COOPERATION WITHOUT CONSENSUS:
NATIONAL DISCUSSIONS AND LOCAL IMPLEMENTATION IN GENERAL EDUCATION REFORM
1930-1960

BY

KEVIN SHADY ZAYED

DISSERTATION

Submitted in partial fulfillment of the requirements
for the degree of Doctor of Philosophy in Educational Policy Studies
in the Graduate College of the
University of Illinois at Urbana-Champaign, 2016

Urbana, Illinois

Doctoral Committee:

Associate Professor Christopher M. Span, Chair
Professor James D. Anderson
Professor Philo A. Hutcheson, University of Alabama
Associate Professor Timothy R. Cain, University of Georgia

Abstract

This study explores the general education movement of 1930-1960—a movement devoted to revising the content, and methods, of reforming the first two years of postsecondary study for undergraduates. It begins by noting that much of the extant literature focuses on the curricular statements produced by Harvard, Columbia, and the University of Chicago as well as their assumed influence upon other institutions of higher learning—including historically black colleges and universities, women's colleges, religiously affiliated colleges, land grants, and community colleges—during this time period. This study complicates this reading of the movement by arguing that the curricular statements of Harvard, Columbia, and the University of Chicago were unable to achieve curricular reform on their respective campuses and were deemed to be unacceptable by institutions across the nation. The study asks, then, if the curricular theories of these prestigious universities were unable to create and/or sustain a fixed body of curricular content on their own campuses, is it likely that they influenced the curriculums of other institutions across the country? And more important, if the curricular structures in place at these institutions were constantly evolving—driven by faculty and student concerns, local context, the politics of curricular compromise, and not representing a linear, top-down *method* of reform—what method of reform did these universities and other institutions of higher learning look to, for achieving tangible and sustainable mechanisms of reform?

This study then offers a new way of seeing curricular reform in the general education movement by relying on the lenses provided by an exploration of three cooperative studies of general education—or studies funded by philanthropic groups in which a number of institutions and their representatives cooperate with each other and educational researchers to spur reform of

their own curricular measures. The three cooperative studies of general education focused on are the Eight-Year Study (1930-1942); the Cooperative Study in General Education (1938-1947), and the California Study of General Education in the Junior College (1948-1952).

Using insights from an extensive exploration of the cooperative studies, this study argues that reform in the general education movement operated in a "matrix of influence" that involved educational research, philanthropy, and (both inter- and intra-) institutional "cooperation without consensus," rather than a top-down channeling of reform from prestigious institutions. Further, this led to a cyclical and iterative interplay between national discussions and local implementation that changed both the content of general education and the methods of its constant reform. These processes shaped the way people talked about, implemented, and executed general education measures on their campuses. Through these processes, words became ideas, and ideas eventually became curricular structures implemented at the most basic levels. These reforms were almost always sensitive to local context and were often advertised to the public as being politically, economically, socially, and culturally expedient and relevant.

Dedication

To the Family who are Friends

And to the Friends who are Family

And to the young man who began this journey: "This is what I would tell my young self…There was never a shot of doing this perfectly. It was never in the cards." (John Mayer)

Acknowledgements

It is rather fascinating that in every course, conversation, and conference that I encountered dedicated to teaching me the craft of research, no one ever mentioned the importance of maintaining some record of those whom one may wish to acknowledge at the end of a project. I was taught to catalog every citation, archival document, and piece of feedback that I received. "You may need that later," was the constant refrain. I decided rather early in this project to keep a file of people that I wished to acknowledge later. I am excited that later is finally here.

I would have had precious little to catalog if it were not for the many librarians and archivists that assisted me: the knowledgeable and helpful University of Illinois library and interlibrary loan staff, as well as a number of archives which were instrumental in providing me with the primary sources that made up so much of this dissertation. Not only were each of their archivists supportive and extraordinarily well versed in their holdings, but many of them went above and beyond to facilitate the requests of a "broke" graduate student who did not have the resources to visit their archive in person. Often, this involved scanning or photocopying the materials and mailing them to me. My sincere appreciation goes to Kelsey Knox (Pepperdine University), Carol A. Leadenham (Hoover Institution), Christine Colburn and Barbara Gilbert (University of Chicago), Joanna Bares (Rockford University), Sarah Roberts (Michigan State University), Sister Margery Smith (St. Catherine's University), Jim Armistead (Harry S. Truman Library and Museum), David Olson (Columbia Oral History Research Office), Jane Gorjevsky and Jen Comins (Carnegie Collection, Columbia University), Amy Fitch and Camelia Muresan (Rockefeller Archives) and Michelle Drobik (Ohio State University). I would also like to thank John W. Boyer of the University of Chicago for allowing me permission to access the Dean of

the College archival records and Ron Basich for photocopying a number of folders from the American Council on Education Papers.

I have been very fortunate to have several wonderful mentors. Each has given me a model to look up to, and their company to look forward to. Thank you to my dissertation committee. To have this collection of scholars supporting me truly made the committee the envy of my colleagues. Each of the committee members had the uncanny ability of knowing exactly when to allow me to sail out to sea alone and when to serve as a lighthouse to guide me home. My adviser Christopher Span has been a constant source of inspiration and laughter. He helped me navigate graduate school and much of my 20s with his wisdom and sense of humor. His ability to promote the autonomy of his students while knowing exactly when and what support to offer is simply remarkable. Similarly, James Anderson combined sage advice with the ability to put anything and everything in its proper perspective. Tim Cain always made time for me, and our many conversations in his office continue to give me much to mull over. Above all, I always enjoyed his company. His willingness to stay on my committee three years after moving to the University of Georgia is evidence of his unwavering commitment to students. Philo Hutcheson has been a keen source of support and good cheer since the first time we met, when I was a first-year graduate student at the History of Education Society (HES) Annual Meeting.

Each of the following individuals have not only been gracious with their time, but have all contributed to the blueprint of how I approach my career and, in many cases, my life. Adam Nelson has been kindly corresponding and chatting with me since I was a junior in college, when his book *Education and Democracy* spoke to me about the power of liberal education to change my life and the history of education to become my life's work. Craig Kridel has always been a wonderful scholar to "talk shop" with and has been generous with his time and insight. Jackie

Blount honestly might be the kindest person I have ever met. If anyone came close to challenging her, it would be Karen Graves. AJ Angulo, Lynn Burlbaw, Katherine Chaddock, Dionne Danns, Amy Wells Dolan, Linda Eisenmann, Milton Gaither, Julia Grant, Bob Hampel, Tim Lacy, Chris Loss, Maggie Nash, Bob Osgood, Sharon Pierson, David Potts, Bill Reese, Kate Rousmaniere, John Rury, Nate Sorber, John Thelin, Don Warren, the recently deceased Joe Watras, Harold Wechsler, Joy Williamson, and Wayne Urban have all been wonderful role models and have provided key advice along the way. I am also grateful to have met and learned from Adrea Lawrence, who graciously offered me the opportunity to teach online courses for the University of Montana and shared her insights with me.

Fellow graduate students and new faculty members have supported me on an almost daily basis. Mario Rios Perez has been inspiring and grounding me since our first day of working together at the *History of Education Quarterly* (HEQ). Mario, along with Paul Mathewson, made working for HEQ not only a pleasure, but a formative experience. Ethan Schrum and Bryan McAllister-Grande have been gracious both as sounding boards and in sharing their own work with me. Michael Hevel's acerbic humor and example of excellence not only sent me back to the drawing board at times, but gave me much to reflect on once I was there. Michelle Purdy frequently reiterated her faith in me in my moments of darkness. I admire Ben Johnson as a wonderful historian, a terrific father, and an even better human being; he balances his heavy responsibilities with grace and humor.

Jake Hardesty constantly motivated me by "showing me the other side." He graciously brought me to Rockford University to speak about general education, introduced me to supportive faculty members there including Debra Dew and William Gahan, occasionally allowed me teach a section of his classes while he observed, and assisted me in attaining a

position as an adjunct faculty member. And of course, the man, the myth, the legend, Jon Hale, has been my big brother in just about every way since we met in 2009. Though he constantly encourages me to forge my own path (as a big brother should), I am certain that I will always study his footprints in the snow (as little brothers often do).

Many at the University of Illinois have done much to challenge and inspire me in their classrooms and in their offices. Chris Higgins through his many courses and our many conversations shaped not only my teaching, but also my worldview. Walter Feinberg afforded me the opportunity to work for him at the end of my graduate studies and graciously allowed me to finish writing this dissertation in his office. I could not have asked for a greater "capstone" experience. I am also grateful for the support I received from Yoon Pak, Nick Burbules, and William Trent. Jeanne Connell, David Zola, Shameem Rakha, and Daniel Berry not only kindly allowed me to gain teaching experience under them but also provided me with both the autonomy and guidance necessary to experiment and hone my teaching. The many administrative assistants and support staff in the College of Education were also very helpful. I would also like to thank many of the fellow graduate students that I met at the University. I greatly appreciated the company and friendship of Olanipekun Laosebikan, Heather Greenhalgh-Spencer, Justin York, Adrienne Pickett, Alisha Johnson, Theo Moton, Angela Slates, Tony Laing, Carey Hawkins Ash, Charles Terry, Sammer Saleh-Jones, Jasmine Parker, Jameson Brewer, and Shana Riddick.

I dedicated this dissertation to the family that are friends and the friends that are family. No words can do justice to the amount of appreciation I have for the friends who have been my family. I am forever grateful for the adventures I have had and will continue to have with Rob Goren, Mark Keitges, Eddie Manofsky, Eric Ridenour, and Theresa Lawrence. I appreciate the

music and friendship of Phil Dickey, Will Knauer, and the other members of Someone Still Loves You, Boris Yeltsin. I would also like to acknowledge the many acquaintances who made the logistics of this dissertation possible. Thank you to everyone who lent me a couch or floor to sleep on while doing archival research, those New Yorkers who proved the stereotype wrong and kindly gave directions to a tourist, and every late-night diner server who kept my cup of tea full and wished me luck at 3 AM.

I also dedicated this dissertation to the family that have been my friends. My mother inspired me to study the past as a young child by taking me to antique shops and second-hand bookstores, pastimes that we still enjoy. My father made schooling a priority in our household. He emigrated to the U.S. at a young age, forestalled his own dreams to work long hours so that he might provide opportunities for his children to do better than he, and held us to the highest standards. Nasser is the ideal big brother. Indeed, it is because I have a big brother like Nasser that I am able to use that term as one of my highest compliments. My wonderful big sister Maha was there in my darkest moments. My kid brother Johnny irritates me in the best ways, both by being boneheaded at times and by reminding me of my own limitations at others. Abeer is not only a wonderful big sister, but is also a terrific mother. I am privileged and honored to serve as godfather to Abeer's daughter Audrey and Nasser's daughter Julie.

One of my greatest inspirations, British celebrity chef Marco Pierre White, once said, "Children change you. It does not matter if they are yours or someone else's." My beloved nieces and nephews—Audrey and her brother Omi, Julie and her brother Nasser, Jr.—have changed me, in part by putting me in closer contact with the child I once was, to recall ideals and emotions that can be weathered by the real world. My obligation to them is borne out of my desire to give

them something close to what Uncle Abe, Aunt Hiam, and Cousin Jimmy gave me: moments where the lines of mentorship and friendship blur.

So much of this journey has been about replacing fear with faith. My faith has always been with the Lord Jesus Christ and the Heavenly Father. I appreciate the many blessings You have offered and the path You have taken me on. May I always have You by my side as I continue the journey.

Table of Contents

Chapter 1

Reform in the General Education Movement: Cooperation Without Consensus and the Matrix of Influence

So great is the passion spent in searching for the perfect curriculum and so perennially is the search undertaken that there are few teachers indeed who are not plunged into despair at the very mention of it. Nevertheless, despite its heartache, curriculum revision is all that teachers can think to do in order to respond to the pressures of the present.[1]

—David H. Bayley

A certain amount of confusion and conflict is inevitable in any growing developing social movement. General education is no exception. From its inception the general education movement has been misunderstood, misinterpreted, misjudged as to its nature, purposes, and direction. Frequently general education is accepted or rejected uncritically. It deserves better treatment at the hands of those who are active in its support or rejection. Terms often associated with the movement have been lifted from another context, and, unless defined carefully when used, tend to prevent people from communicating easily and understandingly.[2]

—Gordon N. MacKenzie and Hubert Evans

Before making a statement of my own conceptions of general education it is perhaps desirable that I dispose of Robert Maynard Hutchins. I find everywhere I go, in spite of the statements made about him, that he is still something that has to be dealt with.[3]

—Charles H. Judd

"A general education movement is under way," soon-to-be U.S. Commissioner of Education, Earl J. McGrath began his editorial in the inaugural issue of the *Journal of General Education* in 1946, "It is moving across the educational landscape with speed and force. It will sweep away many conventional forms of high school and college education. It will cause major modifications in professional and technical education. It will radically change requirements for graduate degrees. It will profoundly affect the thinking and the lives of our people."[4] It may be

---

[1] David H. Bayley, "The Emptiness of Curriculum Reform," *Journal of Higher Education* 43 (1972): 591-592.

[2] Gordon N. MacKenzie and Hubert Evans, "The Challenge of General Education for the Secondary Schools," *Journal of General Education* 1 (1946): 64.

[3] Chairman: Mark A. May, Participants: Charles H. Judd, Henry M. Wriston, Roscoe Pulliam, Grayson N. Kefauver, Bertie Backus, and B. Lamar Johnson, "General Education in the United States: A Panel Discussion," *Educational Record* 20 (1939): 438.

[4] Earl J. McGrath, "The General Education Movement: An Editorial," *Journal of General Education* 1 (1946): 3. In 1948, while participating in a roundtable discussion at the annual meeting of the Classical Association of the Middle West and South, McGrath and the journal were complimented by the president of the association who remarked, "I suppose no educator in the United States is better qualified than you to outline for us the General Education movement in America, since you are the editor of the *Journal of General Education*, whose function is to interpret this movement to educators and laymen alike." A transcript of this discussion appears in Dorrance S. White, "The General Education Movement and the Classics," *The Classical Journal* 44 (1948): 85. On McGrath's larger

an understatement to suggest that the *Journal of General Education* was created at a rather opportune moment. It was a time when the term "general education," nebulous though it was to many, was of great concern to all. This dissertation relies on two separate, but interrelated definitions of general education. The first is a broad, operational definition that suggests general education to be simply the type of schooling and education offered to students in their first two years of postsecondary study. This initial definition is intended to fully encompass the wide "school" oriented projects and "educational" processes that were conceived, considered, and reformed during the general education movement. The second definition conceives general education as the portion of the undergraduate curriculum that deals with culture, citizenship, and the shaping and transmission of both. This definition encompasses many of the overlaps between general education and its close cousin, liberal education.[5]

Indeed, general education was not only on the minds of educators in 1946, it had managed to capture the attention of the American public as well. The previous summer, as Harvard University prepared to release its treatise on the matter—a report entitled *General Education in a Free Society*—the major theses of the forthcoming report were "'leaked' by the press" and commanded headlines in the *New York Times*.[6] Though Harvard's opinion and its theories were prevalent in the public forum, McGrath was quick to note in his editorial that curricular experimentation and reform was being conducted by a number of colleges and

---

involvement with the general education movement, see his personal reflections in Earl J. McGrath, "Fifty Years in Higher Education; Personal Influences on My Professional Development," *Journal of Higher Education* 51 (1980): esp. 81-87 as well as John Young Reid, "The Public Career of Earl James McGrath: Vindicating Education for Holistic Man" (PhD diss., University of Arizona, 1978).

[5] For a discussion on the various definitions of general education floating around during the mid-twentieth century, see George J. Bergman, "Definitions of General Education," *Journal of Educational Administration and Supervision* 33 (1947): 460-468. On the distinction between general and liberal education, see Kevin S. Zayed, "The Paradox of Mortimer J. Adler: Revisiting the Distinction between Liberal and General Education," *Comparative and International Higher Education* 5 (2013): 41-46; Katherine E. Chaddock and Anna Janosik Cooke, "Endurance Testing: Histories of Liberal Education in U.S. Higher Education" in *Higher Education: Handbook of Theory and Research, Volume 30* ed. Michael B. Paulsen (Dordrecht: Springer, 2015), 187-244.

[6] Craig Kridel, "Student Participation in General Education Reform: A Retrospective Glance at the Harvard Redbook," *Journal of General Education* 35 (1983): 156.

universities across the country. "Much has already been accomplished in individual institutions," he asserted, "to adapt instruction more closely to the needs of contemporary society. Throughout the education world an ebullient ferment is at work. Faculties are reassessing educational philosophy, policy, and practice. A new educational era has begun."[7]

One of the institutions busily experimenting with its general education program was Michigan State College (now Michigan State University). As part of a larger project to grow the institution during the tenure of President John A. Hannah, new administrative structures and curricula were implemented.[8] Looking back in 1980, Hannah recalled the creation of the university-wide general education curriculum of the early 1940s and claimed, "Robert Maynard Hutchins at the University of Chicago…from a few self-appointed experts, tried to derogate this proposed M.S.U. development. But our faculty committees listened to the critics and then went on their own way… [We] made a substantial contribution at that time, I believe, toward a general, nationwide reconsideration of the components and objectives of general education."[9] Such a statement raises a number of questions. What was the nature of this "general, nationwide reconsideration" that occurred between approximately 1930 and 1960, often referred to, then and now, as the "general education movement?" This dissertation defines the "general education movement" as the groundswell of writing and experimentation on programs of creating, implementing, teaching, and evaluating curricula for students during their first two years of post-

[7] McGrath, "The General Education Movement," 8.
[8] For the story of the institution's transformation, see Paul L. Dressel, *College to University: The Hannah Years at Michigan State, 1935-1969* (East Lansing: Michigan State University Publications, 1987); David A. Thomas, *Michigan State College: John Hannah and the Creation of a World University, 1926-1969* (East Lansing: Michigan State University Press, 2008). For a more intensive look at the reforming of curricula at Michigan State during this time period, see Arthur Thomas Vrettas, "John A. Hannah's University College: A General Education Model" (PhD diss., University of Akron, 1991). Small portions of this introduction are taken from Kevin S. Zayed, "Reform in the General Education Movement: The Case of Michigan State College, 1938-1952," *Journal of General Education* 61 (2012): 141-175.
[9] John A. Hannah, *A Memoir* (East Lansing: Michigan State University Press, 1980), 91.

secondary study which occurred between roughly 1930 and 1960.[10] More important, how did institutional and curricular reform function in this movement? These are two questions that will be considered in this dissertation.

Hannah's statement also places our attention squarely on a figure so commonly linked to general education that one hesitates to discuss the topic without mention of him: Robert Maynard Hutchins, president of the University of Chicago from 1929 to 1950. Yet this statement's very existence forces us to question what many historians have taken almost as given about Hutchins and general education reform. Specifically, it forces us to question our appreciation of the top-down manner of influence from a few university programs to many other institutions of higher learning. In reading the literature on general education during the mid-twentieth century, one is struck by the repeated appearance of a few characters. As historian Bruce A. Kimball noted three decades ago, "the big names are always noted—Aydelotte, Meiklejohn, Hutchins, Chicago,

---

[10] As a national movement with thousands of members, it is difficult to point to core values of the movement. Indeed, one observer in 1959 would put the issue thusly: "As far as I can see, [the movement] has been largely spontaneous; no dedicated plotters have been directing it from underground headquarters. For this reason, the movement has been slow in defining itself and is still unclear about its limits." However, W. Hugh Stickler conducted a survey of members thought to be associated with the general education movement and identified five characteristics of the movement. They were as follows: the movement helped establish the legitimacy of programs of general education; curricular experimentation and revision was a cornerstone of the movement; greater integration of the various aspect of general education was achieved; the movement's preference for programs designed around student needs, as opposed to content; and the movement's influence on the teaching of liberal arts. Initial quote comes from J. Glenn Gray, "The Philosophical Basis of General Education," *Journal of General Education* 12 (1959): 131. For a full discussion, see Stickler's article, "Whence and Whither General Education? A Consensus of Educators and Laymen," *Journal of Higher Education* 28 (1957): 195-201, 235-236. Another particularly concise and accurate distillation of the movement is Ralph W. McDonald, "Fundamental Issues in General Education," *Journal of General Education* 4 (1949): 32-39.

My view of the general education movement gaining momentum around 1930 and being at full force in the late 1930s is at odds with the widely accepted notion of "revivals" presented in Ernest L. Boyer and Arthur Levine, *A Quest for Common Learning: The Aims of General Education* (Washington, D.C.: The Carnegie Foundation for the Advancement of Teaching, 1981). Boyer and Levine see the general education movement revival as having gained major impetus at the end of the Second World War. These dates are determined to be commensurate with the publication of particular reports. However, the theories underlying these reports were articulated, and the experimentation supporting these reports was conducted, well before the War, during the 1930s. To demonstrate this point, consider Earl J. McGrath, "A Bibliography on General Education," *Educational Record* 21 (1940): 96-118. This bibliography contains over 400 entries "culled from an original list of more than 1,500 items," and includes everything from books on theories to articles and reports on experiments.

Columbia, Harvard."[11] Frank Aydelotte and Alexander Meiklejohn aside, historians have not only focused on Chicago, Columbia, and Harvard, but have imbued their work with the implication that these three institutions have had a prominent role in influencing general education curricula at many smaller institutions with diverse constituencies over a geographic distribution as wide as the nation, if not the world.[12] Indeed, historian Larry Cuban captures this

---

[11] Bruce A. Kimball, *Orators and Philosophers: A History of the Idea of Liberal Education* expanded edition (New York: The College Board, 1986/1995), 3. Other historians have noted this quote as particularly salient when framing their own interventions, however many historians have only added only a single institution to the list of those considered influential. See, for example, William N. Haarlow, *Great Books, Honors Programs, and Hidden Origins: The Virginia Plan and the University of Virginia in the Liberal Arts Movement* (New York: RoutledgeFalmer, 2003), 3.

[12] Examples include, but are not limited to: R. Freeman Butts, *The College Charts Its Course: Historical Conceptions and Current Proposals* (New York: McGraw-Hill Book Company, 1939); Andrew Park Orth, "The History of General Education as a Philosophical Development in American Higher Education" (PhD diss., Pennsylvania State University, 1952); Bernard T. Rattigan, "A Critical Study of the General Education Movement" (PhD Diss., The Catholic University of America, 1952); Charles Hoover Russell, "The Required Programs of General Education in the Social Sciences at Columbia College, the College of the University of Chicago, and Harvard College," (PhD Diss., Columbia University 1961); Russell Thomas, *The Search for a Common Learning: General Education, 1800-1960* (New York: McGraw-Hill Book Company, 1962); Daniel Bell, *The Reforming of General Education: The Columbia College Experience in its National Setting* (New York: Columbia University Press, 1966); Richard Colin Nelson-Jones, "General Education in American Higher Education, 1955-56 to 1964-65" (PhD diss., Stanford University, 1967); M. Elizabeth LeBlanc, "The Concept of General Education in Colleges and Universities, 1945-1979" (PhD diss., Rutgers University, 1980); Phyllis Keller, *Getting at the Core: Curricular Reform at Harvard* (Cambridge: Harvard University Press, 1982); Michael Bisesi, "Historical Developments in American Undergraduate Education: General Education and the Core Curriculum," *British Journal of Educational Studies* 30 (1982): 199-212; W. Brown Patterson, "Defining the Educated Person: From Harvard to Harvard," *Soundings: An Interdisciplinary Journal* 66 (1983): 192-217; Brinton Sprague, "The Development of General Education in Washington Community Colleges" (PhD diss., University of Washington, 1987); Gary E. Miller, *The Meaning of General Education: The Emergence of a Curriculum Paradigm* (New York: Teacher's College Press, 1988); David A. Hollinger, "Two NYUs and 'The Obligation of Universities to the Social Order' in the Great Depression" in *The University and the City: From Medieval Origins to the Present* ed. Thomas Bender (New York: Oxford University Press, 1988), 249-265; Nona Joyce Sellers, "A Description of Faculty Perceptions Concerning General Education and the Means of Satisfying General Education Requirements by Undergraduate Students in a Liberal Arts School and a Professional School at a Typical Institution of Higher Education" (PhD diss., University of Alabama, 1989); George Hjelm Higginbottom, "The Civic Ground of Collegiate General Education and the Community College" (PhD diss., Cornell University, 1991); W.B. Carnochan, *The Battleground of the Curriculum: Liberal Education and American Experience* (Stanford: Stanford University Press, 1993); Irving J. Spitzberg, Jr., "It's Academic: The Politics of the Curriculum" in *Higher Education in American Society* third edition eds. Philip G. Altbach, Robert O. Berdahl, and Patricia J. Gumport (Amherst, NY: Prometheus Books, 1994), 289-305; Anne H. Stevens, "The Philosophy of General Education and Its Contradictions: The Influence of Hutchins," *Journal of General Education* 50 (2001): 165-191; Morton and Phyllis Keller, *Making Harvard Modern: The Rise of America's University* (New York: Oxford University Press, 2001); John Guillory, "Who's Afraid of Marcel Proust?: The Failure of General Education in the American University" in *The Humanities and the Dynamics of Inclusion Since World War II* ed. David A. Hollinger (Baltimore: Johns Hopkins University Press, 2006), 25-49; Russell K. Nieli, "From Christian Gentleman to Bewildered Seeker: The Transformation of American Higher Education," *Academic Questions* 20 (2007): 311-331; Michael N. Bastedo, "Curriculum in Higher Education: The Organizational Dynamics of Academic Reform" in *American Higher Education in the Twenty-First Century: Social, Political, and Economic Challenges* fourth edition eds. Michael N. Bastedo, Philip G. Altbach, Patricia J. Gumport (Baltimore:

standard interpretation well in his work on Stanford when he suggests that a "small group of research-driven universities has had a disproportionate influence historically on curricular and instructional practices in higher education both in the United States and abroad...Curricular reforms at Columbia during World War I, at the University of Chicago in the 1930s, and at Harvard in the 1950s attracted the attention of hundreds of other less-prestigious institutions' administrators and faculties."[13]

This interpretation and its corresponding timeline stem from an account of general education reform during the twentieth century often related in histories, contemporary pieces, and commentaries on the topic of general education.[14] The story begins in the wake of the First World War with two courses at Columbia University: "Introduction to Contemporary

---

Johns Hopkins University Press, 2016), 60-83; Cynthia A. Wells, "Realizing General Education: Reconsidering Conceptions and Renewing Practice" ASHE Higher Education Report Series, Volume 42, Issue 2 (San Francisco: Jossey-Bass, 2016). Studies that focus on secondary education and international contexts include Sister Mary Richardine Waldron, "A Study of the Curricula in the Adrian Dominican High Schools and Their Conformity to the Recommendations and Suggestions of the Harvard Report" (PhD diss., DePaul University, 1948); William G. Wraga, *Democracy's High School: The Comprehensive High School and Educational Reform in the United States* (Lanham, MD: University Press of America, 1994), 77-81; S.R. Dongerkery, *Some Experiments in General Education* (Bombay: University of Bombay, 1955); Gopalakrishna Ramanathan, *The Quest for General Education: Reflections on the Harvard Report* (Bombay: Asia Publishing House, 1968); Betty S. Anderson, *The American University of Beirut: Arab Nationalism and Liberal Education* (Austin: University of Texas Press, 2011); Gry Cathrin Brandser, "The Harvard Report and the Limits of Liberal Education: Lessons for Europe" in *Academic Identities—Academic Challenges?: American and European Experience of the Transformation of Higher Education and Research* eds. Tor Halvorsen and Atle Nyhagen (Newcastle upon Tyne: Cambridge Scholars Publishing, 2011), 294-339.

[13] Larry Cuban, *How Scholars Trumped Teachers: Change Without Reform in University Curriculum, Teaching, and Research, 1890-1990* (New York: Teachers College Press, 1999), 2.

[14] Contemporary reports on general education that subscribe to an interpretation similar to Cuban's and offer this timeline include, but are not limited to Robert Blackburn, et al., "Changing Practices in Undergraduate Education" (Berkeley: Carnegie Council on Policy Studies in Higher Education, 1976); Jerry G. Gaff, "Historical and Contemporary Perspectives" in *General Education: Issues and Resources* eds. Jerry G. Gaff, et al., from The Project on General Education Models (Washington, D.C.: Society for Values in Higher Education , 1980), 17-30; California Postsecondary Education Commission, "One World in Common: General Education in Historical, National, and Statewide Context, Commission Report 81-27" (Sacramento: Author, 1981); The Penn State Symposium on General Education, "Students in the Balance: General Education in the Research University" (University Park: Pennsylvania State University, 2002); Center for Studies in Higher Education at the University of California, Berkeley, "General Education in the 21st Century: A Report of the University of California Commission on General Education in the 21st Century" (Berkeley: Author, 2007).

Civilization" and John Erskine's well-known "Great Books" Course.[15] The former course represents, according to the one scholar, "The grandparent of modern general education."[16] The latter fascinated a student, Mortimer J. Adler, who accepted a professorship at the University of Chicago and influenced his colleague, President Robert M. Hutchins, to boldly institute the Chicago Plan in 1931 centered on the Great Books approach.[17] In the midst of this revolution, Hutchins delivered a series of lectures that were later published as *The Higher Learning in America*.[18] Shortly after the Second World War, Harvard took the torch from the University of Chicago with the publication of *General Education in a Free Society* in 1945.[19] Rather than

---

[15] On these courses and broader curricular reforms at Columbia in the wake of the First World War, see David Joseph Leese, "The Pragmatic Vision: Columbia College and the Progressive Reorganization of the Liberal Core—The Formative Years, 1880-1941" (PhD diss., Columbia University, 1987); Timothy P. Cross, *An Oasis of Order: The Core Curriculum at Columbia College* (New York: Office of the Dean, Columbia College, 1995); Robert A. McCaughey, *Stand Columbia: A History of Columbia University in the City of New York, 1754-2004* (New York: Columbia University Press, 2003), chapter ten; Wm. Theodore de Bary, *The Great Civilized Conversation: Education for a World Community* (New York: Columbia University Press, 2013), chapters 2-3. Though "western civ" courses figure prominently in most histories of general education and are a staple of the narrative about Columbia's postwar general education reform, Daniel Segal makes the argument that the relationship between these two courses and the "Western Civ." course that figures prominently in most narratives of the history of general education is "more tenuous" than previously believed. See his article "'Western Civ' and the Staging of History in American Higher Education," *American Historical Review* 105 (2000): 770-805; quote from 781.

[16] Julie Thompson Klein, *Humanities, Culture, and Interdisciplinarity*: *The Changing American Academy* (Albany: State University of New York Press, 2005), 30.

[17] The relationship between Hutchins, Adler, and curricular reform is discussed in John Walton, "The Apostasy of Robert M. Hutchins," *Educational Theory* 3 (1953): 162-165; Mary Ann Dzuback, "Hutchins, Adler, and the University of Chicago: A Critical Juncture," *American Journal of Education* 99 (1990): 57-76; James Sloan Allen, *The Romance of Commerce and Culture: Capitalism, Modernism, and the Chicago-Aspen Crusade for Cultural Reform* revised edition (Boulder: University Press of Colorado, 2002), esp. chapter three; David O. Levine, *The American College and the Culture of Aspiration, 1915-1940* (Ithaca, NY: Cornell University Press, 1986), chapter five; Gerald Graff, *Professing Literature: An Institutional History* (Chicago: University of Chicago Press, 1987); Tm Lacy, *The Dream of a Democratic Culture: Mortimer J. Adler and the Great Books Idea* (New York: Palgrave MacMillan, 2013). The actual Chicago plan and what became known as the Hutchins College (general education program of the University of Chicago) are described succinctly by F. Champion Ward, "Requiem for the Hutchins College: Recalling a Great Experiment in General Education," *Change: The Magazine for Higher Education* 21 (1989): 25-33. A broader discussion of this program appears in Paul John Plath, "The Fox and the Hedgehog: Liberal Education at the University of Chicago" (PhD diss., University of Illinois at Urbana-Champaign, 1989).

[18] Robert M. Hutchins, *The Higher Learning in America* (New Haven: Yale University Press, 1936). For concise summaries of Hutchins's book and its reception see Leon Botstein, "Wisdom Reconsidered: Robert Maynard Hutchins' *The Higher Learning in America* Revisited" in *Philosophy for Education* ed. Seymour Fox (Jerusalem: The Van Leer Jerusalem Foundation, 1983), 17-38; Harry S. Ashmore, "Introduction" in *The Higher Learning in America* Transaction Edition (New Brunswick, NJ: Transaction Publishers, 1995), esp. xx-xxxii.

