

Introduction

Dr. Michael Bronner, the third of the “next four” at New York University, was born and raised in California and completed his professional education through his MA degree, all in Business Education, at San Jose State College under the direction and guidance of his mentor, Alvin C. Beckett, himself a doctoral recipient in Business Education at New York University in 1955. Michael’s teaching began in 1958 with the East Side High School District in San Jose, CA, at Samuel Ayer, Andrew Hill, James Lick, William Overfelt, and Oak Grove high schools where he served for a decade, moving to become the Business Department Chairman at Overfelt and Oak Grove and opening both of these two new schools in the rapidly expanding Santa Clara Valley (Silicon Valley) in San Jose. Throughout this period his teaching included all of the then-traditional business courses ranging from accounting to general business to secretarial practice to marketing and to typing and shorthand. As with many business teachers of the time, he also taught Adult Education evening courses in the San Jose Unified District and at San Jose Community College.

It was during the early part of this decade—in the early 1960s—that Michael’s work with the California Business Education Association’s Bay Section as the newsletter editor and later Section officer, and the Santa Clara County Office of Education, along with some innovative teaching reviews, drew the attention of the California Banker’s Association (CBA). He was asked to develop a teaching unit for General Business on banking fundamentals. This original and small unit encouraged the CBA to press for a large-scale inclusion of more instructional materials until the How and Why of Banking was born. This teaching unit, which was completed in 1963, covered three weeks of instruction and included a detailed instructor’s guide, lesson plans, transparency masters and binder, student practice sets, a dozen large wall charts, four film strips, and evaluation materials, all housed in a three-foot tall, 18-inch square professional container. Through the generous financial support of the CBA and the encouragement of the California County Boards of Education, the teaching unit was supplied to every high school Business Education Department in the State.

Michael Bronner 2015

Following that successful enterprise he was then tapped to provide consulting and contact services for the development of the Career Banking Counseling Unit, also provided to every California high school counseling office, showing the myriad of career options open within the banking and financial industry for high school and community college graduates.

These projects were extremely successful and were honored with a Freedom Foundation Award from Washington, D.C. in 1963.

Based on his work with the CBA, CBEA, and his creative teaching methods—especially in bookkeeping and accounting—the Gregg Division of the McGraw-Hill Book Company in New York City invited Michael to join eight other educators throughout the U.S. to serve as ‘Field Editors’ for their newly-developed Accounting 10/12 text in 1966. For the next two years in addition to his Department Chairman role, his day/evening teaching, and his professional responsibilities, he traveled throughout California and the West presenting new concepts in accounting instruction to business teachers, administrators, and professional organizations as well as to business groups and career counselors.

In 1968 McGraw-Hill’s Gregg Division asked him to join their Business Education Publishing Group in New York as a Sponsoring Editor on the Accounting Education Team, responsible for authorship contacts and contracts, manuscript development, publication of texts along with a raft of supporting materials. From 1968 to 1970, he was responsible for supporting over a dozen major published Gregg products, including the unique 57-piece accounting project, which became a major success for the Division as well as a second-year accounting text for the same area. He also helped develop business law manuscripts, clerical simulation projects, and office machine texts. He gave numerous presentations to local, regional, and national business education conferences while publishing many articles for business teachers throughout the country.

In 1970, after exactly ‘a year to learn and a year to return the investment,’ he was asked by one of his Gregg author contacts, Dr. Karen Gillespie, to join her at NYU to handle the Department’s
Michael Bronner 2015

BA and MA Business Education Program, coordinate and supervise student teachers, and serve as the advisor to the Program's undergraduate organization. Karen knew that he wanted to return to California to work for a doctorate and she 'made him an offer he couldn't refuse' with a salaried faculty tenure-track appointment, assisted faculty housing, tuition remission for his required courses, and a free hand in teaching at both the BA and MA levels. He did not refuse Karen's offer, obviously, and finished his PhD in 37 months with her support and the encouragement of his new-found NYU colleagues.

From 1970 to 2007 he has taught and advised—at all levels,—undergraduate, Masters, certificate, and doctoral students in over 200 courses with more than 4,000 students. Since he was teaching in NYU's Business Education curriculum, he thought it only prudent to add to his California administration/supervision credentials by acquiring NYC licenses in Basic Business, Accounting and in Typewriting. And to keep current with the business world, he consulted frequently with Olsten and Manpower agencies, Aeolian and Chickering Pianos, and both State and City funded employee outreach programs. One of his instructional highlights involved teaching in NYU's graduate program in San Juan, Puerto Rico from 1971 to 1992. These alternate weekend experiences, every other semester, and his four-week summer programs for Business Education over this 21-year period were exciting additions to his New York City activities. He says that "I outlasted five airlines" during this period, the last three years of which he served as the Director of the Puerto Rico Residence Center, successfully closing the NYU Center in 1992.

We now turn to Dr. Bronner's authorship and writings over his lengthy career.

Acknowledgement is sincerely offered to Dr. Burt Kaliski—also with an NYU Business Education doctorate—for his work reviewing and commenting and critiquing these works. A major debt of gratitude is due him for his professional and personal efforts throughout this lengthy process. Unfortunately, and sadly, Dr. Kaliski passed away June 16, 2015, seeing only half of this project completed.

Michael Bronner 2015

In the following sections, italics reflect Burt's remarks and comments, and standard type, flush left, indicate the publication content. Michael's commentary is in standard type, usually indented.

Authorship Contributions

Unlike other business educators with an extensive resume of writings and publications, Dr. Michael Bronner began this phase of his career at a young age, well prior to his doctoral work at NYU. The first article that he was a part of was written in 1961 as one of a four-person team and presented a very clear plan of how to carry out a team teaching effort at the high school level. Interestingly, his writing style, while it matured over the years, showed germs of his later publications. The topic chosen also foreshadowed his willingness to continuously try new ideas throughout his professional career. Excerpts from this article follow.

How effective is team teaching in general business? Here's a story of how it worked at Andrew Hill High School in San Jose, California, where a process of team teaching in general business was instituted during the 1960-61 school year.

In team teaching, two or more credentialed teachers take joint responsibility for planning, teaching, and evaluating one class. It usually involves the use of secretarial help, two or more smaller classes scheduled together as one large class and a free period scheduled for team planning.

(with Gerald W. Maxwell, Cliff Leschinsky, and Katherine Warner, "Team Teaching in General Business," Business Education World, 42:4, December, 1961, 7.)

To begin preparations for the team-teaching experience, a summer planning workshop was held under the direction of Dr. Gerald W. Maxwell of San Jose State College. It was attended by the team-teachers-to-be as well as by other business teachers in the school district.

Michael Bronner 2015

To supplement the experience the team teachers gained on the job, an intensive investigation into background information on team teaching was conducted by [graduate student] Katherine Warner.

The general business team at Andrew Hill High School consisted of two regularly credentialed business teachers, Michael Bronner and Cliff Leschinsky, and a secretarial paraprofessional, James Armstrong.

Messrs. Bronner and Leschinsky worked as “equals.” . . . Bronner took the lead in six units of the General Business course and Leschinsky played the top role in the remaining six. Both teachers, however, contributed to the planning and teaching of each unit.

(Op. cit., 7-8.)

The article goes on to discuss the mechanics of the team taught classes, as well as lesson planning, cost considerations, teaching techniques, grading, and the advantages and disadvantages of team teaching for the teachers, the students, and the administration. It concludes with the following thoughts about the future of team teaching.

Only time can tell the extent to which team teaching will be used in the future. Certainly some solution is needed to the problem of too many students and too few schools—and it may very well be that team teaching will play a prominent role in the solution to this problem.

Certainly more testing and experimentation is needed to determine whether team-taught classes produce the best over-all results for students. We need to learn how team-taught students in large classes can be assured of adequate individual attention, and we need to continue development of team-teaching methods and techniques.

The value accruing from any team teaching will vary in direct ratio to the thought and preparation that go into the organization and execution of the program. A school should not rush into team teaching without proper forethought and planning merely in an effort to be “up to

date.” Administrators should note carefully the strong points and the potential pitfalls of other team studies and experiences.

As Michael stated, “At this early stage of team teaching, we’re driving a car with 350 horsepower at a speed of 20 miles per hour down an open highway; it sure beats walking, and it’s faster than riding a bike, but we’ve got a long way to go in order to meet its full potential!”

(Op. cit., 31.)

Michael’s next published effort was done in coordination with the California Bankers Association (CBA). As mentioned previously, he was the chair of the Business Education Department at William C. Overfelt High School in San Jose, CA, and he worked with the CBA to develop a set of materials that could be used to explain to students how the banking system worked. The introduction to the project, was called “The Idea Behind This Series. . .” and follows.

. . . is to show you the HOW and WHY of Banking. Not long ago, this subject was of little concern to the average citizen. Bank services were limited to decision-makers in business and government. But such changes have taken place over the past half century that the average citizen has become the prime decision-maker.

Our economy is now geared to a mass market, which includes practically all Americans. Its ebb and flow are decided by the average citizen. WHAT he buys, WHEN he buys, how much he SAVES, how much he BORROWS sets the trend of our economy.

His savings have become a prime source of credit. His borrowing has grown to such proportions that he has become a prime consumer of credit. Money is the fuel which speeds up or slows down our economy. The average citizen has become its major supplier and consumer.

It is time, therefore, that our citizens become fully aware of the close relation between their day-to-day living and our banking system.

Michael Bronner 2015

The purpose of this series is to help you realize the important role banking will play in your life, and to prepare you for the day, soon to come, when you will become directly involved with your particular bank.

(“A Teaching Guide for The How and Why of Banking,” California Bankers Association. 1963, 2.)

While subsequent iterations of the CBA unit were produced, Michael’s later role shifted to that of a curriculum consultant rather than continue as the primary author. Few additional publications of this Association thus appear as part of his bibliography. For example, there was a 1967 publication titled “Careers in Banking” to which he provided significant content, but received no writing credit.

During his remaining years as a secondary school business teacher and department head, he became very involved in business education in California professionally. While he contributed a wide variety of pieces to newsletters and local publications such as the California Business Education (Bay Section) Newsletters, the San Jose Junior Chamber of Commerce, and Phi Delta Kappa regional publications, his writings took a hiatus for a couple of years, resuming when he moved into his editorial role in 1968 at McGraw-Hill’s Gregg Division. Some of the articles noted in his bibliography that were written between 1969 and 1971 were in publications that are no longer available—The Balance Sheet, BEA Journal, BTA Journal, CBEA Journal, NJ BEA Observer, Revista Alpha, Sincerely Yours, and Today’s Secretary—so we move next to the publication that launched his career in business teacher education, his doctoral dissertation in 1973. An abstract of that dissertation follows.

The History of the Business Education Association of Metropolitan New York

The Problem

The purpose of this study was to record the history of one of the major professional business education organizations in the U.S., the Business Education Association of Metropolitan New York, and to list the contributions the organization has made during their 48-year history.

Procedure

The methodology employed in this study was the survey of primary and secondary sources of information, analysis of officer and member responses to an open-ended written questionnaire, and an in-depth series of interviews with former officers and current members of the Association. The historical aspects of this study were obtained through a review of minutes of meetings, original documents, yearbooks and periodicals, questionnaire results, and personal interviews. Contributions of the Association were determined through analysis of both the results of questionnaire answers and interviews.

Findings

The Business Education Association of Metropolitan New York originally began in 1926 with a series of meetings held at New York University in an attempt to unify the various segments of business education in the New York Metropolitan Area. Three existing organizations became affiliate members of the newly-formed organization: The Association of Teachers of Accounting, the Gregg Shorthand Teachers' Association, and the Pitman Shorthand Teachers' Association. As business education in the New York Metropolitan Area increased in prominence, association membership also increased, encouraged by active affiliate section meetings, semiannual conventions, yearbooks, and the efforts of business education publishers

Michael Bronner 2015

and equipment suppliers. The number of affiliated sections grew from the original three to a total of nine by 1972.

The organization was known progressively as the Commercial Education Association of New York and Vicinity, the Commercial Education Association of New York City and Vicinity, the Commercial Education Association of the City of New York and Vicinity, and the Business Education Association of Metropolitan New York.

At the Association's outset, the founders set forth nine Aims and Purposes to which every subsequent President and Executive Board has been committed. Among these, the unification of business teachers and their respective subject areas has been the major objective of the Association since its inception. That these objectives are being met is evident from the long list of contributions made by the Association indicated by the former officers and members who responded to the questionnaires and interviews.

Among the major contributions listed were: business and education interaction as evidenced through active business-education days held annually since 1959; dissemination of business information; the Association's publications, which include the Yearbook, Newsletter, and Journal; and unification of teachers through semiannual and annual conventions and subject-oriented section meetings. Curriculum development, leadership training opportunities, and the Association's various awards programs were also mentioned.

Reflections concerning the present and future roles of the Association were also sought from questionnaire and interview respondents. The present role was perceived to include the following positive reactions: the promotion of interest in the profession, the continued improvement of instruction, the continued performance of a needed service, and the updating of business education content.

The suggested future roles of the Association included the preparation of students for business; the provision of improvement of instruction; the promotion of professionalism and the

improvement of the image of business education; a greater contact with business; and the encouragement of better leadership and leadership training opportunities.

Conclusions from the Abstract

While some divergence of opinion existed relative to the effectiveness of the Business Education Association of Metropolitan New York in its present form, it is apparent from the list of contributions and personal reflections of the membership and former officers of the Association that the objectives of the organization are being met and that they are giving impetus to future growth of New York Metropolitan Area business education.

(“An Abstract of The Business Education Association of Metropolitan New York: An Investigation of its Role and Growth,” Unpublished doctoral dissertation, New York University, 1973.)

One of the many benefits of writing a good dissertation is the chance to disseminate it to others via publications and presentations. Such is the case with Dr. Bronner’s dissertation. He wrote an article on it for NBEA’s Business Education Forum in 1974 and a full chapter in the Yearbook of the Business Education Association of Metropolitan New York in 1975. The conclusions in the article are interesting and significant, expanding considerably on the conclusions from the smaller and earlier abstract.

Conclusions from the Dissertation/Yearbook Chapter

1. The Association’s original aims and purposes have been adhered to and expanded to meet changed needs thus serving as evidence of the founders’ vision and the Association’s flexibility over its 48-year history. Continued evaluation of these aims and purposes should be an ongoing activity.

Michael Bronner 2015

2. The Association has served as an effective spokesperson for business education in the New York Metropolitan Area through the work of its many committees, Executive Board actions, affiliate sections, and professional activities. The Association's relationship with the New York City Board of Education, carried out through the office of the Director of Business and Distributive Education, provided visibility of engendered support from the Board of Education.

Recent membership declines, however, suggest the need for an examination of the Association's ability to meet the objectives of the New York Metropolitan Area business education population.

3. The Association has provided opportunities for the advancement of leadership in business education through the work of its many affiliated sections, the activities of the Executive Board, and numerous opportunities for committee work. Recognition has been accorded outstanding leadership efforts.

Greater involvement of beginning business educators in the BEA's leadership process should be available. The encouragement of first- through third-year teachers should be a specific objective of the Association's long-range programs.

4. The Association has provided a forum of exchange for professional growth, personal improvement, and social interaction between teachers, administrators, and businessmen through conventions, section meetings, special conferences, and workshops.

Static Associate Membership numbers, however, suggest that an increased emphasis be placed on requiring a broader representation from the business sector to expand the liaison role that currently exists.

5. The Association has maintained its relevancy and flexibility by adapting to changing business education conditions throughout its history as evidenced by its constitutional revisions and legislative actions.

Legislation emanating from both the New York City Board of Education and the New York State Education Department also suggests that the Association might expend additional efforts to improve and maintain a dialogue with both bodies in an attempt to serve as a more influential spokesman for the local business profession.

6. The Association has widened its sphere of emphasis to encompass an expanding business education community that includes the junior high school and community college sectors as well as increased numbers of business firms.

In order to increase the participation of business educators at the junior high school, community college, and private business school levels, special interest programs should be explored. Emphasis should be directed at increasing community college participation and solving attendant articulation problems.

Continued consideration should be given to the expansion of the Association's membership with the appointment of chairmen for specific geographic areas in the New York Metropolitan Area. Greater emphasis should be given to expanding the potential membership from outside the immediate vicinity by holding sectional workshops and meetings where a concentration of those potential members exists. Student membership should be actively encouraged from each teacher-training institution within the New York Metropolitan Area.

7. The Association has contributed to the personal and professional goals of its membership by providing outlets for creative writing, opportunities for leadership, and participation in study groups.

Increased attention should be given to the Association's publication efforts. The *Yearbook*, *Newsletter*, and *Journal* should be published more frequently if finances permit. The *Newsletter* should include a broad range of topics with specific emphasis on current information and the *Journal* should stress teaching methodology.

8. The Association has continued to be concerned with specific problems affecting business education in the New York Metropolitan Area. Business education curriculum development, equipment, and methodology workshops attest to these aspects.

The improvement of the image of the Business Education Association as well as the enhancement of public relations in general is suggested. The image may be improved through the establishment of a Professional Relations Committee with specific charges that may aid in the attainment of this goal.

Renewed consideration might also be given to the advantages of professional affiliation with the National Business Education Association. At present the BEA is the only association of major size in the United States to retain an independent role.

9. The Association's urban setting offers an opportunity for the organization to concentrate its efforts on providing programs that stress the improvement of business instruction through special interest meetings, workshops, and conventions.

10. Long-range objectives of the Association suggest that the Future Planning Committee should be reactivated with the charge of developing specific goals for the Association's future.

11. The Association has no central depository for the safekeeping of important organizational materials. The establishment of a permanent center for these records should be obtained in order that records may be located and reviews of previous actions may be undertaken without undue time-consuming effort. The location acquired would also serve as a clearing house for materials and the dissemination of Association information.

The BEA, it was noted in the 1974 Yearbook, was not without its problems; however, the Association has served business education interests in the New York Metropolitan Area during its 48-year history and has made many contributions to the profession that include annual

conventions, special and official section meetings, Business-Education Days, publications of the *Yearbook*, *Newsletter*, and *Journal*, leadership training, and the Association's awards program.

Problems, however, may serve as a source of stimuli when an association is confronting difficulties; but the organization gains new vigor and a renewed dedication to the tasks ahead.

Almost a half-century of business education progress is a firm foundation upon which to continue to build and serve the New York Metropolitan Area business education community. The BEA thus looks forward to another 50 years of vitality as well as professional growth and service.

(“The Business Education Association of Metropolitan New York – Forty-Eight Years of Progress.” Chapter 17 of the 1972-1974 BEA Yearbook No. 29, New York, NY, 197, 138-141.)

