

hour that decided this but the need. The amount of time varied depending on how much work needed to be done.

There was reality in content for content was related to the understandings of children, it was meaningful for it was in answer to their own questions and it was effective since it found its reason for being in use.

This was possible because the method allowed full interaction within the group to take place. It provided security through affection and the sense of belongingness, it made it possible for each child to feel a sense of achievement through his contribution to the group through a wide variety of media, it made possible mutual respect and consideration for each other which built a sense of self-

esteem allowing one to give fully even as he was given unto.

We are not building children for a good life *tomorrow*. We are discovering ways of making life good *today*, we are not telling children how to live but we are living with children as we ought to live that individual and social goals can be realized in action.

We learn through experiencing. Generalizing from our learnings we are provided with new insights into the problems we daily face. Setting goals in terms of widest possible social good we discover self fulfillment in these social ends and purposes. The teacher who can make it possible for children to move with confidence out into ever widening areas of experiencing can be sure that integration is taking place. *Try living* with children.



Bafflegabb in the Program of Studies*

H. E. PANABAKER

Teachers in Canada are perplexed as to the manner of attaining certain educational objectives that you cannot place your finger on. Aren't teachers in the Philippines bewildered by the same type of "bafflegabb" in the statement of our educational objectives? There is a difference, however, between the Canadian teacher and the teacher in the Philippines. While the bafflegabbed Canadian teacher raises his arms in surrender and looks into the want ad column for new jobs, the Philippine teacher sticks on, pretending that he is not really bafflegabbed.—
EDITOR.

The most serious occupational disease among Alberta teachers today is frustration. The disease has several causes; but among the most serious is bafflegabb in the program of studies, or, to be more

precise, the curriculum guides.

Bafflegabb has been defined as follows: "Multiloquence characterized by consummate interfusion of circumlocution or periphrasis, inscrutability, incognizability, and

* Reprinted from the *Education Digest*, Sept., 1952 issue.

other familiar manifestations of abstruse expatiation commonly utilized for promulgations implementing procrustean determinations of governmental bodies." This rather technical definition may be interpreted for the non-technical reader as the art of using a great many high-faulting words in order to conceal your meaning, if you have one, so that you can please everybody at once.

There was a time, not too long ago either, when a reasonably intelligent teacher could read the program of studies and understand what was expected of him. Now, however, he pores over the multifarious curriculum guides in their very bright and attractive colors and finds spread before him "a very fantastical banquet" from which he turns aside neither nourished himself nor able to give nourishment to others.

Among the dishes at this banquet is one labeled "OBJECTIVES." Formerly, this was a simple, unadorned bowl containing a few health-giving fruits. Now it is an ornate tureen, heavily incrustated with gold leaf in the later Italian style. Raising the pretentiously heavy cover releases an aroma not the most enticing and reveals an assortment of exotic fruits, the product of grafting so-called psychology on the ancient tree of pedagogy.

Ordinary human beings enter the teaching profession on the naive assumption that the teacher's function is to teach reading, writing, arithmetic, language, social studies, or science so that, when pupils have finished a certain part of the work, they will be able to read a certain level of material correctly, do certain mathematical

problems accurately, or know certain facts in social studies and science and be able to demonstrate that knowledge. Of course, such people understand that methods of teaching have changed; they know that mere repetition and drill will not suffice. They expect to conduct classes in line with the best of modern knowledge. They will motivate pupils by a variety of means and in a multitude of ways encourage them to participate in a wide range of activities. They will be very genuinely concerned with the personal development of the children under them. They will seek to make their classrooms healthful places in which children may grow.

However, they still fondly believe that their job is to educate—that through their activities, children will be able to do many specific things more accurately and to know many specific things more precisely. They hold to the quaint notion that exact knowledge does possess virtue even in these progressive days. They believe that when the facts about his country are suitably experienced by the child, he will acquire certain desirable attitudes toward it, that when a child has mastered arithmetical processes, he will have some insight into quantitative thinking, and that when the child has been really drilled in science, he will gain some understanding of the rigorous discipline involved in the scientific method. But they have a deep-seated feeling that such attitudes, insights, and understandings are long in developing and, therefore, can be only the rather distant end-products of education.

So these healthy folk come into the teaching profession. The task

may be to teach the social studies. They have the idea that they are to deal with the history and geography of Canada and other parts of the world to the end that the child will know a considerable body of historical and geographical facts which he will be able to relate in certain ways as a basis for understanding present-day problems. They think their functions is to build the foundation of fact and that the understanding will come later as a result of growth and experience. But when they read the curriculum guides they soon learn how wrong they are.

They find such things as these listed as *specific objectives* for various units of work. "The child should show that he has acquired an attitude of intelligent loyalty to Canada. The child should show that he has acquired a generalization that Canadians increase their wealth through labor, machinery, and the use of power. The child should show that he has acquired an attitude of active interest in man's further improvement of the standard of living through the fuller exploitation of the possibilities of raw materials. The child should show that he has acquired an attitude of admiration for the work of the pioneers in shaping Canada as a free democratic country. The child should show that he had acquired the habit of looking objectively at the world around him. The child should show that he has acquired an attitude of intelligent loyalty to the various community groups of which he is a member. The child should show that he has acquired the habit of regarding himself as a member of organized groups to each of which

he owes a responsibility. The child should show that he has acquired the ability to make comparisons of exports of countries through the use of bar graphs. The child should show that he has acquired the generalization that administering the decisions of Parliament requires the services of experts. The child should show that he had acquired an attitude of intelligent pride in being a member of the British Commonwealth of Nations."

"Well," say our beginners, "those are very good objectives, very good indeed. But how, pray, are we to make sure they are achieved. How, for example, do we define an attitude of social concern — listed as one of the specific objectives of the Health and Social Development Course? With specific objectives stated in this way, when will we know, how can we tell whether or not we have done our job effectively? To us, as self-respecting workers, this question is extremely important."

Our beginners turn again to the books for answers. The books let them down. Oh, they contain much erudite educational philosophy, considerable criticism, implicit and explicit, of the traditional school, but of help in developing, recognizing, or measuring these intangibles called attitudes practically nothing at all, although unit after unit lists them as specific objectives rather than concomitant learnings.

A little later these ordinary human teachers begin scanning the "help wanted" columns in the daily press or making contacts with the oil industry. Can you blame them — much?