[19] The Committee on the Objectives of a General Education in a Free Society, *General Education in a Free Society: Report of the Harvard Committee* (Cambridge: Harvard University Press, 1945). On this work's origins, execution,

center on a Great Books approach, Harvard's recommendations involved a distribution model that centered on the political, nationalistic, and social nature of knowledge.[20] To varied degrees, each of these institutions, the traditional narrative contends, influenced the ideas and practices of institutions of higher learning across the country.

This understanding of general education reform is not purely historiographical, but has also influenced how higher education researchers and, ultimately, instructors and policymakers have seen general education reform to the present day. For instance, in a relatively recent article in the *Journal of General Education*, Thomas F. Nelson Laird and colleagues noted that Harvard University "for better and worse is seen as a bellwether of sorts for general education"[21] Another recent study focused on documentary analysis of contemporary documents and journal literature devoted to general education concluded: "Private universities populate the history of general education revision and reform…One particular institutional record of reform of general education, however, is often held up as both a model to emulate and an example of the excess of time and energy spent in the pursuit of an effective general education curriculum—the reform efforts of Harvard University."[22] Emulation is not the only type of influence accorded to these

---

and reception see Anita Faye Kravitz, "The Harvard Report of 1945: An Historical Ethnography" (PhD diss., University of Pennsylvania, 1994).

[20] On the differences between Columbia and Harvard's plans for general education, see James Piereson, "Columbia Beats Harvard" in his book *Shattered Consensus: The Rise and Decline of America's Postwar Political Order* (New York: Encounter Books, 2015), 321-334.

[21] Thomas F. Nelson Laird, Amanda Suniti Niskode-Dossett, and George D. Kuh, "What General Education Courses Contribute to Essential Learning Outcomes," *Journal of General Education* 58 (2009): 67.

[22] Andrea Word, "General Education for the 21st Century: A Quest for Common Principles" (PhD Diss., University of Alabama, 2012), 26. Qualitative and quantitative studies of general education that carry this interpretation include but are not limited to Craig Alan Kridel, "Toward a Theoretical Base for General Education Curricular Design" (PhD diss., Ohio State University, 1980); Michael Ralph Bisesi, "General Education: Case Studies and Policy Implications for Texas Colleges and Universities" (PhD diss., University of Houston, 1980); Jerry G. Gaff, "General Education in a Contemporary Context," *Current Issues in Higher Education* 2 (1980): 1-5; Gordon Wayne Smith, "Rationales for General Education: A Critical Analysis" (PhD diss., University of California at Los Angeles, 1984); Craig C. Howard, *Theories of General Education: A Critical Approach* (New York: St. Martin's Press, 1992); Michael Nelson, "Alive at the Core: Programs and Issues" in *Alive at the Core: Exemplary Approaches to General Education in the Humanities* eds. Michael Nelson and Associates (San Francisco: Jossey-Bass, 2000), 1-19; Margaret S. Murandu, "An Investigation of Undergraduate Students' Perceptions Regarding the General Education Program at Idaho State University" (PhD diss., Idaho State University, 2004); Susan R. Merrifield, *Readin' and*

institutions. For instance, historian Hugh Hawkins speculated that in moments of reforming general education on their own campuses, professors have occasionally responded with "'The University of Chicago tried that, and it didn't work.'"[23]

Beyond academia, policy advocacy research engaged in the topic of general education follows the trend of looking at highly prestigious institutions—especially research universities. When the National Association of Scholars produced its report "The Dissolution of General Education: 1914-1993," they limited their data to "very selective institutions" and justified this move by arguing "These are the colleges and universities that, as leaders in scholarship and research, establish the patterns frequently imitated by others."[24]

Despite these contentions, a number of historians and other scholars—many of whom focused on Harvard, Columbia, and Chicago—noted that these institutions were unable to create tangible and sustainable reform on their own campuses. Historian Katherine Chaddock noted a number of "vocal objections" to John Erskine's attempts to expand the study of Great Books at Columbia.[25] Donald N. Levine referred to the "founding myth" of the College of the University

---

Writin' for the Hard-Hat Crowd: Curriculum Policy at an Urban University (New York: Peter Lang, 2005); Kenneth J. Boning, "Assessing Coherence in General Education Programs" (PhD diss., Saint Louis University, 2006); Robert William Wauhkonen, "How General Education Changes Students: Understandings of the Attainment of General Education Learning Goals" (PhD diss., Boston University, 2008).

[23] Hugh Hawkins, "The Higher Learning in Chicago," *Reviews in American History* 20 (1992): 378.

[24] National Association of Scholars for Reasoned Scholarship in a Free Society, "The Dissolution of General Education: 1914-1993" (Princeton, NJ: Author, 1996), 3. Similar sentiments can be found in the works of The Boyer Commission on Educating Undergraduates in the Research Universities, which focus on undergraduate education as a whole. See the most well-known of their reports, *Reinventing Undergraduate Education: A Blueprint for America's Research Universities* (Stony Brook, NY: Author, 1998). For a discussion on the reasons behind the Boyer Commission's choice of research universities, see Wendy Katkin, "The Boyer Commission Report and Its Impact on Undergraduate Research," *New Directions for Teaching and Learning* 93 (2003): 21-22.

[25] Katherine Elise Chaddock, *The Multi-Talented Mr. Erskine: Shaping Mass Culture Through Great Books and Fine Music* (New York: Palgrave MacMillan, 2012), chapter six, esp. 87; Katherine Chaddock Reynolds, "A Canon of Democratic Intent: Reinterpreting the Roots of the Great Books Movement," *History of Higher Education Annual* 22 (2002): 10. Detailed studies of the debates that helped to shape and guide the Columbia general education program are David Walter Moore, "Liberalism and Liberal Education at Columbia University: The Columbia Careers of Jacques Barzun, Lionel Trilling, Richard Hofstadter, Daniel Bell, and C. Wright Mills" (PhD diss., University of Maryland, 1978); David Andrew Zapotocky, "The Contribution of the Concept of Historical Synthesis in the Design and Implementation of a General Education Undergraduate Curriculum—Liberal Arts Tripod—At Columbia University During the Period 1919-1946" (PhD diss., New York University, 1996).

of Chicago wherein Hutchins—and to a lesser extent Adler—convinced the faculty to institute a Great Books curriculum and argued, "The story is colorful, inspirational perhaps, but quite untrue…The College faculty...considered but firmly rejected his [Hutchins] aspiration for a curriculum organized around the Great Books."[26] In his history of the University of Chicago, John W. Boyer noted that the efforts of Robert Hutchins left the university "with the contradictory legacy of a powerful vision of intellectualism and a weakened institutional framework in which students and faculty could live out that vision."[27]

Historians and other scholars have also noted that the aforementioned *General Education in a Free Society*—colloquially known as the Redbook, or the Harvard Report—was ineffective in creating sustainable curricular structures at Harvard. For instance, historian Frederick Rudolph, in his classic history of the undergraduate curriculum contrasted the respective and relative ineffectiveness of the Redbook and Yale's *Reports* of 1828, by arguing, "The Harvard Report of 1945 knew what was best for everyone, quite as much as a similar self-assurance (or wisdom) had found its way into the Yale Report of 1828. Its failure to transform the undergraduate curriculum was no more an expression of institutional weakness than was Yale's failure to prevent curricular reform a century before. The course of study was beyond the control of the curriculum designers in New Haven or Cambridge."[28] Historians John Thelin and

---

[26] Donald N. Levine, preface to *The Idea and Practice of General Education: An Account of the College of the University of Chicago*, by Present and Former Members of the Faculty, centennial edition. (Chicago: University of Chicago Press, 1950/1992), v. Levine builds on this interpretation in his book *Powers of the Mind: The Reinvention of Liberal Learning in America* (Chicago: University of Chicago Press, 2006). This interpretation also exists in various forms in Benjamin McArthur, "Revisiting Hutchins and *The Higher Learning in America*," *History of Higher Education Annual* 7 (1987): 8-28; Mary Ann Dzuback, *Robert M. Hutchins: Portrait of an Educator* (Chicago: University of Chicago Press, 1991); Philo A. Hutcheson, "In the President's Opinion: Robert Hutchins and the University of Chicago History Department," *History of Higher Education Annual* 17 (1997): 33-52; John W. Boyer, *A Twentieth-Century Cosmos: The New Plan and the Origins of General Education at Chicago* (Chicago: College of the University of Chicago, 2007).

[27] John W. Boyer, *The University of Chicago: A History* (Chicago: University of Chicago Press, 2015), 320.

[28] Frederick Rudolph, *Curriculum: A History of the American Undergraduate Course of Study Since 1636* (San Francisco: Jossey-Bass, 1977), 262. Also see Frederick Rudolph, foreword to *Revitalizing General Education in a*

Christopher Miller put the issue more bluntly in questioning the inclusion of an abridgement of the Redbook in a recent documentary history: "Why the 1945 Harvard Red Book continues to receive attention seems baffling. It had little impact on the course of study at host Harvard – and probably is one of those works that many invoke, few read, and even fewer heed."[29] A former president of the University of Chicago, Hanna Holborn Gray, recently suggested that the Redbook was "generally more praised than practiced."[30]

There are examples of historians and other scholars who accept that Chicago, Columbia, and Harvard were unable to affect change on their own campuses, but still contend that these institutions were influential across the nation. For example, Christopher J. Lucas argues, "Hutchins…did feel that if the curriculum started at Chicago proved successful, other institutions eventually would fall into line. And for a time in fact some did. Such was the prestige of the University of Chicago and the personal charisma of its chancellor that elements of the Chicago program were indeed replicated in scores of experimental colleges, honors departments, and schools throughout the country."[31]

Arthur Levine and Jana Nidiffer noted, "The recommendations of the Redbook [were] adopted all over America, but not in Cambridge."[32] Historian Andrew Jewett explained that Harvard "famously failed to heed its own curricular recommendations" and continued on to

---

Time of Scarcity: A Navigational Chart for Administrators and Faculty, by Sandra L. Kanter, et. al (Needham Heights, MA: Allyn & Bacon, 1997), x-xiv.

[29] John Thelin and Christopher Miller, "Review: *American Higher Education Transformed, 1940-2005: Documenting the National Discourse*," *Teachers College Record Online*, July 30, 2008.

[30] Hannah Holborn Gray, "The University Idea and Liberal Learning" in her series of published lectures *Searching for Utopia: Universities and Their Histories* (Berkeley: University of California Press, 2012), 51.

[31] Christopher J. Lucas, *Crisis in the Academy: Rethinking Higher Education in America* (New York: St. Martin's Press, 1996), 134. Lucas's work offers a similar interpretation of Columbia and Harvard.

[32] Arthur Levine and Jana Nidiffer, "Key Turning Points in the Evolving Curriculum" in *Handbook of the Undergraduate Curriculum: A Comprehensive Guide to Purposes, Structures, Practices, and Change* eds. Jerry G. Gaff, James L. Ratcliff, and Associates (San Francisco: Jossey-Bass, 1996), 76. A similar sentiment is expressed in Arthur Levine, *Handbook of the Undergraduate Curriculum* (San Francisco: Jossey-Bass, 1978), 596.

suggest that "the Redbook's vision proved widely influential in postwar America."[33] Philosopher D.G. Mulcahy concurred, arguing, "The recommendations made in *General Education in a Free Society* were not accepted by Harvard University itself. The thinking in the report, while hardly original, did have considerable influence in the broader debate on the curriculum of high schools and colleges, however."[34] Ernest L. Boyer claimed that the Redbook "became the Bible on campuses from coast to coast, even though in Cambridge itself the Harvard faculty rejected its proposals."[35] Louis Menand displayed a similar opinion in his popular commentary *The Marketplace of Ideas*: "Regardless of its effect on undergraduate instruction at Harvard, the Redbook mattered, for two reasons. The first was its success as a book. It was widely read and widely discussed. By 1950, it had sold more than 40,000 copies. It put general education on the national map….The Redbook made colleges pay attention to the question of 'what every student should know,' whether those colleges ended up instituting full-fledged general education programs or not."[36]

Both of these interpretations, however, raise two crucial questions: if the curricular theories of Harvard, Columbia, and the University of Chicago were unable to create and/or sustain a fixed body of curricular content on their own campuses, is it likely that they influenced the curriculums of other institutions across the country? And more important, if the curricular structures in place at these institutions were constantly evolving—driven by faculty and student concerns, local context, the politics of curricular compromise, and not representing a linear, top-down *method* of reform—what method of reform did these universities and other institutions of

---

[33] Andrew Jewett, *Science, Democracy, and the American University: From the Civil War to the Cold War* (New York: Cambridge University Press, 2012), quotes from 330, 333.
[34] D.G. Mulcahy, *The Educated Person: Toward a New Paradigm for Liberal Education* (Lanham, MD: Rowman and Littlefield Publishers, 2008), 8.
[35] Ernest L. Boyer, "The Quest for Common Learning" in *Common Learning: A Carnegie Colloquium on General Education* (Washington, D.C.: The Carnegie Foundation for the Advancement of Teaching, 1981), 6.
[36] Louis Menand, *The Marketplace of Ideas: Reform and Resistance in the American University* (New York: W.W. Norton, 2010), 40.

higher learning look to, for achieving tangible and sustainable mechanisms of reform? It is these two questions—more specific, but closely related to the earlier questions about reform in the general education movement—that this dissertation explores.

Throughout this dissertation, I will propose a new way of seeing curricular reform in the general education movement, and rely on the lenses provided by an exploration of three "cooperative studies" of general education to explore how this reform functioned on the ground.[37] These three cooperative studies of general education are the Eight-Year Study (1930-1942); the Cooperative Study in General Education (1938-1947), and the California Study of General Education in the Junior College (1948-1952). Each cooperative study involved at least twenty-two institutions examining facets of their general education curricula, each was funded by at least one philanthropic foundation, and each—save for the Eight-Year Study—functioned under the auspices of the American Council of Education.[38]

Drawing insights from extensive explorations of the cooperative studies, I argue that reform in the general education movement operated in a "matrix of influence" that involved educational research, philanthropy, and (both inter- and intra-) institutional "cooperation without consensus," rather than a top-down channeling of reform from prestigious institutions.[39] Further,

---

[37] Cooperative studies are scenarios "in which several colleges, recognizing a common interest project or problem or individual campus problems, unite under some accepted plan to analyze the problem or problems and share their discoveries with all participating institutions." This definition is taken from Sister Hildegarde Marie, "Initiating a Cooperative Study Among Catholic Women's Colleges," *National Catholic Educational Association Bulletin* 49 (1952): 238.

[38] See the attached appendix for a full list of institutions and supporting organizations.

[39] Educational research will be discussed further and differentiated throughout the dissertation, however, it can be broadly defined as "attempts to collect facts that could be used for planning education and for providing support for schools." This definition is taken from Robert M.W. Travers, *How Research Has Changed American Schools: A History from 1840 to the Present* (Kalamazoo, MI: Mythos Press, 1983), 5.
Similarly, philanthropy will be dissected further at various points in the dissertation, however, much of this study is concerned with "scientific philanthropy," which can be defined as seeking to "determine by careful investigation which of the many competing claims [for philanthropic assistance] were likely to produce more benevolence per dollar." Further, "scientific philanthropy" seeks methods of producing research or solutions to problems—in this case educational research for educational solutions. It "should seek causes and cures. It should find a remedy for a disease, rather than build a hospital to treat its victims. It should root out the reasons for poverty, not give alms to the

this led to a cyclical and iterative interplay between national discussions and local implementation that changed both the content of general education and the methods of its constant reform. These processes shaped the way people talked about, implemented, and executed general education measures on their campuses. Through these processes, words became ideas, and ideas eventually became curricular structures implemented at the most basic levels. These reforms were almost always sensitive to local context and were often advertised to the public as being politically, economically, socially, and culturally expedient and relevant.

This dissertation is built upon the idea of "cooperation without consensus." Much of the literature on the general education movement argues that it was a "Quest for Common Learning" or a "Search for a Common Learning."[40] In this light, the movement might be seen as one of the many contributions made by higher education to the "liberal consensus" that took place from the 1930s to the early 1960s.[41] In a nation still recovering from a brief but exhaustive participation in

---

impoverished. It should expand knowledge and deal in new ideas." Quotes are from Gerald Jonas, *The Circuit Riders: Rockefeller Money and the Rise of Modern Science* (New York: W.W. Norton, 1989), 23 and Judith Sealander, "Curing Evils at Their Source: The Arrival of Scientific Giving" in *Charity, Philanthropy, and Civility in American History* eds. Lawrence J. Friedman and Mark D. McGarvie (New York: Cambridge University Press, 2002), 220-221, respectively. Philanthropic donors analyzed in this study are overwhelmingly represented as foundations, which can be "defined as large stocks of wealth controlled by independent, self-perpetuating boards of trustees and devoted to the support through grants of charitable purposes." This definition comes from David C. Hammack, "American Debates on the Legitimacy of Foundations" in *The Legitimacy of Philanthropic Foundations: United States and European Perspectives* eds. Kenneth Prewitt, et al. (New York: Russell Sage Foundation, 2006), 49. A more specific definition may be found in David C. Hammack and Helmut K. Anheier, "Appendix A: What is a Foundation?" in their book, *A Versatile American Institution: The Changing Ideals and Realities of Philanthropic Foundations* (Washington, D.C.: Brookings Institute Press, 2013), 157-161.

This dissertation also defines "interinstitutional cooperation" as activity between the representatives of two or more institutions, or an institution and an organizational body. This definition is purposely left broad for two reasons. The first, as scholar Daniel W. Lang suggests, is that "the terminology of cooperation is confused and imprecise." See his article, "A Lexicon of Inter-Institutional Cooperation," *Higher Education* 44 (2002): 153-183. The second reason is that a broad definition allows for a greater incorporation of activities conducted by the institutions that are being explored in this dissertation, whereas selecting from available definitions may perpetuate the current condition as described by Lang.

[40] These interpretations are reflected in the following titles: Thomas, *The Search for a Common Learning*; Boyer and Levine, *A Quest for Common Learning*.

[41] Though earlier literature identifies the liberal consensus as a phenomenon of the 1950s-1960s, newer interpretations have challenged this. For the earliest and most recognizable discussion of the "liberal consensus," see Godfrey Hodgson, *America in Our Time: From World War II to Nixon—What Happened and Why* Princeton Paperback ed. (Princeton: Princeton University Press, 1976/2005). For a newer interpretation that casts the

what was then the bloodiest conflict the planet had ever seen—whose core beliefs in democracy were being threatened by advancing fascist and totalitarian regimes, in capitalism by a devastating depression, and in its own social status quo by increasingly louder calls for equality—a "tone of unity" and appreciation for common ties reigned.[42] Similarly, in a society for whom the term "'Coherence' was more than a metaphor; it literally meant a social order in which every element was organically interrelated…in which man had regained *control* over his environment and his destiny," curricular unity and coherence may have seemed to be an ideal of the day.[43]

It is true that certain elements of the general education movement were incredibly concerned with active threats to democracy, capitalism, and the social status quo, and strove for unity and coherence. For instance, two university administrators would suggest in 1946:

> The confusion in education is to a very large degree a reflection of the cultural, political, and economic chaos of the contemporary world. Education is in a state of confusion because life itself is a madhouse of conflicting thought patterns, incompatible forces, irresponsible and irresolvable powers, rampant nationalisms, and bitter cultural and racist animosities…Clearly then, the problem of achieving unity within the sphere of education is inextricably bound up with the larger problem of achieving some degree of integration within our contemporary culture. But while education will continue inevitably to reflect the larger situation, education as part of its function in the culture, should help to create the unity lacking in the culture.[44]

However, unity and coherence did *not* prove to be synonymous with common curricula, for the simple fact that higher education was—and was recognized as—both a segregated and variegated system. There was "institutional stratification," along a series of racial, gendered, and class-

---

consensus as having occurred from the 1930s to the 1960s, see Wendy L. Wall, *Inventing the "American Way": The Politics of Consensus from the New Deal to the Civil Rights Movement* (New York: Oxford University Press, 2008).

[42] Wall, *Inventing the "American Way"*, 5.

[43] Richard H. Pells, *Radical Visions and American Dreams: Culture and Social Thought in the Depression Years* (Urbana: University of Illinois Press, 1973/1998), 75. For a discussion on the value of coherence during the Depression years, with a brief description of Hutchins's *The Higher Learning*, see Terry A. Cooney, *Balancing Acts: American Thought and Culture in the 1930s* (New York: Twayne Publishers, 1995), 191-218.

[44] Joseph Brewer and Donald Heiges, "The Search for Unity in Higher Education," *Harvard Educational Review* 16 (1946): 22, 39.

based constructs that bore the hallmark of a "rigid, hierarchical educational structure."[45] Attempting to create a "common learning" in a system of varied institutions was seen as paradoxical. To illustrate this, consider the following argument by historian Harold S. Wechsler,

> Daniel Bell and others suggest that early advocates of general education wished to socialize the increasing number of immigrant students who appeared at Harvard, Columbia, Chicago, and other metropolitan universities. But these colleges would not likely design a curriculum for the supposed needs of a constituency they were simultaneously seeking to exclude. Columbia, for example, hoped—but failed—to segregate the professionally oriented Jewish students from their more genteel Protestant counterparts and to restrict the contemporary civilization sequence to the latter group.[46]

Wechsler reminds readers that, more than anything, institutions of higher learning designed—and still design—their curricula to suit the perceived political, economic, and sociocultural needs of their students. His discussion also implies that these perceived needs are often created and read through a filter of racial, religious, gendered, and class based assumptions.

Conversely, other institutional types—historically black colleges, women's colleges, religiously oriented liberal arts colleges, normal schools, community colleges, etc.—would be unlikely to simply accept curricula wholesale from institutions that differed from them in terms of location, student enrollment as measured by numbers and demographics, endowment, and numerous other factors. This has been well illustrated by Kelly Ritter in her study of the Woman's College at the University of North Carolina. She argued that in the wake of the Redbook, "the Woman's College rejected the general intellectual wishes and claims of the Harvard Study because they were in fact, drafted in ignorance of the special needs of institutions

---

[45] Julie A. Reuben and Linda Perkins, "Introduction: Commemorating the Sixtieth Anniversary of the President's Commission Report, *Higher Education for Democracy*," *History of Education Quarterly* 47 (2007): 267. Levine, *The American College*, 163; David F. Labaree, "Understanding the Rise of American Higher Education: How Complexity Breeds Autonomy, May 24, 2010" (Translated into Chinese and published August 2010 in *Peking University Educational Review*, 31:3. https://people.stanford.edu/dlabaree/selected-papers. Accessed December 29, 2015.

[46] Harold S. Wechsler, "Comment on 'My Education in Soc 2,' by David Riesman" in *General Education in the Social Sciences: Centennial Reflections of the University of Chicago* ed. John J. MacAloon (Chicago: University of Chicago Press, 1992), 218.

such as the Woman's College….The report ultimately fell short on many campuses that were founded upon special educational missions and/or were created to serve student populations in non-elite venues. Such institutions necessarily instead subscribed to the notion that curricular reform, including the examination of the values upon which that curriculum is founded, must be a local endeavor."[47]

Significantly, Ritter's argument does go against the conventional wisdom influenced by an analogy that David Riesman introduced nearly sixty years ago in his series of published lectures *Constraint and Variety in Education*: the snake-like procession. Riesman foregrounds his discussion of this phenomenon by initially arguing, "universities today tend to follow national models, and hence are at once less parochial and, arguably, more nationalistic—tied less than before to a provincial sect or municipal culture, but bound all the more firmly to the all-American way."[48] Next, Riesman suggested that certain institutions—often prestigious private research universities such as Columbia, Chicago, and Harvard—made up the head of the snake; many more composed the middle, while others remained as the tail. As the head of the snake moved, the middle and certain elements of the tail would attempt to follow, while other elements languished. Though it seemed that Riesman was painting a picture of a system that would lend itself to cooperation to stimulate imitation or even innovation, Riesman could point to little of either. Indeed, he went so far as to proclaim a sort of provincialism pervaded most institutions of

---

[47] Kelly Ritter, *To Know Her Own History: Writing at the Woman's College* (Pittsburgh: University of Pittsburgh Press, 2012), 92-148, quote from 94. Similar reservations about the Harvard Report were expressed during a conversation held with Teachers' College, Columbia University Professor (and soon-to-be Dean of the College of Education at Ohio State University) Donald P. Cottrell and the faculty members of the all-female Hood College of Frederick Maryland. They are briefly covered in Donald P. Cottrell, "General Education with Special Reference to the Women's College: Address to Hood College Faculty, December 7, 1945" Box 3, Donald Peery Cottrell Papers, RG.40.51, Ohio State University Archives, The Ohio State University, Columbus, OH.

[48] David Riesman, *Constraint and Variety in American Education* Landmark Edition of 1977 (Lincoln: University of Nebraska Press, 1956/1977), 1. Also see Wilfred M. McClay, "Institutional Diversity and the Future of American Higher Education: Reconsidering the Vision of David Riesman" in *The Relevance of Higher Education: Exploring a Contested Notion* ed. Timothy L. Simpson (Lanham, MD: Lexington Books, 2013), 199-212.

higher education that were not at the head of the snake, offering that "The president of a land-grant college is not likely to feel that any Ivy League college is really relevant for his problems."[49] Riesman was accurate on this front. Indeed, one faculty member serving on a committee dealing with undergraduate education at Michigan State University in 1979 would remark, "'We are a Land Grant institutions serving a wide range of students with very diverse backgrounds…We will not have the same clientele as Harvard.'"[50]

This all raises central questions for consideration: why did the cooperative studies explored in this dissertation rest on a foundation of cooperation? Indeed, why were institutions of every type willing to be selected to create generalizable samples? Why would Catholic institutions cooperate with Protestant ones? Why would historically black colleges cooperate with community colleges? Why would historically black colleges cooperate with other historically black institutions with whom they had previously engaged in fierce debates over curriculum and the future of the race? Why would research universities cooperate with normal schools? The first part of the answer has to do with pragmatic concerns. The political economy of the Great Depression made cooperation expedient—if not entirely necessary. As Robert H. Kroepsch and M. Stephen Kaplan explained, "A trend toward voluntary collective action began to appear in the late 1920s…The pressure prompting these arrangements included the depression and the growing criticism of overzealous competition, needless duplication, and excessive institutionalism."[51] Further, curricular revision and "self-examination" had been consistent

[49] Riesman, *Constraint and Variety*, 13.
[50] John Duley, "Conversations on Undergraduate Education, Paper #80" (unpublished manuscript, Michigan State University, 1979), Surviving copy is available at the Morris Library, Southern Illinois University, Carbondale, IL.
[51] Robert H. Kroepsch and M. Stephen Kaplan, "Interstate Cooperation and Coordination in Higher Education" in *Emerging Patterns in American Higher Education* ed. Logan Wilson (Washington, D.C.: American Council on Education, 1965), 174. It would also be important to note that the Depression itself was not the sole cause of the general education movement. As James Keith Baker argues, "That the depression accelerated the acceptance of the concept of general education in an undeniable fact; that it originated that concept is an erroneous impression." James Keith Baker, "The Evolution of the Concept of General Education" (PhD diss., Yale University, 1947), 192.

features of throughout the history of American higher education. The Great Depression "accentuated" the desire of higher education personnel to continue experimenting.[52]

The second part of the answer has to do with nearly constant verbal and demonstrative expressions from the leadership of the cooperative studies reassuring that autonomy of the participating institutions and individuals would be maintained and respected. Indeed, this was a frequent concern raised by the participating institutions and would need to be contended with before cooperation could occur. This issue has a perennial echo on the higher education scene. As Jaap Tuinman reminds readers in his more contemporary call for cooperation, many academics and administrators see cooperation and autonomy as competing ideals, and accomplishing the former requires lengthy discussion regarding the latter.[53] Certainly this is further complicated by the inclusion of members occupying different positions in perceived status hierarchies such as foundations. John Fischetti and Elizabeth Aaronsohn eloquently capture the difficulty of cooperation in their call for cooperation between all with a vested interest in teacher education (another portion of the curriculum that has been subject to constant debate and reform), noting "Early meetings are often filled with misinterpretations, turf protection, and backbiting… We have learned to mistake isolation for autonomy, and to identify talking to each other as cheating or wasting time."[54] While cultural goodwill did contribute to cooperation to some extent, pragmatic concerns and verbal reassurances of the maintenance of institutional and individual autonomy were the main impetuses behind cooperation. Though institutions and their representatives did learn from each other, they only did so in the belief that

---

[52] Lotus D. Coffman, "The Efficacy of the Depression in Promoting Self-Examination" in *Needed Readjustments in Higher Education* ed. William S. Gray (Chicago: University of Chicago Press, 1933), 10-24.
[53] Jaap Tuinman, "Productive Co-Operation and Collaboration Among Educational Institutions of Perceived Unequal Status: Practical Fundamentals," *Tertiary Education and Management* 1 (1995): 38-48; esp. 40.
[54] John Fischetti and Elizabeth Aaronsohn, "Cooperation Starts Inside Schools of Education: Teacher Educators as Collaborators" in *Collaboration: Building Common Agendas* ed. Henrietta S. Schwartz (Washington, DC: American Association of Colleges for Teacher Education, 1990), 140.

they could return to their own campuses with the ability to create their own curricula slightly richer for the experience. At the end of the day, their curricula needed to serve their constituents, advance their world view, and be advertised through their traditional channels. Put simply, the institutions did not cooperate *for* consensus, but rather, cooperated *without* consensus.

The second concept developed by, and advanced in, this dissertation is the "matrix of influence." When historians and curriculum theorists have discussed curricular reform on the K-12 level, they often offer the analogy of a telephone game.[55] An attempt at curricular reform begins at the top of the hierarchy, or the beginning of the process, with what historian David F. Labaree calls the "rhetorical curriculum": the ideas of educational reformers, published and communicated to the larger policy-oriented and non-policy-oriented public.[56] The ideas championed in the rhetorical curriculum make their way down the chain of command, from policymaker to state officials to superintendents at the district level, to principals and teachers at the school level, and finally to the students themselves. However, each actor purposely and pragmatically interprets the messages and changes their meaning to suit their localized context, circumstances, and personal values.

Several historians and other educational researchers have examined this game in action and concluded that the "rhetorical curriculum" hardly ever changes the "curriculum-in-use"—the method and content of teaching in the classroom. These studies also contend that the "rhetorical curriculum" has little effect on the "received curriculum" the type of information that students

[55] Though not applied directly to curriculum reform in this instance, see the discussion of the telephone game phenomenon in Jane L. David and Larry Cuban, *Cutting Through the Hype: The Essential Guide to School Reform* revised, expanded, and updated edition (Cambridge: Harvard Education Press, 2010), 5-6.
[56] David F. Labaree, "Politics, Markets, and the Compromised Curriculum," *Harvard Educational Review* 57 (1987): 483- 494.

accept.[57] As many of these scholars have gone on to lament, this state of affairs results in little change over time.[58] Indeed, Labaree contends "Each wave of reform dramatically transforms the rhetorical curriculum, by changing the way educational leaders talk about the subject. This gives the feeling that something is really happening, but most often it's not."[59] The resulting situation of K-12 curriculum can be described by "the metaphor of a hurricane…Hurricane winds sweep across the sea, tossing up 20-foot waves; a fathom below the surface turbulent waters swirl, while on an ocean floor there is an unruffled calm."[60]

In many ways, these theories and analogies are comparable—if not equivalent—to theories proffered about curriculum reform in higher education. Both sets of theories conclude that miscommunications occur and messages are changed, that messages tend to operate within structured hierarchies, and the result is little change over time.[61] Gordon B. Arnold addresses the perceived situation of little change over time: "The perception of failure in the reform of a general education curriculum is often rooted in the desire for comprehensive change. Lesser change is frequently seen as inadequate and has been described in dismissive language, such as

---

[57] Two of the more well-known studies are Larry Cuban, *How Teachers Taught: Constancy and Change in American Classrooms, 1880-1990* second edition (New York: Teachers College Press, 1993); Seymour B. Sarason, *Revisiting "The Culture of the School and the Problem of Change"* (New York: Teachers College Press, 1996).
[58] This is explored in the classic by David B. Tyack and Larry Cuban, *Tinkering Toward Utopia: A Century of Public School Reform* (Cambridge: Harvard University Press, 1995).
[59] David F. Labaree, "The Chronic Failure of Curriculum Reform," *Education Week* 16 (1999): 42.
[60] Cuban, *How Teachers Taught*, 2.
[61] For a discussion of hierarchies and curricular reform in higher education, see the discussion of "transformative leadership" in William G. Tierney, *Curricular Landscapes, Democratic Vistas: Transformative Leadership in Higher Education* (Westport, CT: Praeger, 1989), chapter eight; esp. 145-149. For broader discussions of curriculum reform, see Paul Blackmore and Camille B. Kandiko, eds., *Strategic Curriculum Change: Global Trends in Universities* (New York: Routledge, 2012). For a discussion of curriculum reform as incremental see John Thelin, "A Legacy of Lethargy?: Curricular Change in Historical Perspective," *Peer Review* 2 (2000): 9-14.

