The Blumenfeld Education Letter

"My People Are Destroyed For Lack Of Knowledge" HOSEA 4:6

Vol. 8, No. 11 (Letter 87) EDITOR: Samuel L. Blumenfeld November 1993

The purpose of this newsletter is to provide knowledge for parents and educators who want to save the children of America from the destructive forces that endanger them. Our children in the public schools are at grave risk in 4 ways: academically, spiritually, morally, and physically — and only a well-informed public will be able to reduce these risks. "Without vision, the people perish."

Debunking Whole-Language Myths About New Zealand

Whenever whole-language advocates are asked where whole language has been used successfully and produced wonderful results among children, they invariably cite New Zealand, that legendary welfare paradise in the South Pacific. For example, Marie Carbo, in her attempt to discredit Prof. Jeanne Chall's pro-phonics book, *Learning to Read: The Great Debate*, in an article entitled "Debunking the Great Phonics Myth," (*Phi Delta Kappan*, Nov. 1988), wrote:

> Currently, the U.S. ranks a dismal 49th in literacy out of 159 members of the United Nations. The country that ranks first, New Zealand, teaches reading through the whole-language approach, which integrates literature, story writing, and the arts—and also incorporates some phonics, when needed.
>
> By contrast, phonics has been emphasized in many American classrooms for the past 20 years. . . . If phonics is so effective and so much of it has been taught for the past 20 years, one might reasonably ask why the U.S. ranks 49th in literacy.

It's amazing how ignorant a professor of education can be when it comes to teaching reading. First, what Ms. Carbo fails to acknowledge is that phonics taught within the context of a look-say or whole-word reading program is practically useless, because children who develop a holistic reflex acquire a block against seeing words phonetically. They can only use their phonetic knowledge if they make a conscious effort to do so, and sight readers usually don't. Second, phonics in whole-language is taught as phonetic clues, as one of the many strategies used in whole-word or sight reading, and it is taught only "when needed." Children are encouraged to guess the word rather than sound it out, and a good guess, even if phonetically incorrect, is considered preferable if it relates to the "meaning" of the text. For example, the authors of *Evaluation: Whole Language, Whole Child* (Scholastic, 1988) write (p. 19):

> The way you interpret what the child does will reflect what you understand reading to be. For instance, if she reads the word *feather* for *father*, a phonics-oriented teacher might be pleased because she's come close to sounding the word out. However, if you believe reading is a meaning-seeking process, you may be concerned that she's overly dependent on phonics at the expense of meaning. You'd be happier with a miscue such as *daddy*, even though it doesn't look or sound anything like the word in the text. At least the meaning would be intact.

In other words, children are taught that phonics is less useful than guessing in trying

The Blumenfeld Education Letter is published monthly. Sources of products and services described are not necessarily endorsed by this publication. They are intended to provide our readers with information on a rapidly expanding field of educational activity. Subscription Rate: 1 year $36.00. Address: Post Office Box 45161, Boise, Idaho 83711. Phone (208) 322-4440.

to figure out a new word.

Third, whatever phonics is taught in a whole-word or whole-language program is taught in a fragmentary, piecemeal way right up to the sixth grade so that the student never does get the opportunity to understand the alphabetic system as a system or develop the needed phonetic reflex.

As for New Zealand's alleged high rank on the literacy scale, a well-researched, revealing article in the June 1993 issue of *North and South*, a prestigious magazine published in New Zealand, demolished that myth once and for all. The article, "Our Illiteracy: Reading the Writing on the Wall" by Jenny Chamberlain, states:

