

SCHOOL COUNSELORS, NDEA, AND  
SCHOOL DESEGREGATION IN ALABAMA:  
THE EVOLUTION OF A PROFESSION

by

MARY BURKE GIVENS

A DISSERTATION

Submitted in partial fulfillment of the requirements  
for the degree of Doctor of Philosophy  
in the Department of Educational Leadership,  
Policy, and Technology Studies  
in the Graduate School of  
The University of Alabama

TUSCALOOSA, ALABAMA

2009

Copyright Mary Burke Givens 2009  
ALL RIGHTS RESERVED

## ABSTRACT

After the Soviet Union launched Sputnik in 1957, Congress funded the National Defense Education Act of 1958 (NDEA) which created school counselor training institutes throughout the country in order to identify highly talented students, especially in the sciences, mathematics, and foreign languages. The National Defense Counseling and Guidance Training Institutes greatly increased the number of school counselors, especially in the Southern states, and also coincided with the desegregation of Southern schools. Along with the involvement of the federal government in funding higher education preparation, was the rise of standardized testing employed in the selection and separation of students. This project investigates the relationship between the NDEA, school counselors and whether or not the NDEA helped shaped an institutional identity of school counseling that interfered with equal educational opportunity (EEO) for African American students in public schools in the South. It is a qualitative study relying on historical documents and interviews of counselors, and counselor educators.

## DEDICATION

This dissertation is dedicated to my parents who taught me the value of lifelong learning. It is also dedicated to the hundreds of students who enriched my life and taught me real lessons about fairness and schooling over the last 42 years.

## ACKNOWLEDGMENTS

I am pleased to have the opportunity to thank so many of the people who made this project possible. I am indebted to Jerry Rosiek who set me on this path in 2001. I also appreciate the post qualitative group organized by Dr. Rosiek who gave strong support in the early years when it was certainly needed. Dr. Rosiek was my first adviser and I will never forget the care he gave to me and all of his students. It was an honor to have him continue on the dissertation committee even though he was far away.

Dr. Stephen Tomlinson supported my efforts to finish this program and gave me excellent advice along the way. While he was not physically on my committee, his presence was felt and I am eternally grateful. Dr. Jamie Satcher, my tennis partner, and a dissertation committee member, provided so much help, especially in the IRB process. I am looking forward to once again playing tennis after this project is complete.

Dr. Becky Atkinson gave me sisterly support over the years. I truly appreciate her friendship and her wisdom. Dr. Rebecca Ballard worked wonders with my dissertation and I am so glad that she is a detail-oriented person.

I cannot say enough about Dr. John Petrovic, who became the committee chairperson during a very stressful time, and pushed, pulled, nagged, and berated me into finishing the work. He is brilliant and absolutely a star of the highest order. Finally, I am so grateful for my friends, in Alabama and Florida, who span my lifetime. They have given me so much support and love and I am blessed to have them in my corner.

## CONTENTS

ABSTRACT.....	ii
DEDICATION.....	iii
ACKNOWLEDGMENTS .....	iv
LIST OF TABLES.....	xii
CHAPTER I: INTRODUCTION.....	1
Statement of the Research Problems Central to the Construction of School Counseling .....	2
Statement and Description of the Research Questions .....	4
Limitations of the Study.....	5
Importance of the Study.....	5
Methodology of the Study .....	6
Theoretical Framework.....	7
Conclusion and Summary .....	8
CHAPTER II: THE EVOLUTION OF SCHOOL GUIDANCE COUNSELING: POLITICAL, THEORETICAL, AND HISTORICAL INTERSECTIONS.....	9
Working Definitions .....	9
The Origins of School Counseling.....	10
David Snedden’s Social Efficacy Model.....	12
The First Years: Vocational Guidance Emerges in the Early 21 <sup>st</sup> Century .....	12
From Vocational Guidance to Pupil Personnel Work.....	13

The Growth of Counseling as a Profession.....	14
Influence of NDEA .....	15
Federal Programs and Equal Educational Opportunity .....	15
School Counselors as Fixers .....	16
Comprehensive Development Counseling.....	17
History of the NDEA .....	18
Title V of the NDEA: Creating the School Counselor .....	22
Training Counselors Under NDEA Title V in Order to Locate the “Able”.....	24
The Intentions of Title V Versus the Reality .....	25
A Review of School Counselor Literature Related to the NDEA .....	27
Theory Building and Professional Issues in the Shadow of Sputnik: C.H. Patterson and the Department of Education Publications.....	34
Professional Beliefs and Issues after the Passage of NDEA.....	35
Acknowledging Differences Between Teachers and Counselors. ....	36
Patterson’s Critique of NDEA Counseling and Guidance Training Institutes .....	38
The Professionalization of School Counseling, (1960-69) .....	39
A Structural Analysis of the School Counseling Profession .....	40
Further Discussions of School Counselor Professional Development .....	43
Negotiating School Counselor Realities: Roles and Functions .....	48
How Counseling and Testing Influenced School Counseling .....	48
Administrators Vis-à-vis School Counselors.....	50
Theory Building and Comprehensive Models .....	51
School Counselor Accountability, One Argument for Comprehensive Developmental Programs.....	53

The Achievement Gap and the Transformation of School Counseling .....	55
Social Justice Advocacy and Critical Assessments of School Counselor Programs. ....	56
Miscomprehending Counselor Advocacy.....	56
Critical Discussions of Counselor Advocacy and Marginalized Students.....	57
School Counselor Practice and Empowerment and Achievement Groups .....	60
The Nice Counselor, Changing the Dynamics.....	61
Power and the Politics of School Counseling .....	63
Summary and Conclusions .....	64
CHAPTER III: SCHOOL COUNSELORS AND EQUAL EDUCATIONAL OPPORTUNITY.....	66
Liberalism and Equal Educational Opportunity .....	66
Liberal Political Theory .....	67
Equal Liberty, Primary Goods, and John Rawls' Theory of Justice.....	68
The Rawlsian Connection to EEO .....	72
Distinguishing Between Liberal and Democratic Aims .....	72
Defining EEO: Inputs vs. Outcomes and Other Issues .....	74
A Brief History of Equality of Educational Opportunity.....	75
Equality of Educational Opportunity and the Court Decisions .....	77
Further Refinement of Equality of Educational Opportunity (EEO).....	81
The Liberal-Egalitarian Position, The Threshold Principle of Distribution and EEO.....	83
Compensatory or Participatory EEO .....	84
Current Communitarian Political Theory, EEO, and A Critique of Liberal-Egalitarianism.....	85



Libertarianism, EEO, and the Critique of Liberal-Egalitarianism.....	87
Utilitarianism, EEO and the Critique of Liberal-Dgalitarianism.....	88
Summary and Conclusion.....	89
How School Counselor Practices Affected Equal Educational Opportunity.....	93
Analyzing the State of School Counseling Programs.....	95
CHAPTER IV: METHODOLOGY AND RESEARCH DESIGN.....	98
Introduction.....	98
Research Questions.....	99
Theory of Knowledge.....	99
Methodology and Symbolic Interactionism.....	100
Why this Study was Suited to a Qualitative Design.....	102
Embedded Case Study Methodology.....	104
Design of the Study.....	105
Role of the Researcher.....	107
Units of Analysis.....	109
Selecting a Sample.....	109
Site Selection and Data Collection Methods.....	110
Data Collection and Analysis: Constant Comparative Methods.....	113
Applying Triangulation and Other Methods of Validity and Reliability to the Case.....	114
Internal Validity.....	114
External Validity.....	115
Reliability Issues.....	116
Analysis, Findings, and Conclusions.....	116

CHAPTER V: RESULTS AND FINDINGS.....	117
Introduction .....	117
Data Collection .....	119
Findings of Themes and Categories in the Congressional Record .....	120
Issues of Race and Nondiscrimination.....	120
President Eisenhower expressed his wishes .....	122
The Explanation of Themes .....	123
Ideological issues: States rights vs. federal intervention. Finding 1.....	124
Ideological issues: Freedom, Democracy, and EEO.....	128
Democracy and education.....	129
Ideological issues: Americanism vs. communism .....	129
Public Rhetoric of NDEA .....	130
Intentions of the NDEA legislation.....	132
Summary of the Congressional Hearings .....	134
The NDEA Counseling and Guidance Training Institute Reports.....	136
The 1959 Counseling and Guidance NDEA Training Institutes .....	136
Ideological Issues: Freedom of Choice and Democracy .....	137
Ideological Issues: EEO.....	137
Ideological Issues: States Rights vs. Federal Intervention.....	138
Public Rhetoric of NDEA .....	139
Intentions of the Institute Designers and Intentions of the Legislation .....	139
Contributions to Counselor Education.....	140
Results: Outcomes, Problems, and Recommendations.....	140

Counselor Education in Regular Session Institutes .....	143
Ideological Issues: Freedom, Democracy and EEO .....	144
Contributions to Counselor Education.....	145
Summary, Conclusions and Recommendations.....	145
School Counselor, Counselor Educator, and Clinical Counselor Interviews .....	146
The Participants .....	147
Results of the Interviews.....	151
Race, Desegregation, and EEO.....	152
Analyzing Counselor Responses to Desegregation .....	153
School Counseling and Individual Growth and Development .....	155
Individual Experiences vs. Institutional or Systemic Racism.....	156
Perceptions of EEO.....	156
The Mechanics of Desegregation and EEO.....	158
Expectations and Desegregation .....	161
EEO, Liberal-Egalitarian Politics, and Democratic Values.....	162
Liberal Conceptualizations of Progress .....	163
Intentions of NDEA .....	165
Effect of the Institutes in School Counseling .....	168
Public Rhetoric of NDEA .....	169
Public Perception and Institutional Expectations .....	170
Results of the Legislation .....	172
Impact of Testing in School Counseling.....	172
NDEA Legislation Created School Counseling.....	173

Findings .....	173
Summary .....	174
CHAPTER VI: Summary, Discussion, and Recommendations .....	176
Introduction and Purpose .....	176
Literature Review.....	177
Methodology .....	177
Conclusions .....	178
Conclusion One.....	178
Conclusion 2 .....	180
Conclusion 3 .....	183
Discussion .....	188
Summary and Recommendations .....	193
REFERENCES .....	195
APPENDICES .....	206

## LIST OF TABLES

1. Description of Findings.....	174
---------------------------------	-----

CHAPTER I:  
INTRODUCTION

The social and political atmosphere of the 1950s is often portrayed as a period of peace and prosperity after the upheavals of the Great Depression in the 1930s and World War II in the 1940s. The Cold War, the paranoid pursuit of communists at home, the Korean War, the continued segregation of African American citizens by both *de jure* Jim Crow laws in the South and informal *de facto* restrictions in the rest of the nation, have faded in the public memory. Large numbers of White Americans joined the middle class in the years after World War II. This was not the case for African American citizens, many of whom continued to suffer serious deficits of equal opportunity in all areas of American life.

But change was imminent. The armed forces were desegregated during Harry Truman's administration, and little by little the Howard Law School graduates who worked for the National Association for the Advancement of Colored People (NAACP) defense fund effected change in the educational status of African American graduate and professional students (Kluger, 1977). Additionally, the specter of genocide in Hitler's regime weighed heavily on the consciences of many, and, in some eyes, Jim Crow segregation in the Southern states represented a practice reflective of Nazism (Kluger, 1977).

Almost unnoticed by the general public, Eisenhower appointed Earl Warren, the affable Republican governor of California to be the Chief Justice of the Supreme Court after Chief Justice Vinson's death. Along with the four New Deal justices, including Hugo Black of Alabama, the Warren Court decided unanimously for the plaintiffs in *Brown v. Board of*

*Education of Topeka, Kansas* in 1954 rejecting *Plessy vs. Ferguson (1896)* and the proposition that separate education could be equal education for African American students. This decision released a firestorm among Whites in the Southern states while giving hope to the infant civil rights movement (Kluger, 1977).

Every inhabitant of the Southern states was affected by *Brown*. It immediately toughened Southern resolve to the extent that efforts by Southern legislators to achieve modest accommodations in the areas of social services or education were met with vigorous opposition because of fear that civil rights legislation would be an unacceptable rider on the bills (Clowse, 1981). This atmosphere played itself against Cold War fears of Communist aggression and dominance. While the march to desegregation slowly moved forward, federal assistance to education in the shadow of *Sputnik* allowed for the introduction of school guidance counselors and the growth of standardized testing determining academic merit. *Sputnik* was launched by the Soviets in the fall of 1957. The campaign for the National Defense of Education Act (NDEA) began shortly thereafter and the debate and passage of the bill occurred during the 85th Congress in 1958.

### Statement of the Research Problems

#### Central to the Construction of School Counseling

Title V of the *National Defense Educational Act of 1958* is recognized as the catalyst for the growth and development of school counseling in the United States (Baker, 2001; Herr, 2001; Lambie & Williamson, 2004; Myrick, 1994; Sink, 2005).

All of these historical factors evolved in the same time period, between the end of World War II and Lyndon Johnson's War on Poverty in the mid to late sixties. Four conditions forged a specific construction of school counseling identity and purpose within the Southern

states in the late fifties and early sixties: 1) security concerns among the citizenry after *Sputnik's* launch, which led to the passage of the National Defense for Education Act (NDEA) in 1958; 2) the ascendancy of an educational meritocracy fueled by a devotion to standardized testing; 3) the interplay of political reality in the South and the need for federal aid to education juxtaposed to the furor over desegregation; and 4) the identification of groups of students as educationally disadvantaged or culturally deficient due to race as exemplified in James Conant's *Slums and Suburbs* (1961) and the Moynihan Report (1965) (Tozer, Violas, & Senese, 2002). The effect of these reports was to imply that the problems were within the students, not the system.

The national conversation after the launch of *Sputnik* rebuffed what was described derisively by conservative critics as the progressive education of John Dewey (Clowse, 1981). As Clowse (1981) argued, "in speeches and writings the critics claimed that flabby curricula and shirking of basic subjects were robbing America of competent citizens and, some asserted, of a valuable resource: trained manpower" (p. 14). Vice Admiral Hyman Rickover was one of the main critics who believed the United States should embrace the Soviet educational system and predicted disaster in the Cold War if it did not (Clowse, 1981). Concerns with testing, student placement, tracking, career emphasis versus academic emphasis, and the best way for students to learn are still argued within the academy and the general population to the present day.

Many school counselors were trained through the NDEA Title V Counseling and Guidance Training Institutes. The stated goal of the legislation was to identify academically-talented students, particularly in the sciences. The legislation was influenced by the common conception that academic aptitude could best be measured by standardized tests and that education should reflect the needs of the country, not necessarily the needs of the individual. School counselors and counseling programs were encouraged first to focus on students with



academic potential. One could actually frame counselor training and practice as a patriotic imperative to identify the best and brightest students. The research problems are concerned with how and in what ways NDEA counselor training may have determined school counselor practice to the present day. Also, did the influence of the NDEA detract from equality of educational opportunity for African American students during and after school desegregation in Alabama?

#### Statement and Description of the Research Questions

The research questions were as follows:

1. What were the expressed intentions of the NDEA legislation and what were its institutional effects on school counseling and
2. What were the contradictions within public rhetoric surrounding NDEA legislation in relationship to school counselor practice and Equality of Educational Opportunity?

It was not the purpose of this project to prove a quid pro quo connection between NDEA and resistance to desegregation. It is doubtful that anyone involved in the NDEA thought of it as a means to separate students for purposes of segregation. However, it became a method of internal segregation through tracking, testing, and gate keeping practices of school counselors and it reflects the fascination with the quantification of human ability which grew out of the measurement movement in the early years of the twentieth century.

The questions simply form the topical framework for the project, the development of the profession of school counseling, derived, in large part from the NDEA and the evolution of theories of equality of educational opportunity (EEO) during the era of racial desegregation in the Southern states.

## Limitations of the Study

Narrowing the topic to the relationship of the NDEA Title V Counselor Institutes to school counselor practice in Alabama was decidedly regional, but it was also a way of looking at the equal educational opportunity (EEO) of African American students during and after the desegregation process. At the outset, the focus of this study was the relationship between NDEA Title V institutes, school counselor practice, and EEO in Alabama.

The study, conducted in Alabama, relied solely on the experiences of school counselors and counselor educators within a state in the deep South. Other regions of the country can reject assertions based on Southern experiences. One reason is that the South is the only area of the United States that practiced *de jure* or legislated segregation. While other regions of the country engaged in *de facto* segregation which included internal segregation or tracking, and segregation through neighborhood schools. There has been a perception that the South stood alone in segregating African American students. While this is not the case in practice, the burden of that distinction lies within the South. Southern schools are currently among the most integrated schools in the country due to the history of court-ordered mandates (Orfield, 2001). With the demise of court-ordered desegregation in Alabama schools brought about by the decisions of a conservative Supreme Court, it has been recognized that re-segregation efforts have increased within Alabama school districts so that they may soon resemble schools in the rest of the country (Orfield, 2001; Orfield, & Lee, 2006).

## Importance of the Study

The literature of school counseling addresses issues of counselor roles and tasks; the tension between training and practice; and the tendency for school counseling programs to be defined by societal and administrative concerns (Burnham & Jackson, 2000; Myrick, 1987).

This study looked at connections that have not been analyzed or addressed in school counselor literature, particularly how NDEA shaped counseling practice to extend to schools and school counselors who did not attend the institutes. Additionally, the project aggressively critiqued school counselor praxis to unwrap habitudes or customs which purported to encourage equal educational opportunity among African American students, but may actually limit them.

### Methodology for the Study

The chosen methodology for the project was the single case study, as described by Robert Yin (1994). A case study can look at a single public program with multiple units of analysis. The case study followed the general outline offered by Yin, utilizing multiple sources of data to include documents, archival records, oral histories, and interviews (Merriam, 1988; Creswell, 1998). The process of triangulation is a rationale for using multiple sources of information and relies on fact checking of data and events to confirm findings (Merriam, 1988; Stake, 1995; Yin, 1994). In this project, the bounded case (Stake, 1995) is school counseling as derived in part from NDEA programs in the State of Alabama between 1958 and the present to include the period of active desegregation of Alabama secondary schools. The design of this case study was the historical case study (Merriam, 1988; Hancock & Algozzine, 2006).

Data gathering followed two approaches. The first approach was historical in nature and included coding the records of congressional hearings and documents published by the Department of Health, Education, and Welfare reporting on the NDEA Counselor programs. The second phase of data collection included conducting interviews with counselors and counselor educators in Alabama. The research process consisted of individual interviews with five school counselors and counselor educators. Data analysis utilized the constant comparative method in which “units of data deemed meaningful by the researcher are compared with each

other in order to generate tentative categories and properties” (Merriam, 2002, p. 143).

### Theoretical Framework

The theoretical framework for the topic was the concept of equality of educational opportunity (EEO) as conceptualized by James Coleman (1968; 1975), Nicholas Burbules and Ann Sherman (1979), Kenneth Howe (1997), and others. Equal educational opportunity is a derivative of liberal thought and formed the basis for much of the analysis surrounding the court cases as well as the legislation concerning the desegregation of schools in the Southern states. The research project was concerned with a working definition of equality of educational opportunity and analysis of equal educational opportunity as it applied to school counselor practice and the education of African American students in Alabama.

The theory of knowledge linked to methodology derived from the phenomenological perspective represented by Herbert Blumer in *Symbolic Interactionism: Perspective and Method*, first published in 1969 and Clifford Geertz’s *The Interpretation of Cultures* originally published in 1973. Geertz described “thick description” (1973) as uncovering “conceptual structures that inform our subjects’ acts, the ‘said’ of social discourse, and to construct a system of analysis in whose terms what is generic to those structures...will stand out against the other determinants of human behavior” (p. 27). The analysis of archival products and congressional hearings was linked to interviews of counselors and counselor educators through the knowledge that all are products of human interaction and open to analysis.

Symbolic interactionism, on the other hand, is a “down-to-earth approach to the scientific study of human group life and human conduct” (Blumer, 1986, p. 47). Symbolic interactionism employs direct observation of the studied phenomenon and is especially suited to the case study methodology of using public documents, interviews, oral histories and other sources to create a

picture of the phenomenon. Blumer (1986) supported the “ability to place oneself in the position of the individual or collectivity” (p. 51). This aspect of participant observation, developed as a school counselor, was an important part of the study of the NDEA and its effect on school counseling and counselor education.

### Conclusion and Summary

School counseling emerged from a Progressive Era interest in vocational guidance to become a recognized educational profession in the early 1960s. Its development and growth into a profession separate from that of teaching was supplemented and supported by Title V of the National Defense Education Act of 1958 which set aside funds for the graduate education of school guidance counselors. The position grew rapidly from that point.

The proceeding chapter addressed the history of school counseling and its several identities from the early part of the 20<sup>th</sup> century to the present. Additional attention was paid to the NDEA and its influence. The chapter then surveyed the literature in the field related to an analysis by various counseling professionals of characteristics, roles, and tasks expected of school counselors.

The final section of Chapter II will place equal educational opportunity, in a theoretical framework drawn from the literature about the topic. Chapter III will discuss school counseling and equal educational opportunity. Chapter IV will describe the theory of knowledge related to the methodology of the research project, that of symbolic interactionism. It will also discuss research methodology and the rationale for the research. Chapter V presents data from interviews and the analysis of the written material produced by congressional debate, and evaluations and reviews of the NDEA Guidance and Counseling Training Institutes. Chapter VI draws conclusions and recommendations from the preceding work.

CHAPTER II:  
THE EVOLUTION OF SCHOOL GUIDANCE COUNSELING:  
POLITICAL, THEORETICAL, AND HISTORICAL INTERSECTIONS

Working Definitions

The history of school counseling does not lend itself to an easy understanding of the terms used to identify it. In the early years of the twentieth century the term *vocational guidance* was used to characterize the services employment bureaus and secondary schools provided for clients. A single teacher (with no additional training or pay) was often appointed to be the “vocational counselor” (Sink, 2005). In other schools, vocational guidance activities were provided in the classroom by teachers as part of a program. The emphasis was solely on vocational choice. In both cases a list of duties was provided to the educator. Thus, the early years of the profession could be characterized as *task oriented* (Sink, 2005). There were no provisions for vocational guidance personnel to be treated as professionally separate from teachers.

By the latter teens and 1920s vocational guidance had shifted in the schools to *educational guidance*. It reflected less attention to the needs of industry or the social implications of immigrants and more emphasis on the child study movement, the growth of psychology, progressive education, and the emergence of individual measurement in society and education (Gysbers, 2001).

In the 1930s the concept of *pupil personnel work* took hold (Gysbers, 2001; Sink, 2005). G.E. Myers (1935) described pupil personnel workers as including school nurses, school doctors, attendance officers, and vocational counselors. During the 1950s and 1960s, *pupil personnel services* became the term of choice and *school counselors* or *school guidance counselors* became the fulltime providers of services. Christopher Sink (2005) listed six services to fall within the job definition of school counselor in the 1950s and 1960s. These were “orientation, assessment, information, counseling, placement, and follow-up” (p. 153). The *position* of counselor within this framework was emphasized, not guidance or counseling as a separate *program* (Sink, 2005). This period coincided with the passage of the National Defense Education Act of 1958 in which Title V Part A supported state standardized testing programs to ascertain academic aptitude and achievement of students and Part B provided for graduate institutes to prepare school guidance counselors. It was at this time that the profession truly began to be defined as separate from teaching, and the school guidance counselor became a common position in k-12 schools.

From the 1970s to the present day the position of school counselor has evolved to be considered a *program of guidance* (Sink, 2005). The term used to describe the counselor is *school counselor* or *professional school counselor* although *guidance counselor* is also used. Often, programs are developed as a curriculum and sanctioned by the state. Alabama’s program, for instance, is called the *Comprehensive Counseling and Guidance State Model for Alabama Public Schools* (SDE, Bulletin 89) and is commonly called the State Plan.

### The Origins of School Counseling

In a general sense, the birth of school counseling was a result of the development of two distinct lines of scientific thinking in the early years of the twentieth century. On one side, John Dewey led a group of child-centered theorists who were interested in developmental learning

theories (Lambie & Williamson, 2004). Learning involved the acquisition of skills which would lead the learner to the knowledge needed to solve problems.

On the other side, E.L. Thorndike and other behaviorists approached learning with an emphasis on behavioral methods and standardized testing to identify aptitude. Thorndike provided the foundation for education with the idea that “learning consists of the formation of links between specific stimuli and responses through the application of rewards” (Doolittle & Camp, 1999, p 3). These theoretical orientations were brought to bear on the early history of school guidance counseling through the Progressive Era interest in immigrant learners, the settlement house tradition, and the application of scientific methodology in vocational counseling and testing.

The first book which addressed the role of vocational guidance was published posthumously in 1909. *Choosing a Vocation* (1909) by Frank Parsons laid out procedures to assist young men and women in securing a job that was commensurate with their interests and abilities. Parsons advised against simply hunting a job. Vocations should be chosen after a thorough, honest, self-searching process, a process pursued with scientific efficiency. In fact, a reference to “efficiency” appears four times in the first page. Parsons recommended a vocational counselor to guide young men and women through a thorough search of the positives and negatives of a vocation. Parsons, known as the “father of guidance” (Baker, 2000; Herr, 2001; Lambie & Williamson, 2004; Myrick, 1987; Sink, 2005), was retrospectively the first practitioner of vocational counseling. *Choosing a Vocation* (Parsons) would not be out of place in a career counseling center today with its emphasis on self study, aptitudes, and interests. His admonition to “learn what you are best adapted to do, and get started in that line” (Parsons, p. 14) was a succinct explanation of his interpretation of vocational guidance.



## David Snedden's Social Efficiency Model

In 1983, Arthur G. Wirth described the social efficiency theory of David Snedden as structuring education “to aid the economy to function as efficiently as possible” (pp. 73-74). Schools would be enabled by vocational guidance to sort students according to ability, thus enabling a match of capacity with jobs. Snedden's and Prosser's framework for social efficiency in career and technical education consisted of six theories which embraced a heavy emphasis on testing and evaluation; a sequential behavioral approach to learning vocational skills; as well as the conceptualization of social class as static (Camp, 1983). Snedden and Prosser sought to streamline and make efficient vocational education, preparing students for specific jobs (Wirth, 1980) .

### The First Years: Vocational Guidance Emerges in the Early 20<sup>th</sup> Century

Other early figures in the vocational guidance movement are associated closely with the growth of guidance activities in the schools. Guidance activities were identified as “providing occupational information, vocational assessment, and job placement” (Myrick, 1987, p. 8). Jessie B. Davis, a principal in Michigan, was one of the co-founders of the National Vocational Guidance Association (Myrick, 1987). He also introduced vocational guidance programs in the schools of Grand Rapids, while Eli Weaver introduced vocational guidance in the public schools in New York (Myrick, 1987).

Myrick (1987) outlined several additional influences during the early part of the twentieth century which critically affected the movement of the guidance concept into the schools. A growing fascination with how learning occurred resulted in theories which focused on the person (or child) and the influence of the environment. Behaviorists, such as J.B. Watson, Thorndike, and others, developed learning and social behavior theories. G. Stanley Hall, noted for child

study theories, supported the idea that each child is unique and must be observed carefully to meet its individual needs. By the 1920s, Sigmund Freud, Alfred Adler, and Karl Jung were instrumental in the growth of psychology, talking therapy, and the concept that childhood experiences determine adult behavior.

Finally, Myrick argued that the greatest impact on the growing guidance movement was the development of measurement instruments which purported to determine intellectual ability, career aptitudes, and psychological traits. During World War I, armed forces recruits were evaluated by standardized testing procedures to measure intellectual ability and aptitude for specific jobs. The testing movement soon extended to schools and became identified as a guidance activity.

#### From Vocational Guidance to Pupil Personnel Work

The 1930s brought the introduction of vocational counseling as a product of pupil personnel work. Pupil personnel work operated as a service construct and vocational counseling was viewed as just one service offered in the schools (Sink, 2005). During the 1930s some states appointed state guidance directors to oversee standardized testing (Myrick, 1987). In the 1940s, World War II signaled the expansion of testing to include intellectual, achievement, career aptitude, and personality trait assessment at numbers greatly exceeding the testing project in World War I (Myrick, 1987; Schmidt, 2008). Similar to the aftermath of World War I, testing grew considerably in the schools. John J. Schmidt (2008) acknowledged not only the influence of World War II in the growth of standardized testing, but also the influence of WW II in creating opportunities for mental health services in government and business.

## The Growth of Counseling as a Profession

The first theory of counseling used in schools was a direct byproduct of behavioral theories that emerged in the latter part of the nineteenth century and beginning of the twentieth. In the 1930s, E.G. Williamson at The University of Minnesota introduced trait and factor theory derived from Parson's approach (Schmidt, 2008). The approach was the beginning of "directive or counselor-centered theory" (Schmidt, 2008, p. 9). Counselors were expected to gather data and dispense information to their students. By gathering data, standardized testing was used to identify traits and match the traits to job categories. Even though Williamson modified his view of counselor intervention in later years, he continued to emphasize that the counselor was expected to protect the expectations and interests of society (Schmidt, 2008).

Soon after WWII, Carl Rogers introduced his first book on counseling theory which focused on the relationship between counselor and client and privileged the growth of the individual (Schmidt, 2008). The emphasis on self-direction moved the process away from the counselor centered approaches of problem solving and information dispensing guidance, as well as the analytical influence of Freudian psychology (Schmidt, 2008).

In the early 1950s Rogers produced two books which became the basis for client-centered therapy and emerged as the common focus of counselor education programs (Schmidt, 2008). He emphasized the nature of the counselor-client relationship. The theory was clear and deceptively easy to learn. It corresponded to the theme of personal freedom to choose. The decision making process was left to the client. Throughout the 1960s and 1970s, many school counselor training programs limited their approach to Roger's client-centered theory (Myrick, 1987).

### *Influence of NDEA*

In a brief history of school guidance counseling before and after NDEA, Myrick (1987) acknowledged the NDEA Guidance and Counselor Training Institutes as truly the beginning of the growth of school counseling in all parts of the nation. He described the bill as “perhaps the single most important event in the history of the school counseling profession” (Myrick, p. 9). It gave credit to the value of a school counseling professional in high schools and it also provided funding. What it did not do, however, was assure a consistent standard for school guidance counselors. Some counselors were trained in institutes that only required that four or five courses be taken during summer sessions. The courses were theories of counseling, tests and measurements, career or occupational counseling, and a foundations course in guidance programs (Myrick, 1987). Many of the summer institutes had no provision for practicum or internship experience. Counselors were hired with minimal requirements and limited notions of what a counseling program should be. With reduced preparation and skills, the counselors often became “quasi-administrators” whose duties were confined to whatever the administration expected. That included “schedule changers, test coordinators, record keepers, and administrative assistants” (Myrick, 1987, p. 10). Others substituted for teachers, administered discipline or functioned as clerks. Initially, school counselors in many states, including Alabama, and Florida, were required to have several years of teaching experience and hold certification in a teaching field. Despite these conditions, the field emerged as a profession with the formation of the American School Counselor Association in 1958, the same year the NDEA was passed.

### *Federal Programs and Equal Educational Opportunity*

During President Johnson’s War on Poverty federal dollars became the means by which school districts in the South were desegregated while remedial programs were introduced to

address the needs of children born in poverty (Tozer, Violas, & Senese, 2002). Portions of the *Civil Rights Act of 1964* and the *Elementary and Secondary Education Act of 1965* specifically addressed the desegregation issue, withholding funds from school districts that did not follow federal guidelines for desegregation and also empowering the justice department to intervene or initiate desegregation law suits (Brown, 2002; Crespino, 2002). Ten years later, the same attention was addressed to children with disabilities in the *All Handicapped Children Act of 1975* (Lambie & Williamson, 2004). All of these initiatives had an influence on the growth of school counseling programs and the focus of those programs. Left to further discussion is the shift in NDEA training from selecting the academically talented to the responsibility of school counselors to address the academic and personal needs of all students.

#### *School Counselors as Fixers*

Myrick (1987) offered a description of school counselor expectations often imposed by the school—The identity of a *fixer* put the school counselor in the untenable and impossible position of being the person responsible for the success or failure of students.

From the beginning, when counselors were first employed, they have been in the ‘fix-it-up’ business. If students were squabbling over something, a counselor was supposed to ‘patch things up.’ If students had poor attitudes about school, a counselor was to ‘set them straight’....It was as though the counselor had some magic solution or inspiring speech which, when administered to disruptive students, would make them more cooperative. (p. 12)

By the end of the 1970s, the position of school counseling had grown to the point that virtually every school system in the country employed school counselors from elementary school through high school. School counselor positions were still determined, for the most part, by the perceived needs of the district or the school administrators. Counselors were generally seen as testing experts, registrars, schedulers, and *fixer*. Individual and small group counseling was recommended and counseling methodology had expanded to include cognitive theories, such as

Albert Ellis's Rational Emotive Therapy and William Glasser's Reality Therapy. With the admission of severely-disabled students to public education, behavioral management theories were also employed (Myrick, 1987).

### *Comprehensive Development Counseling*

The developmental approach won favor with the American School Counselor's Association (ASCA), state departments of education, including Alabama, and counselor education programs in higher education. The developmental approach

is an attempt to identify certain skills and experiences that students need to have as part of their going to school and being successful. Learning behaviors and tasks are identified and clarified for students. Then, a guidance curriculum is planned which complements the academic curriculum. (Myrick, 1987, p. 15)

The developmental model incorporated classroom guidance activities as an important part of the program. It was also a program with accountability, requiring a guidance plan for the school setting, which follows and is led by the state plan.

Planning is a huge aspect of a developmental program, as is identifying the skills needed at specific developmental levels. Developmental counseling programs are scientific, that is, they are measurable. Developmental counseling, according to Myrick (1987), designates roles for the administration, the school counselors, the teachers, the career counselors, the school psychologist, the school social worker, and other administrators and support staff.

A developmental program is determined by members of the profession. This is a major and recent shift in who decides the focus of the school counseling program. Previously school counselors answered to school district requirements or administrative requirements and had little input into job descriptions. Additionally there was no comprehensive agreement from district to district or state to state on what comprised an exemplary program. Encouraged by the theoretical work conducted by Norm Gysbers, Robert Myrick and others, ASCA provided national

standards for comprehensive developmental school counseling programs in 1997, and later produced the ASCA National Model for comprehensive programs (Herr, 2001; 2002).

Comprehensive developmental programs for school counselors represent the evolution of a profession from task orientation to service models to program standards. Just as the first efforts at vocational guidance were responses to progressive era concerns with preparing an efficient, well-trained work force, educational reform in the United States was most often linked with some kind of crisis: immigration, war, illiteracy, the trek westward, and in the case of NDEA, security concerns fueled by the Cold War (Herr, 2002).

#### History of the NDEA

NDEA was reportedly the result of the national panic created by the Soviet Union's launch of an unmanned satellite named *Sputnik* in 1957 (Herr, 2001; Lambie & Williamson, 2004; Sink, 2005). It is commonly considered that *Sputnik* caused the NDEA. But Barbara Clowse (1981) in *Brainpower for the Cold War: The Sputnik Crisis and National Defense Education Act of 1958* repudiated this common assumption. All portions of the NDEA bill were proposed separately prior to the second session of the 85<sup>th</sup> Congress in 1958. *Sputnik*, and its effect on the perceptions of the American public, gave Congress the opportunity to pass a federal aid to education bill. The opportunity to craft federal assistance to education in the states was particularly important to the men who introduced the bill in the Senate and the House, Senator Lister Hill and Congressman Carl Elliott of Alabama. The NDEA was the first major foray into federal funding for higher education after the G.I. Bill.

Dwight Eisenhower's election to the presidency coincided with the entrance of large numbers of baby boom children to the nation's school systems. Local and state districts were in desperate need of classrooms and began to request federal aid for school construction (Nelson &

Weinbaum, 2006). For Eisenhower, there were three major concerns. First, there was the fear that federal aid would mean federal control of schools. Second, there was the fear that federal aid would also go to parochial and private schools. Finally, there was the specific fear among southern legislators, after *Brown v. Board (1954)*, that federal meddling and offers of funds for local and state construction and teachers, would lead to strings—the desegregation of the schools as payment for federal assistance and federal intrusion into the long held belief that education should be decided by local and state governments, not the federal government (Nelson & Weinbaum, 2006). Among Northern congressmen, there was a demand that federal educational funding be tied to desegregation. Every time a funding bill was introduced in the House, Congressman Adam Clayton Powell of New York would attach a rider that called for desegregation as a prerequisite for funding (Clowse, 1981; Ritchie, 1983). The legislation would be defeated by the Southern Democrats who controlled a number of key committee chairmanships and votes.

Then, two things happened. First, Eisenhower, after *Brown II (1955)*, and the “with all deliberate speed dictum,” adopted the posture of gradualism when it came to desegregation of Southern schools (Nelson & Weinbaum 2006). Second, in 1957, *Sputnik* was launched. The rationale for federal aid became security, and Senator Lister Hill of Alabama was able to introduce a bill in the Senate forming the NDEA, while Alabama congressman Carl Elliott introduced the NDEA bill in the House (Ritchie, 1983). The NDEA did not address classrooms but it did address the preparation of teachers and school counselors. It also offered funds for equipment and technology.

The NDEA occurred within a few years of Emmett Till’s brutal murder in Mississippi, three years after the Montgomery bus boycott and two years after Arthurine Lucy’s attempted



admission to The University of Alabama. In the South, any pretensions of good will in terms of race had disintegrated with the *Brown I* decision in 1954 and the federal involvement in Little Rock in 1957. The senator who introduced the bill, Lister Hill, was a New Deal liberal in a state whose power structure opposed President Roosevelt at every turn<sup>1</sup>, but whose common people appreciated government attention and investment in jobs, health care, and social security (Hamilton, 1985). A majority of the White population of Alabama took a sense of entitlement from their whiteness and expected their leadership to uphold the separation of the races.

Stewart McClure, the chief clerk of the Senate Committee on Labor, Education, and Public Welfare at the time of the NDEA (Ritchie, 1983), was interviewed concerning the history and development of the act. He recalled that the principal concern in the mid-1950s was federal assistance with school construction and recruitment and pay of teachers. As previously mentioned, the baby boomers had started school and there was great need for new facilities and teachers. In an oral history interview, McClure described the atmosphere of the House in the mid-fifties:

As I said earlier . . . the three “Rs” according to the Chamber of Commerce were not reading, ‘riting, and ‘rithmetic; they were Reds, race, and religion. They marched these issues forward at any time whenever whichever one seemed appropriate. And in the House it was terribly effective. You had the famous Powell amendment, for example. He wasn’t working for the Chamber of Commerce, of course, but somebody would provoke him into offering an ant-discrimination amendment and the whole thing would just die, particularly since he was the chairman of the committee at one point. So you just went in this terribly stupid circle, around and around, everybody would get up and yell about the need for more schools and better teachers’ salaries, yes, yes, yes, yes, yes, but don’t forget the Reds, and the Catholics want special treatment, and all those African Americans that might be treated equally. In that kind a miasma of propaganda you couldn’t get anywhere. (Ritchie, 1983, p. 110)

---

<sup>1</sup> The power brokers who controlled major economic entities, from large scale plantations to steel and textiles, were named “the Big Mules” by Governor Bibb Graves early in the 20<sup>th</sup> century. They “lived off the labor of ‘little mules’ who did the heavy lifting (Anniston Star, 2006).

McClure recognized the impact of *Sputnik* on the national consciousness as an opportunity to support education outside of the above concerns with “Reds, religion, and race” (Ritchie, 1983, p. 110). Senator Hill followed his thinking and was determined to introduce the bill in the Senate. Fortuitously, Carl Elliott, another Alabamian, was the chair of the Subcommittee on Education in the House, and the bill was actually drafted in a meeting in Montgomery, Alabama (Ritchie, 1983). While Senator Hill introduced and supported the NDEA, he was particularly sensitive to the overwhelming opposition to federal intervention in his home state. He signed the Southern Manifesto which rejected *Brown*, and he served as the team captain in filibusters against the *Civil Rights Act* (Hamilton, 1985).