Sadly, the optimistic ending of the yearbook article did not come to fruition as within two decades, for a variety of reasons, the Association declined in membership dramatically as business education courses in the Metropolitan New York Area schools contracted sharply. As of 1992, the Association, like other business education professional organizations, ceased to exist despite the efforts of many dedicated leaders. Happily, under the leadership of the NYU Business Education faculty members, the NYU programs adapted to the changing landscape and remain viable as of the date of this writing in 2015.

Michael returned to his basic business roots in a 1975 article that he partnered with his long time mentor and colleague, Dr. Alvin C. Beckett of San Jose State University. It was another creative effort, similar to that of the earlier team teaching article in the sense that it showed another way to teach a very traditional subject.

Business educators should always be alert to new methods of improving instruction. Many changes are evolutionary rather than revolutionary, and these include improved use of instructional time, better scheduling of students, and increased teacher performance through the

Michael Bronner 2015

use of new methods and materials. This is especially true in the basic business area that serves as a foundation for more advanced course work.

Results of various post-high school open admissions surveys and numerous discussions with business educators from throughout the country have underscored the need for a more effective approach to the problem of presenting basic business concepts – especially for those at the community college level. Existing programs, however, are generally structured in terms of a semester course and it is this relative inflexibility that hinders a more effective approach to the improvement of basic business education.

There is a solution to this problem that some have considered yet few have had the courage to implement – that of sub-dividing traditional business courses into MODULES! Not only is the content of many of the traditional business courses ideally suited to the module concept but the allocation of existing course credit also lends itself to a matching division. Thus, by planning modules in such a way that allows for the granting of partial credit for the completion of each module, students may transfer or withdraw at the conclusion of a module, receiving credit and a grade for work completed. Therefore, if modules are planned to stand alone, students may enter at any point in the traditional course sequence and receive the appropriate units for work accomplished.

(with Alvin C. Beckett, “Basic Business Goes “Mod,” The Journal of Business Education, 50:7, 293.)

The article goes on to give examples of how specific basic business courses can be divided into logical sections and then discusses the pros and the cons of this modular approach. The article then concludes as follows:

The module approach appears to have much to offer a business education curriculum. The salvaging of course credit, tuition, and those students destined to become “early leavers” or to the advantages of relevant instructional design, program planning, and teaching-learning

Michael Bronner 2015

methodology all bode well for a thoughtful consideration of this concept. Indeed, the module approach may provide one answer to the business educator's constant search for curriculum improvement. The module concept is evolutionary, not revolutionary.

(Op. cit., 294.)

Michael has always been active in local, state, regional, and national business education associations, holding office, serving on committees, giving presentations, and writing. The next example we see is an article written for the 1978 NBEA Yearbook. The article deals with educational evaluation. A particularly interesting section follows, one which shows his perpetual interest in the history of the business education field.

A Brief History of Business Education Evaluation

Evaluation in business education evolved from the early apprenticeship days when assessment in the form of observation occurred as the apprentice moved from rank amateur to accomplished journeyman. Evaluation of the total individual was essential as this type of training also included religious, moral, and ethical instruction in addition to appropriate skill development. One individual, the master craftsman, was responsible for all aspects of training as well as for evaluation. Then, as now, the weight of evaluation was placed largely on the product developed. If the individual performed – that is, accomplished the task assigned – he was judged accordingly.

As the world evolved into a more sophisticated state, apprenticeship training moved from this one-to-one situation and gave way to the itinerant teacher whose role was to travel from town to town, giving instruction in the art of penmanship, bookkeeping, and other related clerical skills. As the itinerant teacher's income was derived from his students, and since news did travel even in those early days, it was incumbent upon him not only to teach for the trade but also to evaluate adequately and honestly those under his instruction. Since only a few weeks were allotted for

Michael Bronner 2015

each visit, assessment was highly personal and ongoing. However, as economic growth continued and demand for trained workers expanded, the need to develop schools to train larger numbers of employees for clerical and managerial professions became apparent. One of the first of these schools was Dolber's Commercial College, founded in New York City in 1835. Others followed rapidly in the major urban centers of the day. Evaluation of the product graduated was determined by the wages one could command based upon skills developed in the particular school.

Assessment, however, was still largely informal until the Bryant-Stratton chain of business schools standardized procedures, texts, and evaluation techniques and instruments in the mid-1800's. Students who transferred from one school in the chain to another not only were guaranteed equal tuition but also equivalent placement—an advantage largely unheard of in those days.

When the typewriter became commercially successful and shorthand systems found their way into offices throughout the latter part of the nineteenth century, researchers followed with productivity standards based on output and skill measurement tasks. Syllabic intensity, standard word counts, and measures of production established by the commercial high schools of the early 1900's were based largely on the demands of local businesses who, in turn, hired the graduates. Soon businesses themselves began testing applicants on skills and, where otherwise qualified applicants were lacking, they established internal training programs based on their specific needs. Lucinda Prince, for example, initiated training for department store saleswomen in Boston as early as 1905.

Evaluation activities also flourished outside the traditional school and retail trade setting. Frederick Taylor, the "Father of Scientific Management," utilized testing procedures widely to increase output and to evaluate his employees. The famous Western Electric Hawthorne studies were outgrowths of Taylor's interest in determining specific norms and standards for employees.

Predictive instruments were introduced in the late 1920's with the subject of shorthand prognosis receiving major attention. Tests developed during the decade following have, in fact, largely withstood the test of time and are even today being used in schools throughout the nation.

Finally, as a result of the Vocational Education Act of 1963, the Amendments of 1968, and the 1976 reaffirmation of these earlier legislative actions, evaluation is a specifically mandated activity that must occur for any district utilizing VEA funds. State departments of education are responsible for assessment, but the burden of evaluation falls upon the individual school and its specific business education program. This type of program evaluation, therefore, is a continuous process and involves a scope beyond individual students or classroom achievement. Self-assessment on such a scale cannot help but bring about sweeping changes that will integrate the practices of business with the theories of the educational community.

(“A Theory of Educational Evaluation.” Chapter 16 of the 1978 National Business Education Association Yearbook No. 16, Reston, VA, 1978, 76-78.)

An article written in 1981 tackles, with strong words, the economic illiteracy of secondary school business teachers, an illiteracy a decade later, which contributed to the loss of the high school economics courses to the social studies department. Dr. Bronner did not beat around the bush at all on this one.

This is an angry article—one made so by the failure of business teachers to face squarely an issue that weakens our nation daily. This issue asks *why*, despite today's information overload, do so few individuals within our professional ranks know so little—so very little—about the basics of the business environment in which they live. We have become, for the most part, a nation of flabby business and economic illiterates—“econoliterates”—if you will. And, because of this functional illiteracy, our students graduate with little business and economic muscle tone.

Our discipline—business education—has two primary objectives: teaching for business and teaching about business. After more than 150 years of preparing students to enter the business world—and doing a fairly adequate job at that—the second objective has fallen into obscurity and neglect. Our graduates leave our secondary schools knowing so little of our business and economic system to be virtually defenseless in dealing with the realities of living in and coping with the business world.

Examples abound of high school graduates being unable to balance a checkbook (or to write a correctly drawn check for that matter), make simple travel and lodging arrangements, select an appropriate form of insurance for themselves and their property, or make arrangements for credit at a local store or for a national credit card. *Profit* is, for many, a dirty word (if we can believe the results of recent research opinion polls), and the difference between the structure of the single proprietorship, partnership, and corporation may well be written in Greek for all the good this does. Yes, this is an angry article!

Yet there may be some valid reasons for the demise of basic business and economic understandings. Increased academic requirements allow students fewer program electives, thus encouraging them to take only single-period, non-sequenced, job-entry training courses such as shorthand and typewriting (keyboarding), if they take any business courses at all. Declining enrollments force cutbacks in faculty that serve to remove the young and (more often than not) energetic new teacher to be replaced by a tenured-faculty member who may not even come from the business education ranks. Or, if not, the replacement may be a senior business teacher who has neither taught the subject matter for years nor has maintained currency with it.

(“Keeping ‘Fit’ in the Basics of Business and Economics,” Business Education Forum. Vol, 36., No. 3, December, 1981, 14.)

After suggesting solutions to and resources for these problems, he concluded the article with the following paragraph.

Mental fitness is as important as good physical health, and there is absolutely no excuse for a business/economics teacher to be intellectually flabby in this day and age. As with the novice jogger, it is better to start with a 200-yard trot than to leap into a marathon. Begin by developing your own business/economics “fitness plan” and start small . . . but start today!

(Op. cit., 17.)

Michael contributed extensively to the yearbooks of our profession. The next stop in showing his writing history is in another yearbook, albeit an unusual one. For a period of time, the National Business Education Association departed from the formal hard-cover yearbook into yearbook issues of the Business Education Forum. Next are the introductory and concluding sections of a chapter by him in the 1983 yearbook issue of the Forum: the topic of the yearbook issue is the promotion of business education, long an essential part of his character.

The purpose of this chapter is to identify and describe the wide variety of national association activities and publications which abound in the business education field and serve to promote its aims and objectives. Because of the wide scope of this approach, only those activities and publications sponsored by selected national/vocationally oriented associations will be discussed.

One of the hallmarks of any professional group is the dissemination of information by its officers and members. This dissemination may take many forms: newsletters, reports, papers, policy statements, journals, reviews, and yearbooks to name but a few. “Getting the message to the membership” has long been avowed as a primary purpose of most associations; with increased pressures competing for the attention of everyone, it is important to make these communication efforts as effective and efficient as possible in order to reach the targeted audience. Association activities such as conferences, meetings, conventions, and related gatherings enhance the face-to-face contact of members, elected officials, sponsors, supporters, and the general public, and provide excellent opportunities for exchanging information. It has become difficult, if not impossible, to identify the line separating professional efforts and lobbying activities, and this

thin line is becoming thinner each day. Professional activities, including lobbying efforts, include publications as a prime force in this information/communication process.

(“Promoting Business Education Through National Association Publications and Activities,” Chapter 9 of the 1983 Business Education Forum Yearbook Issue, Reston, VA, 1983, 40.)

The student of business education history will enjoy reading the listing of names of organizations in the field of business education in 1983. Some of these organizations still exist, though under different names, while others are gone.

This chapter has attempted to present a wide spectrum of professional associations concerned with the promotion of business education aims and objectives through their activities and publications. One cooperative promotional project, National Education for Business Week, is [currently] sponsored by 13 of these national associations, youth organizations, and content-oriented groups including the Administrative Management Society, Association of Independent Colleges and Schools, American Vocational Association, Classroom Educators of Business and Office Education, Delta Pi Epsilon, Future Business Leaders of America, National Association of Business Teacher Education, National Association of Business Education State Supervisors, National Association of Supervisors of Business Education, National Business Education Association, National Shorthand Reporters Association, Office Education Association, and Professional Secretaries International. During National Education for Business Week, members of these 13 organizations sponsor special events aimed at drawing the attention of communities across the nation to the crucial role of business education in the free enterprise system and stimulating interest among young people in vocations and careers that have promising futures in the world of business.

In addition to promoting the value of business education programs to the public, professional organizations provide a more personal opportunity for growth and advancement to individual business educators. One has only to look for the wide array of these national associations for the scope of potential involvement within our field. Membership and participation in the activities
Michael Bronner 2015

of these associations offers rewards far in excess of the dues paid and the publications received. Meeting new people at conferences and conventions and exchanging ideas, concerns, and solutions to problems is one rewarding aspect. Likewise, contributions to the many publications not only make the individual writer's ideas available to the entire profession but also enhance the communication skills of the writer. Sharing experiences is exponentially magnified when one considers the vast potential of 100,000 vocational educators in the United States alone. By joining and actively participating in organizations fostering professional and personal growth, the business educator can make a significant impact on the field as well as on public opinion.

(Op. cit, 44.)

One of Michael's major areas of service to business education at the national level was the periodic survey of National Association for Business Teacher Education (NABTE) institutions. The first of these efforts was in 1983 in which NABTE institutions for 1980-81 and 1981-82 were surveyed. Of particular note was the number of institutions surveyed in the former year--that is 286. This number is useful for comparison with numbers presented later in this chapter. The article that is referenced next gave a profile of the NABTE institutions at the time. What is presented here are the opening two paragraphs of the article.

The Problem and Its Setting

The status of business education has been a topic of study for a number of years, beginning with Kauzlarich in 1951 who studied the inception, objectives, and services to business education offered by NABTTI institutions. In recent years, however, the focus has been to identify the shifting patterns within business education with emphasis on teacher education, office administration, developing technology, and the problems of matching supply with demand.

Michael Bronner 2015

Professional activities and state and federal legislation have also received attention; however, a continuing investigation focusing on business education with respect to forming a “base line” for the identification of business *teacher* education problems and trends has been missing since . . . 1976.

The present state of flux with which business teacher education finds itself in the United States has generated cause for concern – and not without good reason. Decision making cannot take place in a vacuum, and the rapid pace of change leaves decision makers with data sadly out of date even within a short period of time. Questions concerning the supply and demand of and for business teachers at the secondary level, changing shifts of state certification or licensing, the merging with other institutional units or the elimination of business teacher education programs, and the efforts of our professional leaders need valid and current data upon which to make decisions affecting future business teacher education activities and programs. Without these data, business teacher education may not have a future!

(“The Status of Business Education in the United States,” NABTE Review, Volume 10, 1983, 34.)

The article concludes with two brief sections.

General Comments and Observations

While most of the general comments and observations have been noted in foregoing sections, one major theme permeated the responses—for both years. Those institutions that failed to adapt to the changing dynamics of technology, nontraditional student population, demand for nontraditional teachers (at the secondary level, for example), and the increased calls for teachers of adults and business training personnel have been forced to adapt under pressure. Those institutions taking the initiative and implementing plans developed through appropriate survey and forecasting methods found themselves keeping abreast of the changing market.

Summary

Other than the foregoing comment, as with the earlier study cited, no conclusions have been developed in this paper. Instead, a profile of NABTE institutions can be drawn with comparisons and implications made by the reader relative to his/her own setting.

(Op. cit., 38)

Dr. Bronner never hesitated to encourage other business educators to join him in the writing process, suggesting that this would assist in their professional development. An interesting example of this joint effort was a 1984 article that focused on high school keyboarding, an article that he wrote with a New York State secondary school business teacher.

Most of us, with more than a year of teaching beginning keyboarding under our collective belts, constantly face the frustrations caused by beginning typing students whose early skill development often results in copy containing more errors than correct words. Students frequently resort to physical attacks on the typewriter and mutterings of dire consequences because of their frustrating lack of coordination between fingers and appropriate keys. Teachers are circling endless fields of errors and attacking strikeouts, while wondering if it is all worth it.

Of course, in the long run, it all works out for most of us of course . . . with trained typists and relieved teachers. However, is this difficult and frustrating early period *really* necessary in the first place? What would happen if we taught beginning keyboarding students to use the many available correction devices as soon as the keyboard had been learned and then require their use for all work – *including timed writings* – throughout the term?

(with Roberta W. Pash, "First-Time Final" Copy: A Keyboarding Experiment," Business Education Forum, 39:3, December, 1984. 20.)

The article goes on to pose research questions centering on the effects of allowing early correction techniques on speed and accuracy of student work. Two groups were set up for the experiment: one allowed to correct and one not. Conclusions of the experiment follow.

While teaching students how to correct errors in a beginning keyboarding class may run counter to established tradition, the foregoing results in a personal keyboarding class—albeit of limited duration and with a small number of students—provide evidence that speed and accuracy achievement in the long run is not damaged and overall scores are generally higher. Student reactions lend support to this to a great extent, and the pride in submitting “first-time-final” copy cannot be overestimated. One of the most positive results of the experiment came shortly after the conclusion of the term when a former student approached the instructor with the comment “I’m using my typing skills in my new job – and learning how to correct my errors helped me get it.”

(Op. cit., 21.)

While many business teacher educators are involved in the traditional business education organizations only, such as NBEA and DPE, Michael’s reach extended beyond these into other areas. A major involvement of his professional life involved organizations encompassing office systems, notably the Office Systems Research Association—now the Organizational Systems Research Association (OSRA). He was part of the executive board of that association, including former President, and a contributor to its publications. What follows is a 1986 article with a very intriguing title, “The Sound of One Hand Clapping.” The opening and closing sections of that article follow.

The best bargain struck is when buyer and seller are mutually pleased with the results. This is equally true when business and education cooperate in bridging the gap between the

requirements of the workplace and the limitations of the classroom. When only one half of this paradigm works, it is the sound of one hand clapping!

The need for cooperation among these two domains – business and education – has long been accepted; however, little has been accomplished of any magnitude except in professions such as accounting and medicine where formal internships are required for licensing. In these professions, strong field input helps in the design of curriculum, which prepares graduates for entry-level and advanced positions. The Office Systems Research Association (OSRA) office systems curriculum reflects the first stages in joining these business and education domains.

Each of the ten courses in the OSRA curriculum was conceived, designed, and built on business/education cooperation. Members of the Curriculum Group reflected backgrounds and interests from a wide variety of business and education fields. The curriculum thus developed, therefore, reflected business-relevant content within a framework of effective instructional methodologies, all designed to produce office systems personnel with a strong balance of content and practical application.

The OSRA example, however, illustrates but a small fraction of potential business/education cooperation. Much more can and should be accomplished to return relevance to the classroom and build better bridges between these two domains. This article will attempt to suggest a number of opportunities where these bridges may be built – including advisory committees; internships for both students and instructors; resource allocations; and professional associations and student organizations.

(“Business and Education: The Sound of One Hand Clapping?,” Office Systems Research Journal, 5:1, 1986, 37-40.)

Summary

There are numerous opportunities for business and education to enhance mutual cooperation. The development of a strong and active advisory committee is one way. The creation of internships for both students and faculty provide excellent opportunities for business to get involved with education – and obtain a mutual “return on their investment.” Resource allocations of equipment and technology also offer outstanding opportunities for education to participate in up-to-date technology and, in some cases, to serve the business community as well. Finally, professional association membership from both sides of the fence offer business people and educators a “common ground” to share interests and increase dialog. In addition, student memberships in professional associations also provide excellent opportunities to encourage the learners’ career growth and development as well as to enhance their future goals and objectives within the office systems area.

In short, business and education must continue to improve their cooperative climates -- not only for their mutual self-interests – but also for the enhanced quality of the educational product. For if either fails to reach out to the other, office systems may be destined to hear “one hand clapping.”

(Op. cit., 40.)

