. Researchers Judge (1993) and DeConinck, Stilwell & Brock (1996) found when utilizing Confirmatory Factor Analysis, the overall fit of the PSQ supported the four dimensional model (i.e., pay levels, benefits, pay raises and pay structure/administration) as they loaded on the hypothesized dimensions. In sum, the PSQ is grounded with strong psychometric properties.

Analysis
We begin our analysis by carefully reviewing the data. We obtained complete data for 73% of the respondents. Missing data were examined for patterns that could potentially bias results and none were readily identifiable.

To further address the issue of missing data and the lack of balance of respondents between states, we conducted a regression analysis using a Maximum Likelihood (ML) estimation process.

Furthermore, we compared this model to a hierarchical linear model that takes into account groupings based on districts and state. According to the results of the likelihood-ratio test, $\chi^2 (df=2) = .63$, $p=0.73$, groupings were not needed.

We then compared the ML estimated model (without nesting) to an ordinary least squares (OLS) model with robust standard errors clustered at the district level. Standard errors were clustered by district to account for potential correlation in errors between districts (e.g., district specific pay practices that may influence the pay satisfaction of teachers).

There was no practical difference between the results of the two models (i.e., coefficients were of course identical, and p-values did not substantively differ).
Consequently, for the sake of parsimony, we report results from the OLS model. According to our results, the presence of collective bargaining was a significant predictor of pay satisfaction ($b=.32$, $p=.02$).

This provides support for the argument that one of the benefits of unions that collectively bargain on behalf of their employees, is the increased satisfaction of their constituents as it relates to their pay. This association is beyond the association found between absolute dollar amount, as regional adjusted salaries were controlled for in the model ($b=.0000165$, $p=.037$).

Beyond the pay related variables, teacher experience and districts’ per pupil expenditure (see Table 2) were also found to be related to pay satisfaction scores; however there is an increased likelihood that these findings were a result of chance ($p=.073$ and $p=.093$ respectively).
### Table 2

Regression Results for the Determinants of Pay Satisfaction Under Collective Bargaining

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Variables</th>
<th>(b)</th>
<th>(t)</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Collective Bargaining</td>
<td>0.320*</td>
<td>(2.37)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Teaching Experience</td>
<td>-0.021</td>
<td>(1.81)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Master’s degree</td>
<td>-0.135</td>
<td>(1.15)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Master’s + 30 degree</td>
<td>0.012</td>
<td>(0.09)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Doctorate degree</td>
<td>-0.105</td>
<td>(0.32)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Male</td>
<td>-0.009</td>
<td>(0.10)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Nonwhite</td>
<td>-0.110</td>
<td>(0.54)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Age</td>
<td>-0.005</td>
<td>(0.62)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Contractual Workdays</td>
<td>-0.000</td>
<td>(0.11)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Region Adjusted Base salary</td>
<td>0.000*</td>
<td>(2.12)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Supplementary Income</td>
<td>0.001</td>
<td>(0.01)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Loan Debt Amount</td>
<td>-0.000</td>
<td>(0.58)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>District Student Teacher Ratio</td>
<td>-0.015</td>
<td>(1.13)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Officer at Professional Org</td>
<td>-0.225</td>
<td>(1.15)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>District Per Pupil Expenditure</td>
<td>0.000</td>
<td>(1.70)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Constant</td>
<td>2.071**</td>
<td>(3.76)</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

\(R^2\) | 0.22 

\(N\)   | 179

*aRobust standard errors (clustered at the district level) appear in parentheses.

* \(p<0.05\);
** \(p<0.01\)
Conclusion
Findings from this study align with past research that has suggested that the presence of labor unions is related to a higher level of pay satisfaction for employees (Bryson et al., 2004; Currall et al., 2005; Evans & Ondrack, 1990; Gomez-Mejia & Balkin, 1984).

Given this, one advantage of collective bargaining may be to positively impact how employees feel about their compensation. Because we accounted for salary in our study, our findings that employees reported more positive perceptions of pay when collective bargaining is present than when it is absent are beyond the influence of salary amount. This may be a result of teacher (or teacher representative) input opportunities provided by collective bargaining in the salary determination process, regardless of absolute dollar amount relative to salaries offered by peer districts.

Advocates who seek to remove unions must attend to the loss of employee voice via union representation if collective bargaining is to be eliminated from public education. Otherwise, the pay satisfaction of employees may suffer, which may result in negative consequences including high turnover (Tran, 2015) as suggested by Collective Voice/Exit theory (Freeman & Medoff, 1979).

Limitations
There are many avenues of potential future research on the topic explored in this study. For instance, instead of using composite PSQ scores as an outcome, future researchers may examine collective bargaining’s impact on individual facets of pay satisfaction.

One limitation of this study is that we used district averaged (and not school/classroom) class size and per pupil-expenditure due to data unavailability. We addressed this concern statistically by both clustering standard errors by districts and comparing our results to one using a multi-level model framework to account for district level errors and found comparable findings. This provides greater confidence in our results, and can be compared to those from future studies examining these variables from the classroom or school level.

In sum, our findings suggest that collective bargaining impacts teachers’ financial being beyond salary increases in dollar amounts, after adjusting for the influence of the regional labor market on pay. This is in line with Freeman and Medoff’s (1979) voice theory, which suggests that having a voice in the administrative decision making process reduces dissatisfaction.