The reaction in Alabama after *Brown v. Board of Education* (1954) and the Central High School debacle in Little Rock, as well as the growth of civil rights activism, led Alabamians to turn away from populist and moderate governors like Jim Folsom and Gordon Persons to the rabid racial politics of John Patterson and George Wallace. Newly-minted, middle class Alabamians who had benefited the most by Lister Hill’s and other’s efforts with the Tennessee Valley Authority, health care, and a litany of New Deal programs were the most virulent in condemning the men who made their newfound prosperity possible (Hamilton, 1985). In 1964, Carl Elliott was defeated for Congress in a gerrymandering ploy by the Wallace controlled Alabama legislature. In 1968 Lister Hill retired from the U.S. Senate because he knew he would be defeated in Alabama.

Lister Hill and Carl Elliott walked a fine line in the Congress, as well as in Alabama. Both houses of Congress were dominated by Southern congressmen whose sole purpose, it seemed, was to halt federal interference in any matter that could lead to desegregation in southern schools, as well as other areas of Jim Crow apartheid (Ritchie, 2003). On a national

level, no one, including John F. Kennedy, wanted to confront the southern power brokers in the Congress (Kotlowski, 2005).

*Title V of the NDEA: Creating the School Counselor*

The NDEA was signed into law by President Dwight D. Eisenhower in September of 1958 as P.L. 85-864. It contained four title programs that impacted education in the United States. They were 1) Title II, which provided student loans for higher education; 2) Title III, which provided funds to improve instruction in science, mathematics, and modern foreign languages; 3) Title IV, offered national defense teaching fellowships for graduate students in a number of areas; and 4) Title V, which provided funds for guidance, counseling, and testing to support the “identification and encouragement of able students” (Flattau, Bracken, Atta, Bandeh-Ahmadi, de la Cruz, Sullivan, 2006, p. I-3). The NDEA provided funds and a sense of direction for school guidance programs (Myrick, 1987). Additionally, the establishment of Educational Testing Services (ETS) and the subsequent passage of NDEA gave the newly-hired guidance counselors a common mission, that of identifying and separating students of high academic aptitude for the patriotic good of the country (Clowse, 1981; Lemann, 1999; Tyler, 1961).

NDEA was the first comprehensive legislation passed by Congress to underwrite federal funding for higher education. In the early 1950s the National Science Foundation (NSF) and the National Institutes of Health (NIH) had funded training grants, fellowships and teacher training institutes to a very limited degree, but nothing had approached the scope of the NDEA (Flatteau et al., 2006).

The school counseling profession grew rapidly with monies made available for counselor positions and training (Myrick, 1987). According to Tyler (1961), there were only 11,000 school guidance counselors in the United States during the period immediately prior to the NDEA. In

the most recent information from the National Center for Educational Statistics (Fall, 2005), there were 103,268 school counselors in the United States and 1,814 school counselors in Alabama.

Ralph Bedell, the Director of the NDEA Title V, part B, Counseling and Guidance Training Institutes, reported in a 1988 interview that one of his first acts after his appointment was to query the U.S. Office of Education as to the number of full-time graduate students in school counselor programs. The office replied that it did not keep statistics on groups of fewer than 300 students. In 1967, as a result of the NDEA Guidance and Counselor Institutes, there were 10,000 master's-level school counselors trained by NDEA Institutes (Bourne, 1988).

During the hearing in the House after the passage of NDEA in 1959, the greatest emphasis was placed on the issues of student loans and the allocation of funds to institutions of higher learning under Title II. In the testimony concerning Title V, part A, assurances were made of interest by the states in a testing program. Afterward, Robert Bedell, the director of Title V, part B, the Guidance and Counseling Institutes, testified to the interest and commitment of the states and institutions of higher education and set the initial number of summer training institutes in counseling and guidance as around 45 (NDEA of 1958, 1959). The University of Alabama was in the first group of summer institutes. A major focus of the committee hearing surrounded the need for more funding. Supplemental funding was also requested and granted for Title V, parts A and B (NDEA, 1958, 1959).

Prior to the passage of the NDEA, few school systems in the United States had shown an interest in the specific provisions within the legislation. The states were more interested in school construction and teacher salaries (Clowse, 1981; Nelson & Weinbaum, 2006). Those issues aside, there was little hesitance when the NDEA allowed school systems access to scientific

equipment, audio visual machinery, and other technology to assist instruction, particularly with the aim of aiding the nations' defense (Nelson & Weinbaum). The addition of school guidance counselors, counseling and guidance training institutes, and testing programs was also met enthusiastically according to the testimony in the house (NDEA, 1958, 1959).

*Training Counselors under NDEA Title V in Order to Locate the "Able"*

It is commonly assumed among school counselors and others (Clowse, 1981; Gysbers, 2001; Myrick, 1987; Nelson & Weinbaum, 2006) that the wording of the NDEA was specifically designed to identify and educate academically talented students, particularly in the areas of science and mathematics. Ralph Bedell, director of the National Defense Guidance and Counseling Institutes Program, took issue with the assumption in an interview in 1988. He explained that Congress specifically cited "able students" in its introduction to the Law, but Congress did not mean to identify only the highly intelligent (Bourne, 1988). Bedell believed that the term was political, not psychological, and Congress had meant those who were capable of doing a job. In the wisdom of hindsight, Bourne also claimed that many of his counseling colleagues had misinterpreted the focus of the NDEA. First, the judgment of who was able was left to local programs. Bedell stated, "It was not a judgment based on past academic achievement, of what people had accomplished, but a judgment based on what they were capable of" (Bourne, 1988, p. 138).

While Bedell's interpretation is interesting for a number of reasons (a discussion I will raise in the analysis section), the wording of the law was quite clear. The introduction to the NDEA (NDEA, U.S. Statutes at Large, 1958, p. 1581) states in Section 101: "The security of the Nation requires the fullest development of the mental resources and technical skills of its young men and women . . . We must increase our efforts to identify and educate more of the talent of

our Nation.” Under Title V, Section 503, the following call was issued to the states:

- (1) a program for testing students in the public secondary schools . . . to identify students with outstanding aptitudes and ability, and the means of testing which will be utilized in carrying out such program; and
- (2) a program of guidance and counseling in the public secondary schools of such State (A) to advise students of courses of study best suited to their ability, aptitudes, and skills, and (B) to encourage students with outstanding aptitudes and ability to complete their secondary school education, take the necessary courses for admission to institutions of higher education, and enter such institutions. (NDEA, 1958, p. 1592)

It seems clear that the NDEA did target academically talented, students of both high achievement and high aptitude for rigorous academic studies. Testing was also a major criterion in identifying academically talented students. The inclusion of the principle that “the States and local communities have and must retain control over and primary responsibility for public education” (NDEA, 1958, p. 1581) did not preclude a general agreement of just what “outstanding aptitudes and abilities” meant (p. 1581). The states who requested funds from Title V (NDEA, 1958) had to create state plans for testing and propose counseling and guidance programs. The cost was paid in full the first year, afterward states were required to match funds.

The Counseling and Guidance Training Institutes were divided between short- term, summer-based programs and regular-session institutes. The short-term institutes were initially funded to quickly increase the number of counselors in schools (Flatau et al., 2006). After 1961, the focus was on improving the quality of school counselor training. The summer institutes were used for professional development of school counselors who had completed some graduate work. The semester and full-time programs then began training full-time educational professionals who had no previous training in guidance and counseling (Flatau et al., 2006).

#### *The Intentions of Title V versus the Reality*

Programs and funding for NDEA, Title V, began in 1959 and were extended in various forms until June of 1971 (Flatau et al., 2006). During that period, elementary schools, junior

colleges, and technical schools were added to both Title V part A and Title V part B programs.

NDEA Title V part B was successful in training guidance counselors for schools throughout the nation. It was also successful in constructing school counseling as a profession separate from teaching. The change was astounding. In the 1958-59 school year, 90-95% of students attended schools with nonexistent or inadequate guidance programs (Flatau et al., 2006). By the 1965-66 school year, 83% of students attended a school with a state approved guidance and counseling plan (U.S. Congress. Senate. Committee on Labor and Public Welfare. Subcommittee on Education, 1967e). Additionally, full-time school counseling positions tripled between 1958 and 1966, and of the 1966 total of 43,000, 19,000 counselors had attended NDEA institutes (U.S. congress. Senate. Committee on Labor and Public Welfare. Subcommittee on Education, 1967e).

School counselors who attended institutes were more likely to remain counselors and also were more likely to stay in education if they did not continue as counselors (U.S. Department of Health, Education, and Welfare, Office of Education, Bureau of Elementary and Secondary Education, 1969). The number of standardized aptitude and achievement tests increased to include almost all high school students by 1966 (Flattau et al., 2006). Other effects that could possibly be attributed to Title V programs included an increase in students finishing high school, a decline in drop-out rates, and an overall increase in college attendance during Title V (Flattau et al., 2006). The authors of an outcome study chaired by Pamela Flattau (2006) acknowledged, however, that the evidence of a decline in drop-out rates and increases in college attendance during the period of Title V was circumstantial and unproven.

Other possible contributing factors to an increase in college attendance and lowering of high school drop-out rates could be the increase in financial aid over the same period, the growth

in the number of community and technical colleges in the nation, and additional federal programs designed to decrease school drop-out rates, increase post-secondary attendance, and offer vocational education (Tozer, Violas, & Senese, 2002). There is no doubt, however, NDEA Title V greatly increased the number of school guidance counselor positions, school guidance counselor graduate programs, and signaled the birth of the profession of school counseling.

While the previous sections have addressed the history of school counseling and the history and purpose of the NDEA, the next section will review literature dealing specifically with school counselor characteristics, tasks, purposes, and duties as addressed in NDEA publications and other counselor-related publications in the 1960s. The research problems concerned how and in what ways NDEA counselor training may have affected school counselor practice to the present day and in turn, how and in what ways those practices may have interfered with EEO for African American students during and after school desegregation in Alabama. The literature review inspects sources to set the stage for interviews and analysis of primary resources from 1958 until the present.

#### *A Review of School Counselor Literature Related to the NDEA*

The following passages analyze some major primary sources influencing school counseling in the period surrounding the passage of the NDEA. While early interest in guidance was represented in the area of vocational services, the focus after the passage of the NDEA was upon the identification of academically talented students as a requirement of the legislation. The initial Counseling and Guidance Training Institutes were aimed at rapidly producing school guidance counselors with some training. The later, regular-session institutes coincided with the aspirations of the Great Society and expanded the focus of the training.



Two publications by the U.S. Department of Education communicated the shifting purposes and goals of the NDEA Counseling and Guidance Training Institutes and are representative of the publications by federal educational authorities during that period. The first, written by Leona E. Tyler (1960), was entitled *The National Defense Counseling and Guidance Training Institutes Program: A Report of the First 50 Institutes*. The second report was an evaluation of the regular session institutes entitled *An Evaluation: Counselor Education in Regular Session Institutes*, by George Pierson (1965). After the review of Department of Education sponsored evaluations and reports, the literature is divided into several sections. First, there is an analysis of literature dealing with the evolution of school counseling in the early 1960s as represented in an introductory textbook, *Counseling and Guidance in Schools*, by C.M. Patterson, published in 1962. Patterson discussed the effects of the NDEA, as well as theory construction and systemic influences of the school culture. Secondly, there is a discussion of the professionalization of school counseling in the 1960s and beyond. Finally, publications which address ongoing issues in professional school counseling related to the roles and expectations of school counselor practice are critiqued and reviewed to include the play of outside forces and events on the profession.

The first section of Leona Tyler's (1960) report detailed the principles guiding the creation of the plans for the summer institutes. One of the first principles, also promoted by James Conant (1959), the influential former president of Harvard, was the concept of the comprehensive high school. The comprehensive high school supported an eclectic mix of intellectual abilities, class, and economic levels. Tyler wrote that large comprehensive high schools had developed "rich, diversified programs" (p. 6) which required professional guidance in order to help students make intelligent choices among courses and programs. In turn, students

at small schools required assistance simply because curriculum offerings were *not* comprehensive: The brilliant or talented student must take the same courses as the average student.

Tyler (1960) then connected democratic philosophy with guidance for academically talented students so that they could make the best possible choices for themselves, and, in turn contribute to the nation. Self-direction was the only way that a democratic society could encourage the talented to contribute to the needs of society. She wrote, “For us, the right of a person to shape his own destiny takes precedence over the right of society to make use of his talents” (p. 7). Counseling and guidance (she uses these terms interchangeably) allowed students to make “good choices and plans” (p. 7). Democratic principles, as well as freedom of choice, appeared over and over in the reviewed publications and represented important values in school counselor practice. *How* the values were interpreted at the time of the NDEA, as well as later, are areas subject to analysis in a later chapter.

Tyler (1960) recognized the lack of training of many in the guidance field and supported the specialized knowledge and skills provided by advanced graduate work. She described the plight of part-time guidance worker teachers, who may or may not have had some instruction in guidance and counseling. “A teacher with no special training for counseling, allowed one or two periods a day for this activity, may spend most of his time checking attendance records and talking briefly to students who have been absent” (p. 9). School counseling’s purpose according to Tyler, was “to stimulate individual students to their optimum development” (p. 9). She also made clear that school boards were solely responsible for the lack or inclusion of guidance programs in their schools.

Tyler (1960) emphasized that school counselors were needed for all students: the talented, the disabled, and the problem student. But in a later chapter, she described the aim of the NDEA as serving “to facilitate in a number of ways the identification and development of talented students” (p. 11). In her view the wording of the Act and the focus of the institutes could not fail to have an influence on counselor’s perceptions of their purpose in the schools. That purpose in the beginning was to identify and guide academically talented students.

In a key passage that described the expectations of school counseling roles and responsibilities in the NDEA Counseling and Guidance Training Institutes, Tyler (1960) wrote:

The emphasis the National Defense Education Act places on the utilization of talents rather than the overcoming of deficiencies can be an asset if applied wisely. It can provide a new look at what the role of the counselor is. In work situations there are always external pressures influencing counselors to help ‘problem’ students. The institute program sets up a sort of counter-pressure upon them to assist unusually talented students to make the most of their lives. The emphasis on this part of the counselor’s task in institute programs may have a pervasive influence on counseling philosophy as a whole. (p. 14)

Tyler believed that guidance and counseling for academically talented students was less of a priority before the NDEA, while guidance and counseling for problem students was the focus of school guidance programs.

Tyler’s (1960) remarks highlighted the paradox of the NDEA. On one hand, the Act resulted in an explosion of growth and attention to the field of school guidance and counseling. On the other hand, there were reservations related to the stated goal of the NDEA to locate and guide the academically talented toward specific career fields. The principle concern was freedom of choice of the individual. This concern was expressed by both Tyler and Pierson (1965). The concern was also described by Patterson as well in his 1962 foundational textbook.

All of the first summer institute enrollees in 1959 came from schools in which the participants were either employed as guidance staff or were employed as teachers who intended

to become guidance counselors (Tyler, 1960). This status was proscribed by the Act. Thus, another aspect of school counselor identity was decided early on. The school counselor would have a work history as a teacher.

The method of selecting institute participants was twofold (Tyler, 1960). There was a general announcement which appeared in newspapers, pamphlets, and posted announcements. School superintendents, principals, and guidance directors also received announcements. The second method alerted school administrators and requested that they nominate persons in their schools and ask them to apply. Applicants were frequently evaluated for ability to complete graduate work by the Miller Analogies Test, Graduate Record Examination, or the Concept Master Test. Tyler reported that many of the institutes attempted an assessment of personality characteristics. These traits were frequently determined by the administration of the Minnesota Multiphasic Personality Inventory (MMPI). Other assessments included the Strong Interest Inventory or the Kuder Occupational Interest Inventory.

The nomination of candidates for NDEA institutes by school administrators guaranteed that school counselors would conform to the administrator's conception of counselor characteristics. School counselors in the years after NDEA, had very little input as to what their jobs would be. Both Tyler (1960) in her description of the 50 summer institutes and Pierson (1965) in an evaluation of the regular session institutes were emphatic in their reports that school counselor's duties, tasks, and purposes were determined by school administrators and school systems.

The second publication by the U.S. Department of Education was written by George A. Pierson and constituted an evaluation of the year long NDEA Guidance and Counselor Training Institutes (Pierson, 1965). The evaluation looked at counselor educator practices in the year-long

or regular-session institutes. Nationally, there were 65 full-year regular-session institutes conducted at 23 colleges and universities in 1963-64 (Pierson, 1965). In the South, the only two schools represented were the University of Georgia and the University of Florida. Pierson explained that the first two years of NDEA programs were devoted to short-term summer institutes, whereas the last three years were concentrated on full-year programs. Additionally, there was a shift in emphasis within the regular-session institutes. Some of the programs were aimed at preparation for local or regional employment as high school counselors. Other programs focused on a national appeal. Finally, and most significantly, some of the institutes allowed counselors who had completed their master's degree to become a specialist in working with minority groups (Pierson, 1965). By the end of the five-year period, educational forces in the United States were attuned to the requirements of President Johnson's War on Poverty, the *Civil Rights Act of 1964*, and the *Elementary and Secondary Schools Act of 1965* (Tozer et al., 2002). The original focus of the NDEA to address the academically talented was enlarged to include all students.

Pierson (1965) addressed issues in his evaluation that occupied the student counselors and counselor educators during the regular-session institutes. Many of the participants were teachers and Pierson wrote that they were, in some ways, better prepared to understand the culture of the school than non-teachers. In another sense, teaching experience could be a liability because it stresses self-discipline, academic achievement, and group concerns. Counselors focus on self-fulfillment, self-understanding, the purposes of one's life and the concerns of the individual (Pierson, 1965). Pierson described the ideal school counselor in the following way: "The ideal high-school counselor is a tough-minded, hard-thinking scientist who cares deeply about schools, education, and society, and who has great compassion for adolescents!" (p. 32).

The description of the ideal counselor appeared in a section devoted to several concerns that Pierson (1965) identified as basic issues in school counseling and guidance. The first issue was the dichotomy of “determinism and a free society” (p. 31). This dichotomy was reflected by counselors as a conflict between thinking and feeling. The deterministic forces among the counselor educators reflected leanings toward behaviorism, preferably operant conditioning. The freedom of choice adherents were concerned with feelings as evidenced in existential or self-actualizing theory, the ultimate ability for man to choose.

The counselor educators at the institutes agreed, overall, that the role of the school counselor could not be predetermined by the institutes, nor could it be limited to a list of tasks. Each school community was different. The climate of the school determined the success or failure of a counseling program, and it was incumbent on the school counselor to make the connections between the faculty, the administration, the students, their parents, and the community in order to sell the program. School counseling positions, according to Pierson (1965), were related to the counselor’s ability to please all the stakeholders.

The next section opens with a review of C.H. Patterson’s text published in 1962. Patterson’s text is used to compare and contrast his positions with those of Tyler and Pierson. The text registered several concerns with the NDEA Counseling and Guidance Training Institutes and the process of selecting candidates. Even though the book was published before Pierson’s evaluation in 1965, the issues addressed by Tyler (1961) and Pierson (1965) are also present in Patterson’s text.

## Theory Building and Professional Issues in the Shadow of Sputnik:

### C.H. Patterson and the Department of Education Publications

C.H. Patterson's (1962) introductory text, *Counseling and Guidance in Schools*, appeared shortly after the passage and implementation of the NDEA Counseling and Guidance Training Institutes. His emphasis was on the philosophy and purpose of school counseling and guidance. Patterson's textbook contrasted its approach with other texts of the period preoccupied with "techniques and methods of the how-to-do-it variety" (p. ix). Patterson's book engaged theory. The specific theory involved school counseling from a client-centered or self-theory approach. Patterson believed that the approach was consistent with democratic philosophy.

The turn toward a theory of self-direction or self-choice was apparent in Patterson's writing, as well as the writings of Tyler (1960) and Pierson (1965). In all the works, a certain tension was revealed between the requirements of the NDEA, (i.e., to address the selection and education of the academically talented), and the theoretical biases of the counselor writers.

Patterson (1962) wrote:

Not only is it believed that freedom of choice enables each individual to make his greatest unique contribution to society, but it is assumed that in any event, in a democratic society, no one, not even a professionally trained counselor, should determine the decisions and choices of another. (p. 19)

The tension was addressed in stating that the emphasis on the development of scientific and technical manpower was present before *Sputnik* in the reports of the National Manpower Council (1962).

Patterson (1962) also wrote, "It appears that the concept of counseling and guidance which is held by some who look to this field for help are not the concepts held by professional people in the field itself" (p. 21). He acknowledged that manpower needs may override personal choice in a time of serious threat to national security, but did not see the situation in the early

1960s at that level of threat. Additionally, and interestingly, he described the focus on guidance and counseling to select the nation's scientists and technicians as "synonymous with selection and classification" (p. 21). He differentiated between the role of industry and the armed forces in selecting and classifying manpower and the responsibility of the counselor to assist the individual in making a free choice of occupation. The difference lay between a focus on the individual and a focus on the group.

The American Personnel and Guidance Association (APGA), in 1958, also weighed in asserting the right of individuals to choose and the importance of supporting all students. The APGA endorsed the notion that raising the level of choice for all students would alleviate the scientific and technological needs of the nation along with encouraging the maximum development of human talent (Patterson, 1962).

This early critique of the NDEA and its adherents privileged individual choice over group determinism and illustrated the somewhat ambivalent position of many in education, particularly James Conant, who in 1948 seemed to support "selection and classification" (Patterson, 1962, p. 22) as a guidance activity, while also writing that "a democracy, unlike a totalitarian state, cannot force its youth into what the authorities consider the appropriate groove of advanced education" (Patterson, 1962, p. 22) The tension between group needs and individual choice illustrates how the two positions could exist closely and schizophrenically in one mind.

#### *Professional Beliefs and Issues after the Passage of NDEA*

Leona Tyler, George Pierson, and C.H. Patterson represent the early position of counselor educators concerning the importance of the NDEA. Both Tyler (1960) and Patterson (1962) recognized the requirements of the NDEA to select academically talented students. Pierson (1965) evaluated later aspects of the program as demonstrated in the regular-session institutes



and was less concerned with the issue of academic talent. In fact, by 1965, the emphasis had broadened to include all students.

Tyler, Pierson, and Patterson understood that the methods taught in the early sessions to identify the academically talented and to counsel them in vocational and educational areas would also apply to any student. The ideas of freedom of choice and self-actualization were prominent in all three books. The writers also associated freedom of choice and self-actualization with a democratic philosophy. Pierson's (1965) evaluation was focused almost entirely on counselor educators. Tyler (1960) and Patterson's (1962) focused on the school counselor. The concern with individual freedom to choose, self-actualization, and a democratic philosophy was also synonymous with counselor philosophy.

#### *Acknowledging Differences Between Teachers and Counselors*

One aspect of the NDEA procedure allowed administrators to select untrained teachers to participate in the institute. While Pierson (1965) merely mentioned the procedure in his evaluation of the regular-session institutes, he did discuss the downside of making counselors out of teachers. He asserted that teacher experience could be a liability because of a difference between "attitudes and values" (Pierson, 1965, p. 20) of teachers, which stress discipline, achievement, and group welfare, and the attitudes of counselors which stress self-understanding and self-actualization, matters of individual choice.

Patterson published *Counseling and Guidance in Schools* in 1962 before the implementation of the full-year graduate institutes. His observations were based on the short-term institutes that actually lasted a summer. According to Tyler (1960), whom Patterson often references, the participants of those short-term institutes were drawn almost entirely by the terms of the Act— from teachers or counselors without much training who were actually performing

counseling and guidance duties. Patterson's (1962) assertion that inadequately trained former teachers would serve only to "increase the quantity of inadequately trained counselors" (p. 80) was a response to those first summer institutes and the selection of the candidates.

Other concerns linked with the requirement of teaching experience were expressed by Patterson (1962). First, at the time of writing the textbook, virtually all schools required teacher experience as a criterion for hiring a counselor. State departments of education required teacher experience for certification as a school counselor. Additionally, many graduate schools required teacher experience before a student could be accepted in a school counseling program. In one survey cited by Patterson, school administrators overwhelmingly endorsed teaching experience as a prerequisite for a school counselor position. Patterson noted that other personnel workers in the schools, such as nurses or social workers, did not have to have teaching experience. He concluded that the requirement for teaching experience was likely not based upon factual conditions, but "emotional beliefs" (p. 57). Patterson wrote that the requirement for counselors to be teachers may have had more to do with garnering teacher acceptance of counselors in the schools.

Patterson (1962) also questioned the wisdom of the U.S. Department of Education in isolating institute trainees from regular counseling students. He and Tyler (1960) agreed that this isolation would limit the growth of professional relationships and academic rigor in institute programs. Thus, while conditionally praising the attempt to provide additional training for school counselors, there was an agreement among early counselor educators/authors that the NDEA was not "a panacea" (Patterson, 1962, p. 81).

*Patterson's Critique of NDEA Counseling and Guidance Training Institutes*

Patterson devoted several pages to the effects and possible negative outcomes of the NDEA Counseling and Guidance Training Institutes. First, the Act did not include recommendations from professional organizations in counseling, and counselor educators. Secondly, Patterson was concerned that the legislation was being promoted as a singular solution to the need for trained school guidance counselors and this was not the case. Finally, the Act was charged with identifying and training the talented in specific areas: science, mathematics, foreign languages. In some instances, there were fears that the Act would restrict the training of school counselors to the narrow confines of talent selection.

Patterson (1962) cited Tyler (1960) in stating that the restriction of school counselor training in the institutes to talent selection did not occur, but the presence of some discord among counselor educators concerning the Act and the institutes is clear. In addition to the concerns that school counselor training was restricted to narrow areas, there was also a concern with institutes that attempted to cover too much so that the results focused on procedures, rather than a philosophical and psychological basis for counseling. Patterson concluded that the greatest overall problem for the NDEA Counseling and Guidance Training Institutes, whether short-term or regular-session, was that they were invariably incomplete by being narrowly focused in their course offerings or by attempting to cover too much so that nothing was learned in depth.

In a section entitled *Problems and Issues in Institute Operation*, Tyler (1960) also wrote of the incomplete nature of the institute experience. Her objections were similar to Patterson's (1962). She noted the wide variance between entrance exam scores, asserting that institute participants with lower scores would not be able to understand abstract concepts. This assertion spoke to understandings of standardized testing and intellectual ability at the time of the

institutes. The second issue with the institutes addressed the randomness of institute courses. Institute participants may have completed 15 hours of graduate work without a course in developmental psychology or a course in statistics. Some participants had no coursework in career guidance. Additionally, the required coursework from institute to institute was different depending upon the focus of the counselor educators. For instance, 33 of the 50 summer institutes required some kind of practicum experience. There would be considerable difference between the professional expertise of counselors who had practicum experience compared to those who did not. Other problems focused on the personalities of the institute trainees, the motivation of the trainees, and the means to better screen institute applicants.

The next section reviews the literature of the profession from the early 1960s, when NDEA institutes and programs were most active, to the present. There is a striking similarity to issues of roles, tasks, characteristics, purposes—from the early days of the NDEA Counseling and Guidance Institutes to the present. Two major changes that will be addressed are the recent efforts by professional school counselors to define their professional identity, and strong initiatives to encourage school counselors to be social justice advocates. The literature will be grouped both chronologically, to take advantage of the previous historical narrative, and categorically, to highlight aspects of counselor subjectivity..

#### The Professionalization of School Counseling, (1960-69)

The criteria for the consideration of guidance as a profession were first introduced by C.G. Wrenn and J.G. Darley in E.G. Williamson's edited work in 1949 (Wrenn & Darley in Williamson, 1949). Patterson (1962) reproduced the criteria in *Counseling and Guidance in the Schools*:

- (1) The definition of job titles and functions
- (2) A body of knowledge and skills
- (3) The application of standards of selection and training
- (4) A self-imposition of standards of admission and performance
- (5) The development of professional consciousness and professional groups
- (6) The legal recognition of the vocation
- (7) The development of a code of ethics
- (8) The performance of a socially needed function. (pp 81-82)

Patterson (1962) dedicated the remainder of the book to determining how well school counseling met the standards of a profession, noting that only the last function (8), was met, with some progress in 1 through 3, 5, and 7. Additionally, he privileged the function of school counselor, distinguishing it from “guidance worker” (Patterson, p. 82) and acknowledging its function as unique in the world of education.

#### *A Structural Analysis of the School Counseling Profession*

David Armor (1969) took a different approach to studying the guidance counselor in the schools. He applied a sociological framework by examining “the structure of counseling and its relation to the larger society within which it operates” (Armor, p. 7). The study addressed an analysis of professions in general terms, as well as school counseling programs specifically, to determine the roles and characteristics of the profession.

A study of professions in general, according to Armor (1969), would contain the following basic criteria: “technical competence in a complex body of knowledge, self-regulation through association, and a ‘service’ orientation to the goals of the larger society” (p. 9). Armor used the term “institutionalized influence” (p. 14) to describe the body of knowledge in professions.

This body of knowledge is codified to some degree and should meet the following criteria—it offers a useful service; it is accepted by the public with a degree of trust and a belief in the competence of the knowledge and the provider of the knowledge. There is a clarity to the

body of knowledge that convinces the public that the information or service provided is important and the practitioners are licensed or regulated as to their qualifications. Finally, there is at least a collective understanding that the profession performs some service to the social world (Armor, 1969).

Much of the remainder of Armor's (1969) work was devoted to a structural analysis based upon the presence or absence of the above criteria in school counseling. In true structuralist fashion, Armor (1969) described the changes in the structure of society from an agricultural labor force to a specialized industrial society. These changes, between 1840 and 1930, resulted in changes in family structure and in occupational structure. Choosing an occupation moved from following the family occupational history, to depending upon outside sources to help the student find "the best fit" between an individual and an occupation; this defined the 'right' job" (Armor, p. 29).

In the beginning of the vocational guidance movement, the service of occupational matching was generally limited to settlement houses, vocational bureaus such as Frank Parson's and other social service entities. Soon, schools were increasingly involved, and there was a shift from vocational guidance to educational guidance. School counseling became less concerned with occupational choice and more concerned with whether or not the student would enter college (Armor, 1969).

Finally, around World War II the mental health movement emerged as a third function of the counselor. The focus became overall emotional and social wellbeing. The social-emotional aspect was said to influence the ability of the individual to make a good choice in selecting an occupation. Counseling, then, became a means of achieving a good self-concept (Armor, 1969).

In addition to the above-mentioned aims of guidance, standardized testing played a huge role in helping counselors achieve the best fit in the matching of occupation with interest and aptitude (Armor, 1969). Standardized testing functioned as the scientific aspect of the profession and added additional validity to the knowledge base.

While not a perfectly trustworthy body of knowledge, the evolution of vocational guidance, to educational guidance, to social-emotional counseling, coupled with the use of standardized testing, did give the appearance that school counseling was developing as a profession (Armor, 1969). Additionally, the field welcomed several professional associations, in vocational guidance and educational guidance, as well as school guidance and counseling.

The emergence of the National Vocational Guidance Association (1913) then the creation of the American Personnel and Guidance Association (1952) and the American School Counselor Association (ASCA) (1952)<sup>2</sup> provided the associational influence Armor described as necessary to a profession. The associations published peer reviewed journals, set standards for practice and ethics, and encouraged research.

In describing the structural nature of school counseling as a profession, Armor (1969) addressed two aspects often encountered in school counseling literature from the beginning to the present. The issue of freedom of choice appears over and over in the school counseling literature. But, the use of standardized testing to convince students of their strengths and weaknesses, as well as the goal of matching identified traits with occupations, has been somewhat paradoxical and ambiguous throughout the history of the profession (Armor, 1969).

The best example of the paradox is the work of E.G. Williamson, known also as the developer of the directive counseling method (Armor, 1969). While Williamson strongly

---

<sup>2</sup> Other sources, See Myrick, 1987, list American School Counselor Association creation as 1958. Additionally, the author was at an Alabama Counseling Association Executive Council meeting in 2008, in which the current state ALSCA President announced that it was ASCA's 50<sup>th</sup> birthday.

supported standardized testing as a counter to the self-analysis methodology of Parsons, among others, he also “emphasized the importance of a student’s freedom of choice in making decisions” (Armor, p. 39). Armor paid particular attention to Williamson’s use of freedom of choice noting that “concern with freedom can be found in almost all of the writings on guidance from the earliest days up to the present time” (p. 39). Tyler (1960), Patterson (1962), and Pierson (1965) also stressed freedom of choice in the school counseling process. Armor believed that it said something about “the counselor’s relations within the social structure” (p. 39).

The final aspect of a structural description of school counseling as a profession was described by Armor (1969) as a service orientation to the goals of the larger society” (p. 9) and by Patterson (1962) as “the performance of a socially needed function” (p. 82). Armor expanded his analysis to describe the emergence of school counseling, especially in the area of occupational choice, as the replacement, in functional terms, of the role of the family. He termed it an example of “structural differentiation” (Armor, p. 44).

#### *Further Discussions of School Counselor Professional Development*

By the 1960s, school counseling programs had become staples in high schools throughout the country. Additionally, the presence of NDEA Counselor and Guidance Institutes led to growing numbers of graduate programs in counselor education and counseling psychology. Hill and Green (1960) wrote that very little of the academic writing on “guidance and personnel work in educational institutions” (p. 115) addressed issues of “selection, education, and professionalization” (p. 115) of personnel and guidance workers.

In a review of research in the area, Hill and Green (1960) reported that several studies of high school administrators identified previous teaching experience, preferably in the school system in which the counselor had taught, as desirable. Other studies indicated that school



counselors were generally hired from the school system in which they taught. Additionally, the authors reported that current studies had failed to definitively identify desirable counselor personality traits because of the “reasons that a standardized personality pattern for the effective counselor was probably a will-o-the-wisp, namely, the amazing variety of behaviors used by the counselor” (Hill & Green, 1960, p. 117). Additionally, they reported that at least one study indicated that characteristics valued in counselor training were not necessarily the characteristics that would be valued or effective in the job. Tolerance for ambiguity was one trait that indicated counselor effectiveness in communicating “among trainees” (p. 118). Additionally they wrote that two generalizations emerged from the studies of characteristics of counselors. They were

- (a) The complexity of both the counseling process and other activities of guidance and personnel workers is too great to expect clear-cut or standardized personality definitions for effective workers;
- (b) evaluations of effectiveness in counseling under carefully controlled conditions, though they probably cannot provide conclusive evidence regarding traits of counselors in general, will continue to provide suggestive leads to fundamental research that is needed in the field of the selection of counselors. (p. 119)

Hill and Green registered hope that the shortage of “personnel workers” would result in long-term research involving selection, characteristics, and perceived professional definition which could affect counselor education.

Stripling and Lister (1963) responded with an article which took up the Hill and Green (1960) challenge but added little additional information. Stripling and Lister entitled their article *Selection, Preparation, and Professionalization of Specialists*, which indicated a shift from Hill and Green’s label of personnel workers. The concern over whether graduate counseling students and school counselors should have teaching experience was revisited, with results from a study indicating that none of the 32 counselor educators who reported from the Commission on Guidance in American Schools (Wrenn, 1962) included teacher experience or other experience

as prerequisites to counselor training. The article appeared to reiterate what was addressed in the Hill and Green article (1960): The idea that what was valued in counselor education may not be considered useful in practicing school counseling.

One other research study was reported which added some new information. Lyle Schmidt (1962) conducted a study which compared inter-counselor and principal-counselor agreement concerning counselor ideal and actual counselor roles and functions. There were significant areas of agreement were found, but there were also significant areas of disagreement (Stripling & Lister, 1963).

Shertzer and Stone (1963) addressed deterrents presented to guidance program development by school administrators. This article provided an additional insight into the ongoing tension between administrative expectations of school counselors, and the development of professional conceptions of school counselor subjectivity. In previous writings in this chapter, it has been demonstrated that administrators often had a hand in selecting counseling trainees and in shaping expectations of school counselor behaviors and duties (Tyler, 1960; Patterson, 1962; Pierson, 1965).

Shertzer and Stone (1963) listed several deterrents to school counselor professional development. The first failure was the lack of adequate program development of guidance services despite the addition of financial aid as represented by NDEA Title V, part B. Whereas the training programs emphasized the “main strength of guidance by affording counselors time with the individual” (Shertzer & Stone, 1963, p. 25), many administrators could seemingly not break away from the idea that services had to be administered to large groups. A corollary of the first deterrent had to do with the use of funds. Historically, lack of funds had been presented as the reason for little or no guidance program services. With the advent of NDEA funds, however,

the argument did not hold but NDEA funds were often used to extend previous (non-counseling) programs while not addressing the entire guidance counseling program. Shertzer and Stone (1963) wrote, “No clearer illustration exists than that of equating good guidance with extensive, unnecessary testing” (p. 26). Shertzer and Stone reported that “vast amounts of money were poured into stockpiling tests and the overtesting of student populations with little or no consideration given to the *use* of test results” (p. 26).

A second deterrent according to Shertzer and Stone is the propensity for administrators to couch their educational needs in ways that will appeal to the public but are programs in name only. Guidance programs were often in that category.

The third deterrent was that of confusion between what administrators expect of the school counselor, such as quasi-administrative duties, and what counselors *should* expect guidance and counseling programs and tasks to be. Shertzer and Stone (1963) noted that administrators often requested counselors who could spend time with individual students. When hired, however, the administrators then assigned various tasks that were not counselor related. Shertzer and Stone asserted it was the school counselor’s responsibility to speak up as to their role assignments. Counselors must be able to effectively communicate with administrators in setting the standards, activities, and goals of a counseling program.

The fourth deterrent had to do with counselor educators and the various controversies concerning school counselors (Shertzer and Stone, 1963). The issues were familiar, (e.g., Should school counselors come from the teaching ranks? How much training in psychology should a school counselor have? What are the roles and tasks of school counselors? What services should be offered?) These issues may have been misinterpreted by administrators as signs that the programs and services were weak when, in actuality, discussion and change were part of growth.

The fifth deterrent presented to guidance program development involved a lack of research in “guidance program development and management” (Shertzer & Stone, 1963, p. 29). The authors pointed out that neither guidance *nor* administrative programs had a strong history of program research. Thus trial and error was the common approach.

The sixth deterrent was the lack of attention paid to financing and the provision of adequate facilities for guidance counseling programs (Shertzer & Stone, 1963). The final deterrent from administrators had to do with the assumption that guidance counselors could handle everything—students at both ends of the ability continuum; students with emotional and behavioral problems, and students in danger of dropping out of school.

The 1963 article by Shertzer and Stone addressed issues of the professionalization of guidance counseling in the years immediately after NDEA Title V, part B. The development and support of programs was linked to the ability of school counselors to communicate the needs of the program to administrators, as well as the responsibility of the administrators to learn enough about guidance services to effectively incorporate them into the overall objectives of the school (Shertzer & Stone, 1963). The role of the counselor as envisioned by administrators was that of a quasi-administrative figure who understood the culture of the school by first having been a teacher in the school.

The previous authors and articles reiterated role problems among school counselors, particularly in their role definitions by administrators. But the Shertzer and Stone (1963) article, in the early days of the profession after the NDEA, pointed out, better than most writers, the responsibility of school counselors to define their purpose, roles, and tasks. In other words, school counselors were largely responsible for their own development as a profession.

## Negotiating School Counselor Realities: Roles and Functions

In the preceding sections the lineage of school counseling from vocational guidance, to student personnel workers, to school guidance, and, finally professional school counseling was described, but very little attention was paid to what is often considered the most important aspect of the school counselor's role, that of a counselor. Additionally, there was the understanding that the school counselor would be involved in testing. The requirements for NDEA Title V were explicit in requiring, as Part A of the act, the funding of standardized testing programs in the participating states.