Starting in 1987, Michael began to co-author several articles and textbooks with his NYU colleague, Dr. Bridget O’Connor. An early effort was an article about LANs.

Local Area Networks (LANs) are highly touted and promoted by their adherents—vendors and purchasers alike—as a viable concept/technique linking the many technologies of the automated office. The technology involved is important because if the office is to become an integrated system, technology such as the LAN is needed to tie together databases, provide for the sharing

of peripheral devices such as printers, and offer communication linkages for users within the system itself. The promises of LAN technology have been great.

Despite this optimism, evidence suggests that problems do exist within LAN installations, including issues relative to the lack of data security, inadequate training, malfunctioning equipment, unrealized technological expectation, and the entire spectrum of human factors – interaction, socialization, and ergonomics—to mention a few.

This article investigates specific LAN applications, users, why the organization chose to network, and perhaps most important, an assessment of the major implementation/use concerns of managers of LAN installations.

Interviews with LAN vendors, users, and office automation consultants generated a list of successful/detrimental implementation factors. A questionnaire was then drafted and reviewed by 35 members of the New York Chapter of the Association for Systems Management (ASM) and 12 members of the Office Systems Research Association (OSRA).

Two hundred individuals were sent a questionnaire that assessed their current use of LAN with forced choice items in addition to a 21-item Likert scale to ascertain the “success” of the LAN; 36 usable returns were received. The researchers selected 15 respondents for telephone interviews on human factor issues related to the study.

(with O’Connor, Bridget N., “The LAN: Is It Living Up to Expectations?,” Journal of Systems Management, Nov., 1987, 6.)

Based on the results of the questionnaires and the interviews, the following conclusions were drawn.

LANs were perceived as successful. Success, moreover, appears to have been unrelated to the type of industry; the length of time the LAN had been in operation; the number of units connected to the LAN; or the degree or extent of use of the LAN. Because of the wide variety of applications and the perceived success of the LAN regardless of the number of types of applications used, LAN implementers should not be obligated to serve any one specific purpose upon initiation of the LAN; applications will grow.

LAN technology can, indeed, do what it claims to do. The selection and implementation process, however, must be thorough to ensure the proper LAN configuration for a given organization.

The request for LAN technology initiated from microcomputer users in 28 percent of the cases suggests that end users appear to have a relatively large impact on the decision to network. All users—including LAN managers—are more concerned with what the technology can do than with what it costs.

The role of in-house and self-training for LAN users appears to be in the dominant training form. Vendors' roles appear to be diminishing. LAN use, to date, has had little impact on how professionals communicate, except that communications can be more frequent and are sometimes shorter.

LAN managers whose responses constituted the data for this investigation represent a wide spectrum of business, industrial, and educational environments. The original question – is the LAN living up to its early expectations – has been answered with a resounding “yes!” Current literature and the trade press have been exploded with LAN topics, and as more LAN applications are identified, this technology is destined to become commonplace. As with all rapidly-developing technology, what once was novel becomes standard. LANs appear to be adhering to this concept.

Michael Bronner 2015

(Op. cit., 9.)

Rather than focus on a single area of business education, Dr. Bronner wrote articles that encompassed a wide range of fields within business education. A good example of this versatility is a 1989 article on office systems.

Office systems is one of the most rapidly expanding fields of business education today. Technology announcements flood the daily papers, and even our well-prepared graduates find themselves running hard just to keep pace with these new developments. The office environment has evolved into an ergonomically designed “cost center” with career ladders and paths heretofore never considered possible. Compounding this dramatic growth, our educational system today strives to catch up with yesterday and, at the same time, wrestle with the future.

What can business teachers of office systems do to bridge the gap between existing classroom technology and the demands of today’s workplace? What resources do we have to make our tasks easier and more effective? The following five areas contain suggestions and recommendations for business educators to help them cope with the ever-increasing chasm between the classroom and the workplace. These areas – the advisory board, reference materials, continuing education, internships and externships, and research activities – are designed to help you keep current in office systems education.

(“Keeping Current in Office Systems Education,” Business Education Forum, 44:1, October, 1989, 16.)

The article then describes each of the five areas mentioned in the previous paragraph and then summarizes them as follows:

Michael Bronner 2015

Keeping current in office systems specifically and in business education in general is a never-ending task and has never been more important than it is today! Technology has become more “revolutionary” and “evolutionary,” and these dramatic changes are destined to continue into the future. The foregoing suggestions and recommendations are designed to help you—the professional business educator—keep abreast of these changes. While these suggestions and recommendations are primarily designed to help the office systems instructor, their application extends far beyond the boundaries of this specific subject area into all business education arenas and at all levels.

(Op. cit., 18.)

In 1991, Michael conducted a follow up to his 1983 study of NABTE institutions. The opening paragraphs and the conclusions drawn from this study are presented here.

Data describing the status of business education in the United States have been collected over the past decade, beginning in 1980. These data, collected from NABTE-member institutions by the NABTE Research Coordinator, have provided information concerning both qualitative and quantitative details of institutional practices, enrollments, and standards throughout the United States. Data were reported beginning with the 1980-81 academic year and annual surveys were conducted for the following six years, then on a biennial basis. Reports were included in six issues of the *NABTE Review* (Bronner, 1983; Schmidt, 1984; Schmidt, 1985; Hopkins, 1986; Hopkins, 1987; and Stocker, 1989).

The basic nature of these descriptive data has changed little over the years; however, some modifications have been made in the questions that were asked. Because of the trend away from the preparation of business teachers for the traditional secondary marketplace to the preparation

Michael Bronner 2015

of business educators for postsecondary arenas including business and corporate training, the 1989 questionnaire was modified to describe these practices. This report reflects, to some degree, a separation of traditional and nontraditional business education preparation. As such, the framework provided by Stocker (1989) will be followed to allow for direct comparisons of these data over time and credit should be accorded his previous work for its outline, structure, and detail. More discussion concerning this point will be provided later in this report.

It is hoped that the information and trends described in this article will be of use to business teacher educators in order to improve and strengthen their respective programs. The following major sections detail the procedures used to collect the 1989-90 data, the findings and analyses of these data, a discussion of the trends, issues, and problems provided by each institutional respondent, and some summarizing comments.

(“Business Education in the United States: 1989-90 NABTE Survey Results,” NABTE Review, Volume 22, 1991, 5.

There were twelve major summary comments that resulted from the data gathered in this study. They make one ponder how well these comments have held up today. The twelve, as well as a concluding paragraph, are reported next.

1. The total number of NABTE institutions continued to decline from an original mailing to 305 institutions in 1980 to 236 in 1990, a decline of 69 institutions (23 percent) over this past decade.
2. The increase in mergers of departments and programs continues to illustrate that declining numbers of students and faculty mitigate against separate programs in business teacher education.
3. The conclusion drawn from the previous study that the 5th-year certificate would likely become more important in the future has begun to surface in this study.

4. The earlier-noted shift of business teacher education programs away from colleges of business to colleges of education continues with additional shifts occurring during the period of this study.

5. As reported by Stocker (1989), the trend to the use of a state or national teacher examination continues.

6. While undergraduate, master's, 6th-year educational specialist, and doctoral enrollments continue to decline, the actual numbers graduated either increased or remained relatively constant.

7. Admissions requirements for all degrees and certificates remained essentially the same for the reporting institutions.

8. Skills courses continue to be dropped from NABTE curricula with a wide range of options available for students—including proficiency examinations, local community or junior colleges, and private business schools. Increased attention was given to the addition of microcomputer applications courses, information systems courses, and other content-area courses.

9. Supply and demand estimates appear to be holding at about the same rates and levels from the previous study as approximately 50 percent of those responded that supply exceeded demand overall with the more populous areas showing a somewhat larger shift.

10. Faculty salaries, as expected, continue to increase with an even wider range within ranks and a considerable overlap between ranks.

11. Issues and problems identified continued to mirror those reported by Stocker with only minor shifts in ranking and placement.

12. The most significant trend reported was the widespread computer involvement at all levels, which supports the previous study's top ranking.

In business education's early years, institutions and faculty with clearly defined missions prepared teachers for clearly defined roles. However, in recent years business education programs at all levels have undergone wrenching questions of identity, experienced enrollment declines, and found a blurring of content teaching demarcations. Business education as a field of study has changed. Today, business education programs prepare not only business teachers for the traditional 7-12 grades but many also prepare students to enter the field of corporate training and/or office systems in both the public and private sector. In addition, returning older and/or nontraditional students seek certification at both the secondary and elementary levels, further compounding the issue of what is appropriate business teacher education. With such a blurring of missions and roles, the next NABTE survey will need to pay particular attention to identifying what, specifically, business education is – not strictly business teacher education. It is critical that as professionals we be aware of trends and issues in the whole of business education. NABTE can take steps to provide the structure, organization, and encouragement that administrators, faculty, and students need as we enter the twenty-first century.

(Op. cit., 15-16).

The year 1994 was the year that Michael, along with Bridget O'Connor, developed a case study on electronic meeting systems that they presented at the PRIISM '94 International Conference in Hawaii. The case study combined two areas of interest: new technology and curriculum and demonstrated the effect on curriculum of electronic meeting systems (EMS). Following are the Introduction and Implications sections of that paper.

Introduction and Background Information

A sea of forces has pushed higher education to reevaluate the traditional ways in which faculty members fulfill their primary roles of teaching, research, and service. These forces include

Michael Bronner 2015

declining state support; the institution's need to keep tuition increases down and teaching quality up; the demand to be more responsive to myriad requirements of the business community, the professions, and society in general; and an increasingly diverse and scattered student body, which all combine to compel faculty to rethink the way in which each of these disparate roles is performed.

Information technology has had a profound impact on the way in which knowledge is acquired and disseminated. While most faculty use computers and telecommunications technologies in their roles as teachers, researchers, and service providers, these tools have typically been used to make communication or knowledge dissemination processes easier or faster. Examples of applications in these categories include on-line library searches, electronic mail, and distance education.

However, one component missing from these knowledge applications is the process of group collaboration. Information dissemination and transfer is not the same as collaboration; this is the process of shared creation. Collaboration, the very heart of faculty roles, means that individuals with complementary skills work together to develop a shared understanding that would not be possible alone. University governing systems, most research and writing endeavors, and curriculum development activities are but three examples of ways in which faculty collaborate to perform these essential tasks.

The purpose of this paper is to describe a specific illustration of effective collaboration, one involving a curriculum development activity, designed to create a new Master's degree in the training area. The use of an electronic meeting system, Ventana Corporation's *GroupSystems*, was the key technology; a computer lab, the environment. As described here, this collaboration occurred among New York University School of Education faculty, the New York City business community, and current graduate students at NYU. The goal here is to discuss the role of technology in supporting group processes; to explain how specific technology tools were used to

Michael Bronner 2015

support university-level curriculum development tasks; and to describe how participants felt about their individual experiences in the process. The paper concludes with implications for electronic meeting systems and, eventually, the networked university.

(with O'Connor, Bridget N., "The Role of Electronic Meeting Systems in Supporting Curriculum Development: A Case Study," PRIISM '94 International Conference Proceedings, 34-35.) Also with O'Connor, Bridget, N., "Facilitating Curriculum Development: The Role of Electronic Meeting Systems," NABTE Review, Issue Number 22, 1996, 5-9.)

Implications

These collaborative experiences, using an electronic meeting system to support a curriculum development process, confirm several things that we know about how we "work" and what happens when new tools are made available. First, it is difficult to change traditional work habits. Second, participation can result in not only a better product, but an enthusiastic buy-in from those who are working on the project. Moreover, since we are information systems educators, and not only expound on the need for tying information technologies to business objectives, these experiences are precisely an example of doing just that. . . .

It is possible that the experts and students responded positively to the activity not only because of the technology, but because they were part of the problem solving process [the Hawthorne Effect]. As key stakeholders in the development of any curriculum that could result from their participation, individuals would probably have reported a high level of satisfaction even if the meetings were not supported by the technology. However, and this is a big "however," the technology allowed and encouraged their participation. In other words, the technology made it possible for these groups to make major contributions in a very short period of time.

Technology, thus, served as a collaboration enabler.

As we all adjust to declining resources and the need to be more responsive to both the business community and to our students, information tools such as EMS can be part of the response. At the present time, we should continue to experiment, learn from our experiences, and report our results in using new tools with diverse applications and audiences. Such experiences will help us all become more effective members of the networked university, just as our business counterparts are adjusting to the networked organization.

(Op. cit., 41.)

A 1996 article was an unusual follow up to an earlier article: one written by Michael a decade earlier. The earlier article spoke of one hand clapping, with the single hand being one of two components: business and education. The 1996 article focuses on how to make both hands clap and contains sections on the office systems curriculum that Drs. Bronner, O'Connor, and others worked on for many years, the role of internships, the need to acquire and allocate resources, the place of professional associations, and a particularly strong section on the place of legislation in the business/education linkage. It is this legislation section that is reported here.

Recent times have not been good ones for supporting workforce preparation. The two political party agendas have been at loggerheads for some time and the educational enterprise ultimately suffers. Higher education funding has seen reduced tuition aid and scholarship grants and lowered research support. Block grants, which lump national program support into large clusters delivered to individual states for their implementation, frequently amount to fewer dollars than their previously distributed individual component parts. . . . This also means reduced support for work-related programs and activities affecting Organizational and End-user Information Systems (OEIS) programs. This is despite the technology thrust advocated by many states as a solution to containing educational costs while delivering high-quality instruction. Likewise, tax

Michael Bronner 2015

breaks for businesses that hire new employees will shrink, if not disappear altogether, further depressing our graduates' opportunities to find their initial positions.

All this means is that educational institutions, since they have no profit base from which to operate, will have to work harder and more efficiently with local businesses to bridge the growing gap that our legislators have created. It also strongly suggests that professionals in both arenas – education and business – will have to do more with less, making it critical for legislative contact to be established and enhanced. Communication and network links, on-site visitations, and continuous pressure to bring the message of business-education cooperation to our elected officials is needed to ensure that their deliberations continue to include support for those issues that impact educational institutions.

Schools and businesses and legislatures, however, often simply fail to communicate with one another. The Educational Quality of the Workforce (EQW), sponsored by the Office of Educational Research and Improvement, U.S. Department of Education, in decrying the lack of coordination between education and industry, indicates that employers seldom use measurements of educational performance—grades, teacher recommendations, or school reputations—to select from among qualified applicants. The EQW also says that on the average, employers report that 20% of their employees are not proficient in their current jobs, and what business wants are workers with good attitudes and communications skills. More direct and business-like transactions between universities and employers to end the disconnection between them should be developed, and universities must see employers as customers whose needs should be correctly gauged. In order to reach the second—and perhaps more critical complaint—young workers in particular should understand what employers seek as well as the importance they place on self-discipline and on a demonstrated commitment to a job as well as in content competence.

While legislative actions cannot create this dialogue, the support of business/education connections can be enhanced through legislative bodies. One must reach out to our elected
Michael Bronner 2015

officials, invite their participation in school/business activities, and be kept informed by frequent letters, e-mail correspondence, newsletters, and announcements. We must remember and keep in mind, that we elect our officials, not the reverse.

(“Curriculum Development: The Need for Business/Education Cooperation,” Office Systems Research Journal, Spring, 1996, 16-17.)

Textbook writing had not been part of Michael’s portfolio until he began serving as a co-author with Bridget O’Connor and Chester Delaney in a series of books. The first, Training for Organizations, appeared in 1996. The introduction and overview of this textbook follow.

Introduction

This book underscores the notion that training is a crucial function in any organization. As a training professional, your job is to support your organization, and, as a professional, you need to understand the needs of your particular industry, business, and personnel. You are a team player and a change agent. You are an adult educator as well as a savvy business person. You are a writer, teacher, coach, mentor, and administrator. You are versed in the role of technology in instruction and in administration. You are keenly aware of trends that affect the workplace – in your community, your organization, and in society at large. In short, you are an active, integral part of your organization.

As a training professional, you are increasingly involved in the personnel process: hiring, retaining, training, and rewarding. You may offer training to job applicants as part of an employee selection process. You provide training for new hires and long-timers at all levels of the organizational strata. You provide counseling and educational programs that help personnel grow in their careers. You encourage staff and management development activities. If
Michael Bronner 2015

organizational downsizing occurs, you develop job search strategies for those who leave and stress management programs for those who stay. As organizations adapt to new work processes and as organizational structures become flatter and less hierarchical, your role as a problem solver and facilitator becomes more vital. Also, as promotional opportunities expand and contract, you are involved in designing new reward structures that acknowledge individuals for what they know rather than who they manage.

Your many roles include needs assessor, instructional designer, instructor, evaluator, and project manager. Your job demands, thus, are complex and varied. You need to learn theoretical foundations that explain sound training practices – problem solving strategies, group behavior, and planned change. But theory is difficult to comprehend without an understanding of the practices it explains. Therefore, you also need to be aware of good, experience-based training practices and how to use them.

Training for Organizations includes topics not typically covered in a “training” book. These topics include treating training as an innovation and techniques to ensure training success *before* implementation. We emphasize the practical and the theoretical in discussing needs assessment and evaluation strategies, and stress the art and science of writing a training proposal. We discuss the promises and limitations of technology on the delivery of learning experiences as well as on the administration of training departments. In short, we offer you an understanding of the many roles you will play in your training career, and we provide concrete experiences that can transfer not only to your first job or your current job but also to help you move up your future career ladder.

Overview

Training for Organizations is divided into six parts and twelve chapters. The parts and chapters are presented in a logical order, but each part can stand on its own. This means that you can start at your key point of interest and move toward topics and chapters as your interests expand.

Part One, “The Training Process,” sets the stage for the entire book. In its prologue we describe the need for organizational training against a backdrop of societal trends and issues. Part One, in an attempt to translate trends and issues into practice, describes how the mission of a training department influences its structure and the services it provides, as well as the skill sets required of the training professional. Training itself is a continuum of activities, not only classroom instruction. With this in mind, in Part One we overview the *training cycle*. The training cycle can help you understand the training process – how assessment, design, implementation, and evaluation tasks are separate and distinct, yet interrelated and interdependent. The training cycle serves as a framework for managing training projects as well as understanding this book.

Part Two, “Needs Assessment and Evaluation,” consists of three chapters. The first chapter in this Part emphasizes that training is done to address organizational needs or new opportunities. The best training solutions are based on a careful needs assessment that takes into account the organizational environment as well as the needs and abilities of individuals. The next chapter stresses that evaluation should be considered up-front in designing training programs, rather than as an afterthought or “it’s nice to have, but hard to do, so we don’t do it,” philosophy. Linking the outcomes of the needs assessment with strategies to determine if those outcomes actually occurred is the focus of the chapter on evaluation. The concluding chapter in Part Two provides the practical how-to for these vital training roles. Research techniques related to designing and using selected methods – observations, interviews, questionnaires, and simple experiments – are discussed.