> It's a phrase heard so often it now passes for fact--that New Zealand is a "highly literate" nation. . . . It's a comfortable thought—a nation of 3.4 million people who rate among the world's most proficient readers and writers. . . . So it seems churlish, unpatriotic even to reintroduce an offensive term into the vocabulary. The word is illiterate and contrary to popular belief that's what we are becoming.
>
> It's almost as though we've made a national pact with each other to ignore our illiteracy. We want to believe that we're a nation of bookworms, so we disregard the signs that it's there among our very young, our adults, our unemployed and in the workforce—a ball and chain dragging down the performance of a nation. . . .
>
> A national survey, along the lines of those conducted in Britain (1987), Canada (1987) and Australia (1989), has never been done in New Zealand, though ARLA, the Adult Reading and Learning Assistance Federation, is currently pressing hard for one. Information on illiteracy is gathered piecemeal by interested groups but nobody puts it all together to make a picture—if they did it would be composed of facts like these:
>
> Despite the enormous emphasis placed on reading in primary schools our current teaching method fails 25 per cent of new entrants. One in four six-year-olds requires remedial help after one year at school. A recent ARLA survey on workplace literacy reveals between 20 and 22 per cent of the New Zealand workforce are not coping well with the literacy demands of employment.
>
> In 1987 a Justice Department survey of 19 prisons showed that 47.8 per cent of inmates had reading ages of less than 10 years.
>
> In 1992 a staggering 17,000 young people (one third of school leavers) went straight from school onto unemployment benefit with no post-secondary education—a national tragedy.
>
> No one is monitoring the number of adolescents who slide through secondary education and leave school unable to read and write adequately, yet our polytechnics and universities are now having to redirect funding into basic literacy and numeracy tuition in learning-support units. Most units report that numbers of students requiring this help are increasing.
>
> People in the employment industry increasingly despair of the illiteracy of the young people they try to match with the positions employers offer. Says Kathy Kostyrko, president of the 75-agency National Association of Personnel consultancies: "Young people coming out of school can't spell, can't write and can't think for themselves. We put them through our tests and they don't get a look in the door. Everyone in industry feels the same."
>
> New Zealand's illiteracy is a huge national problem bubbling away under the lid of our complacency, a problem we mistakenly believe we can ignore but which is about to boil up and burn us any moment.

So if New Zealand has a "huge" reading problem virtually as bad as ours, where do the whole-language people get this idea that New Zealand is the utopia of literacy? Chamberlain explains:

> In part our reputation is based on a 1970 international reading survey of 15 countries in which our 14 and 18-year-olds ranked top. But this survey is now very out of date.

In other words, Ms. Carbo is using 1970 data to argue against the teaching of phonics when it was probably phonics which permitted those 14 and 18-year-old New Zealanders to become the good readers they were.

The Reading War in New Zealand

It is the introduction of whole language into the schools of New Zealand which has brought about the present literacy crisis in that country. Chamberlain writes:

There is a reading war going on in this country being waged between, on the one hand, teachers and Reading Recovery teachers who use the contextual or "whole language" approach (the way most of our primary school children learn to read) and, on the other, by the phonics faction. The latter are led by a small group of reading experts who dare to challenge the whole-language devotees and say that young children would catch on to literacy earlier if contextual teaching were balanced by teaching the old ABC way--sounding out the letters and letter clusters so that young readers have the code which helps them unlock words for themselves.

The whole-language method (whereby children are immersed in books and the experience of reading and infer the letter-sound rules by which language is constructed rather than sound them out in a formal way) gradually took hold in the New Zealand education system from the 1970s and was part of the holistic and progressive education policy adopted at the time.

The Reading Recovery scheme, also whole-language based, is nationally coordinated from well-appointed headquarters at the Auckland College of Education. Devised by renowned reading expert Marie Clay in the early 70s, it's the jewel in the ACOE crown and the tutors (currently 35 of them) who go on to teach Reading Recovery teachers are trained here. The Reading Recovery scheme is implemented in 61 per cent of state schools with six-year-olds and costs the country $10.4 million annually.

It has brought New Zealand and in particular the Auckland College of Education a great deal of attention and international kudos over the last few years. The scheme was exported to Ohio in 1984, adopted in Surrey, Britain, in 1990 and in September 1992 was being trialled in 20 London education authority areas. Hundreds of American teachers visit the college each year to learn about it and we train overseas Reading Recovery tutors here.

"But I don't think we do as good a job in the first years of school as we could," says Auckland University education lecturer Tom Nicholson. "New Zealand is keeping a top place in international surveys but only by having a huge ambulance at the bottom of the cliff in the form of Reading Recovery. Twenty-five per cent of six-year-olds go through Reading Recovery and if there was 100 per cent coverage that percentage would be higher. . . .

William Turnner, Massey University professor of education, believes that increasing the phonics content of lessons would reduce time spent in Reading Recovery by 33 per cent. A study done in the state of Rhode Island in 1990/91 by Massey doctoral student Sandra Iversen, a Reading Recovery tutor employed by Rhode Island to implement Clay's reading programme there, showed that the time spent in Reading Recovery by students could be reduced by almost 40 per cent by increasing the phonics content of the lessons.