### *How Counseling and Testing Influenced School Counseling*

As previously discussed, the first theory of counseling used in schools was behaviorally oriented. E.G. Williamson created the theory of trait and factor counseling at The University of Minnesota. Trait and factor counseling was very directive and emphasized the collection of data through testing and interviews. The school counselor would then dispense information to the student (Schmidt, 2008). The idea of selection and classification, chiefly in planning further education or career choices, reflected the behavioral interests of the early years of the 20<sup>th</sup> century. The concept of democratic freedom of choice emphasized in the previous sections by Tyler (1960), Patterson (1962), and Pierson (1965) was limited in directive counseling.

Patterson (1962), in *Counseling and Guidance in Schools*, endorsed the client-centered theory of counseling initiated by Carl Rogers. Tyler (1960) also endorsed it. By the 1980s, client or person-centered theory gave way to descriptions of several approaches in Shertzer and Stone's (1981) *Fundamentals of Guidance*. While Shertzer and Stone (1981) endorsed choosing a theoretical base, they did not limit their discussion to the client-centered or self-theory approach of the counselor educators of the 1960s, Tyler and Patterson.

Shertzer and Stone (1981) introduced a section on the variety of counseling theories by listing some of the more prominent frameworks. They included rational-emotive, gestalt, existentialist, Maslovian self-actualization, and newer conceptualizations of behavioral theory. Their distinguishing characteristics are similar to Rogerian theory in one important aspect: They are focused on the individual. They support the freedom of individuals to choose, as best they can, and to leave decisions up to the individual.

Current thinking concerning school counseling, exemplified by Schmidt (2008), acknowledges the inability of students, whether they are children in elementary school or near-adults in high school, to have control over situations in their lives. Other aspects of current school counseling include developing counseling relationships with teachers and parents. Schmidt also discussed the theoretical basis and rationale for eclectic counseling, that is, utilizing a variety of methods to include brief counseling, a practical problem solving approach in schools, and crisis counseling, a method used when immediate, critical issues, such as suicidal thoughts or substance abuse, are present. Crisis counseling is directive and often involves referral and consultation. Current school counseling strategies tend to be practical, are time bound, and are part of a comprehensive program.

Historically, testing was closely aligned to guidance services. As previously described, the early emphasis on vocational counseling was tied to the results of aptitude and achievement testing. It is impossible to accurately discuss the growth of standardized testing without acknowledging the contributions of James Conant and Henry Chauncey in the birth of Educational Testing Services (ETS) in the mid-1950s (Lemann, 1999). Eventually, ETS became the means for identifying the meritocratic order of those who would benefit from admission to the best colleges and universities in the United States.

James Conant (Lemann, 1999) was the former President of Harvard University. He became the confidante of President Eisenhower and was responsible for the growth and development of the comprehensive high school. Conant was one of the first supporters of guidance counseling programs, but he also demonstrated a tendency to categorize and sort students in some of his writings (Patterson, 1962). Henry Chauncey was one of Conant's assistant deans at Harvard and was led, with Conant's assistance, to become the president of ETS. Together, their ideas of a gifted meritocracy, not based on heredity, took form. Whereas testing was somewhat limited in determining an individual's future prior to WWII (unless one happened to be in the military), after WWII, testing, especially the Scholastic Aptitude Test (SAT), became determinant and selective (Lemann, 1999).

The requirement of NDEA Title V part A for a statewide testing plan, as well as the resources to buy the tests, sealed the fate of school counselor programs. Standardized testing and school counselor programs were bound together. The tension between behavioral theories and practice which looked to results of standardized testing and counselor activities which privileged freedom of choice and the primacy of the individual is a continuous issue in counselor practice.

#### *Administrators Vis-à-vis School Counselors*

Lambie and Williamson (2004) reviewed the historical changes in school counseling and acknowledged that school counselor's roles grew over time. They described school counselor's roles as "vast and ever-changing" (p. 127) leaving many practitioners to struggle with issues of role ambiguity. Lambie and Williamson discussed the expansion of school counselor roles throughout the historical narrative without the removal of any responsibilities. In agreement with Lambie and Williamson's historical perspective are the results of a study by Burnham and Jackson (2000), which identified 17 non-counseling activities reported by the school counselors.

Tennyson (1989) reported a survey in the late 1980s that indicated school counselors should be made aware of role discrepancies and work to change them. Additionally, Tennyson et al. recommended that school counselors should negotiate with school principals on role clarification. The understanding that school counselor's roles and functions are often buried in quasi-administrative work was a constant theme in the literature and was related to the expectations of school principals.

Other articles also addressed the difficulties of meeting the expectations of the school principal vis-à-vis the roles understood by school counselors. This issue stands out across time. Both Patterson (1962) in his first text, *Counseling and Guidance in Schools*, and Shertzer & Stone (1981), in the 4<sup>th</sup> edition of *Fundamentals of Guidance*, dealt with the perception by administrators that school counselors should perform quasi-administrative functions; share confidential information with the principal; be more controlling of students; and, on occasion, administer discipline. Tennyson et al. (1989) reported in their study of role understandings among secondary school counselors, that school principals often see school counselors as bound to "scheduling, counting credits, and other administrative functions" (p. 402). The survey by Tennyson et al. occurred around the time that comprehensive and developmental counseling program models were finding support in state program development as well as with ASCA.

Tennyson et al. recommended greater understanding and awareness by school counselors of the ASCA model and the theories governing that model and program development.

### *Theory Building and Comprehensive Models*

Beginning in the 1970s, counselor educators, including Gysbers (1981) and Myrick (1987), concentrated their work on theory building around the idea of comprehensive developmental school counseling programs (Schmidt, 2008). This emphasis divided counselor



functions around four separate roles including “leadership, advocacy, collaboration and teaming, and systemic change” (Schmidt, 2008, p. 23). Much of the emphasis in the comprehensive model was to establish certification and programmatic standards in order to make school counselor practice consistent and standardized. Schmidt’s foundations text, as well as Robert Myrick’s (1987) text and professional articles by Gysbers (2001) and Christopher Sink (2002) reflected a concern for the development of a distinct professional identity.

Sink (2002) reported in *Professional School Counselin*, that several contemporary writers had stressed school counselors’ accountability. Schmidt also tied school counselor accountability to the requirements of the *No Child Left Behind Act of 2001* (NCLB), but cautioned that the emphasis on high stakes testing ignored “individual differences, developmental stages, and issues of diversity that are foundational to determining appropriate curriculum, instructional methods, and other services” (cited in Sink, 2002, p. 20). The NCLB has put pressure on all stakeholders in schools related to test scores and the purpose of testing.

In a description of a qualitative study of school administrators and their perceptions of the role of school counselors, Amatea and Clark (2005) reported administrator reactions to four counselor roles. These were (a) the innovative school leader, (b) the collaborative case consultant, (c) the responsive direct service provider, and (d) the administrative team player. The study consisted of a small group of 26 principals in elementary through high school. The fewest number supported the innovative school leader and the highest number supported the collaborative case consultant role and the responsive direct service provider. Both of these roles emphasize working with individual students through the adults in their lives, such as parents, teachers, and administrators. In this role the administrators expected the counselors to be less an expert and more of a collaborator. There were also expectations that the counselor would take

care of “school procedures and paperwork” (p. 25).

The responsive direct service provider role was equally valued by the administrators. This role called for an emphasis on direct student services and separate activities to include classroom guidance activities and individual counseling. The administrators regretted the amount of paperwork required of their counselors, but assumed the paperwork would get done while keeping a primary focus on students (Amatea & Clark, 2005).

Some administrators in the study expected the school counselor to be an administrative team player. They saw their counselors as responsible for a variety of non counseling duties to include

Scheduling, coordination of the standardized testing program, coordination of the special education staffing and placement process, referral of students for outside services, and ‘pinch’ hitting as a disciplinarian, substitute teacher, lunchroom supervisor, or bus duty representative when necessary. (Amatea & Clark, 2005, p. 27)

Fully one-fourth of the administrators adhered to the team model, while one-third of the administrators supported the collaborative case model and another one-third supported the responsive direct services model. Interestingly, the innovative leader role was the position most favored in the ASCA National Model (2003) (Amatea & Clark, 2005). This study appears to indicate that theory building and program development models pursued by counselor education programs and the professional association, as well as state departments of education, may encounter difficulty when faced with a systemic interpretation of counselor roles and purposes by administrators.

*School Counselor Accountability, One Argument for Comprehensive Developmental Programs*  
Sink (2002) addressed the issue of counselor accountability that was tied to the comprehensive developmental program model. He endorsed “(a) alignment of school counseling

program goals with school reform goals, (b) the use of evidence-based best practices, and (c) the employment of outcome-based evidence...” (p. 170). However, Sink was not comfortable with the assertion that higher academic achievement outcomes can be empirically proven to be the result of comprehensive school counseling programs. He suggested that holding school counselors accountable for higher test scores or grades may lead to problems in public perception when grades or test scores do not increase to the standards set by outside entities. Additionally, Sink suggested that school counselors should concentrate on accountability standards that can be directly linked to counselor tasks, such as career planning, school climate, and responsive services.

The push for counseling programs aligned with national and state educational achievement goals is also a part of both the ASCA (National Model, 2003) standards for professional school counselors as well as comprehensive developmental programs. Bemak (2000), prior to the NCLB, proposed a redefinition of counselor roles to focus on national and state achievement objectives which would result in lessening the “well-documented achievement gap between low income and minority students in comparison with other student groups” (p. 323). Sink (2002) addressed Bemak’s assertions but expressed reservations as described in the previous paragraph.

The link between testing, evaluation, and other measures of accountability was certainly a component of the NDEA, Title V, and continues to define the role of school counseling. Around the beginning of the 1990s, articles in the major counseling journals began to stress the role of school counselors as social justice advocates. Multicultural competency and issues bearing upon multiculturalism became a subset of school counselor education and practice. By the beginning of the millennium, there was also a call to address the academic achievement deficits of many

minority students.

*The Achievement Gap and the Transformation of School Counseling*

Both for-profit and non-profit entities weighed in during the 1990s to address the large number of minority students, particularly in urban schools, who dropped out of high school. Concern with the education of minority students was a catalyst for The Education Trust, established in 1990 (The Education Trust, 1997) by the American Association for Higher Education. It was a nonprofit foundation designed to encourage colleges and universities to support K-12 reform efforts. In 1996, The Education Trust initiated a “five-year, multi-staged national initiative for transforming school counseling” (Martin, 2002, p. 148). The Education Trust was funded by the DeWitt Wallace-Readers Digest Fund, and some of its work concerning school counselors was supported by the MetLife Foundation, an insurance company foundation (The Education Trust, *Transforming School Counseling*, 2003). Other funding came from The College Board and American College Testing (ACT) (Martin, 2002).

The Education Trust Transforming School Counseling initiative (2003), The College Board, and ASCA standards for professional school counselors were heavily involved in advocating accountability standards for school counselors, as well as following the data to engage school counselors in raising academic achievement among minority students (Martin, 2002). The counselor accountability-standards-measurement movement, as well as the multicultural-advocacy movement, formed two distinct paths in school counselor program development and practice. That is not to say that the accountability-standards-measurement movement and the multicultural-advocacy proponents could not collaborate with each other, it is merely to suggest different influences. The accountability-standards-measurement group would argue that evaluation as promoted by NCLB was the path to determining where learning gaps lay

and how to address them. But multicultural and social justice advocates could argue that measurement, in itself, was fraught with injustice.

*Social Justice Advocacy and Critical Assessments of School Counselor Programs*

A conceptualization of school counselors addressing societal problems impacting students has been around at least since the 1970s (Field & Baker, 2004). This perspective relies on school counselors to be “social change agents” (Field & Baker, p. 1097). More recently ASCA’s National Model for Comprehensive School Counseling Programs (2003) framed school counselor approaches as a “responsive outreach service” (Gysbers & Henderson, 2001 as cited in Field & Baker, 2004). Advocacy, according to Field and Baker included multicultural competence. Field and Baker also acknowledged that school counselor literature did not do a good job of exploring what advocacy was and how it was done. Numerous studies cited in the Field and Baker article addressed the lack of empirical research involving advocacy and included an absence of clear definitions and tasks incorporating advocacy, as well as the underuse of advocacy behavior in school counselor programs.

*Miscomprehending Counselor Advocacy*

Field and Baker (2004) conducted a research study that identified three themes that interfere with the ability of school counselors to function as advocates. The first was lack of clarity in the counselors’ job descriptions; the second was a sense that the school counselors in the study were not valued in the educational community; and the third addressed the lack of communication within the schools. Other responses concerned the effect of administrators in either supporting or dismantling advocacy efforts.

Field and Baker (2004), however, identified aspects of school counselor identity that may affect the presence or absence of successful advocacy programs. First, they mention the duties

the school counselors listed as advocacy-oriented. Activities included or identified by the counselors included “supporting students, writing letters, making phone calls, standing up for students, negotiating bureaucracy, and appealing to individuals who have the power to make life better for students” (p. 64). The authors noted that only one of the responses offered any hope of “changing the systems that may be creating or contributing to students’ academic, personal, or social problems” (p. 64). Additionally, none of the so-called advocacy roles involved recognition of the sorts of systemic barriers erected to exclude students for reasons including racism, class issues, language issues, or conditions of poverty.

Field and Baker (2004) suggested that the tasks identified by the counselors fit into a reactive, after-the-fact model. They also suggested that counselors shy away from risk taking in addressing serious issues that impact students. They wrote, “Attempts to change aspects of the school climate that may be problematic or inhibit student growth and success were not mentioned” (p. 65).

#### *Critical Discussions of Counselor Advocacy and Marginalized Students*

Recently, Hipolito-Delgado, and Lee (2007) addressed the issue of advocacy for “marginalized communities” (p. 327) by professional school counselors. They asserted that oppression has real and lasting negative effects on the students impacted by “racism, classism, homophobia and ableism” (p. 327). Further, they wrote that oppression is structural and represented by inequalities of funding in the communities of the oppressed, who are more likely to be placed in special education and lack access to effective teachers and adequate facilities. Hipolito-Delgado and Lee believed the structure of oppression can be broken by the enactment of empowerment theory, based on Paulo Freire’s work. Critical consciousness, positive identity, and social action are aspects of empowerment theory. These authors suggested that school

counselors can actively engage in creating a sense of empowerment in students and become involved in marginalized communities to encourage social action.

Reactions to the Hipolito-Delgado & Lee (2007) article appeared in the same edition of the journal, *Professional School Counseling*. Schmidt (2007) applauded its intent, but offered several criticisms. First, Schmidt acknowledged that “too frequently, counselors have contributed to the legacies of marginalization and oppression, by conforming to school traditions and policies that either overtly or covertly discriminate, degrade, and dehumanize the educational process” (p. 338). Secondly, Schmidt wrote that the concept of empowerment as written in the Hipolito-Delgado & Lee (2007) article was secondary to a sort of school counselor primer in marginalization and oppression in which the authors attempted to educate readers to the problems. Additionally, Schmidt was concerned that the concept of empowerment theory was limited in the article to the empowerment of the marginalized and oppressed. He wrote, “Everyone might benefit from the use of a theory or model of practice that encourages students to self-reflect, increase their awareness of development, fight social injustice, reach-out to others in caring ways, and practice other attributes we could assign to personal empowerment” (p. 338).

The assertion in the Hipolito-Delgado & Lee (2007) article that oppression and marginalization are causal and somehow destined to create psychological problems led Schmidt (2007) to critique the notion that poor beginnings are somehow absolute shapers of poor identity. Schmidt’s essay also noted that the previous authors’ ideas of personal empowerment seemed to imply the counselor “doing to” rather than the oppressed and the counselor “doing with” (p. 338). Empowerment, Schmidt wrote, should follow Jane Addams’ suggestion that “One does good, if at all, with people, not to people” (p. 339).

The other critique by Sciarra and Whitson (2007) stated that empowerment theory fits well with The Education Trust (2003) findings that course selection in high school was the greatest single variable in determining future success in post high school education. But Hipolito-Delgado & Lee, according to Sciarra & Whitson, did not mention academic achievement as a result of personal empowerment. Sciarra & Whitson wrote that the acquisition of a “positive identity” (p. 336), critical consciousness, and social action skills was not related by Hipolito-Delgado & Lee to educational achievement. Academic achievement was, in Sciarra’s & Whitson’s words, “the ultimate goal of all school counseling activity” (p. 336).

Sciarra and Whitson (2006) exemplified another example of confusion in the conceptualization of what a school counselor should be. According to one line of thinking by proponents of the comprehensive developmental program models, the ASCA (2003) Counseling Model, as well as NCLB, achievement and academic attainment are the sole objectives of school counseling programs. This is what they exist to do, and activities to advocate, empower, or address issues of oppression, are only important if they reach the ultimate measurable goal, achievement.

Hipolito-Delgado & Lee (2007) saw the issues of marginalization and oppression as critical to human survival and psychological wellbeing. If personal empowerment occurs, achievement will follow. There is a critical difference in the two. The accountability-measurement group hypothesizes that achievement is the ultimate beginning and psychological health and self-worth will follow once it is attained. The multicultural-social justice group believes that the ultimate goal is personal empowerment and self-worth through social action, and achievement will follow once it is attained.



### *School Counselor Practice and Empowerment and Achievement Groups*

Bemak (2005) addressed the possibility of implementing Empowerment Groups for Academic Success (EGAS) with at-risk and marginalized students. His article was a response to a previous piece on an empowerment group with African American at-risk female teenagers in an urban setting. The group process included an implementation of multicultural competencies along with empowerment and social justice activities. Bemak listed five issues that stood in the way of using the group approach and empowerment with at-risk students.

First, many counselor's sole experience in group work is very structured. Empowerment groups are only effective when the locus of control is with the group, not the counselor facilitator. Bemak lamented the fact that many school counselors cannot let go in group settings.

The second key issue was hesitancy among counselors to work cross-culturally. Demographically, students are becoming more diverse and school counselors are not. The typical school counselor is female and white (Bemak, 2005). So, the lack of comfort with diverse cultures is a huge problem. On the other hand, Bemak noted that Cheryl Holcomb-McCoy, a female African American counselor educator and writer, was adamant in responding to the article. Any empowerment group for African American females should have an African American female counselor leader. Bemak agreed, but there are few African American female counselors. In their absence, it is incumbent upon others to learn to deal cross culturally and to fill the gap. The ideal is not the real in the world of school counselors.

The third block to implementation is described above: The demographics of the profession are weighted heavily toward White women. The fourth block to implementation according to Bemak (2005), involved the high number of minority students who are considered to be at-risk through substance abuse, drop out, teen pregnancy and other activities which are

difficult for schools to deal with. Bemak (2007) wrote that many educators rejected problem students, blaming them, not the inadequate and ineffective programs the schools and school counselors provide.

The final block to implementation is related to controlling behaviors by school counselors, not empowerment. Bemak (2007) wrote: “Those who typically make the decisions must relinquish their power and authority, as the previously disempowered gain greater control to manage their own lives” (p.402). In a school setting that is wishful thinking.

### *The Nice Counselor, Changing the Dynamics*

The second article written by Fred Bemak and Rita Chi-Ying Chung (2008) specifically addressed aspects of school counselor subjectivity, the “Nice Counselor Syndrome” (p. 372), as well as fusing the Transforming School Counselor Initiative (Erford, House, & Martin, 2007 as cited in Bemak & Chung, 2008) with the social justice initiative of empowerment. Bemak and Chung attempted to explain the disjuncture, described in earlier reviews, between the accountability-achievement-measurement orientation and the advocacy-social justice-empowerment orientation. The authors describe the Transforming School Counselor Initiative as a call for school counselors to “embrace their roles as culturally competent social justice advocates and organizational change agents when working to close the achievement gap” (p. 372). The article explored the resistance of many school counselors to function as advocates and change agents for minority students and other groups who are oppressed. Bemak & Chung (2008) explained the resistance as a result of school counselor tendencies to be “nice people who consistently strive to promote harmony with others while avoiding and deflecting interpersonal conflicts in the school setting” (p. 374).

This is the essence of the *nice counselor syndrome*. The nice counselor avoids activities which may be seen as “controversial, conflictual, or challenging by other persons in the school community” (p. 374). School counselors, according to Bemak and Chung (2008), tend to be team players who will avoid dealing with the potential unpleasantness of conflict. If they do not engage students of color and poor students, they will not have to confront the forces that oppress them—those subjects often being linked to systemic inequities in the institution.

Additionally, the nice counselor is also cooperative in taking on quasi-administrative tasks assigned by administrators. The nice counselor, to paraphrase Bemak and Chung (2008), is a sweet person who believes in keeping the status quo and in being cooperative within the system, and who does not have the time to address systemic inequalities and oppression. The personality characteristics of nice counselors include personal fears of being disliked by their peers or ostracized in their jobs; being labeled as troublemakers when all they want to do is help, apathy as a coping strategy, anxiety over the inequities, guilt in not addressing them, and a sense of personal powerlessness and/or anger when confronted with the problems in the school (Bemak & Chung, 2008).

Bemak and Chung (2008) suggested that school counselor activities should include “(a) improved academic achievement for all students, (b) better attendance rates and reduced student tardiness, (c) promotion of higher test scores, (d) fewer disciplinary referrals, (e) reduced school dropout rates, (f) promotion of a health school climate...” (p. 378). The above activities offer school counselors opportunities to combine achievement and behavior objectives with social justice concerns without directly challenging the institutional status quo of the school.

### *Power and the Politics of School Counseling*

Much of the discussion of school counselor practice is actually a discussion of power and the ways in which it is distributed and transmitted. Bud McClure and Thomas Russo (1996) explored the various political implications of counselor practice which also applied to school counselor identity and practice. Their first position, that “much of the counseling profession remains entrenched, reified, and encapsulated from engaging in effective social change” (p. 162) was followed by a debate that implicated school counseling. It was between those counselors who argue for an advocacy-social justice approach and those that wanted to stay the course in terms of political involvement, afraid that increased activism will invite censure. While the entire profession of counseling was the subject of the article, the authors included incidents specifically related to school counseling along with general observations concerning counseling practice.

McClure and Russo (1996) referred to Chomsky’s definition of mandarinism when behavior is performed without awareness of the “role really played, the function really served of the objectives really pursued (Chomsky as cited in McClure & Russo, p. 164). They described school counselors who tried to convince their students that the intolerable conditions in their schools were not really that bad. Students were counseled to adjust to poor conditions rather than work to change the conditions that provoke the pain.

McClure & Russo (1996) listed “impediments to change” (p. 165), which replicated some of the issues of school counselor practice previously analyzed. First, counseling practice and theory focused on the individual and the concept of “the Self” (McClure & Russo, p. 165) and seemingly excluded the influence of social, historical, and cultural factors. Secondly, the focus on counselor licensure, professionalization, and credibility resulted in an alliance with the “dominant paradigm” (McClure & Russo, p. 165). The dominant paradigm holds power.

McClure & Russo described the origin of power and its relationship to counselors in the following manner—

Power comes from the institutions in which counselors work and from the agencies that license them. It is granted contingent on one's working within prescribed boundaries that serve the larger system, and it can be taken away or certification denied if individuals attempt to use that power against those same institutions. Transformative change is unlikely. (p. 166)

The third impediment to change in the profession had to do with the emphasis on science and the value of neutrality (McClure & Russo, 1996). Counselors employed the notion that they were objective, and thus insulated from the influence of the social, political, and institutional nature of their work. Borrowing from psychology, counselors ascribed to the medical-scientific model in establishing their credibility. The use of measurement and diagnosis was part of school programs.

#### Summary and Conclusions

The early history of school counseling and guidance focused on selection through testing and vocational choice. There were competing schools of thought between those who mainly supported developmental theories and those who supported behavioral theories. The developmental theories of the Chicago School, personified by John Dewey represented one position (Lambie & Williamson, 2004), and the social efficiency movement represented by David Snedden (Wirth, 1983), as well as the behavioral theories of E. L. Thorndike, were prominent proponents of the other in the early 20<sup>th</sup> century (Myrick, 1987).

The NDEA Counseling and Guidance Training Institutes as well as the support for standardized achievement and aptitude testing greatly influenced the rapid growth of school counseling in the 1960s (Myrick, 1987). School guidance and counseling evolved into student personnel work and it was not until the 1980s and 1990s that the profession developed as a

comprehensive developmental program.

NDEA was originally enacted to identify academically talented students and to encourage those students to enroll in higher education (Tyler, 1960). Support was also provided for achievement and ability testing to select promising students at an early age. The original institutes were held in the summer of 1959. The regular, year-long institutes began in 1963-1964. By the time the regular session institutes were enacted, the focus of the institutes had shifted from the selection of the academically talented to services for all students (Pierson, 1965).

Problems with the growth and development of the profession of school counseling emerged as tension between administrative and institutional conceptualizations of counselor practice which involved school counselors as test administrators, and quasi-administrative functionaries. School counselors were required to have teaching experience and were often expected to administer discipline. The counseling function of school counselors, and the need for confidentiality was often distrusted and misunderstood by administrators.

The role of social justice advocacy in school counseling was a recent addition to the identity of school counselors, and several articles addressed the absence of the advocacy function in counselor practice. School counselors were portrayed in some articles as people who wished to get along within the school setting (Bemak & Chung, 2007). In getting along, they may agree to roles that further limited their ability to function effectively as a professional school counselor (Schmidt, 2007).

The next chapter focused on the ways school counselors affected the equal educational opportunities of school children. It also defined and analyzed liberal political theory and equal educational opportunity history and theory

CHAPTER III:  
SCHOOL COUNSELORS AND  
EQUAL EDUCATIONAL OPPORTUNITY

In this chapter I lay out a particular conceptualization of “equal educational opportunity” (EEO). I begin with a brief overview of liberal political theory since this sets the foundation for the various interpretations of equal educational opportunity that I review. As the philosophical framework for this project, understanding equal educational opportunity is crucial to an analysis of the shaping of counseling and the ways this served or not the educational needs of students.<sup>3</sup>

Liberalism and Equal Educational Opportunity

The description and analysis of the persons and events surrounding the NDEA, civil rights era legislation, and judicial decisions would not be complete without a comprehensive presentation of liberal political theories and EEO, as represented in the Congress and judicial system from the New Deal to the Civil Rights Era of the 1960s and 1970s. The topic of equality of educational opportunity was represented in the research question that explored the ways in which EEO was either supported or circumvented by school counselors. The analysis of liberal-egalitarian theory and EEO reflected the acceptance of liberal theories in the functioning of every aspect of public policy in the United States from its beginning until the present.

---

<sup>3</sup> To some degree, the problem of “presentism” is raised here. However, it should be noted that discussions of the meaning of equal educational opportunity were occurring more or less in the same time period, especially discussion driven by the Coleman Report. Furthermore, the later and current discussions and interpretations of EEO are relevant to the extent that the profession continues to be open to earlier critiques. It can be argued, for example, that counselors still serve as gatekeepers.

## Liberal Political Theory

Tozer et al. (2002) suggested six ideas that were fundamental components of classical liberalism that emerged in the American colonies in the eighteenth century. They were “faith in reason, natural law, republican virtue, progress, nationalism, and freedom” (p. 25). Liberalism replaced the feudal idea that “worth was determined by one’s place in society” (Tozer et al., p. 25) with an understanding that each individual possessed certain rights. Consequently the discussion and argument of liberal political theory until the present time reflects the tension between the conceptualization of individual rights and the good in a free society.

John Locke was associated with social contract theory in the classical tradition Locke hypothesized a pre-civil “state of nature” (Abowitz, 2000, p. 26) from which men<sup>4</sup> would enter into a “commonwealth” (p. 26). The idea was that “a person is, by nature, free within a social construct called civil society” (p. 26). Within this construct the person would escape “the inconveniences and insufficiencies of the state of nature . . . through consent and contract” (p. 26). Locke’s ideas were extremely important in the years of the American Revolution and the young republic.

An additional aspect of liberal philosophy was the notion of the neutrality of the state. Kymlicka (1989) wrote “that people are entitled to ‘neutral concern’ from the government” (p. 76), which meant that as long as their idea of what was important (the good) did not infringe on the rights of others, and even if it was disapproved by the majority, it was allowed in a liberal society. Neutrality formed a basic principle of noninterference in the lives of individuals, and it was represented in American society in the Bill of Rights in which unpopular opinions and acts were protected from government interference.

---

<sup>4</sup> It is important to point out that Locke’s notions of the consent of the governed and social contracts applied only to men.



Negative freedom is related to the concept of neutrality and is described as freedom from government interference (Tozer et al., 2002). The idea of negative freedom derived from classical liberalism. Positive freedom, the duty of government to intervene for the wellbeing of its citizens, evolved over the course of United States History. Both understandings of freedom are also incorporated in liberal political theory and EEO.

The next section outlines the liberal political philosophies which shaped and developed the concept of EEO. None is more important than *A Theory of Justice*, published by John Rawls in 1971. Rawls actually outlined many of the ideas for the book in an article in 1957. Later, as a response to dialogues concerning *A Theory of Justice*, Rawls wrote an article that appeared in 1985. Most of the commentary in this work is referenced in the two articles which appeared before and considerably after the 1971 book.

#### *Equal Liberty, Primary Goods, and John Rawls' Theory of Justice*

Contemporary liberal theory is often defined by what it is not. Thus, articles addressing theories posit themselves as responses to other positions. *A Theory of Justice* (Rawls, 1971) was designed as a response to utilitarian political theory. Utilitarian theory was concerned with the overall good of society, typically discussed in terms of happiness, while Rawls defended societal rights and an explanation of primary goods that differed from the utilitarian understanding.

The “primary goods” essentially refers to those things – “liberty and opportunity, income and wealth, and the bases of self-respect” (Rawls, 1971, p. 303) -- that the two principles of justice will seek to divide along the lines set out by the “difference principle.” The difference principle, is set out by Rawls in the second part of the second of his two “principles of justice” which are:

- (1) Each person has an equal right to a fully adequate scheme of equal basic rights and liberties, which scheme is compatible with a similar scheme for all.

- (2) Social and economic inequalities are to satisfy two conditions: First, they must be attached to offices and positions open to all under conditions of fair equality of opportunity; and second, *they must be to the greatest benefit of the least advantaged members of society*. (emphasis added, p. 303).

Kymlicka (1988) provided an explanation of Rawls' theory of the good in his critique, Rawls on Teleology and Deontology. Rawls proposed "a thin theory of the good" (p. 186) which "best enables people to act on and examine their beliefs about values" (p. 187). It was an understanding of the good that was not imposed on the person but came from the individual's "essential interests" (p. 187) and was open to revision and change.

It contrasted with the utilitarian theory of the good which imposed a conception of the good on the social world while treating society as if it was a single entity, not composed of individuals. The utilitarian view was, according to Kymlicka, a perfectionistic view of society while Rawls' explanation of the good was antiperfectionist, in that it was not "tied to the promotion of any particular view of the good life" (p. 188). It was specific however, in championing the freedom to change one's ideals as well as to access to the primary goods.

The two principles of justice are the bulwark of Rawls' concept of "justice as fairness." Rawls was interested in balance between competing claims of liberty. He was also committed to the idea of the first principle of justice, "that each person participating in a practice, or affected by it, has an equal right to the most extensive liberty compatible with a like liberty for all" (p. 653). Justice could be attained, in the first principle, by recognizing difference in the access to liberty or rights, while equalizing access.

In the second principle of justice, Rawls (1957) described the existence of inequality in a democratic society as "allowed only if there is reason to believe that the practice with the inequality will work to the advantage of *every party*" (p. 654). The key to the concept of inequality was that there must be general agreement to acknowledge inequality among citizens.

The extension of this idea is that the practice of an inequality, such as an elected or appointed office, must somehow work to the advantage of all the citizens, especially those who have less access to the fruits of society.

Differences in social standing, in Rawls' theory of justice (1971), were based upon the consent of the citizenry and mitigated by the idea that access and opportunity to the privileges were available to all. It was a cooperative idea, that the citizen could gain some privilege but would agree to spread societal benefits to the least privileged or weakest members of the social order (as per the directive of the difference principle). In that sense all would benefit and it would be an incentive to encourage citizens to assist all members of the group.

The 1957 article also outlined an early form of what came to be known as the original position in *A Theory of Justice* (1971). The idea of a reworking of Locke's social contract led Rawls to posit a position in which hypothetical community members would come up with principles to handle complaints. In order to do so, they must design a set of principles in which:

Each is to propose the principles upon which he wishes his complaints to be tried with the understanding that, if acknowledged, the complaints of others will be similarly tried, and that no complaints will be heard at all until everyone is roughly of one mind as to how complaints are to be judged. (p. 656)

In this early analysis of theories of justice, Rawls acknowledged the need for a sort of blind side in constructing equality and justice in which the participants recognize that the liberties they give to themselves will be shared equally.

Rawls (1985) sought to rework the social contract so that it placed all members of the society in a free and equal position. Thus, one group should not have greater access to advantages than any other group. That led to the idea of the original position which he describe as "some point of view removed from and not distorted by the particular features and circumstances of the all-encompassing background framework, from which a fair agreement

between free and equal persons can be reached” (Rawls, 1985, p. 235).

The term, “the veil of ignorance” described a hypothetical position in which the participants did not know their standing in society, prior to the selection of a “conception of justice” (p. 238). The position, though hypothetical, illustrated the idea that fairness required the consideration of rights and goods and restrictions in a society to be chosen without knowing where the selector would be in terms of social position or other marks of rank. If one did not know where her position would be in the hypothetical society, she would surely choose the best idea of rights and goods for all.

In his later article, published almost thirty years after the 1957 work. Rawls responded to various critiques and questions surrounding *A Theory of Justice* (1971). Rawls (1985) referred to *A Theory of Justice* (1971) as a political theory intended to describe optimal conditions of fairness for a constitutional democracy. The work was not “intended as the application of a general moral conception to the basic structure of society” (p. 225) as with utilitarianism, which was applied to individuals as well as nations as a moral philosophy.

Another important aspect of justice as fairness for Rawls (1985) addressed the development of the principle of tolerance after the religious wars in Europe following the reformation. Tolerance, the emergence of constitutional democracies, and the growth of capitalistic “large market economies” (p. 225) resulted in a reassessment of how democratic societies worked, allowing for diverse and conflicting understandings of the good. Justice as fairness to Rawls proposed the aim of justice to be “free agreement, reconciliation through public reason” (p. 230). Rawls (1985), in the latter argument, clearly believed that the concept of justice must steer away from the metaphysical and moral philosophies. He presented this approach, which he presents as a notion of “reasonable pluralism” (Rawls, 1993), as practical,

fair, and part of human nature. The notion of reasonable pluralism is necessitated by the promotion of the “moral powers” -- “a capacity for a sense of justice and a capacity for a conception of the good” (Rawls, 1985, p. 23). The concept of the good was not a narrow understanding, rather it was “what is valuable in human life” (p. 233) to include one’s important relationships and affiliations.

### *The Rawlsian Connection to EEO*

The idea of the original position described the potential for a society to select fair and just principles for all its citizens without discrimination based upon social rank. While Rawls did not specifically address EEO, the idea that all in a society should receive the best that was available (Rawls, 1957) could be applied to schooling to the extent that education and, therefore an equal opportunity for education, is almost universally recognized as a prerequisite for equal opportunity more generally.

### *Distinguishing Between Liberal and Democratic Aims*

Strike (1991) more thoroughly extended the discussion of liberal political theory in a democratic society to include schooling. He argued that liberalism was primarily about freedom. Classical liberal theorists supported the idea of freedom by connecting it to rights which limited the authority of the state in the social contract theory of Locke, or by limiting “the authority of the state over individuals” (p. 415). According to Mills, Strike distinguished between “liberal” and “democratic”, establishing that they did not mean the same thing and could have “differing and conflicting interpretations” (p. 415). No society with a monarch could be democratic, but it could be liberal. That is, certain rights would be within the control of the state, and certain rights would be private. On the other hand, a society could decide that there would be one state religion by democratic means, but that society would not be liberal. While acknowledging the tension

that existed between democracy and liberalism, Strike believed that both were necessary for a free and equal society, and “we might believe as a consequence that they are entitled both to the right to be free of unreasonable state interference” (p. 417), as liberalism, and “the right to participate in such public decisions as necessary” (p. 417), as democracy.

Kymlicka (1989) described modern liberalism as being concerned with “civil and personal liberties” (p. 13). Individuals must have the opportunity to gain knowledge of different views and the ability to analyze and question those views through the liberal commitment to education. With these liberties came the ability to determine what was valuable as described in the following passage:

According to liberalism, since our most essential interest is in getting these beliefs right and acting on them, government treats people as equals, with equal concern and respect, by providing for each individual the liberties and resources needed to examine and act on these beliefs. This requirement forms the basis of contemporary liberal theories of justice. (p. 13)

The key liberal egalitarian principles which emerged from Rawls (1971), theory of justice invoked fairness by proposing a way to grant all members of a society equal opportunity “to the most extensive liberty compatible with a like liberty for all” (p. 653). Additionally, the principle also provided for the advancement of some citizens, mitigated by the idea that greater advantage entailed greater benefits to all. Strike (1991) distinguished between liberalism and democracy, while Kymlicka (1989) acknowledged the role of government in providing for individual “liberties and resources” (p. 13). These contemporary liberal theories incorporated egalitarian principles of positive freedom, the recognition that government was responsible to its citizens to provide equitable access to liberty and happiness.

Contemporary liberal theorists who focused on equality and fairness in the distribution of society’s rights and goods greatly influenced the evolution of theories of EEO and for that reason

were important to the development of the theories of EEO surrounding desegregation as well as the enactment of the NDEA Title V. Many questions concerning school counseling practice were centered in the school's and the school counselor's interpretation of justice, fairness, equality and the distribution of society's benefits.

The influence of classical liberal political theories that stressed neutrality as expressed by the idea of negative freedom or nonintervention by the government, and the limitation of powers administered by the federal government, were just as important in the understanding of EEO, and the ways in which justice was distributed in education, as the concepts of positive freedom which supported a strong government that looked after the needs of its citizens.

In the following sections, I provide a discussion of the historical trajectory of conceptualizations of EEO that derive from liberal political theory as reviewed previously. I point out the ways that these liberal-egalitarian principles ultimately inform the conceptualization of EEO to which I cleave. In the process, I will incorporate and/or explain away other political theories that might inform conceptualizations of EEO, including communitarianism, libertarianism, and utilitarianism.

#### *Defining EEO: Inputs vs. Outcomes and Other Issues*

Equal educational opportunity emerged as a central concept in educational policy after *Brown v. the Board of Education (1954)*. Howe (1992) distinguished between the analysis of EEO in philosophical debates concerning differing conceptions of justice and the criterion of educational inputs or outcomes, with the specific application of EEO in educational policy discussions. In educational practice, the expression, EEO, was used as if its meaning was transparent and self-explanatory. The philosophical analysis of EEO was not much good in determining policy according to Howe (1992) and the use of the term in describing educational

policy was not as simple as it seemed. Howe (1992) asserted that EEO had different meanings for different issues.

Amy Gutmann (1987), in the introduction to *Democratic Education*, acknowledged the contrast between the political theory of and the practice of EEO. She wrote,

In general, we cannot understand a political theory or use its principles to evaluate existing practices until we engage in the process of formulating its principles, translating them into practices, and judging the practices against our convictions. (p. 18)

The first empirical attempt following *Brown v. Board of Education* (1954; 1955) to apply political theory of EEO to educational practices was a massive study conducted by the sociologist James Coleman and others, published in the 1960s. In 1967, Coleman spoke at a conference sponsored by Harvard University Graduate School of Education, concerning the U.S. Office of Education report on *Equality of Educational Opportunity*. The presentation was later published in the *Harvard Educational Review* under the title of *The Concept of Equality of Educational Opportunity*. To my mind, the Coleman study provided an early example of Gutmann's (1987) contention that political theory must be tested in practice and adjusted as to results.