Part Three is “Instructional Design.” In this Part’s first chapter, the best of what we know about learning is reviewed: adult learning theory, cognitive science, and motivation theory. The next chapter shows how program design flows from needs assessment outcomes and is based on sound educational practices.

Both chapters in Part Four, “Training Delivery,” discuss training delivery strategies and how their effectiveness can be evaluated. First, training delivery methods based on live instruction are discussed. Methods are categorized by the nature of the group to be involved in training, and include “how to” deliver a lecture, use a case, conduct a role play, etc. The next chapter describes the many possibilities in mediated instruction. *Mediated* describes a situation in which instruction is delivered by some form of media rather than by a live instructor.

Part Five, “Additional Job Skills for Trainees (Tools of the Trade),” consists of three chapters that are all about creating an environment where learning solutions can flourish. To ensure that learning plans are well communicated, an outline guide is provided for writing a training proposal, and suggestions for developing oral presentation skills are offered. Administrative tasks, while not glamorous, are also crucial to training department success. To this end, the next chapter includes a description of course registration and scheduling systems, checklists for facility administration, and even a special learning module on developing training department budgets. To better appreciate the role of learning in all organizations, the final chapter of this Part overviews theoretical foundations for planned, systematic change efforts and techniques for facilitating group processes. It is suggested that the training professional can play the role of a change agent by working with others in the organization to ensure that new learning is assimilated into the organization.

Part Six, “Trends for the Future,” gives you a glimpse into what’s next for the training professional. In this Part, the trainer of the present is transformed into the trainer of the (not-so-

far-away) future. This future-based scenario is designed to move you to think creatively beyond what currently *is* to what *can* and *may* be.

(with O'Connor, Bridget N. and Delaney, Chester. Training for Organizations. Cincinnati, OH: South-Western Educational Publishing, 1996, vii-ix.)

This textbook, as did all of their textbooks, reviewed very well, and excerpts from three different reviews follow. The first review is an independent, unpublished one; the second and third are from formal publications.

Training for Organizations is a book that challenges every person working in the training function of an organization or aspiring for a career in training. Training for Organizations is thorough in its treatment of the topic from both the practical and theoretical viewpoints from the beginning needs assessment through the completion of the training. The book is one of the best to come out of South-Western Publishing in many years.

The book also presents both the positive and negative aspects of selected learning projects. The authors challenge trainers to link their initial needs assessment with their culminating evaluation. In other words, what is it that trainers intend to do that will result in success when the training is complete? Training for Organizations requires up-front strategizing and won't accept after-the-fact excuses. Training for Organizations pulls no punches.

Any person aspiring to a successful career in training would profit from reading this book. Training for Organizations will broaden the reader's understanding of this important function in the work place and challenge the reader to think differently about some topics and to follow the authors' suggestions for reading on other topics.

*(“Rehwaldt, Susan S., Book Review, Unpublished, 1,2,4.)
Michael Bronner 2015*

The topic of change presents an interesting backdrop for examining the expanding role that training plays not only in maintaining a knowledgeable workforce, but in attracting more qualified workers. The purpose of this book is to present guidelines for preparing “professional trainers” to become an integral part of the hiring, retaining, and training functions now most familiar to human resource departments in today’s companies. As downsizing and the resulting new work processes become more commonplace among business organizations seeking a competitive edge in the global marketplace, management has developed a greater sensitivity to employees trying to accommodate change.

This text provides a comprehensive guide for making human resource personnel more aware as well as better prepared to help others through a continuous stream of organizational transitions designed to mobilize workers for the purpose of adding additional value to their work. The strategy of the authors is to integrate adult learning theory into the training process on the premise that learning is basically about how to change one’s knowledge, skills, and attitudes to generate more productivity. Therefore, the trainer is perceived by the authors as in fact a “change agent,” one who enables organizations to refocus by generating a renewed spirit among employees to take a company to that next level of success.

The solidity of this text lies in the ability of the authors to interweave learning theory into training strategies. The trainer is compared with a classroom teacher in the K-16 educational structure, indicating the evident similarities as well as the subtle differences resulting from stressful work places where change often brings insecurity. It is this sensitivity of the authors that provides the reader with much needed insight into the training process.

Training for Organizations is very appropriate for undergraduate courses offered in educational studies or business administration, particularly in community colleges. Learning to be successful in the Information age necessitates bringing trainers into the mainstream of educational theory. Michael Bronner 2015

As the authors state in their conclusion, the need to facilitate learning, unlearning, and relearning throughout an organization is crucial today. This text should be considered for use in undergraduate instruction as well as outreach programs for the business community.

(Morrison, James L., Book Review, Journal of Education for Business, Vol. 71, No. 5, May-June, 1996, 308-309.)

Training for Organizations . . . offers a comprehensive overview of the training function; it provides a compelling reason to integrate technological change into the training function. This work admirably summarizes where we are now and where we need to go. Most importantly, Training for Organizations gives us the tools and techniques needed to get there.

The authors put the business of training in its larger context – that of satisfying the needs of both the organization and the individual learner. The learning organization regards training not as a “nice-to-have-but-first-to-go” benefit but as an essential part of its strategy for remaining competitive. This presupposes a vision of a desired outcome, as the authors’ state, “ensuring that the right people learn the right things at the right time in the right priority order.”

The “big picture” the authors present describes the shift from control models (often characterized by Theory X management assumptions) to a model that recognizes and encourages our innate desires for learning. We learn not merely to survive but with the means to grow and prosper. It is no coincidence that the ability to re-create and re-learn are the conditions required for success that also characterizes the dynamic organization.

There are too many useful features in this book to enumerate them all. This review summarizes them only to suggest the thoroughness of their efforts. Above all, the design, intended to make it a text book, works to the advantage of the training professional using it as a reference. Each

chapter opens with highlights to help you focus on key points presented and closes with questions provided for group discussions.

O'Connor, Bronner, and Delaney do an admirably concise job of explaining the many roles human resource professionals can expect to perform throughout their career. In effect, the trainer as a perpetual learner serves as role-modeler and role-model for entire organizations. They provide concrete examples, scenarios and guidelines for students new to the field as well as seasoned trainers seeking to put their own experience into perspective.

Finally, the book is a pleasure to read on many levels and refreshingly jargon-free—features that confirm it as a useful text for everyone, student and professional.

(Pison, Thomas., Book Review, The Lamplighter, Vol. 36, No. 5, Jan., 1996, 12.)

For many of the NYU “Fours,” delivery of the Peter L. Agnew Lecture came at the apex of the career. Not so for Michael Bronner, as the year 1996 was not only the year of his first textbook, it was also the year of his Agnew Lecture. As is the case with all of the Agnew Lectures, its content was significant and worth capturing for posterity, so here in its entirety is his Agnew Lecture, the 20th in the series.

PETER L. AGNEW MEMORIAL LECTURE

Michael Bronner

September 18, 1996

Good evening and welcome to the 20th Annual Peter L. Agnew Memorial Lecture. I'm honored to deliver the 20th Business Education Lecture in this series since I'm now in the very august
Michael Bronner 2015

company of our previous speakers--Chet Delaney, Carol Gresser, L. Jay Oliva, Padmakar Sapre, Karen Gillespie, Carol Belamy and others. And as you've heard, the Agnew Foundation has also had a long and very distinguished history, supporting Business Education throughout the nation--much in the same vein and with the same enthusiasm that Pete had during his tenure on this earth. As with all good folks, he may be gone but he's certainly NOT forgotten. We in Business Education continue to owe him and his work a great debt. . .his Foundation Trustees continue to manage a "gift that keeps on giving." Long may it continue.

This lecture, however, will be somewhat different from many of the previous ones that you may have attended. You'll notice that there are NO computers present; NO overhead projectors; NO TV monitors; and NO multimedia slide shows. This is, in short, a "lecture" in the very sense of the term. . .so you can drop off to sleep if you'd like; however, you'd better do it before I do! Just a reminder, however, there will be a quiz at the end of my talk.

No, not really, but I do plan to leave some time for questions and/or comments as well as time for you to continue your reception conversations. After all, that's what Pete would have liked.

I thought it was about time to talk about Business Education in its "pure" or traditional sense as we have not done this in the past two decades in this forum. As such, this talk, like Gaul, is divided into three components (so you can keep track and tell when we're nearing the end!): #1 The History of Business Education; #2 The Current Status of Business Education; and #3 The Future of Business Education.

Now I know that some of you are rereading your program, wondering if I've switched titles on you at the last minute. Not really, as when we talk about Education for Business (note the subtle change in wording), and delivering the future within this arena, we need to look at the past before we can understand the present. . .and we MUST understand the present before we can even try to fathom the future. To paraphrase the philosopher, Santanya a bit, he said, "Those who fail to heed the lessons of history are doomed to repeat their mistakes." It seems that all too few of us have heeded Santanya's sage advice since we continue to make the same mistakes over
Michael Bronner 2015

and over again.. Thus I'll begin at the beginning, segue into the present, and hope to leave you with a bit of the Bronner view of the future. Would I be so lucky with horses and Lotto! But let's begin:

The History of Business Education—or Education for Business

Citing from the 1990 NBEA Chronology of Business Education in the United States--1635-1990, now in its third revision—and giving due credit to the work of Wanous, Schmidt, and Jennings—our field does go back some 360+ years as we first emerged as a nation. Note that I said “field” as it's my contention that we are not a “profession” per se since the definition of the latter demands a specific discipline, requires continuing education, demands an internship and an examination for state or regional certification. A profession also has established standards and an elected board to oversee them with sanctions to remove licenses from those who do not comply with these standards. Business Education is also hampered by our difficulty in defining these two simple terms. Defining “business” is very nearly impossible; likewise, the same for “education.” This problem is not quite so difficult when attempting to define “Education for Business,” however. But after all, any term that is easily defined is not very exciting, I've been told. But how did we get to where we are today? What lessons can we learn from our history? Let's look at a few selected highlights over these past 360+ years.

In 1635 the Plymouth Colony hired James Morton to teach reading, writing, and “casting accounts,” which included the basics of business mathematics. As our budding nation grew, business mathematics became, of course, critical to business success. Twelve years later, in 1647, the creation of the Latin grammar schools was required by law and served to prepare boys for college; however, business courses were also included for those entering the growing business sector.

Remember, of course, that the primary method of learning about business and becoming an entrepreneur was through the age-old tradition of apprenticeship training. As the needs for business skills quickly outstripped the abilities of one-on-one training, it was evident that another

Michael Bronner 2015

method of instruction was needed. One of those methods included the “itinerant teacher”—one who made his way from village to village and from town to town, teaching specific subjects (limited at best) to groups of students along the way, each student paying for his instruction. This was, obviously, not a very efficient method of promoting wide-scale business education. Small steps were taken when the subject Bookkeeping was offered as a specific course—first in Boston in 1709 and then in New York and Philadelphia in 1731 and 1733 respectively. These were small steps, however, and a broader, more efficient method was needed. This was created in 1749 when Benjamin Franklin established his Academy in Philadelphia, offering business subjects, among other classes. The academy was unique in that its primary aim was to prepare youth for “changing conditions of society, government, and business.” (Chronology, p. 1) As such, formal classes in business, articulated with those in other disciplines, provided the first true move leading to what we see on today’s educational scene.

Bookkeeping seems to be the first “traditional” business course offered at the secondary level with Boston leading the way. In 1823 this subject was offered in the first public high school—The English Classical School for Boys, which prepared students for commercial careers as well as for college. Four years later, Massachusetts law required the establishment of a high school for every municipality with 500 or more families and the teaching of Bookkeeping was mandated. Since these schools were supported by public tax monies, it was felt that commercial preparation was required as it was seen as the more useful skills—even then, they knew!).

Shorthand, once used by Marcus Tiro, Cicero’s secretary, has been around since 100 BC when Tiro recorded Cicero’s orations for posterity. In the United States, however, the first shorthand system was developed by Thomas Lloyd (no relation to typing author, Alan Lloyd, I’m told) back in 1819; however, as one of the first Congressional Reporters to use shorthand, he strengthened the subject’s popularity as a recording skill. Remember, too, that this method had to be read back or transcribed into longhand since the typewriter had not been developed. . .this technology had to wait until the late 1860s.

Another note about shorthand—Isaac Pitman’s method, which he first published in 1837 and called Stenographic Sound Hand (due to its phonetic structure), was used as the primary method of shorthand communication across the country from the mid-1800s to the 1900s. As a form of “ever-circulators,” which, as the name implies, circulated around the country for adherents of this skill, an individual would write the beginning of a story in Pitman shorthand, send it along to another member of this informal club to be read by him (no women were recorded as members), added to—again, in Pitman shorthand—and sent along to yet another member of the club. In this way, the skill (some say art) of the system was honed, expanded, and circulated from coast to coast. As a skill, the Pitman system was taught in Chicago, Philadelphia, and New York schools until recent years.

And while on the subject of shorthand (and a bit out of date order), John Robert Gregg, another Englishman, developed his system, called “Light-Line Phonography—The Phonetic Handwriting,” which was vastly different from Sir Isaac’s method—in 1888 and brought it to the United States, specifically to Boston, in 1893. Mr. Gregg was the exact opposite of Sir Isaac. Where Gregg was the consummate showman, Pitman was taciturn and quiet; where Gregg was often confrontational, Pitman was reticent; where Gregg was innovative and encouraged system revisions, Pitman felt that his system was sufficiently “pure” and needed no changes. Where the Gregg system was considered easy to learn but difficult to transcribe; Pitman shorthand was difficult to learn but easy to transcribe. In short, (no pun intended) these two systems went head-to-head in the early 1900s with Gregg coming out by far the winner. By the late 1960s, Gregg shorthand was taught in 98% of America’s high schools. (Just think of the royalties!) While shorthand is no longer offered to the degree it once was, where it is offered, it’s usually the Gregg system.

One of the most significant pages in our history was the development of the private business school, which had its beginnings as early as 1834 with the opening of the first business college in Philadelphia by R. Montgomery Bartlett. His work in commercial training—largely penmanship, bookkeeping, and clerical skills—laid the foundation for the following six decades

Michael Bronner 2015

where the private business college was the undisputed king of commercial education in the United States. I term this period the era of the private business school, which ushered in most of the structure, content, courses, associations, and accreditation activities, we have today.

While the first such business college was formed in 1834, multi-school chain operations did not evolve until eight years later in 1842 with the four-site Eastman Commercial College chain with its base in Rochester, New York. The Bryant-Stratton business college chain, however, overshadowed all previous chain schools with its sheer size and scope. Begun in 1853 in Cleveland, Ohio with one school, the Bryant-Stratton group had expanded to over 50 such schools a decade later. The Bryant-Stratton story is notable due to its many contributions to business education practice that we now take for granted. For example, uniform textbooks were developed for all schools; tuition transfers between schools went with students who moved from location to location; school business managers frequently met to standardize and promote business education—the prelude to our current annual conferences and conventions—and articulation as well as standardization of courses and course content along with teaching methods were all innovations we take for granted today. To quote from the Chronology, “The private business colleges made several notable contributions to the development of business education during this period. They demonstrated that training for office occupations could be given in the classroom more advantageously than in the apprenticeship situation. They trained the business teachers for early high school programs and worked to have high schools adopt business programs. Private school educators wrote the business textbooks that were used by the early high schools and were instrumental in establishing the Department of Business Education in the National Education Association (NEA). (Chronology, p. 3)

Expanding his Bryant-Stratton school in New York, which he managed in 1858, Silas S. Packard purchased it from the chain in 1867, renaming it Packard College. Other school managers followed his lead by buying their own schools, thus ending the chain-school domination—while expanding the private colleges at the same time. Packard’s contributions as a business education leader, author, and innovator served as benchmarks for the field at that time.
Michael Bronner 2015

He was credited with the concept of “amanuensis,” which means the teaching of shorthand and typewritten transcription—which moved commercial education broadly forward and later provided many women with their initial job entry skills.

As you may recall from your early readings in American History, the Civil War took place during the early 1860s and, to fill the vacancies created by men conscripted into the Union Army, General Francis Spinner, President Lincoln’s Treasurer, hired 1,500 women to take their places, thus bringing women into the labor force in large numbers for the first time. While many of these women returned to their homes following the end of hostilities four years later, many remained in government offices. Their many successes and contributions opened the door for women in business to follow.

The invention of the first practical typewriter by Christopher Lathan Scholes in 1868 provided a major jolt for commercial education as this invention further widened the commercial doors for teaching keyboarding and, shortly thereafter, merging shorthand dictation with typewritten documents. Touch typing—as we all learned it and know it today—was introduced as early as 1878 by Frank McGurrin, the then-recognized typing champion. The first texts on the subject were published in 1880 with instruction on the skill of touch typewriting beginning about a decade later. “Type-writers,” usually men, were trained by the hundreds on this skill from the 1880s, but their numbers only scratched the surface of the commercial and clerical needs of expanding business enterprises. As in the 1860s, women began to move into the business office to meet the needs for more skilled clerical workers. This created an interesting symbiotic relationship. . .more skilled employees were needed to meet the demands of business; more commercial classrooms were needed to train these new workers; and more business teachers were needed. The cycle seemed to have a life of its own and grew dramatically through these early years. Of course, nothing lasts forever. . .

Moving to the evolution in schools, the first successful collegiate school of business was founded at the Wharton School of Finance and Commerce at the University of Pennsylvania in 1881 with

Schools of Business at the University of California and the University of Chicago following shortly thereafter. The first commercial high school was opened in Washington, D.C. in 1890, followed by one in Brooklyn in 1899 and another in New York in 1901. Boston followed suit in 1906. Because these schools concentrated solely on commercial education, they were not constrained by tradition and, thus, formulated some of the most innovative programs for business—classes based on needs required by business, internships and work-study experiences, and related clerical skills. Remember, however, that this period focuses on bookkeeping and clerical skills training and, as yet, does not consider marketing or distributive education. This would come shortly.

The importance of the commercial high school foreshadowed the eventual decline in the private business college sector—since this training could be acquired at no expense. However, by the 1920s, most such single-concept high schools had disappeared because by that time, the comprehensive high school had come into being where business education was an integral part of the curriculum. The early champion of this was Edmund James, in 1890, a professor at the Wharton School (later the President of the University of Illinois), who issued a number of reports to the American Banking Association recommending business training not only for the university but also for secondary education. His 1892 report urged the creation of commercial high schools and the following year, based on his then-recent European tour observations, recommended that business education be included as an integral part of the comprehensive high school. His 1893 report was the first calling for a type of “education about business as well as education for business.” We have, over the years, reversed this emphasis but perhaps it’s time to revisit James’ earlier vision.

