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8. Examine the philosophical and historical development of career and technical (vocational) education from its origin to the present.

The Roots of Vocational Education

Philosophically and structurally, vocational education has had many changes in its long history. Its beginning dates as far back as ancient Grecian apprenticeships which were a means to obtain occupational training, but were not considered a part of any school curriculum. With the discovery of the “New World,” the custom of apprenticeships followed the colonists from Europe to colonial America, however “with the development of slavery, this form of white servitude declined” (Gordon, 1999). Although small in numbers, more modernized apprenticeships continue to exist to this day with its practitioners emphasizing the educational benefits of the arrangement. Modern day apprentices work under the terms of formal apprenticeship agreements, but they work regular hours, reside in their own homes and earn real wages instead of the “meat, drink washing, lodging and apparel” promised during the colonial period (Gordon, 1999).

Mechanic’s Institutes and the Lyceum Movement

The industrial revolution came later to America than to Europe mainly due to restrictive trade laws (Gordon, 1999). However, by the second decade of the nineteenth century industrialization had arrived in America and with it came the growth of working man’s organizations comprised of skilled laborers who began to organize trade and craft unions in order to improve their bargaining power (Barlow, 1976). This growth also spurred the beginnings of the American lyceum movement, a popular device for adult education, where “scientific farming” was a frequently heard topic (Gordon, 1999). The Gardiner Lyceum, in Gardiner, Maine, was the first school that was dedicated entirely to practical studies. By 1833 there were about one thousand lyceums in the United States, but due to a lack of adequate financing and
increasing distrust by farmers and mechanics the Gardiner Lyceum closed a few years later, and many others followed its fate.

At around the same time period several schools based on England’s Mechanic’s Institute model opened up, the Franklin Institute in Philadelphia in 1824, the Maryland Institute for the Promotion of Mechanic’s Arts in 1826, the Ohio Mechanic’s Institute in 1828, and later the San Francisco Mechanics Institute in 1854. They were different in some regards, but each was designed to promote practice with science. Similarly, in 1825 the Rensselar School, a second-generation lyceum, opened in Troy, New York. While the mechanic’s institutes were primarily interested in the vocational needs of the populace, the Rensselar School planned for the educational and cultural needs of its students as well (Barlow, 1976). The concept was to provide teachers of science with the opportunity to apply scientific principles they were studying on actual farms. Rensselar continued to expand with the addition of Mathematical Arts in 1835 leading to its evolution into the first engineering school in the United States (Gordon, 1999).

The Morrill Acts and the Manual Labor Movement

Interest in agricultural and industrial education continued to increase up through the middle of the nineteenth century. Along with that interest came many American citizens to champion this particular style of education, Jonathan Baldwin Turner among them. Turner believed that society consisted of two classes, the professional and the industrial, and wanted federal aide to be granted for the establishment of industrial universities in each state. Turner’s idea traveled from the Illinois state legislator to the U.S. Congress. In 1857, Vermont congressman Justin S. Morrill introduced a bill into the U.S. House of Representatives that was passed in the house but lost support due to rebukes by President Buchanan. Proponents of the bill didn’t give up however, and on July 2, 1862 the newly elected President Abraham Lincoln
signed the current version of the bill into law. The bill called for public lands to be granted to each state based on their representation in congress (30,000 acres for each senator and representative) to be used for establishing colleges benefiting agriculture and mechanical arts (Barlow, 1976). Institutions of higher education under the Morrill Act of 1862 were known as “land-grant institutions” (Gordon, 1999). A second Morrill Act was adopted in 1890 (also known as the “Maintenance Act”) which in part provisioned educational opportunities for African American students.

As early as 1853, Frederick Douglass had begun advocating industrial schools for Negroes, an idea that came to fruition in 1868 when General Samuel Chapman Armstrong organized the Hampton Institute which was based on the philosophy that there was dignity in all forms of work and that human beings, regardless of race, could only truly appreciate that which they earned. Therefore, students at Hampton were expected to work for the school to earn their tuition, thus beginning the manual labor school movement in America (Gordon, 1999). Previously, Armstrong had been the superintendent of education for Negroes in Virginia and it was Armstrong who garnered the interest of the American Missionary Society and convinced them to purchase a large estate on the Hampton River in Virginia in order to house the institute. Armstrong viewed labor in the school as a triple force: 1) strengthening will, self-reliance and independence, 2) as a means whereby the student might earn an education to make them fit to be teachers and leaders and 3) a means by which the student could learn how to support themselves after graduation by the work of his hands as well as his brains (Barlow, 1976). One of Hampton’s most famous graduates was Booker T. Washington who went on to teach at Hampton and later, in 1881, became principle at Tuskegee Institute in Alabama.
Federal Legislation