Future research should examine other potential benefits of collective bargaining in order to fully understand the contributions to teacher welfare. This understanding would be beneficial to both supporters (because they can further justify their contributions) and detractors of unions (because they have to address the union contributions if they plan to recommend an alternative) and will better facilitate a thoughtful and informed discussion between the two.
Author Biographies

David Buckman is an assistant professor of educational leadership at DePaul University. He has a background as an educator in both middle school and elementary school. His research interests are human resources issues in the preK-12 setting. E-mail: buckman@email.sc.edu

Henry Tran is an assistant professor at the University of South Carolina who studies education human resources (HR) and finance. He is a nationally certified HR professional and sits on the board of advisors for the National Education Finance Conference. E-mail: tranhe@mailbox.sc.edu

I. Phillip Young is a professor and at the University of South Carolina’s Department of Educational Leadership and Policies. His research interests are human resource issues in the public school setting. E-mail: ipyoung@mailbox.sc.edu
References


Local control is one of the traditional virtues of American public education credited for delivering the prosperity the nation has enjoyed for decades (Goldin, 2008). However this virtue has been eroded gradually over the years.

Today local education decisions are directly affected by policies and policy recommendations from the outside—at the state, national, and sometimes even international level.

As a result, education leaders live in a much more complex policy environment than ever before. They not only have to work with the local community but also must interpret and implement policies made beyond their control, which may or may not be consistent with the culture and traditions of their local communities.

Moreover, as guardians of the wellbeing of students in their schools, they may be compelled to take actions to fend off outside policies that may hurt their students. Furthermore, as a member of the education profession, they need to actively contribute to the development of healthy policies at the state and national levels.

These complex tasks require education leaders to have a clear understanding of policies and more importantly the politics and evidence behind them. Unfortunately, to have a clear understanding is not easy - not only are many of the policy issues complex in nature but also because of the politics in policy making.

Influenced by different interest groups, education policies in the U.S. are often the results of political comprises supported with
selective uses of evidence, biased interpretations of data, and widespread myths (Hacsi, 2002); (Berliner, 1996); (Berliner, 2014); (Ravitch, 2013); (Ravitch, 2010). As such, education policies and their associated politics and evidence are as complicated and confusing as the U.S. tax laws.

_Education Policy Perils: Tackling the Tough Issues_, co-edited by Chris Tienken and Carol Mullen, offers excellent insights into some of the toughest issues in education with provocative but practical recommendations for education leaders to navigate the complex and complicated policy landscape.

Each of the seven chapters in the book, authored by accomplished researchers, is devoted to one significant and relevant issue in education: school choice and competition, corporate influence in public education, English language learners and social justice leadership, curriculum standardization and customization, international assessment and comparison, state level politics and curriculum policy, and standardized testing.

While these are not the only significant issues in education, they have been some of the major forces shaping the policy landscape in the United States.

These issues are tough because there are no easy and straightforward solutions that meet the needs and expectations of all stakeholders. They are tough also because there is no agreed upon definition of the outcomes of education. As a result, empirical evidence collected to support or reject certain proposed solutions can always be subject to questioning and reinterpretations based on ideology.

Furthermore, educational research has long suffered from methodological constraints in that it is not always possible to conduct truly randomized trials like medical research. Thus, results of educational research, especially those pertaining to large policy issues, are often susceptible to reasonable doubts and deliberate manipulation.

Consequently, educational policies have often been made based not on evidence, however limited it may be, but more on ideology. The politically powerful are able to influence the development of policies that favor their ideology and market them as necessary for the benefit of all children. Such is the case of major education policies in the United States over the past few decades.

The ideology of narrowing and defining education outcomes as standardized test scores, privatization and marketization of public education, and curriculum standardization as education equity has dominated major policies at the national and state levels.

The authors of this book collectively challenge the dominant ideology and policies. Christopher Lubienski and P. S. Myers question the wisdom of choice and competition in education in their chapter _The Rhetoric and Reality of School Reform: Choice, Competition, and Organizational Incentives in Market-Oriented Education_. Carol Mullen challenges the proliferation of corporate networks in public education in her chapter _Corporate Networks and Their Grip on the Public School Sector and Education Policy_.

Mariela A. Rodríguez criticizes the traditional “subtractive programs” for immigrant children with limited English proficiency in her chapter _Leading in a Socially Just Manner: Preparing Principals with a Policy Perspective_. Tom Tramaglini and Christopher H. Tienken contest the one-size-fits all curriculum for all children, especially for students in high poverty schools in their
Michael Marder protests the elimination of the requirement that all students take Algebra II in Texas. Svein Sjøberg takes the globally powerful PISA and OECD to task in his chapter OECD, PISA, and Globalization: The Influence of the International Assessment Regime. Finally, Christopher Tienken objects the use of standardized tests to drive education policy making in the last chapter of the book Standardized Test Results Can Be Predicted, So Stop Using Them to Drive Education Policymaking.

The challenges are well presented, logically argued, grounded in research literature, and backed up with good data. Intended as a challenge to conventional beliefs, this book is provocative. It provides a voice of opposition to what have been the dominant policies. As such, it is an invitation for contention and controversy. It can lead to gut-reaction dismissal or whole-hearted embrace of the ideas, arguments, and data presented in the book.

Thus to get the most out of this book requires patience, critical self-examination, and an open mind. It is perhaps best to use the book to start a community-wide discussion about the tough issues in education, to examine the evidence, to argue over the reasoning, and to debate the theories and ideologies.

This is where I find the book also falls short. For the purpose of debate and discussion, I wish the book included a commentary accompanying each chapter that counters the main arguments. But even without the counterpoints, Education Policy Perils: Tackling the Tough Issues is an excellent navigation guide of the bewildering education policy terrain.
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