Claire Aumonier, Home Schooling Association national counsellor (an estimated 3000 New Zealand children are currently being schooled at home), says that children she sees, most of whom are very bright, come out of school with an anxiety about learning to read: "Because it's contextual they don't see and feel themselves learning and they feel insecure about the process. They then attach the insecurity to other subject areas. My way of teaching reading is steeped in phonics. It makes them secure and gives the tools to create words. They know why cat is cat and that's why they can read catastrophe." Aumonier says it takes her three months to teach a child who can't even read "in" or "on" to read fluently and that it is an "absolutely fascinating process which they just love". . . .

It's hard to avoid the conclusion that New Zealand's reputation for being a world leader in reading really rests on a now superceded 23-year-old survey and superb marketing. . . .

Cashing In On the Myth

With American educators embarking by the planeload on whole-language pilgrimages to Auckland, some enterprising New Zealanders were bound to see "gold in them thar suitcases." Chamberlain tells us about one entrepreneur who has made a fortune selling whole-language materials to Americans. She writes:

Wendy Pye, of Wendy Pye Enterprises, is New Zealand's major children's book exporter. The readers (first reading books) and television programmes produced by her company are based on the New Zealand whole-language reading method—the foundation of Clay's Reading Recovery system which has been described by Pye's editorial and educational director Brian Cutting as "really hot property in the US". New Zealand's credibility in the reading field gives Pye's readers ready acceptance in the United States. Cutting, before he was recruited by Pye, was a senior lecturer at the Auckland College of Education.

The leading whole-language guru in

New Zealand is John McCaffery, senior lecturer in reading and language at the Auckland College of Education. According to McCaffery, literacy is:

> a social, cultural, political process which is contextually bound. We now know there is no such thing as universal literacy. You can no longer prepare people to go out into the world as fully functional literate people. Our definition of what literacy is is keeping up with changes in society and being in a position to prepare children for them. What we now understand is that there is no such thing as literacy. There are a whole lot of literacies that are valued by people. The forms are specific to occupations and levels.

That sounds a lot like what is being prepared for American children in Outcome-Based Education: functional literacy for a specific occupation but not for the lifelong enjoyment of books or as a means of access to the wisdom of mankind. Functional literacy ignores the written word's spiritual dimension and reduces man to a functioning machine, trained as a "worker," and brainwashed to accept his or her status in the new pyramidal hierarchy of the New World Order ruled by the universitarian elite. Mr. McCaffery's definition of literacy agrees very nicely with what Harvard professor Anthony Oettinger told a group of Telecom executives in 1981:

> The present "traditional" concept of literacy has to do with the ability to read and write. But the real question that confronts us today is: How do we help citizens function well in their society? How can they acquire the skills necessary to solve their problems? Do we really want to teach people to do a lot of sums or write in "a fine round hand" when they have a five-dollar handheld calculator or a word processor to work with? Or do we really have to have everybody literate--writing and reading in the traditional sense—when we have the means through our technology to achieve a new flowering of oral communication? It is the traditional idea that says certain forms of communication, such as comic books, are "bad." But in the modern context of functionalism they may not be all that bad.

Thus our top educators and academicians now believe that our public schools should abandon imparting traditional high literacy in favor of a stunted, comic-book form of literacy which enables individuals to "function" in society, as a cog in the machine. And that's what whole-language is calculated to do: dumb-down the general public so that it becomes manipulable by the ruling elite. Literacy researcher T. G. Sticht, who now works for Labor Secretary Robert Reich, clearly expressed this view in 1987 when he said:

> Many companies have moved operations to places with cheap, relatively poorly educated labor. What may be crucial, they say, is the dependability of a labor force and how well it can be managed and trained--not its general educational level, although a small cadre of highly educated creative people is essential to innovation and growth. Ending discrimination and changing values are probably more important than reading and moving low-income families into the middle class.

In other words, the idea of universal literacy, that is, literacy for the heart and mind, literacy that nourishes the soul, is now passé as far as the public educators are concerned. If you want your child to acquire that kind of literacy, that lifelong love of books, that love affair with the written word, you will have to impart it at home or enroll your child in a private school that also believes in that traditional kind of literacy.