'piecemeal' or 'rearranging the deck chairs.'"[62] Further, several theorists and commentators have employed the analogy that reforming general education is similar to moving a graveyard.[63]

Whether these theories are correct in regard to modern curriculum reform is not the major issue considered in this dissertation. Rather, I contend that the politics of curriculum reform—especially during the general education movement—were different and did not correspond well to the analogy of a telephone game. The primary feature of a telephone game is its non-transactional and linear nature. One person begins the game; the next listens, purposely or inadvertently changes the message, and communicates it to the next player. The game seemingly ends with the final player and there is little to suggest that a cycle of communication will reoccur. The telephone game also assumes that each person understands the chain of command and will stay silent to those higher in the hierarchy. Further, each player only communicates with the two players on either side of themselves.

The politics of curricular reform in the general education movement broke the rules of the telephone game in important and consequential ways. To begin with, there was little hierarchical linearity. Personnel in higher education could move between the classroom, administration, and the policy sector rather freely—though this often varied by institutional type and size.[64] Certainly, leadership in higher education was forged by the "logic of hierarchy" through a

---

[62] Gordon B. Arnold, "Symbolic Politics and Institutional Boundaries in Curriculum Reform: The Case of National Sectarian University," *Journal of Higher Education* 75 (2004): 572.

[63] See, for instance, Thomas Klein and Jerry Gaff, "Reforming General Education: A Survey" (Washington, D.C.: Association of American Colleges, 1982), 9. A similar example of this sentiment is cited by Rudolph, *Curriculum*, 3. The phrase is also repeated in Gilbert Allardyce, "The Rise and Fall of the Western Civilization Course," *American Historical Review* 87 (1982): 698; Ruth G. Shaw, "Curriculum Change in the Community College: Pendulum Swing or Spiral Soar?" in *Innovation in the Community College* ed. Terry O'Banion (New York: MacMillan, 1989), 23.

[64] See the following chapters by H. Gordon Hullfish, "The Functions of the Faculty in the Administrative Process" and Harvey H. Davis, "Organization of the Faculty for Effective Instruction, Student Relations, and Research" in *The Administration of Higher Institutions Under Changing Conditions* ed. Norman Burns (Chicago: University of Chicago Press, 1947), 72-91.

system of "promotion through the hierarchy of academic administration."[65] However, high standing in the hierarchy was not required for involvement in curricular reform.[66] Although it should also be noted that those situated higher in the hierarchy had the opportunity to contribute to and shape the composition of those serving on committees that produced policy statements.[67] For instance, the most famous policy statement on higher education of its time, the 1947 report *Higher Education for American Democracy* was authored by the President's Commission on Higher Education, a twenty-eight-person panel that "represented a wide range of institutions of higher education."[68] Though the committee included members not directly associated with institutions of higher education, the highly influential "American Council on Education worked closely with the White House in selecting the members" of the commission.[69]

Second, though instructors and administrators of the time period had to grapple with national, regional, and local assessment much as their K-12 counterparts did, there can be little doubt that the former had more autonomy and increasingly marginalized the topic for various reasons.[70] "College" Kliebard notes, "has no massive system of certification and other state

---

[65] Michael D. Cohen and James G. March, *Leadership and Ambiguity: The American College President* second edition (Boston: Harvard Business School Press, 1986), esp. chapter 2, quotes from 19.
[66] This is a situation that persists to this day, on this, see Susan M. Awbrey, "General Education Reform as Organizational Change: Integrating Cultural and Structural Change," *Journal of General Education* 54 (2004): 1.
[67] Philo A. Hutcheson and Donna Adair Breault, "National Higher Education Policy Commissions in the Post-World War II Era: Issues of Representation," *The Sophist's Bane* 2 (2003): esp. 21-22.
[68] Philo Hutcheson, "Goals for United States Higher Education: From Democracy to Globalisation," *History of Education* 40 (2011): 47.
[69] Thomas R. Wolanin, *Presidential Advisory Commissions: Truman to Nixon* (Madison: University of Wisconsin Press, 1975), 83. For a fuller discussion of the committee selection process, see Janet Cecile Kerr-Tener, "From Truman to Johnson: Ad-Hoc Policy Formulation in Higher Education" (PhD diss., University of Virginia, 1985), esp. 59-72. For a list of the committee members and their professional titles, see Thashundray C. Robertson, "Access to Success: Truman, Obama, and the Evolution of Presidential Agendas for Community Colleges" (PhD diss., University of South Carolina, 2011), 186-188.
[70] On the difficulties of K-12 teachers and the wider field of "education" as a whole in responding to assessment and/or testing movements see Jal Mehta, *The Allure of Order: High Hopes, Dashed Expectations, and the Troubled Quest to Remake American Schooling* (New York: Oxford University Press, 2013). On the history of general education assessments see Richard J. Shavelson, "A Brief History of Student Learning Assessment: How We Got Where We Are and a Proposal for Where to Go Next" (Washington, D.C.: Association for American Colleges and Universities, 2007), 7-10; Richard J. Shavelson, *Measuring College Learning Responsibly: Accountability in a New Era* (Stanford: Stanford University Press, 2010), chapter two; Jeremy D. Penn, "The Case for Assessing Complex

controls for its professional personnel. Therefore, its faculty reflects not just different training but different professional commitments as well as a much higher degree of autonomy."[71] Though numerous examples of national general education assessments existed, there was little in the way of national oversight. Accrediting bodies themselves were largely regional during the time period. And while one might speculate that "the spokesmen for all of higher education," the American Council on Education (ACE), was able to create a set of national standards, attempts at the "coordination" of regional accrediting bodies stalled during the general education movement.[72]

Further, the concept of permutations can be applied to general education to help us understand that that students had (and continue to have) an exponentially diverse set of ways to satisfy their general education requirements. Of course, this also made—and continues to make—assessment difficult. Though describing a contemporary program, the following discussion applies well to the general education movement. "Except in rare cases, the general education program is not really constructed as a 'program' in the same sense that majors are, with most students taking the same core set of courses," Martha Marinara, Kuppalapalle Vajravelu, and Denise L. Young explain, "When charged with establishing outcomes for the

---

General Education Student Learning Outcomes," *New Directions for Institutional Research* no. 149 (2011): 5-6. On the tendency of faculty members to despise or disregard general education assessments in the past as well as the present-day, see Peter Ewell, "General Education and the Assessment Reform Agenda" (Washington, D.C.: Association of American Colleges and Universities, 2004), 2-4; Marilee J. Bresciani, "The Challenges of Assessing General Education: Questions to Consider" in *Assessing Student Learning in General Education: Good Practice Case Studies* ed. Marilee J. Bresciani (Bolton, MA: Anker Publishing Company, 2007), 1-15.

[71] Herbert M. Kliebard, "A Century of Growing Antagonism in High School-College Relations," *Journal of Curriculum and Supervision* 3 (1987): 61.

[72] V.R. Cardozier, *Colleges and Universities in World War II* (Westport, CT.: Praeger, 1993), 4. On the failure of ACE to "coordinate" regional accrediting bodies up to 1940 see Hugh Hawkins, *Banding Together: The Rise of National Associations in American Higher Education, 1887-1950* (Baltimore: Johns Hopkins University Press, 1992), 90-94. On their failure in this era and beyond see Donald Mitchell Stewart, "The Politics of Higher Education and Public Policy: A Study of the American Council on Education" (PhD diss., Harvard University, 1975), chapter three. On the relative failure of regional accrediting bodies in higher education to achieve full legitimacy across the twentieth century, see Harland G. Bloland, "The Origins of Regional Accrediting Associations and Commissions" in his book *Creating the Council for Higher Education Accreditation (CHEA)* (Phoenix: Oryx Press, 2001), 15-32.

entire [General Education Program], the request seems as daunting as tracking Ahab's white whale across the North Atlantic."[73] The authors add that "disciplinary specialization" and a set of unspoken and contested "desired outcomes" each discipline and curricular unit are further complicating matters. When considering the whole system of American higher education, institutional diversity would further the difficulty of system-wide assessment.[74] "Curricular niches among colleges and universities," scholar Wade M. Cole explains, "can develop around such factors as enrollment composition, organizational mission, institutional identity, and location in status hierarchies."[75] This certainly held true throughout the general education movement.

Given all this, the system was every bit so complex and difficult to standardize and control that it would seem that there was no logical top of the hierarchy. Put simply, there was no beginning of the telephone game—a situation that continues to this day and is captured eloquently by the recent conclusion of two curriculum theorists, "The sheer number of higher education institutions in the United States and the lack of a central agency that coordinates their efforts make it difficult to generalize about postsecondary curricula."[76]

In the absence of a structured hierarchy, a system emerged in which administrators, teachers, students, researchers, policymakers, and others were constantly talking, listening, and changing both what they said and heard based on prior experience and ongoing experimentation.

---

[73] Martha Marinara, Kuppalapalle Vajravelu, and Denise L. Young, "Making Sense of the 'Loose Baggy Monster': Assessing Learning in a General Education Program is a Whale of a Task," *Journal of General Education* 53 (2004): 1-2.
[74] Mary Glenn Wiley and Mayer N. Zald, "The Growth and Transformation of Educational Accrediting Agencies: An Exploratory Study in Social Control of Institutions," *Sociology of Education* 41 (1968): 36-56, esp. 41-42.
[75] Wade M. Cole, "Mandated Multiculturalism: An Analysis of Core Curricula at Tribal and Historically Black Colleges," *Poetics: Journal of Empirical Research on Culture, the Media and the Arts* 38 (2010): 485.
[76] Lisa Lattuca and Joan S. Stark, *Shaping the College Curriculum: Academic Plans in Context* second edition (San Francisco: Jossey-Bass, 2009), 32. However, one should be aware that standardization is not a prerequisite for meaningful assessment. See the very important and timely discussion of this fact in David A. Eubanks, "Assessing the General Education Elephant," *Assessment Update* 20 (2008): 4-6.

Indeed, curriculum reform in higher education was less of a game of telephone and more of a switchboard with thousands upon thousands of flashing lights and no central authority controlling the flow of information—a matrix. Members of the movement could get their messages out to everyone and could listen to the many messages being provided by others. They also interpreted the messages and implemented suggestions at will. National discussions drove local implementation and local implementation constantly informed national discussions. Rather than change in theory and practice being infrequent or incremental, it occurred all the time—most everywhere.

These national discussions and local implementation were all aided—if not driven—by an apparatus that supported the research and reform of curricula and college teaching: studies sponsored by regional and national associations and consortia, journal upon journal related to college teaching and curriculum reform, money pouring in from philanthropic groups, and conference after conference that brought scholars together. Educational research, philanthropy, and inter- and intra- institutional cooperation drove the matrix. Influence did not flow from a single—or a series—of source(s). Any of the messages that entered the matrix could potentially influence a listener—to any degree. Put simply, curricular reform in the general education movement was neither top-down nor bottom-up. It operated—much as curriculum reform in higher education has likely always operated—via a matrix of influence.

Chapter Outline

To tell this story of reform in the general education movement, I devote the present chapter to a discussion of the regnant theory of general education reform as well as the general significance of general education in American higher education. By exploring the wide prevalence of the thesis arguing that Columbia, Chicago, and Harvard served as examples of

reform to a myriad of other institutions of higher education, one can achieve a sense of how ingrained this theory is to the majority of historical and contemporary scholarship. Once this theory is questioned, a competing theory is explored and the methodological and conceptual groundwork of the dissertation is laid.

The second chapter of the dissertation focuses on the Eight-Year Study, which primarily examined secondary school curricula and functioned from 1930 to 1942. The chapter argues that this study laid the theoretical precepts and practical methods that informed all future cooperative studies focused on general education reform and would set the course in curriculum reform and philanthropic support for all cooperative studies in general education on the postsecondary level. Though this dissertation is concerned primarily with general education reform in institutions of higher education, there can be little doubt that a project to bring secondary and higher education into a greater hierarchical, standardized system had occurred and was continuing with a great deal of momentum during the general education movement.

The focus of the third chapter, the Cooperative Study in General Education, began in 1938, when select institutions of higher learning approached American Council on Education (ACE) President George Zook to ask about pooling precious resources to attack the problems of general education. Zook was receptive and, impressed with the success of the Eight-Year Study, asked Ralph Tyler to serve as director of the new project. As Tyler would recall some forty-five years later, Zook and others "were conscious of the effectiveness of the Eight-Year Study, and working that way…what they wanted, I think, was the experience growing out of the Eight-Year Study. So [the Cooperative Study] was designed very much like that."[77]

[77] Ralph W. Tyler, Interview, July 7, 1983, quoted in Miriam Cassandra Rumjahn, "A Chronicle of the Professional Activities of Ralph W. Tyler: An Oral History" (EdD Diss., Pepperdine University, 1984), 56.

To supplement the institutions that had approached Zook and ACE, a selection process took place, bringing the grand total of participants to twenty-two institutions. These institutions represented an extraordinarily wide geographic and demographic range. Schools from California to Pennsylvania and of every conceivable institutional type were assembled. This chapter examines the cooperation between these diverse institutions and the resulting reform and argues that cooperation without consensus was the method of choice for the institutions involved. Once the broad philosophy of the participants is explored, special attention is paid the experiences of Michigan State College to illustrate how reform functioned at the institutional level. This study completed its work in 1947. The following year, the focus of the fourth chapter, the California Study of General Education in the Junior College, began its work and would continue until 1952. This chapter explores the significance of the general education movement through the lens of the community college. Though community colleges had participated in the Cooperative Study in General Education, the California Study brought the resources of a state invested in the community college concept and growing rapidly. More important, the California Study began on the heels of the report of the oft-mentioned Truman Commission. As the report of this commission, *Higher Education in an American Democracy*, made clear, the future of higher education was to be built on twin pillars of access and general education. The community college—and in many ways, community colleges located in California—stood most to gain from this. So too did the general education movement. However, the philanthropic funding for this study paled in comparison to its predecessors. As the final cooperative study actively funded by philanthropic foundations, it marked something of a "last hurrah" for the general education movement. A concluding chapter considers the fabled death of the movement and argues that the "spirit" of the movement continued to live on in smaller reforms. It provides a brief sketch of the

origins of the Unit One Program at the University of Illinois and reflects on the movement's legacy as a whole.

The Complexities of Curriculum History and the Use of Cooperative Studies as a Source: A Statement on Methodology

In many ways, histories are shaped by the views that historians hold about the nature of curriculum reform as well as the evidentiary considerations available. Naturally, curricular historians will gravitate to the most consequential reforms and institutions to describe the curricular considerations. This section lays out two complexities associated with writing higher education curricular history. After each is described, a case will be made for why the cooperative studies of general education utilized in this dissertation are an ideal source to alleviate and address the problem raised. Though the descriptions of the complexities will occasionally be drawn from the reflections of historians who specialize in the K-12 curriculum, their insights will provide understanding of some of the treacherous terrain that awaits historians of the undergraduate curriculum.

Before laying out the complexities themselves, perhaps it may be best to illustrate their collective effect. It can be argued that these complexities are partially responsible for the fact that curricular histories of American higher education are in painfully short supply. This was noticed by Louis Franklin Snow in his 1907 survey of the undergraduate curriculum. "That this phase of college life has been heretofore neglected is a trifle surprising." He lamented. "Even so soon as collegiate instruction began, the reporter and the historian seem to have made it their particular business to concern themselves with many minor details of the management of the enterprises…. [T]he real work of the college—the lectures given, the recitations heard, the text-books used—has been either wholly neglected or is mentioned in such brief fashion as to give but a vague idea

of what was the actual condition of things scholastic."[78] Unfortunately, precious little has changed in the last century. As recently as 2011, Thelin declared, "Although teaching and learning are allegedly at the heart of higher education, scholars have made relatively few attempts (and with limited results) to penetrate the changing classroom and curricula of the American campus."[79]

Both Snow and Thelin speak to the same paradox: arguably the most important aspect of higher education—the curriculum—has received a disproportionately low amount of attention in the historical literature. Critical to the success of a history of any aspect of the undergraduate curriculum, then, is the identification of the reasons for the existence of this paradox. Even more crucial would be an attempt to identify lenses through which to explore the undergraduate curriculum—and general education—efficiently and effectively.

The First Complexity: Lack of Primary Sources

The relative lack of sources and the nearly impenetrable world of the classroom replete with a closed door is perhaps the most challenging aspect of reconstructing the curriculum of the past. Historian Herbert M. Kliebard asserted, "A great deal of attention has been lavished on the question of who went to school but relatively little on the question of what happened once all those children and youth walked inside the schoolhouse doors. In a sense, reluctance to tackle that kind of question is understandable; it would be a formidable task to try to answer in the contemporary context."[80] Indeed, Cuban concurs that the modern classroom would be difficult to study. He offers the metaphor of a black box to describe "what happens daily in classrooms.

---

[78] Louis Franklin Snow, *The College Curriculum in the United States* originally published by Teachers College, Columbia University (New York: AMS Press, 1907/1972), 11-12.
[79] John R. Thelin, *A History of American Higher Education* second edition (Baltimore: Johns Hopkins University Press, 2011), 447.
[80] Herbert M. Kliebard, "Preface to the First Edition" in his *The Struggle for the American Curriculum, 1893-1958*, third edition (New York: RoutledgeFalmer, 2004), xvii-xviii.

Even though it should be known to all, since every policy maker, researcher, parent, and taxpayer attended school, it remains out of public sight—what occurs in classrooms remains mysterious to nonteachers because memories fade and children's reports of what they do in a school are, at best, laconic, hiding more than revealing."[81] The same may be said of college classrooms of the present day.[82] What day-to-day records truly exist of college teaching—especially general education courses? "For all the intellectual firepower trained on the topic of general education," one scholar noted, "there is a positive dearth of factual information about its actual conduct on campus."[83]

The First Solution: Meticulous Documentation Surviving both as Published Documents and Archival Evidence

Perhaps the foremost advantage historians of higher education who study the undergraduate curriculum have over their K-12 counterparts is the existence of college archives. "Archivists at colleges and universities," Thelin explains, "have collected unorthodox materials which can be the 'historical flesh'…to make dry institutional bones come to life."[84] That said, historians of higher education must be wary that institutions of various institutional types may not have had the institutional support and/or resources to maintain a college archive. A powerful discussion of this troubling fact comes from Philo Hutcheson, who offers that "the community college does not exist as text. Its history for professional historians is not even buried; it was destroyed, since little care to archival records of these institutions, such as those records existed,

[81] Larry Cuban, *Inside the Black Box of Classroom Practice: Change Without Reform in American Education* (Cambridge: Harvard Education Press, 2013), 10.
[82] Pat Hutchings, "From Idea to Prototype: The Peer Review of Teaching" in *Reconnecting Education and Foundations: Turning Good Intentions into Educational Capital* eds. Ray Bacchetti and Thomas Ehrlich (San Francisco: Jossey-Bass, 2007), 305.
[83] Lawrence Locke, "General Education: In Search of Facts," *Change: The Magazine of Higher Learning* 21 (1989): 21.
[84] John R. Thelin, *Higher Education and Its Useful Past: Applied History in Research and Planning* (Cambridge: Schenkman Publishing Company, 1982), 17.

has ever been taken."[85] The cooperative studies explored in this dissertation produced an avalanche of materials—both published in traditional scholarly channels and archival—and were able to house these materials. Indeed, for colleges without the ability to store their archival material, a picture—albeit incomplete—can still be drawn from the evidentiary considerations that survive in the archives of the organizations and other institutions of higher learning that those colleges worked with.

Further, many of the participants in the cooperative studies had strong programs devoted to institutional research—or "research which is directed toward providing data useful or necessary in the making of intelligent administrative decisions and/or for the successful maintenance, operation, and/or improvement of a given institution of higher education."[86] These programs were not limited to research universities and in fact, were often found in many community colleges as well.[87] To the extent that material was produced toward institutional research and betterment, it was often preserved by the institutions themselves and other supporting organizations. The following is a list and brief discussion of the published and archival resources that are common to each of the cooperative studies under review in this dissertation.

---

[85] Philo Hutcheson, "Reconsidering the Community College," *History of Education Quarterly* 39 (1999): 318.
[86] W. Hugh Stickler, "The Expanding Role of Institutional Research in American Junior Colleges," *Junior College Journal* 31 (1961): 542.
[87] Ibid., 545. Indeed, the general education movement and many of its most notable members had a strong relationship with institutional research and were responsible for its proliferation throughout institutions of higher learning. On this see W.H. Cowley, "Two and a Half Centuries of Institutional Research" in *College Self Study: Lectures on Institutional Research* eds. Richard G. Axt and Hall T. Sprague (Boulder, CO: Western Interstate Commission for Higher Education, 1959), 1-16; William L. Tetlow, "Institutional Research: The Emergence of a Staff Function in Higher Education" (PhD diss., Cornell University, 1973); William F. Lasher, "The History of Institutional Research and Its Role in American Higher Education Over the Past 50 Years" in *AIR: The Association for Institutional Research: The First 50 Years* eds. Gary Rice, Mary Ann Coughlin, and Richard Howard (Tallahassee, FL: Association for Institutional Research, 2011), esp. 9-14; Donald J. Reichard, "The History of Institutional Research" in *The Handbook of Institutional Research* eds. Richard D. Howard, et al. (San Francisco: Jossey-Bass, 2012), 3-21.

The first type of source produced by the cooperative studies are reports that were published frequently in practitioner-oriented and disciplinary journals. Major goals of each of the cooperative studies were to "provide opportunities for summer workshops, training facilities and programs for new faculty members, clearing materials and ideas, and publishing materials of general usefulness."[88] These opportunities and publications were advertised in practitioner-oriented journals in the hopes that they would provide the impetus to spur reform on campuses across the nation. An instance of this was seen in the 1951 volume of the *California Journal of Secondary Education*. Early in 1951, the director of the California Study, B. Lamar Johnson, provided a "survey" of the work of the Study, and "Much of the material in this article was presented in an address given by Dr. Johnson at the fall meeting of the California State Junior College Association."[89]

Later that year, the journal dedicated much of an issue to a "Symposium on Junior College Education" and included a "preview report" of the California Study. Further, a descriptive article was also provided by a faculty member from participating Bakersfield College.[90] Articles by faculty members describing their experiences with cooperative studies were common. A decade before the Bakersfield College article, an Olivet College faculty member participating in the Cooperative Study in General Education reflected on his own experiences and published them along with a questionnaire developed from the cooperative work completed in the Study.[91] These types of articles also made their way into discipline-oriented journals. For example, a faculty member from Muskingum College participating in the

---

[88] "Interuniversity Co-Operation in Programs of General Education," *School and Society* 63 (1946): 372.
[89] B. Lamar Johnson, "Next Steps in the General Education Study," *California Journal of Secondary Education* 26 (1951): 47-52. I will discuss Johnson's career at some length in chapter four.
[90] *California Journal of Secondary Education*, Volume 26, Issue No. 7 (November, 1951). Ralph Prator, "The Counseling-Guidance Plan at Bakersfield College," *California Journal of Secondary Education* 26 (1951): 426-429.
[91] Richard A. Barnes, "Discovering Student Needs: A Questionnaire Study Including Alumni and Undergraduate Opinion," *Journal of Higher Education* 12 (1941): 469-472.

Cooperative Study in General Education published a description of a course he had created in *The Journal of the American Academy of Religion*.[92]

A second type of source were conference proceedings published at various points by the cooperative studies. These were often available for sale from the American Council on Education and were reviewed and advertised in numerous journals. While the published materials of the cooperative studies swell with insights and provide an outstanding lens on cooperation, the archival materials held on individual campuses offer the ability to see how those ideas were translated into practice. Syllabi, examinations (inventories), committee meeting minutes, student materials, and instructional materials can help flesh out the reality of the classroom

The Second Complexity: Overrepresentation of Ideology—Curriculum Theorists, Weathervanes, and the Question of Influence

Historians who have lacked these archival resources—or who have not had access to them—have attempted to write the history of curriculum by interpreting a different set of evidence. To return to the previous discussion by Kliebard, "Trying to address that question [of what occurred in schools], even in the recent past, means drawing interpretations from grossly incomplete evidence. Regrettably, it often means making inferences from the statements of leading figures in the education world rather than from classroom documents and reports of participants."[93] Indeed, in the absence of surviving documents detailing tangible practice on the ground, historians tend to turn to policy documents. Kliebard himself would refer to these documents as "weather vanes by which one could gauge which way the curriculum winds were blowing."[94] However, even he acknowledged their weakness lay in their inability to explain how

[92] James L. McCreight, "Human Living: An Integrated Course in Psychology, Philosophy, and Religion," *The Journal of the American Academy of Religion* 16 (1948): 151.
[93] Kliebard, "Preface to the First," xviii.
[94] Ibid.

the ideas represented by these weather vanes influenced classroom practice—to whatever extent they did so at all.[95] Labaree referred to weather vanes as a "rather crude instrument."[96] An even stronger critique came from O.L. Davis Jr., who, in a discussion of the historiography of the curriculum operating in secondary schools during the Second World War, argued, "Position statements are never satisfactory substitutes for reports of practice. On the other hand, prescriptions and advice are usable; their limits simply must be acknowledged."[97]

Another form of weather vane that historians, of both K-12 and higher education curriculum history, have also analyzed is the writings of well-known curriculum theorists. Indeed, the personalities behind documents such as *The Higher Learning in America* or the Redbook are as prevalent in histories of the undergraduate curriculum as the philosophies of the works themselves.

The Second Solution: Focus on the Politics of Curriculum Reform as Displayed in Archival Evidence such as Minutes of Meetings and Avoid Discussions of Theorists and Ideology

Cooperative studies, ideally, provide the variety of archival evidence and the lenses by which to represent the complex experience of curriculum formation and reform to shift the historian's attention away from an overreliance on the ideology of the curriculum theorists who participated in the administration of the studies. However, the existence and accessibility of archival material has not always guaranteed that the cooperative studies themselves have not been interpreted as weather vanes. While the cooperative studies are replete with archival

[95] Herbert M. Kliebard, "Introduction" in *Forging the American Curriculum: Essays in Curriculum History and Theory* (New York: Routledge, 1992), esp. xii-xiii. This introduction does, however, make a powerful argument for the type of curriculum history that predominates can still coexist with more narrowly focused case studies.
[96] Labaree, "Politics, Markets," 486.
[97] O.L. Davis Jr., "The American School Curriculum Goes to War, 1941-1945: Oversight, Neglect, and Discovery," *Journal of Curriculum and Supervision* 8 (1993): 125.

material, the responsibility falls to the historian to examine the materials that were not published as they will give a fuller picture of the operation of the studies.

Indeed, it bears noting that some of the cooperative studies in this dissertation have already received substantial attention from historians of the K-12 and undergraduate curriculum. While the Cooperative Study in General Education "remains one of the more remarkable yet much overlooked projects of American higher education," the Eight-Year Study is one of the most discussed episodes in the history of American education.[98] However, the archival material produced by the Eight-Year Study has only begun to take precedence in the historians' interpretations. Prior to this, many interpretations of the Eight-Year Study revolved around the published reports. In addition, the California Study of General Education in the Junior College has received quite a bit of attention. There again, the archival evidence has been relatively unexplored, while the final report has guided historians' interpretations.

So the question becomes, how can one produce a curricular history with a focus on cooperative studies that employs the studies as lenses by which to examine the method and content of general education and its reform? Thelin provides the answer. He proclaims:

> I differ from many historians of curriculum in the following manner. Although I rely heavily on intellectual history as a base, I am not specifically concerned with the discussions and philosophical debates among the truly great scholars and thinkers. My focus is more modest: look to see how the curriculum is carried out at the level of the campus and the classroom. In short, I try to look at the diffusion of ideas from thinkers to institutions. Far from being anti-intellectual, I have great respect for the power of ideas. My codicil is that powerful ideas often take interesting twists and turns when one entrusts them to the structures and subcultures of the campus.[99]

---

[98] Craig Kridel and Robert V. Bullough Jr., *Stories of the Eight-Year Study: Reexamining Secondary Education in America* (Albany: State University of New York Press, 2007), 95.
[99] John R. Thelin, "The Anatomy of Institutions: Historians and the Search for the Unwritten Curriculum" in *Curriculum History: Conference Presentations from the Society for the Study of Curriculum History* ed. Craig Kridel (Lanham, MD: University Press of America, 1989), 66.

This will require only limited discussions of ideology or of curriculum theorists represented in the cooperative studies. Greater emphasis will be placed on the archival considerations, in which the content of general education is hammered out on both the local and national levels. Further, individual institutions will be looked at within their local contexts. This will discourage any semblance of a monolithic discussion of any cooperative study. It will also assist in dealing with what historian called "the special difficulties involved in determining influence in intellectual history."[100]

Thelin also provides another theory on how histories of higher education may be written. In his sweeping monograph, *A History of American Higher Education*, Thelin suggests that he provides a "vertical history," or discussion of a diverse set of colleges and universities that form "the familiar landmarks that stand upright in our institutional consciousness" as well as a "horizontal history," or discussion of "the founding and influence of institutions and agencies that cut horizontally across the higher-education landscape. These include private foundations, government agencies, and regional boards."[101] Though the following discussion by Sheila Slaughter predates Thelin, she seemingly applied his theory to higher education curriculum history and implies that most of the scholarship devoted to curriculum reform tends to overlook the "horizontal" institutions: "most American scholars of the post-secondary curriculum continue to write about curricular formation and change as if it were internal to community colleges, colleges and universities. This literature rarely considers the role in curricular formation played by groups, associations and organizations external to the academy, nor does it treat scholarly and

[100] Richard Emmons Thursfield, *Henry Barnard's American Journal of Education* (Baltimore: Johns Hopkins Press, 1945), 9.
[101] Thelin, *A History of American*, xxviii.

professional associations as having any interests other than the advancement of knowledge."[102] By utilizing the cooperative studies, which featured a diverse set of institutions cooperating with associations, philanthropic groups, and other institutions, this dissertation provides both a "horizontal" and "vertical" history of general education that is sensitive to Slaughter's concerns.

Having discussed the methodological emphases of this dissertation, it is necessary to return to the paradox identified by Snow and Thelin. Both authors suggest that the undergraduate curriculum—and to some extent general education—has been seen as the foundation of the collegiate experience. While the importance of general education may seem assured, its significance to various members of the campus community and its contemporary relevance must be explored to lay a broader base of significance to the dissertation.

The Significance of General Education to American Higher Education

The Prevalence and Value of General Education: Market Shares and the Metaphor for American Political, Economic, and Sociocultural Goals and Aspirations

To some scholars, general education is a dying phenomenon. Perhaps one of the most famous observers of higher education, Clark Kerr, contended more than two decades ago that "General education has been in decline for most of the past three centuries."[103]

To others, general education is a sleeping giant to be revived every few decades as cultural events cause Americans to "need what general education has to offer."[104] Though Ernest Boyer and Arthur Levine might well have concurred that general education has been rapidly losing traction among a large proportion of institutions of higher learning, they offer that

---

[102] Sheila Slaughter, "Class, Race and Gender and the Construction of Post-secondary Curricula in the United States: Social Movement, Professionalization and Political Economic Theories of Curricular Change," *Journal of Curriculum Studies* 29 (1997): 2.
[103] Clark Kerr, *The Great Transformation in Higher Education, 1960-1980* (Albany: State University of New York Press, 1991), 331.
[104] Boyer and Levine, *A Quest for Common Learning*, 6.