The first major organization to promote business education (that is, the one about which I’ll talk) was the National Commercial Teachers Association, formed in 1895 by a group of private business college members who, disillusioned, spun off from the NEA Department of Business Education. They later changed their association name to the Eastern Business Teachers Association in 1897—with Silas S. Packard as their first president. The organization merged

Michael Bronner 2015

with EBEA in 1972, thus eliminating the duplication of two separate associations in the Eastern Region under the NBEA umbrella.

While on the subject of organizations, the International Society for Business Education (ISBE) was formed in Zurich, Switzerland, in 1901. The U.S. Chapter of ISBE was formed in 1969 with NYU's Herbert Tonne as its first president. There are currently 23 member countries of ISBE, and each year the organization holds an International Conference at a designated host country. Last year's meeting, for example, was held in Orlando, Florida . . . next year's meeting will be held in Denmark. ISBE became an affiliate of our National Business Education Association (or rather the other way around it would seem) in 1969.

While Drexel Institute has been credited as the first collegiate institution to offer a program for business teacher preparation in 1898, I have long been given to aver that NYU is the "home" of business education. I'm not sure that this contention is correct; however, since the "Big Four" were essentially responsible for Business Education in the U. S. as we know it, beginning with a formal undergraduate and graduate program in 1926, I'll stay with my original contention. As Pete Agnew would have said, "never let the truth interfere with a good story."

At the present time, though, NBEA records 168 paid institutional members of the National Association for Business Teacher Education (NABTE), down significantly from 305 institutional members in 1980 when I did the first national survey, and down from 188 when Mike Curran conducted the most recent survey last year. I'll address this issue a bit later.

Another event that impacted our field was the establishment of the first junior college in 1902 in Joliet, Illinois. There are now more than 1,400 junior, community, and technical 2-year schools in the U.S. and its territories. This rather misunderstood phenomenon—the two-year college—has made a major impact on Business Education as we know it. The historical mission of this institution includes not only transfer options, but offers terminal degrees in a host of business subjects; continuing education for specialized skills (again, largely business-oriented), and community outreach programs aimed at the adult learner. More recently, the two-year college

Michael Bronner 2015

has forged partnerships with local area businesses and has entered the “School-to-Work” transition field as well. Each of these expanded arenas has made an impressive impact on Business Education; however, our field has done little, if anything, to influence or join with the two-year college in these efforts. There are reasons, of course—or excuses; however, the truth is, Business Education as we know it, has missed the boat on this expanding market! Again, more about this later on.

A key player in our early history was Frederick G. Nichols, the first state supervisor of business education in 1909. (OK, OK, for the purists, I. O. Crissy in 1898 was really the first; however, little is known of his accomplishments so we’ll move to one we do know about—Mr. Nichols.) Nichols was appointed the City Director of Business Education in Rochester, New York in 1905 and from there, moved on to become the New York State Supervisor of Business Education four years later. He was, a generation later, instrumental in establishing achievement tests for personnel managers to use in hiring Business Education graduates. His most influential work, however, was with NYU’s Paul S. Lomax in establishing the National Council for Business Education, a leadership group through which evolved today's National Business Education Association. His 1933 text, Commercial Education, in the High School, was the first such principles book for the field, and an original manuscript of his, concerning the private business school, is in our Program library office in the East Building.

Of the many organizations representing Business Education over the years, two major honorary groups centered on commercial students. The first of these, Pi Omega Pi, was founded in 1923 at Northeast Missouri State Teachers College and was designed to promote scholarship and ethical ideals in Business Education for undergraduate students. At the present time, there are about 80 Pi Omega Pi chapters active. The second organization was Delta Pi Epsilon, founded in 1936 here at NYU by Paul S. Lomax, our first Department Chairman, and was designed to promote scholarship, leadership, and cooperation among graduate students in Business Education. More than 25,000 members have been initiated into this graduate honorary society with 105 chapters throughout the United States and Puerto Rico. I am honored to serve as only the sixth sponsor
Michael Bronner 2015

for Alpha Chapter, the first chapter of our Society. Dr. Burt Kaliski, our NYU graduate of note, serves as the most recent sponsor of the Delta Gamma chapter in Manchester, New Hampshire, and Dr. Aida Santiago, also our NYU graduate, as the 104th chapter sponsor in Puerto Rico.

Another group, this one reflecting all vocational subjects—The American Vocational Association—was incorporated in 1926 with the merger of the Vocational Education Association of the Middle West and the National Society for Vocational Education and the Business Education Division created in 1925. Administration, Agriculture, Business, Employment/Training, Family and Consumer Science, Guidance, Health, Marketing, Special Needs, Technical, Technology, Trade, and New and Related Services divisions make up AVA and its 38,000 members, spread over five geographic regions.

Following closely on AVA's heels, the National Association of Commercial Teacher-Training Institutions (NACTTI) was formed in 1927 to represent business teacher-education interests. This organization was the forerunner to our current National Association for Business Teacher Education (NABTE), and serves as the research and teacher-education arm of NBEA. And continuing on the subject of organizations, in 1933 the National Council for Business Education was formed (note the name business education in the title--not commercial education) to achieve unity for our field. A little more than a decade later, in 1946, the Council merged with NEA's Department of Business Education becoming the United Business Education Association—the predecessor of NBEA, which was renamed in 1962.

There were other activities going on from the legislative front that influenced Business Education as well. As early as 1917 the Smith-Hughes Act provided federal funds for the support of part-time vocational schools and reimbursed teachers for supervising work-experience students. This major piece of legislation—the first of its kind with a major impact on our field—was followed by the George-Deen Act some two decades later that provided funds for the then-called distributive education subjects (we now call them marketing education—but they also included sales, work experience, advertising, warehousing, and the like). These funds, however, were limited to part-time and evening schools, thus limiting their impact on high schools of that period. Another near decade had to pass before the George-Barden Act was signed into law in 1946, and this Act added to the funds made available for distributive education. Seventeen years had to pass until in 1963 the Vocational Education Act was passed, Michael Bronner 2015

which was the first to include business and office occupations within its scope. Our older (more mature) generation will recall shorthand language labs, electric (or even Selectric) typewriters, and even word processors and other office equipment cranking their tardy way into our classrooms. The VEA was amended in 1968, providing a major overhaul of Business Education funding and continuing the support for our field.

But what of our organizations? What was happening during all this time? The Future Business Leaders of America organization was formed in Tennessee in 1942 through the work of Hamden Forkner, later of Columbia University, who encouraged high school student participation and leadership development in Business Education. Following these successes, the Distributive Education Clubs of America were formed a few years later in 1946, largely with the support of the George-Barden Act. This organization, called DECA, with its competitions and contests throughout the U. S. probably did more to enhance marketing education than all of the foregoing legislation combined. Kids love competition—displays, public speaking, and sales promotions—and thus, DECA flourished. What a great way to learn about distributive education ... competition and games.

At this point, let me take a “teacher's break” and ask this audience how many of you have ever belonged (or still belong) to the National Business Education Association? Let's see a show of hands. I'm sure that some of us were around when the first of the five geographic sections of NBEA came into the national fold ... the Southern BEA, back in 1950. SBEA was followed in 1951 by WBEA; then in 1952 by M-PBEA; and in 1962, both EBFA and N-CBEA. Interestingly enough, the final piece in the NBEA jigsaw puzzle included one of the earliest organizations as the merging of the National Commercial Teachers Association and the National Business Teachers Association (the former established back in 1895) made up the north-central region of the map. Remember, now, the ECTA (organized back in ---- when? 1897) was also in force giving the east TWO separate but very active Business Education organizations. They remained competitors—the private business schools and the secondary schools until 1972 when EBTA finally (although with some reluctance), agreed to merge, joining with EBFA to complete the five geographic national organizational quilt.

Also at this time, let's not forget to return to the private business schools—who really began it all. In 1962 (obviously a hotbed year of organizational activity), two separate private business
Michael Bronner 2015

school organizations merged to become what was known as the Association of Independent Colleges and schools (AICS) ... which served to accredit the private schools ... and take some of the sting out of the questionable activities a few of the private schools had practiced. This accrediting organization is now called the Accrediting Council for Independent Colleges and Schools, and their standards cover more than 560 main and branch schools—about 20% of the nation's total private school population.

How did these various organizations "get the word out" to their memberships and beyond? Besides the occasional newsletters and annual and semi-annual conferences, they published annuals. Of course this was in the days when people really liked to write (carbon paper and erasers notwithstanding) and books didn't cost \$80-\$90 as they do today! Annuals? Yearbooks? Oh my yes, we had annuals and yearbooks! The first one I've been able to find locally was a 1930 version of the Commercial Education Association of New York City which the CEA (now the BEA) published yearly until 1972. It's signed by Peter L. Agnew himself. An interesting historical footnote here is that my old dissertation found its way into this publication as the last chapter in the last yearbook ... the 1972 version—not the 1933 one! I think that tells us something! However, the venerable old ECTA published their first in 1929 (how many of us were around then?). The National Commercial Teachers Association also began publication of a yearbook in 1935, and in 1944 they joined forces (ECTA and NCTA) and began publishing the American Business Education Yearbooks. Volume No. 1, which is signed by Paul S. Lomax. This publication binge lasted until about 1962 when (if you were paying attention) NCTA joined the umbrella NBEA. EBTA continued to publish their own annual until 1972 when—(what happened in that year?) ... right! They joined with EBTA. Since 1963, however, the Business Education yearbook market has been pretty much ruled by NBEA.

Just so we don't leave out other important organizations (and I'm sure I have to some degree), let me shift gears a bit to a group that is made up of three separate Business Education organizations: the Policies Commission for Business and Economic Education, which was born in 1959. This Commission was formed with representatives from NBEA, DPE, and in 1972, AVA's Business and Office Education Division. Its work is quite important as the Commission develops and produces the Mission Statements . . . or "This We Believe About. . . ." some topic in our field. These statements articulate the philosophical underpinnings of Business Education in a wide variety of subjects, and describe to the outsider what we're all about. I commend these statements to you as a cornerstone of our philosophical base.

While many other organizations have been formed to reflect specific interests in our field—the International Word Processing Association (IWPA) in 1972; the Association of Records Managers and Administrators (ARMA) in 1975; and the Office Systems Research Association (OSRA) in 1980 to name a few, most have concentrated on the role of technology—obviously an

element now growing with almost a mind of its own. At least fifty separate technology organizations now exist, each claiming to reflect a specific niche in the technology picture ... and each, seemingly, with its own publication, if my mailbox is any indication of this.

OSRA began in 1982—a year after IBM introduced its first personal computer. A small band of university business educators (including Indiana University's Georgia Miller, our 1992 Agnew lecturer) broke away from NBEA. They foresaw the impact that the personal computer was going to have on all aspects of business and needed an outlet that NBEA would not—or could not—provide for research related to how individuals (later called end-users) would apply and learn to use computing technologies in all aspects of their work. This group identified early-on the need for new curricula that would ensure that universities trained its graduates in a new set of skills that organizations would need in applying new technologies to areas at that time unforeseen by most business teacher educators as well as management information systems educators. Professor O'Connor's dissertation advisor was Dr. Miller, and Bridget led both the 1986 and 1996 OSRA multiple course curriculum projects. Bridget was also president of OSRA in 1988-89, and I was president in 1990-91.

Because the "content area" of business education traditionally was related to communications and computations, and because the microcomputer would have tremendous impact on these functions, the field of what was called "office systems" has evolved also. Graduates of office systems programs were prepared to be the conduit between business, organizational, or individual needs and MIS departments. As Bridget and I described in an early OSRA paper, MIS traditionally was charged with developing the system right (conserving computer/technological resources); OS is charged with the developing the right system and ensuring that systems were usable—and used—by their ultimate user. By the way, OSRA no longer calls itself the "office systems research association." The new curriculum is called "organizational and end-user information systems" (OEIS), and the organization is keeping its OSRA logo—but with the subtitle "technological solutions for business," with the 'O' forming a globe. This is similar to what ACM (Association for Computing Machinery) has done with its name. OSRA now stands for Organizational Systems Research Association, thus keeping the same acronym.

And what our information systems courses are all about at the graduate level here at NYU is helping educators—teachers and administrators and trainers—make sound choices about their technology investments, and to make sure that technological solutions address learning needs and support sound educational policies and administrative practices. In other words, Business Education in its management role wants to be sure that "end users" apply the promises of technological advances to their industry, and in its education role, wants to foster the development of learning strategies (both live and mediated) that help ensure that a system lives up to its promises.

Likewise in our schools of business, change has been a relative constant since the late 1950s when enrollments swelled but the curriculum did not keep pace. After two separate and independent commissions—the Carnegie and the Ford Foundation—sponsored investigations of the B-schools in 1959, their Pierson and Gordon-Howell reports each, respectively, recommended sweeping changes in the way they did business. Leonard Silk—another former Agnew Lecturer here—and at that time on the *Fortune* magazine editorial board, summarized these recommendations in the now-famous Silk Report of 1960, entitled The Education of Businessmen. In the Silk Report, he recommended that, among other items, at least 50% of the curriculum be in the liberal arts; that less stress be placed on “vocationalism,” and more on theory; and above all, academic and entrance standards be raised. We noted with particular interest his recommendation No. 7, which stated that "improving the expanding doctoral programs is the most important single item for improving the whole field of business education over time." We here in Business Education took that recommendation very seriously as the business school's accreditation agency, the American Assembly of Collegiate Schools of Business (AACSB) noted that business school faculty could obtain their doctorates either in their respective disciplines OR—and this is a major “or”—in Business Education where their dissertation research would focus not only on their discipline but also on demonstrating strong methods of research with major attention given to the improvement of instruction. We responded to this almost immediately when Dr. Karen Gillespie moved to our Department in 1966 from the School of Retailing, which at that time was a division of our School of Commerce (now Stem). Dr. Gillespie instituted a major emphasis on the preparation and development of business school faculty. She felt—and we continue to concur some 30 years later—that the

renewed interest in good teaching in the schools of business (and elsewhere, of course) goes hand in hand with our Business Education mission. As such, 75% of our doctoral students occupy faculty positions in two- and four-year schools of business programs, and our doctoral graduates have received numerous research awards. Business ethics, technology implementation, and global business issues are among the many topics currently being pursued by our candidates.

The last piece in this history that deserves mention returns to NBEA and to one of our guests here this evening. In 1987 the Peter L. Agnew Memorial Lecture Series was established and the Foundation provided funds to support outstanding lecturers at each annual national NBEA meeting. As you've heard, these individuals were "top notch" and served to bring out the membership in droves. The individual largely responsible for this activity also served NBEA as the Interim Executive Director in 1989 between the resignation of the outgoing Executive Director, O. J. Byrnside, and the appointment of Janet Treichel, who serves NBEA today. This individual is Arthur H. Rubin. Recognition and a round of applause, please!

So that sort of brings us up to date (leaving out huge chunks of history, of course). What is the current status of Business Education today? What was the impetus for the major changes we experienced over the past few years? What does the future hold for our field and how will we—or should we—deliver it? The answers, of course, are many and varied.

The Current Status of Business Education

In 1983 a major policy document was created. It was written by fewer than 20 individuals and was called A Nation at Risk: The Imperative for Educational Reform. It pushed hard for a "back to basics" reform movement at the secondary level, recommending an increase in graduation requirements—particularly in English, mathematics, and science. This report, I contend, changed the "playing field" for Business Education, perhaps forever. As such, with mandated increases in these "academic" courses, many program offerings in Business Education could not survive as no room now existed for one-two-or three year business sequences. This was also true for the arts and humanities and other vocational areas, as well. Coupled with this and the push for everyone to go to college as an academic thrust—technology skills now demanded by business as a result of the introduction and rapid expansion of the personal computer, caught

many (perhaps most) of our sizeable secretarial science faculty by surprise. No longer was shorthand a viable skill; no longer was keyboarding offered only at the secondary level (third and fourth-grader hackers were becoming adept at creating their own keyboarding style); and no longer were entry-level clerical skills needed by business since the technology handled most of this without much need for prior training. As a result of this evolution (or revolution)—as well as the aging of our Business Education faculty and shifts in demographic employment styles—nationally our enrollments at the secondary level plummeted. The more than 300 colleges and universities that once taught business-teacher education students in 1980 dropped to nearly half that number in 1995. In New York City alone, we have fewer than a dozen secondary schools with viable Business Education programs, down from over 90 a little more than a decade ago. Membership in traditional business education associations—NBEA, for example, has dropped to about 12,000 from a high of nearly 20,000, eight or nine years ago; BEA shrank to about 400 from Dr. Betty Iannizzi's Presidency high-water mark of nearly 1,800 in the 60s; and AVA is substantially down in all of its vocational divisions. The Holmes Group—a large association of schools and colleges of education—was formed about a decade ago and recommended that all 7-12 certification be granted only after a subject (discipline) major had been completed. For example, a BA with a major in English was needed for English teacher certification; a BA in mathematics before certification in that subject; and likewise, a bachelor's degree in business prior to business teacher certification. In short, certification for secondary teaching was pushed to a fifth year and "education" majors were to become nearly extinct. Adding to this dilemma, a number of states either discontinued or severely constrained the traditional certification for business teachers and/or offered an "end run" to certification by encouraging those with business experience to come directly into schools and teach full time while earning a minimum number of education credits ... with few, if any, of these credits in business teaching methods or philosophy, principles, or curriculum. No wonder our field experienced a decline in numbers and a loss of direction.

Now this is a fact of life! The one constant is change—and changes occur and will continue to impact what we knew as traditional business education. Note that I say "traditional" business education because when a door closes, another one opens, and we have always responded to the

challenge of change in the past, and the present times are no exception. What's going on now in our field?

First of all, there is a concerted and national move toward "School to Work Opportunities."