#### A Brief History of Equality of Educational Opportunity

Equality of education emerged in the 19<sup>th</sup> century in the United States in the “common school” (Coleman, 1967) in which four conditions existed:

- (a) Providing a *free* education up to a given level which constituted the principal entry point to the labor force.
- (b) Providing a common curriculum for all children, regardless of background.
- (c) Partly by design and partly because of low population density, providing that children from diverse backgrounds attend the *same school*.
- (d) Providing equality within a given *locality*, since local taxes provided the source of support for schools. (p. 6)



Coleman acknowledged that the four conditions were still considered to define EEO by many. Those conditions took away barriers to school entrance, but would not take into account extraneous conditions among students. During the Common School era, there were economic barriers to the equitable enactment for poor children since farm work and other trades required the children of poor families to enter the work area early. Also, there were limitations in the ability of sons of craftsmen to extend their education beyond grammar school if they were to train in their father's occupation. In brief, secondary education often foreclosed opportunities for working class children while opening opportunities for middle and upper class children.

Coleman (1967) addressed the continuing existence of the preceding system as a dilemma that was still accepted in the sixties:

This question still arises with differentiated secondary curriculum: an academic program in high school has not only the effect of keeping open the opportunities that arise through continued education, but also the effect of closing off opportunities that a vocational program keeps open. (p. 7)

The common school concept of EEO resulted in fewer opportunities for working class students. It also promoted an assumption that mere exposure to a curriculum would provide an adequate level of equality. Coleman (1967) pointed to the expectation that the child, in this concept, would do all the work. The only requirement of the school was that it "provide an opportunity" (Coleman, p. 8) by simply being there. The school was passive in this framework, an ideal of EEO that Burbules and Sherman would later dub a "formalist" ideal (a discussion to which a return subsequently).

This idea of EEO relied on an assumption that the school could predict the child's future and thus place the child in a curriculum that met the needs of that future. But Coleman argued that in the United States social mobility was not as static as European nations and diverse occupational opportunities were more common than in Europe.

### *Equality of Educational Opportunity and the Court Decisions*

The concept of separate but equal public facilities was decided in *Plessy v. Ferguson* (1896). It quickly became the standard in public education in the Southern states. Then, in 1954, the ruling was changed in *Brown v. Board*, the decision being that separate, by its very nature, was unequal. The South vigorously opposed the logic that African American and White children attending the same school was a factor in achieving equality of educational opportunity. They applied the logic that separate schools did not violate the standard of equality because the earlier concept provided for a common curriculum (Coleman, 1967). The Southern argument, that the level of equality could be achieved by mirrored resources (which, in fact rarely occurred) caused the Supreme Court a great deal of trouble. Therefore, the Court included two findings when it overturned *Plessy*, stating in the first instance, “the legal premise that the use of race as a basis for school assignment violates fundamental freedoms” (p. 11) and in the second instance, the *effect* (Coleman, 1967) of separate schools had a pervasive and punitive influence on the future opportunities of African American children.

Coleman (1967) believed that the Court could have successfully struck down *Plessy v. Ferguson* (1896) with an argument that focused entirely on the first premise. But the court’s ruling shifted the focus of the goals of EEO to “*results*” (p. 11) or outcomes that were the “implicit”(p. 12) goals of the earlier concerns of EEO. They were not, however, expressed as such until the very moment of the Court’s ruling.

The problem with the ruling, according to Coleman (1967), was that it allowed for the “assessment of gross inequalities, such as that created by dual school systems in the south...but nothing beyond that” (p. 12). Then, the focus on the “effects of schooling” (p. 12) was used as justification for another concept, that of racial integration. Effects of schooling was not a

“criterion of inequality” (p. 12) as Coleman described it, but a means to the creation of racial integration as the primary focus of the ruling.

Coleman (1967) identified the *Survey of Equality of Educational Opportunity* he helped design and conduct for the Office of Education as the “next stage in the evolution of this concept” (p. 12). The original notion that the criterion of race in school assignments “violates fundamental freedoms” (p. 11), he believed, was replaced by the new concepts which confused and extended the definition of equality of educational opportunity so as to make the task of identifying levels of EEO difficult. The added criterion, “equality as measured by results of schooling, and equality defined by racial integration, confounded the issue even further” (p. 13).

In designing the survey, Coleman (1967) was charged with attending to the needs of the Office of Civil Rights in the Justice Department; the Congress, and the Office of Education. It was apparent that there were several concepts of equality of educational opportunity. Coleman took his direction from an internal memorandum<sup>5</sup> which listed the concepts identified as unequal. The types of inequality were also described in a later publication, *The Evaluation of Equality of Educational Opportunity*, (Coleman, 1968) a publication which attempted to answer some of the critiques of the original survey. Coleman’s description of the five concepts of inequality was as follows:

- (a) One type of inequality referred to “differences of the community’s input to the school, such as per pupil expenditure, school plants, libraries, quality of teachers, and other similar quantities (p. 13).
- (b) A second type was defined “in terms of the racial composition of the school, following the Supreme Court’s decision that segregated schooling is inherently unequal” (p. 13).

---

<sup>5</sup> The source of the internal memorandum is not identified in this presentation. However, *The evaluation of equality of educational opportunity of Schools* (Coleman, 1968) gives a more detailed description of the process and the original statement that authorized the survey in *The Civil Rights Act of 1964*.

- (c) “Various intangible characteristics of the school as well as the factors directly traceable to the community inputs to the school” (p. 14). Included teacher morale, expectations of students, student’s interest in learning, etc.
- (d) The fourth type of inequality had to do with effects or results. What were the outcomes for students who shared backgrounds and abilities? “Equality of education is equality of results, given the same input” (p. 14).
- (e) This type of inequality refers to “terms of consequences of the school for individuals of unequal backgrounds and abilities” (p. 14).

This criterion would be equality of results given differing individual input. (Coleman used as an example children from homes in which English was not the first language.)

Thus, this conceptualization of inequality recognized both inputs and outcomes as important components. In planning the survey, the investigators recognized that (a) there was no one single understanding of equality of educational opportunity; and (b) the survey must approach several ideas of equality (Coleman, 1967). The first decision had to do with “discovering the intent of Congress” (p. 13) and the second with the idea of intent to discriminate, or “locating willful discrimination” (p. 13). The decision was made to focus on the fourth type of inequality, “Equality of education is equality of results, given the same input” (p. 14) and also addressed the other four types of inequalities which would insure pluralism in the report (p. 15).

Focusing on the several types of inequalities supposedly would lead to educational policy to improve effects or results of education (Coleman, 1967). Coleman argued that it was not the responsibility of the Survey to determine government policy. It was the responsibility of the Survey to determine what conditions of inequality could be identified. Coleman referred to the political nature of the process to define equality by writing, “Such a definition will be an outcome of the interplay of a variety of interests, and will certainly differ from time to time as these interests differ” (p. 15). The Survey represented a new evolution to Coleman in the definitions of equality, splitting into two camps. The first three conditions of equality were

decided by input—external factors ranging from the school administration to the educational preparation of the students at the school and such extraneous factors as teacher morale. The last two conditions represented the effects or results of education. In the report of the survey, the dichotomy between inputs (which had previously limited the range of options) and effects demonstrated the concept of “*effective* equality of education . . . in those elements that are effective for learning” (p. 17).

Coleman (1967) demonstrated that inputs were viewed in the same order of importance between students attending White schools and students attending African American schools. The critical effect of focusing on results moved the discussion away from the “definitions” (p. 17) implied by the “inputs” (p. 17) criteria, to the “effects of inputs” (p. 17) becoming the criteria for the measurement of the quality of schooling as well as the degree of equality of educational opportunity that obtained.

Coleman’s (1967) conclusions referred to the prior understanding represented by the common school, that children (and their families) held the responsibility for taking advantage of educational opportunities. The evolution of equality of educational opportunity in Coleman’s eyes, rested with the school. The shift in responsibility was created by the movement from a concern with inputs to a focus on effects. Inequality of educational opportunity, according to Coleman, was measured by “the difference in achievement at grade twelve between the average Negro and the average white” (p. 21), and “in effect, the reduction of that inequality of opportunity, is a responsibility of the school” (p. 21).

Coleman’s (1967) work, and the analysis and defense of the survey, provided considerable information and discussion among political theorists and policymakers in the years thereafter. It was most important for its focus on the political implications of the court ruling in

*Brown*, and the legislation passed to effect equality of educational opportunity. The next section describes several approaches to the identification of equality of educational opportunity during the decades after the Coleman Report.

*Further Refinement of Equality of Educational Opportunity (EEO)*

Nicholas Burbules and Ann Sherman published an article in 1979 which addressed the acceptance of equality of educational opportunity or EEO, critiquing, among other aspects of EEO, the use of the term in the educational and political vernacular. They asked if equal education was a “worthy ideal?” (p. 105) or, was it a mistaken principle, incapable of definition and subject to ideology? The authors reviewed the principle of EEO and responded to six common criticisms. They concluded that the criticisms indicated that the principle of EEO, alone, was not adequate “to guarantee a decent education to every person . . . the principle constitutes a necessary, but not sufficient, basis for educational policy” (p. 105).

EEO was described by Burbules and Sherman (1979) as “a distributive principle, concerned with providing *access* to education” (p. 106). One central thrust of the paper was to question Coleman and others, as to the conceptualization of EEO as results-oriented. They posited EEO as a principle that implied “willing” and “choice.” For them “it is an essential feature of an opportunity . . . that it can be ignored, or passed up . . .” (p. 106).

The possible types of EEO were described by Burbules and Sherman as *formalist*, *actualist* and *equal outcomes*. The *formalist* interpretation limited the principle to access. It allowed only that formal barriers to equal participation in schools be removed. The strict interpretation removed restrictions based on race, gender, disabling condition, etc., but did not allow for additional intervention to even the playing field. Compensation was not emphasized. Different “inputs” such as social and economic status, educational background of parents, and

myriad other factors that might influence a child's opportunities were not engaged. Burbules and Sherman (1979) described the *formalist* interpretation as encouraging people to pull themselves up and "make their own opportunities" (p. 106).

An actualist interpretation recognized barriers to EEO based upon lack of earlier opportunities. Considered in this interpretation were the differing needs of the students, with an emphasis on compensatory intervention. There was a focus on fairness and the responsibility of the institution and less concern with students making their own way.

The third interpretation of EEO, *equal-results*, focused on Coleman's study and conclusions. Equal-results could be interpreted in several ways. Some political theorists argued for results that were *the same* for everyone; others looked at *equal* amounts of progress between groups who started at different levels; still others asked for *proportional* measures in which the distribution of achievement within each group looked alike.

Upon reviewing a number of criticisms of the concept itself, Burbules and Sherman (1979) offer the following summary that is worth citing at length:

On the positive side, it [the principle of EEO] preserves certain right of liberty and free choice; it determines the distribution of opportunities for education on the basis of relevant, rather than irrelevant, characteristics; and it supports policies which will expectably equalize educational outcomes. On the negative side, the principle does not lead one to question, the goals of education; it is a meritocratic, individualistic, and competitive principle; it cannot guarantee a more equal distribution of educational outcomes; and it is conservative and indeterminate with regard to a broad range of social and educational outcomes. In short, given different determinations of 'relevance,' given alternative conceptions of 'education,' and given other social goals or principles, the principle of equal educational opportunity could support nearly any kind of educational policy. (pp. 110-111)

In short, according to Burbules' and Sherman's (1979) explanation of the three types of EEO, formalist, actualist, or outcomes based, all demonstrated serious flaws. Indeed, they dismissed the last as not being a conceptualization of EEO at all. In order to counter the values that were

not challenged by EEO, the authors recommended additional principles that would insure “a just distribution of education, and a decent education for each person in society”(p. 112). However, the only principle specifically identified was Rawls’ difference principle, stipulating “any distribution, as for education, must work to the ‘greatest benefit to the least advantaged in society” (p. 111).

Burbules’ and Sherman’s (1979) analysis was the source of an article by Howe (1989), who responded to the outcomes entails choices argument section. Howe agreed that the argument was quite acceptable when applied to adults, but lost its validity when applied to schoolchildren. He wrote, “Because children’s capacity and responsibility for choice making are limited, the sense in which they enjoy opportunities is attenuated” (p. 317). Also, since surrogates were responsible for making the choices for children, whether it entailed parents, or the state in the guise of schools, Howe supported some form of “mandatory opportunities” (p. 317) for children. Howe also built on Burbules’ and Shermans’ correct observation that traditional (conservative) conceptualizations of EEO did not question the educational status quo.

*The Liberal-Egalitarian Position, the Threshold Principle of Distribution and EEO*

Howe’s (1997) outcomes-based interpretation of EEO relied on four criteria for what he described as “the educational threshold” that formed the ‘participatory educational ideal”:

- (1) There was a certain level (threshold) of educational attainment which would enable individuals to acquire societal benefits of employment, health and a good life.
- (2) The threshold was also characterized as a collective good for the benefit of the whole society.
- (3) The threshold was needs-based in that different educational investments were required for individuals. Not everyone had the same needs.
- (4) The threshold was results or outcome based. (p. 26)

Howe credited the work of Amy Gutmann (1987) for his analysis of the threshold principle, and described her work as liberal communitarian. The *democratic threshold principle*, depicted by



Gutmann (1987) in *Democratic Education*, described two principles of “democratic distribution” as:

- (1) “*The democratic authorization principle*” which “recognizes the mistake in maximization by granting authority to democratic institutions to determine the priority of education relative to other social goods.
- (2) *The democratic threshold principle* “that avoids the mistakes in both equalization and meritocracy by specifying that inequalities in the distribution of education goods can be justified if, but only if, they do not deprive any child of the ability to participate effectively in the democratic process. (p. 136)

Gutmann (1987) explained that education above the democratic threshold could be distributed according to meritocratic principles, while education below the threshold was not acceptable. Gutman recognized that decisionmaking concerning the threshold requirements was something to be decided democratically. Overall, her discussion of the democratic threshold principle provided a beginning for Howe’s (1997) description of the “participatory educational ideal” (p. 26).

#### *Compensatory or Participatory EEO*

The liberal-egalitarian position may be characterized as “compensatory” according to Howe (1989). Compensatory EEO was described as a systematic effort to recognize the need to “help shape desirable educational careers by compensating for characteristics of individuals that disadvantage them in education institutions” (p. 29). The child would be provided with opportunities to allow for differences or correct deficiencies. Compensatory education could be compared to Burbules’ and Sherman’s (1979) conception of actualist EEO. It was also open to the critiques of the Burbules and Sherman article. Because compensatory EEO often imposed a specific cultural and value-laden standard to students, it was criticized for ignoring the voices of marginalized groups and imposing the status quo on marginalized groups. Compensatory EEO was also criticized by left leaning political theorists because it did not address the underlying

social (class) and economic structures of inequality. Compensatory EEO was criticized by the right because it allowed for governmental interference.

The participatory ideal of EEO, combined with compensatory views, allowed historically marginalized groups to negotiate what they valued in terms of EEO (Howe, 1989). The critical distinction between compensatory and participatory EEO was the recognition that compensatory EEO, as practiced in schooling and the administration of schooling by the state, generally *defined* the abilities, limitations, and rights of groups, rather than listening to the voices of those groups and allowing them to define their own needs and educational interests in light of their own view of the good.

Notice that Howe's interpretation is rooted in the liberal ideal of autonomy, among other ideals. More, however, it is a liberal-egalitarian view, in the tradition of Rawls. Thus, it is not surprising that his participatory ideal of EEO is further informed through critiques of non-liberal (communitarianism) and non-egalitarian (libertarianism and utilitarianism) theories. In the following sections define these theories and briefly address their differences with the liberal-egalitarian position and ideals of EEO.

#### Current Communitarian Political Theory, EEO, and A Critique of Liberal-Egalitarianism

Communitarian political theory is centered in the idea that human beings are defined by the communities that they inhabit so that the individual is the product of those communities. The community, not the individual or the state should be the object of analysis (Arthur, 1998).

Communitarians believe that modern society has lost its sense of social equilibrium with too much emphasis on rights without an equal focus on responsibilities. Important concepts to communitarians are "fraternity, solidarity, civic pride, social obligation, and tradition" (p. 354). Responsibility to the community is privileged over responsibility to the individual. The trade-off,

to communitarians, is greater opportunity, but the units of analysis are the communities in which the individual participates.

Contemporary communitarian theorists emerged in the 1970s as a response to John Rawl's *A Theory of Justice*, Ronald Dworkin's *Taking Rights Seriously*, and Robert Nozick's *Anarchy, State and Utopia*, (Arthur, 1998). The argument between communitarians and liberal-egalitarians was based on the premise among liberals that society did not determine the good for its members, society made it possible for its members to pursue the good. Communitarians asserted the impossibility of separating the individual from the social communities to which they were attached. The association with these communities was not voluntary or chosen. Therefore communitarians denied the premise of individual agency, a key aspect of liberal-egalitarian thought.

The differences between liberal-egalitarians and the contemporary communitarians were many. A major distinction existed between individual good and the rights implicit in seeking that good, and the conceptualization of some kind of common or societal good for communitarians which would supersede the rights of the individual. The focus on individual rights and distributive justice was particularly abhorrent to communitarians, lodged as they were, in a sense of the community as an organism and individuals as parts of that organism, not singular entities.

As regards EEO, Howe (1997) argued that contemporary communitarians could interpret EEO merely as "expanded school choice as the key to responding to the diversity that currently characterizes U.S. public education" (p. 10). However, the communitarian position did not account for the fact that school choice could not guarantee that community could be created. Choice was only one part of EEO. Additionally the focus on group solidarity among communitarians so removed the individual from the center of the discussion that it would prove

impossible to determine just what EEO meant for students other than the re-creation of the community. The focus on recreation of the community and the lack of provision for the capacity of individuals to challenge the community is, for Howe, a clear betrayal of the liberal democratic impulse. The participatory ideal allows for group solidarity in determining the content of EEO, but emphasizes the individual capacity to reason about and challenge the group.

#### Libertarianism, EEO, and the Critique of Liberal-Egalitarianism

Historically, the contemporary libertarian position of theorists such as Nozick was very close to classical liberalism with its focus on negative freedom. Libertarians objected to the involvement of government in distributing and redistributing goods and/or services in the hopes of effecting material change in the lives of its citizens (Howe, 1997). They believed in a minimalist approach to government which would not include “unequal patterns of results” (p. 23) to justify taking goods from one group of citizens to give to another group. Howe (1989) in critiquing this position was quick to point out that children cannot choose their education. Modern libertarian thought was closely associated with Robert Nozick’s argument that “individuals have an inviolable moral right to be free in their person and property, and the minimal role of the state is to protect individual freedoms” (Abowitz, 2000). Other aspects of classical liberalism embodied in libertarian thought are the concern with governmental interference in the lives of its citizens; a laissez faire approach to economics; and the appeal to reason and “rugged individualism” (Tozer et al., 2002).

Howe (1997) argued that the contrast between Rawls’ liberal-egalitarian stance and Nozick’s (1974) libertarian argument was that Rawls recognized that individuals cannot control their circumstances for good or ill in the “natural lottery.” While Nozick acknowledged the “unfortunate” nature of chance in human lives, he would not support intervention by government

to address the resultant inequities. Furthermore, libertarians do not seem to recognize social causation and base their beliefs on a free market view of educational opportunity which did not support fair distribution of resources in a just society. Libertarians would support a formalist approach to EEO which offered the bare opportunity to an education with no assistance for those with unequal beginnings. Libertarians did not recognize equal outcomes, rejecting any attempts to level appropriations of the good.

Howe (1989) expressed consternation at the libertarian ideal. He argued that essentially libertarians hold that “being born into a poverty stricken environment...has no effect on one’s life chances, that society has no responsibility to try to do something, that this is ‘unfortunate but not unfair’, that all that is required is an exercise of will,” which, for Howe, “seems beyond the pale” (p. 326).

#### Utilitarianism, EEO and the Critique of Liberal-Egalitarianism

Utilitarianism historically was defined as “the greatest happiness for the greatest number” (Christman, 2002, p. 14). As a political theory, utilitarianism could possibly deny individuals or groups of individuals, basic human rights in the cause of maximizing the overall good.

Utilitarians practice trade-offs, that is, one person’s good could be sacrificed for the good of another, or the group as long as the overall good or happiness is increased. The problem was that separate individuals were treated as part of the same social organism. Rawls emphasized the nonexistence of a social organism, as such, and the existence of individual social lives. As he argued, “Promoting the good of the social organism can’t be the goal from which people’s rightful claims are derived, since there is no social organism” (p. 22). This was a position that was also part of the communitarian motif, a lack of concern for the traditional liberal appreciation of individuals.

Howe (1997) similarly critiqued utilitarianism, presenting what he saw as the primary brand of it as “meritocratic utilitarianism” (p. 24). “Meritocratic utilitarianism” was said to have two strands. The first was “(a) educational policies are to be evaluated on the basis of their effects on economic productivity (this being perhaps the only quantifiable notion of “overall happiness”); and (b) educational opportunities were to be distributed (and designed) on the basis of economically valuable skills” (p. 25). Utilitarianism, as described by Howe (1989), was invested in outcomes and equal education opportunity. There are problems in focusing on economic productivity and economically acceptable skills in educational programs, however. Focusing on economic skills and means of maximizing production ignores shifts in populations, changes in the marketplace, and the desires and/or talents of individual students. Howe (1979, 1989) described a Head Start pre-school program that prepared students for reading and other academic skills. One can imagine it being sacrificed if empirical research endorsed an intensive science program for gifted students with a high interest in science and there was a critical need for scientists. The question of equal education opportunity becomes bogged down in the concern for economic advancement

### Summary and Conclusion

It would be incorrect to attach the development of concepts of EEO entirely to *Brown vs. Board of Education* in 1954. In fact, the move toward ideas of positive freedom in which government took the initiative in correcting the balance between intervention in the lives of its citizens and individual freedoms and autonomy had begun in the early years of the United States. The rejection of the Articles of Confederation in favor of the United States Constitution, while bitterly debated, was one of the first salvos in the move toward a centralized federal government engaged in the lives of individuals.

The Progressive Era, which began in the latter years of the 19<sup>th</sup> century, signaled greater government intervention in the lives of its citizens. During the Depression of the 1930s, President Roosevelt's New Deal programs, as well as changes in the composition of the Supreme Court, set the stage for the events of the 1950s and 1960s which altered the relationship of the federal government to public education in the states.

Coleman (1968) listed the types of inequality found in education as differences in community input; the effects of school segregation of the races as evidenced in the *Brown* opinion; intangible characteristics of the school, community, and students themselves; differences in outcomes for students with shared backgrounds and abilities and differences in consequences for students of unequal input, such as second language learners. The first three conditions of inequality were related to external inputs, while the last two had to do with the effects or outcomes of schooling. The most important idea coming forward into a discussion of NDEA, school counseling, the school's role and the issue of EEO was Coleman's conclusion that each of the first three conditions placed the burden of responsibility for choices concerning opportunities in education on the child and the family. The last two conditions of inequality placed the burden of responsibility on the school to insure EEO measured by effects. The conclusions from the survey affected policy and legislation going forward as well as the conversation surrounding the theoretical implications of EEO.

One of the questions I hope to answer in the following pages is how the actions of schools, as well as the practice of school counselors, actually encouraged or retarded the enactment of effective EEO within schools in Alabama. In constructing the philosophical framework to do this, I also considered the definitions of the three types of EEO provided by Burbules and Sherman (1979). Formalist EEO, described by Coleman (1967) as emerging in the

nineteenth century Common School Era, provided a very limited opportunity and left the major responsibility to the child and the family. Actualist EEO was compensatory, but also placed somewhat of a burden on the child and the family to take advantage of assistance. Equal outcomes could be interpreted to mean several things: absolute equality no matter what differences existed; equal amounts of progress measured by the child's starting point, and proportional or relative equality based upon the normal distribution.

Liberal-egalitarian theories of justice, as described in Rawls' (1957;1971;1985) work, focused on the equal distribution of rights, liberty, and justice, based upon need, so that everyone in the society would have an equal opportunity. The varying ideas of contemporary liberalism were represented in this work first by Rawls, then Kymlicka and Strike, and finally, Howe. Each critiqued competing theories of the social and political world.

The key problem with communitarian political theories and their application to EEO was that communitarians believed that the goals of the community held precedence over the goals of the individual, so the mention of equality of educational opportunity among individuals was not a consideration. EEO could be attained based upon community standards, but the standards would not address individual needs. Howe (1997) stated that school choice was one criterion of EEO for communitarians and it could not guarantee community. Besides, EEO was much more than school choice.

The libertarian position was closely associated with the ideas of classical liberalism, especially neutrality and the concept of negative freedom. In terms of EEO, the formalist version of EEO, in which access was the only aspect, provided the only option in the libertarian framework. Howe (1997) observed that children were not free to choose their education or their



circumstances and the libertarian position rejected any idea that entailed a redistribution of goods. The sole, minimal role of the state was to protect individual freedoms.

Rawls (1971) reinvented the idea of the social contract so that the utilitarian position of the greatest happiness for the greatest number was replaced with the ideas of fairness, that is, the distribution of rights and goods should be fair. Kymlicka (1991) also dealt with utilitarianism, describing Rawls theory of the good as not being imposed on the individual, but coming from the individual interests of the person. Utilitarian theories aligned with meritocratic approaches to EEO found in the formalist and actualist positions, which conceded that numerous individuals would not achieve the benefits of a decent education.

An additional assessment of utilitarian theories was provided by Howe (1997) in describing meritocratic utilitarian theories as being committed to outcomes which related to the individual's ability to be economically productive. Schooling was a part of the process, and EEO was tied to the acquisition of work skills. The concept of meritocratic utilitarian practices recalled the NDEA legislation and the concern with producing math, science, and foreign language graduates, as well as testing everyone.

In the concluding pages of this chapter I discussed how the critique of school counseling by Hart and Jacobi (1992) illustrated various conceptualizations of EEO described in the earlier sections of this chapter. In subsequent chapters I continued to identify practices among school counselors and schools which impeded or supported a participatory ideal of EEO. I also challenged the understanding of EEO in the public rhetoric surrounding NDEA and school counseling programs, to the extent that expressions of equal opportunity represented in the congressional hearings over NDEA actually perpetrated limited access to EEO in the schools.

## How School Counselor Practices Affected Equal Educational Opportunity

In the 1990s there was a growing recognition that school achievement among minority students critically lagged behind grade level standards defined by standardized achievement and ability testing. Several entities, including The Education Trust (1996), and ASCA National Standards, in 2003, identified the main purpose of school counseling programs as increasing student achievement.

Hart and Jacobi (1992) in *From Gatekeeper to Advocate: Transforming the Role of the School Counselor* critiqued both school counselors and school counseling programs. Specific criticism included a lack of basic philosophy that left school counselors vulnerable to conforming “to the beliefs and attitudes that prevail in the school and that constrain academic success” (p. 40). A second criticism was the position of school counseling as ancillary to the curriculum and other decision making areas in the school. Third, counselor-student ratios nationally in 1992 reflected inadequate school counselors for the number of students, exacerbated by the various clerical and administrative duties that many school counselors were expected to complete. Fourth, guidance and counseling for minority and low-income students was often inadequate and ill-informed. Fifth, school counselors were not subject to accountability in terms of student outcomes, including college-going rates of low income and minority students, as well as dropout rates, low student achievement and other areas. Finally, the guidance and counselor programs did not make use of other resources within the schools from faculty input to nurses and social workers.

The Hart and Jacobi (1992) book aggressively linked the practices of school counselors to “contribute to the perpetuation of educational inequality by supporting tracking systems and by failing to correct students’ misconceptions about the meaning of such assignments”(p. 7).

Additionally, school counselors often became “the ‘enforcers’ of a school’s philosophy by ensuring congruence between students’ course choices and activities on the one hand and the offerings and expectations of the school on the other hand” ( p. 8).

The book was published shortly after the organization of The Education Trust in 1990, but before the Transforming School Counseling Initiative in 1996 (The Education Trust, 2003). It mirrored the issues supported by the Transforming School Counselor Initiative, the ASCA National Model (2003), and various other authorities in counselor education. Hart and Jacobi’s (1992) work was important to this project because it addressed the issue of gatekeeping and other strategies which affected the educational opportunities of marginalized and oppressed students. School counselor practices stemming from the years of NDEA were often conflicted and determined to a great extent by the expectations of the institution in which school counselors worked. School counselor practice that ensured advocacy for social justice, could be demonstrated to lag significantly behind the focus on accountability and measurement as the preceding reviews have demonstrated.

In their critique of school counselor programs, Hart and Jacobi (1992) wrote the following about school counselors: “All too often, counselors (and others) feel unwilling or unable to effect meaningful change until someone else (e.g., the state, school board, principal, or students themselves) takes action” (p. 40). In other words, school counselors must be led. Hart and Jacobi’s critique of school counselors lay much of the responsibility upon school counselors for functioning as gatekeepers in preserving and protecting the status quo of education systems that limit opportunities for minority students. Hart and Jacobi also discussed the lack of a guiding philosophy among school counselors. “Few counselors are guided by a well-developed

philosophy of their roles and goals. Few counselors are guided in their work by a belief system that clearly spells out their goals and values” (p. 39).

The ultimate goal, according to Hart and Jacobi (1992) and expressed by other contemporary writers in the area, was academic achievement of students. Acting as ancillary to the functioning of the school, counselors could not independently establish goals and objectives to achieve academic achievement, let alone anything else. They could not be advocates for change and they could not be proactive. School counselors, Hart and Jacobi wrote, were reactive, “responding to the needs established by others, and accepting the role of ancillary or support staff” (p. 39). School counselors who accepted the roles imposed upon them, as perpetual outsiders, had little hope of gaining acceptance of their activities or ideas and were most likely to be assigned to quasi-administrative work.

School counseling continues to reflect the tension between the progressive era ideas of social efficiency and developmental psychology. The emphasis on measurement through the years, and certainly in the requirements of NDEA Title V has inextricably bound school counselor’s work and the results of testing. Testing led to tracking and tracking was a reflection of gatekeeping, the practice of selectively placing students in classes which foretold their futures. Sadly, much of what school counselors do and what they *are*, were determined by societal forces out of their control. Much was made in previous chapters, of the historical and practical role of the NDEA in the construction of school counseling, and the particular role of school counselors who, in the end, administered various understandings of equal educational opportunity.

#### *Analyzing the State of School Counseling Programs*

The specific aspects of Hart and Jacobi’s (1992) critique of school counselors and school counseling programs bears some further attention. As of 1992 there were inadequate counselors

for the number of students. A lack of adequate counselors directly reflected a failure to attain the minimum standard of access to services, formalist EEO. Also, school counselor programs for minority students were characterized as inadequate and ill-informed. This assertion was a betrayal of the participatory ideal that supported the inclusion of minority voices in educational decision-making. There was a lack of accountability for school counselors. The percent of students entering higher education programs; the drop-out rate in schools, and even the level of academic achievement and access to classes, reflected a failure of actualist or compensatory EEO, to support student success. Testing, tracking, and gatekeeping denied students equal access to opportunities after high school. This practice betrayed the idea of outcomes based EEO (Hart and Jacobi, 1992).

The failures in EEO also reflected the lingering effects of school counseling and guidance programs that were primarily determined by administrators and the early NDEA institutes' marriage to testing, selection, and placement.

In the final chapter, the standard by which I judged EEO in my analysis rejected the formalist understanding of equality which allowed only access to schooling without any consideration for differences in life circumstances. The actualist standard also fell short for its connection to meritocratic principles and the imposition of expectations on the student by the school. The actualist or compensatory principle also ignored the structural nature of inequality imposed by economic and political institutions. Outcomes based ideas of EEO, alone, failed to produce egalitarian results and also often did not take into consideration the structural problems that limited outcomes in the first place. My ideal for EEO combined the Burbules and Sherman (1979) suggestion that EEO alone was not enough, that EEO should include Rawls' difference principle described as "any distribution , as for education, must work to the 'greatest benefit to

the least advantaged in society” (p. 111), with Howe’s (1997) ideas of a “participatory educational ideal” (p. 26) that included a threshold level that was outcomes based and would provide all school children the equal opportunity to achieve society’s goods.

CHAPTER IV:  
METHODOLOGY AND RESEARCH DESIGN

Introduction

In a review of 17 doctoral dissertations addressing school counseling and the NDEA of 1958, Title V, the research questions focused on behavioral and attitudinal change after participation in the NDEA Counseling and Guidance Training Institutes, career patterns of school counselors, job performance of school counselors, selection and preparation of school counselors and political theories of school reform and policy formation as represented by NDEA<sup>6</sup>. No dissertation addressed the systemic or institutional evolution of counselor identity and practice as a result of the NDEA Counseling and Guidance Training Institutes and what that meant in terms of EEO.

Prior to the NDEA of 1958 there were fewer than 15,000 school counselors in the country (Tyler, 1960). After the implementation of the first short term-summer institutes and the regular year-long NDEA Counseling and Guidance Training Institutes, school counseling programs grew exponentially. The implementation of the NDEA occurred shortly after *Brown v. Board of Education* and extended through the Civil Rights Era to the early 1970s. Institutes were conducted in all of the Southern states in which Jim Crow era laws and school segregation continued to determine both White and African American experience. This study addressed the

---

<sup>6</sup> See doctoral dissertations, Birashk, B. (1979), Cherekjian, A. (1965), Dirusso, L. (1966), Dwyer, M. (1972), Fischle, M. (1967), Gann, L. (1971), Kelly, J. (1972), Kerr-Tener, J. (1985), Koppich, J. (1990), Looney, C. (1968), Padovr, A. (1969), Paxton, J. (1971), Reid, V. (1965), Rochester, D. (1965), Vespoli, V. (1986), Wilson, L. (1967), Zollo, R. (1971)

ways in which the growth and development of the school counseling profession was influenced by the NDEA, and, in turn, how counselor practices and/or programs derived from the NDEA directly affected EEO for African American students within Alabama.

#### Research Questions

The research questions for this study were as follows:

- (1) What were the expressed intentions of the NDEA legislation and what were its institutional effects on school counseling, and
- (2) What were the contradictions within public rhetoric surrounding NDEA legislation in relationship to school counselor practice and Equality of Educational Opportunity?

#### Theory of Knowledge

The theory of knowledge that informed the methodology of this project was based on the “Chicago School of the 1920s and 1930s” (Woods, 1996, p. 32). Blumer (1969), who coined the term symbolic interactionism, credited the pragmatist theories of George Herbert Mead, John Dewey, William James, and others with its development. Blumer (1969) wrote “Despite significant differences in the thought of such scholars, there is a great similarity in the general way in which they viewed and studied human group life” (p. 1). Pragmatist philosophy was particularly attuned to the following themes: 1) Ideas are tested by experience and then adjusted based upon the empirical evidence; 2) The interplay of habit and transaction offered opportunities to analyze the systemic ways in which institutions impose their will; 3) Finally, pragmatist theory argued that human beings are constantly confronted with facts that are contingent and open to interpretation.

The most important theorist who “laid the foundations of the symbolic interactionist approach” (Blumer, 1969, p. 1) was George Herbert Mead at the University of Chicago. Mead’s



approach to experience and meaning was as follows:

At the heart of Mead's thought is the 'self'. Mead is centrally concerned with the inner experience of the individual and how the self arises within the social process. Much activity is symbolic, involving construction and interpretation, both within the self and between the self and others. Much activity is symbolic, involving construction and interpretation, both within the self and between the self and others. (Woods, 1996, p. 32)

Symbolic interactionism is concerned not only with how the individual understands the meanings of social actions, but how that understanding is shared by others. This co-analysis of meanings can apply to non verbal or symbolic objects, or to verbal as expressed by language (Woods, 1996). Social interactions, both verbal and non-verbal are constructions and are fluid, constantly changing, re-inventing or re-interpreting meaning. Individuals, according to Woods (1996), see "their own behavior not only from the view of significant others but also in terms of generalized norms, values, and beliefs" (p. 34). Mead referred to this phenomena as "the generalized other" (Woods, 1996).

#### *Methodology and Symbolic Interactionism*

The first and most important idea of symbolic interactionism is that "enquiry must be grounded in the empirical world under study" (Woods, 1996, p. 37). In research, theories are tested against empirical observation, not the other way around. As Woods wrote, "Research methods are the means to discover that reality; they do not themselves contain it" (p. 37).

The second idea of transactional interactionism is that society is composed of layers of reality. Berger (1966, p. 34), quoted in Woods (1996), spoke of "social reality having 'many layers of meaning. The discovery of each new layer changes the perception of the whole" (p. 38). The methodology requires an open mind and patience, the willingness to go where the data leads the researcher.

A third idea of transactional interactionism was the idea that “to understand social interaction, it is necessary to witness it as closely as possible and in depth, in all its manifestations and all the situations in which the form under examination occurs” (Wood, 1996, p. 39). The emphasis in Woods (1996) and Blumer’s (1969) writings viewed the research project as long term immersion in the research and in the construction of meanings by the actors.

The fourth idea referred to the understanding of the culture under study through the understandings of the members of the culture. Woods (1996) wrote, “The observer therefore, must attempt to see these symbols from the standpoint of the culture, rather than imposing on them the frameworks and understandings of other cultures within which the same symbols may have different meanings” (p. 39).

The fifth methodological idea had to do with symbols. Woods wrote (1996), “Methodologically, this means learning the language of the participants, with all its nuances and perhaps special vocabulary” (p. 41).

The sixth methodological idea is that of comprehending “the context within which it occurs” (Woods, 1996, p. 43). And the seventh, looked at the research as a process of uncovering meaning. Again, Woods (1996) described how people constantly process their interpretations of others’ behavior. Woods wrote (1996), “Social interaction is a moving process, with people defining, assigning meanings, aligning and realigning their actions, seeing how they can best satisfy their interests, comparing and contrasting them with others, adjusting them if necessary, and devising strategies” (p. 45).

Symbolic interactionism is generally applied to sociological or anthropological ethnography. The researcher becomes immersed in the “small-scale, everyday life, seeking to understand processes, relationships, group life, motivations, adaptations and so on” (Woods,

1996, p. 48). Critics attacked it for its inability to “theorize the larger system and to see how the ‘everyday’ is affected by it” (p. 48). Woods (1996) reported that symbolic interaction does look at “social structures and system” (p. 48). But the whole point of symbolic interactionist theory is the social construction of meaning and the understanding of meaning through the eyes of the actor. Individuals are affected by structures and systems, and, in the same vein, individuals affect the construction of social structures and systems. That is the methodological focus of this research project, as represented in the research questions.

#### *Why this Study Was Suited to a Qualitative Design*

While a great amount of information exists concerning school counseling programs and counselor roles and responsibilities, often represented as a task list, very little information was available concerning how counselor roles evolved and whether counselor activities shaped EEO for African American students. A qualitative approach to the research project included the selection and careful analysis of documents concerning the NDEA in the *Congressional Record*, as well as publications by HEW after the first 50 summer institutes (Tyler, 1960), as well as an evaluation of the regular session institutes during 1963 and 1964 (Pierson, 1965). Interviews of active and retired school counselors, counselor educators, and an NDEA Counselor and Guidance Training Institute attendees also provided additional information. The scope of the qualitative interviews, as well as the investigation of the documents, offered a multi-layered picture of the expectations and themes expressed in the congressional hearings, as well as the evolution of school counseling, and school counseling experience.