"revivals" often occur. Though they realized that student protests of the 1960s took a toll on general education, by the end of the 1970s and the beginning of the 1980s Boyer and Levine suggested that the current interest in general education constituted "nothing less than a national revival."[105] Still another interpretation casts general education as a perennial topic.

In the same year that Kerr published the aforementioned discussion of general education, scholars William Toombs, Marilyn J. Amey, and Alexander Chen explained, "Scanning the flow of academic literature suggests that active interest in general education surfaces like sunspots every 8 to 10 years, but that is a bit misleading. An underlying wave of concern for the amount and content of general studies in the curriculum is continuous." Toombs, Amey, and Chen also contend that general education is a constant source of concern for faculty, administrators, students, and public critics of higher education. [106]

The question, of course, is which of these viewpoints is most accurate? Is general education a dying phenomenon, an ideology capable of revival, or a perennial concern? It would seem that there is truth to each of the viewpoints but that the last is essentially correct. General education is in many ways in decline—especially when considering the success of disciplinary specialization and the continued prevalence of the modern research university. That said, one can certainly point to certain periods where interest in the topic reaches a fever pitch. However, the simple fact is that general education is always an ongoing concern. Indeed, statistical profiles of institutional reform of general education began to be taken in the late 1970s, and by the turn of the twenty-first century James L. Ratcliff and colleagues were able to proclaim that "The high

---

[105] Ibid., 5. For a discussion of interest in general education from the late 1960s all the way to the late 1970s, see Helen B. Warren, "Recent Themes in General Education: A Bibliographic Essay," *Journal of General Education* 34 (1982): 271. Warren, among others, point to the concept of a "third period" of general education developed by Stanley O. Ikenberry in his article "The Academy and General Education," *Journal of General Education* 23 (1971): 175-189.

[106] William Toombs, Marilyn J. Amey, and Alexander Chen, "General Education: An Analysis of Contemporary Practice," *Journal of General Education* 40 (1991): 102-118; quotes from 103.

level interest in general education continues a trend dating from at least 1977."[107] By 2005, Shawn M. Glynn and his colleagues noted that "It has been estimated that about ninety-five percent of the four-year colleges and universities in the United States offer general education programs."[108] By 2009, Steven M. Brint and his colleagues argued that "General education requirements comprise, on average, approximately 30% of the undergraduate curriculum."[109] In that same year, Hart Research Associates published the results of a survey of "433 Chief Academic Officers or designated representatives at [American Association of Colleges and Universities] Members" and found that "The vast majority (89%) of these institutions are in some stage of assessing or modifying their general education program."[110]

Certainly this presents a picture of general education as being a serious and significant component of the offerings of colleges and universities. But, placed against the backdrop of recent trends that have seen tuition rise, student loan debt increase, and the value of a college degree as a sound investment being questioned, there may still be some debate about the value of general education and the reasons for studying it. Though the statistics show general education to have a solid market share of the undergraduate curriculum, Brint and colleagues would suggest that a greater market share of the undergraduate curriculum in the last several decades has been held by the "Practical Arts" or degree programs with an emphasis on "occupational and professional" aims.[111] This fact, taken with the increasing movement to vocationalize all

---

[107] James L. Ratcliffe, et al., "The Status of General Education in the Year 2000: Summary of a National Survey" (Washington, D.C.: Association of American Colleges and Universities, 2001), 17.
[108] Shawn M. Glynn, Lori Price Altman, Ashley M. Owens, "Motivation to Learn in General Education Programs," *Journal of General Education* 54 (2005): 151.
[109] Steven Brint, et al., "General Education Models: Continuity and Change in the U.S. Undergraduate Curriculum, 1975-2000," *Journal of Higher Education* 80 (2009): 605.
[110] Hart Research Associates, "Trends and Emerging Practices in General Education Based on a Survey Among Members of the Association of American Colleges and Universities" (Washington, D.C.: Association of American Colleges and Universities, 2009).
[111] Steven Brint, et. al., "From the Liberal to the Practical Arts in American Colleges and Universities: Organizational Analysis and Curricular Change," *Journal of Higher Education* 76 (2005): 151-180.

institutional types of higher education in an effort to win the "race between education and technology" and an increasing movement toward student choice seems to suggest that scholarly attention should perhaps focus on the more pre-professional aspects of the college curriculum.[112]

Indeed, general education, with its close association—if not conflation—with liberal education delivered through the liberal arts seems to be the least effective step that colleges and universities can take toward providing a greater rate of return on investment. It is true that an economic argument should be and has been made throughout the past and present to justify general education.[113] Scholars have examined whether general education can be provided cheaply and efficiently, and whether it can provide students with the necessary skills that employers desire. In the estimation of many, general education can and should help Americans to achieve their competing and conflicting goals in social efficiency and social mobility. Put simply, many believe that general education can not only produce engaged citizens, but also professionals who can contextualize, enjoy, and evolve their craft. But, these are not the only factors that keep general education strong in American higher education. It is general education's ability to help Americans achieve their goals in democratic equality and cultural transference and transformation that assure its importance and vitality.[114] It is the relation of general education to

---

[112] On the movement to vocationalize higher education, see Marvin Lazerson, *Higher Education and the American Dream: Success and its Discontents* (Budapest: Central European University Press, 2010). On ability of American higher education to help win the "race between educational and technology," or to provide a higher rate of return for schooling (measured by income) see Claudia Goldin and Lawrence F. Katz, *The Race Between Education and Technology* (Cambridge: Belknap Press, 2008). On the increase in student choice see Karen Jeong Robinson, "The Rise of Choice in the U.S. University and College, 1910-2005," *Sociological Forum* 26 (2011): 601-622.

[113] An example of this argument can be found in Jonathan Yonan, "Majoring in Servitude: Liberal Arts and the Formation of Citizens" in *Civic Education and the Future of American Citizenship* eds. Elizabeth Kaufer Busch and Jonathan W. White (Lanham, MD: Lexington Books, 2013), 111-123.

[114] For a discussion that introduces the terms of "democratic equality," "social efficiency," and "social mobility," and contrasts them as competing values, see David F. Labaree, "Public Goods, Private Goods: The American Struggle over Educational Goals," *American Education Research Journal* 34 (1997): 39-81.

our highest democratic and social aspirations, more so than to our current economic realities, that keeps general education alive.[115]

The value of general education—and the reason it continues to command attention and space in the undergraduate curriculum as well as the scholarly literature—lies in the fact that it "constitutes the 'symbolic territory' on which knowledge about the common good and a sense of the body politic are molded, inasmuch as higher education can shape them at all. It is knowledge that moves inward toward a consideration of the subject(s) of citizenship and outward to a critical reflection of what constitutes peoples and nations. It is learning that gives meaning and recognition to solidarities."[116] The value of general education also lies in its ability to serve as a metaphor for American political and sociocultural aspirations. Indeed, as Michael Geyer claims, "Since what is at stake are the very terms of social identity and citizenship, general education has always been closely watched and has always been sharply contested. It should not surprise, then, that general education has been most heavily embattled in the civil war over the control of higher education."[117] This invariably makes it the most disputed, if not the most important, portion of the undergraduate curriculum and possibly the entire *raison d'être* of American higher education. Perhaps the issue was stated most simply by Cynthia A. Wells. "Any general education discussion is," she opined, "a thinly veiled debate as to the purpose of college itself."[118]

This raises an important point: to many, general education is simply a battleground upon which to hold discussions for assumptions and values. Often, when higher education is critiqued, or is proclaimed to be "at a crossroads" or "in a crisis," curriculum is often the main focus. Joan W. Scott contends, "The rhetoric of 'crisis in higher education' has figured its meaning in terms

---

[115] David R. Hiley, "The Democratic Purposes of General Education," *Liberal Education* 82 (1996): 20-26.
[116] Michael Geyer, "Multiculturalism and the Politics of General Education," *Critical Inquiry* 19 (1993): 500.
[117] Ibid.
[118] Cynthia A. Wells, "General Education and the Quest for Purpose" in *Ernest L. Boyer: Hope for Today's Universities* eds. Todd C. Ream and John M. Braxton (Albany: State University of New York Press, 2015), 36.

of warring oppositions. We have learned to understand the current malaise in terms of 'culture wars' and 'canon wars' that feature campus radicals versus conservative public proponents of multiculturalism versus defenders of tradition, scholars who insist on the political construction of all knowledge versus those who would preserve the purity and beauty of a necessarily nonpolitical, because objective, truth."[119] However, rather than a collaborative discussion held between public interests, administrators, faculty members, and students, general education becomes an area whereby competition carries the day. Scott continues, "These images of war and ravishment carry with them a diagnosis and an implied cure. If we could defeat the enemy—whoever we take that to be—the crisis would be over, and peace or health would be restored; if the enemy triumphs, on the other hand, the university, as it was or should be, will be destroyed."[120] "Embattled" and "contested" are certainly choice words for the state of general education since its inception. But more so than those terms, "reform" is perhaps a more apt keyword for the discussions surrounding the conceptualizing and execution of general education. Whether this process is a collaborative effort among peers or a mudslinging battle, reform is the key objective for policymakers, administrators, faculty members, and students. Put simply, stakeholders seek reform through a myriad of methods.

The Stakes of General Education and its Reform for Administrators, Faculty Members, Policymakers, and Students: "Responsibility" and "Opportunity"

The relation between general education and its reform between administrators and faculty members—to such extent as those roles are different and/or occupied by different people—and

---

[119] Joan W. Scott, "The Rhetoric of Crisis in Higher Education" in *Higher Education Under Fire: Politics, Economics, and the Crisis of the Humanities* eds. Michael Bérubé and Cary Nelson (New York: Routledge, 1995), 293. Similarly, Robert Birnbaum and Frank Shushok, Jr., argue that curriculum is a "chronic crisis" that "appears with moderate continuity and frequency." See their chapter, "The 'Crisis' Crisis in Higher Education: Is that a Wolf or a Pussycat at the Academy's Door?" in *In Defense of American Higher Education* eds. Philip G. Altbach, Patricia J. Gumport, and D. Bruce Johnstone (Baltimore: Johns Hopkins University Press, 2001), 59-84.
[120] Scott, "The Rhetoric of Crisis," 294.

the general public, policymakers, and students is perhaps the key discussion that drives the collegiate enterprise. There are valid reasons for beginning with administrators and faculty members and then exploring their relation to other groups. "If the American college graduate is weak in analysis and the spirit of inquiry, unable to communicate in his own or any other language clearly and effectively, and with it all ethically unsure and ignorant of his own history and culture," Rudolph opined, "the responsibility lies not with the schools or with college and university presidents, nor with the politicians or the people, but with the professors. They have the power to will great change in the undergraduate curriculum."[121] And, many faculty members understand Rudolph's point and take the responsibility (and opportunity) seriously. Indeed, Sandra L. Kanter and colleagues have contended that administrators and faculty make up an overwhelming majority of "initiators of general education reform."[122] As such, and for the simple fact that administrators and faculty members tend to create and execute the general education curriculum, much of the onus of engagement and communication logically falls on them.[123] Finally, and perhaps most convincingly, faculty members are critical to the process of reform because of their ability to represent what general education is in a particular setting. Consider the following statement by Jerry G. Gaff, who spent decades serving as a policymaker at the American Association of Colleges and Universities (AAC&U), "which defined itself as the only major national organization focusing on liberal and general education," as well as a faculty member serving on general education committees in colleges across the nation.[124] Looking back

---

[121] Frederick Rudolph, "The Power of Professors: The Impact of Specialization and Professionalization on the Curriculum," *Change: The Magazine for Higher Education* 16 (1984): 41.
[122] Kanter, et. al, *Revitalizing General Education in a Time of Scarcity*, esp. 29-44.
[123] However, Clark Kerr noted the importance of senior administrators and presidents providing leadership, initiatives, and resources for the faculty to rally around. Clark Kerr, "Liberal Learning: A Record of Presidential Neglect," *Change: The Magazine for Higher Education* 16 (1984): 32-36.
[124] Steven Brint, "Focus on the Classroom: Movements to Reform College Teaching and Learning, 1980-2008" in *The American Academic Profession: Transformation in Contemporary Higher Education* ed. Joseph C. Hermanowicz (Baltimore: Johns Hopkins University Press, 2011), 53. On the history of the AAC&U, see Linda

relatively late in his career, Gaff advised that institutions should discuss general education frequently:

> It is important for campuses periodically to hold such conversations because the reasoning behind decisions previously arrived at tends to fade with the passage of time, eroding the social compact that explicitly defines the expectations for student learning and provides a rationale for the curriculum. Then faculty members tend to focus narrowly on their own courses and the interests of their departments and to forget the larger educational agenda facing the students. In such situations, faculty often advise students to "get their general education requirements out of the way" or teach their own courses in ways that neglect the broader purposes that nurture the qualities that characterize an educated person. Another reason for initiating periodic conversation about the aims of education and the best curricular configurations for achieving them is that large numbers of today's faculty have not been involved in such conversations.[125]

Indeed, if faculty members are to be able to shape the objectives of the curricula they offer—or at the very least understand the objectives and rationales that helped to call the curricula into existence—it is imperative that they participate in the reform of general education frequently. Unless they have a hand in developing and reforming curricula, the qualifications that faculty members bring to their campuses will not be fully delivered. Further, faculty members will have a difficult time providing justifications of curricular coherence and/or relevance to those involved with accountability or evaluation measures, policymakers and members of the general public, and most importantly their students, if they have not either participated in or studied general education reform.

There is a cost to lack of communication in each case. If assessment and evaluation personnel are unaware of faculty or curricular objectives, then their job of creating meaningful assessments will be compromised. Lack of communication will not impede these personnel from creating assessments, but rather they will create assessments given the information available, and these assessments will surely be less tailored to specific needs. Indeed, "assessment of student

---

Eisenmann, "'Making Better Colleges:' AAC's Century of Change and Commitment," *Liberal Education* 101 (2015): 30-37.

[125] Jerry G. Gaff, "What is a Generally Educated Person?," *Peer Review* 7 (2004): 4.

academic achievement in [general education] is a reality which every institution must face."[126] To achieve "assessment with integrity" Paul Hanstedt recommends a "dialogic" between assessors and faculty members, with assessors adapting their assessments to "the work that faculty and students already do" and "what really matters to [students and faculty]." Further, Hanstedt contends that "If we're going to make assessment meaningful to and easier for general education faculty, we need to be deliberate about writing it into the structure of the program."[127] This, of course, can only be accomplished by faculty members and assessment personnel participating in communication informed by engagement with general education reform in theory and practice.

Assessment and evaluation personnel are not the only group that faculty and administrators must communicate with. Policymakers including state budgetary personnel, external funding agencies such as philanthropic groups, and the general public have taken an intense interest in general education reform. "For more than 30 years," Kanter and colleagues begin, "public reports have criticized the quality of postsecondary education…By the 1980s the public outcry for general education reform had intensified. By the 1990s that outcry had turned into deep frustration with the seeming inability of colleges and universities to change general education significantly."[128] To be unable to speak to, or communicate effectively with, the general public and policymakers is a dangerous prospect in the modern era, as "Interdependence threatens the management of colleges and universities because external agencies, especially those in the political sector, have both the authority and the resources to dictate the terms by

---

[126] James O. Nichols and Karen W. Nichols, *General Education Assessment for Improvement of Student Academic Achievement: Guidance for Academic Departments and Committees* (New York: Agathon Press, 2001), 16.
[127] Paul Hanstedt, *General Education Essentials: A Guide for College Faculty* (San Francisco: Jossey-Bass, 2012), 97-105.
[128] Kanter, et. al, *Revitalizing General Education in a Time of Scarcity*, 29.

which those institutions function."[129] The goal, it would seem, is to negotiate the desires of the many agencies, political groups, and consumers, while retaining as much autonomy as possible.[130]

The final group that would be affected by lack of communication is students. The extent to which students are represented as consumers by the governmental agencies that offer student loans or their guardians who pay their tuition can be better fleshed out by the insights presented in the previous section on policymakers and the general public. However, the extent to which students experience general education in the classroom marks perhaps the greatest reason for their interest in general education reform. Students certainly have the most to gain from general education and the ways in which students and faculty work together directly affects what and how students learn. If student concerns are not taken into account, and dialogue between faculty and students as to the purposes of general education does not occur, a situation can arise wherein students experience what Gerald Graff calls the "volleyball effect." In this situation, "the curriculum represents not a coherent intellectual world with conventions and practices anyone can internalize and apply to the specific challenges of each discipline, but an endless series of instructors' preferences that you psych out, if you can, and then conform to, virtually starting over from scratch in each new course."[131] Students have reacted unfavorably to or revolted

---

[129] Ibid., 17.

[130] A full discussion of this as well as suggestions are presented in Michael S. Harris, "Out Out, Damned Spot: General Education in a Market-Driven Institution," *Journal of General Education* 55 (2006): 186-200. See also Sheila Slaughter, "The Political Economy of Curriculum-Making in American Universities" in *The Future of the City of Intellect: The Changing American University* ed. Steven Brint (Stanford: Stanford University Press, 2002), 260-289.

[131] Gerald Graff, *Clueless in Academe: How Schooling Obscures the Life of the Mind* (New Haven: Yale University Press, 2003), 67. Perhaps the strongest definition and defense of "coherence" in general education is "Principle # 3: Strong General Education Programs Continuously Strive for Educational Coherence" in "Strong Foundations: Twelve Principles for Effective General Education Programs" (Washington D.C.: Association of American Colleges, 1994), 12-17. Also see D. Kent Johnson and James L. Ratcliff, "Creating Coherence: The Unfinished Agenda," *New Directions for Higher Education* 125 (2004): 85-95. However, coherence is by no means a universal goal. For a discussion of opinions against coherence, see Marshall A. Hill, "Who Wants Coherence?" in "General Education in an Age of Student Mobility: An Invitation to Discuss Systematic Curricular Planning" (Washington,

against the curriculum throughout the history of American higher education, often citing a lack of relevance.[132] Further, not all student concerns are alike. For every student concerned with social mobility, or the lack of exposure to cultural issues, there may be just as many students confused about or apathetic toward the objectives of their college education.

That said, no matter the concern expressed by the student, communication—if not dialogue and reform—can alleviate the concern by exposing the student to the purpose of the curriculum.[133] Numerous scholars have pointed to ways in which student participation in general education reform can alleviate concerns, clarify objectives, and create a curriculum that students will deem both relevant and gratifying, even if this curriculum is not what they had originally demanded.[134]

This is especially crucial in the contemporary era where students have, by some estimates, gained enough power from changes in legislation and market-based competition to tip the scales of power against their faculty counterparts, disagreements with students over academic

---

D.C.: Association of American Colleges and Universities, 2001), 11-12. On contemporary student perceptions of general education, see Kenneth E. Nuss, "Student Perceptions of General Education at a Comprehensive University and Implications" (EdD diss., University of Northern Iowa, 1997); Clarissa A. Thompson, Michele Eodice, and Phuoc Tran, "Student Perceptions of General Education Requirements at a Large Public University: No Surprises?" *Journal of General Education* 64 (2015): 278-293; Michael Kirk-Kuwaye and Dominic Sano-Franchini, "'Why Do I have to take this Course?:' How Academic Advisers Can Help Students Find Personal Meaning and Purpose in General Education," *Journal of General Education* 64 (2015): 99-105.

[132] See the discussion of this issue as a perennial tension in higher education by Robert L. Spaeth, "Individualism vs. Liberal Arts Education: The Understanding of Old Subjects," *Vital Speeches of the Day* 54 (1987): 22-26. The best overview remains Philip G. Altbach, *Student Politics in America: A Historical Analysis* (New Brunswick, NJ: Transaction Publishers, 1974/1997). Numerous case studies can be found between David Yamane, *Student Movements for Multiculturalism: Challenging the Curricular Color Line in Higher Education* (Baltimore: Johns Hopkins University Press, 2001) and Mikaila Mariel Lemonik Arthur, *Student Activism and Curricular Change in Higher Education* (Burlington, VT: Ashgate, 2011).

[133] Susan B. Twombly, "General Education: The Insiders' View," *New Directions for Higher Education* 80 (1992): 91-103; Rick Szostak, "'Comprehensive' Curricular Reform: Providing Students with a Map of the Scholarly Enterprise," *Journal of General Education* 52 (2003): 27-49.

[134] See, for instance, George L. Geis, "Student Participation in Instruction: Student Choice," *Journal of Higher Education* 47 (1976): 249-273; Task Group on General Education, "Enlisting Students as Coinquirers" in "A New Vitality in General Education" (Washington, D.C.: Association of American Colleges, 1988), 37-39; Susan B. Twombly, "Student Perspectives on General Education in a Research University: An Exploratory Study," *Journal of General Education* 41 (1992): 238-272; Mary Jane Feldman, "A Strategy for Using Student Perceptions in the Assessment of General Education," *Journal of General Education* 43 (1994): 151-167.

content has posed significant risks for academics and institutions alike.[135] Indeed, faculty members have a responsibility to justify their choices to students and balance their expertise with student demands, not simply for the students themselves, but also for the society as a whole. As Thelin reminds readers, there is a "historical and legal fact that colleges and universities forfeit societal trust if instruction vacillates wholly according to student demand. The ultimate 'consumers' of higher education 'products' are not students, but those members of the community served by university graduates."[136] And, this of course brings the issue full circle. The justifications underlying general education are not simply for students, or assessment personnel, but for all involved and/or affected by higher education. Ultimately, the logic of Thelin's argument applied to the present discussion suggests that general education should exist not only for those who are involved in teaching, taking, and assessing general education, but all members of society who invest in, and expect to benefit from, the collegiate enterprise.

Achieving clarity in one's own mind and then communicating with the aforementioned groups can be can be difficult if faculty members have not previously participated in the reform of general education. The quote by Gaff alludes to this fact, and Glenn Irvin takes the argument a step further:

> Faculty members commonly approach general education from the background of the undergraduate general education programs they went through or experiences they have had in other institutions. Most do not read the literature of general education, do not contribute to its scholarship, attend its conferences, engage in its dialogue. They view general education from the perspective of their departmental interests rather than from any conception of general education as an autonomous program with its own goals and principles. We would never allow this condition to exist for any other major program

[135] David Riesman, *On Higher Education: The Academic Enterprise in an Era of Rising Student Consumerism* (New Brunswick, NJ: Transaction Publishers, 1980/1998); George B. Vaughan and Charles R. Dassance, "The Missing Link in the Student Consumer Movement," *New Directions for Community Colleges* 39 (1982): 31-40; John R. Thelin and Amy S. Hirschy, "College Students and the Curriculum: The Fantastic Voyage of Higher Education, 1636 to the Present," *NACADA Journal* 29 (2009): 9-17.
[136] Thelin, *Higher Education and Its Useful Past*, 9-10.

> area, yet we tolerate and eve encourage it in general education…The refusal of faculty members to grant legitimacy to general education and to recognize it as a program further erodes its credibility and makes it difficult, if not impossible, to achieve coherence.[137]

Both Gaff and Irvin suggest that faculty members tend to look at general education through the lens of their departmental-based interests. While this may be true, scholars Ann S. Ferren and Kay Mussell have made an argument that departmental interests and those of general education are not typically opposed, and should not be seen as being in opposition. That which benefits general education can also benefit the department, and vice versa. They also provide reasons why, and benefits that will accrue, from departmental leaders—themselves often faculty members—being not only be familiar with general education but also active in its reform.[138] Adding to these reasons is the fact that the ways faculty members engage their general education teaching in relation to their discipline will have an effect on student learning.[139] Further, departmental leaders who take a hand in the reform of general education will have a chance to align with other departments by sharing resources, discussing common missions, and reducing duplication. That said, there have been departmental leaders who have done precisely the opposite—seeking to "protect their turf" by effectively building a wall around their department, classes, and resources. Taking steps toward accomplishing these goals will likely lead to efficiency and philosophical clarity for the institution as a whole—both often stated goals of administrators who are higher in the hierarchy.[140]

---

[137] Glenn Irvin, "The Plight of General Education," *The Educational Forum* 54 (1990): 374.
[138] Ann S. Ferren and Kay Mussell, "Leading Curriculum Renewal," in *Leading Academic Change: Essential Roles for Department Chairs* eds. Ann F. Lucas and Associates (San Francisco: Jossey-Bass, 2000), esp. 254-262.
[139] Thomas F. Nelson-Laird and Amy K. Garver, "The Effect of Teaching General Education Courses on Deep Approaches to Learning: How Disciplinary Context Matters," *Research in Higher Education* 51 (2010): 248-265. See also Charlotte L. Briggs, "Curriculum Collaboration: A Key to Continuous Program Renewal," *Journal of Higher Education* 78 (2007): 676-711 for an argument that inter-departmental cooperation can lead to curricular reform. Though not specifically related to general education, having conducted private departmental work on curricular reform can lead to better outcomes when dealing with broader general education measures.
[140] Scott M. Fuess Jr. and Nancy D. Mitchell, "General Education Reform: Opportunities for Institutional Alignment," *Journal of General Education* 60 (2011): 1-15; Barbara E. Walvoord, *Assessment Clear and Simple: A*

However, much of the time, departmental interests undermine those of general education. Pat Hutchings, Ted Marchese, and Barbara Wright summarize the situation well: "On many campuses, larger ones especially, the odds are long *against* attention to general education. The action is in the department. People are busy with their 'own' work, and general education seems a distraction from more pressing concerns."[141] Irvin also points to a set of crucial resources for faculty members: a research apparatus devoted to the reform of general education. He makes it clear that faculty engagement with the latest research and wholehearted support are both needed in order for general education—and its reform—to succeed. While his points are surely warranted, it is somewhat difficult to look past his slightly damning tone. Indeed, it would almost appear from his discussion—and perhaps from the way the present section of this chapter was constructed—that faculty members consciously or unconsciously *neglect* general education.

To whatever small extent this may be true, it is certainly not borne out of malice or deliberate negligence, to be sure. Rather, as Hanstedt reminds us, "today's faculty are busier than ever before."[142] Further, "Graduate programs rarely include courses on pedagogical design because the focus is, naturally, on the content area."[143] That said, Hanstedt encourages faculty members to look at general education "as both a responsibility and opportunity." He contends, "We have a responsibility to prepare our students for the challenges of work and global citizenship outside the academy. This means providing them with the knowledge and methodologies and skills of our fields, but also with the intellectual flexibility that will allow them to adapt thoughtfully and productively to the rapid changes of the workplace—and, indeed,

---

Practical Guide for Institutions, Departments, and General Education second edition (San Francisco: Jossey-Bass, 2010), chapter four.

[141] Pat Hutchings, Ted Marchese, and Barbara Wright, "Using Assessment to Strengthen General Education" (Washington, D.C.: The Assessment Forum of the American Association for Higher Education, 1991), 8.

[142] Hanstedt, *General Education Essentials*, 1.

[143] Ruth Benander, "Redesigning Courses from the Ground Up: From Outcomes to Assessment to Activities" in *Developing Faculty Learning Communities at Two-Year Colleges: Collaborative Models to Improve Teaching and Learning* eds. Susan Sipple and Robin Lightner (Sterling, VA: Stylus Publishing, 2013), 60.

the changes taking place in the world at large." He continues, "It's an opportunity in other ways as well. When we're asked to whittle time out of our cramped schedules and be deliberate about how we're teaching a general education course—to think carefully about our audience and the goals for that audience—more often than not, we find approaches to the classroom that we'd previously overlooked."[144] The same can certainly be said for administrators, policymakers, and students. Having established the significance of general education to contemporary colleges and universities, and having suggested ways by which members of campus communities can engage the topic, one crucial question remains: To what extent can the present dissertation serve as a boon to assist administrators, faculty members, policymakers and the general public, and students in initiating or continuing conversations that result in the sustainable and beneficial reform of general education?

The Significance of the Present Dissertation to Historians, Policymakers, Commentators, Administrators, Faculty Members, and Students

The Relationship of History to Higher Education Scholarship and Policy Research

When Thelin questioned the purpose of historical perspectives in higher education, he wrote of a "bittersweet sense of the limits of historical research to provide definitive and foolproof answers to institutional problems."[145] Despite this limitation, there remains a broader conversation afoot about the role of history in higher education scholarship and vice versa. Both sides seem to see benefit from the incorporation of each other's work, historian and administrator Linda Eisenmann observes.[146] How then, does the present dissertation bridge the gap between

---

[144] Hanstedt, *General Education Essentials*, 107-108.
[145] Thelin, *Higher Education and Its Useful Past*, 173.
[146] Linda Eisenmann, "Integrating Disciplinary Perspectives into Higher Education Research: The Example of History," *Journal of Higher Education* 75 (2004): 7-22; Linda Eisenmann, "Practicing What I Teach: Does a Career as a Higher Education Professor Inform My Work as a Dean?," *Review of Higher Education* 32 (2009): 515-535.

history and higher education scholarship? How does it offer a methodologically sound history that is informed by the present?

I have contended with a varied mix of historians and other scholars of higher education on the topic of general education. The questions asked in a historical sense are guided by contemporary scholarship. For instance, Susan Gano-Phillips and Robert W. Barnett recently edited a brilliant volume entitled, *A Process Approach to General Education Reform*, where they suggest that "A majority of scholarship devoted to general education reform has focused almost exclusively on the *content* of the curriculum…This book examines general education reform from a different lens. Rather than focusing on the content or outcomes of reform efforts, this book examines the *processes* or mechanisms by which campuses are seeking to achieve such curricular reforms."[147] However, the case studies in the volume are all contemporary and drawn from the experience of the authors. In many ways, this dissertation applies their argument and presents a number of historical case studies that pay attention to the process of general education reform over the resultant content. Paul L. Gaston and Jerry G. Gaff have noted that "Some committees have learned the hard way that the strategies for curricular change can prove as important as the substance of their proposal, and their experiences may help fellow travelers on the road to general education reform."[148] Historical analysis of previous "travelers on the road to general education reform" can certainly help contemporary travelers.

There is also an organic interchange of contemporary theories and historical experience from a disinterested perspective—one that strives for the elusive ideal of objectivity. I argued in this chapter that historians of higher education have informed contemporary scholarship, and that

---

[147] Susan Gano-Phillips and Robert W. Barnett, "Introduction" in *A Process Approach to General Education Reform: Transforming Institutional Culture in Higher Education* ed. Susan Gano-Phillips and Robert W. Barnett (Madison, WI: Atwood Publishing, 2010), 7.
[148] Paul L. Gaston and Jerry G. Gaff, *Revising General Education—And Avoiding the Potholes: A Guide for Curricular Change* (Washington, D.C.: Association of American Colleges and Universities, 2009), 7.

the assumptions about reform that permeate histories have also found their way into contemporary works. By challenging the assumptions and the stories from a historical perspective, the diffusion of knowledge may cause contemporary scholars of higher education to challenge their own views about the history of general education. While it will be crucial to challenge contemporary understandings of the history of general education reform, in many ways contemporary scholars will find familiar terrain within the pages of this dissertation.

Historical Support for Current Theories about General Education Reform

This dissertation as a whole tends to validate several contemporary views of curriculum reform. To return to Gano-Phillips and Barnett, they further argued, "In examining the processes used to reform the general education curriculum, this volume recognizes that individual campus cultures must be assessed and examined in defining an institutionally-specific process for curricular reform. A one-size-fits-all approach has not proven successful historically." One wonders whether their argument would not be reinforced by a historical study that found that higher education personnel were, seventy to eighty years earlier, operating by the same principles and best practices they are recommending.[149] Beyond simply being another tale of "nothing new under the sun," the historical case studies presented in this dissertation could stand alongside their contemporary case studies and speak to the perenniality of their findings.

That said, this dissertation provides a narrative of reform across time that stands in sharp contrast to handbooks on general education that are created for faculty members thrust into the role of dealing with general education on their campuses.[150] Rather than drawing from personal experience, or offering theories on the specifics of working with general education, this

[149] Gano-Phillips and Barnett, "Introduction" in *A Process Approach*, 7.
[150] Examples include John P. Wynne, *General Education in Theory and Practice* (New York: Bookman Associates, 1952); Lewis B. Mayhew, ed., *General Education: An Account and Appraisal: A Guide for College Faculties* (New York: Harper and Brothers, 1960); Clifton F. Conrad, *The Undergraduate Curriculum: A Guide to Innovation and Reform* (Boulder: Westview Press, 1978); Hanstedt, *General Education Essentials*.

dissertation provides an opportunity to see faculty members struggling with the very same challenges—committee meetings, educational researchers, grant writing, teaching, assessment—that contemporary faculty members face. While the guides are wonderful tools, they can be rather abstract if a narrative touch is not brought to them. It also brings forth narratives from a diversity of institutions that will provide a greater diversity of examples from which contemporary readers can select. Put simply, it can speak to personnel across the diversity of institutions that make up American higher education.