These days, children probably learn more phonics at home than they do at school. In fact, one whole-language teacher by the name of Martha A. Bergstresser Ramos recently complained about that in an article entitled "Sounding off on 'sound it out.'" She wrote:

> Reading anthologies nowadays reflect current reading research and have teacher instructions that include encouraging students to integrate picture, context, and graphophonemic cues. It seems appar-

ent that for at least 20 years the words "sound it out" have not been presented as a technique for teachers to learn and use—yet the phrase lives on.

Last year I had an enlightening experience with a first-grade Reading Recovery student. For weeks I had been modeling word identification strategies. I asked him, "Did you get your mouth ready and think what would make sense? Have you checked the picture? Did you check to see if it looks right? What do you see about this word that you already know?" And yet, when I asked him, "What can *you* do to figure out the word?" he always answered, "Sound it out!"

One day, in desperation, I asked him, "Who *tells* you to sound it out?"

"My dad," he said.

I should have known. We are not our students' first or only teachers, and this is one reason that the phrase lives on from generation to generation. . . .

[W]e must enlist parents as our teaching allies. We do not want the techniques parents use to help their children read to conflict with the reading strategies we are teaching at school. To ensure that parents are helping rather than hindering may require extra parent meetings, seminars, training sessions, and informational bulletins sent home. . . .

We may never be able to discover when people started saying "Sound it out." Some teachers may even choose to continue asking children to sound things out.

I believe, however, that this phrase has outlived its usefulness, and perhaps we should all begin to say "*Think* it out" instead. Then we must give children all the strategies and tools they need for applying their thinking skills to the task of reading.

Ms. Ramos, who is a reading specialist for the Northside Independent School District in San Antonio, Texas, has performed a most useful service. She has provided the best evidence from an educator that the schools are now doing everything in their power to make sure that children do not develop the needed phonetic reflex and, instead, are forced to look at our written and printed language as an ideographic system, to be "thought out" rather than sounded out. What she fails to understand is that ours is an alphabetic reading and writing system, and that the only way anyone can become proficient in using it is to develop the needed phonetic reflex. Without it, one becomes a crippled, handicapped reader unable to use our alphabetic system as it was designed to be used.

Britain's Secret Education Establishment Fights Conservative Reforms

The following is from the *Sunday Telegraph* (London), June 27, 1993:

Ministers are to be asked to bar civil servants from attending secretive meetings with senior educationists who are accused of undermining John Patten's school reforms.

The chairman of the Conservative back-bench education committee is to write to Mr Patten, the Education Secretary, to demand action on the All Souls Group, whose members include a number of top-ranking officials and which meets three times a year in Oxford.

Senior figures in the Prime Minister's Downing Street policy unit are said to be deeply concerned about the activities of the organisation, which lists among its members the permanent secretary at the Department for Education, Sir Geoffrey Holland.

Its convenor is Nick Stuart, who was deputy secretary at the department until last year and who has now been moved to the Department of Employment. . . .

Regular attenders include the chief inspector for primary schools, Jim Rose, and the chief inspector of further education colleges, Terry Melia, a former senior chief inspector of schools. . . .

Meetings take place under Chatham House Rules, which ban those who attend from talking about what they have seen or heard. No records or minutes are kept, and the membership, which is by invitation only, has never before been published. . . .

Sir Rhodes Boyson, an education minister under Margaret Thatcher, said it represented the forces which were working against the Government's aims on education. "These are meetings of the counter-revolution," he said.

Sheila Lawlor, deputy director of the Centre for Policy Studies, said that Conservative education reforms were being subverted by the educational establishment. "The spirit of reform has been undermined at each stage. But this is a very powerful world, and if these people didn't meet in Oxford they would still

find ways of watering down Government policy," she said.

A second article in the same newspaper states:

John Patten wasn't there. Neither was any other government minister. But a lot of men and women who matter in education were. This was the shadowy "education Establishment" holding one of its clandestine thrice-yearly meetings, gathering in an oak-panelled Oxford room.

Under the auspices of the All Souls Group, some of the most powerful people in the world of education meet to exchange views on the issues of the moment.

Many believe it is here, rather than at the Department for Education, that crucial questions about schools are raised. One member, who did not want to be named, said that the group had caused frustration to successive Education Secretaries.