The application of qualitative methodology incorporated aspects of experience through a variety of lenses, which offered context to the project. Garrison (1998) quoted Dewey (*Experience and Education*, LW13:25) in describing the two aspects of educational experience:

The conceptions of *situation* and of *interaction* (transaction) are inseparable from each other. An experience is always what it is because of a transaction taking place between an individual and what, at the time, constitutes his environment...The environment...is whatever conditions interact with personal needs, desires, purposes, and capacities to create the experience which is had. (p. 66)

This attitude of inquiry, though connected to the process of education, also allows the qualitative researcher to search and uncover a rich pattern of information with which to analyze the formation of the school counselor profession, and, in turn, the practices of school counselors. Qualitative inquiry can be said to be a project that adds texture to the explanation of experience. Texture is needed in this case because describing and understanding human behavior is rarely accomplished by a singular lens.

The researcher is recognized as being an integral part of the process in qualitative research. "Experience", according to Davydd Greenwood and Morten Levin (2005) "emerges in a continual interaction between people and their environment; accordingly, this process constitutes both the subjects and objects of inquiry...the knowledge creation process is based on the inquirers' norms, values, and interests" (p. 53).

Qualitative research is most suited to this project because of its emphasis on a variety of methods which employ "an interpretive, naturalistic approach to its subject matter" (Denzin & Lincoln, 1994, p. 2 as cited in Creswell, 1998). Creswell focused on the processes of inquiry "based on distinct methodological traditions...that explore a social or human problem" (p. 15). Sharan Merriam (2002) wrote in *Qualitative Research in Practice*,

The key to understanding qualitative research lies with the idea that meaning is socially constructed by individuals in interaction with their world. The world, or reality, is not the fixed, single, agreed upon, or measurable phenomenon that it is assumed to be in positivist, quantitative research. Instead, there are multiple constructions and interpretations of reality that are in flux and that change over time...Learning how individuals experience and interact with their social world, the meaning it has for them, is considered an *interpretive* qualitative approach. (p. 4)

Finally, the development of qualitative research as an accepted form of inquiry was closely linked to the publication of Glaser and Strauss' book, *The Discovery of Grounded Theory*, originally published in 1967 (Merriam, 2002). The goal, according to Merriam, was to “derive, inductively from data a theory that is ‘grounded’ in the data —hence grounded theory” (p. 7).

### Embedded Case Study Methodology

Robert Yin (1994) distinguished between *embedded* and *holistic* single-case studies. A *holistic* case study is used when “no logical subunits can be identified and when the relevant theory underlying the case study is itself of a holistic nature” (p. 42). In this single-case study, there are logical subunits and the study incorporates two distinct topical frameworks, the evolution of school counseling theory formations, as well as the philosophical and political theory of equality of educational opportunity. The logical subunits of investigation are the components of the NDEA, as it affected counselor practice from inception of the Act to the present day.

This qualitative research study employed the methodology of the embedded single case study as described by Yin (1994). In this study the case was the practice or program of school counseling since 1958, when the NDEA Title V legislation provided the resources to fund school counselor programs, testing programs, and school counselor education within the varied states. The case was described as a “bounded system” (Merriam, 1988, p. 178) and was constrained by time as well as by program (Creswell, 1998), that of school counseling in Alabama. The embedded aspects of the single case as described by Yin (1994) were multiple units of analysis that include NDEA program literature and evaluations; legislation, and counselor, counselor educator and supervisor interviews.

Robert Yin (2004), in the introduction to an embedded case study by Lipset, Trow, and Coleman, discussed embedded cases as covering different degrees of analysis—the main “case” as well as a “subunit” embedded within the main unit of analysis. There are two challenges to this methodology. First, Yin (2004) cautioned that generalizations and analysis of data may presented more challenges in dealing with the main case than in dealing with the subunits. He also wrote that finding links between the main case and the embedded units may present difficulties.

Robert Stake (1995) described the study of the case as an investigation of a phenomenon that is of “special interest” (p. xi). It is the study of “the particularity and complexity of a single case, coming to understand its activity under special circumstances” (Stake, 1995, p. xi). Case studies in education as related by Stake, involve “persons and programs” (Stake, 1995, p. 1). In this case, school counseling in Alabama after NDEA, was the overarching analysis. Within this analysis, the effect of NDEA, the impact of the school, and the individual role of counselors in effecting equality of educational opportunity, represented the parts of the whole. Additionally, the goal of this qualitative case study was to investigate an area in which there was little research, that of the ways in which school counseling developed as a profession after NDEA, during the desegregation of schools in the Southern states.

### The Design of the Study

The design of the study was a historical case study recommended by Hancock & Algozzine (2006). In establishing the relationship between design and method, “historical approaches are grounded in representing and interpreting records, papers, and other sources of information about people, phenomena, or practices”(Hancock & Algozzine, year, p. 34) and are considered design elements. Methods of the historical case study design are “document analyses

and interviews” (p. 34). The strategies allow the researcher to interpret “factors that both caused and resulted from events” (Hancock & Algozzine, p. 36).

The historical case study design was described by Sharon Merriam (1988) as employing the methods commonly associated with historiography—in particular, the analysis of primary source material in a systematic way. The historical case study in education has described “institutions, programs, and practices as they have evolved in time” (Merriam, 1988, p. 24).

Merriam (1988) wrote that “data are nothing more than ordinary bits and pieces of information found in the environment” (p. 67). They range from the “concrete and measurable” (p. 67) such as historical documents related to NDEA; the record of congressional hearings; the words of the act itself and the writings of contemporary counselor educators, to the “invisible and difficult” (p. 67). The “invisible and difficult” extends to the interviews of counselors as well as the careful coding and categorizing of the historical record.

In describing qualitative data, Merriam (1998) quoted Patton (1980) who included “*detailed descriptions* of situations, events, people, interactions and observed behaviors; *direct quotations* from people about their experiences, attitudes, beliefs, and thoughts; and excerpts or entire passages from documents, correspondence, records and case histories” (p. 22). Questions are generated from the research questions, from the documents, from the literature review, and finally, and most importantly, from the voices of the people who are interviewed.

The research questions lead to ideas about what we can learn from the study of the single case (Stake, 2005). Some ideas are the result of my experience as a school counselor. Others were generated through the literature review. Whatever they were, these tentative propositions were the beginning of an *instrumental* single-case study described by Stake as the examination of a particular case “to provide insight into an issue or to redraw a generalization” (p. 445).

Additionally, he wrote that “the case is of secondary interest, it plays a supportive role, and it facilitates our understanding of something else” (p. 445). The “something else” was an idea that included the research questions of the current study.

The historical case study design was described by Sharon Merriam (1988) as employing “techniques common to historiography—in particular, the use of primary source material. The handling of historical material is systematic and involves learning to distinguish between primary and secondary sources” (p. 24). Additionally the historical case study in education has described “institutions, programs, and practices as they have evolved in time... (They) may involve more than a chronological history of an event” (p. 24). Performing a historical case study engages context, rationale, and impact on “the institution or participants” (p. 24).

The study reflected Merriam’s (2002) description of a qualitative case study as “an intensive description and analysis of a phenomenon or social unit such as an individual, group, institution, or community ( p. 8). Criswell (1998) described Merriam’s description of a case study as a methodology and Stake’s as “the ‘case’ as an object of study” (p. 61). All three writers focused on qualitative case studies. Yin (1994) was concerned with the case study as process and discussed qualitative, quantitative, and mixed methods case studies.

#### Role of the Researcher

I began my teaching career in 1967. I was a junior high school teacher in a rural central Florida county. It was the first year of desegregation in the school system. I taught social studies and American History for 7 years. I then became a school counselor and worked in middle school, high school, and elementary counseling in Florida and Alabama for 30 years. For five of those years I was a school psychometrist for a rural county district in central Alabama. My last 27 years of active employment as an educator were in Alabama. I was a president of the



Alabama Counseling Association in 1999-2000, and was also a member as an officer and committee chairman of the governing board of the Alabama School Counselors Association (ALSCA). I continue to serve on the executive council of the Alabama Counseling Association. At the initial stage of the doctoral program I was still actively employed as a school counselor in a middle sized (more than 500 students) high school in east central Alabama. I retired in 2005 but have continued contacts with counselor educators, counselors, supervisors, administrators and superintendents. I also continue to work with students in the academic center of the athletic department at The University of Alabama.

Therefore, on several levels I am still deeply engaged in education, and with educators in general and school counselors in particular. The problems posed in my dissertation proposal are directly related to personal experience and observation covering 37 years in public education. The topics of equality of educational opportunities and the life chances of African American students are issues that concern me. The role of the school counselor in perpetuating secondary or internal segregation, that is, segregation of students within a school setting, rather than between schools, is of great importance to the counseling profession. It is certainly of great importance to me. As a researcher, I am also partially a participant.

Merriam (1988) noted that a good case study was produced when the researcher understood and was “sensitive to the biases inherent in this type of research” (p. 39). Also, Goetz and LeCompte (1984) wrote that case study research (and also qualitative research in general) demanded that the “subjective participation and biases of both participants and researcher” (p. 95) must be acknowledged in the construction of the research. Self awareness and admission of bias, was, in Guba’s and Lincoln’s (Merriam, 1988, p. 39) opinion, the means by which the researcher could avoid bias.

Other issues in the conduct of a qualitative case study, according to Merriam (1988), were sensitivity, both to the data collected and to the sources of that data. Additionally, the researcher must be able to communicate effectively. To do so meant establishing rapport, conveying empathy, constructing probing questions, and actively listening (Merriam, 1988). Those qualities of the researcher were also the qualities required of a counselor in the school setting (Patterson, 1962; Shertzer & Stone, 1981; Schmidt, 2008).

### Units of Analysis

The guiding unit of analysis in this project was the practice of school counselor as it emerged from the NDEA forward. School counselor interviews included retired counselors and counselor educators. The subunits of analysis were the NDEA and the practices, procedures, theories, proscribed in its counselor institutes as well as the documentary evidence of the legislation to include congressional hearings, and published reports and evaluations of the short-term and long-term institutes. Additionally, the interviews included one participant in two NDEA counselor institutes.

### Selecting a Sample

Since the study design was that of a historical single-case, much of the information to be collected consisted of documents, and records of congressional hearings, etc. The chosen sample design is explained in the next paragraph.

Merriam (1988) described two types of sampling. The first, *probability sampling*, is what is commonly developed in a quantitative study. It invokes the “random sample” and “allows the researcher to generalize results of the study from the sample to the population from which it was drawn” (p. 47). In the case of school counseling, a random population would very likely miss the subject participants who could supply the most information about the NDEA as well as the

evolution of school counseling. The historical single-case study is meant to document not only the NDEA, but also the emergence and growth of school counseling. The second type of sampling is called *nonprobability*. Merriam wrote that it is the best choice for qualitative studies because there is virtually no way that probability sampling and its method of determining the chance that a “population element” (p. 47) will appear in the sample, could be accomplished.

In a qualitative single-case study, the researcher is more concerned with “discovering what occurs, the implications of what occurs, and the relationships linking occurrences” (Merriam, 1988, p. 48). Quantitative researchers who utilize probability sampling, according to Merriam, are more interested in “how much” or “how often” (p. 48).

The sampling method described by Patton (1980) in *Qualitative Evaluation Methods* is called “purposeful sampling” and by Chein (1981), “purposive” (Merriam, 1988, p. 48). Purposive sampling assumes that the researcher is looking to “discover, understand, gain insight; therefore one needs to select a sample from which one can learn the most” (p 48). The method allowed for the selection of participants who met the criteria established by the researcher.

#### Site Selection and Data Collection Methods

The site for the interviews was the Canterbury Episcopal Chapel as well as Graves Hall on the campus of The University of Alabama, a Barnes and Noble Bookstore in Birmingham, Summit Mall, the offices of the Alabama Board of Examiners in Counseling in the Medical Forum in Birmingham, and a private home in Mentone, Alabama. The location of the documents to be analyzed was the Annex Library on the campus of The University of Alabama in Tuscaloosa, Alabama, The documents were in my possession during the study. Additionally, the HeinOnline data base for government documents provided by The University of Alabama Libraries was used in selecting and downloading portions of the *Congressional Record, v. 104*,

85<sup>th</sup> Congress, 1958.

The first step in the collection of data was a close reading of the documents pertaining to the NDEA, reports of NDEA counselor institutes, and records of the congressional hearings. Additionally, evaluations of both the short-term counseling and guidance training institutes and the long-term guidance and training institutes were included. With the exception of *The Congressional Record*, these documents were reviewed in the literature review, but were coded and categorized in the document analysis process.

The second step in data collection involved semi-structured interviews of the five people described in the section on *Sample and Data Collection*. Merriam (1998) described interviews as means to gain information that is not readily available by empirical methods of direct observation. Feelings, interpretations of events, interactions, and behavior are included.

Particularly important was interview information concerning past events (Merriam, 1998). The recollection of counselor institute experience was important but information that indicated the degree of influence the NDEA institutes have on current school counselors and their programs, as well as the influence of NDEA through the years on the perception of school counselors within the schools by administrators and supervisors was also important.

Interviews range from “highly structured questionnaire-driven interviews” (Merriam, p. 73), to “open-ended, conversational formats” (p. 73). The highly structured interview is common in survey research and in such large projects as the census. A polar opposite of the highly-structured questionnaire is the unstructured interview which is usually employed as an exploratory effort. The researcher does not know enough about the subject to form questions and the open-ended interview allows the researcher to gain knowledge for future interviews.

Interviewing in qualitative case studies is generally more “open-ended” (Merriam, p 73), and focuses on the singular experience of the participant as unique. The semi-structured interview shares a few characteristics with its highly structured cousin. First, there is common information concerning age, gender, race, educational and work history, to establish. Second, a list of questions or subjects is part of the process. The way in which the questions are worded or the order of the questions is left to the interviewer (Merriam, 1998). The respondent then, is allowed to lead the researcher to an idea of the respondent’s experiencing of the process under investigation. The interview questions are based on the research questions established in this project. The interview protocol will be alike for each respondent but it is expected that the individual interviews will result in differing interpretations of events.

The former school counselor who is presently a counselor-educator was asked to describe her interpretation of the tensions between counselor-education and school counselor practice. The retired school counselors and counselor supervisor responded to questions directed at counselor practice within the schools; how school desegregation was carried out in the schools, and what practices may have excluded students.

The interviews were conducted using a cassette as well as a digital tape recorder. While the length of the sessions varied, the researcher spent at least two hours with each participant. If additional clarification of the interview responses was necessary, the participants were contacted by phone or email. If additional interviews were needed each participant agreed to a follow-up to the initial session.

After each interview I transcribed the tapes and began the process of coding and categorizing the information.

## Data Collection and Analysis: Constant Comparative Methods

Data collection and data analysis are simultaneous, using the constant comparative data analysis method (Merriam, 1988; Criswell, 1998; Strauss & Corbin, 1998; Oxtay, 2004).

Constant comparative data analysis was suggested and revised by Anselm Strauss, one of the co-founders of grounded theory, and Juliet Corbin. Both were the authors of *Basics of Qualitative Research: Techniques and Procedures for Developing Grounded Theory, 2<sup>nd</sup> Edition* (1998).

The book suggests approaching the data as a “microanalysis” (p. 65). The authors recommend the focused nature of a procedure that exams bits and pieces of data—words, phrases, sentences in a very minute way. They speak of “mining the data” (p. 65), that is, paying attention to detail, going line by line through the data, and generating initial “open coding” (Strauss & Corbin, 1998, p.101), the process “through which concepts are identified and their properties and dimensions are discovered in data” (p. 101). After the initial coding process the researcher returns to the open codes and engages in “axial coding,” which links categories to subcategories, “at the level of properties and dimensions” (p. 123). The third level of coding is “selective coding” which brings the categories of codes together in a “story” (Creswell, 1988, p. 150) about the data. Grounded theory is an inductive act; the theory comes out of the minute analysis of the data (Oxtay, 2004).

In the constant comparative process, the researcher closely reads the text for categories that have meaning, at that point, to the researcher. This is the open coding phase. Then, the researcher “saturates” (Creswell, p. 150) the categories, continuing to look and connect, and interview, and look and connect, until there is no new information. Constructing the “categories, properties, and tentative hypotheses . . . is a process whereby the data gradually evolve into a

core of emerging theory, according to Merriam (1988, p. 144). She also asserted that “this core is a theoretical framework that guides the further collection of data”(p. 144).

During the inductive process, the researcher continues to fine tune the data against the emerging categories (Merriam 1988). The researcher looks for enough data to support the category or hypotheses, if there is enough the category is continued. If the data is insufficient to support the category it is thrown out (Merriam, 1988). This process of inclusion of data and exclusion of data is deductive, according to Merriam, as well as inductive. The end result of the constant comparative mode should be an idea or insight into the case.

#### Applying Triangulation and Other Methods of Validity and Reliability to the Case

Merriam (1988) wrote that qualitative case study is ideal for triangulation, a process that utilizes “multiple methods of data collection” (p. 69) to analyze the case. In this research project interviews were coupled with documents and government records to develop a broad picture of school counseling and the NDEA. Additionally, the interview participants were linked by common threads with education, but each had a different area of focus. There should be an overall trend of consistency in the findings.

Qualitative case study research does not approach validity and reliability in the same way as quantitative research. The question, in qualitative research, is the trustworthiness of the results. There are several ways of measuring this trustworthiness.

#### *Internal Validity*

Internal validity is defined as how well the findings “match reality” (Merriam, 1988, p. 166). But this may be too high a bar. All claims of validity or “truth” are subject to the interpretation of the investigator’s particular reality. Both Merriam and Stake (1995) addressed the issue of reality from a relativist or constructivist position. It was also the position of

pragmatist theorists including John Dewey. Reality is contingent and ever-changing. It is not one set, fixed stationary object that the researcher “discovers” (Merriam & Stake, 1995, p. 167).

Merriam (1988) believed that what is being examined are “people’s constructions of reality, how they understand the world” (p. 167). In the qualitative case study the appearance of reality and the opinions of those folks in the study, are what constitutes internal validity. The so-called validity of a qualitative case study rests on how well the investigator represents the multiple “mental constructions”(Lincoln & Guba, 1985, p. 295) of the participants and the data.

One way of testing the trustworthiness of the representation in the qualitative case study is to “member check” (Merriam, p. 169). The researcher gave the transcripts of the interviews to the participants and asked if they believed the results to be an accurate representation of the case. This procedure was followed throughout the course of the study. Another test is to ask one’s peers to examine the findings during the study (Merriam, 1988).

A third method is an “audit trail” (Merriam, p. 173) in which every aspect of the study will be carefully documented. This procedure includes describing the process of collecting data; explaining open coding, axial coding, selective coding and the categories derived from the process; explaining research decisions in minute detail so that the study could be repeated.

#### *External Validity*

Will the findings of the study be generalizable? This is a difficult, if not impossible question in qualitative case study research. The choice of the study was to investigate a particular, bounded system (Merriam, 1988; Stake, 1995). Stake (2005) wrote:

The purpose of a case report is not to represent the world, but to represent the case . . . The utility of case research to practitioners and policy makers is in its extension of experience. The methods of qualitative case study are largely the methods of disciplining personal and particularized experience. (p. 460)



### *Reliability Issues*

Lincoln and Guba (1985) refer to “consistency” or “dependability” (p. 288) when discussing reliability. By carefully explaining the role of the researcher and the reason for the choice of the particular case, as well as the methods and selection of participants, documents, and the like, it was hoped that others would agree that the analysis of the findings are a reasonable explanation of the case. Triangulation can apply to reliability, as well as the “audit trail” as described by Merriam (1988, p. 172). Reliability, in the traditional sense of replicating a study, may not be possible in the qualitative case study, but careful attention to the details of the case can aid dependability of the findings.

### *Analysis, Findings, and Conclusions*

As a matter of personal preference, the analysis of transcripts and documents was completed without the use of a computerized data analysis program. It is my belief that the process of hearing, writing, and formatting a transcript enables the researcher to become intimately familiar with the data and supports the emergence of themes and categories.

CHAPTER V:  
RESULTS AND FINDINGS

Introduction

The first analysis of data through open and axial coding developed themes found in the *Congressional Record, 1958, 85:104*. The three themes were ideological issues, the public rhetoric of NDEA, and intentions of the legislation. The ideological issues represented opinions favoring NDEA as well as those in opposition. The issue of local and states rights versus federal intervention encompassed most of the opposition to the legislation and presented the vehicle by which Southern Democrats could voice their objections, ostensibly to federal encroachment, but also to the issue of EEO and desegregation in the South. The second sub-topic of ideological issues was freedom, democracy, and EEO, and the last sub-topic discussed the polarized values of Americanism vs. communism and what it meant in the pursuit of NDEA.

The second theme dealt with the public rhetoric of NDEA and the need for the sponsors of the legislation to capture the mood of the nation. Also, the rejection of what was styled as progressive education was linked to a kind of weakness in the education system of the United States. John Dewey and progressive education, or concerns with self-concept, were portrayed as not strong or tough enough to defend the citizenry against the communist onslaught. Another perception surrounded the concept of wasted talent, epitomized by large numbers of high school students either dropping out of school, or not pursuing a college education. The idea that the high

schools of the nation lacked academic rigor and did not do enough to lure students into advanced science, mathematics, and foreign language courses was also prevalent.

The third theme addressed the intentions of the NDEA legislation. The focus of the bill was squarely on the education of the academically able or talented, estimated at the top 25% to 30% of the nation's students. There were calls for scholarships, student loans, and graduate education for teachers. The addition of testing and the NDEA Counseling and Guidance Training Institutes signaled the growth of school counseling in the nation.

In the second section of Chapter IV, the report of the first 50 NDEA Counseling and Guidance Training Institutes (Tyler, 1960) as well as the evaluation of the regular session NDEA Institutes (Pierson, 1965) resulted in the application of the previous themes, as well as the addition of two more unique themes, contributions to counselor education and results, outcomes, problems, and recommendations. One particular shift in the results, outcomes, problems, theme also concerned the analysis of the intentions of NDEA, and a change that occurred between the initial summer institutes and the beginning of the regular session institutes.

In the final section, the results of five interview transcriptions addressed the themes of intentions of the legislation and reflected regional differences both in the state and within the United States. The analysis of regional differences continued in Chapter V. The lasting effects of the legislation, those of testing and tracking also represented the intention of the legislation, but added to another theme, that of the results of the NDEA Institutes.

The theme of EEO, freedom of choice, and democratic values resonated for the counselors in the efforts toward desegregation in the South during the Civil Rights Era. The lack of preparation for desegregation was addressed, as well as the desegregated bodies of African American students who were treated as though they were invisible.

In addition to the lingering expectations that school counselors would be responsible for testing, as well as placement of students, there was also the aspect of how to manage desegregation and the extreme steps taken to achieve that management.

### Data Collection

The first stage of data collection involved the identification of documents from the *Congressional Record*, volume 104, 85<sup>th</sup> Congress, 1958. The records were selected by employing HeinOnline, the legal research database at The University of Alabama Libraries site. The initial search identified clusters of terms identified with NDEA, words and phrases linked to political theory and ideology, and the historical events leading to the legislation. Another search identified data tied to integration, desegregation, communism, democratic values, and states versus federal rights. The searches resulted in over 200 pages of *Congressional Record* documents of the hearings, speeches, extended remarks, and the legislation itself. The second phase of the analysis involved reading all of the records, open coding the bits of data and searching for categories and sub-categories, or axial coding in the manner recommended by Strauss and Corbin (1998). These categories and sub-categories were divided as to their overall theme.

The next stage addressed the Health, Education, and Welfare (HEW), Office of Education publications that described the first 50 NDEA Counseling and Guidance Training Institutes, written by Tyler (1960), and the evaluation of the regular session NDEA Counseling and Guidance Training Institutes written by Pierson (1965). Using the codes and categories derived from the *Congressional Record* documents, I performed the same process with the HEW Office of Education material.

The final phase of the project was the analysis of five interviews of retired school counselors, a counselor educator, and a clinician who attended two NDEA Counseling and Guidance Training Institutes in the early years of the legislation.

#### Findings of Themes and Categories in the Congressional Record

The initial analysis of *Congressional Record* documents identified a number of codes. From the codes, three themes emerged, and aspects of the themes were repeated over and over, in the printed reports of NDEA Counseling and Guidance Training Institutes, the oral history interview of chief clerk McClure, as well as the five school counselor/ counselor educator interviews. While the themes and categories remained stable in the *Congressional Record*, additional codes and themes emerged in the analysis of publications of NDEA Counseling and Guidance Training Institutes reports and school counselor and counselor educator interviews. The interviews and additional evaluative materials added to the texture of the reports as to how and why school counselors evolved from the 1950s until the present time. Additionally, the interviews added some information to the issues of EEO and desegregation in Alabama.

#### Issues of Race and Nondiscrimination

In this case study the *Congressional Record* represented how lawmakers interpreted the state of education in the United States, the proposed role of school guidance counselors, as well as the purpose of testing in the schools. Finally I wanted to know how ideas of EEO or freedom of choice, as well as the ongoing concern with federal intervention in local and state affairs, was interpreted by the legislators. Separate from the immediate concern with the NDEA was my interest in what was being said about desegregation. I found slight mention of Southern resistance to NDEA through overt comments concerning racial issues. Rather, the concerns were expressed in two ways. First, previous efforts at appropriating aid for school construction had

been effectively defeated because a Northern congressman, Adam Clayton Powell, an African American from New York, and others insisted on a nondiscrimination amendment to the construction bills. The so-called Powell amendment was aimed at Southern states who resisted school desegregation, and, the amendment's insertion doomed the school construction bill among Southern congressional members and thus to failure (H. R. 13247, 1958, 16582).

During the House debate on NDEA, Congressman Wainwright of New York affirmed that the legislation would be supported by the Northern congressmen because the bill was not aimed at building the physical body of Southern segregated schools. Nonetheless, and inexplicably, the proposal was made in August to add a school construction amendment to the Senate version of NDEA (S. 4273, 1958, 17302).

Senator Allott of Colorado remarked, "I think it is a matter of common knowledge that it is impossible to get a school construction bill through the other body, and that the result of adding this amendment to the bill would be simply to preclude any educational help this year" (p. 17302). Senator Hill, Alabama, also concurred that the approval of the amendment in the Senate would spell doom for any education bill in 1958.

While the issue resulted in impassioned discussion during the hearings, the construction amendment was not approved. The final possible challenge to the bill came from Senator Javits of New York (S. 4237, 1958, 17312). He asserted the need for a non-discrimination clause in the same way that the G.I. Bill also included a nondiscrimination clause (17312). During the debate there was general agreement that the clause was appropriate.

The second issue was that of federal vs. state or local control characterized by the reference to the tenth amendment of the U.S. Constitution by Senator Strom Thurmond of South Carolina (S. 4273, 1958). The tenth amendment left rights not spelled out in the first nine

amendments, to the states. This, for many Southerners, was a reason for rejecting desegregation efforts by the federal government.

A key component of resistance to racial integration centered around resistance to interference by the federal government in state and local affairs. A popular revisionist position in Civil War history at that time relied on the assertion that the war had been fought over states rights, not slavery. Southern members of congress could not, even if they wanted to, vote for anything that suggested agreement with federal intervention in fear of the linkage to integration (Clowse, 1981). Conservative Republicans also resisted federal intervention as a matter of political philosophy (Clowse, 1981), and one of the chief objections to the House and Senate versions of the NDEA was the looming issue of federal vs. state and local control. Limiting the intervention of the federal government in the affairs of the states represented an ideological position harkening back to the early days of the American Republic, that of a weak central government (Tozer et al., 2002).

*President Eisenhower Expressed his Wishes*

On January 27, 1958 the Speaker of the House delivered a message from President Eisenhower to the House of Representatives (H. Doc. No 85-318, 1958 at 1073). It was then sent to the Committee on Education and Labor and printed for distribution. In the message Eisenhower addressed what was popularly considered a national crisis (Clowse, 1981).

His message stated:

If we are to maintain our position of leadership, we must see to it that today's young people are prepared to contribute the maximum to our future progress. Because of the growing importance of science and technology, we must necessarily give special—but by no means exclusive—attention to education in science and engineering. (H. Doc. No. 85-318, 1958 at 1073)

The President also encouraged grants to the states to “encourage the strengthening of local counseling and guidance services, so that more able students will be encouraged to stay in high school, to put more effort into their academic work, and to prepare for higher education” (H. Doc. No. 85-318, 1958 at 1074). The message to Congress was sent a few months after the successful launch of the Soviet satellite, *Sputnik*. Eisenhower chiefly endorsed the expansion of National Science Foundation (NSF) activities but then called for “emergency and temporary” (H. Doc. No. 85-318, 1958 at 1073) fiscal support for additional federal programs and expanded science education under HEW for a four year period only. The recommended financial investment was much smaller than the authors of the Senate and House versions of the national defense education act, Senator Hill and Congressman Elliott proposed. The purposes of the grants, along with the growth of guidance and counseling programs, were to reduce wasted talent, drop out rates, and identify talent through testing. As it turned out, NDEA, in its final form promised to do all those things and more.

#### The Explanation of Themes

There were three major themes identified in the *Congressional Record*. They were: (a) ideological issues, (b) intentions of legislation as it applied to guidance and counseling and testing, (c) public rhetoric of NDEA. These three themes were derived, in part from the research problems. Additional categories and themes emerged through open and axial coding of the NDEA Counseling and Guidance Training Institute report and evaluation and the five interviews of counselors and counselor-educators. The three initial themes gleaned from the *Congressional Record* were arranged topically beginning with the overarching questions of ideology.



*Ideological Issues: States Rights vs. Federal Intervention. Finding 1.*

On February 6, 1958, Senator Hruska from Nebraska presented his views on the intrusion of federal aid to education as proposed by President Eisenhower and others. He stated,

Federal management to many folks is terrifying. Why should it not be? An arrangement which can command emphasis on mathematics, physics, and chemistry today on a nationwide, school-to-school basis, can tomorrow or in future years compel even more stringent emphasis on any subjects. What will it be: One-world government, nationalizing industries, abolishing the capitalistic system, outlawing profits and private ownership? (Nebraska's Opposition to Federal Aid To Education, 1958, 1847)

Hruska went on to argue, "The burden of proof is on the proponents of federally managed schools. It is they who must demonstrate that their proposals will result in more qualified students attending schools than are now attending, and that in general the declared objectives will be attained" (Nebraska's Opposition to Federal Aid To Education, 1958, 1848). He inserted several newspaper editorials and interviews from Nebraska newspapers and the State Superintendent of Education, as well as personal letters in the *Congressional Record*. The correspondences from Nebraskans were rife with suggestions that the federal education act would lead to socialism. Also Nebraskan communities were cited who volunteered scholarship aid and other acts of philanthropy to Nebraska students as evidence that the federal funds were not needed (Nebraska's Opposition to Federal Aid to Education, 1958, 1848-1849). These offers evidently were assurances to keep socialism at bay.

Nebraska was not alone in objecting to federal aid. Some Indianans were equally concerned. In July, the State Superintendent of Indiana, Wilbur Young wrote a letter to Congressman Winfield Denton in which he objected to H.R. 13247, the National Defense Education Act of 1958. The Congressman replied to the letter in an extension of remarks on July 31, 1958. Briefly, Congressman Denton praised Superintendent Young's assertion that Indianans were providing aid and that Indiana students were doing a fine job in science and mathematics.

They did not need federal assistance. Congressman Denton reminded the Superintendent that students in other states were not as blessed, “We cannot be satisfied with the quality of education—in Indiana or in the Nation—until it is the very best that we can make it” (H.R. 13247, 1958, 15832). In conclusion, he wrote, “. . . We cannot afford the luxury of arguing whether the local, county, State or National Government should perform this training function. The defense of America is primarily the duty of the Federal Government . . . I believe all the agencies of Government should work together to see that the education and training of America leads that of all the world” (H.R. 13247, 1958, 15833).

Finally, in August, Congressman Berry of South Dakota added his objections to federal aid. He stated:

Federal assistance to education, or probably more properly called Federal intervention in our system of education, has been vigorously advocated by certain groups who have been attempting to socialize our educational system, but thus far those who still believe in free enterprise, those who still believe in freedom of education, those who still have fought the socialized system of education, have been able to ward it off. (H. R. 13247, 1958, 16582)

The idea that federal aid in education was an attempt to insert a socialist form of government seemed odd, considering that the stated reason for federal aid to education was to strengthen national defense—against the Soviet communists, who were, in the minds of many, the first cousins to socialists.

In analyzing the *Congressional Record* hearings concerning NDEA, the objections to the legislation were often expressed according to region. The vast farming areas of the Midwest, represented by Nebraska, South Dakota, and Kansas, were concerned with socialism while Southern congressmen favored states rights arguments supported by the Tenth amendment of the Bill of Rights which left the exercise of rights unassigned in the first nine amendments to the states.

Before the Civil War, the South recognized the Tenth amendment as preserving the right of the Southern states to practice slavery. In the 1950s the cause became the prevention of school desegregation amid the dismantling of *Plessy vs. Ferguson* (1954), as represented by Jim Crow laws throughout the South.

On one level, the objection to federal aid to education illustrated negative freedom (Tozer et al., 2002), that is, freedom *from* control by the federal government. Congressman Abbutt of Virginia responded to the proponents of the bill in the House. He said, “The primary responsibility for education is in the local communities and States and higher educational institutions. There it must remain if our Democratic way of life is to be retained” (H.R. 13247, 1958, 16683). He further addressed the issue of freedom by stating “this legislation, if passed, will greatly endanger the future freedom of our people” (H.R. 13247, 1958, 16683).

The issue of federal vs. state and local control was the issue *du jour*, utilized by representatives of the deep South states who persisted in the support of segregation and also by representatives of the Midwestern states to combat the perceived threats of socialism. It was not a partisan fight. Southern Democrats and Midwestern Republicans could agree on the principles limiting federal aid to education.

In the service of this double-edged attack, Senator Jenner of Indiana inserted various responses to the proposed legislation in the *Congressional Record* as first published in the House edition. The resolution of the legislature of South Carolina in 1957, spoke, in effect, for many in the Southern states:

The people of South Carolina are now, always have been and shall always be unequivocally, incontrovertibly, and unalterably oppose to the infringement of the fundamental right, obligation, and duty of the people and their local governmental authority to provide, supervise, and control the education of the children of this State or the educational processes concomitant thereon which would directly or indirectly infringe upon the rights, duties, and obligations of local or state governments. (S. 4237, 85,

17276).

Other Southerners also voiced their disapproval, including the Lieutenant Governor of Mississippi, Senator Byrd of Virginia who referred to “creeping paternalism” (S. 4237, 85, 17276), the Governor of Texas, the Southern States Industrial Council, the Governor of South Carolina, the Governor of Kentucky, as well as Governor Jim Folsom of Alabama who authoritatively stated that federal aid to education would lead to federal control (S. 4237, 1958, 17297).

In an August, 1958 speech, Senator Strom Thurmond of South Carolina managed to include a statement against progressive education and John Dewey; a damnation of federal interference with the affairs of state and local governments supported by the 10<sup>th</sup> amendment, and a statement on equal educational opportunity. He said, “Except in those fields related directly to national defense, the Federal Government has no constitutional authority to invade the field of education” (S. 4237, 1958, 17297), and, “If we would encourage from our people an upsurge of initiative, industry, and inventiveness, we must bring a halt to the welfare legislation and programs which invariably encourage indolence in any people subjected to their insatiable influence” (17298).

Thurmond’s interpretation of EEO provided a segway to the next section. The analysis of EEO came directly after the identification of progressive education which Thurmond described as “inclusive of a number of erroneous concepts which are now being widely applied to the harm of unsuspecting students and the general population” (S. 4237, 1958, p.17298). Thurmond considered the notion of equal educational opportunity as “the most insidious of these concepts” (p. 17298) identified by progressive education, “that which assumes that since all men are created equal, they therefore, have equal and identical ability” (p. 17298).

This conceptualization of progressive education and EEO will be discussed at length in the final chapter since it represented an outstanding example of speaking about race without speaking about race.

### Ideological Issues: Freedom, Democracy, and EEO

The terms democracy, freedom, freedom of choice, and equal educational opportunity were identified through out the *Congressional Record*, and also used liberally in the reports of the NDEA Counseling and Guidance Training Institutes. In a speech delivered to the American Association of School Administrators in March of 1958, Senator Church of Idaho addressed EEO in terms of NDEA. Oregon Senator Neuberger submitted the speech in the extension of remarks in the *Congressional Record* on March 12, 1958. Church made several statements concerning the concept of freedom. In comparing the educational system in the United States to the educational system in the Soviet Union, he said:

A Nation's educational system is the most important instrumentality by which its national values are served. It would be hard to imagine two nations whose values differ more absolutely than do those of the Soviet Union and the United States...Their educational system is plainly designed to serve the needs of a rigid, doctrinaire, and authoritarian society. Ours is designed, or should be, to serve the needs of a free society. (Public Education at the Crossroads, 1958, 4170)

Church described a form of EEO in which the tension between making courses academically rigorous and paying attention to the needs of less ambitious or able students could be mitigated by giving each student a curriculum commensurate with their ability. He acknowledged:

This would make for unequal treatment...which is not only contrary to the traditions of free public schools, but undemocratic as well...the true democratic principle is to afford to each student an equal opportunity. To give to each an equal opportunity does not mean to give to each an equal dose. (Public Education at the Crossroads, 1958, 4171)

### *Democracy and Education*

In August of 1958, Congressman Holland of Pennsylvania discussed the role of prolonged debate in a democracy (H.R. 13247, 1958, 16577). Also, in August, Congressman Edmondson of Oklahoma described education as “the only solid foundation on which we can base our hopes for the survival and supremacy of the democratic ideal in today’s world” (H.R. 13247, 1958, 16683). Edmondson additionally addressed the concept of EEO in the same paragraph, “We in the Congress have long recognized a national responsibility as well—the responsibility to see that educational opportunity is available to all American children...the case has been well and solidly made that many American children today do not have true educational opportunity in some fields” (H.R. 13247, 1958, 16683).

### *Ideological Issues: Americanism vs. Communism*

The analyzed pages of the *Congressional Record* were filled with references to American values, Communism, the Soviet educational system, Soviets, the Cold War, and national defense. Additionally, *Sputnik* symbolized the consternation of the United States when the Soviet satellite was launched. Senator Church described the public mood after *Sputnik* in the following way, “And now, once more, in the wake of the Russian sputniks, we find the Free World thrown back again on the defensive. Our alliances are shaken” (Public Education at the Crossroads, 1958, 4170).

Numerous speakers sought to emphasize the polarized nature of Americanism vs. Communism. Senator Church, in his speech to school administrators, said, “It would be hard to imagine two nations whose values differ more absolutely than do those of the Soviet Union and the United States” (Public Education at the Crossroads, 1958, 4170). The distinction between the Soviet way of life, and life in the United States, continued to be drawn in the rhetoric of

Congress, emphasizing the deep philosophical and ideological differences between the two nations. Of all the open codes identified in the analysis of the data, references to the differences between the two systems were the most common, with at least ten separate codes.

#### Public Rhetoric of NDEA

It was most important, in introducing the legislation, that the bill's sponsors captured the mood of the nation. The launch of the Soviet satellites was a shock and seemed to represent a setback in what was later called the space race. The education system in the United States was a natural target. Senator Church's speech to school administrators once again identified some of the issues. Repeating a refrain by elected officials, military minds and scientists (Clowse, 1981), Church cited the emphasis on "personality adjustment" (Public Education at the Crossroads, 1958, 4171) aligned with John Dewey's work in the early years of the 20<sup>th</sup> century. He said, "There is much to be said in defense of the emphasis given to personality adjustment in our schools. But the emphasis goes too far, I think, when it causes a corresponding de-emphasis on subject matter" (Public Education at the Crossroads, 1958, 1471). There was general agreement among the congressmen that academic rigor in the United States was compromised by an emphasis on individual development and adjustment. The solution, according to the debate which supported aid in the Congress, was a three pronged attack. First, the national defense education bills, H.R. 13247 and S. 4237, provided the means to train and support school counseling and guidance in order to identify at an early age the able student who excelled in science, mathematics, or foreign languages. Second, the bills provided support for the creation of statewide testing programs and tests which would identify able students. Third, the bills offered scholarship support to attract the able student to higher education. The record of the hearings identified able or talented students as those in the top 25-30 percent range (H.R. 13247, 1958).