A Diversity of Institutions

Historian Christine A. Ogren begins her book, *The American State Normal School*, with a discussion of the previously mentioned theory of the "snake-like procession" advanced by David Riesman. She draws attention to the deleterious effects of the acceptance of the concept and notes that it exposes "gender, race, and class bias" that many institutions during and before Riesman's era subscribed to. Ogren then makes the powerful argument that the concept of the snake-like "procession has implicitly shaped the historiography of higher education. As this field has grown in the decades following Riesman's observations, historians have assumed that the story of elite institutions captures *the* history of higher education."[151] Rebecca D. Cox recently advanced a similar argument: "In general, elite colleges attract a level of attention that is disproportionate to their share of postsecondary enrollments. The most highly selective universities in the United States, for instance, are responsible for only about 3 percent of the undergraduate student population."[152] Ogren and Cox were making the argument that elite

[151] Christine A. Ogren, *The American State Normal School: "An Instrument of Great Good"* (New York: Palgrave MacMillan, 2005), 1. Also see Ogren's complementary discussion in her chapter "Sites, Students, Scholarship, and Structures: The Historiography of American Higher Education in the Post-Revisionist Era" in *Rethinking the History of American Education* eds. William J. Reese and John L. Rury (New York: Palgrave MacMillan, 2008), esp. 192-196.

[152] Rebecca D. Cox, *The College Fear Factor: How Students and Professors Misunderstand One Another* (Cambridge: Harvard University Press, 2009), 1. Ogren and Cox were not the first scholars to notice this effect.

institutions dominated the historiography as they set up their own monographic treatments of less-prestigious institutional types. Whereas Ogren was examining normal srchools, Cox was exploring community colleges.

This raises a question, however: What exactly is at stake in institutional representation in histories of higher education? Is it simply that there will be the proverbial "gap in the literature"? Is it that historians have a responsibility to produce histories that are representative of the experiences of the diverse populations that make up our nation and system of higher education? In many ways, the simple answer is yes. However, historian David Gold suggests that there may be further considerations and makes the following argument in setting up his study of writing instruction at a historically black college, a woman's college, and a rural normal school:

> Our knowledge has often been filtered through…an assumption that innovation begins at elite institutions, and a too-strict adherence to an epistemological taxonomy that does not do full justice to the range of pedagogical practices in diverse institutions. The stories of such schools need to be told and not simply to represent the experiences of once-neglected communities or to satisfy a sense of historical injustice but to offer a more nuanced and representative picture of the past. Though at the margins of historical consciousness, these schools are far from marginal…Indeed, in a country with such a decentralized educational system as the United States, national educational histories cannot be understood but in relation to the local communities in which trends both emerge and play out.[153]

Gold leaves little doubt that understandings of innovation and reform are shaped by the institutional types examined and that examinations of a forest must account for several different types of trees. With great respect to all works that have focused on a single institutional type, perhaps it may be true that to tell the history of a concept in American higher education—such as

---

Eisenmann, Hutcheson, and Nidiffer had noticed some years earlier that "less-prestigious institutions rarely capture the interest of higher-education historians and are infrequently included in general works about the history of the field." See their article "A Conversation: Historiographic Issues in American Higher Education," *History of Education Quarterly* 39 (1999): 292-293.

[153] David Gold, *Rhetoric at the Margins: Revising the History of Writing Instruction in American Colleges, 1873-1947* (Carbondale: Southern Illinois University Press, 2008), ix, 152.

writing instruction, rhetoric, or general education—may require scholarly examination of multiple institutional types in comparison.[154]

This dissertation examines institutions of nearly every type available during the time period under consideration.[155] Indeed, many of the cooperative studies under examination saw it as an element of proper educational research to achieve a generalizable sample of higher education. Similarly, examining these institutions and their personnel as they cooperated on similar problems—while hoping for different outcomes—creates a dissertation that examines the entirety of the general education movement in American higher education. Aside from being a generalizable sample, examining colleges of various institutional types will allow the dissertation and its insights to be sensitive to the inherent racism, sexism, and classism that have existed in the American system of higher education.

The Cottage Industry of Commentary on Higher Education and the Political Act of Writing the History of General Education

As previously discussed, general education is significant because it essentially is a battleground and a metaphor for the values we hope that colleges will represent and instill in the students that attend them. It is part of the social contract but is also incredibly political and value-laden. Any author wishing to take on the thorny topic of general education cannot avoid the cottage industry of commentary surrounding the oft-conflated concepts of general education, liberal education, multiculturalism, the common core, and the canon. Indeed, one would be almost naïve to feel that writing the history of general education did not constitute a political act:

[154] A similar argument is advanced by Susan Kates, *Activist Rhetorics and American Higher Education, 1885-1937* (Carbondale: Southern Illinois University Press, 2001).
[155] Perhaps the only modern institutional types not examined by the dissertation are Tribally Controlled Universities and online colleges as neither institutional type existed during the period.

if only for the fact that higher education and the undergraduate curriculum in particular had been a key battleground in the so-called "culture wars" that were at their height in the early 1990s.[156]

The many commentaries that have appeared and continue to appear on general education are themselves political documents. However, they are political documents that incorporate history as a weapon. Commentaries, to a large extent, often begin with an (occasionally simplistic) retelling of the past regardless of the political leanings of the author. In many of the works, it is that same retelling of Columbia and Chicago's Great Books. To conservative commentators, this was a "golden age" that should be recaptured. To their liberal counterparts, this was a disconcerting era that negated the lived experiences of underrepresented populations.[157] However, women did exist in higher education during the mid-twentieth century. So too did African Americans and people from more challenging socioeconomic backgrounds. To many conservative and liberal commentators, the 1960s marked the birth of culturally relevant general education measures. But this does a disservice to members of underrepresented groups who flourished during earlier time periods and stimulated curriculum change. It also fuels assumptions that are inaccurate.

The question that remains is whether or not this dissertation is a political document as well? Ideally, it should not be. "Knowledge of the past has not always brought agreement among historians," historian Gilbert Allardyce noted over three decades ago, "nor is it likely that more

---

[156] In many ways, historian James T. Patterson reveals that the conservative backlash against higher education constituted some of the opening acts of a broader cultural narrative about "decline" in the 1990s. See his chapter "'Culture Wars' and 'Decline' in the 1990s" in his book *Restless Giant: The United States from Watergate to* Bush v. Gore (New York: Oxford University Press, 2005), 254-291. See also David Yamane, "The Battle of the Books at Berkeley: In Search of the Culture Wars in Debates Over Multiculturalism" in *The American Culture Wars: Current Contests and Future Prospects* ed. James L. Nolan, Jr. (Charlottesville: University Press of Virginia, 2005), 3-34; Gil Troy, *Morning in America: How Ronald Reagan Invented the 1980s* (Princeton: Princeton University Press, 2005), 265-296; Andrew Hartman, *A War for the Soul of America: A History of the Culture Wars* (Chicago: University of Chicago Press, 2015), esp. chapters 7-8.

[157] Susan Jacoby, *The Age of American Unreason* revised and updated edition (New York: Vintage Books, 2009), 137-149.

histories of old curricula and old courses will provide instructions on how to construct new ones. Historical research provides no prescriptions; it provides perspective."[158] However, there may be an opportunity to reconcile the rigors of history marked with its search for the elusive ideal of objectivity, and the desire to provide guidance to current members of the American higher education dealing with general education. Insight comes from one who traveled a similar academic path earlier: historian Bruce A. Kimball. He reflected: "The way that professors have told the story of liberal education has tended to reflect their own interests, both intellectual and professional."[159] Kimball would go on to reify his belief in producing a "disinterested" history of liberal education. The success of his book project, *Orators and Philosophers*, and much of his distinguished career of scholarship on liberal education to spur discussion as well as the relative failure of his work to provide an orthopraxy for liberal education reform make it a model worth emulating. However, it may well be taken a step further by grappling with the following questions: Does disinterested historical perspective itself need to center solely around the reality of the complexity of human experience? Can it not provide orthodoxy? In many ways, this dissertation argues that an orthodox ritual of continual experimentation and reflection sensitive to local context, circumstances, and personal values is the best course of action for any institution of higher learning.

---

[158] Gilbert Allardyce, "The Rise and Fall of the Western Civilization Course: A Reply," *American Historical Review* 87 (1982): 739.

[159] Kimball, *Orators and Philosophers*, vii. Kimball also reflected on the relationship between histories of liberal education and contemporary curriculum reform in Bruce A. Kimball, "The Education for Those Who Are Free," *History of Education Quarterly* 28 (1988): 243-256.

Chapter 2

"The College Has No Monopoly on General Education": The Eight-Year Study, 1930-1942

Students follow no standard pattern…It is true socially. It is true intellectually. And if all these things are true, it seems obvious that there can be no authentic pattern of general education applicable to all men everywhere in the United States, either as to the length of time to be spent, as to the methods to be employed, or as to the content thereof. These things have never been standard, though it is easy to neglect significant differences and pretend that they have been. If we are to retain an educative process, they can never be standardized. Therefore we should welcome every experiment so long as it is sincere and intelligent. We must ask of those who experiment that they should do it without being pretentious, that they should not be eager to advertise it until its results are demonstrable to others, that it should not be unduly imitative of scientific technique, that it should be carried forward with enthusiasm and energy…Much educational change consists in the rediscovery of old truths by seeking them along new paths.[1]

—Henry M. Wriston

Thus, [the Eight-Year Study] was, in truth, a search for process more than a study of the effectiveness of innovative programs.[2]

—Angela E. Fraley

The changes which have taken place in the content and organization of the curricula of the Thirty Schools are no more significant than the **ways** in which they have come.[3]

—Wilford and Marjorie Aikin

The [Eight-Year Study] with all its limitations in scope has made a major contribution in breaking ground for further investigations. The success and ability of subsequent experimentation should be credited in part to this first effort.[4]

—Frederick L. Redefer

Introduction: A Concurrent Project

The general education movement seemed to be building toward an apex in 1942. Articles appeared with regular frequency in academic and practitioner-oriented publication outlets alike and colleges across the land were feverishly experimenting with their programs. In the thick of this activity, a prominent observer of the movement noted, "Although the term general education was in its latest sense, first used in referring to programs of higher education, the college has no

---

[1] Henry M. Wriston, "A Critical Appraisal of Experiments in General Education" in *The Thirty-Eighth Yearbook of the National Society for the Study of Education: General Education in the American College* ed. Guy Montrose Whipple (Bloomington, IL: Public School Publishing Company, 1939), 320-321.
[2] Angela E. Fraley, *Schooling and Innovation: The Rhetoric and the Reality* (New York: Tyler Gibson Publishers, 1981), 119.
[3] Wilford and Marjorie Aikin, "The Eight-Year Study of the Progressive Education Association: The Thirty Schools Have Some Evidence," *Educational Method* 20 (1941): 311. Bold intended to replicate italics in original.
[4] Frederick L. Redefer, "American Education Becomes Youth Conscious," *High School Journal* 22 (1939): 266.

monopoly on general education. The objectives of general education directly relate to the problems and goals of secondary-school students; methods and content appropriate to general education have long been forecast and actually developed in pioneering secondary schools."[5] Though this observer, B. Lamar Johnson, scarcely had to remind members of the movement in 1942 that general education was well within the purview of the American high school, his statement forecasted a larger assumption that would later hold wide currency: that general education is solely an enterprise of higher education. While this assumption has gained traction since the "early 1950s," general education was seen by many during the movement—who would no doubt be in agreement with Johnson—as something upon which the high school and the college would need to collaborate.[6]

Not only would secondary educators have a role to play within the general education movement, but much of the responsibility for providing the initial spark of the movement seemed to rest in their hands. In 1935, renowned curriculum theorist and University of Chicago professor Franklin Bobbitt proclaimed general education to be the "new responsibility of the high school."[7] He was not alone. Others in the higher education community agreed that the high school had a role in reforming general education. A contemporary of Bobbitt's, Harl R. Douglass, noted that "From the point of view of the college, we have certain special interests in

---

[5] B. Lamar Johnson, "General Education—What Is It and Why?" in *General Education in the American High School* eds. Sub-Committee of the General Education Committee, Commission on Curricula of Secondary Schools and Institutions of Higher Education of the North Central Association of Colleges and Secondary Schools (Chicago: Scott Foresman and Company, 1942), xii.

[6] This idea of general education being considered primarily an issue for institutions of higher education has been noted previously by curriculum historian William G. Wraga. Writing at the turn of the millennium, he noted that general education "is most commonly associated with the college or university curriculum." See William G. Wraga, "The Progressive Vision of General Education and the American Common School Ideal: Implications for Curriculum Policy, Practice, and Theory," *Journal of Curriculum Studies* 31 (1999): 523, 527. In this piece and in others, Wraga began to sketch some of the collaborations between secondary and higher education regarding general education reform. See also Wraga, *Democracy's High School*, 77; William G. Wraga, "A Century of Interdisciplinary Curricula in American Schools" in *Annual Review of Research for School Leaders* Volume 1, ed. Peter S. Hlebowitsh and William G. Wraga (New York: National Association of Secondary School Principals/Scholastic Leadership Policy Research, 1996), 127.

[7] Franklin Bobbitt, "General Education in the High School," *School Review* 43 (1935): 267.

the secondary school. The college is legitimately concerned…that the high school prepare for college, as well as may be done, its prospective college-going constituency."[8]

The fact that the higher education community had seen the massive increases in secondary enrollment as a sign of a boom to come was not lost on either Bobbitt or Douglass. Because of this and other factors, they felt strongly that it was the high school's role not only to plan general education curricula, but to also execute and implement these measures so that colleges would be aware of their own responsibilities in this area. "Speaking from the point of view of the college," Douglass continued, "I may say that I had little hope then that the colleges would make the needed readjustment. Traditionally, the college has insisted that the major share of any needed readjustment should be made in the lower schools. The hopes of those who were so sure that the new institution, the junior college, would work out the articulation have not been realized."[9] Indeed, the attention of both college and junior college educators were placed squarely on the high school to take the initial steps in the general education movement.

However, neither Bobbitt nor Douglass could point to tangible reforms undertaken by the high school. "The high school has not yet planned the program of general education" Bobbitt lamented, adding that "there is doubt whether high-school people realize the nature and extent of their responsibility for doing so."[10] He drew this conclusion after carefully—and to some extent statistically—analyzing data related to the general high school curriculum, often going back as far as the 1910s to make the case that the high school was not actively developing, reforming, or tinkering with general education curricula. He continued by speculating that higher education might suffer grave circumstances if secondary educators continued to neglect general education reform. Though he provided compelling evidence that little reform had taken place by 1935,

---

[8] Harl R. Douglass, "The College's Interest in the Secondary School," *Educational Record* 20 (1939): 231.
[9] Ibid, 235.
[10] Bobbitt, "General Education," 258.

Bobbitt stopped short of placing full blame on secondary educators. He was sensitive to the fact that secondary and higher education would need to renegotiate their present relationship before a sustained reform effort could take place. "At present the high school is passing through a transitional period," Bobbitt opined, "It still looks to the universities for leadership, standards, and guidance."[11] It was these factors, imposed by the colleges, which would need to be renegotiated before high schools could begin their work.

By 1935, Bobbitt was uncertain to what extent that higher education personnel were allowing their secondary counterparts autonomy to experiment with their curricula. Douglass, on the other hand, wrote four years after Bobbitt and was able to conclude "One encouraging attitude of the college I can cite you—the slowly but certainly increasing tendency of the college to keep its hands off—to give the secondary school a free hand in meeting its obligations. I hope that secondary school people will be prompt to utilize that freedom."[12]

What Bobbitt and Douglass help to illuminate is a central tension underlying the reform of general education during the 1930s. On the one hand, colleges seemed to be asking for general education reform, noting that *their own* present and future reform efforts were contingent upon it. On the other hand, a number of individuals associated with colleges were slowly appreciating the fact that they appeared to be the major obstacle to general education reform. Despite Bobbitt's doubts and Douglass's optimism, many secondary educators of the 1930s were *acutely* aware of their responsibility to reform their general education curriculums. Both were correct that secondary educators had collectively lamented the constriction they faced from their collegiate counterparts and the accreditation measures of the day.[13] They were eager to "utilize" whatever

---

[11] Ibid.
[12] Douglass, "The College's Interest," 240.
[13] This will be discussed further in the chapter. However, for a few sources on the perceived inability of secondary education to move forward as a result of college entrance requirements and other external factors see Jurgen Herbst,

"freedom" could be obtained from the college. This caused tension between the two systems as they were actively working out their identities and their relationship to one another. This tension, unfortunately, stalled whatever progress the early members of the general education movement hoped to make both on a local and national level. The temporary resolution of this tension, however, would result in consequential change for both systems as it was the first in the series of events that led to the style of curricular reform that would become the hallmark of the general education movement.

This temporary resolution was accomplished by the Eight-Year Study, a project that had existed in various forms since 1930 and was designed to experiment with the secondary curriculum with an ambition of nothing short of reforming general education at the secondary level. This Study was overseen by the Progressive Education Association, involved a number of educational researchers with a variety of interests in curriculum, evaluation, and subject matter areas, and sought to reform the curricular offerings and pedagogical methods of the dozens of high schools that were participating. A particularly notable, though not sole, focus of the Study was to "test" more progressive curricular measures against their more traditional counterparts. Ultimately, the Eight-Year Study managed to break through the stalemate between colleges and high schools by way of an agreement that assured that most every college in the country would be willing to accept students from thirty or so selected high schools that departed from the traditional curriculum through experimentation. Largely because of this project and the context in which it operated in, one participant of the general education movement would proclaim, "Both the college and the high school show a commendable alertness to the needs of youth. The common concern of institutions at both levels for the educational welfare of youth is manifested

---

The Once and Future School: Three Hundred and Fifty Years of American Secondary Education (New York: Routledge, 1996), 159-160; Edward A. Krug, *The Shaping of the American High School, Volume 2, 1920-1941* (Madison: University of Wisconsin Press, 1972), chapter seven.

in steps now being taken toward the cooperative guidance of youth; toward the unification of the educational program both horizontally and vertically; and through a growing recognition of the principles of growth, making for differentiation instead of uniformity, for freedom instead of regimentation."[14] This statement captures the general education movement as it has rarely been understood: a concurrent project of both secondary and higher education.

The movement negotiated—with some success—an institutional context that involved the decades-long struggle to bring secondary and higher education into a greater hierarchical, standardized system by professionalizing teaching, imposing standardized accreditation policies, standardizing administration and school-oriented bureaucracy, and finally increasing schooling opportunities for the majority of American citizens.[15] Further, political, economic, and social pressures felt by the secondary schools reverberated in colleges and universities—and vice versa. This had serious intellectual and institutional ramifications for general education in both

---

[14] A.J. Brumbaugh, "Youth as a Common Concern of High Schools and Colleges" in *General Education in the American College*, 109.

[15] On attempts between secondary and higher education create a hierarchical system see John A. Valentine, *The College Board and the School Curriculum* (New York: College Entrance Examination Board, 1987), part one; Theodore R. Mitchell and Lawrence A. Torres, "'Something, But Not Very Much': School-University Partnerships in Historical Perspective" in *Higher Education and School Reform* eds. P. Michael Timpane and Lori S. White (San Francisco: Jossey-Bass, 1998), 15-39; Michael C. Johanek, ed., *A Faithful Mirror: Reflections on the College Board and Education in America* (New York: College Entrance Examination Board, 2001); Marc A. VanOverbeke, *The Standardization of American Schooling: Linking Secondary and Higher Education, 1870-1910* (New York: Palgrave MacMillan, 2008). On attempts to standardize and modernize K-12 education see Raymond E. Callahan, *Education and the Cult of Efficiency: A Study of the Social Forces that have Shaped the Administration of the Public Schools* (Chicago: University of Chicago Press, 1962); Joel H. Spring, *Education and the Rise of the Corporate State* (Boston: Beacon Press, 1972); David B. Tyack, *The One Best System: A History of American Urban Education* (Cambridge: Harvard University Press, 1974); John W. Meyer, et al., "Public Education as Nation-Building in America: Enrollments and Bureaucratization in the American States, 1870-1930," *American Journal of Sociology* 85 (1979): 591-613; Paul E. Peterson, *The Politics of School Reform, 1870-1940* (Chicago: University of Chicago Press, 1985); William J. Reese, *Power and the Promise of School Reform: Grass-roots Movements During the Progressive Era* (Boston: Routledge & Kegan Paul, 1986); Ronald D. Cohen, *Children of the Mill: Schooling and Society in Gary, Indiana, 1906-1960* (Bloomington: Indiana University Press, 1990); Jeffrey E. Mirel, *The Rise and Fall of an Urban School System, Detroit, 1907-1981* second edition (Ann Arbor: University of Michigan Press, 1999); Tracy L. Steffes, *School, Society, & State: A New Education to Govern Modern America* (Chicago: University of Chicago Press, 2012). See also the documents in Frederick M. Raubinger, et al., eds., *The Development of Secondary Education* (New York: The Macmillan Company, 1969).

systems.[16] As such, the story of general education reform on the K-12 level carries similar themes, characters, and arcs as the complementary story of general education reform in higher education. Further, individuals associated with higher education often observed how their counterparts in secondary education were responding to crises and reforming their curricular offerings. "Indeed, one may regard the movement" one member of the general education movement wrote in 1950, "as a process of broad, interrelated learning from high school through at least two years of college."[17]

To demonstrate the role and significance of secondary education within the general education movement, this chapter explores the Eight-Year Study and argues that as the first cooperative study focused on general education reform, it laid the theoretical precepts and practical methods that informed the multiple future cooperative studies responsible for consequential reform during the general education movement. It solidified the relationship between members of the movement from both secondary and higher education and codified the methods by which they experimented, communicated, and funded their attempts to reform their general education programs. The Study proved influential not simply because of its structure, but also because it responded directly to the surrounding institutional context and political economy that affected both secondary and higher education.

Rather than solely examining curricular reform as it was carried out in the schools participating in the Eight-Year Study, the chapter positions the Eight-Year Study as a progenitor for the other cooperative studies to be examined in the dissertation. Indeed, the Study would set the course in curriculum reform and philanthropic support for all cooperative studies in general education on the postsecondary level.

---

[16] Wraga, "The Progressive Vision of General Education," 523-544.
[17] Russell M. Cooper, "The Rise of General Education," *Journal of the National Education Association* 39 (1950): 30.

To demonstrate how the Eight-Year Study served as a point of origin for the General Education Movement, this chapter begins by examining the political economy of secondary schooling during the Great Depression. This section shows that cooperative experimentation was considered necessary to respond to the massive enrollment increases in the face of declining resources. Next, the chapter explores the intellectual climate of educational research at the time by focusing on organizations, philanthropic foundations, and their influence on the production of educational research. The following section examines the leadership of the Eight-Year Study and their rather iconoclastic views on experimentation, evaluation, and their search for philanthropic funding. Finally, the chapter shows how the Study innovated methods of cooperative experimentation and reform, including but not limited to the concept of a Cooperative Study, workshops, student and teacher assisted reforms, and the creation of shared curricular materials.

Though the Eight-Year Study is one of the most discussed episodes in the history of American education, most scholars who debate its merits argue about the extent to which it changed the contemporary high school curriculum or the extent to which it offers insight for contemporary reform movements.[18] Few have discussed the influence that the Eight-Year Study had upon the general education movement and higher education. Those who have discussed this have found its influence to be negative or negligible. Kliebard, for instance, labeled the Eight-Year Study as a chapter within "A Century of Growing Antagonism in High School-College

[18] The Eight-Year Study is mentioned by nearly every work on the history of American secondary education in the United States. A few major treatments of the Eight-Year Study include: Eugene Lyle Baum, "History of the Commission on Relation of School and College of the Progressive Education Association, 1930-1942" (PhD diss., Washington University, 1969); Neil Kurshan, "The Eight Year Study: Origins, Impact, and Implications" (Ed.D. diss., Harvard University, 1973); J'Nelle Smoak Gibson, "The Eight-Year Study: A Limited View of College Admission Reform" (PhD diss., University of Michigan, 1974); Pier Luigi Gregory DePaola, "Managing National Educational Change: The Case of the Eight Year Study" (PhD diss., Indiana University, 1977); Carol M. Thigpen, The Development and Evolution of the Eight Year Study" (PhD diss., University of North Carolina at Chapel Hill, 1978); Richard P. Lipka, et al., *The Eight-Year Study Revisited: Lessons from the Past for the Present* (Columbus, OH: National Middle School Association, 1998); Kridel and Bullough, Jr., *Stories of the Eight-Year Study*.

Relations."[19] On the contrary, the Eight-Year Study played a major role in the general education movement. This chapter provides an important corrective to the extant literature by expanding the historical understanding of the scope of the movement.

Politics, Economics, and the Effects of Increased Enrollments on General Education Reform in the Secondary School

The Thayer Commission, one of the three commissions that made up the Eight-Year Study, produced a report with an opening chapter intended to provide the context that American high schools were facing. Significantly, the chapter also made the argument that these factors were the primary motivators for general education reform. These motivators included a list of political, economic, social, cultural, and institutional factors including the following: "New Conditions Affecting Youth…A Changing School Population…The School's Responsibility for the Education of All Young People…A New Concern for the Democratic Way…Opportunities and Threats in Social and Cultural trends…Cultural Confusion…New Theories of Learning…Confusion in Educational Purposes and Practices"[20] As such, this chapter serves as a useful distillation of the shared social and institutional contexts that high schools and colleges faced during the general education movement. By briefly reviewing each of these strands of context we gain a clearer image of the factors that led to the general education movement's reform impulses. The following section traces this context, often using the words of contemporary observers to convey the anxieties and understandings of the time period.

---

[19] Herbert M. Kliebard, "A Century of Growing Antagonism in High School-College Relations," *Journal of Curriculum and Supervision* 3 (1987): 64-66. See also Harold C. Hand, "Children and Youth—Pawns or Sacred Entities?" in *Curriculum Innovations 1966: Trends and Issues* ed. Paul M. Halverson (Syracuse, NY: School of Education, Syracuse University, 1966), 1-15; Cuban, *How Teachers Taught*, esp. 83-91; Tyack and Cuban, *Tinkering Toward Utopia*, 98-99; Diane Ravitch, *Left Back: A Century of Battles over School Reform* (New York: Simon and Schuster, 2000); Patricia Albjerg Graham, *Schooling America: How the Public Schools Meet the Nation's Changing Needs* (New York: Oxford University Press, 2005), 86-90.

[20] V.T. Thayer, Caroline B. Zachry, and Ruth Kotinsky, *Reorganizing Secondary Education* (New York: Appleton-Century-Crofts, 1939), chapter one.

The most obvious event requiring reevaluation of the secondary school offerings involved the massive enrollment increases that had occurred since the beginning of the twentieth century. Though these increases had been exponential, they had also been consistent.[21] Taking stock at the end of the 1930s, one observer noted, "In 1890 the total enrolment [sic] of the public elementary and secondary schools in the United States was 12,722,48; in 1936 the total was 26,367,098, an increase of 107 per cent. During this same period the enrolment [sic] in the public high schools increased from 202,963 to 5,974,537, an increase of 2,844 per cent. The enrolment [sic] of higher institutions, public and private combined, increased from 156,756 in 1890 to 1,055,360 in 1934, an increase of 572 per cent"[22] Placing these enrollment increases in the context of the broader American population, this observer continued "As late as 1890 only 3.8 per cent of the young people aged fourteen to seventeen were enrolled in public high schools in the United States; at present more than 60 per cent of the population of this age group are actually enrolled in the public high school."[23] These enrollment increases indicated that high schools were growing exponentially, and that this growth had also led to the growth of higher education.[24] These increases also provided a number of opportunities for administrators,

---

[21] Harold S. Wechsler, *Access to Success in the Urban High School: The Middle College Movement* (New York: Teachers College Press, 2001), 3. Though the most accurate statistics related to enrollment in this era come from the publications of the National Center for Education Statistics—especially the "Digest of Education Statistics" reports and Thomas D. Snyder, ed., *120 Years of American Education: A Statistical Portrait* (Washington, D.C.: National Center for Education Statistics, 1993)—I have elected to refer to education statistics that were published and analyzed in primary sources from the time period. Though it may sacrifice statistical accuracy, it provides a picture of educators during the time period grappling with enrollment figures and the anxieties that they produced. A useful distillation of official statistics tracking secondary school enrollments during this time period can be found in Daniel Tanner, *Secondary Education: Perspectives and Prospects* (New York: The Macmillan Company, 1972), 37. A useful distillation of statistics related to student attendance and days of instruction in the school year can be seen in Thomas K. Fagan, "Compulsory Schooling, Child Study, Clinical Psychology, and Special Education: Origins of School Psychology," *American Psychologist* 47 (1992): 237.

[22] John Dale Russell, "Change in Composition and Character of the School Population," in *Critical Issues in Educational Administration* ed. William C. Reavis (Chicago: University of Chicago Press, 1938), 4-5.

[23] Ibid, 5.

[24] This argument is fleshed out in Lori Ann Kent, "The Expansion of American Higher Education, 1880-1920: Status Maintenance for the Elite or Human Resource Development for the Country?" (PhD diss., University of Washington, 1984), esp. chapter 6. For data and analysis of the overall increases in college enrollments at this time, see Raymond Walters, *Four Decades of U.S. College Enrollments* (New York: Society for the Advancement of

teachers, citizens, and students to imbue the curriculum with the content and objectives associated with their political, economic, social, and cultural values.

Chief among these values was the desire to promote and protect the political philosophy of democracy in a world that had recently seen the rise of a number of totalitarian states.[25] As one major philanthropic officer and member of the Progressive Education Association (PEA) (the organization that oversaw the Eight-Year Study) recalled, "If American schools ever felt the need of placing new emphasis on our democratic way of life, it was during the middle and late thirties when fascism in Europe was daily gaining added strength."[26] As a political and non-occupational goal of schooling, instilling civic pride and training for participatory democracy was within the purview of general education.[27] Therefore, it became a responsibility of the general education movement and would factor in to reform efforts. Given the extension of schooling to the masses represented by the enrollment increases, the relationship between

---

Education, 1960); Roland L. Guyotte, "Liberal Education and the American Dream: Public Attitudes and the Emergence of Mass Higher Education, 1920–1950" (Ph.D. diss., Northwestern University, 1980); Levine, *The American College*; Christopher P. Loss, *Between Citizens and the State: The Politics of American Higher Education in the 20th Century* (Princeton: Princeton University Press, 2012); Roger L. Geiger, *The History of American Higher Education: Learning and Culture from the Founding to World War II* (Princeton: Princeton University Press, 2015), chapter 10. For hard figures not only on enrollment but its relationship to overall American population and age demographics see P.F. Valentine, "The College and America" in *The American College* ed. P.F. Valentine (New York: Philosophical Library, 1949), 28.

[25] On the rise of totalitarian states and American responses see Abbott Gleason, *Totalitarianism: The Inner History of the Cold War* (New York: Oxford University, 1995); Steven Casey, *Cautious Crusade: Franklin D. Roosevelt, American Public Opinion, and the War Against Nazi Germany* (New York: Oxford University Press, 2001); Benjamin L. Alpers, *Dictators, Democracy, and American Public Culture: Envisioning the Totalitarian Enemy, 1920s–1950s* (Chapel Hill: University of North Carolina Press, 2003); David Ciepley, *Liberalism in the Shadow of Totalitarianism* (Cambridge: Harvard University Press, 2006); Daria Frezza, *The Leader and the Crowd: Democracy in American Public Discourse, 1880-1941* Martha King, trans (2001: Athens: University of Georgia Press, 2007), esp. chapters 7-8; Christopher Vials, *Haunted by Hitler: Liberals, The Left, and the Fight Against Fascism in the United States* (Amherst: University of Massachusetts Press, 2014), chapters 1-3.

[26] "Fred L. Redefer, Interview with Victor Henry Streit, May 12, 1950" cited in Victor Henry Streit, "A Study of Some Curriculum Problems of the Thirty Schools in the Eight Year Study" (M.A. Thesis, Adelphi College, 1951), 28.