These federally funded initiatives, signed into law in 1994, have responded to business demands that high school graduates come to the marketplace with the necessary work attitudes (let alone skills) so that the transition between school and work is enhanced. Three core elements exist: 1) school-based learning--classroom instruction based on business-defined occupational skill standards; 2) work-based learning—career exploration, work experience, structured training and mentoring at job sites; and 3) connecting activities--courses integrating classroom and on-the-job instruction, matching students with participating employers, training of mentors and the building of other bridges between school and work. And while on this topic, let me pause for a commercial. ABC News correspondent Cokie Roberts (a former Agnew speaker at our national meeting) will host a PBS special on Friday, September 20, at 10:00 p.m. taking a look at how to compete in the 21st century job market. Students in all subject areas, regardless of high school major, visit partnered business workplaces to get a feel for the environment; short, intermediate-length, and long-term internships are arranged to experience workplace demands; and speakers from business frequent classes thumping the drums of attitude, effort, supervision, and opportunity. Here in New York City, for example, "Virtual Enterprise Schools," have begun, led by Staten Island Business Educator and NYU grad, Iris Blanc. One such school in each Borough (with two in Manhattan) is designed to provide a "virtual business experience" at the school site so that when students are ready to enter the workplace, they have a sense of what to expect with some simulated experiences under their collective belts.

Formal schooling, however, does not mean the completion of one's education. Education has already become a life-long process for most people, and schools will become, as a recent article in the *Cincinnati Enquirer* noted, "Centers of Learning." (September 7, 1996, 132) In Northern KY, for example, it is predicted that lifelong learning will be delivered through distance learning (note, not distance "education") that will "help deliver quality education to people in the workplace and home [at any place and at any time]." This is but one example of our response and for which business teachers should be prepared.

Another illustration is the opening of computer literacy classes at the elementary, middle, and intermediate school level. Real business problems are provided as assignments; and frequently business educators are involved in coordinating or developing curriculum for these classes.

Junior Achievement (JA)—at the elementary as well as the secondary levels and in newly-developing countries—provides yet another opportunity for cross-department cooperation, involving social studies, mathematics, and English classes as well as business courses. Business educators frequently serve as JA coordinators in many of our nation's 17,000 school districts.

Still another example involves business partnerships—usually coordinated through the community college and the local business sector—although they also exist to some degree at the secondary level. This is where entrepreneurship classes and their students are contracted by businesses to become actively engaged in solving specific and real business problems and move back and forth from classroom to the workplace in doing so. For some students, this experience provides the first exposure to a business environment other than as a consumer. Guided by both faculty and businesspeople, productivity and accountability is doubly enhanced, and all three populations benefit.

But where are our business teachers to be found? What avenues are open to them today now that the secondary market has shrunk? Stop and think about this for a minute. What opportunities exist for those with your skills and abilities and education? If you read the papers (and I'm sure you do), you'll have noticed the expanding number of advertisements for training personnel. These opportunities are multi-faceted: with all of the Fortune 500 firms—and most of the top 1000—training departments are either a "fact of life" within the business or outsourced firms provide training for them. Training consultants are in great demand in today's rapidly-changing marketplace, and the American Society for Training and Development (ASTD) with New York's 1,650+ members attest to this—make use of business teacher abilities. And when businesses want to hire trained individuals for traditional business tasks, where do they go? To the major employment agencies such as Manpower, Olsten, and Kelly Services, each one of which has a major training component. These opportunities provide fertile ground for business educators. And where do adults who are returning to the workplace (or entering it for the first time) brush up on old skills or acquire new ones? Adult education programs for one and schools offering

continuing education for another—both of which currently are booming enterprises. Business teachers needed here, too! And let's not forget what started our field in the first place—the private, for profit, proprietary school. It's estimated that there are nearly 2,000 schools and colleges providing this type of instruction throughout the U.S. and a number of them have been regionally accredited to offer two- and four-year degrees as well. Good places for business educators.

And since I've introduced training a moment ago—what better mesh with our own business education and experience is this new market? The primary difference is the fact that you will be facing adults and not teen-agers; therefore, learning about how the adult learner learns is essential. Training delivery is now one of the biggest businesses in the country and growing rapidly. As we've said in our book, Training for Organizations, corporations in the U.S. spend more money annually on training than do all the public school systems in the country combined.

Since technology is multiplying at a breakneck pace (Moore's Law—which states that technology doubles every 18 months—actually it's faster and more robust than that), the demand for trainers to keep abreast of this technology and to offer training in any of its major components—software, hardware, operations, management—continues to outstrip the availability of trainers to do so. Add to this the expanded need to prepare global thinkers and culture-sensitive entrepreneurs—even at the most basic levels—for virtually all middle-to-large-scale firms and you have a ready-made market for business teachers. This will ensure that individuals already in the workplace continue to be able to do their jobs regardless of whatever evolution transpires.

In fact, this is where I suggest we "deliver the future."

The Future of Education for Business

Since the progression from business teacher to corporate trainer is a natural one, we should take advantage of it and prepare ourselves for these demands. Schools of education can do this; however, I would suggest that for most of these institutions, a strong focus on the Kurt Lewin schema—needs analysis, design and development of instructional materials, implementation methods, and evaluation—be joined with a hard look at the adult learner and on adult learning

theory (Malcolm Knowles' concept of andragogy as contrasted with pedagogy ... and do you know that many graduate schools don't even offer a course on the adult learner?) This examination should provide a sound foundation for every teacher of organizational theory. Likewise, providing for strong experiences in training delivery methods and techniques and methods of evaluation for all the foregoing are well within the purview of schools of education. For content such as the management skills needed to direct such training programs and other related human resource management areas usually found within this arena, schools of business are those that usually provide this content, although many such institutions still feel these are “soft skills” and exceed their mandate. Since over half of our NABTE institutional members are housed in schools of business, outreach—in both directions—is a required activity; proactivity is the key.

Rodney Dangerfield's lament notwithstanding, "I don't get no respect," is all too often true when it comes to educators dipping their toes into the business pond. It seems imperative—no, more than that, critical—for future business trainers or those in transition, to gain some practical experience in business. I would then contend that business internships for business students and recertified business teachers be required in order to bring a sense of credibility to the tasks at hand. Consider for example the old Indian adage, "Unless you walk a mile in my shoes. . . '—need I say more?

Education for business goes even a step further when we consider that most of our future and ongoing learning will not take place in a traditional classroom but site-specific, on the job, or even at home. This learning has major ramifications for business educators as we develop learning systems for our respective disciplines that can be used anywhere. And, because we've been trained to assess learning needs, develop learning solutions, and evaluate the results, we're in an excellent position to provide these services to the marketplace—wherever that marketplace may be.

But what of the "traditional business teacher preparation" programs; will they disappear? Well, frankly, no they won't. Because of our School-to-Work partnership programs, the roles of today's business educator at the secondary level are more akin to that of a trainer than that of a traditional classroom teacher. This is because the emphasis is not on content but rather on

developing needs assessments, program development, and work experience study options, the new role of the business educator will provide the linkage between the secondary school and the workplace. There are two positions I might offer--each with their respective pros and cons. The first might be called the Darwinian approach—that of the survival of the fittest. We've noted the demise of a number of marginal business education programs over the years; however, there are still a good number of strong departments continuing to provide outstanding graduates for existing and future positions. After all, business education at the secondary level will not disappear but it will change to meet the needs of the community in which it lives. Notable among these are selected programs in the south and central portions of the U.S. among a few in our area as well. They include—but are not limited to: Southern Illinois University in Carbondale, and Eastern Illinois in Charleston; Northern Illinois University; the University of Georgia; Bloomsburg University in PA; Montclair and Rider Colleges in NJ; the University of Wisconsin-Whitewater; University of Minnesota; Ball State in IN; Utah State University; the University of Houston, TX; Emporia State in KS; Southern University in MO; and even my old stomping grounds—San Jose State and San Francisco State. However, unless we prepare our successors, even these programs will dwindle and die.

The other approach follows what Burt Kaliski wrote in his 1987 NBEA Yearbook chapter, "Implications of Change for Effective Teaching." In this chapter Burt suggested that we must change our goals to include business education for leadership positions in all educational settings. We must also change our content as I've noted earlier, and we must change the structure of how we deliver business education. He also suggested that each of the five NBEA regions house one premier business teacher education program so as to concentrate our teacher preparation efforts toward excellence, without diluting our resources. These schools, he said, would include NYU in the east; the University of Georgia in the south; Texas Tech in the mountain plains region; Northern Illinois University in the central region; and San Jose State in the west. Obviously, if you're a Montclair, a Lehman, a Bloomsburg, a New Hampshire College, or a University of Connecticut, this might not sit too well with you. It is, however, another bold look at the problem we all face.

And there you have it ... at least some of it from the Bronner perspective. I'm sure that much has been missed from this somewhat overlong presentation; however, I've attempted to provide a bit

of the history of our field (so we can try to avoid the same mistakes); a taste of our present condition, with both opportunities and problems; and a whiff of what I consider to be possibly around the corner for business education. I hope I've left you with a desire to want more as I've always said that it's better to bite off more than you can chew rather than to die of starvation. Thanks for listening, and now, any questions?

(20th Annual Peter L. Agnew Memorial Lecture, New York University, 1996.)

Michael's role in carrying out and interpreting national surveys continued through the late 1990s. While there had been regular surveys of NABTE members since 1983, no survey had been carried out specifically of state business education association presidents until the one done by Michael that is reported next. This extensive survey resulted in four conclusions and four specific recommendations that do provide some interesting food for thought.

Conclusions

1. Business education as a field is in a dramatic state of flux, and state, regional, and national leadership must address these issues forcefully and courageously. Our national association has made many inroads here; however, its recommendations have not been implemented by the individual states. State legislatures dictate educational policy, despite the impact of Washington. Therefore, state business education associations should take a much more proactive role in affecting legislative change in their respective state capitals. High visibility and significantly increased lobbying efforts appear to have promise of being an effective approach. Letter-writing campaigns alone simply won't do the job.

2. Technology is "here and now" and not "down the road." Business educators must address the issue of technology at lower grade levels as well as master the use—and appropriate instructional techniques—in this area. Increased efforts to partner with local businesses and suppliers for new technology, classrooms, and instructional support must be an individual and department objective.

3. Business educators are leaving the field in alarming rates, and new secondary-level business educators are not being prepared in sufficient numbers by the declining numbers of business teacher education institutions. Because of the logical extension and expanding nature of corporate training education as a business education focus, it is recommended that the preparation of such individuals be supported by NABTE and its institutional college and university members. The result would be an increase in needed educators for the corporate stage. NABTE and NBEA membership could likewise increase if the associations address this issue and make a concerted outreach to this potentially large population.

4. States are trying valiantly to maintain each of their respective entities; however, they appear isolated and do not communicate with other states in their region—or those with comparable memberships or problems elsewhere—to join forces and address common problems. NBEA regions tend to be likewise isolated and little regional impact is seen on the state level.

Specific Recommendations

1. While difficult, as previously reported, states should consider electing officers for longer terms, each with a strong legislative focus. This would allow for a more concerted—and possibly more effective—set of actions, which would result in a positive attitude change in their respective state capitols. Release time and legislative workshops should be provided to support these actions.

2. Regional associations need to be more proactive in supporting the states they represent. Greater articulation and stronger ties with states are greatly needed. This also suggests that our many national organizations (NBEA, ACTE, DPE, OSRA) must likewise work together—not separately. Too much duplication of effort wastes energy and resources, and is ultimately ineffective.

3. Greater outreach should be extended to national and regional training organizations, such as ASTD. These organizations will continue to grow over the next few years and will encompass many of the traditional business education issues and practices. Trainers are business educators, too. Partnerships with business are integral to this end and would address school-to-career issues essential to our graduates' survival.

4. Work-based learning is a fact of life, and business education should be competent in the issues and trends impacting this concept. Adult learning methods, just-in-time site based learning, Web-based instruction, and the development of task-directed learning activities, are all elements of lifelong, self-directed learning. Individual states, as well as our national and regional organizations, should embrace and prepare business educators for this trend that goes far beyond traditional secondary education.

(“A Ten-Year Review of Business Education Issues: A Longitudinal Survey of the Perceptions of State Business Education Presidents, 1988-1998.” NABTE Review, Volume 27, 2000, 19-20.)

The year 2002 brought about the Second Edition of the Training for Organizations textbook with Bridget O’Connor and Chester Delaney as well as a significant article about conducting longitudinal research in business education. The differences between the first and second editions of Training for Organizations have had a profound impact on expanding training careers.

The second edition of Training for Organizations includes topics not typically covered in a train-the-trainer workshop or book. These topics include treating training as an innovation, and techniques to ensure training success before implementation. The text emphasizes the practical as well as the theoretical in discussion needs assessment and evaluation strategies. It stresses the art and science of writing a training proposal. It discusses the promises and limitations of technology on the delivery of learning experiences as well as on the administration of training departments. In short, the book offers an understanding of the many roles played in a training career and provides concrete experiences that can transfer not only to the first job or the current job but also to help move up the career ladder. Especially new to this edition are *Voices from the Field*, in depth and focused interviews with six successful training professionals whose experience and expertise may inspire one to find new directions within a career as a professional trainer.

Interesting features from the second edition include: specific Learning Objectives for each chapter; Think it Through chapter questions; Ideas in Action, suggestions for future research;

Voices from the Field (see above); Additional Readings for each chapter; Resource Websites; and Appendices containing recommended training resources and journals as well as professional organizations and their websites and “listserves.”

(Preface, x, xii.)

Following the success of the second edition of that text, O’Connor, Bronner, and Delaney produced yet another edition—the third—in the series, published this time by HRD Press in Amherst, MA, in 2007. It was now entitled Learning at Work: How to Support Individual and Organizational Learning. This edition differed substantially from the earlier two texts in that the philosophy and the term that focused on instructor-led “training” shifted throughout to focus on the student as the critical individual, the “learner.” This is since the thrust of corporate instruction must be directed to the individual as the focal point, not merely the instructor being the “sage on the stage” but the “guide on the side.” This shift was a significant philosophical and intellectual move and, thus, so did the nature of the content of the book.

Some of the essential changes included updates of earlier major characteristics—Learning Objectives; Think It Through; Ideas in Action; Voices from the Field; Additional Resources; and Appendices, which presented sample learning proposals of different length and content; Professional Resources, and essential Professional Organizations and “listservs” and websites. As such, this was an entirely new undertaking and resulted in a new, dynamic text for the field.

(Learning at Work, 2007, Preface, xiii.)

The following article on longitudinal research states that much of it appeared in the 2001 DPE National Conference Book of Edited Readings as it was to be presented at that conference. However, after 9/11, Michael, as well as many others, did not attend that conference. Thus the article cited next is a revision and extension of that absent presentation. The introductory section and the section that follows it are presented here.

For the most part, business education research tends to be of two types: (a) quasi-experimental with control and experimental research groups or (b) survey and correlation research. Both of these research paradigms offer a valuable snapshot of what is going on—either as potential for future changes or what is currently happening at the time of the research. This strength, however, only captures a snapshot of time and does not address the larger concerns of such research findings, which by itself, may be an aberration of the period in which the study was conducted. One remedy to this problem can be addressed by longitudinal research, which studies similar issues over time. Think of longitudinal research as covering trends (Gallup Poll), panels (same people over time), or cohorts (different sample, similar population). . . .

Why Consider Longitudinal Research?

With the exception of the National Association for Business Teacher Education biennial surveys that have assessed the status of our field since the early 1980s, not much longitudinal research is conducted in Business Education. When the results of research are used to modify or improve practice of any type, it is important to make sure that they are stable and not transitory in nature. The quality and quantity of the sample selected and the population from which the sample is derived is critical. One cannot overstate the importance of the validity and the reliability of the data collection instrument(s) and the quality of the data interpreted by the researcher. So much rests of the quality of “one-shot” research that making wide generalizations to the larger population, or to the problem investigated, is subject to major error in both analysis and in interpretation. Think in terms of longitudinal research as being more like a movie than a single photograph.

Longitudinal research includes trend studies, similar to voting predictions and Gallup Polls. Cohort studies occur when a different sample comes from a constant population, such as surveying college business education professors over time. The population base remains constant—business education professors, but the sample changes with each survey iteration. Panel studies are those in which a specific sample is selected from a population at the beginning of the research and then the same panel continues to be surveyed over time to identify changes, which may be extrapolated to the population from which they were selected. An example is following a selected panel of business professors to track their professional experiences

throughout their careers and then relate these experiences to the business faculty population. Mortality—the of members of the sample over time, also termed attrition—is a major difficulty with this type of research as is the possibility of some bias reflected by those panel members who remain in the survey pool.

Longitudinal research also presents its own unique set of conditions and challenges that differentiate it from traditional surveys. The first is that it is a survey method that contains many of the problems inherent in this type of research; however, other questions that need to be considered include the number of such surveys over time to be considered longitudinal. Is two too few; is a dozen too many? A consensus of authors of current research texts suggests that from three to four iterations is the most commonly reported. The NABTE research reflected in this article originally considered five iterations over nearly two decades; however, the final report covered just one decade with three iterations, thus shortening both the time covered and the iterations for the sake of practicality.

Longitudinal research does not completely obviate these problems, as each of them can exist in the first and in subsequent surveys or observations. And, of course, such problems can be more easily addressed when they are observed over time rather than in a single survey distribution.

(“Conducting Longitudinal Research,” The Delta Pi Epsilon Journal, Vol. XLIV, No. 3, Fall, 2002, 221-222.)

Over the years, Bronner and Kaliski, had grown increasingly concerned about the future of our field, especially with the lack of formal attention given to the myriad problems, which failed to elicit national focus. In 2002 Burt’s Peter L. Agnew Lecture: “Business Education in the 21st Century,” which promulgated a national look at these issues and culminated in the formation of a “Business Education Think Tank,” The Agnew Group (TAG). This report appeared in a special issue of the *DPE Journal*, Winter, 2007 to summarize the work of TAG. The details of this important venture follow:

The Agnew Group

Beginnings

Over the years we have seen many efforts to try to work proactively toward the future of business education. In 1985, for example, An Action Agenda for Business Education emerged from one “think tank” activity, but it went nowhere. In 2003 a new team was created, one called The Agnew Group (TAG). This group was sponsored by the Peter L. Agnew Foundation, housed at New York University; Michael Bronner is one of the trustees of the Agnew Foundation. Michael, along with Burt Kaliski of Southern New Hampshire University, acted as co-founders and hosts of TAG. Other members of the first TAG team were Marcia Anderson (Southern Illinois University), Connie Forde (Mississippi State University), Dennis LaBonty (Utah State University), Judy Lambrecht (University of Minnesota), Peter Meggison (Massasoit Community College, MA), Pauline Newton (Presentation High School, San Jose), Bridget O’Connor (New York University), Sharon Lund O’Neil (University of Houston, Martha Rader (Arizona State University), and Bonnie Sibert (Nebraska State Department of Education). Robert Mitchell (DPE Executive Director), also served as an ex-officio member. Membership, affiliations, and contact information of the first TAG and the second TAG groups appear as follows:

Purpose

TAG’s primary purpose was clear: To prepare a series of white papers on what must be done to ensure the survival and promote the growth of business education in the 21st Century. TAG 1 first met for three days in New York City during the spring of 2003 and was actively involved in two specific activities. The first was extensive data collection; enrollment data in business education by state, information about yearbook and related publication contributions and legislative trends, and organizations to which business educators can belong to support the aims of our field.