16120) as measured on tests of ability or aptitude.

Congressman Carl Elliott of the 7<sup>th</sup> District, Alabama was the House sponsor of the bill, and spoke on August 7, in support of the House version (H.R. 13247, 1958, 16577). He addressed the concerns of Americans, “Mr. Speaker, I believe the American people have been more concerned in the period of this past year with their educational system, and particularly with the quality of that educational system” (p. 16577). The Congressman stated that one-half of the “bright students of our Nation are not going on to college” (p. 16578).

Senator Lister Hill of Alabama, the Senate sponsor of the bill entitled S. 4237, echoed Elliott’s words a week later in the Senate: “A severe blow—some would say a disastrous blow—has been struck at America’s self-confidence and at her prestige in the world. Rarely have Americans questioned one another so intensely about our military position, our scientific stature, or our educational system” (S. 4237, 1958, 17230). In the same speech, Senator Hill also addressed the lack of academic rigor present in the high schools, punctuated by figures which cited the few numbers of students taking advanced science, mathematics, and language courses in American schools (s. 4237, 1958). The appeal to the American competitive spirit was encapsulated by Senator Hill in a reference to the American personality. He said, “Americans know we must mobilize our Nation’s brainpower in the struggle for survival” (p. 17230). Senator Lyndon Johnson joined his colleague when he stated during the August 13 hearing that

I think history may well record that we saved liberty and saved freedom when we undertook a crash program in the field of education. We have not gone far enough, fast enough. I do not think the people of the Nation realize the competitive struggle which exists. There must be an awakening, not only in congress, but throughout the country... (p. 17231).

The public rhetoric reflected in Congress, rejected progressive education, encouraged national defense, and sought out solutions to the lack of academic rigor that was viewed as



directly affecting the future defense of the nation. Additionally the Congressional proponents of NDEA appealed to the competitive spirit of the American people.

#### Intentions of the NDEA Legislation

The House bill passed first without the provision for scholarships. Instead it contained student loan provisions. The debate in the Senate took this into account and reinserted the scholarship provision.

First, the national defense education bills, H.R. 13247 and S. 4237, provided the means to train and support school counseling and guidance in order to identify at an early age the able student who excelled in science, mathematics, or foreign languages. Second, the bills provided support for the creation of statewide testing programs and tests which would identify able students. Third, the bills offered scholarship as well as loan support to attract the able student to higher education. The record of the hearings identified able or talented students as those in the top 25-30 per cent range (H.R. 13247, 1958. 16120) as measured on tests of ability or aptitude.

Congressman Elliott opened his remarks on August 4, 1958, “A continued waste of our precious human resources and our inattention to the needs of America’s educational system could result in a national calamity. If we are to meet this challenge to our Nation’s security we must make certain that all our citizens have ample opportunity to attain the highest level of their capacities” (Extension of Remarks, 1958). He also addressed the current crisis, in stating:

The level of the civilization of a society is determined by the extent to which the talents of its members are developed. The more complicated the society the more imperative the need for the maximum development of every talent of every member of that society...We can no longer leave the development of talent so largely to chance as we have done in the past. (p. 16119)

The remainder of Elliott’s speech listed the areas that needed assistance in the American educational system. Only one in four high school graduates attended college; only one of five

college graduates studied for a master's degree; and one in seven went beyond the master's to a doctorate. Additionally, Elliott stated that studies showed the 200,000 "superior high-school graduates do not enroll in college, while still another group of about 52,500 high-school students with intelligence scores in the top 25 percent of ability do not even finish high school" (H. R. 13247, 1958, 16120).

Congressman Elliott acknowledged that many students were not motivated to attend college while others lacked financial resources. He attributed this to a lack of guidance and stated, "It is a demonstrated fact that adequate testing, counseling, and guidance can make significant contributions to the identification and educational development of all high-school students, but particularly those in the more able category" (H.R. 13247, 1958, p. 16120).

During House debate in August, Congressman Thompson of New Jersey<sup>7</sup> made the following statements concerning the value of guidance, counseling, and testing:

The benefits from testing, guidance, and counseling are not merely a matter of opinion. Scientifically conducted studies prove conclusively that students who have had the benefits of guidance services in high schools make better marks than those who have not had guidance from a trained counselor...they enter college in larger numbers and receive degrees by more than two and one-half. (H.R. 13247, 1958, 16584)

In determining the population of the able, Thompson reported results from the Rockefeller Report on Education, Special Studies Project Report V, 1958: "By using test results in conjunction with previous school achievement it is possible to predict that those identified as the most able—upper 20 percent—will succeed in college in more than 9 out of 10 cases" (p. 16585).

Additionally, according to Thompson, "only 4 out of 5 of students in the top quarter of their class finish high school. Only 2 out of 5 in the top quarter go on to college. Many with high potential simply do not enroll in college preparatory programs" (p. 16585). The solution

---

<sup>7</sup> Educational Testing Services (ETS) was located in Princeton, New Jersey.

Thompson supported was the addition of statewide testing in the early grades of high school, as well as the benefits of guidance and counseling (H.R. 13247, 1958, 16585).

Senator Hill spoke to the advantages of guidance and counseling services as well as testing in the debate over S. 4237 in mid-August:

The bill provides for aptitude testing of children as they are entering high school, I order to identify the particular talents and potentialities of each child. To assure that all of our children, and especially those most gifted intellectually . . . can be encouraged to develop their abilities to the maximum, guidance and counseling services will help high school students along paths of study best suited to their individual capacities, and will give particular attention to urging that the ablest and most promising take the courses that will qualify them for admission to college. (S. 4237, 1958, 17234)

Not all were convinced that guidance counselors were a panacea in the high Schools. Senator Jenner of Indiana was adamant in his opposition to the NDEA, and specifically abhorred the idea of guidance counselors and testing. In one passage he stated, “I do not want the Federal Government ever to put its clammy hand on the free educational system of this country . . .” (S. 4237, 1958, 17281). In reference to guidance and counseling he declared, “There are gimmicks in this program, providing funds for psychological testing, which are dangerous instruments for thought control. . . Let us not be deceived by the innocent-sounding name. This business of testing and guidance and counseling smells to high heaven. It is the special thought-control branch of the educationists” (p. 17282). Jenner continued, linking testing with UNESCO and efforts to “overemphasize sex, to set up conflicts between parents and children, between races and between sections, for internationalism and against our Constitution. Then the results are kept secret in files parents cannot see” (p. 17282).

#### Summary of the Congressional Hearings

What began to emerge in the NDEA hearings among the supporters of NDEA was an understanding of equal opportunity, EEO, in the *actualist* (Burbules & Sherman, 1979) or

*compensatory* (Howe, 1997) framework. The opponents of the legislation such as Senator Strom Thurmond of South Carolina, railed against the notion that everyone could possibly have equal access, let alone assistance to enter higher education. Their definition of equal opportunity did not even approach the minimalist *formalist* understanding of EEO that only allowed access to public education.

The appeal to competition, the comparison of the American educational system to the Soviet, and the discussion of lack of academic rigor seemed to hearken back to the days of World War II when the whole nation was organized to defeat the enemy.

The resistance to the legislation either targeted socialism, most notably condemned by Midwest congressmen, or the intervention of the federal government into the affairs of the states, heard from Southern legislators. Both sides of the NDEA debate rejected progressive education, which paid entirely too much attention to the psychological development of the individual and was judged an abject failure and probably the reason the United States was losing the space race to the Soviets.

The congressmen and senators who favored the NDEA supported a government that intervened in the welfare of its citizens, represented by the idea of positive freedom (Tozer et al., 2002), the commitment of the government to provide services and support for its citizens. The Alabamians, Congressman Carl Elliott and Senator Lister Hill, emphasized the need for student aid in the form of guidance services, testing, early identification of talent, scholarships and loans. They described public education in the United States as lagging behind and losing a competitive edge. But the *actualist* (Burbules & Sherman, 1979) commitment to providing support to those in need, was, at this time strictly meritocratic, in that it was tied to test scores and other signs of academic ability.

The sections reviewed in the *Congressional Record* provided rich sources of data concerning the ideological issues which included federal vs. states rights issues, EEO, and the opposition between Americanism and Communism. The other two themes, the public rhetoric of NDEA as well as the intentions of the legislation as it applied to guidance and counseling also clearly emerged in the data.

In the following section the themes generated in the *Congressional Record* were applied to the reports of the first NDEA counseling and guidance training institutes and the evaluation of the regular session counseling and guidance training institutes. The process of open coding led to axial or categorical codes and the identification of additional themes.

#### The NDEA Counseling and Guidance Training Institute Reports

There were several publications released by *HEW*. In 1961, Tyler wrote a review of the first 50 Institutes. In 1965, Pierson's evaluation of regular session institutes was published.

#### *The 1959 Counseling and Guidance NDEA Training Institutes*

The introduction of the review of the first 50 NDEA Counseling and Guidance Training Institutes first looked at "the principles that guided the designers in their plans" (Tyler, p. 1), an assertion that related to the theme that emerged from the *Congressional Record* called intentions of the legislation. The second chapter addressed the design of the institutes. The third included contributions to counselor education that was identified as a theme specific to the booklet. Another area previously identified was the public rhetoric of NDEA and elements of this theme were found in the publication. The ideological issues of democracy, freedom and EEO were also analyzed, along with the newly identified theme of results which contained the categories of initial outcomes and identified problems of the first institutes. The addition of new themes and the rewording of the initial congressional themes identified in the previous section could be

confusing. I have arranged the topics or themes in the same order as described in the section on the congressional hearings so as to encourage clarity and understanding. In the last section, the new themes of contributions to counselor education and a final theme of results of the institutes were introduced.

*Ideological Issues: Freedom of Choice and Democracy*

While the issue of American and Communist ideologies was not a part of the report on the first institutes, the description of ideological values of freedom, democracy, and EEO were identified in the publication. Tyler (1960) wrote the following statement in the introductory chapter in describing the benefits of self-direction, the right of students to choose their education and their careers:

Such self-direction is the only kind of motivation that is consistent with our democratic philosophy. We cannot single out bright students or any other one group of citizens and compel them to shape their lives according to a certain pattern because of the needs of society (p. 7).

She added that “the right of a person to shape his own destiny takes precedence over the right of society to make use of his talents” (p. 7), and “Our long experience with the democratic system has demonstrated to us that there need be no essential conflict here. The choice a person makes about what to do with his life . . . represents a synthesis of his personal and social values” (p. 7). Democratic values were represented as the ability to choose what the person wanted to do with their life, and it was assumed that the choice would be what was best for society. Tyler implied, however, that choice would best be served by educational guidance.

*Ideological Issues: EEO*

Tyler (1960) described the comprehensive high school as a place where

Students with long family traditions of scholarship and culture share classrooms and laboratories with students who see the school situation as a somewhat distasteful prelude to work. Furthermore, different varieties of intellectual capacity, special aptitudes, and

attitude toward education occur in all possible combinations. (p. 6)

This description of comprehensive high schools reflected a formalist interpretation of EEO, that of access. Tyler (1960), as well as the legislative proponents and the institute designers, emphasized the chief goal of the legislation, that of finding able or talented students. She acknowledged that some counselors may find the selective application of guidance and counseling services distasteful in the following statement:

This particular title, like the act as a whole, is concerned primarily with the academically talented student. Some counselors may not find this emphasis congenial. Their values lead them to insist on the worth of every human being, whatever his level of ability and their practice in the past has often consisted largely of service to the slow learner and the misfit. The Office of Education would certainly not disagree with the general principle that every individual is important, but all laws do not provide assistance to all people. (p. 13)

While Tyler or others could not foresee the effect of the emphasis on the talented or able student, at the very least it seemed that the early legislative and institute focus on an academic elite, selected chiefly by test scores, provided a model for guidance counselors that affected the future EEO of students.

#### *Ideological Issues: States Rights vs. Federal Intervention*

Tyler (1960) warned that the limitation of federal funds was a warning to project managers “that it is necessary to consider very seriously the possible consequences of Federal participation in an educational enterprise so completely decentralized” (p. 13). Federal programs should not compete, in Tyler’s word, with local programs. She wrote, “the total educational fabric may be weakened rather than strengthened in the process” (p. 13). She opted for federal projects to represent pilot programs, in the case of the institutes, trying out ideas not applied in existing programs. The tension between federal intervention and state and local control reflected the concerns during the congressional debates.

### *Public Rhetoric of NDEA*

At numerous points in the report of the first institutes, the issue of academic rigor in the high schools was cited. “Our schools must be strengthened and improved. They are not stimulating the fullest development of all the human resources of the Nation” (Tyler, 1961, p. 5). And, “Since World War II, Americans have become increasingly concerned about the education of those students who show an unusually high level of academic talent” (p. 7). Finally, “Study after study has demonstrated that a considerable proportion of our most intelligent citizens never make the special contribution to society that they might have made had they received the advanced education necessary for the full development of talent” (p. 7). Tyler’s assessment was that “guidance is essential” (p. 7). She wrote that there were “many and complex reasons” (p. 7) why “brilliant students do not go to college or drop out before they finish” (p. 7).

The description of talent wasted or poorly directed was consistent with the results of the theme of public rhetoric surrounding NDEA in the analysis of the congressional hearings on the legislation.

#### *Intentions of the Institute Designers and Intentions of the Legislation*

Tyler (1961) wrote that the result of the hearings of the Senate Committee on Labor and Public Welfare showed “that the need for guidance services was clear to the framers of this legislation. Guidance was not included as an incidental attachment to the main program . . . It was an essential building block in the structure Congress was attempting to set up (Tyler, p. 8). Tyler asserted that the purpose of guidance was to “stimulate individual students to their optimum development” (p. 9). She wrote that there were current facilitate in a number of ways the identification and development of talented students” (Tyler, 1961, p. 11). The introduction to Title V, *Guidance, Counseling, and Testing: Identification and Encouragement of Able Students*



V (A) and (B) stated that “We must increase our efforts to identify and educate more of the talent of our Nation” (Tyler, 1961, p. 81). Tyler (1961) emphasized:

Because of the emphasis on the development of individual talents, the guidance provisions of the act are really the critical provisions, as was pointed out by Dr. Homer Babbidge, Jr., Assistant Commissioner for Higher Education, at a conference for directors of Counseling and Guidance Training Institutes in March, 1959. (p. 11)

The charge to identify “the able” (H. Doc. No. 85-318, 1958 at 1074), which ranged from the top 25 percent to 30 percent (H.R. 13247, 1958. 16120) of high school students as measured on tests of ability or aptitude, expressed the intentions of both legislation and the designers of the NDEA Counseling and Guidance Training Institutes.

By the time NDEA became PL 85-864, the purpose of guidance and counseling programs was described by Tyler (1961) as follows: “the central purpose of the institute program is to improve the quality and increase the number of secondary school counselors who can identify and work with the academically able student” (p.12). She continued, stating that “this particular title, like the act as a whole, is concerned primarily with the academically able student” (p. 13). Additionally, the administration of tests that purported to measure academic ability were aligned with the addition of guidance counselors under Title V (A) of PL 85-864. According to Tyler, Institute trainees must know and understand measurement and statistics in order to interpret the tests. As a requirement of the Law in Title V (A), states were to establish statewide testing. Testing and guidance and counseling had entered an alliance that continues until this day.

#### *Contributions to Counselor Education*

The NDEA Counseling and Guidance Institutes were different depending upon their location and the selected population. But, they shared certain characteristics as developed by the institute designers (Tyler, 1961). Primarily the brief six- to eight-week summer institutes had to focus on what the enrollees needed to learn, and this was decided by the institute designers who

took their lead from the legislation and the direction of HEW. The goal of each institute was to offer a focused period of time in which they were designed to “make this period of a few weeks stand out in each enrollee’s life as a distinctive period with an unusual growth stimulating effect on his professional development” (Tyler, 1961, p. 19).

Tyler (1961) addressed the issue of contributions to counselor education through a discussion of professional issues. The first issue had no impact on this study: that of addressing school guidance and counseling in private schools. The second issue was “the integration of the institute program with regular ongoing programs of counselor training and certification” (p. 73). Tyler reported, “If the most outstanding faculty members and the practicum space and equipment are assigned to the institute, what happens to the regular summer courses” (p. 74). The solution to this issue seemed to rest in getting the contracts from the government early so as to plan accordingly, and perhaps “Some sort of clearinghouse for available counselor training personnel would be helpful” (p. 74). Finally, Tyler suggested that the goal of the institute program might be “to complement the efforts that colleges and universities are already making to train guidance workers by trying out some ideas not incorporated in ongoing programs” (p. 14).

#### *Results: Outcomes, Problems, and Recommendations*

All of the initial institutes attempted to assess whether or not the objectives of the programs were achieved. Methods included quantitative measures to include rating or survey instruments; early qualitative or narrative ideas including journaling and focus groups; comprehensive examinations; standardized tests such as the Minnesota Teacher Attitude Inventory and new measures adopted from personality research to assess self-concept (Tyler, 1961). Changes in participant attitudes, professional values, “knowledge and skills” (p. 62) did occur. Some participants were unhappy with their experience and Tyler hypothesized that one

institute that reported many ratings of dissatisfaction “had selected counselors from States that constitute an underdeveloped area, so far as guidance is concerned, and then attempted to present course work that would show them what professional training for counselors is really like” (Tyler, 1961, p. 62). Participants who indicated dissatisfaction with aspects of institutes were generally dismissed as not fitting with the majority or not being able to meet the standards of the programs. Overall, the institute directors in the 50 initial sites, as well as Tyler, indicated changes in professional attitudes and realizations of what needed to be done among the participants. Some of the problems cited by institute directors included wide differences in ability and in preparation, even after a screening process in the application stage; differences in personalities and values.

Evidently there was some widespread resistance toward statistical and measurement classes, and Tyler (1961) remarked, the people who taught the classes. She acknowledged more resistance to measurement and statistics than any other part of the programs, but emphasized the need for statistical knowledge among school guidance counselors due to the increased importance of ability and achievement testing in identifying the academically talented..

There was some concern in the institute reports concerning practicum experience. Tyler (1961) reported that “33 of the 50 institutes had made some provision for supervised practice in counseling” (p. 71). While many institute directors saw the value of live counseling experience, some questioned whether beginning trainees should complete a practicum, and others, who did not offer practicum opportunities, did not seem to appreciate their value.

Finally, Tyler (1961) addressed the issue that has defined school counselor practice from the NDEA to the present: “The sharpest conflict here is that between the concept of the counselor’s role generally held by professional counselors and counselor educators, and the

concept often held by school administrators” (p. 76).

*Counselor Education in Regular Session Institutes*

The evaluation of counselor preparation in the year-long regular session NDEA Institutes was conducted in 1964 and the work was published in 1965 (Pierson, 1965). Several events had changed the focus in the political as well as public mind concerning education and the role of the government in EEO. The Civil Rights movement and the violence surrounding school and civil desegregation had led to the passage of the *Civil Rights Act of 1964* (Tozer et al., 2002). Other legislation, notably the *Elementary and Secondary Education Act of 1965* (Tozer et al., 2002), provided specifically for educational assistance to poor and minority students.

The themes identified in the *Congressional Record* and in Tyler’s report on the first 50 institutes, were not, overall, the focus of the evaluation by Pierson (1965). The emphasis on the academically talented was briefly mentioned in a section on school climate in which Pierson wrote:

Enrollees had discovered the importance of *climate* in a school. They had learned that counselors must assist in the development of a climate in which the school as an institution and education as a process are respected, a climate in which the welfare of the individual and the welfare of the group are both given consideration, a climate in which individual differences are appreciated and understood but where great pride is taken in the scholarly achievements of the academically gifted. (p. 46)

With the exception of the singular reference to the academically talented, as part of the whole school climate, the theme of intentions of legislation and intentions of the institute designers was unexplored. Likewise, there were no references to training counselors to address a lack of academic rigor, or drop outs, or wasted talent included in the theme of public rhetoric of NDEA. The counselor trainees in the regular sessions were involved in a rigorous counselor training program which approached the education of every student. Additionally, the theme of ideological issues appeared in reference to freedom, democracy, and EEO, and not to issues of states rights

vs. federal intervention. Two themes were repeated from Tyler's (1961) study. The first was that of contributions to counselor education, and the second was results, outcomes, problems and recommendations.

*Ideological Issues: Freedom, Democracy and EEO*

Pierson (1965) identified five basic issues after a query to the directors of the regular session institutes during 1963-64. The tension between what Pierson referred to as a "deterministic psychology" (p. 31) and a "society founded upon the concepts of freedom and individual responsibility" (p. 31) was expressed by the directors of the regular institutes and seemed to have developed into a "thinking-feeling dichotomy" (p. 32). The thinkers are concerned with the counselor who "is seen as an expert who knows how to collect data, how to organize it, how to diagnose a situation, and how to help a student think his way through his various problems" (p. 32). The non-determinists, according to Pierson, tend to be "feelers" (p. 31). They were more invested in a sense of man as having free will. Pierson wrote that guidance and counseling had not come to a point of recognizing the necessity of both aspects in the counseling setting.

The second part of the "determinism-free society" (Pierson, 1965, p. 33) dichotomy was that Pierson recognized that counselor educators were addressing limitations on freedom of choice, as well as "the societal limitations upon choice resulting from differences in culture, race, geography, and economic circumstances" (p. 33). Counselor educators, according to Pierson, were no longer naïve as to the dynamics of choice and determinism. Additionally, the question of freedom of choice and EEO for diverse groups of students was mentioned for the first time in any of the documents. In the *Congressional Record* there were vague acknowledgements of a need for a nondiscrimination clause in the legislation, but the hearings were overall silent in

confronting the position of diverse groups.

### *Contributions to Counselor Education*

Counselor educators in Pierson's (1965) evaluation "Made it quite clear that they believed that an individual student has some control over his educational and vocational future and that this ability to control his future is precious" (p. 33). The counselor educators in the NDEA institutes expressed awareness of the conceptualization of mental health and individual responsibility. Counselor educators at the institutes were also aware, according to Pierson, that "school counselors must be able to establish effective working relationships with students, teachers, administrators, and parents; and they must be able to provide help for students that is practical and useful" (p. 35). Pierson also emphasized that counselor educators and the institute participants, due to the practicum experiences were also aware that "schools exist for everybody" (p. 35). Again, in this brief passage, Pierson (1965) refuted the original intent, according to Tyler (1961), of restrictions in the application of guidance counselor attention.

Counselor educators in the institutes were very aware of the "relationship between theory and practice" (p. 35) as well as the ideas that school counselors "will always demand a greater understanding of human behavior than basic science can provide" and "school counseling is an art as well as a science" (p. 35).

### *Summary, Conclusions, and Recommendations*

The last theme was a bit different from the results, outcomes, conclusions, and recommendations theme in Tyler's publication. Pierson (1965) focused on a summary, conclusions and recommendations.

The summary, conclusions, and recommendations portrayed the regular session institutes, for the most part, as rigorous training experiences in which counselor educators employed by the

institutes as well as student counselor trainees were given ample practical experiences, as well as broad exposure to theory, other disciplines, and methodology. Pierson (1965) envisioned a creative training ground for counselor educators as well as the participants.

The focus on the original purpose of NDEA, supported by Tyler in 1961, had disappeared in Pierson's evaluation, as the influence of events and legislation in the sixties turned the aims of NDEA to all students. The shift in emphasis of the NDEA will be addressed in the final chapter.

#### School Counselor, Counselor Educator, and Clinical Counselor Interviews

The single case described in this study was the practice of school counseling in Alabama, and the embedded aspect of the case was the NDEA Title V of 1958. While the analysis of the congressional hearings and HEW sponsored publications dealt with NDEA Title V and the counseling and guidance training institutes, the interviews focused on the work experiences of school counselors, a counselor educator, and a clinician who attended two NDEA institutes. So far we have learned what congressmen, representing the public, thought a school guidance and counseling program should be. We have also heard from the designers and directors of the NDEA institutes through the words of two counselor educators who were hired by HEW to document the institutes, from the initial summer training to the year-long regular sessions. Additionally, the publications represented a picture of what the institute expected of the school counselor attendees. In the next section the interviews chronicled the experiences and insights of counselors in the schools, in the university setting, and during the period of the institutes.

Another way of looking at the three levels of data was to visualize the congressional reports as representing a global understanding of school guidance counseling at a moment in time that corresponded with two national crises: the perception that the United States was losing the scientific, educational, and ideological competition with the Soviet Union, and the civil rights

struggles coupled with desegregation of schools in the South. The second level of data described how the intentions of the congress translated to the training and philosophical construction of school guidance counselors in the NDEA institutes. Finally, the current section dealt with the particular, a description of what it was like to be a school counselor after NDEA, as well as the implications of school counselor practice in supporting or discouraging EEO.

The interview participants in this study included three women and two men. All identified as Caucasian or White Americans. As an active member of both the ALCA executive council and formerly, the ALSCA governing board, I know many counselors in schools, universities, and other settings. From a pool of ten people, seven White and three African American, the five interview participants were chosen, or rather, chose to participate. Others in the pool were either unavailable or unresponsive to my queries.

In 1992, Hart and Jacobi reported that roughly two-thirds of school counselors were female, and 90% identified as non-Hispanic whites. The interview participants and the pool from which the participants emerged, reflected that fact. Each of the participants agreed for their names to be used in the interviews which were conducted as oral history.

### *The Participants*

The initial interview was conducted with Dr. David Carroll at the Canterbury Episcopal Chapel at The University of Alabama in Tuscaloosa, Alabama. Dr. Carroll received his bachelor degree in social studies and history education from The University of Alabama. He was a ROTC Air Force Cadet and consequently spent a tour of duty in Vietnam in the early seventies. Because of his experience as a human services officer with his battalion in Vietnam, he entered a masters degree program in counseling at William and Mary in Virginia in 1972. After completing the program, Dr. Carroll and his wife returned to Tuscaloosa and accepted teaching jobs with the



Tuscaloosa City School District. Dr. Carroll said, “Basically, we’ve lived here every since, and worked 35 years in the City school system, all of it in the West End of Tuscaloosa, pretty much voluntary, I just had a chance to move to other schools, but you know basically I felt I was effective working here with that population and those folks”. After two years teaching social studies in a junior high school, Dr. Carroll became the fulltime school counselor. From that point he eventually became the ninth grade counselor at Central West in Tuscaloosa and remained at the school for the remainder of his career.

Dr. Walter Cox was interviewed in the offices of the Alabama Board of Examiners in Counseling. Dr. Cox is the Executive Director of the Board. He was born in Michigan and graduated from Owosso College in 1959. He began working on his master’s degree and during that time he took a job with the Lansing Public Schools as a counselor coordinator for a special program at a junior high school in which he worked with 60 students and their parents. This position required off-campus time in the community. He served in this position for three years and in the summer of 1962 attended a NDEA Counseling and Guidance Training Institute at Western Michigan University. In the fall of 1963 Dr. Cox entered a year long NDEA Counseling and Guidance Training Institute at The University of Illinois. Dr. Cox took a position at The University of Wisconsin Plattville Campus to initiate a counseling center and also attended a summer training institute at Ohio State University in 1965. Concerning the Ohio State institute he said, “To be quite candid with you I think that a new legislation had come out. Whether it was NDEA or the Elementary and Secondary School Education Act I can’t remember” (08/07/2009). Finally, Dr. Cox entered Indiana University in the summer of 1966 and completed a doctorate in counseling. He was also a member of the staff at the University counseling center during that time. Dr. Cox’s career focus became higher education and clinical counseling.

In 1978, Dr. Cox and his family moved to Birmingham, Alabama and held a primary appointment with the School of Medicine at UAB to direct a mental health counseling clinic. He also opened a private practice. Later, in 1983, Dr. Cox's appointment with UAB was changed to include a partnership with the federal government. During Dr. Cox's tenure at UAB, primary appointment as an associate professor was with the School of Medicine, but a secondary appointment was in the School of Education through which he taught counselor education courses. Dr. Cox became the Executive Director of the Board of Examiners in Counseling in 1989 and continues to hold that position.

Nancy Fortner, Ed.S., grew up in Auburn, Alabama. She attended Auburn City Schools and Auburn University. Auburn High School was desegregated in her senior year in high school, in 1967. Her majors were history and political science and her parents insisted she also earn teacher certification credentials. She graduated in 1971. Her first job as a teacher was at Opelika High School. Nancy Fortner was interviewed in Birmingham, Alabama.

Nancy Fortner replied when asked how she had chosen counseling "I had two wonderful role models . . . at Opelika High School, that really encouraged me in the counseling . . . They were just great role models. I said I was going to go back and get my masters in counseling and this was my first year of teaching and they just took me under their wing and helped me . . ." (08/12/2009). After her husband finished pharmacy school at Auburn, the Fortners moved to Aiken County, South Carolina where Nancy Fortner was hired as a school counselor in a rural school system. They then moved to Huntsville and she worked as the first elementary counselor, beginning in 1975, as a high school counselor at Johnson High School, and, until recently, as the guidance and counseling supervisor for the Huntsville City School System. Nancy Fortner holds a masters degree in counseling education from Auburn University and an educational specialists

degree in administration from the University of North Alabama. She was a president of the Alabama Counseling Association (ALCA), and a longtime officer and board member of the Alabama School Counselors Association (ALSCA). Nancy Fortner was very active in promoting small group counseling as well as training and consulting peer helpers.

Joy Burnham, Ph.D. is an associate professor in counselor education at The University of Alabama in Tuscaloosa, Alabama. She was interviewed in her office at The University of Alabama. Dr. Burnham received her undergraduate degree in elementary education from Auburn University, and her master's degrees in counseling at Jacksonville State University. She was a teacher in the Anniston City School System before attending Auburn for the Ph.D. program in school counseling. She received her doctorate in 1995. Her research has included work in school counselor roles and expectations. She was also supportive and had input into the development of the Alabama State Plan for School Counseling, a comprehensive developmental program for Alabama schools. One of her significant contributions to school counseling in the State of Alabama was a survey of the state's 1600 school counselors of which 1244 responded. The results painted a picture of the school counselor's perceptions of what a school counseling program should be, contrasted with what it often was.

Karole Ohme, Ed.S., is a practicing licensed professional counselor in the Ft. Payne, Alabama area. Her career spans the 1960s to 2000s. She received a master's degree in counseling psychology from Auburn University in 1969 and was a school counselor at Jefferson Davis High School and Montgomery Academy in Montgomery, Alabama. She resigned as a school counselor at Montgomery Academy in the mid 1980s to enter graduate school at UAB. She received an educational specialist degree in counseling and became a licensed professional counselor (LPC). Karole Ohme had a private practice in Montgomery, Alabama; worked as a

counselor at hospice, directed counseling grant programs at Troy State University Montgomery (TSUM); and was a counselor supervisor for counseling internships at TSUM. She was a president of ALCA and served for many years on the executive council. She was also one of the founding members of Chapter VII, the ALCA chapter in the Montgomery region.

Although not germane to this project except as background, Karole Ohme was a freshman at The University of Alabama in 1956-57 during the period that Arthurine Lucy attempted to enroll. Her experiences during that period were vivid reminders of the ever-looming face of white supremacy in Alabama in the mid 1950s.

### *Results of the Interviews*

I addressed the issues and themes identified in the previous data sections in the same order as they appeared in the congressional hearing section: (a) race, desegregation and EEO, (b) ideological issues, (c) intentions of the NDEA legislation, and (d) the public rhetoric of NDEA and (e) results. In the counselor interviews, race, desegregation, and EEO described counselor reactions to desegregation and the issue of race in Alabama. The ideological issues centered around the ways in which the counselors described equal educational opportunities, or EEO.

The intentions of the NDEA legislation were also discussed as well as perceptions concerning the success or shortcomings of the NDEA Counseling and Guidance Training Institutes, under Title V, and other effects of NDEA.

The public rhetoric surrounding NDEA legislation was related to the role of school counselors within the schools and how that role evolved to the present day. It described the tension between institutional and administrative expectations of school counselors, and school counselor's struggles with those expectations.

There was also some crossover in counselor thoughts concerning how NDEA was originally intended and how those ideas affected school counselors today, which led into the final group of categories, results of the NDEA legislation. The results category included the identification of school counselors with testing, the struggle school counselors experienced, in many instances, with administrative ideas about counseling tasks, and the long range opinions of NDEA Title V, coupled with the long range effects.

After completing the data section from the counselor interviews, I identified findings from all sources of data and connected the findings and data sources in Table form. After a summary of the findings I devoted the final chapter to an analysis of the findings, a summary and discussion of conclusions based upon the research questions, and recommendations for future research.

#### Race, Desegregation, and EEO

School counselors make very good storytellers, and the semi-structured questions in the interview led first to recollections of the personal. David Carroll lived in Ozark, Alabama, one of several small towns surrounding Ft. Rucker, a large army post, which housed helicopter and flight training. He described the community in the following way:

But where I grew up, like I say in Ozark, Alabama, in the middle of all that was going on, I watched television every night and saw the whole Montgomery bus boycott, everything that happened, Birmingham, the Freedom Riders, . . . I could not understand all that was going on there, cause in our home town black people could vote! Were encouraged to vote!

He was not alone. Nancy Fortner depicted Auburn, Alabama, as a homogenous little town in the late sixties, “it was so small, the parents taught at the University and that was the norm, that was the value you had.” Her description of desegregation in 1969, her senior year in high school reflected little or no resistance in Auburn to the process: “The next year when

integration came there weren't that many African Americans maybe less than ten in my class".

Joy Burnham recalled when her parents told her "there would be some changes . . . I don't think anything major happened in that city (Alexander City). There were no bus burnings or bad things I heard about in Anniston, not as a kid but as an adult living in Anniston, hearing the horror of what went on there".

Karole Ohme was a counselor in the early 1970s at Jefferson Davis High School in Montgomery. Despite the infamous name of the school and Montgomery's history in the Civil Rights movement, she recalled few conflicts due to race. Student academic placement, she remembered, was more contentious when it involved the children of the military personnel from Maxwell and Gunter Air Force Bases who, it seemed, all insisted their children should be in the most advanced classes.

#### *Analyzing Counselor Responses to Desegregation*

As illustrated in a future section, the counselors were aware of the inequities of the desegregation efforts in Alabama. Nancy Fortner recognized the lack of planning in the Auburn response to desegregation. David Carroll related the many times Tuscaloosa City Schools were in federal court in the 1970s. And Joy Burnham as well as the others compared the uneventful process in their home communities with the violence and resistance in cities like Anniston, Birmingham, and Selma. All of the Alabama counselors remarked that their particular homes, during the violent years of the 1960s, were not affected. But there was a unanimous understanding that the results of desegregation did not achieve equality. Why did the four counselors from Alabama remember desegregation itself as a calm process in their particular cities? I considered several answers. On the surface it seemed that the presence of military bases and the diversity they brought, in Ozark, Alabama, and Montgomery, as well as the University in

Auburn, would influence the process. But Selma, Alabama, had an air force base, and Anniston, Alabama, site of vicious attacks on the Freedom Riders, was the home of Ft. McClellan, a large army post. Montgomery certainly experienced racial strife during the bus boycott and afterward. The military presence did not seem to affect acceptance or for that matter, long term resistance to desegregation.

A possible explanation could be the timing. By 1969, when Nancy Fortner was a senior in high school and Auburn schools desegregated, most of the protests and violence accompanying the Civil Rights struggle had already occurred. Federal court orders were in place and legislation had insured that federal funds would be denied school systems that did not comply with desegregation orders. Joy Burnham, the youngest of the counselor participants, was in second grade when Alexander City desegregated, and that was in 1970 or 1971. David Carroll began work in the Tuscaloosa School System shortly thereafter, and Karole Ohme finished her graduate training and began work as a school counselor in the early 1970s.

Another explanation related to the ways in which the national understanding of education, opportunity, and race shifted between the early sixties and late sixties. President Johnson's legislative success in congress in the years after President Kennedy's assassination changed the landscape for a brief period. One example was the shift in emphasis in the NDEA Title V institutes between the first summer sessions in 1959, and the regular sessions beginning in 1963-64. The initial NDEA legislative call to identify and guide the academically talented, diminished in the face of the Great Society's commitment to the education of all students which became the focus of legislation and counselor education in the NDEA institutes. At the time when David Carroll, Nancy Fortner, and Karole Ohme started their careers as school counselors, EEO and the various federal programs that supported it, were welcome additions to poor schools

in the South.

When talking about equality with the Alabama counselors, the conversation inevitably turned to race, desegregation and the Civil Rights era. David Carroll became a school counselor based upon his relations with African American airmen in Vietnam. In talking about race and equal opportunity he described his beliefs about race in a particularly poignant way: “Like I said, Vietnam. When you did all that, and everybody lived and died together, you kind of caught on to the fact that it was not a big deal.” He also made the point that his job as human relations officer for the battalion led him to a position in which “at one time I was the only White officer the Black kids would even talk to.” The statement, in one respect, supported David Carroll’s understanding of himself as a person who was committed to equality between the races. In another respect, his position as a White officer from the South signified several other ideas. First, he was in a position of power. As a First Lieutenant, it must not have seemed to him that he had much control, but to the young Black airmen, he was someone who could get things done. The power differential made equality a moot issue. Everyone was in survival mode, and according to Dr. Carroll’s own accounts, he was a listener. To a fellow Southerner, and many of the young Black men in Vietnam came from the South, the image of the White man who could protect or assist Black people was not uncommon. .

#### *School Counseling and Individual Growth and Development*

School counseling, counseling of any sort, is a profession devoted to the growth of the individual. In counselor education courses, particularly in the early 1970s, when David Carroll attended graduate school for a masters degree in counseling, the most common theory was personal counseling, by Carl Rogers, in which the responsibility for solving life’s problems was placed on the individual (Myrick, 1987).



### *Individual Experiences vs. Institutional or Systemic Racism*

David Carroll's life story and his interpretation of events surrounding race, was mirrored in the other school counselor interviews and pointed to an interpretation of individual racism that was quite common, and quite problematic. All of the Alabama interview participants spoke of their parent's moderation in terms of race and attributed their egalitarian beliefs to their parents. All of the counselors recounted individual acts by their parents that demonstrated good relations with African Americans. But racism is a systemic and institutional issue.

The power of an individual to solve racism is severely limited. That does not mean that individuals should not challenge issues of racism in their lives. It does mean that the power dynamics of race, are often not analyzed. Warren (2001) argued that "one of the most significant aspects of so-called "white talk" is the assertion of individual power to affect racism. By centering power in the individual, the systemic nature of whiteness, its hold on institutions, and its tendency to view all other cultural manifestations as somehow lacking, is reproduced" (p. 456). It should be emphasized that the analysis of race as systemic and institutional, does not negate individual action to combat racism. The enactment of social practices between the races is often experienced on a level below direct consciousness as a cultural performance

### *Perceptions of EEO*

Nancy Fortner was a senior at Auburn High School when tentative efforts were made to integrate African American students in 1969. Looking back she described her impressions of the students. "Then the next year when integration came there weren't that many African Americans maybe less than ten in my class, but I think so many times that they had to leave their school to agree to come without a peer group and I don't think we did a very good job of recruiting." She continued, "They just showed up and they were quiet and they had lunch at the same table and

we did not make them go apart.”

Nancy also gained insights when she became a teacher at Opelika High School, seven miles away from Auburn:

We had a diversity of students and a high population of African American students . . . So that as a classroom teacher, that would be 1973, desegregation had happened but still working with students and seeing the impact that they were there but they were really invisible. You were visible if you were an athlete.