[27] Dominic W. Moreo, *Schools in the Great Depression* (New York: Garland Publishing, 1996), esp. chapter one; Miller, *The Meaning of General Education*, esp. 106.

general education, democracy, and schooling was all too obvious to members of the general education movement—including those in higher education.[28]

Schools also faced challenges related to the economic conditions created by the Great Depression. While the enrollment increases did not represent a new challenge for educators by the 1930s, their effects were compounded by the complexities of the labor market. The most relevant effect of the Depression for secondary educators was the new lack of labor opportunities for high school aged youth that had existed previously.[29] These spikes in enrollment have been well-documented and offered as the reasons behind the modernization of (particularly urban) school systems.[30] However, when taken together with the diminished labor market, these increases were also responsible for the rise in interest and desire for general education. As more students enrolled in the face of murky occupational prospects, general education was seen by educators and students alike as not only necessary, but rather favorable. The relationship between enrollment, economics, and general education was noticed by collegiate and secondary educators during the time. Reflecting on the enrollment increases that had taken place, one college president, Ernest Hatch Wilkins, noted "What does this extraordinary increase really mean? It means, primarily, this: that the number of high-school graduates who want and can afford *further general education* (that is, further education which is not specifically

---

[28] Aaron J. Brumbaugh, "The Purpose and Scope of General Education" in *Administrative Adjustments Required by Socio-Economic Change* ed. William C. Reavis (Chicago: University of Chicago Press, 1941), 57-68.
[29] The Director of Evaluation of the Eight-Year Study reflected on this some years later. See Ralph W. Tyler, "Curriculum Development in the Twenties and Thirties" in *The Curriculum: Retrospect and Prospect: The Seventieth Yearbook of the National Society for the Study of Education, Part I* (Chicago: University of Chicago Press, 1971), 41; Jeri Ridings Nowakowski, "An Interview with Ralph Tyler" Occasional Paper Series, Paper # 13 (Evaluation Center, College of Education, Western Michigan University, Kalamazoo, 1981), 9. For much of the Progressive Era, youth had something of an advantage in gaining employment, particularly for unskilled jobs. See the discussion of this phenomenon in Lizabeth Cohen, *Making a New Deal: Industrial Workers in Chicago, 1919-1939* (New York: Cambridge University Press, 1990), 197, 320-321. On the scarcity of work for youth in the Great Depression see John Modell, *Into One's Own: From Youth to Adulthood in the United States, 1920-1975* (Berkeley: University of California Press, 1989), 121-132.
[30] See the studies cited in footnote 171.

occupational) has enormously increased."[31] Though Wilkins briefly noted economic concerns, historian Hugh Hawkins explains the relationship a bit more clearly. "Perhaps as jobs disappeared during the Great Depression," he notes, "students were more willing to seek a broad education, since it was hard to know what 'career' to prepare for."[32] The president of the University of Cincinnati would also note that in addition to students "seeking a haven in this era of economic storms," or being "in college by virtue of federal subsidy," "more fundamentally the [enrollment] statistics testify to the persistent faith of America that higher education yields economic and cultural returns for youth and for the country as a whole."[33]

A third strand of context that educators—in particular those associated with the Eight-Year Study—were facing in the 1930s was the fact that the enrollment increases and broader access to school had brought students who were perceived to possess a diversity of skills, talents, abilities, and most importantly, educational and occupational goals. Clearly, the one-size fits all curriculum dictated by the college entrance exams had failed a number of students. The Director of the Eight-Year Study, Wilford M. Aikin, complained, "Half of the boys and girls who begin

---

[31] Ernest Hatch Wilkins, *The College and Society: Proposals for Changes in the American Plan of Higher Education* (New York: The Century Co., 1932), 5.

[32] Hawkins, "The Higher Learning," 382. On the view that the students in the 1930s and beyond required a college degree for employment and agreed with this notion see Mary C. McComb, *Great Depression and the Middle Class: Experts, Collegiate Youth, and Business Ideology, 1929-1941* (New York: Routledge: 2006), especially 1-30; Levine, *The American College*, especially 185-209. On youth unemployment and federal policies designed to provide jobs to students see Anthony J. Badger, *The New Deal: The Depression Years, 1933-1940* (Chicago: Ivan R. Dee, 1989), 207; George P. Rawick, "The New Deal and Youth: The Civilian Conservation Corps, the National Youth Administration and the American Youth Congress" (PhD diss., University of Wisconsin, 1957); David Tyack, Robert Lowe, and Elisabeth Hansot, *Public Schools in Hard Times: The Great Depression and Recent Years* (Cambridge: Harvard University Press, 1984); David L. Angus and Jeffrey E. Mirel, *The Failed Promise of the American High School, 1890-1995* (New York: Teachers College Press, 1999), 59-62; Richard A Reiman, *The New Deal and American Youth: Ideas and Ideals in a Depression Decade* (Athens: University of Georgia Press, 1992); Steven Jay Gross, "Civic Hands Upon the Land: Diverse Patterns of Social Education in the Civilian Conservation Corps and its Analogues" in *Social Education in the Twentieth Century: Curriculum and Context for Citizenship* eds. Christine Woyshner, Joseph Watras, and Margaret Smith Crocco (New York: Peter Lang, 2004), 42-56; Jes Raul Cisneros, "The Civilian Conservation Corps as Educational Technology, 1933-1942" (PhD diss., Northern Illinois University, 2010).

[33] Raymond Walters, "Recent Trends in Student Enrollments" in *The Outlook for Higher Education* ed. John Dale Russell (Chicago: University of Chicago Press, 1939), 29.

the work of the secondary school drop out before completing it."[34] Elsewhere, he suggested that a one-size fits all curriculum had the effect of "forgetting the school's obligation to the 80 per cent who stop their schooling at or before graduation from high school."[35] This raised a series of crucial questions for general education. If a one-size fits all curriculum was a major factor behind a massive dropout problem—a state of affairs that could not continue simply because youth had far fewer employment prospects available to them upon dropping out—how could general education evolve on the basis of providing a set of experiences that would take the individual student's needs, abilities, etc.?

Could general education reform account for student differences rather than simply serving as a set of common content that each student was required to master? Could general education be flexible and malleable for different students and different locales? If so, would it not then be necessary to let each locale, indeed, the individual schools and teachers who work closely to help craft and evolve their curricula? These questions were in the forefront of the minds of many secondary educators of the time.[36] "The question has been frequently raised in recent discussions" the final report of the American Youth Commission noted, "whether it is not possible to organize a program of general education that will be suitable for all pupils and at the same time make provision for specialized training above and beyond general education for various groups of pupils who are preparing for different careers."[37]

---

[34] Wilford M. Aikin, Foreword to *Appraising and Recording Student Progress*, eds., Eugene R. Smith, Ralph W. Tyler, and the Evaluation Staff. (New York: Harper and Brothers, 1942), xvii. For a discussion of Aikin's career see Craig Kridel, "Aikin/Aiken: Dashed Hopes and a Legacy Misspelled," *Journal of Curriculum Theorizing* 13 (1997): 38-39.

[35] Wilford M. Aikin, *The Story of the Eight-Year Study: With Conclusions and Recommendations* (New York: Harper & Brothers, 1942), 118; Wilford M. Aikin, "What's Wrong with our Schools?" *New York Times*, 7 September 1941, 191.

[36] Robert V. Bullough, Jr. and Craig Kridel, "Adolescent Needs, Curriculum and the Eight-Year Study," *Journal of Curriculum Studies* 35 (2003): 151-169.

[37] Special Committee on the Secondary School Curriculum, *What the High Schools Ought to Teach: The Report of a Special Committee on the Secondary School Curriculum Prepared for the American Youth Commission and Other*

Initially, the Eight-Year Study, and later, other elements of the general education movement sought to provide an affirmative answer to this question. Indeed, providing instruction geared to each student's individual needs became the *raison d'etre* of the Study. "Increasingly, it is being recognized that there is no one curricular pattern" one Eight-Year Study staff member noted in a national publication, "that will meet the individual needs of all students and that there is no specific pattern that provides a suitable basis for entrance to college."[38]

This raises the question of the college's opinion on general education for the individual.[39] As Douglass had noted, the college had an interest in the high school's view of general education and the students that they were preparing for higher education. Higher education personnel raised two major concerns with how the high school commenced general education reform. The first concern was related to the perennial tension between "excellence" and "equality." Were high schools providing a strong education to those who intended not only to continue to college, but also to specialize and become a member of the intellectual elite? Douglass had also raised this issue, noting bluntly that "The college is much concerned that, while the mediocre and the dull are being provided for, the bright be not [sic] permitted to vegetate—to grow at less than their

---

Cooperating Organizations (Washington, D.C.: American Council on Education, 1940), 11. On the relationship between enrollments and the opportunity to engage in wide curriculum reform particularly as it relates to a "custodial" mission of the high school, see Angus and Mirel, *The Failed Promise*, esp. 72; Sevan G. Terzian, "Custodialism and Career Preparation in a Comprehensive High School, 1929-1942" in *The Death of the Comprehensive High School?: Historical, Contemporary, and Comparative Perspectives* eds. Barry M. Franklin and Gary McCulloch (New York: Palgrave MacMillan, 2007), 19-36. Another factor involved secondary educators considering the influx of immigrants from Southern and Eastern Europe as well as people of color. On this see Joel Perlmann, *Ethnic Differences: Schooling and Social Structure Among the Irish, Italians, Jews & Blacks in an American City, 1880-1935* (New York: Cambridge University Press, 1988); Paula S. Fass, *Outside In: Minorities and the Transformation of American Education* (New York: Oxford University Press, 1989); Jeffrey E. Mirel, *Patriotic Pluralism: Americanization Education and European Immigrants* (Cambridge: Harvard University Press, 2010).

[38] Gordon N. MacKenzie, "Youth and the High School" in *General Education in the American College*, 58-59.

[39] Many of these opinions can be seen in William S. Gray, ed., *Provision for the Individual in College Education* (Chicago: University of Chicago Press, 1932); Harold Taylor, "The Individual Student" in *Essays on Teaching* ed. Harold Taylor (Freeport, NY: Books for Libraries Press, 1950/1971), 212-234; Paul M. Limbert, "Trends and Patterns in the Changing College Curriculum," *Teachers College Record* 40 (1939): 669-684.

optimum rate and to develop bad habits and standards of study and work."[40] Regardless, many in higher education knew that their ability to deal with the enrollment increases—and any subsequent decreases—by how they dealt with the issue of general education. "Much will depend upon the success of the colleges" noted one professor "in their attempt to work out a program of general education."[41]

A second concern was related to the first in some ways. Even as the high school provided different opportunities for students, could it continue to measure students in such a way that colleges would be able to understand the talents and abilities of each student? As one University of Chicago educator put it, "The cooperation of institutions in securing more objective measures of student abilities and in informing students more fully concerning the opportunities and facilities they offer undoubtedly represents the direction in which precollege guidance should move."[42] Though a massive oversimplification, it is possible to reduce these two concerns to the question of whether or not general education would still be able to maintain a meritocratic system in theory and practice.

These two concerns raise an important issue regarding the views of secondary and higher educators and their relationship with general education. In describing the Eight-Year Study as evidence of an antagonistic relationship between secondary and higher education, Kliebard noted that colleges clung tight to the notion of an elitist liberal education with strong disciplinary grounding in the major subjects and American high schools were actively working toward a counter ideal. "The likes of Robert Maynard Hutchins, Mortimer Adler, and Jacques Maritain, speaking from their perches in the major U.S. universities," Kliebard argued, "defended the

---

[40] Douglass, "The College's Interest," 232; W.H. Cowley, "Financial Retrenchment and Lower Grade Students," *Journal of Higher Education* 27 (1934): 430-434; Max McConn, "The Dilemma of Democratic Education: Academic Standards vs. Individual Differences," *Vital Speeches of the Day* 2 (1936): 225-228.
[41] Newton Edwards, "Factors Affecting Future Trends in Student Enrolments" in *The Outlook*, 58.
[42] A.J. Brumbaugh, "Youth as a Common Concern," in *General Education in the American College*, 102-103.

virtues of the organized disciplines of knowledge…The colleges had, by and large, become the upholders of one tradition, and the high schools of some others. The two were viewing the educational process through different lenses, and the Eight Year Study, whatever the outcome, was not going to change that."[43]

Leaving aside the fact that Robert M. Hutchins hired a major figure of the Eight-Year Study to the University of Chicago in 1938 and assisted in providing facilities for a large proportion of the Study's staff, the issue here is that Hutchins, Adler, and the like are seen as the face of collegiate general education.[44] This logic plays into the notion that they, and their "major U.S. universities" they were associated with (most notably the University of Chicago and Columbia University) were the symbols of general education. They were merely one face. They made their points and were considered. However, the positions they held (as a college president and as a philosophy of law professor whose proficiency in philosophy was questioned by members of the philosophy department in his own institution) as well as the ways in which they made their points (via polemics or speeches) were held, by and large, by progressive educators to have less authority than other members of higher education.

The Effects of Intellectual Currents and Organized Knowledge on General Education Reform in the Secondary School

There were a number of key reasons for this. The first was that progressive secondary educators—who were without a doubt "individuals with diverse philosophical, political, and ideological perspectives" but who tended to make up most of the secondary educators in the

[43] Kliebard, "Growing Antagonism," 66.
[44] On the fond relationship between Ralph W. Tyler and Robert M. Hutchins, as well as the ways in which Hutchins's views on general education evolved, see James Phillip Echols, "The Rise of the Evaluation Movement: 1920-1942" (PhD diss., Stanford University, 1973), 192; "Tyler for Judd" *Time*, February 28, 1938; George A. Antonelli, "Ralph W. Tyler and the Curriculum Arena: A Historical Interpretation" (PhD diss., Southern Illinois University, 1971), 173-174; Ralph W. Tyler, "Education: Curriculum Development and Evaluation," an oral history conducted 1985-1987 by Malca Chall, Regional Oral History Office, The Bancroft Library, University of California Berkeley, 1987), esp. 108-113, 120-121, 153-157, 160-168.

general education movement—"deliberately fashioned their practices on scientific findings." [45] Many of them were—or worked with—what David Tyack and Elisabeth Hansot referred to as "Managers of Virtue," or

> an informal association of individuals who occupied influential positions (usually in university education departments or schools, as policy analysts or researchers in foundations, and as key superintendents), who shared common purposes (to solve social and economic problems by educational means through 'scientific' diagnosis and prescription), who had common interests in furthering their own careers, and who had come to know one another mostly through face-to-face interactions and through their similar writing and research. They controlled important resources: money, the creation of reputations, the placement of students and friends, the training of subordinates and future leaders, and influence over professional associations and public legislative and administrative bodies.[46]

The PEA during the late 1920s and 1930s had shifted from an association more inclined to work toward "publicizing progressive education" to one that made a clear decision to "embark upon educational research" as a "result of the influx into the Association of several young educators aglow with their new profession's faith in science."[47] Indeed, one member of the Eight-Year Study would observe, "The experimentalist, recognizing the irrelevance of resistance, argument, and controversy without data, but also proceeding to formulate sound assumptions and to test

---

[45] William J. Reese, "American Education in the Twentieth Century: Progressive Legacies," *Paedagogica Historica* 39 (2003): 416; John S. Brubacher, "The Challenge to Philosophize about Education" in *Modern Philosophies and Education: The Fifty-fourth Yearbook of the National Society for the Study of Education, Part I* ed. Nelson B. Henry (Chicago: University of Chicago Press, 1955), 5. Rita Hofstetter and Bernard Schneuwly, "Progressive Education and Educational Sciences: The Tumultuous Relations of an Indissociable and Irreconcilable Couple," in *Passion, Fusion, Tension: New Education and Educational Science, End 19th – Middle 20th Century/Education nouvelle et Sciences de l'education, Fin du 19e-milieu du 20e siècle* eds. Rita Hofstetter and Bernard Schneuwly (Bern: Peter Lang, 2006), 1-15; Brian Jackson and Thomas P. Miller, "The Progressive Education Movement: A Case Study in Coalition Politics" in *Active Voices: Composing a Rhetoric of Social Movements* eds. Sharon McKenzie Stevens and Patricia Malesh (Albany: State University of New York Press, 2009), esp. 100-105. An important discussion of the relationship between the progressive education movement and the general education movement comes from William G. Wraga who argues that the latter represented a streak of educational progressivism that "emphasized intellectual purposes." William G. Wraga, "Left Out, The Villainization of Progressive Education in the United States," review of *Left Back: A Century of Failed School Reforms*, by Diane Ravitch, *Educational Researcher* 30 (2001): 36-37.
[46] David Tyack and Elisabeth Hansot, *Managers of Virtue: Public School Leadership in America, 1820-1980* (New York: Basic Books, 1982), 129-166; quote from 130.
[47] Patricia Albjerg, Graham, *Progressive Education from Arcady to Academe: A History of the Progressive Education Association 1919-1955* (New York: Teachers College Press, 1967), 89.

them, provides data which serve as a basis for further action, thus making his contribution to advance. Education too often resists or neglects this approach."[48]

Further, many members of the movement tended to see general education reform as a scientific enterprise as well as an extension of educational research—and certainly the relationship between educational research and science has been documented.[49] That is to say, curriculum reform should have the scientific method of experimentation applied to it and many justified their views through this. As the American Youth Commission—a philanthropically funded program operating under the American Council on Education that sought to study the various problems of youth from 1935 to the early 1940s—was able to report, "A compelling reason for giving serious consideration to the organization of a new program of instruction is that scientific studies have revealed the importance of adapting instruction to various types and grades of individual ability."[50] Therefore, secondary educators were disposed to favor not only the views, but the methods of working, of certain kinds of higher education personnel. Often, they worked closely with educational researchers and associations to achieve their ends. Ultimately, as an extension of educational research, general education reform relied on philanthropies, associations, and deliberative committees or cooperative studies.[51]

The rise of associations and the increase in experimentalism by educational researchers was again tied to the context of the enrollment increases and the political, economic, social, and

---

[48] Laura Zirbes, "The Function of the Curriculum" in *The Changing Curriculum* eds. The Joint Committee on Curriculum (New York: D. Appleton-Century Company, 1937), 60. On the theories behind and the projects that denoted broader experimentalism in secondary education at this time see Leon Alirangues, "The Experimentalist Curriculum Paradigm" (PhD diss., Rutgers University, 2002), esp. chapters two and three; William H. Schubert, et al., *Curriculum Books: The First Hundred Years* second edition (New York: Peter Lang, 2002), chapter four.
[49] Douglas Sloan, "The Teaching of Ethics in the American Undergraduate Curriculum, 1876-1976" in *Ethics Teaching in Higher Education* eds. Daniel Callahan and Sissela Bok (New York: Plenum Press, 1980), 45; Ellen Condliffe Lagemann, *An Elusive Science: The Troubling History of Education Research* (Chicago: University of Chicago Press, 2000).
[50] *What the High Schools Ought to Teach*, 11.
[51] A discussion defining educational research in this vein during this time period can be seen in Carter V. Good, "Organized Research in Education: Foundations, Commissions, and Committees," *Review of Educational Research* 9 (1939): 569-575.

institutional situations they faced. Experimentalism was necessitated by the "paradoxical" budgetary situation that had been created by the enrollment increases. As enrollment increased, budgets for secondary and higher education were either reduced or remained stagnant during the Great Depression.[52] This created a situation in which individual high schools or colleges could not afford to experiment on an individual basis. As such, institutions that were interested in experimenting with their curricula had to rely on cooperative enterprises that could somehow be managed and sustained by the national associations whose foci included education. This, again, held true both for secondary and higher education and for issues well beyond general education, and by 1934 the National Education Association was able to report that there were over 250 "National Deliberative Committees in Education in operation."[53]

That said, this was a relatively new development for national associations, who were themselves young organizations. They were not used to managing very many deliberative projects. They were more seen and used as information clearinghouses in their initial years. Despite this shift, national associations were, by and large, interested in assisting their membership in experimenting in any way they could. Unfortunately, they had found that not only

---

[52] For the decline in K-12 school budgets see Harry Zeitlin, "Federal Relations in American Education, 1933-1943: A Study of New Deal Efforts and Innovations" (PhD diss., Columbia University, 1958); S. Alexander Rippa, "Retrenchment in a Period of Defensive Opposition to the New Deal: The Business Community and the Public Schools, 1932-1934," *History of Education Quarterly* 2 (1962): 76-82; Gilbert E. Smith, *The Limits of Reform: Politics and Federal Aid to Education, 1937-1950* (New York: Garland Publishing, 1982); Paula S. Fass, "Without Design: Education Policy in the New Deal," *American Journal of Education* 91 (1982): 36-64; Jeffrey Mirel, "The Politics of Educational Retrenchment in Detroit, 1929-1935," *History of Education Quarterly* 24 (1984): 323-358; Tyack, Lowe, and Hansot, *Public Schools in Hard Times*, esp. chapters one and two; James M. Wallace, *Liberal Journalism and American Education, 1914-1941* (New Brunswick, NJ: Rutgers University Press, 1991), 109. For the decline in higher education budgets see Malcolm M. Willey, *Depression, Recovery, and Higher Education: A Report by Committee Y of the American Association of University Professors* (New York: McGraw-Hill Book Company, 1937); Guyotte III, "Liberal Education and the American Dream," 148; Mary Garwood Reeves, "Economic Depression in Higher Education: Emory University, the University of Georgia and Georgia Tech, 1930-1940" (PhD diss., Georgia State University, 1985); Kevin P. Bower, "'A Favored Child of the State': Federal Student Aid at Ohio Colleges and Universities, 1934-1943," *History of Education Quarterly* 44 (2004): 364-387.
[53] These committees are listed in National Education Association, "A Directory of National Deliberative Committees in Education: Prepared for the Joint Commission on the Emergency in Education" (Washington, D.C.: Author, 1934).

could they not finance cooperative experimentation but that they could barely survive as a result of diminished membership dues during the Depression. Addressing this situation and assisting member institutions proved crucial for national associations and would lead them to form relationships that would create a national apparatus of institutions, associations, and foundations that focused on general education reform.

The broadest and most well-known national association devoted to education of this time period and perhaps the one with the most stability was the American Council on Education (ACE), founded in 1918. The Depression had ravaged individual institutions, be they colleges or high schools, and this caused potentially grave financial constraints for ACE. To meliorate this issue, ACE debated and adapted major changes to its constitution in 1933. At the annual meeting that year, President Charles Riborg Mann

> explained that the proposed changes in the Constitution had been motivated by a desire expressed in many quarters for the creation of a national coordinating and cooperating center which would include all levels of American education; that whereas education up to this time has been organized horizontally, there is now a disposition to organize it more in vertical columns with reference to the developing individual; that since the American Council at the present time was more nearly representative of all aspects of American education than any other existing organization, the consensus of opinion seemed to be that such slight modifications as might be necessary in the Constitution to make it clear that the Council regarded the whole field of education as its province might advantageously be made.[54]

By making a strong statement that the Council would work on behalf of both secondary and higher education, any issues that the Council or its members deemed significant (e.g. general education), could be handled through a cooperative effort between high schools and colleges. This fact will gain further significance later in the story. Mann also addressed the issue of obtaining funding. He noted that "the present financial emergency has made it more difficult for

[54] "The Sixteenth Annual Meeting of the American Council on Education" *Educational Record* 14 (1933): 262.

the institutions to bear the entire burden of financing the central administration of the Council through membership dues, and that it had become necessary to seek emergency grants for this purpose from the foundations."[55]

The foundations that Mann was referring to were the major philanthropic foundations that were pledged to funding American secondary and higher education. When surveying the field of philanthropic foundations that would be willing to support educational associations in the early 1930s, Mann seemed to have options. By 1937, Ernest Victor Hollis, a scholar studying the relationship between philanthropic foundations and education noted "at least 575 foundation-type trusts that exert and widespread and abiding influence on the cultural life of the United States."[56] However, Mann could only consider the General Education Board of the Rockefeller Foundation (GEB), the broader Rockefeller Foundation, the Carnegie Foundation for the Advancement of Teaching, and the broader Carnegie Corporation of New York as these "four giants dominated higher educational philanthropy until the second world war."[57] This was true of all educators who sought major grants. Speaking of the period between 1900 and his writing in 1937, Hollis himself would concede that, "Despite the fact that since that time foundations have multiplied annually almost by geometric progression, more than three-fourths of the known assets are still in the group established before 1915 by Andrew Carnegie and John D. Rockefeller, Sr."[58]

Of these possibilities, it was the General Education Board "which came to the Council's rescue…In 1934, it made a general support grant of $300,000 to the Council as well as a major

---

[55] Ibid.
[56] Ernest Victor Hollis, "Evolution of the Philanthropic Foundation," *Educational Record* 20 (1939): 587.
[57] W.H. Cowley, *Presidents, Professors, and Trustees: The Evolution of American Academic Government* ed. Donald T. Williams (San Francisco: Jossey-Bass, 1980), 177-178; On the relationship between philanthropic foundations and higher education during this time period see John R. Thelin and Richard W. Trollinger, *Philanthropy and American Higher Education* (New York: Palgrave MacMillan, 2014), chapters 1 and 3.
[58] Ernest Victor Hollis, *Philanthropic Foundations and Higher Education* (New York: Columbia University Press, 1938), 121.

grant for the creation of an American Youth Commission to operate under the Council's aegis."[59] Historian Donald Mitchell Stewart noted that these two events solidified "the basic character" of ACE and that "all future internal changes would be simply variations on patterns already established."[60] However, the General Education Board needed the ACE as its officers were contemplating beginning a major "commission on general education" which would devote nearly fifteen million dollars toward the improvement of education in the United States. Using a financially strapped but respected national education organization as a conduit seemed ideal as the foundations were sensitive to seeming officious. "In order to minimize 'resistance' to such an enterprise," historian Charles D. Biebel noted "…the officers [of the General Education Board] envisioned utilizing an already existing national educational organization to 'sponsor' the commission on general education. Since such an organization would already command stature and authority, it could become an ideal channel for Board funds and influence." Ultimately, Biebel contends, the General Education Board decided to move forward by providing grants to the American Council on Education.[61] Instead of serving purely as an informational clearinghouse, ACE was required to become "operational (e.g. run the American Youth Commission) and provide tangible services to its benefactors, while at the same time appearing to protect the institutional interests of its members and involving their leaders in Council activities. This necessitated the continued proliferation of committees and activities."[62]

This situation would lead the Chairman of ACE, R.M. Hughes, to deliver a speech on the future of the Council in 1933. "If the Problems and Plans Committee can formulate projects clearly enough and can pass on them widely enough," Hughes began, "it will undoubtedly in

---

[59] Stewart, "The Politics of Higher Education and Public Policy," 31.
[60] Ibid.
[61] Charles D. Biebel, "Private Foundations and Public Policy: The Case of Secondary Education during the Great Depression," *History of Education Quarterly* 16 (1976): 3-33, quote from 12.
[62] Ibid, 33; Hawkins, *Banding Together*, 115-116.

time gain the large confidence of the educational foundations…It should result in the Council being the agency through which a large part of the funds devoted to educational research on a large scale are administered. If this should work out…the American Council on Education would rapidly become the center of educational planning in America."[63] To achieve these goals, an amendment to the ACE constitution was proposed in the same year. It read "The general object of the Council, and the basis of membership therein shall be the initiation, the promotion and the carrying out through cooperative action of enterprises of fundamental importance for the advancement of American Education by means of systematic studies, publications, conferences and other similar devices."[64] The following year, 1934, the constitution read: "The general object of the Council, and the basis of membership therein shall be to advance American education in any or all of its phases through comprehensive voluntary cooperative action on the part of educational associations, organizations and institutions and in the fulfillment of that purpose to initiate, promote and carry out such systematic studies, cooperative experiments, conferences, and other similar enterprises as may be required for the public welfare and approved by the Council."[65]

By the early 1930s, the broader Rockefeller philanthropies had begun their campaign to reform education at the secondary level "The purpose of the new campaign," according to historian Theresa M. Richardson, "was to restore order to society through restructuring schools with attention to the emotional and social needs of the expanding teenage population newly concentrated in high schools."[66] This program also "stressed both research and experimentation

---

[63] R.M. Hughes, "The Chairman's Address: The Future American Council on Education" *Educational Record* 14 (1933): 281.
[64] "Constitution of the American Council on Education: As Amended at the Annual Meeting of the Council, May 5, 1933" *Educational Record* 14 (1933): 434.
[65] "Constitution of the American Council on Education" *Educational Record* 15 (1934): 381.
[66] Theresa M. Richardson, "Rethinking Progressive High School Reform in the 1930s: Youth, Mental Hygiene, and General Education," *American Educational History Journal* 33 (2006): 81. On this program also see General

in looking toward improvements in general education."[67] Studies that were "buttressed by well-devised and adequately supported experimental and demonstrational procedures" were most likely to be funded by the GEB.[68] Moreover, Hugh Hawkins noted that the General Education Board was joined by the various Carnegie philanthropies in feeling that ACE assistance and oversight was extremely helpful—if not absolutely necessary—for school personnel working on cooperative studies in both secondary and higher education to achieve grants from the foundations.[69]

These changes provided a major boon and a pathway to funding to the general education movement. Here was the premiere association, the association of associations, now faced with the situation of research as its *raison d'être* and working closely on the problems defined by philanthropies as important. These associations also helped to employ educational researchers who would assist local school personnel with their reform efforts. An institutional apparatus for educational research was now being set firmly in place. It was focused especially on secondary education—and general education as broadly defined by the GEB was a major priority. As one foundation officer recalled of the early Depression years, the motivation of the General Education Board was its realization during that time period that "despite increasing interest in research, no institutions or other philanthropic organizations were capable or prepared to

---

Education Board, *Review and Final Report, 1902-1964* (New York: Author, 1964), 49-50; Theresa Richardson, "Refiguring Schools as Child Welfare Agencies: Rockefeller Boards and the New Program in General Education at the Secondary Level," *American Educational History Journal* 32 (2005): 126-128; William J. Buxton, "Communication Practice and Theory in the 'New Humanities' and 'New General-Education' Programs of Rockefeller Philanthropy" in *Patronizing the Public: American Philanthropy's Transformation of Communication, Culture, and the Humanities* ed. William J. Buxton (Lanham, MD: Lexington Books, 2009), 65-76. It is crucial to note, however, that the philanthropists and educational researchers were also eager to reform aspects of higher education.

[67] Bruce Clayton Flack, "The Work of the American Youth Commission, 1935-1942" (PhD diss., Ohio State University, 1969), 7.

[68] "General Education" in *Annual Report of the General Education Board: 1933-1934* (New York: General Education Board, 1935), 9.