TAG's second purpose was to speak to as many of our professional organizations as possible. As of 2008, we had presented our ideas and plans at a number of business education conferences, at annual NBEA conventions, and at DPE's national research conferences. We continued to involve all business educators and asked for their help in sending us information that may be of relevance to our efforts. As we shifted from TAG 1 to TAG 2, we asked that business educators who were aware of interesting programs or initiatives; state legislative efforts or research projects we should consider; contact Michael Bronner or Burt Kaliski, and we would forward these data to the new TAG 2 group accordingly.

In 2008—after five years of activity, which included numerous presentations to state, regional, national, and international gatherings and the development of two major publications—*Business Education 2020* and the Fall, 2007 special issue of the *Delta Pi Epsilon Journal*—it was decided to pass the torch to a new group of think tank members, TAG 2. TAG 2 members and their affiliations and contacts appear under The Agnew Group Contacts section on this site.

TAG 2 established their own agenda at the 2008 DPE conference in Chicago; however, members of the original TAG 1 group served as mentors and advisors for one year, through the national DPE conference meeting in San Francisco in 2009.

The following is a brief overview of this major undertaking, which appeared in the Winter 2007 issue of the *DPE Journal*. It has been updated from the publication date to reflect changes from 2007 to the date of this writing in 2015.

The Short and Active History of The Agnew Group

The field of business education, as we know it, has been driven by the needs of society since the beginnings of our nation's history—from apprenticeship training, to factory vestibule settings, to the emergence of the for-profit private business schools, to specialized vocational high schools, to the comprehensive secondary school, to business teacher preparation at the college level. The impact of federal, state, and local educational policies, technological innovations, national and

global events, and a diverse, global workforce, all serve to remind us that we must continue to adapt to change

Over the years many have worked proactively to create a future for business education, with many such recommendations coming from research and advocacy groups called think tanks. In the mid-1980s, for example, an action agenda for business education emerged from one such think tank activity. The purpose of this introductory article, thus, is to describe the genesis and contributions of The Agnew Group (TAG), a think tank that worked to identify the issues that business educators need to address, quickly through our professional organizations, in the coming decades. As a think tank, we have conducted trend analyses and research, and we hope these ideas feed into an action agenda (see Chapter 9) that can be vetted with all business educators.

How We Began

As the speaker at the *26th Peter L. Agnew Memorial Lecture* at New York University in October 2002, entitled “Business Education in the 21st Century,” Dr. Kaliski addressed six critical questions: (1) What will business education be? (2) Where will it be? (3) How will it be delivered? (4) Who will teach it? (5) Who will prepare the teachers? (6) Who will lead us? The importance of these six questions spurred Kaliski and Bronner to invite ten prominent business educators from around the country to join in an effort to address these critical issues. This was the genesis of The Agnew Group (TAG).

TAG, sponsored by The Peter L. Agnew Foundation, was housed at New York University, where the first business teacher education program was offered and Delta Pi Epsilon was founded. Burt Kaliski and Michael Bronner served as co-chairs of The Agnew Group, which was named in recognition of the Agnew Foundation’s support. The Agnew Foundation is managed by three trustees—Arthur Rubin, Lester Brookner, and Michael Bronner.

We invited a small group of business education professionals to join TAG; criteria were that they had written and researched extensively in the field and/or had served in major national business

education leadership roles. Members were to represent the many levels of business education and various geographic regions within the U.S. Original TAG members were:

- Marcia Anderson* - Southern Illinois University - Former DPE President
- Connie Forde* - Mississippi State University – Former NBEA President
- Dennis LaBonty – Utah State University – Former NABTE President
- Judy Lambrecht* – University of Minnesota – Former DPE President
- Peter Meggison* – Massasoit Community College – Former NBEA and DPE President
- Pauline Newton – Presentation High School (CA) – Former ISBE, WBITE and CBEA President
- Bridget N. O’Connor* – New York University – Former OSRA President, AERA SIG National Executive Committee member, and AERA SIG Workplace Learning Chair
- Sharon Lund O’Neil* - University of Houston – Former NBEA and DPE President
- Martha Rader – Arizona State University and prolific Business Education author
- Robert Mitchell* - University of Arkansas - DPE Executive Director – Ex-Officio
- Janet Treichel* – NBEA Executive Director – Ex-Officio

*Denotes John Robert Gregg Award Recipient [updated]

Donna Cochrane – Bloomsburg University (PA) – Former NBEA President; Mary Ellen Olivero – Pace University (NY); Anne Rowe* –State Department of Education (VA); and Bonnie Sibert – State Department of Education (NE) were also original and/or early TAG members; however, due to retirements and expanding professional obligations, each requested that they be replaced on TAG’s original roster. Their contributions are gratefully acknowledged.

Our Purpose

We began with two explicit charges:

1. First, to prepare a series of white papers on what can be done to better ensure the survival and promote the growth of business education in the 21st Century. To develop this first charge, we met for three days at New York University during the spring of 2003. During that period, we focused on developing a specific, yet workable and open-ended agenda, beginning with extensive data collection—Business Education enrollment data, information about yearbook and related journal contributions, legislative trends, and professional organizations. This agenda included wide-ranging discussions and meetings of working groups, which covered the gamut constituting our field.
2. The second purpose was to identify and to gather information and reactions from as many of our business education professional organizations as possible over the ensuing four years. To date, these presentations have included all national, regional, and a large number of state business education associations, as well as our international group, the International Society for Business Education (ISBE). Other related associations, such as the Association for Career and Technical Education (ACTE), the American Educational Research Association (AERA), and the Special Interest Groups (SIGs) of Business Education and Workplace Learning, and the American Society for Training and Development (ASTD) conferences were also targeted. Corporate university conferences and our tri-organization-supported Policies Commission for Business and Economic Education (PCBEE) meetings also provided data for these ongoing TAG discussions. In addition, many graduate business teacher education classes and the National Association for Business Teacher Education (NABTE) representatives were surveyed, as well as were selected state department of education personnel. Their input provided substantial breadth and depth to our investigations.

The Early Meetings

A thorough review of the 1985 publication, *An Action Agenda for Business Education (The Agenda)*, which was a report of the proceedings and recommendations of the National Conference on The Future of Business Education (1985), provided early guidance for TAG

members. While this important document attempted to outline specific areas of concern for business education, TAG members felt that its recommendations had not been adequately addressed or sufficiently implemented, and our national and regional associations had not always supported new directions. Each of the four questions posed in *The Agenda* is listed below, followed by TAG concerns:

1. What is business education?

- The response to this question remains universally vague as few business educators can yet agree on a precise definition of our field. We feel this is one of the most critical issues facing us, and a clear definition still remains elusive.

2. Where is business education?

- Business Education has seen many traditional business offerings move from the secondary to the elementary and middle school level to partnerships merging post-secondary education with and among the business community, and to the growth of the corporate university concept. While business courses and programs still exist at the secondary level, they have declined substantially over the past two decades.

3. Where are the occupational opportunities for high school business education graduates?

- While small businesses still provide the majority of job opportunities, traditional secondary education falls short of adequately preparing these new employees for the workforce. The publication of *A Nation at Risk* (1983) pushed for higher education for (almost) all high school students resulting in the expansion of required college prep courses and the decline of business electives (among others). The preparation of qualified business education graduates dramatically slowed largely due to the decline of these secondary business offerings and program options.

4. What is the future of business education?

- Despite *The Agenda's* recommendation for improving the image of business education to enhance its future, not a great deal has been done to effectively promote our field to external audiences. *The Secretary's Commission on Achieving Necessary Skills* (SCANS) report from the U. S. Department of Labor (1991) pushed hard for what it termed "Workplace Know-How" but also acknowledged that many high school students do not believe what they are learning is connected to the real world. The National Business Education Association (NBEA) has undertaken a number of positive initiatives, for example, its legislative publications and the [then] use of Matthew Broderick as a marketing spokesperson to address this issue. The problem, unfortunately, is that these marketing activities are primarily internal to the field with little resulting outreach to our larger audiences. The decline in business education student enrollment throughout the U.S. and the substantial drop in the number of our teacher preparation institutions from 305 in 1981, to a total of 127 in 2002 (Chalupa, (2003) provide ample evidence of this growing problem.

The Agenda's four primary questions generated seven general areas of consideration: marketing of business education, curriculum, professional organizations, pre- and in-service education, research and development, funding, and legislation. However, despite the lofty concerns presented in this 1983 publication, with which few could argue, empirical evidence following this report and the recommendations that it posed have been largely absent, and an articulation of the definition of business education remains vague.

As such, and as a beginning step, TAG considered a new definition of business education, first by considering a broad definition of business and then by considering an equally broad definition of education—both daunting tasks. These considerations resulted in the following working definition: "Business education is a multi-faceted, interdisciplinary field of study encompassing content, context, processes, and interactions focusing on successful engagements in personal and societal economic and organizational systems. This includes, but is not limited to, economics, technology, lifelong (all-inclusive), self-directed, sustaining, multi-dimensional, and cross-functional skill sets" (TAG 2003).

Business education, as we know it, is education *for* business, *about* business, and, more recently, *in* business. As a broad concept, this definition goes beyond courses and specific topics and extends to the broader picture to which business education should strive. The *13th Annual Peter L. Agnew Memorial Lecture* at New York University, entitled “Toward a Redefinition of Business Education” (Sapre, 1988), focused on precisely this broad issue. Sapre’s concerns with the impact of technology, reform movements, and the emergence of new institutions and programs are still issues with which we wrestle today.

A Paradigm Shift for Business Teacher Education

The emerging conceptual frameworks for preparing business teacher educators at all levels include a paradigm shift from “teaching” to “learning” (O’Connor, 2004). The current generation of millennials’ learning preferences have changed rapidly and dramatically over the recent years as electronic media has broadened, extended, and largely enriched their ability to solve problems; to investigate beyond the borders of traditional texts and lectures; and to examine new and different ways to solve problems. Teaching teachers how to learn—and how to teach others to learn—is a concern for all business teacher educators. Instruction must adapt to these new learning tools and strategies since one of our premises is that the development of self-directed learning will extend beyond the traditional classroom—secondary and above—into the learner’s future work life.

New Career Options

Learning in business can be added to our well-known philosophy, for and about business, suggesting career options in corporate education for business teachers (O’Connor, 2004). This shift, TAG suggests, is critical to the concept of the future preparation of business instructors and is a major policy shift. Because teachers of business subjects are adept in both content and teaching/learning methods, a new career venue for graduates lies within the corporate education environment—the corporate university. When organized around a model for continuous learning and development, the corporate university emerges. Thus, as previously noted, we envision a

third component in our description of business education extending from for business and about business to include the concept of in business, as well. Our graduates work in a wide variety of environments outside of traditional schooling—in the corporate world where employee learning is not only ongoing but requires billions of budget dollars in employee learning and development.

This learning and development enterprise involves individuals at all levels, from the apprentice employee through middle management to the highest regions of administration, and in all fields and disciplines, including new product development, federally-mandated compliance training, to coaching, mentoring, and innovative and traditional managerial techniques. Armed with a strong theoretical grounding, effective assessment techniques, curricular content design and development, instructional methods and evaluation processes, this environment is open to those well versed in professional education. Workplace learning—learning that goes on within a business enterprise—and lifelong learning—learning leading to an individual’s improved and enhanced performance from basic skills to advanced competence—are all very appropriate realms for the professional business educator (O’Connor, 2004).

Summary

While [at the time of the publication of this article] TAG is only four years old, its members have accomplished a great deal during this period. From Kaliski’s 2002 Agnew Lecture to thousands of contacts at all professional levels in a wide range of venues both at home and abroad, along with our 20/20 vision publication in 2006, the message remains the same: the future of our field, Business Education, must remain high on our professional agenda. Members of TAG continue to actively search for new ways to inform, advise, and encourage business educators to become more pro-active and less re-active relative to the survival of our field. Is this new wine in old bottles? Perhaps; however, more critical, I think, is that it is new wine in NEW bottles. Cheers!

References

- The Agnew Group. (2003, May). Minutes of Meeting, May 30, 2003, 2.
- The Agnew Group. (2006). *Business education: A 20/20 vision*. New York, NY: Author.
- Chalupa, M. R. (2001). Business Education in the United States: 2001–2002: NABTE Survey Results. *NABTE Review*, 30, 10-15.
- Kaliski, B. (2002, October). *Business Education in the 21st Century*, 26th Annual Peter L. Agnew Memorial Lecture, New York University, NY.
- National Business Education Association. (2006). Business Education Professional Leadership Roster. *Business Education Forum*, 61(2), 63-71.
- National Commission on Excellence in Education. (1983). *A nation at risk: The imperative for educational reform*. Washington, D.C.: U.S. Department of Education.
- National Conference on The Future of Business Education. (1985, August 11-14). *An action agenda for business education*. Cincinnati, OH: Author.
- O'Connor, B. N. (2004). *The Agnew Group Web Site*. Retrieved April 6, 2004, from <http://www.nyu.edu/education/alt/beprogram/TAG/history.html>
- Sapre, P. M. (1988, March 15). *Toward a redefinition of business education*. New York University, New York: Alpha Chapter, Delta Pi Epsilon.
- The Secretary's Commission on Achieving Necessary Skills. (1991). What work requires of schools: A SCANS Report for America 2000. *Report from the U.S. Department of Labor*, ix.

A Special Issue of the DPE Journal

As a result of the significant work of TAG, a Special Issue of the *Delta Pi Epsilon Journal* was published in the Winter of 2007, entitled “Envisioning the Future of Business Education: A Report of the Agnew Group.” In this issue TAG members wrote about specific concerns and recommendations based on their research and collaboration as members of this group. Dr. O'Connor served as the editor and was the author of a research article for this

publication. Bronner, Kaliski, Lambrecht, Rader, Meggison, Anderson, LaBonty, O’Neil, and Forde all contributed major articles. Bronner and Kaliski also had two seminal articles, the final one of the Special Issue, which served to present “An Action Agenda for Business Education.”

Related Professional Contributions

Michael’s authorship, presentations, and related contributions extended far beyond the Business Education area, as his many professional memberships resulted in numerous high points in his long career. In addition to his work with numerous professional bodies, he also served as a member and chair (1988–2003) of the Peter L. Agnew Foundation’s Advisory Committee and later, from 2003 to 2008, as a member of the Board of Trustees prior to the closing of the Foundation. Included, but not limited to these professional bodies are the National Association for Business Teacher Education (NABTE); International Society for Business Education (ISBE); California Business Education Association (CBEA); American Education Research Association (AERA) and its Workplace Learning SIG; Organizational Systems Research Association (OSRA); and New York Academy of Public Education NYAPE). In addition, his post-retirement activities involved his philatelic hobby (stamp research and collection), which has extended to national and international organizations. A summary of these professional highlights follows, as do selected details of this part of his post-academic life.

The Collectors Club of New York

A Brief Review

While stamp collecting, even “serious collecting,” can be and is a very rewarding hobby for millions in the U.S. and internationally, Michael was encouraged by Dr. Alvin C. Beckett, who, by the way, received his NYU Business Education doctorate in 1955 from our very own Program. Dr. Beckett relocated to San Jose State University at the conclusion of his academic work at NYU and became Michael’s advisor and mentor, and introduced him to enjoy first collecting stamps and then to move into more depth and research—philately. In addition, Michael, through

the encouragement of Dr. Allan Boudreau—another NYU doctoral graduate in higher education and also a major philatelist and Freemason—sponsored Michael’s application for membership in the Collectors Club of New York (no apostrophe) as well as supporting Dr. Beckett’s encouragement, he also a Freemason, to join both the CC as well serving as the Club Administrator for the 80+ year-old Masonic Stamp Club of New York.

These memberships led to Michael’s being invited to join and eventually elected to first a one-year and later a full three-year term as a member of the Collectors Club Board of Governors, where he became, not surprisingly, deeply involved in its massive research library collection of books and related printed philatelic materials. He also found himself coordinating and authoring the numerous presentation reports later summarized and published in the *Collectors Club Philatelist* (CCP) journal. A brief listing and a sample of the reports he prepared follows:

Brian Moorhouse, England, Haiti, CCP January/February 2012, Vol. 91, No. 1, 52.

Ray Simrak, Canada, Canadian Airmail, CCP November/December 2013, Vol. 92, No. 6, 375-376.

Daniel Warren, Virginia, CSA, CCP May/June 2014, Vol. 93, No. 3, 187-189.

Leonard Hartmann, Kentucky, CSA, CCP July/August 2014, Vol. 93, No. 4, 253-255.

Alan Warren, Pennsylvania, Tibet, CCP July/August 2014, Vol. 93, No. 4, 256-257.

Guillermo Gallegos, Mexico, El Salvador, CCP September/October 2014, Vol 93, No. 5, 311-313.

Maurice Hadida, Paris, Morocco, CCP November/December 2014, Vol. 93, No. 6, 380-383.

Les Lanphear, III, U. S., CCP January/February 2015, Vol. 94, No. 1, 53-55.

Walter Farber, Chicago, IL, CCP, May/June 2015, Vol, 94, No. 3, 180.

Jeffrey Shapiro, Timothy O’Connor, Yamil Kouri, Sandeep Jaiswal, Boston Group, July/August 2015, Vol. 94, No 4, 242-243.

Kees Adema, Fairfield, CT, CCP July/August 2015, Vol. 94, No. 4, 244-246.

Michael Bronner 2015

Frederick Lawrence, Gilbert, AZ, CCP September/October 2015, Vol. 94, No. 5, (in press)

Office Systems Research Association

A Brief Review

In 1983, at almost the very beginning of the personal computer age, a group of faculty gathered and created an organization founded on research and practice of this new dimension, OSRA. Professor O'Connor was one of the founding members of this group and when she joined NYU the next year, she brought with her the passion and enthusiasm for this new field. As such, she became instrumental in the development and the publications, which expanded almost exponentially throughout the U.S. and resulted in a national curriculum first for undergraduate Office Systems students and then expanding to the graduate level. You can read the details of this exciting development in Professor O'Connor's chapter; however, you can read between the lines here when Michael followed her lead as she moved from OSRA membership to a member of the OSRA Board and then to national President. With this dual 'one-two-punch' from the O'Connor/Bronner team, it was inevitable that research, presentations, and publications would follow—and they did! Technology became the driving factor in business teaching, and the logical expansion from business teacher education, which earlier involved keyboarding and shorthand, to learning in the workplace with all its ramifications, occurred.