As an example of formalist EEO, the description coincided with the experiences of many teachers and counselors in the newly desegregated South, including myself. Access was granted, but nothing other than athletics provided opportunities for visibility. And those opportunities were confined to a certain celebrity and backdoor remediation to insure the student would be eligible for the game.

African American students who were determined to succeed academically faced tough odds in breaking out of low academic expectations. Nancy recalled tracking at Auburn High School where her mother taught advanced biology. One of her mother’s former students told her his story:

He told me he was really attached to my mom because he said so many of the teachers didn’t put them in advanced courses. And they didn’t put them in honors courses. He said that many of the African American students had parents who wanted them to take advanced courses, so he ended up in my mother’s biology class, and she was one of the few teachers that did not teach them like they were black students . . . He said she expected everybody to learn.

There was no question that African American students in Alabama faced severely limiting conditions that restricted the possibility of a decent education. During the desegregation process, African American students in Alabama often gave up community schools that were barely adequate, to attend the newly integrated previously all-white schools that were generally in much better condition than the segregated African American schools. They were isolated in

their new surroundings and they often isolated themselves to preserve some semblance of normalcy in an environment in which they were perceived to be uneducated and uneducable. It was not a coincidence that special education and self-contained classes quickly followed desegregation in the South. But some areas of the state did worse than others and that concern continues to this day.

### *The Mechanics of Desegregation and EEO*

In the enactment of desegregation, there were differences across Alabama, and across the South in the level of integration. The Black Belt was the section of Alabama that had been home to the huge cotton plantations, and large numbers of slaves. The cotton economy eventually revived after the Civil War, and many African Americans continued to live in the area and work as tenant farmers or sharecroppers.

The Black Belt stretched from the Mississippi border to Macon and Chambers County in the east. If you traveled south from Tuscaloosa for about 50 miles to Perry County, there was a place where the soil changed from the clay of upstate Alabama to the rich dark soil of the Black Belt. Tuscaloosa County was perched on the very edge of the region and as the largest city in West Alabama and located on a navigable river, it grew as the center of the cotton ginning and brokerage activity in the area. The population in the Black Belt region and Tuscaloosa County ranged from 50 percent African American to well over 80 percent. In many of the Black Belt counties, the White answer to desegregation was to form private academies. Several private academies also opened in Tuscaloosa.

David Carroll was a part of the process of desegregation in the Tuscaloosa City Schools from 1972 to his retirement in 2007. His entire career as a junior high and ninth and tenth grade counselor was spent on the West side of Tuscaloosa, a majority African American area.

Tuscaloosa City Schools reluctantly desegregated its schools through a choice plan in September of 1965, when around 100 African American students entered the formerly all White schools (Wendt, 2004). In 1978, the system was once again the subject of a federal desegregation case and that decision resulted in the creation of Central High School, composed of Druid High School, the west campus, and Tuscaloosa City High School, the east campus. David Carroll was the school counselor for the west campus, 9<sup>th</sup> and 10<sup>th</sup> grade students. His description of the combination of the schools after the court decision provided a view into the mechanizations of school systems throughout Alabama in achieving a semblance of EEO:

And so there was a phase-in, and for the first year, 1979-1980 school year, we had all of the 9<sup>th</sup> graders for the City in the old Westlawn junior high school building. Then the next year we all moved up to the Druid High School Building. In 1979-1980, we had the 9<sup>th</sup> graders at Westlawn, the 10<sup>th</sup> graders at Druid, the 8<sup>th</sup> grade was at Eastwood, the 7<sup>th</sup> grade was at the old Tuscaloosa Junior High School. When we moved out of West Lawn, the 6<sup>th</sup> graders from all over the system moved into that building. And in the interim period, we started with the consolidation of the high school and they had also been continuously in court.

He then described the previous year, 1978, when the court handed down the decision that the choice plans did not provide equal access for African American students. He recalled:

In the fall of 1978 they'd been in court and we were right at the opening of school and it looked for sure like we were going to merge the two schools that year (Druid and Tuscaloosa High), and just before school started, the week before the kids were to report, the judge said no. . .it was either a reprieve or another delay.

David recited the procedures, once the combining of the schools began in 1979, as “massive amounts of regulations” involving the assignment of teachers, the number of sports teams, the cheerleader squads, “so that first year we had the merged school we had a red team and a white team. We had red cheerleaders and a white set of cheerleaders and they were randomly picked. That went on for several years”.

Nancy Fortner also described the desegregation process in Auburn, although the school system avoided the long drawn-out journey through the federal courts and effectively desegregated in 1969. “You know, they just didn’t plan for desegregation, we didn’t plan for the arrival of our students. We just assumed that they couldn’t achieve and we didn’t accept that they could, and we did not expect them to achieve”.

In *Brown v. Board*, the Supreme Court rendered two findings. The first stated that “the use of race as a basis for school assignment violates fundamental freedoms” (Coleman, 1967, p. 11). The second stated that separate schools negatively affected the future opportunities of African American children. Coleman argued that the second premise of the ruling moved the focus from EEO to racial integration and equality measured by the results of schooling and effectively “confounded the issue even further” (p. 13). In the South the plans for integration were often complex and bewildering. The hopes for EEO were defined by rules that attempted to force a strict application of equality. Amazingly, the effort was successful in some areas. David Carroll recalled the first group of students to enter and graduate from combined Central High School:

I’ve always told all the kids that were in the first class that went all four years, the 1983 class, that they were the people who made Central High School. Because their attitude was great. They came in with nothing vested in either school because they had never been to either one. They just immediately decided it was fine and we’re going to make it work. That was the kids and that was the parents.

In 1999, the Tuscaloosa City Schools were granted unitary status relieving them from the court jurisdiction of *Lee v. Macon*, 1964. Almost immediately the school system began construction of new high schools which left the West side of Tuscaloosa, Central High School, almost entirely African American.

The actualist application of EEO imposed conditions on students, schools, school districts, and communities. However, without an actualist approach of massive compensatory programs, and forced desegregation, as well as busing to achieve racial balance, it was doubtful that desegregation would have effectively occurred. The South had not done well in providing separate but equal schools, there was no reason to think that would change.

### *Expectations and Desegregation*

Nancy Fortner described the low level of expectations that evidently existed for African American students in Auburn, Alabama in the last section. She also commented on the overall preparedness for desegregation in the State of Alabama. “I don’t think Alabama went into it very enthusiastically from the government perspective, and we just did not plan for it . . . people were afraid”. She compared the arrival of African American students at her high school to the way in which transfer students are treated in Huntsville City Schools, “you know we have transition groups today”.

At several times during our interview, David Carroll recalled situations in which it was apparent the community had very low expectations of African American students and were surprised when the students performed at high levels. David described the reaction at Tuscaloosa High School in the seventies, when four of the top twenty students at Tuscaloosa High School came out of Westlawn Junior High School, “One year we had the top 20 students at Tuscaloosa High School and I think four of them were former Westlawn students which blew everybody’s mind that it could happen . . . the general consensus was they were getting an inferior education.”

Another incident occurred in 1977, when an accreditation team from the Southern Association Commission (SACS) reported to the superintendent and the board that there was one

exceptionally good junior high out of the three in the system. David said, “They went back and made their report to the superintendent and the board . . . they said your outstanding junior high school is Westlawn. Well, they almost fainted because they couldn’t believe it”.

The unfairness of low expectations was particularly evident in the interviews with Nancy Fortner and David Carroll, and their approach to those issues was to attempt to problem solve. In the same sense the events, beginning in the nineties, which made the graduation exam more difficult and increased the role of testing in the schools, as well as the consent decrees that enabled school systems to gain unitary status, were still viewed as challenges by the counselors.

#### EEO, Liberal-Egalitarian Politics, and Democratic Values

The second theme first identified in the *Congressional Record* was that of ideological issues: EEO, freedom of choice, and democratic values. In the case of the participants in the interviews, the overall presence of desegregation efforts and memories of the Civil Rights movement were wrapped up in ideological understandings of EEO, liberal-egalitarian political beliefs and democratic values. Dr. Joy Burnham described the difference between her hometown of Alexander City and Anniston where she lived before moving to Tuscaloosa:

I saw a difference in that city versus Anniston and I’m using Anniston as a good analogy. Because every kid, rich, poor, black, white whatever they were, race, class, went to one school and they had a darn good school, versus you go up to Anniston and uh, it’s 90 percent black and white people don’t go there unless they can’t afford a private school. Very sad, sad situation compared to the place I grew up and how I grew up. Because we were put together, lived together, grew up together, graduated together versus segregation, isolation, “I’m better than you.

Joy taught in both the Anniston City System and the Talladega County system before entering a doctoral program in counselor education at Auburn University. Both communities were rigidly structured along race and class lines, in that African American students and poor White students made up the majority in the public school systems. Her understanding of EEO is that students

should have access, but also there is an assumption that attending a school that does not represent the entire community is a failure of EEO.

In discussing the ASCA National Model (2003), Joy described the prospects for school counselors in Alabama as well as other states:

What a wonderful way for them to hopefully reach out and work together to reach all the students. Because you know, we know in our research you need to reach all the students, and you wonder, how much of that is being done. And I'm not talking about just in Alabama, I'm talking about in the country. But reaching all students is a big thing to swallow. You know, how do I reach every student in the school? And you don't do that without effort and without training.

Understandings of EEO coupled with a liberal belief in progress and an optimism that seemed to characterize the school counselors. As previously addressed, the school counselors and counselor educator portrayed the desegregation of the schools as a positive event. They also recognized the presence and the education of African American students in ways that indicated they believed that academic success was attainable.

David Carroll stressed the climate of Central High School as egalitarian and fair. Problems came from outside forces, of the school board, or superintendent, or various groups in Tuscaloosa that made progress difficult. Nancy Fortner saw the portrayal of African American students as less able, and believed that it was not a true portrait. Joy Burnham recognized the class and race separatism in Anniston, and compared her own experience in a more egalitarian setting in Alexander City to the situation in Anniston.

#### *Liberal Conceptualizations of Progress*

Though a small group, the school counselors in Alabama represented a progressive view of their experiences in schooling. Each was optimistic in describing the circumstances in which they had worked. David Carroll's assessment of his years in Tuscaloosa was largely positive, but several events in the decade prior to his retirement challenged his perceptions of progress in the



system. There was disappointment in the ways in which the Tuscaloosa City System immediately set about dismantling Central High School after the district gained unitary status. He felt strongly that moving from one high school, Central, to three was a mistake.

In all our talk about why you should or should not get rid of Central into three different high schools you understand that Tuscaloosa has not ever had a real gang problem . . . but now you're talking about taking all the teenagers in town who currently on Friday night go to one place, all wear the same color, have friends on the team, and everyone goes home happy. Now you're talking about dividing the town into three separate parts, assigning them different colors, and creating a competitive situation between them, and they are not going to know each other anymore.

David painted a picture of the Tuscaloosa City school system and Central High School that I have heard from a variety of people in the City. The academic programs were good, the extra curricular activities many, and there were strong sports and band programs. Additionally there was an international baccalaureate program. The reasons for dismantling the system ranged from the school district's original assertion of the advantages of small schools versus the large comprehensive high schools of the Conant era (Tozer et al., 2002) to concerns of white flight to greedy real estate developers.

The school counselors and counselor educator from Alabama did not openly identify EEO or any sort of theoretical position with their beliefs in fairness in education. But it was clear, when they spoke of the Civil Rights era, and some of the events they witnessed in schools, that they knew fairness and an egalitarian system when they experienced it. Nancy Fortner was shocked in the early 1970s when she and her husband moved to Aiken County, South Carolina. She recalled her initial reaction:

South Carolina was unbelievable, I had never been to a place. . .it was like a throwback to the forties and fifties almost. I mean they had Black students, but they were over here (She gestured) and there was tracking, and there was an expectation you can't achieve and this is where you need to be.

Later in the interview Nancy identified the time in South Carolina as presenting one of

her best professional development experiences in which the actualist EEO approach of the University of South Carolina, provided the opportunity to work with other counselors and administrators. In speaking of Aiken County Nancy remembered, “They were large schools and they were divided into four areas. I worked up in the most rural area, very, very rural. And it was so different from the rest of the County. But because the test scores were so low, the University of South Carolina picked low achieving schools to bring staff for professional development”. Nancy explained the objective of the project, “We would come on weekends and summer workshops on how to connect our students to the real world. It was interesting because desegregation was there but there was a lot of segregation, the students were still segregated within the schools”.

Throughout the South to one degree or the other, there were areas where the physical surroundings of African American students changed, but the access to greater opportunities did not. It was a cruel irony that granting formalist EEO access often isolated African American students in low expectation academic, vocational, or special education tracks, and foreclosed possibilities for the future.

#### Intentions of NDEA

While four out of the five counselors interviewed did not attend NDEA Counseling and Guidance Training Institutes, all of the participants were aware that NDEA had targeted the academically talented in science, mathematics, and foreign language. All were aware that NDEA Training Institutes resulted in the growth of the school counseling profession. In response to the question, “What do you remember about the NDEA and the guidance and counseling institutes?” I received differing answers.

David Carroll, who was a school counselor at Central High School in Tuscaloosa, Alabama, described his experience with NDEA:

Well, I was relatively young, I was like a 5<sup>th</sup> or 6<sup>th</sup> grader when that passed, you know, in the late 50s and I remember that a lot of people, our teachers, I guess I should say, started going back to school. we had these super teachers who were out of the NDEA training, this was 1962, 1963, 1964, So, we were getting a great education. . .Then over the years as I look back, I kept running up on all these people including my principal at West Lawn. He had a counseling degree . . . and I'm sure it was an NDEA thing. Several of the older folks that I worked with over there, they were all NDEA people.

Dr. Walter Cox attended an NDEA institute at Western Michigan University in the summer of 1962, and entered the regular session NDEA Counseling and Guidance Training Institute at the University of Illinois in 1963. "Do you want to know the evaluation of the Institutes?" Walter Cox asked me the question during our interview. Of the interviewed counselors, Walter was the only participant who attended the NDEA institutes and was actually a school counselor in Michigan before the passage of NDEA legislation. He recalled that the Institutes "were great programs, they were taught certain things, you are not pencil pushers. Counselors had a lot of pencil pushing in those days and sometimes very little counseling".

The drawback to the Institutes, in Walter's opinion, was "they went to the Institute, they got themselves grounded in their profession and by and large, this is my opinion, most of them did not go back to the schools, they went into higher ed!" Walter said:

They were great programs, but the one downfall was that not enough, I'll put it this way, they were trained to go back and provide good services in the school systems, I can't recall more than two or three that went back to teaching or counseling in a public secondary school, a school counselor.

In Alabama, the intentions of the legislation to provide opportunities for academically talented students as well as training for school counselors was viewed by Carroll as a blessing. Even the fact that many of the original NDEA Counseling and Guidance Training Institute participants entered administration and supervision was seen as a positive, giving the

administrators some understanding of what school counselors should do. He remembered “many of those people who had gotten those initial guidance degrees went on to be administrators but they had guidance training. They knew what guidance jobs were supposed to be.”

Nancy Fortner had an entirely different view of NDEA Institutes and the graduates of a specific NDEA Counseling and Guidance Training Institute at Alabama A & M State University, outside Huntsville, Alabama.

But NDEA, those counselors, when I got into it I really noticed it a lot in Huntsville City when I came back in 1975. The counselors who went through NDEA, because you know, Huntsville was growing so much then, so they really needed counselors. And so, so many of the counselors did go to NDEA and they were the least prepared . . . If I’m not mistaken they may have had some funding for tuition. I think there was. So people went back to get their degree and it was four courses. Four courses to get certified and that is what happened all across this country with NDEA, we needed counselors and we didn’t have the pool, so instead of taking it slow and appropriately we did it fast and furious and we have just now in our school district, the last NDEA counselor retired last year. So it just took, I mean that is 30 years, to get all these folks out.

Each counselor provided a different perspective. While they all understood (and Walter Cox experienced) the intentions of the legislation, opinions differed based upon several conditions. The first condition was location. The overall availability of institutes was greater in the Midwest than in the South. Also, guidance counselor positions in the schools were generally located in higher population areas prior to NDEA Title V (Tyler, 1961).

David Carroll appreciated the graduate training in counseling that enabled administrators to understand his role in the school. The availability of any funds to seek a graduate degree in the 1950s and 1960s in Alabama was highly prized. The fact that the program paid a stipend was also invaluable. Alabama was a poor state and opportunities were not easily available in higher education.

Nancy Fortner’s reaction to NDEA Title V institutes revealed a possible flaw between the intent of the legislation and the application of the legislation. The program Nancy referred to at

Alabama A & M may have been a later NDEA Title V institute in the early 1970s.

Additional discussion of the intent of the legislation will follow in the section entitled results. The long range opinion of NDEA as well as the long range effects of the legislation on school counseling will be addressed. Finally, Joy Burnham, the youngest of the counselors, gave a succinct assessment of the effects of NDEA legislation:

I wasn't around at that time. But I know it is very significant and to me, it is the roots of school counseling. Prior to that it was somebody implementing counseling in an English class. It didn't really take root until there was money and there was money for people to go back to school and money for seed money for the field to get going. It was really the linchpin that got it going.

#### *Effect of the Institutes in School Counseling*

The summer NDEA institutes have been criticized over the years for the lack of consistent training, which, as Nancy Fortner recalled, included four courses. Tyler (1961) in her investigation of the initial summer institutes recognized the differences in quality and quantity, as in the lack of practicum experience. Gysbers (1987) was particularly critical of the early institutes which had no standard curriculum and limited class and practicum hours. Nancy Fortner described the NDEA institute counselors in the Huntsville City system as:

So you have those four basic courses, you throw these folks into the field. You have counselors who do not have experience in working in groups. They don't understand personality, learning theory, all of the courses, and they didn't have role models to work with, other counselors to nurture them. And so what you had was poorly qualified counselors, and what they felt comfortable with, most of them, was being test givers and fixing schedules. They became quasi-administrators because I think they were afraid to do any of the counseling, they just didn't feel they were prepared and so what they could do is do clerical work, the registrar work.

With no certain idea of what a school guidance and counseling program should look like, NDEA trainees who limited their education to the summer institutes were subject to doing anything their administration wanted them to do.

A major connection, largely created by the NDEA legislation, was with guidance

counseling and testing. This subject will be addressed in results and in the findings.

### Public Rhetoric of NDEA

The initial thrust of the NDEA Title V was to identify academically talented students at an early age and offer them opportunities for higher education by way of scholarships and loans, in academic subjects, especially science, mathematics, and foreign languages. But the wording of the legislation did not limit the course of study to those three areas.

During the years after NDEA legislation in the early sixties, many high schools supported rocket science clubs and science clubs. There was a clear understanding that the United States was in a race to put a man on the moon, or a man anywhere in space. Watching the Atlas rockets shot from Cape Canaveral, and plotting the path of satellites in the sky was a common pastime in Florida. When John Glenn circled the earth in my senior year in 1962, the entire high school stayed in their homerooms and watched the event on grainy black and white television sets.

Many of the first participants at the NDEA institutes were already functioning in some guidance capacity in their respective schools (Tyler, 1961). When they came back to the high schools the expectation was that they would coordinate the testing and the placement of talented students, as well as test everyone else. So the role of the school counselor originally was determined on one hand by the legislation to seek out the academically talented, but then there was the tension with administration, to take care of the necessary things that the principal and assistant principals did not want to do. Nancy Fortner explained the struggle at Johnson High School in Huntsville, Alabama:

The principal was pretty cool but I remember the assistant principals expectation of us is that we were schedule changers . . .and registration folks when we did registration. And they were threatened when you wouldn't tell them why a student was in your office. I remember many a hurdle we had to cross with that and they didn't understand counselor confidentiality.

### *Public Perception and Institutional Expectations*

In the years after NDEA Title V, school counselors emerged as accepted positions in schools. You will remember from Chapter II that the profession of school counselor had its beginnings during the Progressive Era in career and vocational guidance. Then it became a pupil personnel position in the 1930s to 1950s, which is where it stood in a limited way, when the Soviets launched *Sputnik* in 1957. Guidance counselors were known for scheduling, registering, categorizing (through testing and surveys) students, and sorting according to aptitude and achievement. According to all the interviewed participants, this expectation among administrators and parents and others persisted until very recently. And the changes in perception have had much to do with the acts of school counselors to change the profession from within by applying a developmental program model.

The NDEA institute trainees were also subject to the disjuncture between the counseling and guidance training institutes and the expectations or lack thereof, when they returned to their schools. Walter Cox described the phenomenon in this way:

What was happening and this was my perception but I talked to many people that shared this opinion. You take individuals, you take Mary from one school and George from this one and Tom from this one. You take them off and you do something to them, okay? They are all fired up, and they go back to the old environment and the environment cared very little about anything they were doing or what they'd been taught. They bang their head against the wall for a while and then decide "I'm not going to do this anymore it hurts too much."

One of the threads throughout the interviews with all the counselors was the frustration of constantly having to justify the need for confidentiality, or the need for counseling time, or the importance of career planning and the ways in which time was taken in tasks more effectively carried out by clerical or administrative staff, such as scheduling, registration, testing, cumulative record keeping. Nancy Fortner described a conflict at Johnson High School in Huntsville

involving the three assistant principals and the school counseling staff of five:

The assistant principals wanted us to do hall duty, you know the extended lunch period, we were supposed to stand and guard the hall. So we came up with something clever. We decided, we were going to crack this nut so we did small group counseling during that time. And we said, what do you want us to do, guard the hall or work with kids?

The assistant principals backed down because the principal supported the counselors but the constant justifying and circumscribing inappropriate notions of school counselor roles and tasks required constant vigilance. Teachers also often misunderstood the role of the counselor, as Nancy illustrated:

You just have teacher expectations too. It is not just administrators, they (teachers) want you to come in and solve it, just fix it! It is administrators and teachers, and it is us too. I still think it goes back to a lot of people got certified who should have never been counselors and I think people wanted to get out of the classroom, and these teachers are running from something instead of to.

Administrators, parents, and the general public were not the only people who did not understand the professional role of the school counselor. Nancy described some of the counselors as “enjoying being the SGA sponsor and the cheerleader sponsor and all of that is their little comfort zone”

In speaking of NDEA and the effect of the legislation, Nancy Fortner said:

When you go back and look at our profession it was so young and we were starting out and we did it backwards. You know, instead of starting with elementary, we started with secondary and we didn't train appropriately, so we have a whole generation issue at least of administrators and counselors and parents who don't have models of effective guidance programs.

Both Nancy and Joy Burnham discussed recent graduates in administration and counseling as well, who seemed to understand what school counselor programs were supposed to do.

The issues of school counselor roles and tasks extended back to the era of NDEA, as Walter Cox explained, and in some ways the arguments did not change over the years. There was still, in schools, the understanding that the school counselor did not have a classroom so



must be available for anything that came along. The following section, results, referred back to the issues covered in previous sections and connected them with the intent of the NDEA legislation.

## Results of the Legislation

### *Impact of Testing in School Counseling*

Another aspect of NDEA legislation that was mandated in the Act was the addition of testing in all schools and states so as to identify the academically able or talented. This requirement, in NDEA Title V, part A, required the establishment of standardized testing departments in the states and the addition of testing requirements in the high schools.

David Carroll remarked that the around 1995, the Tuscaloosa schools as well as the state of Alabama turned toward more and more testing. It was a national trend and for the first time standardized achievement testing began to be applied to judging the effectiveness of faculty instruction. He described a situation in which the counselors

Spent more and more time on it. For years we had done subject matter tests, SAT and graduation exams, we were testing people to death anyway. But it was more to help you with instruction than it was pass/fail. I'll tell you, it took us out of the counseling business and put us in the testing business.

But that was not the only issue. Nancy Fortner, the counseling supervisor in the Huntsville City Schools, discussed the issue of testing and school counselors:

Some counselors and I'll be honest just made a career out of testing. We'd have flow charts and graphs and color coordinated, laminated and I thought.....Good! What are you going to do with all of this?

While the early intentions of NDEA legislation were long forgotten, the effects lingered on in the understandings of administrators and school counselors concerning testing. It seems safe to say that one of the lasting outcomes of NDEA legislation was the continuing affiliation of

testing and school counseling. To this day many counselors are identified with a role of test administrator.

Testing in schools was a way of deciding who had merit, whether in the early days of NDEA, or the current climate when standardized testing not only determines which students have merit, but also whether teachers or schools or districts have merit in determining the annual yearly progress (AYP) as required in state regulations and also by No Child Left Behind (NCLB).

### *NDEA Legislation Created School Counseling*

Joy Burnham described her impression of the NDEA Title V program:

I wasn't around at the time. But I know it is very significant and to me, you know it's the roots of counseling. You know prior to that it was somebody implementing counseling in an English class. It was really that linchpin that got it going.

NDEA Title V eventually resulted in the addition of thousands of school counselors in the schools. In many respects that, along with testing, would be the lasting results of the legislation.

### Findings

The research problems were concerned with how and in what ways NDEA counselor training may have determined school counselor practice to the present day. Also, did the influence of the NDEA detract from equality of educational opportunity for African American students during and after school desegregation in Alabama? The findings were related to the research questions which asked: 1) what were the expressed intentions of the NDEA legislation and what were its institutional effects on school counseling, and; 2) what were the contradictions within public rhetoric surrounding NDEA legislation in relationship to school counselor practice and Equality of Educational Opportunity? The findings derived from the data are displayed in Table 1 on the next page.

Table 1.

*Description of Findings*

Description of Finding	Relationship to Research Question
1. The intent of the NDEA Title V legislation was to identify the academically talented.	Intentions of the legislation
2. NDEA Title V (A) provided for testing of students in order to identify the academically talented.	Intentions of the legislation
3. The number of school counselors increased in all regions of the country.	Intentions of the legislation
4. Standardized testing became linked with school counseling and the meritocratic selection of the academically talented.	Institutional effects on school counseling
5. Testing was used to sort students and place in academic or vocational tracks	Institutional effects on school counseling
6. The quality, benefit, and results of NDEA varied across regions.	Institutional effects on school counseling
7. Consequences of the selection and placement of students and EEO were ignored in the public rhetoric. Considerations of the EEO were not part of the conversation.	Contradiction in the public rhetoric in relationship to school counseling and EEO
8. Issues of race and EEO were not addressed openly in the public rhetoric. Shift in focus of NDEA was ignored.	Contradiction in the public rhetoric in relationship to school counseling and EEO

Summary

The intentions of the legislature in crafting NDEA Title V were twofold. First, the Act provided the funds and the structure to both educate counselors and increase the number of school guidance counselors in the United States. Secondly, the Act provided initial funds to support the introduction of standardized achievement and aptitude testing to all the students in a

state. Offices were created to do nothing but handle testing in each state. School guidance counselors became the means by which the tests would be supervised and administered. School guidance counselors then often were given the responsibility of assigning students to academic or vocational tracks. The lasting influence of NDEA was in the support the legislation gave to the creation of an educational meritocracy in which test scores and subsequent academic placement largely determined the success or failure of a student in American schools.

The contradictions in public rhetoric that affected EEO ignored the consequences of the selection and placement of students based primarily upon test scores. At the time of the legislation, in 1958, considerations of EEO were not part of the conversation in the public rhetoric. The South had not begun to desegregate to any degree at all, and still pursued resistance to *Brown v. Board*. The idea of equal educational opportunity in the South was not even considered in the formalist sense of granting access to African American students. The next chapter identifies conclusions derived from the congressional hearings, reports and evaluations of the NDEA Counseling and Guidance Training Institutes, and the interviews of school counselors, counselor educator, and attendee at NDEA training institutes.

## CHAPTER VI:

### SUMMARY, CONCLUSIONS, DISCUSSION, RECOMMENDATIONS

#### Introduction and Purpose

The introduction to this study explored the relationship of the *National Defense Education Act of 1958* with the growth of school counseling in the United States and, in particular, Alabama. Since the launch of the Soviet satellite *Sputnik* occurred within months of the desegregation crisis in Little Rock, Arkansas, the climate of the time led Senator Lister Hill and Congressman Carl Elliott, both of Alabama, to propose a federal aid to education bill that was driven by the fear surrounding the belief that the Soviets were winning the space race by virtue of their education system that was focused on producing scientists.

The research problems were concerned with how and in what ways NDEA counselor training may have determined school counselor practice to the present day. Also, did the influence of the NDEA detract from equality of educational opportunity for African American students during and after school desegregation in Alabama? The focus of the NDEA Title V (A) and (B) was three-fold: First, it established testing programs in all the states to discover the academically talented. Second, it established guidance and counseling programs in the states. And, third, it provided training in the NDEA Counseling and Guidance Training Institutes.

The introduction also presented the two research questions posed for the historical case study.

(1) What were the expressed intentions of the NDEA legislation and what were its institutional effects on school counseling; and

(2) What were the contradictions within public rhetoric surrounding NDEA legislation in relationship to school counselor practice and Equality of Educational Opportunity?

### Literature Review

The review of pertinent literature surveyed the history of school counseling from its connection to early vocational guidance efforts and social efficiency, to the current involvement with program development and professional standards. Additionally current issues in school counseling were reviewed and analyzed. The history of the NDEA legislation was presented, as well as a review of two publications produced by HEW which sought to examine both the short term NDEA Counseling and Guidance Training Institutes in 1959, and an evaluation of the regular session Institutes during the 1963-1964 academic year. Additionally, the topical theory of knowledge, equal educational opportunity, was analyzed in a section that included a discussion of John Rawl's theory of justice as fairness, and James Coleman's monumental study, generative of initial and ongoing conceptualizations of equal educational opportunity following *Brown v. Board of Education (1954)*.

### Methodology

The methodology for this study was an embedded single case study as described by Yin (2004), in which a single, main case is studied, that of school counseling, in which there are embedded aspects, the influence of NDEA, the impact of the school and the role of school counselors in effecting EEO. The design of the study was a historical case study and the documents to be studied included the *Congressional Record*, the previously mentioned reports of the NDEA Counseling and Guidance Training Institutes, and five interviews of school counselors, a counselor educator, and a clinician who attended NDEA institutes. Stake (1995) described the case study as an investigation of a subject that is of "special interest" (p. xi)

The NDEA legislation (P.L.85-864) was divided into ten title sections. The General Provisions of the law were found in Title I, as findings and declaration of policy:

The Congress hereby finds and declares that the security of the Nation requires the fullest development of the mental resources and technical skills of its young men and women. The present emergency demands that additional and more adequate educational opportunities be made available. . . We must increase our efforts to identify and educate more of the talent of our Nation. This requires programs that will give assurance that no student of ability will be denied an opportunity for higher education because of financial need; will correct as rapidly as possible the existing imbalances in our education programs which have led to an insufficient proportion of our population educated in science, mathematics, and modern foreign languages and trained in technology. (p. 1581).

The titles that affected school counseling were Title V (A) and Title V (B). Title V (A).

Title V (A) provided for a program of standardized testing in secondary schools in order to locate “students with outstanding aptitudes and ability” (NDEA, 1958, p. 1592) and also underwrote guidance and counseling programs in “public secondary schools” (p. 1592). Title V (B) provided for Counseling and Guidance Training Institutes, both short-term and regular session institutes (NDEA, 1958).

### Conclusions

All the findings in the previous chapter related to the research questions. In this section I have combined findings to address the conclusions of the study.

#### *Conclusion One*

*The intent of the NDEA Title V legislation was to identify the academically talented determined by testing and to increase the number of school counselors*

The findings that identified the intent of the NDEA Title V legislation to identify the academically talented; to provide monies for testing; and to increase the numbers of school counselors in the nation were intentions of the legislation.

As previously stated, the intention of NDEA Title V (A) and (B) was to establish support

and training for school guidance counselors who would direct their attention to the testing and early identification of the academically talented. The goal was to encourage those talented students to seek higher education. NDEA Title V (A) proposed to establish state department of education offices that would oversee the selection and administration of various aptitude and achievement tests in the state's schools. Even though the direction of NDEA changed by 1963-1964 with the initiation of the regular sessions to a focus on all students, the legislation specified that NDEA was for the academically talented student.

Standardized testing was present in the 1950s. But the range and variety of testing, the sheer weight of money applied to achievement testing, and aptitude testing, and interest inventories, made the identification of talented students, and average students, and students with some cognitive issues, inevitable. Testing could be valuable in determining what a student knew, and what a student needed to know. But the difference, once congress identified progressive education and a lack of academic rigor as the source of difficulty, was that testing began to be used to identify differences, not levels of achievement. Testing became a means of separating students. This coincided with the growth of Educational Testing Services (Lemann, 1999) and the public acceptance of the idea endorsed by James Conant (Lemann, 1999) that a meritocracy existed and could be discovered by standardized testing.

NDEA Title V (B) made provisions to insure that the number of school counselors increased in all regions of the country. Tyler (1960) foretold this result when she discussed the first institutes held in 1959. Prior to the passage of the NDEA Title V legislation, school counselors were located in large urban areas with most situated in regions other than the Southern states. Additionally, there were fewer than 15,000 in the entire nation (Tyler, 1960).

The addition of school counselors in the South coincided with the approach of



desegregation of Southern schools. David Carroll in the Tuscaloosa City School System, and Nancy Fortner in Aiken County, South Carolina, and Huntsville, Alabama, recalled the various actualist projects and regulations that accompanied school desegregation.

The projects, including a two-year professional development program administered by the University of South Carolina, allowed Nancy Fortner to receive training to address the internal segregation she witnessed in Aiken County, South Carolina.

David Carroll, who could recite every detail of the various school attendance districts constructed to promote integration in Tuscaloosa, related the ways the school structured its sports teams, cheerleaders, and other extracurricular activities to give everyone a chance, even if the students were divided into separate teams.

#### *Conclusion Two*

*Standardized testing became linked with school counseling and the selection and placement of student.*

The findings that identified standardized testing linked with school counseling and meritocratic selection of the academically talented; the use of testing to sort and place students in academic or vocational tracks, and the range of the quality, benefits and results of NDEA Counseling and Guidance Training Institutes, varied across regions and were institutional effects of NDEA . The effect of the NDEA legislation on school counseling programs was that school counselors became closely identified with testing and selection, and those practices affected the school and the students in the school. School administrators often assigned counselors to schedule students and to place students in academic or vocational tracks. Testing was an important part of the selection process. This conclusion was based on the findings related to the institutional effects of NDEA on school counseling.

Nancy Fortner recalled the difficulties she experienced while supervising school counselors in the Huntsville City School System. She believed that some school counselors wanted to get out of the classroom and embraced testing because they could handle its quasi-administrative nature. These school counselors achieved state certification and proceeded to do the tasks that were familiar to them, testing, scheduling, registration, and completing cumulative records. Nancy believed that many, including the NDEA institute trainees who were hired by Huntsville, were afraid to do counseling. David Carroll also described the 1990s when testing became high stakes in the state, keeping some students from graduating and requiring huge time commitments from many school counselors.

The connection of school counseling to testing and placement limited the opportunities available to students and often served to keep the students rigidly bound to the social and economic structure of their parents.

Russell Corporation, in Alexander City, was a patriarchal, family-owned textile corporation for many years. Everything in the community, from the hospital to the schools to the community college, country club and Lake Martin developments, was affected by some variation of the Russell Corporation. I was a career counselor at the area technical school for many years. During that time, the students who came from Benjamin Russell High School in Alexander City, and the high schools in Tallapoosa County to attend the technical center were majority African American or working class Whites. While the ratio of White students to African American students at Benjamin Russell High School was sixty percent to forty percent, the ratio at the career center was almost seventy percent African American to thirty percent White. Students who attended the career technical center were trained in a variety of career areas, but a large majority would inevitably work for the textile mill. Their fate was predetermined, not only by

their parent's educational level and socio-economic status or race, but also by the test scores they attained in elementary school. If a child had difficulty with standardized tests, they would be placed in a remedial class as early as first grade. Poor scores meant placement in a lower track and that decision followed the child throughout school. Testing was destiny for the children of Alexander City, and there was evidence in the interviews in this project that Alexander City was not alone.

Another aspect of the institutional effect of NDEA on school counseling was the finding that quality, benefits, and results of the institutes varied across regions. While Walter Cox appreciated the education he received from two NDEA Counseling and Guidance Training Institutes, his experience was somewhat different from the school counselor candidates who attended a summer institute and went back to their schools without completing a master's level program. He was in a graduate program in counseling and took advantage of the opportunities offered in the first summer institute in 1962. He was paid a stipend and he earned eight hours credit. When Walter Cox was selected for the year-long NDEA program in 1963 at the University of Illinois, he had already decided he wanted a career in higher education.

As a counseling supervisor, Nancy Fortner had an entirely different view of the NDEA training institutes. School counselors in Alabama were allowed to gain certification in counseling with the twelve credits they earned at a summer institute at Alabama A & M. With limited training they did not know enough about the growing profession to protest when they were assigned testing, scheduling, registration, discipline, and hall monitoring duties. Also, some school counselors who completed graduate programs were unable to separate themselves from the faculty role in their schools. Until recently in Alabama, school counselors had to hold a teaching certificate and two years teaching experience before they could be hired as a school

counselor.

David Carroll, the school counselor in Tuscaloosa, Alabama, remembered some of the administrators he knew had first attended the NDEA Counseling and Guidance Training Institute at The University of Alabama before they became administrators. In David's eyes the exposure to counseling made them more sympathetic administrators. The purpose of the discussion of the various institutes is to acknowledge the range of education among school counselors and the disparities in quality within the state and across the nation.

The conclusion among the interviewed counselors was that school counselors who were well-trained in accredited programs, whether they attended an institute or not, were more likely to know what school counselors were supposed to do, and more likely to object when they were asked to put a rubber stamp on testing and placing students without sufficient information.

### *Conclusion Three*

*Consequences of the selection and placement of students and EEO were ignored in the public rhetoric as well as consequences for African American students*

The second research question asked, what were the contradictions within public rhetoric surrounding NDEA legislation in relationship to school counselor practice and EEO? The findings of the consequences of the selection and placement of students and EEO, as well as issues of race and EEO, were included in the above conclusion.

Tyler (1960) reported that the first summer institutes after the passage of the legislation were organized around the idea that the counselor trainees would direct their attention to identifying academically talented students, and encourage them to enter higher education. The public rhetoric of the supporters of the legislation endorsed the idea that students who were gifted in science, mathematics, and foreign languages were needed for the security of the nation.

In order to assist the school counselors in the selection of the academically talented, the congress also appropriated funds for the establishment of testing programs in the states. As reported, the focus of the legislation shifted by the time the regular session institutes began in 1963-1964. By that time the *Civil Rights Act of 1964*, and other legislation of the Great Society enabled by President Lyndon Johnson's skills with congress, encouraged the idea that all students needed the benefits of school counselors.

By the mid-sixties, there were efforts to identify what types of equality of educational opportunity were available to students, particularly those students in the South who were affected by desegregation (Coleman, 1967). The survey conducted by Coleman identified five types of inequality and it was decided to concentrate on the idea that given equal input, equality of education was equal results. Coleman determined that the responsibility for taking advantage of educational opportunities did not lie, as in the common school era, with the students and their families. The responsibility for reducing inequality lay with the school.

Burbules and Sherman (1979) described three levels of EEO, formalist, actualist, and equal outcomes. While several speakers during the congressional hearings on NDEA identified EEO as a goal of the legislation, while others, notably Senator Strom Thurmond (S. 4273, 85, 17298), thought it was a terrible idea. EEO at the time of the NDEA was not a well-reasoned concept. It was a political slogan with little real effect. When desegregation became a reality in the South, around the middle of the 1960's, the type of EEO was described by Burbules and Sherman as formalist, limited EEO to physical access to the school. This was the setting that Nancy Fortner witnessed in her senior year at Auburn high school and in the Opelika school system. Unless the African American student was a gifted athlete, the African American students were invisible. When Nancy went to South Carolina in 1972 as a school counselor, there were

efforts to effect actualist EEO in the rural setting in which formalist access had resulted in virtual segregation within the schools.