[69] Hawkins, *Banding Together*, 114-115.

undertake a major effort at finding ways to improve the condition and education of secondary school age youth."[70]

This appeared in very tangible ways. Indeed, this type of cooperative work was born as much out of necessity as ideology. As the Thayer Commission of the Eight-Year Study reminded readers, "Cooperative undertakings of this character have the advantage of utilizing for common ends the differing experiences of workers with varying unique equipments. Each participant in such a group had at his disposal resources which would otherwise be non-existent for him."[71] Indeed, this experimentation went hand-in-hand with general education. One educator noted, "In America, educational experimentation centers almost exclusively on youth and youth problems as millions of dollars in foundation grants are being poured into research and experimentation to speed our efforts in building a better education for youth."[72]

Therefore, the GEB was not only interested in general education, but also the kind of general education derived from experimentation with an emphasis on the individual as opposed to the one-size fits all approach championed by Hutchins. Looking back, one GEB officer recalled that of all the various factions of the general education movement, one of the only programs not to receive any foundation funding or support was Hutchins and his University of Chicago program.[73] Moreover, the GEB worked with many more associations and sponsored many more projects related to general education than simply ACE. "The general education board could not, of course, commit itself to any one approach to these problems." Robert J. Havighurst of the General Education Board began, "Rather, it has helped a number of responsible and

---

[70] Robert J. Havighurst, Interview with Bruce Clayton Flack, 10-25-68 cited in Flack, "The Work," 5.
[71] Thayer, Zachry, and Kotinsky, *Reorganizing Secondary Education*, 418.
[72] Redefer, "American Education," 265. Redefer suggested in this piece that general education was "now a byword of education—a term commonly used to signify educational philosophies and practices that are applicable to *all* youth." See page 267.
[73] Robert J. Havighurst, "Philanthropic Foundations as Interest Groups," *Education and Urban Society* 13 (1981): 204.

representative organizations and institutions to study the changing situation, to formulate what they believe to be the underlying purposes of a general education for young people, and to recommend a series of changes calculated to make the systematic care and education of youth serve these purposes better. Such organizations as the American Council on Education, the National Education Association, the Progressive Education Association, and the Regents of the University of the State of New York, have been helped by the Board to undertake this exploration and deliberation."[74] Richardson would add to this list the "American Council on Learned Societies, National Research Council, and Social Science Research Council."[75]

Not only did the philanthropists enjoy working through associations, but the associations learned that through seeking funds cooperatively, they had a better chance of success with the philanthropists. One foundation officer had noted that this trend had been on the rise since the 1880s, but that the Depression made cooperative requests for funds "necessary for [the] survival of the associations."[76] A great deal of cooperation occurred between organizations as well and this was not only noticed but encouraged by philanthropists. As the annual report of the GEB for 1933-1934 noted, the PEA "cooperates with other national organizations, not only in discussions of educational methods, but also in the publication of reports and in the development of experimental conferences and radio programs."[77]

---

[74] Robert J. Havighurst, "Report on the Program in General Education" in *General Education Board: Annual Report for 1938* (New York: General Education Board, 1938), 66-67.
[75] Richardson, "Rethinking Progressive High School Reform in the 1930s," 81.
[76] Edward C. Jenkins, *Philanthropy in America: An Introduction to the Practices and Prospects of Organizations Supported by Gifts and Endowments* (New York: Association Press, 1950), 105; Robert H. Bremner, *American Philanthropy*, second edition (Chicago: University of Chicago Press, 1988), 148; Ellen Condliffe Lagemann and Jennifer de Forest, "What Might Andrew Carnegie Want to Tell Bill Gates?: Reflections on the Hundredth Anniversary of the Carnegie Foundation for the Advancement of Teaching" in *Reconnecting Education and Foundations*, 56; On the continuation of scientific philanthropy into the 1930s see David C. Hammack, "Failure and Resilience: Pushing the Limits in Depression and Wartime" in *Charity, Philanthropy, and Civility*, 264, 280; Olivier Zunz, *Philanthropy in America: A History* (Princeton: Princeton University Press, 2012), chapter 4.
[77] "General Education" in *Annual Report of the General Education Board: 1933-1934* (New York: General Education Board, 1935), 11.

The question becomes, of course, was who would do more to affect general education? A well-equipped foundation working closely with associations who worked with large tandems of institutions in a cooperative manner to extensively experiment with and evolve their programs, or college presidents who wrote polemics that sold well? The question might well be answered by a story told by W.H. Cowley, himself a distinguished college president, voice on general education, and the very same man who recommended to Harvard University President James B. Conant to pursue what would become the Redbook. Cowley also sat on the Problems and Plans Committee of the American Council on Education in 1940—the very same committee that had proposed and helped to adopt the changes in ACE's constitution. "I well remember a discussion at one of its sessions," Cowley recalled, "concerning the influence of foundations on education. In particular, I remember the observation of a distinguished university president in the group that he would much rather be the head of a leading foundation that of any university in the world. Why? Because, he said, foundation officers (philanthropoids) wield incomparably more policy-molding power than university presidents, or, indeed, than any other group in the academic world."[78]

Thus, the method of reform in general education movement was set. To respond to the political, economic, social, and institutional context and the situation created by enrollment increases, secondary schools would form cooperatives and cooperate both inter- and intra-institutionally to seek out assistance from educational researchers who worked closely with associations. These associations worked closely with philanthropists who funded the experimental activity with the hopes that local and national reform would be achieved. This was

[78] Cowley, *Presidents, Professors, and Trustees*, 176-177. On W.H. Cowley see Brenda Sue Caldwell, "W.H. Cowley: A Life in Higher Education" (PhD diss., University of Oklahoma, 1983). For a discussion of Cowley's role in persuading James Bryant Conant to address general education with a university-wide committee, see Richard Norton Smith, *The Harvard Century: The Making of a University to a Nation* (New York: Simon and Schuster, 1986), 160-161.

the context in which the Eight-Year Study acted on their theoretical assumptions and innovated specific methods of curricular reform that would later shape collegiate cooperative studies of general education.

Key Assumptions of the Eight-Year Study

I have to this point avoided any extended description of the Eight-Year Study for two reasons that would have complicated the matter. The first reason comes from perhaps the two most qualified to speak about the Eight-Year Study: Craig Kridel and Robert V. Bullough, Jr. "Any general description of the Eight-Year Study" they observed, "can become a manuscript-length statement."[79] They were absolutely correct in this assertion as whole studies have been devoted simply to the origins and execution of the Study. Though it is necessary to avoid the very appealing notion of simply directing readers to their article-length attempt at a major definition of the Study, there is another issue at play here.[80]

This issue is explicated by the Study's Director of Evaluation, Ralph W. Tyler. "When the study began," he recalled in 1980 "neither the schools nor the directing committee envisioned what the project really involved."[81] Indeed, the project remained "diverse and fluid" throughout its tenure from 1930 to 1942.[82] However, there are a number of its salient characteristics that will prove important to the story of the general education movement as these characteristics were not only built on the theoretical assumptions behind the methods innovated by the Eight-Year Study but also influenced the thinking of the other collegiate cooperative studies that are analyzed in this dissertation.

---

[79] Craig Kridel and Robert V. Bullough, Jr., "Conceptions and Misperceptions of the Eight-Year Study," *Journal of Curriculum and Supervision* 18 (2002): 65.
[80] The article I am referring to is Kridel and Bullough, Jr., "Conceptions and Misperceptions."
[81] Ralph W. Tyler, "What Was Learned from the Eight-Year Study," *New York University Education Quarterly* 11 (1980): 30.
[82] Thigpen, The Development and Evolution," 145. On this point also see Craig Kridel, "Implications for Initiating Educational Change" in *The Eight-Year Study Revisited,* 33.

An Experimental, Sociological Study

The first characteristic is that the Eight-Year Study was, in fact, an experimental, sociological, study. One scholar went as far as to suggest that it "became the largest social science experiment of its day."[83] Another set of scholars noted that "This experiment, more than any other event of the 1930s, gave the depression years a reputation for innovation."[84] The Study was not only innovative for the broader social sciences, but also for the burgeoning field of educational research. "The Eight-Year Study," one historian noted, "was the first authentic research designed for high schools by professional curriculum planners and an evaluation team."[85] Others attempting to reinvigorate the Study's profile a few years after it ended noted this distinction as well. A pamphlet produced by the American Education Fellowship (formerly the PEA) claimed that the Eight-Year Study "was an experiment, and one of the most notable ever conducted in American education."[86] Still another piece attempting to bring the story of the Study to a wider audience proclaimed that the Study "ended up as a full-scale sociological survey of the school as an organic community, and its effect upon its inmates, whether pupils or staff." "For eight years," this piece continued, "thirty leading High Schools of America became closely-watched laboratory experiments."[87]

The notion that the Study was an experiment continued to show up in works about it decades after it ceased. Indeed, in the early 1970s, another scholar would note that "The Eight-Year Study remains today one of the most comprehensive and rigorous experiments in

---

[83] Joseph Kahne, *Reframing Educational Policy: Democracy, Community, and the Individual* (New York: Teachers College Press, 1996), 120.
[84] Tyack, Lowe, and Hansot, *Public Schools in Hard Times*, 153-154.
[85] Marie Kirchner Stone, *The Progressive Legacy: Chicago's Francis W. Parker School, (1901-2001)* (New York: Peter Lang, 2001), 216.
[86] Agnes E. Benedict, *Dare our Secondary Schools Face the Atomic Age?: A Stirring Challenge Based on the Eight-Year Study* (New York: Hinds, Hayden & Eldredge, 1947), 7.
[87] James Hemming, *Teach Them to Live* second edition (New York: Longmans, Green and Co., 1957), 3.

educational reform ever undertaken by reformers."[88] Almost a decade later, little had changed as another scholar was able to note that "it remains, by far the most extensive attempt at controlled study of experimental schooling ever undertaken in the nation."[89] Kridel and Bullough, Jr. would also echo this sentiment in many of their publications as well, ultimately concluding that the Study "constitutes one of the more innovative school experiments and implementation studies in American education."[90] The notion of the Eight-Year Study as an experiment was a fact that the designers and participants were well aware of. Indeed, one participant would suggest some years later that the Eight-Year Study was "simply an experiment in which several schools had an opportunity to modify or revise their curricula while giving the students well-rounded preparation for college."[91]

However, experimentation has many meanings, and the architects, staff, and participants of the Study were well aware of possible pejorative definitions related to experimentation when applied to school settings. "The schools in the Eight-Year Study came to be called 'experimental schools,'" the final report of the Study noted, but continued that "Most schools were fearful of such appellation. The term had come to connote foolish, careless, haphazard changes made without serious study and concluded without painstaking evaluation of results."[92] Partially to respond to this fear, the architects of the Study and its staff sought to imbue experimentation with a set of flexible criteria. "Thoughtful investigation and planning preceded each innovation," The final report continued, "and careful measurement of results followed. If results were not

---

[88] Kurshan, "The Eight Year Study," viii.
[89] Fraley, *Schooling and Innovation*, 118.
[90] Kridel and Bullough, Jr., "Conceptions and Misperceptions," 63, 69, 76. See also Robert V. Bullough, Jr., "Professional Learning Communities and the Eight-Year Study," *Educational Horizons* 85 (2007): 179; Craig Kridel, "Progressive Education in the Black High School: The General Education Board's Black High School Study, 1940-1948" (The Rockefeller Archive Center Publications Research Reports, 2013), 7, 13.
[91] L. Thomas Hopkins Interview with Victor Henry Streit, May 24, 1950" cited in Streit, "A Study of Some Curriculum Problems," 28.
[92] Aikin, *The Story of the Eight-Year Study*, 19.

satisfactory, further change was made in the light of fuller knowledge. In this sense the Thirty Schools were and are 'experimental.'"[93] A similar sentiment was expressed by an Eight-Year Study staff member who noted that "Basic readjustment in education will not be achieved by a mere acceptance of new values. Experimentalism involves further steps. The potentialities of the new values must be projected into proposals for action. These proposals must then be tried out and improved in action."[94]

These statements provide insight into the definition of experimental used by the Eight-Year Study (particularly the staff): a view of educational research that was scientific to the extent that it validated using the scientific values of observation, data collection, and trial and error. As Kridel would suggest, the Study carried the "spirit of experimentation" but was not a "scientific experiment" as such.[95] Rather, its version of scientific research was similar to the way historian Thomas Bender described quantification by early social workers: "One might call it objective (in that it strove for accuracy), but it was not neutral."[96] The Eight-Year Study did not necessarily strive so much for facts—and certainly not uniform laws—but rather for methods of (educational) experimentation and reform. As such, it represented a form of research that social scientist Theodore M. Porter might have labeled as "mechanical objectivity." This form of objectivity, Porter tells us, features researchers who appreciate "following the rules" and "speaking grandly of a rigorous method, enforced by disciplinary peers, canceling the biases of the knower and leading ineluctably to valid conclusions."[97]

---

[93] Ibid.
[94] Zirbes, "The Function" 61.
[95] Craig Kridel, "Reconsiderations: *The Story of the Eight-Year Study: With Conclusions and Recommendations*," *Educational Studies* 25 (1994): 108.
[96] Thomas Bender, "E.R.A. Seligman and the Vocation of Social Science" in his *Intellect and Public Life: Essays on the Social History of Academic Intellectuals in the United States* (Baltimore: Johns Hopkins University Press, 1993), 49.
[97] Theodore M. Porter, *Trust in Numbers: The Pursuit of Objectivity in Science and Public Life* (Princeton: Princeton University Press, 1995), 4.

Critically and tellingly, the Eight-Year Study did *not* endorse a scientific view of one "objective" and "correct" viewpoint, answer, or in this case, curriculum. This view was in line with a number of other intellectuals in America who were attempting to combine their research ethos (and its German roots) with a democratic spirit that stood in contrast to the standardized efficiency being represented by totalitarian states and Gilded and Progressive Age overreach.[98] It was an attempt to reconcile the political tensions that had haunted Americans ever since the inception of the nation: national versus local control, standardization versus relativism (or diversity), and active engineering versus organic social structures.[99] This research ethos was infused into the methods in which the Eight-Year Study worked. The staff members were well aware that their methods "should be valuable not only to us, the 30 schools in the Experiment, but also to the colleges who will have the opportunity to make their own ratings from raw data, and also to education generally, for no doubt other schools will want to adopt our procedures, if they have merit."[100] Indeed, this viewpoint was continually repeated by the staff during the course of the Study. During one gathering of many of the participants, a member of the staff

[98] On the relationship between progressive era reform and social politics see John M. Jordan, *Machine-Age Ideology: Social Engineering and American Liberalism, 1911-1939* (Chapel Hill: University of North Carolina Press, 1994); Shelton Stromquist, *Reinventing "The People:" The Progressive Movement, the Class Problem, and the Origins of Modern Liberalism* (Urbana: University of Illinois Press, 2006), chapter 4; Jewett, *Science, Democracy, and the American University*. On Progressive Era efficiency, see Jennifer Karns Alexander, *The Mantra of Efficiency: From Waterwheel to Social Control* (Baltimore: Johns Hopkins University Press, 2008), chapter 4. For one Eight-Year Study participant noting that the Eight-Year Study and the decade it represented was a break from the standardization of the 1920s, see Gordon N. MacKenzie "Emerging Curriculums Show New Conceptions of Secondary Education" in *General Education in the American High*, 82.

[99] For a broader discussion see William Graebner, *The Engineering of Consent: Democracy and Authority in Twentieth-Century America* (Madison: University of Wisconsin Press, 1987), 98-102; Laura M. Westhoff, "The Popularization of Knowledge: John Dewey on Experts and American Democracy," *History of Education Quarterly* 35 (1995): 27-47; Jewett, *Science, Democracy, and the American University*, esp. Part II.

[100] Louis Raths, "Progressive Education Association, Evaluation in the Eight Year Study, Bulletin No. 1, Anecdotal Records" (Columbus: Progressive Education Association, Evaluation in the Eight Year Study, Ohio State University, 1935), 1.

proclaimed that "We are striving to improve education not only for the schools in this study but for all American secondary education."[101]

The functioning of this experimentation was captured particularly well by the report of the faculty at the Ohio State University (High) School. "Critical or reflective thinking" they began, "originates with the sensing of a problem. It is a quality of thought operating in an effort to solve the problem and to reach a tentative conclusion which is supported by all available data. It is really a process to problem solving requiring the use of creative insight, intellectual honesty, and sound judgment. It is the basis of the method of scientific inquiry."[102] Once inquiry had been completed and a curriculum was implemented on an experimental basis, it would then have to be tested to see if it met its original objectives and purposes. "Appraisal is important in any educational experimentation." Ralph Tyler noted, "The time when arguments and impassioned pleas would justify the wholesale extension of an educational program is past. The significance of the Eight-Year Study must be judged in terms of its effectiveness in promoting desirable educational changes in boys and girls."[103]

The second way in which the study defined "experimentation" was that it required some level of cooperation on the part of the participants to work with each other with all focused on the melioration of social problems. Indeed, they often referred to the type of study that they were engaged in as a "co-operative study."[104] Again, this spoke to the democratic concerns as well as a

---

[101] Commission on the Relation of School and College of the Progressive Education Association, "Report of the Third Annual Conference of the Eight Year Study: Thousand Island Park, New York, June 24-28, 1935" (Columbus, OH: The Spahr Glenn Company, 1935), 10.
[102] The Faculty of the School, "Eight-Year Study: A Report of the Ohio State University School to The Commission on the Relation of School and College of the Progressive Education Association" (Columbus, OH: Ohio State University School, 1940), 38. Surviving copy is available at the Monroe C. Gutman Library, Harvard University Graduate School of Education, Cambridge, MA.
[103] Ralph W. Tyler, "Defining and Measuring Objectives of Progressive Education," *Educational Record* 17 (1936): 85.
[104] For an example of this, see Ralph W. Tyler, "Evaluation: A Challenge to Progressive Education," *Educational Research Bulletin* 14 (1935): 16.

sense of social fragmentation that will be discussed further. As Aikin would suggest in his final report of the study, "Many in the Study thought *that fundamental revision should be undertaken only after thoughtful, co-operative reconsideration of the high school's function in the community it serves*."[105] Community, in this case, did not simply mean the local community of parents and the like. Rather, it also extended to the teachers themselves. They were expected to work together to craft a shared vision. Aikin would note the necessity of this type of cooperation in the final report by offering that the type research that the Eight-Year Study was based on "demands co-operative deliberation." He partially and practically justified this stance by arguing that "Piecemeal revision by individual teachers or subject departments usually is disappointing."[106] He further encouraged secondary educators in each of their high school to explore "in an open-minded and realistic spirit, its service to its students and community."[107]

These sentiments made their way down to the participants of the Eight-Year Study. This can also be gleaned from the final report of the faculty at the Ohio State School. They reflected, "As the faculty looks back over eight years of experience over the mass of detail, the failures and successes, one thing is apparent. The democratic process has often been wearing, and teachers have worked hard; but teachers as well as students have found that to use the method of intelligence and to work cooperatively for the solution of problems is the way of growth."[108] This view of experimentation that originated in the Eight-Year Study was not only esteemed but emulated as well by other secondary education studies of the time period.[109]

---

[105] Aikin, *The Story of the Eight-Year Study*, 20.
[106] Ibid, 128.
[107] Ibid, 131. Historian Barry M. Franklin has noted that, in the case of Ralph Tyler, the desire to see teachers cooperate was also motivated by concerns over the fragmentation of social cohesion due to urbanization. See Barry M. Franklin, "Education for an Urban America: Ralph Tyler and the Curriculum Field" in *International Perspectives in Curriculum History* ed. Ivor Goodson (Wolfeboro, NH: Croom Helm, 1987), esp. 283-286.
[108] The Faculty of the School, "Eight-Year Study: A Report of the Ohio State University School," 50.
[109] This will be discussed later in the chapter.

In many ways, this approach to experimentation—cautiously scientific, socially oriented, and cooperative—was similar to other social science research of the era. It was the attempt to resolve what sociologist William M. Sullivan deemed the tension between "technical" and "civic" professionalism.[110] Following the bitter partisanship of the Progressive Era and the failure of science to create a world free from national and global conflict, Americans were interested in social science that could meliorate social problems without sacrificing a sense of community to achieve this end. As historian Barry D. Karl notes, "The democratic commitment of American social research demanded that the community provide for its own examination so that it could sustain the programs recommended. The science on which that examination would be based would have to be publically acceptable. Partisan politics would have to fall before the combined forces of accurate information and acknowledged social need."[111] It was this type of research, with its aspirations for institutional and civic improvement, that, by and large, was being encouraged by both the Rockefeller and Carnegie philanthropies.[112]

Grappling with the Tension between Advocacy and Objectivity

---

[110] William M. Sullivan, *Work and Integrity: The Crisis and Promise of Professionalism in America* second edition (San Francisco: Jossey-Bass, 2005), chapter three. On this tension see also Thomas Bender, "The Cultures of Intellectual Life: The City and the Professions" in *Intellect and Public Life*, 3-15; Stephen T. Leonard, "Introduction: A Genealogy of the Politicized Intellectual" in *Intellectuals and Public Life: Between Radicalism and Reform* eds. Leon Fink, Stephen T. Leonard, and Donald M. Reid (Ithaca: Cornell University Press, 1996), 1-25. For a further discussion of the civic ideal see Leon Fink, *Progressive Intellectuals and the Dilemmas of Democratic Commitment* (Cambridge: Harvard University Press, 1997), esp. 25.

[111] Barry D. Karl, "Presidential Planning and Social Science Research: Mr. Hoover's Experts," *Perspectives in American History* 3 (1969): 363; John M. Jordan, "'To Educate Public Opinion': John D. Rockefeller, Jr., and the Origins of Social Scientific Fact-Finding," *New England Quarterly* 64 (1991): 292-297.

[112] While conceding the preference for this type of research in the Carnegie and Rockefeller Philanthropies, historian Mark Solovey has also shown that the influence of this type of research was being questioned by some philanthropic officers. See Mark Solovey, *Shaky Foundations: The Politics-Patronage-Social Science Nexus in Cold War America* (New Brunswick, NJ: Rutgers University Press, 2013), 106-112. Ultimately, Solovey contends, this research model would give way to a model that was less identifiable as scientism and more activist in its orientation. On the relationship between social science research methods, see the literature covered by Theresa Richardson and Donald Fisher, "Introduction: The Social Sciences and their Philanthropic Mentors" in *The Development of the Social Sciences in the United States and Canada: The Role of Philanthropy* (Stamford, CT: Ablex, 1999), 3-21.

The second characteristic of the Eight-Year Study that proved influential was that it sought to resolve the tension between advocacy and objectivity in educational research.[113] The educational researchers who worked on the Study were quick to note that they did not wish to exert influence on the curriculum or practices of the schools that were engaged in reform. They recognized the social and political nature of curriculum reform but balanced their approach by suggesting that any reform effort or idea must be organic and come from the schools and the individuals themselves. They would only assist when asked and even then would only work to organize the ideas and to provide supplemental research. As such, they attempted to provide objective educational research and work in an objective manner, while still understanding that the reform efforts were responding to wider social changes.

As educational researchers, and ultimately, social scientists, the staff of the Eight-Year Study had to figure out—often by trial and error over the course of the Study—not only *how* they would conduct the experiment, but more importantly, justify *why* they would work this way. Put simply, they needed to grapple with the purpose(s) of their work. The questions facing social scientists of the time period have been eloquently stated by historian Mark C. Smith.

> What is the proper role of the social scientist in relation to his or her knowledge of society? In other words, how should social scientists use their knowledge, and indeed, should they have any say at all in its utilization? Should the correct role of the social scientist be that of a technical expert who provides information and advice to whomever requests it? Or should the social scientist go beyond understanding and analyzing society and use scientifically derived information consciously and personally to help create a better society more suited to humankind's basic needs and desires…the question went well beyond the matter of alleged bias or objectivity.[114]

---

[113] The tension between advocacy and objectivity was introduced by Mary O. Furner, *Advocacy and Objectivity: A Crisis in the Professionalization of American Social Science, 1865-1905* (1975; Lexington: University Press of Kentucky, 2010). Though the terms are useful, it is important to note that they were developed for the specific context of the American social sciences in the years that Furner studies. Furner herself did not apply them to educational research as such.

[114] Mark C. Smith, *Social Science in the Crucible: The American Debate over Objectivity and Purpose, 1918-1941* (Durham: Duke University Press, 1994), 6.

Smith lays out a debate between two camps of social scientists. Smith labeled one group the "objectivist service intellectuals" while the other he labeled "purposivists." The former were interested in serving as technical experts on issues of social import as determined by others, but were not value-neutral as such. The latter "insisted on the need for preconceived goals and ends for social science and for social scientists' personal participation in their selection."[115]

The questions posed by Smith, and the categories of social scientists are compounded by the tension faced specifically by educational researchers—like those that comprised the staff of the Eight-Year Study—related to theory and practice. This might be described as "a just below the surface tension between those who wish to improve practice immediately and those who prefer to raise complicated questions of educational purpose, or to inquire, patiently, into possibilities not yet comprehended."[116] This tension itself was (and still is) compounded by four further complications. The first is that the tension is "tinged with issues of gender" and often results in (often male) educational researchers appropriating more quantitative methods in the quest to be seem more legitimate.[117] The second is that "educational researchers… are free to deal with educational questions from whatever disciplinary perspective or methodological approach they find appropriate."[118] The third is that "the education professoriate lives in two cultures—that of the University and that of the public school."[119] The fourth is that "inquiry into

[115] Ibid, 5-6.
[116] Robert J. Schaefer, "Footnotes on Callahan's Teachers College" in *Shaping the Superintendency: A Reexamination of Callahan and the Cult of Efficiency* ed. William Edward Eaton (New York: Teachers College Press, 1990), 62.
[117] Lageman, *An Elusive Science*, 17.
[118] David F. Labaree, *The Trouble with Ed Schools* (New Haven: Yale University Press, 2004), 79.
[119] Clinton B. Allison, "Early Professors of Education: Three Case Studies" in *The Professors of Teaching: An Inquiry* eds. Richard Wisniewski and Edward R. Ducharme (Albany: State University of New York Press, 1989), 47.

education considers many matters, some pertinent to professional work and some not, but all susceptible to detached scrutiny."[120]

Many of the staff members of the Eight-Year Study were aware of these tensions and sought to reconcile them to the best of their abilities. As will be demonstrated later in the chapter by studying the actual methods of working, the staff of the Eight-Year Study tended to fit more into the mold of the "objectivist service intellectuals." Much of the reason for this lay at the heart of their assumption that schools and local communities should be able to constantly experiment, revise, and implement new curricula and schooling structures as times changed.

Creating and Maintaining a Generalizable Sample

As a sociological study based on disseminating educational research, the leadership of the Eight-Year Study felt it necessary to have a generalizable sample.[121] That is to say that they wanted high schools that reflected the wide diversity of high schools in the nation. They favored a sample that featured geographic diversity, public and private schools, and ones with various religious and institutional affiliations. The primary reason for this was that they wanted the Study to be generalizable. As the Chairman of the Reports and Records Committee noted at the Third Annual Conference of the Study, "We are striving to improve education not only for the schools in this study but for all American secondary education."[122] Upon the publication of the final reports, one report noted that "The proposals of the Commissions are designed to apply to the

---

[120] Robbie McClintock, *Homeless in the House of Intellect: Formative Justice and Education as an Academic Study* (New York: Laboratory for Liberal Learning, 2005), 23.

[121] In the early 1930s, just as the Study was getting underway, representative sampling was accepted and widely being applied to a number of social surveys and other sociological research. On the history of representative sampling and its application to sociological research, see Frederick F. Stephan, "History of the Uses of Modern Sampling Procedures," *Journal of the American Statistical Association* 43 (1948):12-39; Alain Desrosieres, "The Part in Relation to the Whole: How to Generalise?: The Prehistory of Representative Sampling" in *The Social Survey in Historical Perspective, 1880-1940* eds. Martin Bulmer, Kevin Bales, and Kathryn Kish Sklar (New York: Cambridge University Press, 1991), 217-244; Sarah E. Igo, *The Averaged American: Surveys, Citizens, and the Making of a Mass Public* (Cambridge: Harvard University Press, 2007).

[122] Commission on the Relation of School and College, "Report of the Third Annual Conference," 10.

education of all adolescents (ranging in age, approximately, from twelve to twenty) whether or not they plan to go to college."[123]

There is a considerable debate among historians over whether or not the Eight-Year Study was able to create and maintain a generalizable sample of schools. Whereas J'Nelle Smoak Gibson finds that "The Schools were more representative of the kinds of institutions with which the Commission and Directing Committee were associated than of American schools in general. The clientele which the schools served was for the most part from the more privileged segments of society," Kathy Irwin finds that it was "clear to the Commission that experimentation could not and should not be the exclusive right of a few private and privileged schools; it required diversity of character, class, and geography."[124] It is not necessary to offer an opinion on this debate. Rather, how the Study staff and Directing Committee (those members charged with choosing the initial participating schools) defined "representative" and how they went about achieving and advertising this concept is of greater concern for our purposes. It is, after all, the notion of a "generalizable sample" chosen by the Eight-Year Study that would be influential to later cooperative studies.

Initially, the major thrust for the Eight-Year Study came from the North Central Association, who represented schools across the Midwest.[125] Motivated equally by concerns about securing philanthropic funding as conducting sound educational research, they sought to

---

[123] Committee on the Function of Mathematics in General Education, *Mathematics in General Education* (New York: D. Appleton-Century, 1940), v.

[124] Gibson, "The Eight-Year Study," 167. Kathy Irwin, "The Eight Year Study" in *Progressive Education for the 1990s: Transforming Practice* eds. Kathe Jervis and Carol Montag (New York: Teachers College Press, 1991), 54. A further discussion of the generalizable sample of the Eight-Year Study appears in Kliebard, *The Struggle*, 180; Tyack, Lowe, and Hansot, *Public School in Hard Times*, 154-155. A map of the selected schools has been produced in Thigpen, "The Development and Evolution," 72.

[125] On the North Central Association, see Calvin O. Davis, *The North Central Association of Colleges and Secondary Schools: Aims, Organization, Activities* (Ann Arbor, MI: The North Central Association of Colleges and Secondary Schools, 1932); Calvin Olin Davis, *A History of the North Central Association of Colleges and Secondary Schools, 1895-1945* (Ann Arbor, MI: The North Central Association of Colleges and Secondary Schools, 1945).

create a generalizable study "and proposed that a 'small number of schools, probably not more than twenty will be chosen to carry on the experiment in secondary education.'"[126] With the move toward more "objective," though less value-neutral educational research, it is clear why a generalizable sample would have been appealing to the architects of the Eight-Year Study.

However, what has yet to be discussed is how philanthropy played a role in motivating the Study members to create a generalizable model. During the Progressive Era and well into the 1930s, philanthropic foundations were interested in supporting what some scholars have termed "scientific philanthropy." This approach to philanthropy motivated philanthropic officers to "determine by careful investigation which of the many competing claims [for philanthropic assistance] were likely to produce more benevolence per dollar"[127] Further, scientific philanthropists were concerned that researchers "should seek causes and cures." Scientific philanthropy ultimately "should find a remedy for a disease, rather than build a hospital to treat its victims. It should root out the reasons for poverty, not give alms to the impoverished. It should expand knowledge and deal in new ideas."[128] Beyond simply attempting to "strike at the root causes of social problems," scientific philanthropy sought researchers who would "test solutions."[129] By providing a generalizable study, the staff of the Eight-Year Study could argue that they were creating knowledge—in this case research methods and conclusions—that would filter down to other secondary schools. This was, indeed, an argument that was made over the

[126] "Proposal for Better Coordination of School and College Work," Unpublished manuscript, Teachers College Library, p. 2 cited in Thigpen, The Development and Evolution," 61.
[127] Jonas, *The Circuit Riders*, 23.
[128] Judith Sealander, "Curing Evils at Their Source: The Arrival of Scientific Giving." In *Charity, Philanthropy, and Civility*, 220-221.
[129] Kathleen D. McCarthy, "From Cold War to Cultural Development: The International Cultural Activities of the Ford Foundation, 1950-1980," *Daedalus* 116 (1987): 93.

course of the Eight-Year Study and particularly in their quest for philanthropic funding.[130] This quest was ultimately successful as "the Carnegie Foundation made grants totaling $70,000 and the General Education Board gave $622,500" over the course of the Study.[131]

The question, then, was what constituted a generalizable sample? There is little doubt that the Directing Committee had a plethora of variables to choose from. Would it be racial demographics? Would it be geographical diversity? Would it be a mix of "traditional" and "progressive" schools? Ultimately, the architects of the Eight-Year Study realized that they could not draw a sample from the population of American high schools. Rather, they could only draw from high schools that were willing to experiment: an issue that would be faced by future cooperative studies. That is to say that each secondary school involved had to, at the very least, be willing to join the Study and not be satisfied with the curriculum as it was currently constructed in their school. Aikin had also noted that the schools "should be well qualified to lead in the improvement of the work of the secondary school."[132]

How, then, was the sample created? Eugene Lyle Baum explains that "More than two hundred secondary schools were nominated for inclusion, and nearly all of them received a letter describing the project and its goals along with an invitation to submit proposed experimental programs…The proposals from interested schools were all reviewed by the Directing

---

[130] For a description of the Eight-Year Study as appealing to scientific philanthropy see Joseph Watras, "The Eight-Year Study: From Evaluative Research to Demonstration Project, 1930-1940" *Education Policy Analysis Archives* 14 (2002): n.p. Retrieved from http://epaa.asu.edu/epaa/v14n21/.

[131] C.A. Bowers, *The Progressive Educator and the Depression: The Radical Years* (New York: Random House, 1969), 217. A breakdown of the total funding of the Eight-Year Study is also presented in Lawrence A. Cremin, *The Transformation of the School: Progressivism in American Education, 1876-1957* (New York: Vintage Books, 1961), 257. The larger Progressive Education Association ultimately received $1,622,000 throughout its life. This is noted in Raymond B. Fosdick, Henry F. Pringle and Katharine Douglas Pringle, *Adventure in Giving: The Story of the General Education Board* (New York: Harper and Row Publishers, 1962), 248.