Michael served as an OSRA Board Member—Member-at-Large, Research (1986-87); Vice-President for Research (1987-89); Executive Vice-President (1989-90); and then President in 1990-91). His writings are listed in the bibliography that follows and are easily identified by the titles; his presentations included those of a Moderator, Speaker, Panel Member, and Chairman.

New York Academy of Public Education

A Brief Review

The New York Academy of Public Education was formed in 1912 to promote the aims and objectives of public education in New York City with a membership limited to public school supervisors and administrators. Michael first served as a Director and Member of the Executive Board from 1993 and then as President in 1996-1998. The organization had a highly-visible membership of more than 300 and under Michael's leadership, invited and hosted then-U.S. Secretary of Education, Richard Riley and Vartan Gregorian, President of the Carnegie Foundation as Medalists in 1997 and 1998. His activities in this organization were prompted by his earlier work with the NYC Board of Education as a consultant in evaluating school supervisors and administrators who were pending permanent appointment.

Accreditation Council for Independent Colleges and Schools (ACICS)

A Brief Review

The ACICS is the national accreditation body for the 'for profit' sector of independent colleges, located in Washington, D.C. This international body serves as the validation conduit for Federal funds to support student loans and tuition; without such accreditation such schools could not operate. Michael served first as an evaluation member and later as a visitation chairman from 1993 – 2007, evaluating schools in at least a dozen states, Puerto Rico, and Dublin, Ireland. He also served as an expert witness to the Board of Directors in D.C. and was a final stage evaluator for the 600 such institutions during his tenure with ACICS.

American Educational Research Association

A Brief Review

The AERA represents approximately 26,000 educators in the U.S. and internationally, and their annual meetings generally draw between 12,000 and 16,000 attendees, including participants and visitors. Their annual Program runs nearly 500 pages in agate-sized print and is said to be the primary source of faculty applicants and faculty hires. The Special Interest Groups number more

than 150 and their total membership tops 30,000 as AERA members can—and usually do—join more than one SIG.

The Workplace Learning SIG has been the ‘home away from home’ for Business Educators, meshing with the Business Education and Information Systems SIG until the latter disbanded. Michael was a member from 1973 to this writing, serving as the Treasurer from 2000 to 2004 and encouraging NYU Business Education graduate students to participate and to take leadership roles in the SIG, many of whom honed their professional contributions and visibility with this experience.

Delta Pi Epsilon – Alpha Chapter

A Brief Review

Since Delta Pi Epsilon originated at NYU in 1936 with Alpha Chapter as its first of over 200 such Chapters, it was logical for our faculty to serve as leaders and sponsors of this professional graduate society, as it was originally named. Michael, along with nearly all NYU B/E faculty—Lomax, Agnew, Tonne, Gillespie, Sapre, and O’Connor—did just that, joining Alpha in 1971, becoming a Life Member in 2005, and serving as Sponsor from 1985 to 1998 and Emeritus in that year. He also served as the Faculty Sponsor of Alpha Chapter in Puerto Rico during its early years from 1985 to 1995 when it became a separate Chapter, Delta Iota.

Among Michael’s activities in addition to serving as Alpha’s Sponsor were numerous presentations to DPE’s annual meetings in the U.S. and Puerto Rico, and contributions to its *Research Proceedings* publication, numbering more than a dozen over a period of three decades.

A separate chapter in this series reviews the history and contributions of Alpha Chapter, Delta Pi Epsilon at NYU.

National Business Education Association and Affiliates

A Brief Review

Michael's membership (1959) and many contributions to Business Education's "parent organization," NBEA span more than a dozen presentations to their annual national conferences, authorship of articles in the *Business Education Forum*, and service from 1972 to the National Association for Business Teacher Education as NYU's Institutional Representative. He also served as the National Research Coordinator (1981 - 1983 and 1989 – 1991); director and principal investigator for the annual research "status report," which he and Dr. Clay Sink of the University of Rhode Island created and honed from 1981 through 1991.

Likewise, Michael served with the U.S. Chapter of the International Society for Business Education (ISBE)—or SEIC, as it was called internationally—presenting, mostly with Professor O'Connor, in Vienna, Austria in 2007; Krakow, Poland in 2004; Stockholm, Sweden in 2003; he also delivered the keynote session presentation to the international society's meeting in Boston, MA in 2005. His work on international issues resulted in the development and teaching of a two part graduate summer class at NYU—International Business Education I and II—in 2004, which appeared in the 2009 issue of the *Journal of Global Business Education*.

Michael also traveled widely throughout the United States, making presentations on business education issues through State and Regional meetings and workshops as well as in Puerto Rico, largely based on his 21 years of teaching and administering the Program on that Island. He and Burt Kaliski were also invited to Anchorage, AK to present to that state's annual education conference and help develop their statewide Business Education group in February 2007.

Michael also found time to serve on editorial and review boards for a wide variety of Business Education publications—*Journal of Business and Training Education*, *Journal of Education for Business*, *Journal for Global Business Education*, *Delta Pi Epsilon Journal*, *Information Technology*, *Learning & Performance Journal* among others, including reviewing proposals for national meetings of AERA and UCEA.

Finally, Michael's deeply-held belief in the values of doctoral education, begun and encouraged by Professor Karen Gillespie in the early 1970s, resulted in an extremely productive doctoral

cohort, in which he is justifiably proud with service as chair, member, or final reader to more than 200 successful doctoral candidates. Their research, he often said, expanded his understanding of such a wide variety of business and business-related topics to the degree originally unimaginable—accounting; business ethics; consumer behavior; management; marketing; information systems; teaching practices and technology; global business issues; insurance; and yes, even the once-mundane topics of shorthand and keyboarding. It was a great source of pride for him that seven of his graduates earned the DPE National Research Award for their dissertations, the very last of whom served as a fitting bookend to his doctoral service with her honor in 2010—Dr. Diane Persky.

A complete listing of these graduates can be found at the end of this chapter.

Michael has been accorded numerous honors and recognition. A selection of his major honors include the prestigious John Robert Gregg Award, shared with Bridget N. O'Connor and presented at the NBEA conference in Philadelphia in 2002; NYU's Professor of the Year in 1990; EBEA and BEA Educator of the Year in 1992 and 1990 respectively; and ASTD's Leadership, Excellence, Achievement, and Performance (LEAP) Award, in 2005.

Thus we can see that he has had a full and active personal and professional life, contributing to his field professionally and enjoying a wide range of personal pursuits as well—flying, sailing, soaring, surfing, SCUBA, snorkeling, skiing, and stamping—which he calls 'most of the 'S' sports. However, teaching and working with students has and continues to be his passion, even in this, his early retirement period—his Chapter Three. May these passions long endure.

Michael Bronner's Doctoral Committees: 1974 – 2010 – M = Member; C = Chair

1974 - Flora Lawrence (M)

1975 - Brother David Ryan, Rel. Ed. (M); Arnold Reiger (M); Rita Franzese, Higher Ed. (M)

1976 - Leon Levy (M)

Michael Bronner 2015

1977 - Aida Santiago-Perez* (M); Salvatore Grande, Ed. Admin. (M)

1978 - Joan Byorek (C); Brenda Hersh (C)

1979 - Richard Rauch (C)

1980 - Blanche Ettinger* (C); Barbara Ann Levine (C); Jennie Daubert Prant (C); Daniel Rosich (C)

1981 - Larry Wills (C)

1982 - Charles Goldsmith (C); Pearl Willing (C)

1983 - William Bernhard (M); Joseph Bonnice (C); Francis DeCaro (C); Osu Eni (C); Joseph Ferioli (C); Hubert Hennessey (C); Emil Wittek (C)

1984 - Howard Budner (M); Anne Fosbre (C); Victor Maiorana (M); Elba Rivera-Marquez (C); Shepherd Walker (C)

1985 - Ronald Colefield (C); John McGinnis (C); Edward Shoenthal (C)

1986 - Avis Anderson (C); Doris Dingle (C); Rhoda Jacobs (C); Harold Perl (C)

1987 - Eleanor Davidson* (C); Gene Goldstein (C)

1988 - Erisbelia Garriga-Illas (C); Suzanne Kuuskmae (C); James Matthews (C); Gloria McDonnell (C); Michael Shapiro (C)

1989 - Eugene Ehrlich (C); Sheila Gersh (C); Cordelia Twomey (C)

1991 - Myriam Burgos (C); Nathalis Wamba (C)

1993 - Richard DeLuca (C); Irene McCarthy (C); John McKenna* (C)

1994 - William McPherson (C)

1995 - John Collins (M); David Kohn (C); Frederick Palumbo (C); Joseph Stern (C)

1996 - Olben Delgado-Mendez (C); Gerard Engholm (C); John Okpara (C); Michael Seda (C)

1997 - Jill D'Aquila* (C); Julia Morrison (C)

1998 - Kenneth Bigel (C); Elizabeth White (C)

1999 - Madelyn Schulman (C)

2000 - John Dobbins (C); Helen McGowan (C); Albert Torressen (C)

2001 - Anthony Basile* (C); Clare Pennino (C); Almerinda Forte (C); Ira Teich (C)

2002 - Rogatus Mpeka (C)

2003 - Scott Schneider (C)

2004 - Daniel Kerr (C)

2008 - William Black (C); Frimette Kass-Shraibman (C); Gaetano Adamo (C)

2009 - Pamela Bandyopadhyay (C)

2010 - Diane Persky* (C)

Totals: 80; as chair (69); as member (11); other departments (23 estimated, but not included in this listing)

*Delta Pi Epsilon National Research Award Recipients (awarded two years following completion)

Michael Bronner's Chronological Bibliography

1961

with Maxwell, Gerald W., Leschinsky, Cliff, and Warner, Katherine. Team teaching in general business. *Business Education World*. December, 1961. 5-10.

1963

The How and Why of Banking. San Francisco, CA: California Bankers Association, 1963.

1969

Bookkeeping and accounting for you. *Sincerely Yours*, January/February, 1969, 19.

1971

Selling business education. *Business Education Observer*, Fall/Winter, 1971, 11-13.

The numbers game. *Today's Secretary*, January, 1971,

Transcription teaser. *Today's Secretary*, February, 1971,

1973

An Abstract of The Business Education Association of Metropolitan New York: An Investigation of its Role and Growth, in his unpublished doctoral dissertation, New York University, 1973.

1974

The Business Education Association of Metropolitan New York – Its Role and Growth.
Business Education Forum, October, 1974, 31-32.

1975

The Business Education Association of Metropolitan New York – forty-eight years of progress.
Chapter 14 in the Business Education Association Yearbook No. 29, New York, NY: Business Education Association of Metropolitan New York, 127-141.

with Beckett, Alvin C. Business education goes “mod.” *Journal of Business Education*, April, 1975. 293-294.

Book review of Organizational issues in industrial society. *Contemporary Sociology*, September, 1975. n.p.

1977

with Cooney, Joan. Word processing – a synthesis. *Business Education Association Journal*, Spring, 1977, 1-8.

Innovations in business education. *Sincerely Yours*, November, 1977, 3.

1978

A Theory of Educational Evaluation. *Chapter 8 in the 1978 National Business Education Association Yearbook No. 16*, Reston, VA: NBEA, 74-88.

1979-1980

Business education in the 21st century. *New Jersey Business Education Observer*, Winter, 1979-1980, 8-12.

1980

CBTE: Competent Teachers and/or Teacher Competencies. *Sincerely Yours*, March, 1980, 23 and *BTA Journal*, August, 1980.

1981

Accounting instruction and computer technology. *Business Education Association Journal*, Vol. 7, No. 1, Spring, 1981, 1-8.

Keeping “fit” in the basics of business and economics. *Business Education Forum*, Vol. 36, No. 3, December, 1981, 16-17.

1982

The future of business education – a view from the associations. *Journal of Studies in Technical Careers*, Vol. 4, No. 3, Winter, 1982, 47-56.

1983

Promoting business education through national association publications and activities. Chapter 17 in the 1983 *National Business Education Association Yearbook*, No. 21, National Business Education Association, 1983, 40-44.

The status of business education in the United States. *NABTE Review*, No. 10, 1983, 34-38.

Field trip effectiveness – a camera is the key. *BTA Journal*, Vol. 1V, No. 1, Fall, 1983, 30-31.

1984

Accounting education: training specialists or educating generalists. *The Balance Sheet*, Vol. 66, No. 1, September/October, 1984, 17-19.

with Pash, Roberta. First-time final copy: a keyboarding experiment. *Business Education Forum*, Vol. 39, No. 3, December, 1984, 20-21.

1985

Basic skills in business education. *Business Education Association Journal*, Spring, 1985, 39-45.

1986

Business and education: the sound of one hand clapping? *Office Systems Research Journal*, Vol. 5, No. 1, Fall, 1986, 37-40.

1987

with O'Connor, Bridget N. OSRA model curriculum for office systems education. Montclair, NJ: Presentation to Beta Phi Chapter of DPE, April, 1987.

with O'Connor, Bridget N. The local area network: is it living up to early expectations? *Journal of Systems Management*, November, 1987, 6-9.

Local area networking in an academic environment. *Proceedings of the Sixth Annual ISECON Conference*. Data Processing Management Association, Park Ridge, IL, 1987, 235-241.

1988

How to teach research. *Delta Pi Epsilon Research Proceedings*, Little Rock, AR, 1988, 105-107.

Investigation of the status of shorthand in business and education. *OT/SE Journal*, Vol. 2, No. 2, 1988-89, 32-41.

1989

with O'Connor, Bridget N. Administrative support systems. *Chapter 17 in the 1989 National Business Education Association Yearbook*. Reston, VA: National Business Education Association, 149-155.

with O'Connor, Bridget N. The local area network in microcomputer classrooms. *NABTE Review No. 16*. Reston, VA: National Business Education Association, 48-52.

Business education in Puerto Rico – where will it be in the year 2000? *Revista Alpha en Puerto Rico*, Vol. 1, No. 1, June, 1989, 5-6.

1990

Ask the experts. *Business Education Forum*, Vol. 44, No. 8, May, 1990, 4-5.

Workforce 2001 – can we cope? The coming crisis in business education. *Business Education Association Journal*, Winter, 1990, 7-12.

with O'Connor, Bridget N. Office systems as an area of study and research. *The Journal of the Office Systems Research Association*, Fall, 1990, Vol. 9, No. 1, 18-25.

A doctoral research model. *Delta Pi Epsilon Research Proceedings*, Columbus, OH, November, 1990, 23-25.

Business education history lessons: is it never too late to learn? *New Jersey Business Education Observer*, 1990-1991, 15-22.

1991

Business education in the United States: 1989-1990 NABTE survey results. *NABTE Review*, No. 18, 1991, 5-16.

1992

with O'Connor, Bridget N. Groupware: a review of its successes. Boston, MA: Presentation at NABTE annual meeting, April, 1992.

1993

with Terlaga, Raymond J., Ray, Charles, and O'Connor, Bridget N. Using computer simulations in collegiate and corporate education programs. Dallas, TX: Presentation at OSRA Conference, March, 1993.

1994

with O'Connor, Bridget N. The role of electronic meeting systems in supporting curriculum development: a case study. *Proceedings of the PRISM 94 International Conference*. January, 1994, Maui, HI: 34-44.

1995

with O'Connor, Bridget N. Facilitating curriculum development: the role of electronic meeting systems. *NABTE Review No. 22*. Reston, VA: National Business Education Association, 5-9.

1996

Curriculum development: the need for business/education cooperation. *Office Systems Research Journal*, Special Curriculum Issue, Spring, 1996, 13-18.

with O'Connor, Bridget N. and Delaney, Chester. *Training for Organizations*. Cincinnati, OH: South-Western Publishing Company.

Conducting doctoral research: suggestions from the advisement trenches. *Proceedings, 1996 Research Conference*, Indianapolis, IN, November, 1996, 245-248.

Michael Bronner 2015

1998

with O'Connor, Bridget N. The cyberprofessional organization. *Chapter 12 in the 1998 National Business Education Association Yearbook*. Reston, VA: National Business Education Association, 129-137.

1999

Let's get serious about conducting action research. *Edited Book of Readings*. 1999 Delta Pi Epsilon Annual Fall Conference, St. Louis, MO, November 18-20, 161-168.

Distance education in business and business education. *1999 Call for Papers*. Eastern Business Education Association Annual Conference, Saratoga Springs, NY, 1-26.

2000

Can we measure training results? Getting past the vagueness of "it depends". *ASTD Lamplighter*. American Society for Training and Development Newsletter (Metro Chapter), Winter/Spring 2000, 1.

2002

with O'Connor, Bridget N. and Delaney, Chester. *Training for organizations, second edition*. Cincinnati, OH: South-Western Publishing Company.

Conducting longitudinal research. *Delta Pi Epsilon Journal*, Vol. 44, No. 1. Fall, 2002, 221-232.

2003

with O'Connor, Bridget N. New directions for business education. Stockholm, Sweden: Paper presented at International Society for Business Education Conference, July, 2003.

2004

with O'Connor, Bridget N. Workplace learning: a foundation for education in business. Krakow, Poland: Paper presented at International Society for Business Education Conference, July, 2004.

Teaching the international business course: an instructional case study. *Journal for Global Business Education* No. 4, International Society for Business Education, Oakland, CA, 13-26.

2005

with O'Connor, Bridget N. Designing and implementing a development program for corporate university faculty: an action research model. Montreal, Canada: Paper presented at AERA Conference, April, 2005.

2007

with O'Connor, Bridget N. and Delaney, Chester. *Learning at work: how to support individual and organizational learning*. Amherst, MA: HRD Press.

with O'Connor, Bridget N. University-corporate partnerships. Vienna, Austria: Presentation at International Society for Business Education Conference, July, 2007.

The Short and Active History of the Agnew Group (TAG). *Delta Pi Epsilon Journal, Special Issue*, Vol. 49, No. 1, Winter, 2007, 1-8.

with Kaliski, Burton S. New Opportunities—Implications and Recommendations for Business Education's Role in Non-Traditional and Organizational Settings. *Delta Pi Epsilon Journal, Special Issue*, Vol. 49, No. 1, Winter, 2007, 32-37.

with Kaliski, Burton S. An Action Agenda for Business Education. *Delta Pi Epsilon Journal, Special Issue*, Vol. 49, No. 1, Winter, 2007, 56-63.

2008 and beyond – see notes with professional organizations and association presentations.

####