Actualist EEO (Burbules & Sherman, 1979) was a compensatory program in which efforts were made to make up for lack of earlier opportunities. Some of the programs of the sixties and early seventies that employed an actualist or compensatory approach were Head Start, Earn and Learn, a program aimed at migrant students, Chapter 1, a compensatory reading and math program, and the Free and Reduced Lunch Program. Most of the federal legislation passed during the 1960s until the present day would be considered actualist EEO.

David Carroll, the school counselor in Tuscaloosa, Alabama, described the many rules and regulations and physical changes enacted in the Tuscaloosa system to affect not so much EEO, as court-ordered integration. While the actualist programs had their faults, many still exist and continue to assist students from historically marginalized groups, particularly students who came from poor homes.

In the conditions for justice proposed by Rawls (1971), the first principle, the attainment of justice meant recognizing that access to rights and liberty was individually different but should be equally accessible. The second principle, commonly called the difference principle, addressed the idea that social and economic equalities must be to the greatest benefit of the least advantaged members of society. Access and opportunity were available to all and inequalities were structured such that everyone would benefit.

While the actualist conceptualizations of EEO were, on the surface, examples of a society willing to apply Rawls' difference principle to its weakest links in terms of society's benefits, it is worth remembering that the compensation was decided by the privileged members of the society and was subject to their ideas concerning society's goods. In other words, it was not the

robust ideal of EEO contained in the participatory ideal.

School counselors were in a particularly strong position in terms of the distribution of opportunity. They were, as described, deeply involved in testing which distributed the goods of education to those who could attain a high score. They were the people who generally determined the placement of students in a particular track and they were also the people who counseled students as to their future opportunities. That is not to say that school counselors were the only determiners of a student's future opportunities, but some were complicit in the desire of the institution to sort and distribute students in ways that promoted order but discouraged EEO.

The school counselors and counselor educators in the interviews believed that counselors who had less training were more likely to follow the directions of the administration in distributing their time and energy to areas that did not promote EEO, such as testing and scheduling, and, according to the interview with Nancy Fortner, some of those school counselors were former NDEA trainees.

As mentioned several times, there was a shift in the objectives and goals of the NDEA Counseling and Guidance Training Institutes at the time that the program moved from short term institutes to regular session institutes. The shift was seemingly the result of a massive movement between 1959 and 1964, in the area of civil rights and government participation in providing for its citizens. For a few years, roughly between 1964 and the early 1970s, the concept of equality of opportunity, and in the area of education, EEO, came to the fore. By the regular session NDEA institutes, Pierson (1965,) who wrote the evaluation of the 1963-1964 institutes, identified the objectives and goals of school counselors as assisting every student. Leona Tyler (1960) had cautioned that only the academically talented could be served. She did not mention race at all. She did caution against using the federal money for anything but what was explicitly

mentioned in the legislation.

Prior to the shift, and especially during the congressional hearings and discussions surrounding NDEA, the issue of race was only mentioned in terms of a nondiscrimination clause. Some Northern congressmen wanted to severely limit the South in federal education or school construction monies because of Southern segregation. Senator Lister Hill of Alabama and other Southern Senators defeated the school construction amendment and supported a nondiscrimination clause in order to get the bill through the Senate (S. 4273, 1958, 17302, 17312).

The other way of mentioning race was to refer to states rights and resistance to federal interference. In the public rhetoric, that is, the congressional hearings, and the general discourse at that time, Southern resistance took a path of absolute denial until the last minute. Thus, planning for a large number of school systems, and the execution of anything but a formalist, show up and be quiet, approach to desegregation, was out of the question. It was not that there were no plans in place; it was that the plans took the formalist path, attempting to satisfy the court, but not invested in any real attempt at EEO that would mean real opportunity. That is why the Tuscaloosa City School System was back in court in 1978, having to comply with orders to effectively desegregate the schools. Finally, when federal funds and grant monies arrived in the Southern states, formal access gave way to actualist compensatory attempts. Nancy Fortner's experience in professional development in South Carolina was an example. Federal funds were also used under Chapter I to fund school counselors in Alabama. The federal programs were an infusion into the education budgets of the South and became a necessity.



## Discussion

The first research question asked how NDEA legislation affected the practice of school counseling within the institution of the school. While I think the previous sections have explained frequently and well the intent of the legislation, the question of how NDEA affected school counseling practice within the institution needs to be expanded. There are few active educators who remember NDEA or the events that triggered the legislation. Counseling literature in the present day treats NDEA as a brief section or a footnote. While the legislation is credited with the growth and development of school counseling, other effects are largely forgotten or ignored.

NDEA did create and support testing apparatuses that have reached epic proportions in the days of NCLB. Educational Testing Services (ETS), created around the same time as NDEA, profited greatly from the business of measuring ability. Schools, using the resources of school counselors and ability and achievement testing, were able to place students in academic tracks, as early as elementary school. School counselors could direct students to college, or trades, or the military, based on test scores. School counselors were also active in screening students for evaluation for special education. Finally, in an Orwellian turnabout, in recent years, standardized testing was used to determine who became a teacher or how well that teacher was doing, based on the student's test scores. School counselors, too, were evaluated as to effectiveness and knowledge.

The premium placed on academic excellence, the space race with the Soviets, the emphasis on science and mathematics, was very much a part of the 1950s and 1960s. When *Sputnik* was launched, I was in the eighth grade. My school counselor in high school was a newly minted NDEA Institute participant. Test scores and college and career choices were the

focus of the counseling program. I do not imagine it was very different for the counselors who participated in the interviews. In fact, their story was also mine to a large degree. The lasting effect of NDEA was in the belief, so well articulated in the congressional hearings, that academic merit could produce a meritocracy, similar to the Jeffersonian notion of a natural aristocracy, that would thrive based upon a native and testable intelligence. Besides, the competition with the Soviet Union had exposed a soft underbelly in American schooling, called progressive education. What was needed was rigorous, focused education to produce the scientists and mathematicians that would eventually win the space race, and defeat the Soviets. While the arms race was not mentioned, at least to any great degree, in the congressional hearings, those of us who knew the language of the Cold War could see its shadow. What a powerful motivator to pick the best and the brightest!

Nancy Fortner and Joy Burnham had strong reservations concerning the roles and tasks assigned to school counselors. Chief among those tasks was testing, funded originally by NDEA. Joy Burnham expressed the differences between the ideal and the actual. School counselors negotiate those roles on a daily basis. Nancy Fortner mentioned the difference new administrators and new school counselors have made in the schools in Huntsville and Joy Burnham was optimistic about the State Plan based upon ASCA Professional Standards.

NDEA Title V accomplished its intentions. School counselors were trained, testing was funded, and academically talented students were identified. The enactment of the NDEA legislative goals in the schools however was not as beneficial. The institutional effects of NDEA resulted in a focus on testing, linked in many cases to school counselors. Testing led to placement in academic or vocational tracks, and, what James Coleman (1967) would have termed “effects or results” (p. 14) because placement in classes based on test scores as early as

elementary school determined opportunity later in life.

The second research question looked at the contradictions within public rhetoric surrounding NDEA legislation in relationship to school counselor practice and EEO. The public rhetoric at the time of the legislation was directed toward the perceived academic deficits that had caused the United States to lag behind the Soviets. In the South the anxiety over school desegregation was the overriding issue. The public rhetoric surrounding NDEA was silent in terms of EEO. If anything, NDEA represented a meritocratic utilitarian view of schooling, in which educational policies were related to economic productivity, and opportunities were offered based upon “economically valuable skills” (Howe, 1997, p. 25). The utilitarian view was outcomes based but hardly a representative of EEO.

The previous sections have described findings and conclusions which identified the issues that the congressional hearings, the reports of the NDEA institutes, and the interviews with school counselors exposed. The following pages will describe the ideal of EEO that I support and contrast that position with the results of the research questions.

I support a participatory educational ideal. According to Howe (1997) a participatory ideal would include a threshold of education that would provide all students the opportunity of employment, health, and a good life. This was characterized as a collective good, as it would benefit everyone. The threshold also provided differing levels of attention, not everyone has the same needs. Finally, the threshold is results or outcome oriented. The participatory educational ideal combined compensatory activities to assist students in gaining the educational threshold, as well as the idea that people need to determine their own needs and goods in society. In other words, the participatory ideal lends recognition to historically marginalized voices such that there can be legitimate challenge to the educational status quo in terms of purposes, goals,

content, etc.

Compensatory educational assistance was not adequate to fulfill the requirements of a fair enactment of EEO in my opinion. Federal money spent for education was compensatory or actualist. The problem with actualist EEO is that someone has to determine what is best for others. In the case of historically marginalized students, what is best for them may not be what the school determines, or what the federal government determines. With the participatory educational ideal, the individual has a voice and is at some level, autonomous. The offer of assistance may be accepted or rejected. Additionally, the representatives of the individual or child have input in the enactment of educational goods, but, as Coleman (1967) noted, the school is responsible for providing the opportunity, not the parents or the child. The common school era idea that the child and the family are responsible for opportunities in schooling if given access to the school is replaced with the idea that the school is responsible for the results or outcomes of education.

The formalist and actualist definitions of EEO place the burden of acquiring a decent education on the child and the family who must have the will to pursue it. Historically marginalized families may have the will but often lack the resources to pursue or take advantage of access or compensatory choices. Additionally, those outcomes must offer a fair opportunity to reap the benefits or goods of society.

Burbules and Sherman's (1979) definitions of three levels of EEO were cited many times in this project, simply because they describe the conditions so well. Additionally, their assertion that the outcomes or results description of EEO is not sufficient, allows for the inclusion of Rawls' theory that accounted for the welfare of the weakest members of society and refined the liberal-egalitarian position.

In addressing the findings and conclusions based upon the research questions, the intentions of NDEA legislation represented a formalist approach to EEO. There was a nondiscrimination clause in the Act and any student, who could meet the standards established by a test that purported to measure ability or achievement, would qualify as academically talented. Once qualified, there were rewards for the test score in the form of assistance in applying for scholarships, college admission, career choice, and student loans. Access to testing was available; the problem was that students did not come to the testing point with the same opportunities because of external conditions which included the input of the school.

The effect of the NDEA legislation on school counseling and the institution of schooling linked school counselor practice with testing, selection, and placement of students. Access to opportunity was often limited by the child's placement in a less desirable or competitive academic or vocational track. Compensatory services determined by the school, would only matter if the services allowed the student to affect the outcome or results of education. The participatory educational ideal would not foreclose opportunities particularly at a young age. The participatory ideal would see an advantage in placing children together who were not all alike in terms of ability.

The participatory educational ideal does not exclude differences among children in pursuing a decent education. Rather it opens up opportunities for all students by acknowledging different levels of needs. The idea is that given similar abilities, measured in a fair and comprehensive way, as in the selection of evaluations not subject to the singular bias of testing; does the student have a fair opportunity to succeed?

So how does the participatory educational ideal inform school counseling and its connection with testing? School counselors since the 1980s have worked to define their

profession on their own. The comprehensive developmental program models represented in state plans, to include Alabama, place social justice and collaborative activities in the forefront in school counselor program plans.

Nancy Fortner and Joy Burnham expressed strong reservations concerning the roles and tasks assigned to school counselors up to the present. Chief among those tasks was testing, funded originally by NDEA. Unfortunately the willingness of some school counselors to embrace the role of test administrator has played into the current environment, fueled by NCLB, which places achievement testing in a prominent position in determining Annual Yearly Progress (AYP) in school systems.

Joy Burnham, the counselor educator, described the tension between the ideal position of the school counselor, as presented in graduate classes, and the actual position, represented by the job itself. School counselors must develop the autonomy within the school to question actions that restrict access to EEO or unfairly minimize the importance of individual students. Both Joy and Nancy Fortner, the former counselor supervisor, are encouraged by some of the recent changes in Alabama. Recently Alabama, led by Associate State Superintendent Tommy Bice, has eliminated the graduation exam. Dr. Bice is also actively working with the Alabama School Counselors Association (ALSCA) to determine the direction of school counseling in the state.

#### Summary and Recommendations

The growth and development of school counseling was directly related to the NDEA Title V legislation of 1958. Along with the legislation however there were problems from inception based upon the ways in which testing was tied to school counseling and the selection and placement of students in academic or vocational tracks. This worked to the disadvantage of historically marginalized students who lacked the resources to compete fairly in the testing and

placement process.

Along with the problems linking school counseling to practices that restricted opportunity for many students, there were also issues related to a clear and consistent definition of the job of school counseling. The counselor became vulnerable to the demands of the administration, teachers, or system in creating roles and tasks within the school. This lack of autonomy impeded the counselor's ability to act as an arbiter of the benefits and drawbacks of testing, student selection, and placement.

Studies such as these are needed to explore the beginnings of the profession as well as the relationship of counselor practice to student outcome.

## REFERENCES

- Abowitz, K. (2000). *Making meaning of community in an American high school: a feminist-pragmatist critique of the liberal-communitarian debates*. Cresskill, New Jersey: Hampton Press, Inc.
- Adams, K. (1997). Common schooling in the politically liberal society: Implications for the development of citizens. *Philosophy of Education Yearbook*. Retrieved from [http://www.ed.uiuc.edu/EPS/PES-Yearbook/97\\_docs/adams.html](http://www.ed.uiuc.edu/EPS/PES-Yearbook/97_docs/adams.html)
- Akos, P. (2007). Early adolescents' aspirations and academic tracking: An exploratory investigation. *Professional School Counseling*, 11(1), 57-64.
- Alabama State Department of Education (2003). *Comprehensive Counseling and guidance state model for Alabama Public Schools*. (SDE, Bulletin 89).
- Amatea, E. & Clark, M. (2005) Changing schools, changing counselors: a qualitative study of school administrator's conceptions of the school counselor role. *Professional School Counseling*, 9(1), 16-28.
- American Personnel and Guidance Association (1958). A statement of policy concerning the nations' human resources problems. *Personnel and Guidance Journal*, 36(1), 454-455.
- American School Counselor Association (2003). ASCA National Model.
- Armor, D. (1969). *The American school counselor: A case study in the sociology of professions*. New York: Russell Sage Foundation.
- Arthur, J. (1998). Communitarianism: What are the implications for education? *Educational Studies*, 24(3), 353-368.
- Ayers, E. (2005). *What caused the Civil War? Reflections on the South and Southern history*. New York: W.W. Norton & Company.
- Baker, S. (2000). *School counseling for the twenty-first century*, 3<sup>rd</sup> edition. Upper Saddle River, NJ: Prentice-Hall.
- Baker, S. (2001). Reflections on forty years in the school counseling profession: Is the glass half full or half empty? *Professional School Counseling*, 5(2), 75-89.



- Beschloss, M. (2002). Carl Elliott, Sr. In Caroline Kennedy (Ed.), *Profiles in courage for our time*, (pp. 9-30). New York: Hyperion.
- Bemak, F. (2000). Transforming the role of the counselor to provide leadership in educational reform through collaboration. *Professional School Counseling*, 3(5), 323-330.
- Bemak, F. (2005). Reflections on multiculturalism , social justice, and empowerment groups for academic success: A critical discourse for contemporary schools. *Professional School Counseling*. 8(5), p. 401-406.
- Bemak, F., & Chung, R. (2005). Advocacy as a critical role for urban school counselors: Working toward equity and social justice. *Professional School Counseling*, 8(3), 196-202.
- Berlak, H. (2005). The *No Child Left Behind Act* and the ‘Reading First’ program. In S. Shapiro & D. Purpel (Ed.), *Critical Issues in American Education*, Mahweh, NJ and London: Lawrence Erlbaum.
- Berrios, R., & Lucca, N. (2006). Qualitative methodology in counseling research: Recent contributions and challenges for a new century. *Journal of Counseling and Development*, 84(Spring), 174-186.
- Blumer, H. (1969). *Symbolic interactionism*. Berkeley, CA: University of California Press.
- Brott, P., & Myers, J. (1999). Development of professional school counselor identity: A grounded theory. *Professional School Counseling*, 2(5), 339-348.
- Brown, F., Carter, D., & Harris, J. III (1978). Minority students, ability grouping, and career development. *Journal of African American Studies*, 8(4), 477-488.
- Brown, K. (2005). *Race, law, and education in the post-desegregation era*. Durham, NC: Carolina Academic Press.
- Burbules, N. (1990). Equal opportunity or equal education? *Educational Theory*, 40(2), 221-226.
- Burbules, N., & Sherman, A. (1979). Equal educational opportunity: Ideal or ideology. In C. J. B. Mcmillan (Ed.), *Philosophy of Education 1979*, (pp. 105-114). Urbana, Illinois: Philosophy of Education Society.
- Burnham, J., & Jackson, M. (2000). School counselor roles: discrepancies between actual practice and existing models. *Professional School Counseling*, 4(1), 41-58.
- Butler, J. (1993). *Bodies that matter*. New York: Routledge.

- Camp, W. G. (1983). Social efficiency and vocational education: An examination of our changing philosophies. *Journal of Vocational Educational Research*, 8(3), 10-19.
- Cash, W., & Munger, P. (1966). Counselors and their preparation. *Review of Educational Research*, 36 (2) 256-263.
- Chomsky, N. (1969). *American power and the new mandarins*. London: Chatto & Windus.
- Christman, A. (2002). *Social and political philosophy*. New York: Routledge.
- Clowse, B. (1981). *Brainpower for the Cold War: The Sputnik crisis and National Defense Education Act of 1958*. Westport, CT: Greenwood Press.
- Coleman, J. (1967). *The concept of equality of educational opportunity* (Report No. SP001383). Cambridge: Harvard University. DHEW, Washington, D.C. Bureau of Research (ERIC Reproduction Service No. ED015157).
- Coleman, J. (1968). Educational opportunity. *Harvard Educational Review*, 38(1), 7-22.
- Coleman, J. (1968). Equality of educational opportunity: Reply to Bowles and Levin. *The Journal of Human Resources*, 3(2), 237-246.
- Coleman, J. (1968). *The evaluation of equality of educational opportunity*. (Report No. R-25). Baltimore, Maryland: John Hopkins University Center for the Study of Social Organization of Schools. DHEW, Washington, D.C. Bureau of Research. (ERIC Reproduction Service No. ED026721).
- Coleman, J. (1975). What is meant by 'an equal educational opportunity'? *Oxford Review of Education*, 1(1), 27-29.
- Coleman, J., Frankel, B., & Phillips, D. (1976). Robert Nozick's anarchy, state, and utopia. *Theory and Society*, 3(3), 437-458.
- Conant, J. (1948). *Education in a divided world*. Cambridge, MA: Harvard University Press.
- Conant, J. (1959). *The American high school today*. New York: McGraw-Hill.
- Conant, J. (1961). *Slums and suburbs*. New York: McGraw-Hill Book Company.
- Cremin, L. (1961). *The transformation of the school: Progressivism in American education, 1876-1957*. New York: Alfred A. Knopf.
- Creswell, J. (1998). *Qualitative inquiry and research design: Choosing among five traditions*. Thousand Oaks, CA: SAGE.

- Creswell, J. (2003). *Research design: Qualitative, quantitative, and mixed methods approaches*. Thousand Oaks, CA: SAGE.
- Crespino, J. (2002). *Southern roots of the new right: John C. Stennis and federal school desegregation, 1954-1972*. University of Virginia: Miller Center Fellow.
- Daane, C. A., & McGreevy, C. (1966). The counseling process and function. *Review of Educational Research*, 36(2), 264-273.
- Davis, S., & Haller, E. (1981). Tracking, ability, and SES: Further evidence on the “revisionist-meritocratic debate. *American Journal of Education*, 89(3), 283-304.
- Dewey, J., & Snedden, D. (1977). Two communications. *Curriculum Inquiry*, 7(1), 33-39.
- Doolittle, P., & Camp, W. (1999). Constructivism: The career and technical education perspective. *Journal of Vocational and Technical Education*, 16(1), 88-97.
- Dworkin, R. (1977). *Taking rights seriously*. Cambridge, MA: Harvard University Press.
- Eisner, E. (1998). *The enlightened eye: Qualitative inquiry and the enhancement of educational practice*. Upper Saddle River, N.J.: Prentice-Hall, Inc.
- Elliott, C., & D’Orso, M. (2001). *The cost of courage: The journey of an American congressman*. Tuscaloosa, AL: The University of Alabama Press.
- Erford, B. (2003). *Transforming the school counseling profession*. Upper Saddle River, NJ: Pearson Education.
- Field, J., & Baker, S. (2004). Defining and examining school counselor advocacy. *Professional School Counseling*, 8(1), 56-63.
- Flattau, P., Bracken, J., Atta, R., Bandeh-Ahmadi, A., de la Cruz, R., & Sullivan, K. (2007). *The National Defense Education Act of 1958: Selected outcomes*. Retrieved March 3, 2008, from <http://www.ida.org/stpi/pages/D3306>.
- Fleming, A. (1960). The philosophy and objectives of the National Defense Education Act, *Annals of the American Academy of Political and Social Science*, 327, 132-138.
- Flinders, D., & Mills, G. (1993). *Theory and concepts in qualitative research*. New York: Teachers College Press.
- Fodor, E. (2009). *Give me liberty: An American history, Volume two*. New York: W.W. Norton.

- Frankenberg, E., Lee, C., & Orfield, G. (2002). *Race in American public schools: Rapidly re-segregating school districts*. The Civil Rights Project Harvard University. <http://www.civilrightsproject.harvard.edu>.
- Garrison, J. (1998). John Dewey's philosophy as education. In Larry A. Hickman (Ed.), *Reading Dewey: Interpretations for a postmodern generation* (pp. 63-81). Bloomington & Indianapolis, IN: Indiana University Press.
- Goetz, J., & LeCompte, M. (1984). *Ethnography and qualitative design in educational research*. Orlando, FL: Academic Press.
- Greenwood, D. & Levin, M. (2005). Reform of the social sciences and of universities through action research. In Norman K. Denzin & Yvonna S. Lincoln (Eds.), *The Sage Handbook of qualitative research*, (3<sup>rd</sup> ed.) (pp. 43-64). Thousand Oaks, CA: Sage.
- Gutmann, A. (1999). *Democratic education*. Princeton, New Jersey: Princeton University Press. (Original work published 1987)
- Gysbers, N. (2001). School guidance and counseling in the 21<sup>st</sup> century: Remember the past into the future. *Professional School Counseling* 5(2), 96-106.
- Hall, E. (1957). Justice as fairness: A modernized version of the social contract. *The Journal of Philosophy*, 54(22), 662-670.
- Hallinan, M. (1991). School differences in tracking structures and track assignments. *Journal of Research on Adolescence*, 1(3), 251-275.
- Hamilton, V. (1985). Lister Hill, Hugo Black, and the albatross of race. *Alabama Law Review*, 36(3), 845-860.
- Hancock, D., & Algozzine, B. (2006). *Doing case study research*. New York: Teachers College Press.
- Hart, P., & Jacobi, M. (1992). *From gatekeeper to advocate: Transforming the role of the school counselor*. New York: College Entrance Examination Board.
- Harvey, G. (2000). Lister Hill, "Godfather of Maxwell Field": A case study in southern economic development. *Alabama Review*, 53(1), 3-28.
- Herr, E. (2001). The impact of national policies, economics, and school reform on comprehensive guidance programs. *Professional School Counseling*, 4(4), 1096-2409.
- Herr, E. (2002). School reform and perspectives on the role of school counselors: a century of proposals for change. *Professional School Counseling*, 5(4), 220-234.

- Hill, G., & Green, D. (1960). The selection, preparation, and professionalization of guidance and personnel workers. *Review of Educational Research*, 30(2), 115-130.
- Hipilito-Delgado, C., & Lee, C. (2007). Empowerment theory for the professional school counselor: A manifesto for what really matters. *Professional School Counselor*, 10(4), 327-332.
- House, R., & Sears, S. (2002). Preparing school counselors to be leaders and advocates: A critical need in the new millennium. *Theory into Practice*, 41(3), 154-162.
- Howe, K. (1989). In defense of outcomes-based conceptions of equal educational opportunity. *Educational Theory*, 39(4), 317-336.
- Howe, K. (1992). Liberal democracy, equal educational opportunity, and the challenge of multiculturalism. *American Educational Research Journal*, 29(3), 455-470.
- Howe, K. (1999). *Understanding equal educational opportunity*. NY: Teachers College Press.
- Johnson-Bailey, J. (2004). Enjoining positionality and power in narrative work: Balancing contentious and modulating forces. In K. deMarrais & S. Lapan (Eds.), *Foundations for Research: Methods of Inquiry in Education and the Social Sciences* (pp. 123-138). Mahwah, NJ: Lawrence Erlbaum.
- Keys, S. (1999). The school counselor's role in facilitating multisystemic change. *Professional School Counseling*, 3(2), 101-108.
- Keys, S., Bemak, F., & Lockhart, E. (1998). Transforming school counseling to serve the mental health needs of at-risk youth. *Journal of Counseling and Development*, 76(4), 381-390.
- Kluger, R. (1977). *Simple justice*. New York: Vintage Books. (Original work published 1975)
- Kotlowski, D. (2005). With all deliberate delay: Kennedy, Johnson, and school desegregation. *The Journal of Policy History*, 17(2), 156-192
- Kymlicka, W. (1988). Rawls on teleology and deontology. *Philosophy and Public Affairs*, 17(3), 173-190.
- Kymlicka, W. (1989). Liberal individualism and liberal neutrality. *Ethics*, 99(4), 883-905.
- Kymlicka, W. (1991). *Liberalism community and culture*. Oxford, UK: Clarendon. (Original work published 1989)
- Kymlicka, W. (2004). *Multicultural citizenship: A liberal theory of minority rights*. UK: Oxford. (Original work published 1995).

- Labaree, D. (2005). Progressivism, schools and schools of education: An American romance. *Paedagogica Historica*, 41 (1 & 2), 275-288.
- Lambie, G., & Williamson, L. (2004). The challenge to change from guidance counseling to professional school counseling: A historical proposition. *Professional School Counseling*, 8(2), 124-131.
- Lang, M. (1992). Barriers to African Americans' educational achievement in higher education: A statistical and conceptual review. *Journal of African American Studies*, 22(4), 510-522.
- Lechte, J. (1994). *Fifty key contemporary thinkers: From structuralism to postmodernity*. London: Routledge.
- Lee, V. & Ekstrom, R. (1987). Student access to guidance counseling in high school. *American Educational Research Journal*, 24(2), 287-310.
- Lincoln, Y., & Guba, E. (1985). *Naturalistic inquiry*. Newbury Park, CA: Sage.
- Lemann, N. (1999). *The big test: The secret history of the American meritocracy*. New York: Farrar, Straus, & Giroux.
- Lipset, S., Trow, M., & Coleman, J. (2004). Union democracy: The internal politics of the International Typographical Union. In Robert K. Yin (Ed), *The case study anthology*. (pp. 113-124). Thousand Oaks, CA: Sage.
- Loughhary, J., Stripling, R., & Fitzgerald, P. (Eds.). (1965). *Counseling, A growing profession: Report of American Personnel and Guidance Association concerned with the professionalization of counseling*. Washington, DC: American Personnel and Guidance Association.
- McClure, B., & Russo, T. (1996). The politics of counseling: Looking back and forward. *Counseling and Values*, 40(3), 162-175.
- Mardsden, P. (2005). The sociology of James S. Coleman. *Annual Review of Sociology*, 31, 1-24.
- Martin, P. (2002). Transforming school counseling: A national perspective. *Theory into Practice*, 41(3), 148-153.
- Merriam, S. (1988). *Case study research in education*. San Francisco, CA: Jossey-Bass Publishers.
- Merriam, S. (2002). *Qualitative research in practice: Examples for discussion and analysis*. San Francisco, CA: Jossey-Bass.

- Moses, M. (2002). *Embracing race: Why we need race-conscious education policy*. New York: Teachers College Press.
- Myers, G. (1935). Coordinated guidance: Some suggestions for a program of pupil personnel work. *Occupations*, 13, 804-807.
- Myrick, R. (1987). *Developmental guidance and counseling: A practical approach*. Minneapolis, Minnesota: Educational Media Corporation.
- National Education Association (NEA). *Status of the American public school teacher, 2000-2001*, at [www.nea.org/edstats/images/status.pdf](http://www.nea.org/edstats/images/status.pdf).
- National Center for Education Statistics (NCES), Institute of Education Sciences, Tables 78,79, 35-2, 66, [www.http://nces.ed.gov/programs/digest](http://nces.ed.gov/programs/digest)
- National Defense Education Act (NDEA), Pub. L. No. 85-864, §101, 501-511, 72 U.S.Statutes at Large, 1580-1605 (1958).
- Nelson, A., & Weinbaum, E. (2006). Federal education policy and the states, 1945-2004, *States impact on federal education policy project, New York State Archives*. Albany: New York State Education Department. <http://www.sifep.nysed.gov/>
- Nussbaum, M. (2001). The enduring significance of John Rawls. *The Chronicle Review*. 47(45), B7-B9.
- Orfield, G. (2001). *Schools more separate: Consequences of a decade of resegregation*. Cambridge, MA: The Civil Rights Project at Harvard University.
- Orfield, G., & Lee, C. (2006). *Racial transformation and the changing nature of segregation*. Cambridge, MA: The Civil Rights Project at Harvard University.
- Oxtay, J. (2004). D. Padgett (Ed.). *The qualitative research experience*. Belmont, CA: Wadsworth/Thomson Learning.
- Padgett, D. (2004). *The qualitative research experience*. Belmont, CA: Wadsworth/Thomson Learning.
- Parra-Cardona, J., Ruben, J., Holtrop, K., & Cordova, D. (2005). "We are clinicians committed to cultural diversity and social justice": Good intentions that can wane over time. *Guidance and Counseling*, 21(1), 36-46.
- Parsons, F. (1909). *Choosing a vocation*. Cambridge, MA: Houghton Mifflin.
- Patterson, C. (1962). *Counseling and guidance in Schools: A first course*. New York: Harper & Brothers.

- Permaloff, A., & Grafton, C. (2008). Political geography and power elites: Big mules and the Alabama Constitution. In G. Connor & C. Hammonds (Eds.), *The constitutionalism of American states*, (pp. 225-235). Columbia, MO: University of Missouri Press.
- Pierson, G. (1965). *An evaluation: Counselor education in regular session institutes* (DHEW Publication No. FS 5.225:25042). Washington, D.C.: U.S. Government Printing Office.
- The persistent racial scoring gap on the SAT. [Special issue]. (2000). *The Journal of African Americans in Higher Education*, 29(Autumn), 85-88.
- Rawls, J. (1957). Justice as fairness. *The Journal of Philosophy*, 54(22), 653-662.
- Rawls, J. (1971). *A theory of justice*. Cambridge, MA: The Belknap Press.
- Rawls, J. (1985). Justice as fairness: Political not metaphysical. *Philosophy and Public Affairs*, 14(3), 223-251.
- Reed, H., & Steffire, B. (1963). Elementary and secondary school programs. *Review of Educational Research*, 33(2), 152-162.
- Reich, R. (1997) Communitarian liberalism and common schools. *Philosophy of Education Yearbook 1997*. [http://www.ed.uius.edu/EPS/PES-Yearbook/97\\_docs/reich.html](http://www.ed.uius.edu/EPS/PES-Yearbook/97_docs/reich.html)
- Ritchie, D. (1983). [Interview with Stewart E. McClure, Chief Clerk, Senate Committee on Labor, Education, and Public Welfare, 1949-1973. Senate historical office oral history project. <http://www.archives.gov/legislative/research/special-collections/oral-history/senate-program/about-the-program.html>
- Rochester, D. (1967). Persistence of attitudes and values of NDEA counselor trainees. *Journal of Counseling Psychology*, 14(6), 535-537.
- Rosenbaum, J., Miller, S., & Krei, M. (1996). Gatekeeping in an era of more open gates: High school counselors' views of their influence on students' college plans. *American Journal of Education*, 104, 257-279.
- Rowe, W., Murphy, H., & De Csipkes, R. (1975). The relationship of counselor characteristics and counseling effectiveness. *Review of Educational Research*, 45(2), 231-246.
- Schmidt, J. (2008). *Counseling in schools: Comprehensive programs of responsive services for all students*, Fifth edition. Boston: Allyn & Bacon.
- Schmidt, J. (2007). What really matters is school counselor empowerment: A response to Hipolito-Delgado and Lee. *Professional School Counseling*, 10(4), 338-340.
- Sciarra, D., & Whitson, M. (2007). A reaction to Hipolito-Delgado & Lee. *Professional School Counseling*. 10(4), 336-337.



- Shertzer, B. & Stone, S. (1981). *Fundamentals of guidance*. Boston: Houghton Mifflin Company.
- Shertzer, B., & Stone, S. (1963). Administrative deterrents to guidance program development, *Theory into Practice*, 2(1), 24-32.
- Sink, C. (2005). *Contemporary school counseling: Theory, research, and practice*. Boston, New York: Lahaska Press Houghton Mifflin.
- Sink, C. (2002). In search of the profession's finest hour: A critique of four views of 21<sup>st</sup> century school. *Professional School Counseling*, 5(3), 156-162.
- Snedden, D., & Allen, W. (1908). *School reports and school efficiency*. New York: The MacMillan Company.
- Spaights, E. (1964). Relationship of actual and ideal counselor roles. *Peabody Journal of Education*, 41(4), 238-241.
- Spears, A. (1978). Institutionalized racism and the education of African Americans. *Anthropology & Education Quarterly*, 9(2), 127-136.
- Stadler, H., Suh, S., Cobia, D. Middleton, R. & Carnery, J. (2006). Counselor preparation: Reimagining counselor education with diversity as a core value. *Counselor Education & Supervision*, 45, 193-206.
- Stake, R. (1995). *The art of case study research*. Thousand Oaks, CA: SAGE.
- Stake, R. (2005). Qualitative case studies. In N. K. Denzin & Y. S. Lincoln (Eds.), *The Sage handbook of qualitative research, 3rd edition*, (pp. 443-466). Thousand Oaks, CA: Sage.
- Strauss, A., & Corbin, J. (1998). *Basics of qualitative research: Techniques and procedures for developing grounded theory*. Thousand Oaks, CA: Sage.
- Strike, K. A. (2000). Schools as communities: Four metaphors, three models, and a dilemma or two. *The Journal of the Philosophy of Education Society of Great Britain*, 34(4), 617-642.
- Stripling, R., & Lister, J. (1963). Selection, preparation and professionalization of specialists. *Review of Educational Research*, 33(2), 171-178.
- Strowig, R. & Farwell, G. (1966). Programmatic research. *Review of Educational Research*, 36(2), 327-334.

- Sue, D., Arredondo, P., & McDavis, R. (1992). Multicultural counseling competencies and standards: A call to the profession. *Journal of Multicultural Counseling and Development*, 20, 644-688.
- The Education Trust. (2003). *Transforming school counseling*. Washington, DC. Retrieved March 7, 2009, from <http://www2.edtrust.org/EdTrust/Transforming+School+Counseling/Metlife.htm>
- The Education Trust. (1997). *What is the education trust?* Washington, DC. Retrieved March 7, 2009, from <http://www2.edtrust.org/edtrust/about+the+ed+trust>
- The Education Trust. (1996). *The national guidance and counseling reform program*. Washington, DC: Author.
- Tozer, S., Violas, P., & Senese, G. (2002). *School and society: Historical and contemporary perspectives* (Fourth ed.). New York: McGraw-Hill. (Original work published 1993)
- Tyler, L. (1960). *The National Defense Counseling and Guidance Training Institutes Program: A report of the first 50 institutes*. Washington, D.C.: U.S. Department of Health, Education, and Welfare Office of Education, U.S. Government Printing Office.
- U.S. Congress. Senate. Committee on Labor and Public Welfare. Subcommittee on Education, 1967e. *Notes and working papers concerning the administration of programs authorized under Title V of the National Defense Education Act, as amended, 88<sup>th</sup> Congress*. Washington, DC: GPO. Committee Print.
- U.S. Department of Health, Education, and Welfare-Office of Education. (1964). *Commitment to Youth: A report on 5 years of progress in guidance, counseling, and testing under Title V of the National Defense Education Act, 1958-59/1962/63* (DHEW Publication No. FS 5.225:25039). Washington, D.C.: U.S. Government Printing Office.
- U.S. Department of Health, Education, and Welfare. Office of Education. Bureau of elementary and secondary education. 1969. *Review of progress under Title V-A, National Defense Education Act of 1958, as amended*. Washington, DC: U.S. Government Printing Office.
- Wirth, A. G. (1983). *Education in the technological society*. Lanham, MD: University Press of America.
- Woods, P. (1996). *Researching the art of teaching: Ethnography for educational use*. London and New York: Routledge.
- Yin, R. (2004). (Ed). *The case study anthology*. Thousand Oaks, CA: Sage.
- Yin, R. (1994). *Case study research: Design and methods*. Thousand Oaks, CA: Sage.

APPENDIX A  
INTERVIEW PROTOCOL

## Appendix A

### Interview Protocol

**Project-** School Counselors, NDEA, and School Desegregation in Alabama: The Evolution of a Profession

**Time-**

**Date-**

**Place-**

**Interviewer-**Mary Burke Givens

**Interviewee-**

**Brief Description-**A historical case study of NDEA, school counselor practice, and desegregation in Alabama.

1. Please tell me about yourself, where are you from, where did you attend high school and college and other demographic information.
2. Tell me about your career as a counselor (school counselor, counselor educator).
3. During what time period were you employed?
4. How did you decide to become a counselor (counselor educator)?
5. How were you affected by desegregation efforts in Alabama during your career?
6. What do you remember about the NDEA and the guidance and counseling institutes?
7. Do you remember feeling any contradiction between what you were expected to do as a school counselor and what you were taught in graduate school?
8. Additionally, were there specific school counselor tasks, practices, during the desegregation years that were related directly to desegregation?
9. How has the profession of school counseling changed over the years?

APPENDIX B  
IRB APPROVAL

June 22, 2009

Office for Research  
Institutional Review Board for the  
Protection of Human Subjects

THE UNIVERSITY OF  
**ALABAMA**  
RESEARCH

Mary Givens  
ELPTS  
College of Education  
The University of Alabama

Re: IRB # 09-OR-189 "School Counselors, NDEA, and School  
Desegregation in Alabama: A Historical Case Study"

Dear Ms. Givens:

The University of Alabama Institutional Review Board has granted  
approval for your proposed research

Your application has been given expedited approval according to 45 CFR  
part 46. Approval has been given under expedited review category 7 as  
outlined below:

*(7) Research on individual or group characteristics or behavior  
(including, but not limited to, research on perception, cognition,  
motivation, identity, language, communication, cultural beliefs or  
practices, and social behavior) or research employing survey, interview,  
oral history, focus group, program evaluation, human factors evaluation,  
or quality assurance methodologies.*

Your application will expire on June 22, 2010. If your research will  
continue beyond this date, complete the relevant portions of Continuing  
Review and Closure Form. If you wish to modify the application,  
complete the Modification of an Approved Protocol Form. When the  
study closes, complete the appropriate portions of FORM: Continuing  
Review and Closure.

Please use reproductions of the IRB approved informed consent form to  
obtain consent from your participants.

Should you need to submit any further correspondence regarding this  
proposal, please include the above application number.

Good luck with your research.

Sincerely,



152 Rose Administration Building  
Box 870117  
Tuscaloosa, Alabama 35487-0117  
(205) 348-5152  
fax (205) 348-8882

Carpatho T. Myles, MSM, JCM  
Director & Research Compliance Officer  
Office for Research Compliance  
The University of Alabama