"One of the reasons why Margaret Thatcher got so infuriated with the educational establishment was that it seemed to have a private core which she couldn't get her teeth into, and half her civil servants seems to be involved," he said.

Anyone who discloses details of who was present or what was said risks being black-balled. No minutes are kept, no papers or public statements ever emerge, and the membership list has never before been published. It includes many top civil servants and leading members of Government education quangos.

Over Saturday evening sherry in the gardens of Rhodes House, Oxford, and later over dinner, the great and the good speak frankly together about government policy---and they rarely have anything complimentary to say.

They are protected by Chatham House Rules, which dictate proceedings are off the record. Those who do not share the group's Left-wing views are occasionally invited to speak, but rarely receive a sympathetic hearing.

Each member is free to bring a guest, and the result is a volatile mixture of the most powerful and the most radical in today's educational world. . . .

The All Souls Group was founded in 1941 by a friend of Rab Butler, then education minister, and was credited with having a major influence on the writing of the 1944 Education Act.

Since those days, the political pendulum has swung from the Left, but in the group little has changed. . . .

Membership is by invitation and the criteria are shrouded in mystery. Names are put forward by members, and after they have attended a meeting a decision is made on whether they have anything to contribute. . . .There are about 50 active members and, once in, few leave.

Comment: Does such a secret education establishment exist in the United States? Undoubtedly it does among the top foundation heads, top professors of education, and top educational operatives in the state and federal governments. They are the ones who decide on policy and coordinate its implementation throughout the United States. Otherwise, how explain the implementation of Outcome-Based Education in state after state as if orchestrated by a central control? How explain the widespread use of whole language in teaching reading when we know that it produces crippled readers? How explain this orchestrated hostility against intensive phonics among educators?

As for the actual formation of an education establishment in the U.S., it seems to have started with a confidential meeting called the Cleveland Conference organized in 1915 by Prof. Charles Judd, head of the University of Chicago School of Education. Judd, who got his Ph.D at Leipzig under Prof. Wilhelm Wundt, was spearheading the movement to reform education in the psycho-progressive mold. David Tyack writes in his book *Managers of Virtue* (p. 132):

[Judd] had a vision that both the structure of the schools and the curriculum needed radical revision, but that change would take place "in the haphazard fashion that has characterized our school history unless some group gets together and undertakes, in a cooperative way, to coordinate reforms."

Judd urged the members of the Cleveland Conference to jump into the breach and undertake "the positive and aggressive task of . . . a detailed reorganization of the materials of instruction in schools of all grades." One of the most important reforms promoted by Judd was in the teaching of reading. It

was his protégé William Scott Gray who produced the Dick and Jane look-say reading program that began America's downward slide into illiteracy.

Among the 19 members who attended the first Cleveland Conference were James R. Angell, a Leipzig alumnus who became president of the University of Chicago and later president of Yale; Leonard Ayres, director of the Russell Sage Foundation; Abraham Flexner of the Rockefeller Foundation; Paul Hanus, director of the Harvard Graduate School of Education; Paul Monroe, founder of the World Federation of Education Associations; Edward L. Thorndike, father of educational psychology at Teachers College, Columbia University; and Ellwood P. Cubberly of Stanford University's School of Education.

Among others who joined in later years were Lyman Bryson of CBS, John Gardner of the Carnegie Corporation, James Bryant Conant of Harvard, and Ralph Tyler of Stanford whose pioneering work in psychological testing helped Benjamin Bloom design Outcome-Based Education. David Tyack writes (p. 132):

> Having no constitution, no minutes, no officers save a "factotum," no bylaws, no "public life," the conference was described in 1949 as a club whose "sole obejct is to make it possible for forty or fifty men to meet once a year and talk about whatever they are interested in for ten or a dozen hours in session and an unpredictable number of hours in lobbies or bedrooms." Members had a chance to "learn about the news behind the news," to get to know leaders in a variety of fields, to share information about new educational programs or jobs or foundation grants or new government programs or regulations. When the Commonwealth Fund decided to give large sums for educational research, for example, its officer Max Farrand outlined the funding program to conference members first.

And now you know why the education establishement is so unresponsive to parental wishes and why the only educational alternatives for parents is to get their children out of the government schools and into homeschooling or a decent private school.