A flurry of legislation followed starting with the Smith-Lever Act of 1914 which completed the land-grant triumvirate—teaching, research, and extension. The Smith-Lever Act provided for a program of cooperative extension work in agriculture and home economics and reinforced the national government’s part in aiding in the expansion of higher learning for the “common individual” (Gordon, 1999). Smith-Lever was followed in 1917 by the Smith-Hughes Act, considered to be the first vocational education act and in part had the effect of isolating vocational education from other parts of the comprehensive high school curriculum. In some cases the requirement to have each state establish a board for vocational education resulted in a board separate from the state’s board of education. The Smith-Hughes Act was a grant in perpetuity. However, in 1997 the Smith-Hughes Act was repealed. Federal aid for vocational education was dramatically increased with a series of bills authored by Senator George going from $1 million annually in 1929 to $3 million in 1934, $14 million in 1936, and $29 million in 1946. In 1956 an additional $5 million for nursing and $375,000 for fishery occupation was added into the mix. When Americans awoke to Sputnik in 1958, the National Defense Education Act was enacted and provided funds to maintain vocational education for technical occupations, such as data processing, necessary to national defense. The fear that technology would bring a large amount of unemployment was the reasoning behind the Manpower Development Training Act of 1962 which in addition to achieving a milestone by providing training for those who were economically disadvantaged included a whopping $375,000,000 to be spent over three years. In 1963 Lyndon B. Johnson signed the most significant vocational education bill to be passed since the Smith-Hughes Act of 1917, the Vocational Education Act also known as the Perkins-Morse bill. Its purpose was to maintain, extend and improve existing programs. It also stipulated that
funds be used for persons who have academic, socioeconomic, or other handicaps that prevent them from succeeding in a regular vocational education program. For the first time, vocational education was mandated to meet the needs of the individual students and not just the employment needs of industry (Mason, Furtado, & Husted, 1989). In 1968 the Vocational Education Amendments of 1968 replaced all previous federal legislation for vocational education except the Smith-Hughes Act. The purpose of the 1968 amendments was to provide access for all citizens to appropriate training and retraining, which was similar to the Vocational Education Act of 1963. The major difference being that the 1968 amendments emphasized vocational education in postsecondary schools and broadened the definition of vocational education to bring it closer to general education (Gordon, 1999). In 1973 the Comprehensive Employment Training Act (CETA) replaced the Manpower Development Training Act which had the primary affect of transferring decision making from Washington to local and state governments (Evans & Herr, 1978). The Vocational Amendments of 1976 extended and increased funding of the Vocational Education Act of 1963 and the Vocational Education Amendments of 1968. One of the primary purposes of was to ensure that states improve their planning by involving a wide range of interested agencies and making use of all available resources for vocational education. Another purpose was to help states in overcoming sex discrimination and sex stereotyping in their vocational education programs. The Job Training Partnership Act of 1982 (JTPA) replaced CETA and was intended to establish programs to prepare youth and unskilled adults for entry into the labor force and to afford job training to economically disadvantaged individuals facing critical barriers to employment. The statue enlarged the role of state governments and private industry in federal job training programs, imposed performance standards, limited support services, and created a new program of retraining displaced workers (Mason, Furtado, & Husted,
1989). The Carl D. Perkins Vocational Education Act of 1984, amended the Vocational Education Act of 1963, and replaced the amendments of 1968 and 1976. The act consisted of two major goals, an economic goal to improve the skills of the labor force and prepare adults for job opportunities and a social goal to provide equal opportunities for adults in vocational education. Since its invocation in 1984, the Perkins Act has been renewed three times, 1990 (Perkins II), 1998 (Perkins III), and 2006 (Perkins IV), with the last implementing three major revisions: using the term “Career and Technical Education” instead of “Vocational Education,” maintaining the Tech Prep program as a separate federal funding stream within the legislation, maintaining state administrative funding at 5 percent of a state’s allocation. The new law also includes new requirements for “programs of study” that link academic and technical content across secondary and postsecondary education, and strengthened local accountability provisions that will ensure continuous program improvement. Currently, the Perkins Act provides almost $1.3 billion in federal support for career and technical education programs in all 50 States (Carl D. Perkins Vocational and Technical Education Act, 2009).
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