

time come to look for comprehensive and technical analyses of national programs and their components? An affirmative answer suggests that there may be a need for a new type of book on fertility and family planning, and may therefore have far-reaching research implications.

MILOŠ MACURA

*Population Division,  
United Nations, New York City*

## Ripe for Change

**Run, Computer, Run.** The Mythology of Educational Innovation. ANTHONY G. OETTINGER, with the collaboration of Sema Marks. Harvard University Press, Cambridge, Mass., 1969. xxii + 306 pp., illus. \$5.95. Harvard Studies in Technology and Society.

American public education has more critics than any other native institution. It is attacked from the Right as being too liberal, from the Left for being irrelevant, and from the Center for not fulfilling its goals. American public education is expensive: schools take up to half or more of local government budgets. It is labor-intensive, employing more professionals than any other institution, with more than half of school budgets going for wages and salaries. Schools have no measures of performance: no one can tell whether a school system is a good one or not. Teaching has low status: teachers are the least highly regarded of the major professions.

Public education is an institution ripe for change, pushed by its critics and pulled by the lure of higher status. It is also an institution that is ripe for being gulled, much as the overcommitted consumer may be lured by the promise of the finance company to consolidate his debts into one smaller payment. Innovations that promise to fix everything—improve performance, lower costs, replace labor by machines, raise professional status by the acquisition of higher-order skills—have a special appeal. Nor do the innovations have to be existent: one can develop a cult that is oriented to a future happy state, much as the natives on some South Sea islands developed “cargo cults” after the Second World War which were designed to bring back the LST’s loaded with the goods and foodstuffs the GI’s had brought with them during the war.

The computer furnishes the basis for a new educational cult. When the computer comes, it will provide more effective instruction, replace expensive persons, raise the level of skill of those who remain, and individualize education—desiderata with which few can quarrel. The high priests of the cult are the computer companies, which extol the virtues of systems that have yet to be developed. The liturgy of the cult is rich with a rhetoric borrowed from systems “theory,” validated by “success” in the RAND Corporation and with the military. The cult has several denominations, each dedicated to one or another system of which none is beyond the pilot stage. In addition to the computer cult, there are several minor, apocryphal movements devoted to new technical devices, some of which are closer to the millennium than are computer-based or computer-assisted learning devices: academic games, language laboratories, new and daring school architecture, and a host of audiovisual aids.

Oettinger’s volume is an examination of the cultish aspects of the expected technical revolution. Oettinger is not an atheist. He is a former head of the Harvard computing center and he believes in the computer and its eventual use in connection with some kinds of learning. But he is scandalized by the unrealistic expectation that machines will take over a large portion of the instructional burden within the next decade. He is shocked by some of the educators’ adoption of the systems rhetoric in a new form of foamy obfuscation.

The evidence presented by Oettinger rests on two sets of observations: First, he shows that, given the most optimistic estimates of the cost of any projected computer-based system, the present system of education is cheaper by a factor of ten. Furthermore, the expected savings in classroom teachers are most likely to be canceled out by new demands for more highly paid personnel and by the use of teachers to provide individual instruction. Secondly, he examines existing school systems to see how they have handled the existing technology and what the possibilities are for their handling something more complicated. In this last connection he has visited a few schools, looked at some statistical studies, and examined carefully the budget of the Watertown (Massachusetts) school system.

Oettinger reasons that if the school

systems are to assimilate in the next decade the highly technical apparatus of computer-based instructional devices, then they should be able at present to employ existing technical devices properly. He finds that schools have a hard time handling even such relatively simple devices as overhead and film strip projectors, let alone the more complicated language laboratories. (A national survey, not cited by Oettinger, conducted by the Bureau of Social Science Research, of Washington, D.C., found that most schools had audiovisual aids on hand and few schools made anything like the optimum use of them.)

The problem is, as Oettinger sees it, that technology has been oversold, that its claims are premature. There are great promises in computer- and other machine-based instructional systems, but their development is nowhere near the point where we can expect anything reasonable within the next decade. But even more important, the current cultish attempts to integrate technology and education divert resources from the more important basic research and development tasks. The point is not how to apply knowledge and technology that already exist, but how to develop the potentialities of technology to the point where it can be used.

Furthermore, the existing educational system is not set up to evaluate properly the claims of new technical advances. Oettinger advocates a healthy injection of competition into the system by allowing consumers more choice. He would encourage the establishment of a variety of separately managed school systems and would give funds directly to families to be spent on the schools they choose for their own children. This seems to Oettinger a reasonable way to motivate school systems to adopt changes which make a difference in the end products, better trained graduates.

Oettinger’s book is important, not because it is the best documented study of the problem but because he has raised the kinds of questions that we need constantly to pose against the claims of cultists. Mindless, premature, mishandled innovation can do more to impede the eventual development of a workable educational technology than do the conservatives on local school boards.

PETER H. ROSSI

*Department of Social Relations,  
Johns Hopkins University,  
Baltimore, Maryland*