Incidentally, the Chatham House Rules mentioned in the *Sunday Telegraph*, which means that all conference proceedings are off the record, refers to Chatham House, the home of the Royal Institute of International Affairs (RIIA), the British counterpart of our Council on Foreign Relations (CFR). And Oxford, where the All Souls Group meets, is also where Bill Clinton studied on his Rhodes Scholarship. The scholarships were founded by Cecil Rhodes, who made his fortune in gold and diamond mining in South Africa in the 1880s and formed a secret society in 1891 with an elite membership to promote the interests of the British Empire.

Professor Carol Quigley, Bill Clinton's mentor at Georgetown University, wrote a book about the secret society entitled *The Anglo-American Establishment*. Quigley wrote:

> The Rhodes Scholarships, established by the terms of Cecil Rhodes's seventh will, are known to everyone. What is not so widely known is that Rhodes in five previous wills left his fortune to form a secret society, which was to devote itself to the preservation and expansion of the British Empire. And what does not seem to be known to anyone is that this secret society was created by Rhodes and his principal trustee, Lord Milner, and continues to this day. . . .
>
> This society has been known at various times as Milner's Kindergarten, as the Round Table Group, as the Rhodes crowd, as *The Times* crowd, as the All Souls group, and as the Cliveden set. (p. ix)
>
> The scholarships were merely a facade to conceal the secret society, or, more accurately, they were to be one of the instruments by which the members of the secret society could carry out his purpose. (p. 33)

The group obviously failed in its mission to preserve the British Empire, but the Rhodes Scholarships continue to be awarded. Rhodes died in 1902, and the country of Rhodesia, which was named after him, has become Zimbabwe. Are the Rhodes Scholarships now being used to recruit the future

leaders of the New World Order? It seems that way, doesn't it?

Vital Reading

Ed School Follies: The Miseducation of America's Teachers by Rita Kramer (The Free Press, 228 pages, $22.95)

Reviewed by Edward Rauchut

"The worst of the ed schools are certificate mills where the minimally qualified instruct the barely literate in a parody of learning," and the rest are not much better, Rita Kramer writes in her most recent book, *Ed School Follies: The Miseducation of America's Teachers*. No book in recent memory provides a more comprehensive report on teachers and the schools that train them.

Ms. Kramer visited education schools across the country, interviewed professors and students, sat in on classes and asked some fundamental questions: Why did you decide to become a teacher? What are schools for? What is the teacher's function?

The answers she received reveal a depressing consensus. "Nowhere in America today," Ms. Kramer writes, "is intellectual life deader than in our schools, unless it is in our schools of education."

The education majors Ms. Kramer observed were clearly in over their heads. An education professor at the State University of New York told her: "We can't presume our students know anything."

Another, at Eastern Michigan University, said: "Young teachers today are just not well educated enough to do the job we're asking of them. . . . They're ignorant, naive, they have low abilities. Let's face it, education is what you go into if you can't get into anything else."

A professor of education at Texas Southern University made a similar point: "The problem is that our teachers don't know enough math and science to teach it to their pupils. They themselves are the products of the system that requires little of its high school graduates and little more of its baccalaureates."

What, then, can these education majors teach? Certainly not subject matter. As one student at the State University of New York put it: "Liberal arts is not what we're interested in. Here you want to start learning about your life. . . . We've been doing liberal arts all our lives in school. Now I want to learn about teaching little children."

A professor of education at Peabody College, on the campus of Nashville's Vanderbilt University, told his class to teach social studies: "As long as it's not just facts, dates. As long as it's dealing with concepts. How nations do problem solving." The dean of education at Peabody said that "what you need to teach is not history of literature, but how to think."

But at the present time, as Ms. Kramer writes, "knowledge—real knowledge in the form of facts, not thinking skills or feelings of self-worth—is about the least concern of the professional education industry. . . . As though anything really creative could go on in an empty head. But what choice is there when teachers themselves don't know beans about anything?"

So what the prospective teachers end up learning, and ultimately teaching, is a political agenda consisting of sentiment and leveling equality.

"All in all, Ms. Kramer writes, because "what matters is not whether or not anyone has learned anything, but that no one fails to pass, the threshold is lowered as required for almost anyone to get by. . . . Meanwhile, any criticism of this state of affairs is met with the charge of elitism, or, worse still, racism."

(Edward Rauchut is an associate professor in the school of professional studies at Bellevue College, Omaha, Nebraska.)