[132] Wilford M. Aikin, "The Purposes of the Eight-Year Experimental Study," *Educational Record* 16 (1935): 108.

Committee."[133] The main criteria were described by Aikin. "In making selections," he began "the Committee decided to include both private and public schools, large and small schools, and schools representing different sections of the United States. But the chief concern of the Committee was to choose competent schools which were dissatisfied with the work they were doing and eager to inaugurate exploratory studies and changes which could not be undertaken without the freedom granted by the colleges."[134] As a result, many schools that showed interest also made it clear that they could not engage in the experiment and were rejected.[135]

By the end of this selection process, the Directing Committee was pleased to report that they had achieved geographic diversity with "school systems from Boston to Los Angeles" and "from Wisconsin to Oklahoma."[136] They had found schools that were willing to "vitalize their work by changes in organization, methods of teaching and content of curriculum."[137] While the Directing Committee felt that they had a limited number of schools, they still felt it was a sizable sample. Though many had, at the time and since, referred to the Eight-Year Study as the "Thirty School Study," a member of the Study's staff noted that "There were never exactly thirty schools anyway, for some of the public school systems, which were counted as one, included as many as fifteen separate schools. Hence 'thirty' in this context has become a label to identify a group of schools which engaged in one of the most educational experiments of our generation, and it has lost whatever mathematical significance it once possessed."[138]

---

[133] Baum, "History of the Commission," 116-117. See also Richard P. Lipka, "Implications for Educational Research and Evaluation" in *The Eight-Year Study Revisited*, 57.
[134] Aikin, *The Story of the Eight-Year Study*, 14.
[135] Robert V. Bullough, Jr., *Democracy in Education: Boyd H. Bode* (Bayside, NY: General Hall, 1981), 132; Tyler, "Evaluation: A Challenge,"10-11.
[136] Ralph W. Tyler, "The Five Most Significant Curriculum Events in the Twentieth Century," *Educational Leadership* 44 (1986): 38; Hemming, *Teach Them*, 88; Ralph W. Tyler, "Educational Benchmarks in Retrospect: Educational Change Since 1915" in his series of published lectures, *Perspectives on American Education: Reflections on the Past…Challenges for the Future* (Chicago: Science Research Associates, 1976), 39.
[137] Aikin, "The Purposes," 116.
[138] Paul B. Diederich, Introduction to *Thirty Schools Tell Their Story* (New York: Harper and Brothers, 1943), xxii.

As mentioned earlier, the question of whether or not a generalizable sample was created is certainly a matter of ongoing debate. However, the Staff was reasonably pleased with the sample they created and began to advertise it as a strength of the Study.[139] "The committee sought diligently throughout the country to make up a list of schools truly representative of the whole range of secondary education." A 1938 PEA report with wide distribution noted, "An analysis of the list of the thirty schools finally chosen will show that many types of schools have been included."[140] Not only did they advertise in national outlets such as the *New York Times*, but they also strove to make certain the participants were aware of the generalizable sample that had been created.

As Gladys L. Borchers, a teacher who participated in the Eight-Year Study, recalled some decades later, the staff "selected special schools and they ranged from private schools, of maybe two hundred fifty students, to public schools of twenty-five hundred. For instance, in one of the private schools they had every facility—beautiful buildings, beautiful grounds, high-paid teachers—and in one of the schools, a public school, they had very poor buildings and very poor equipment." She continued to suggest that the differences were apparent at the time, noting "at Wisconsin High School we always felt that we didn't have a building that compared very favorably with the city school buildings. They were superior. We did better with equipment because we cooperated with the departments on the [Bascom] Hill [of the University of Wisconsin at Madison] with that."[141] For a number of reasons, seeking out and advertising a generalizable sample was seen as crucial for the morale of the staff, the participants, and for all

---

[139] Wilford M. Aikin, "Leeway for the Schools," *New York Times*, 25 September 1932; "20 Schools Picked for Modern Test" *New York Times*, 15 January 1933; Wilford M. Aikin, "High Schools Begin a Big Experiment," *New York Times*, 4 June 1933; Wilford M. Aikin, "Study Plan Tried Out," *New York Times*, 17 March 1935.
[140] *Progressive Education Advances: Report on a Program to Educate American Youth for Present-Day Living* (New York: Appleton-Century Co., 1938), 19.
[141] Gladys L. Borchers, interview by Donna S. Taylor, September-November, 1972, University of Wisconsin University Archives Oral History Project, transcript, University of Wisconsin-Madison University Archive, Madison, WI.

interested in funding or learning from the Study. This view would filter down to cooperative studies of general education on the collegiate level.

Obtaining Funding from Participating Schools

This particular characteristic of the Eight-Year Study is not as complicated in theory or practice as the previous characteristics that have been discussed. The architects of the Study believed that one way that secondary schools could show initial and continuing commitment to participating in the Eight-Year Study was by continuing to pay an ongoing fee to participate. It should be noted that these fees paled in comparison to the grants made by the philanthropic grants. Rather, they were more symbolic. "In every case," Kathy Irwin writes, "individuals and groups were pulling from their own resources, energies, and beliefs that the Eight Year Study was something important."[142] This was instituted at the very beginning of the Study, which, before receiving any philanthropic funding subsisted "on a total contribution of $800 from four interested private schools: Lincoln, Tower Hill, Francis W. Parker, and John Burroughs"[143]

Requesting funding from participating schools proved not only efficient, but prescient as well. Indeed, it would help to pave the way for cooperative studies to gain funding from philanthropic foundations—particularly the General Education Board who were known for their desire to have schools "raise a certain sum from other sources in order to become eligible for a grant."[144]

Ensuring the Autonomy of Each School and Participant

---

[142] Irwin, "The Eight Year" 55.
[143] Graham, *Progressive Education*, 89.
[144] Robert S. Morison, "Foundations and Universities," *Daedalus* 93 (1964): 1116; Warren Weaver, *U.S. Philanthropic Foundations: Their History, Structure, Management, and Record* (New York: Harper & Row, 1967), 156.

The education researchers that made up the staff of the Eight-Year Study believed that the local community, students, teachers, and administrators should be able to create their own "Eight-Year Study" without the direct intervention of researchers. As the final report stated,

> The Directing Committee had decided that the independence and autonomy of each school must be carefully guarded. It thought that significant developments could come only out of each school's sincere attempt to serve better the boys and girls in its own community. The Directing Committee attempted through its membership, through sub-committees, and through specialists in the fields of evaluation, records and reports, and curriculum to render every possible assistance sought by the schools, but to avoid any tendency to dictate thought or action. That policy gave to the schools the freedom and responsibility which belong to them. Without preventing essential unity of purpose, this thoroughly democratic procedure has led to desirable variety in organization and procedure.[145]

Written within this quote was one of the guiding assumptions of the Eight-Year Study: the notion that the autonomy of each school and participant must be assured. This would not only guard against the creation of a one "standard curriculum," but would also meliorate the perennial tensions fostered by having a decentralized American public/private school system operating in an American democracy wary of centralized power.[146] The following section traces how this autonomy was considered and pursued.

Verbal reassurances to protect the autonomy of each school were made early and often to school personnel. These reassurances were given high priority. Aikin began the first volume of the *Thirty Schools Bulletin*—a publication printed and distributed to the teachers involved with the Eight-Year Study—by speaking to this issue. "We have learned" he proclaimed "how to work together towards a common end without sacrificing in any way the integrity, independence, or autonomy of any school."[147] Reassurances were present in other articles in the volume as well.

---

[145] Aikin, *The Story of the Eight-Year Study*, 16.
[146] Ralph W. Tyler, interview, January, 1993 quoted in Lipka, et al., *The Eight-Year Study Revisited*, xi.
[147] Wilford M. Aikin, "The Eight Year Study Moves Forward," *Thirty Schools Bulletin: An Occasional Publication for the Teachers in the Study of the Relation of the School and College* 1 (1937): 1.

"As has been repeatedly stated," the head of the curriculum portion of the Study observed "the Commission on the Relation of School and College is not concerned with having each of the schools adopt and practice the same social philosophy. As a matter of fact, individual variation among schools is encouraged."[148] These assurances were made not only to school personnel, but to all following the Study. Just a year earlier, the Director of Evaluation wrote to a national audience that "no single set of tests for all schools was considered" as "each of the schools in the study is being given freedom to develop an educational program which offers greatest promise under the local conditions for the pupils in that school."[149]

The schools themselves were quite aware of their freedom and expected it to influence their plans of reform. Ultimately, many of them agreed that their autonomy had been ensured throughout the whole process as they produced a variety of different curriculums and methods of working to suit their local clientele. "The curriculum that has resulted from the Beaver School's participation in the Eight-Year Study," one member of their faculty noted, "may not fit any other school, for it has been developed to meet the needs of a particular school, its patrons and their children."[150] This was noticed by Aikin as early as 1935, who would report to participants at the third annual conference of the Eight-Year Study "The variety of procedures presented by the many cooperating groups is not surprising, since it has been the policy of the Directing Committee from the start to permit as much freedom and initiative among and instructors as possible."[151]

Trust in Teachers and Local School Personnel

---

[148] H.B. Alberty, "The Social Philosophy of the School," *Thirty Schools Bulletin: An Occasional Publication for the Teachers in the Study of the Relation of the School and College* 1 (1937): 6.
[149] Tyler, "Defining and Measuring Objectives," 78. This notion was repeated by Hilda Taba, "Planning and Administering the Evaluation Program" in *Appraising and Recording*, 443.
[150] *Thirty Schools Tell Their Story* (New York: Harper and Brothers, 1943), 51.
[151] Commission on the Relation of School and College, "Report of the Third Annual Conference," 1. This report was also advertised nationally in the *Journal of Higher Education*. "The Reporter," *Journal of Higher Education* 6 (1935): 388.

"Trust in teachers" Larry Cuban once explained "was the core assumption that drove the…Eight Year Study."[152] Cuban was absolutely correct. Indeed, a member of the Study's staff wrote in a pamphlet circulated to each of the participating teachers that they were "the real backbone of the Eight Year Study."[153] Not only did this characteristic mark each of the methods innovated by the Study, but ultimately influenced each of the cooperative studies in general education on the collegiate level as well. This section focuses on the assumptions that drove trust in teachers.

The first justification for the trust in teachers was the notion that they were the only ones with direct contact with students. This contact gave them not only the responsibility of implementing the experimental curricula, but more importantly, the experience and perspective with which to inform the researchers (staff) as to what was happening in the classrooms. As Hilda Taba, one staff member of the Eight-Year Study, reported, "The experience in the Thirty Schools was that on the whole teachers made better interpreters than persons statistically qualified but whose personal contact with students was limited."[154] Further, it was believed by many involved that working in connection with educational researchers with philanthropic funding lent a sense of confidence to experimenting teachers. "The prestige of organizations and the cooperation of professional agencies or experts provide," one staff member observed, "a larger measure of security for experimentation and often insure the confidence and continuity needed for a planned program in which the cumulative effects of curriculum change may be evolved and evaluated."[155]

---

[152] Larry Cuban, *Hugging the Middle: How Teachers Teach in an Era of Testing and Accountability* (New York: Teachers College Press, 2009), 64. On the role of teachers in the Eight-Year Study, see Bullough, Jr., "Professional Learning Communities," 168-180; Kridel and Bullough, Jr., "Conceptions and Misperceptions," 78.
[153] John L. Bergstresser, "Evaluating Our Students in Colleges," *Thirty Schools Bulletin: An Occasional Publication for the Teachers in the Study of the Relation of the School and College* 1 (1937): 23.
[154] Hilda Taba, "Planning and Administering the Evaluation Program" in *Appraising and Recording*, 459.
[155] Zirbes, "The Function" 66. "Educators Stress Specialized Study" *New York Times*, 3 November 1934.

The second justification was the notion that the Study needed to represent "democratic" research. That is to say that democratic teachers were not ones who simply taught curricula handed down to them from their superiors. Rather, teachers needed to have a hand in debates and other democratic processes involved in this type of educational reform. If the Eight-Year Study—and indeed the whole progressive education movement—were to remake schooling in the image of democracy, then teachers needed to participate in reform much the way citizens would participate in the political process. However, the rise of the bureaucratic school systems of the Progressive Era had seemed to many involved with the Study as too rigid and ultimately, undemocratic. Aikin identified the problem as such: "School administration in the United States has been autocratic, by and large, rather than democratic. Administration in the schools chosen for the Study has ranged all the way from autocracy to *laissez-faire*, with here and there real democracy in action."[156] Three other staff members suggested that autocracy led to situations where "Administrators boss teachers, and teachers boss pupils."[157]

The heart of this view was best expressed by Earl C. Kelley, who would later write on the benefit of summer workshops for teachers—a method of working innovated by the Eight-Year Study:

> We are all committed to the democratic way of life. But our schools are basically authoritarian. We are perplexed by the dilemma of training children for democratic citizenship by giving them undemocratic experiences. It would seem that if democracy is to survive in our country, we will have to find ways of modifying our teaching techniques, and gradually replacing the autocratic educational regime…Learning democratic techniques is further essential for the survival of the personality of the teacher believes in political democracy but teaches as an autocrat. Such splitting of beliefs and functions is apt, if not reconciled, to damage the teacher deeply in his personal

[156] Aikin, *The Story of the Eight-Year Study*, 33.
[157] W. Carson Ryan and Ralph W. Tyler, *Summer Workshops in Secondary Education: An Experiment in the In-Service Training of Teachers and other Educational Workers* (New York: Progressive Education Association, 1939), 118.

> integration. All who want political democracy and are practicing tyranny in the classroom need to note this risk.[158]

To allow democratic teaching techniques to flourish in the classroom, the staff of the Eight-Year Study believed that it was necessary for the curricula to be conceived in a democratic manner whereby teachers could practice the democratic process amongst themselves and others. Put simply, teacher "relationships must embody democracy at work."[159] In many ways, this was one way that the general education movement was meeting the paradox of liberal education—the ultimate question of whether or not teachers can "progressively engender student autonomy without employing errantly paternalistic methods or assumptions."[160] Ultimately, the democratic process of creating curricula was built on the high value placed on cooperation between school personnel. "Democratic education involves the individual teacher in the whole program of the school." Aikin observed, "He no longer works in isolation. He shares with administrators and other teachers in determining the school's principles and purposes, in formulating policies and in putting them into practice, and in building the curriculum."[161] Cooperation went beyond the walls of the individual teacher's school. The Eight-Year Study staff envisioned teachers able to cooperate interinstitutionally and worked toward this end. Writing in a bulletin distributed to all Study participants, one staff member discussing a specific curriculum problem noted, "If teachers who are interested in this approach will correspond with me, a panel of construction and criticism can be formed. Criteria for establishing organizations and materials can be set up, skeleton outlines of procedures can be formulated, the experiments and achievements of individual teachers can be pooled, and be made available for all, so that the perennial problem of

---

[158] Earl C. Kelley, *The Workshop Way of Learning* (New York: Harper and Brothers, 1951), 119.
[159] Thayer, Zachry, and Kotinsky, *Reorganizing Secondary Education*, 399.
[160] Matthew R. Silliman and David Kenneth Johnson, *Bridges to Autonomy: Paradoxes in Teaching and Learning* (Williamstown, MA: Piraeus Books, 2011), 1. On this paradox also see Adam R. Nelson, *Education and Democracy: The Meaning of Alexander Meiklejohn, 1872-1964* (Madison: University of Wisconsin Press, 2001), esp. xi-xvi.
[161] Aikin, *The Story of the Eight-Year Study*, 41; *Progressive Education Advances*, 26.

the busy teacher—finding time for the reorganization of materials and courses—will be partially solved through the cooperative efforts of many."[162] Cooperative work would not only strengthen the profession and democratic praxis, but also lead to nationwide reforms.

Interinstitutional cooperation occurred amongst the many teachers participating in the Study. John A. Lester, a member of the Friends' Council on Education of Doylestown, Pennsylvania toured a number of regional conferences held by the Eight-Year Study. "Even though the participants in the experiment are widely scattered geographically," he observed, "there seems to be a common bond in a mutual enterprise."[163] It was crucial to promote a sense of common appreciation for experimental work across the teaching profession and all other educators. As one curriculum theorist—who had visited one of the PEA workshops in the 1930s—would note in 1946, "Coordination among schools is also highly desirable, not for purposes of securing uniformity but to quicken the pace of curriculum change through exchange of experience and dispersion of practice…to attack problems that the system as a whole may have in common…and, in general, to further group solidarity throughout the school system."[164]

This was crucial among the staff members—curriculum consultants and evaluators—who would work with the participants of a number of the schools. "There are many kinds of relation among schools." The final report of the curriculum consultants began, "It may be said to make these contacts most vital, a sense of common problems is needed."[165] This feeling was shared by many of the participants of the Eight-Year Study. As Stephen M. Corey, the principal of Wisconsin High School who would go on to edit the very same book on general education in the

---

[162] S.P. McCutchen, "The Study of Contemporary Problems," *Thirty Schools Bulletin: An Occasional Publication for the Teachers in the Study of the Relation of the School and College* 1 (1937): 19.
[163] Commission on the Relation of School and College, "Report of the Third Annual Conference," 2.
[164] Alice Miel, *Changing the Curriculum: A Social Process* (New York: Appleton-Century-Crofts, 1946), 79.
[165] H.H. Giles, S.P. McCutchen, and A.N. Zechiel, *Exploring the Curriculum: The Work of the Thirty Schools from the Viewpoint of Curriculum Consultants* (New York: Harper & Brothers, 1942), 248.

high school that supplied the opening quote for this chapter noted, the workshops were "A very important factory in the growth of harmonious, democratic relationships among administrators, teachers and pupils."[166] Burton P. Fowler, the Headmaster of the Tower Hill School, noted that "Although many differences in purposes exist among the various schools, in considering such general aims as critical thinking, physical health, and the like, obviously a common element predominates. The more definitely we think of these goals and work toward them, the more actively do we become engaged in a common enterprise."[167]

This sense of mutual enterprise did not conflict with the autonomy that had been promised to the schools. "Although each secondary school was granted complete freedom to work out its plan and to design its program in the light of its own problems," one representative of the Denver high schools reflected, "nevertheless common problems were continually stressed and central committees were set up to make possible the exchange of ideas among all the schools so that each might benefit from the experiences of the others."[168]

Ultimately, the staff of the Eight-Year Study clung to the value of preparing teachers for democracy and its effects on reforming the administrative structures of high schools and the relationships of school personnel to each other. "As education comes more and more to be conceived as intimately concerned with the total development of children and young people for democratic living," one of the reports of the Eight-Year Study concluded, "the line-and-staff conception of organization within both school systems and individual schools is changing. Experiments designed to give ever more effective expression to teacher participation in administration, curriculum-construction, and the conduct of the classroom are well under way.

---

[166] Stephen M. Corey Interview with Victor Henry Streit, May 1, 1950" cited in Streit, "A Study of Some Curriculum Problems," 39. Corey would even go on to write on inter and intrainstitutional cooperation for a national audience. See Stephen M. Corey, "Co-Operative Staff Work," *School Review* 52 (1944): 336-345.
[167] Commission on the Relation of School and College, "Report of the Third Annual Conference," 6-7.
[168] *Thirty Schools Tell*, 147.

Supervisors are viewed less and less often as inspectors and directors of instruction, and more frequently as experts who stand ready to cooperate 'on call' with the teaching staff."[169]

Beyond democratic concerns, there was a third concern, that of reconfiguring the relationship between teachers and administrators. It was quite evident to the architects of the Eight-Year Study that reform would simply grind to a halt without the work and backing of the teachers. An instance of this was observed by Luther Tate, principal of Friends' Central School in Overbrook, PA. Referring to the situation of another school within the study, he noted "a steady decline in the interest of a certain faculty because the principal attempted to plan and carry on virtually the entire experimental program of the school unassisted."[170] This was certainly a concern of the Eight-Year Study, to be sure. "As for the executives—that's what they have struggled and toiled for, to achieve greater power and security." One staff member opined with his tongue firmly in his cheek. "The suggestion that they should acknowledge and even release the power of their subordinates, that they should protect those subordinates to the death against interference from the very people who pay their salaries—no matter how short-sighted they see that interference to be—woe, woe, scandal upon scandal. Whisper it not on the floor of the legislature or in the office of the taxpayer or at the banquets of the trustees!"[171]

Trust in teachers, the Eight-Year Study staff concluded, could not be achieved without reconceptualizing the relationship that teachers would have to administrators. As one member of the staff proclaimed in a 1939 issue of the *High School Journal*, "The writer believes that the group which should be most concerned in this development in the secondary-school curriculum is the administrative group. What more deadening procedure could one follow than to have

---

[169] Thayer, Zachry, and Kotinsky, *Reorganizing Secondary Education*, 403.
[170] Streit, "A Study of Some Curriculum Problems," 19-20.
[171] H.H. Giles, "The Urgent Need in Secondary Education," *Phi Delta Kappan* 17 (1935): 250.

teachers spend a summer accumulating new ideas through summer courses or through summer work shops [sic] and then return to a school situation which had remained static?"[172]

The Study carried the expressed purposes of providing teachers the autonomy to experiment in order to stimulate their own "growth." It would have seemed pointless to provide teachers with the knowledge to reform their own classrooms and stimulating their desire to do so without giving them ample opportunity to do so. Members of the Eight-Year Study staff were quite wary that such a situation might develop and considered it a danger to be identified and removed immediately. "Participation in planning" one of the reports of the Study noted, "and in making choices challenges teachers to take responsibility for the most serious kind of thinking. But within the schools it has been shown time and again that it is of small use to give teachers this challenge to accept responsibility, without giving them authority to act."[173] The "authority to act" seemed to the Eight-Year Study staff to be all that teachers needed to reform their programs, techniques, and methods. Contrasting a long history of teacher "inertia" with what appeared to be sweeping changes in both approach and desire to experimentation and reform, this report would later ask, "What, then, brought about the striking changes in attitudes of hundreds of teachers in this Study?" Its authors answered, "It was the discovery of the possibilities of personal growth through teaching; the discovery of a new faith in the democratic ideal and the place of education in achieving it, and the assurance of a modicum of freedom and security…It was the result of a challenge to think and act, coupled with the authority to do so."[174]

The fourth and final concern that convinced members of the Eight-Year Study's staff to place their trust in teachers and to seek to meet them on their own terms was the fact that teachers of the twentieth century were feeling overwhelmed by the responsibilities placed upon

---

[172] T.H. Broad, "Democracy in Administration and the New Curriculum," *High School Journal* 22 (1939): 295.
[173] Giles, McCutchen, and Zeichel, *Exploring the Curriculum*, 216.
[174] Ibid, 308.

them by external educational researchers who were seeking to professionalize teaching and stabilize the curriculum. One scholar noted that teachers were "expected to teach all day, work with parents and the community, collaborate with central staff personnel in thoroughgoing and continuing revisions of the curriculum, attend university classes in the evening and during the summers, translate the general pronouncements of educational theoreticians into usable here-and-now procedures, and in many increasingly bureaucratic school systems cooperate with mindless directives emanating from higher echelons in the system."[175] The staff was well aware that the work of the Study could result in teacher burnout and possible revolt. As such, they worked to ensure that teachers felt that the reforms were organic and could be implemented as painlessly as possible.

Emphasizing Interdisciplinary Cooperation and Curricular Coherence Wherever Possible

A well-known curriculum theorist had written in 1947 that "The vested interests of subject-matter departments tend to perpetuate themselves."[176] This statement captured the prevailing attitude of the general education movement and the staff of the Eight-Year Study. As the general education movement was geared against over-specialization, it seemed necessary that curricula be more coherent and that this should be accomplished by faculty cooperation.[177] Indeed, Aikin had chosen this as an issue to discuss early in the final report stating that "Teachers worked alone or in subject departments. The teacher of English limited his vision and concern to his own field; the teacher of science labored only to teach a certain body of scientific

---

[175] Robert J. Schaefer, "Retrospect and Prospect" in *The Curriculum: Retrospect and Prospect*, 23. A similar point is made by Herbst, *The Once and Future School*, 162. A different perspective is offered by Henry C. Johnson, Jr. and Erwin V. Johanningmeier who noted that teachers wholly embraced extra opportunities and sought them out to the point of putting strain on teacher education programs. See their book, *Teachers for the Prairie: The University of Illinois and the Schools, 1868-1945* (Urbana: University of Illinois Press, 1972), 272-273.

[176] J. Minor Gwynn, *Curriculum Principles and Social Trends* (New York: The Macmillan Company, 1947), 322. On Gwynn's renown in the curriculum field, see Schubert, et al., *Curriculum Books*, 91.

[177] On the history of the "pendulum swing" between coherence and specialization in the general education curriculum, see Kenneth J. Boning, "Coherence in General Education: A Historical Look," *Journal of General Education* 56 (2007): 1-16.

fact and skill. Seldom did they confer, and when they did, the results were usually unsatisfactory because neither understood the other's interests or problems."[178] The teachers and other participants of the Eight-Year Study were informed of this attitude. Borchers recalls that the Staff believed "that schools weren't unified enough, you see—that you took your own department and you worked in your own department and didn't pay much attention to see what was going on in the school."[179] She went on to recall how she worked in her own school to serve as a resource to other teachers who wished to integrate the content of her classes into their own. "What I taught in this was the unit on leisure time, but I also contributed to the other units." Borchers recalled, "For example, if they were having some trouble in science—I remember that Mr. Davis who was teaching a unit in science asked me to come in and talk to the students about the way they gave their reports. I assigned them time before they gave their reports, so they came to me and I helped them prepare their reports. Then they went in to the class and gave them. I would go as often as I could to observe this. In literature, I remember, the English teacher, Miss Springhorn, asked me to come in and evaluate their reading of poetry and help them with that. So you see, you went to a class where you could be of some help, and this was a new project."[180]

New Trier Township High School also reported similar views and actions and concluded that "There has been a gradual breaking down of departmental lines, along with a growing willingness to challenge traditional methods of approach and study seriously better ways of helping boys and girls."[181] The Ohio State University School also noted its own work in this area and suggested that it was "necessary for all members of the staff to think of the total program in terms of children, using the possible contributions of their areas as means to further the purposes

[178] Aikin, *The Story of the Eight-Year Study*, 8.
[179] Borchers, interview.
[180] Ibid.
[181] *Thirty Schools Tell*, 521.

of the school."[182] Finally, staff members would note their work in this area in national publications. For instance, staff member Helen M. Roberts noted her work in teaching reading at the Denver High Schools in a national work describing cooperative efforts in this content area.[183] The PEA also advertised the fact that "Artificial barriers between subjects and teaches are being removed. The useful teacher in the study is no longer a narrow, subject-matter specialist, living in a little world of his own, apart from the lives of his students. He is cooperating with other teachers, seeking to understand their subjects, interests, and points of view, and to discover how he may work most effectively with them. Sometimes five or six teachers work together as a committee under the chairmanship of one of them in planning and teaching a course."[184]

Competing Philanthropies and Views of Educational Evaluation

The Eight-Year Study represents a moment when the general education movement codified its approach to securing funding as well as the view of educational evaluation that would drive each of the cooperative studies undertaken and the resulting reforms. However, there were choices to be made in both realms. The Eight-Year Study proved to be the battleground in which options were tried and relationships and methods were set. In the field of philanthropic foundations committed to general education reform, the choice lay between the Carnegie and Rockefeller philanthropies and their "competing interests."[185]

The field of educational evaluation featured the competing views of William S. Learned and Ben D. Wood, on one hand, and Ralph W. Tyler on the other. As Carnegie-backed Learned and Wood and were fond of their views on evaluation, Tyler—with his new take on educational

---

[182] The Faculty of the School, "Eight-Year Study: A Report of the Ohio State University School to The Commission," 14.
[183] Helen M. Roberts, "Issues Relating to and Principles Underlying an Adequate Reading Program: In High Schools" in *Co-Operative Efforts in Schools to Improve Reading* ed. William S. Gray (Chicago: University of Chicago, Published in Conjunction with *The School Review* and *The Elementary School Journal*, 1942), 73-78.
[184] *Progressive Education Advances*, 26.
[185] Kridel and Bullough, "Conceptions," 79.

evaluation—would eventually establish a great rapport and relationship with the General Education Board of the Rockefeller Foundation. The resulting relationship would determine the course of the general education movement for the next fifteen years. This section examines the relationship between Learned and Wood and the Eight-Year Study before describing their marginalization from the Study. I then explore the ascendancy of Ralph W. Tyler as Director of Evaluation for the Study through a description of his work in the Study and the new tree of educational researchers who he hired, trained, and mentored. This final discussion is particularly important as both Tyler and his list of protégés would be intimately involved with the many cooperative studies discussed in this dissertation.

The Pennsylvania Study and its Relationship to the Eight-Year Study

Responding to much of the same institutional context of soaring enrollments as the Eight-Year Study and the general education movement, the state of Pennsylvania intended, in 1927, to examine their educational offerings. Seeking out expertise and philanthropic assistance, they found a man who was capable of bringing both: William S. Learned, "a prolific Carnegie Foundation staff member."[186] Learned believed that "enduring knowledge" defined as "that which has been so well organized and assimilated that it becomes a permanent part of the intellectual equipment and daily thinking of the person" was something that could be reliably and effectively measured.[187] Indeed, he was convinced that "no system of education can be adequate until we provide means for finding out what a student knows and can do before we begin to instruct him to a level where he can and will take hold for himself."[188] Working with Carnegie

[186] Ellen Condliffe Lagemann, *Private Power for the Public Good: A History of the Carnegie Foundation for the Advancement of Teaching* (Middletown, CT: Wesleyan University Press, 1983), 101.
[187] Walter A. Jessup, "Some Implications of the Survey of Education in Pennsylvania," *Educational Record* 17 (1936): 32.
[188] Ibid, 27.

funding, Learned headed a cooperative study entitled "The Study of the Relations of Secondary and Higher Education in Pennsylvania,"—better known as the "Pennsylvania Study." [189]

Beginning in 1928, this Study sought to test each Pennsylvania high school senior on the college preparatory track purely on the knowledge that they had acquired in high school. The Study would then test these same students as college sophomores in 1930 and as college seniors in 1932. Learned recruited an educational psychologist named Ben D. Wood to assist him in the creation of "objective," often multiple-choice tests. One staff member of the Pennsylvania Study described the tests as such:

> The questions were short, so that pupils could answer not just three or four but hundreds. They had a definitely right and a wrong answer, so that any persons who scored the test could, by following the key, come out with exactly the same score for any one paper. No leeway was left for the teacher's judgment. The papers were scored by experts, who had no other contact with the students. The tests do not pretend to measure character, personality, ideals, social qualities, health, or any other desirable characteristics. They are simply measures of what students know about subjects supposed to be important in general, cultural education. As measures of knowledge they are carefully constructed, and carefully scored, so that comparisons can be made between one individual and another, one institution and another, and the same person at different times during his college course.[190]

The results of the three tests eventually made their way on to "a cumulative record card with graphic analysis."[191] The three tests themselves and the methods of evaluation were considered universal enough for use in other states. The Study itself was heavily advertised by the Carnegie Foundation for the Advancement of Teaching. It was also seen as a great success by the

---

[189] On the Pennsylvania Study see William S. Learned and Ben D. Wood, *The Student and His Knowledge* (New York: The Carnegie Foundation for the Advancement of Teaching, 1938); William S. Learned and Anna Rose Hawkes, "An Experiment in Responsible Learning," *The Carnegie Foundation for the Advancement of Teaching Thirty-Fourth Annual Report* (Boston: The Merrymount Press, 1939), 45-75; Sydney V. Rowland, "Cooperative Study of Eighteen Pennsylvania Secondary Schools," *Educational Method* 20 (1941): 312-315; C. Robert Pace, *Measuring Outcomes of College: Fifty Years of Findings and Recommendations for the Future* (San Francisco: Jossey-Bass, 1979), 10-21; Lagemann, *Private Power for the Public Good*, 101-107; Shavelson, *Measuring College Learning Responsibly*, chapter three. A critical view of the Pennsylvania Study is offered by Nicholas Lemann, *The Big Test: The Secret History of the American Meritocracy* (New York: Farrar, Straus, and Giroux, 1999), 22-24.
[190] Goodwin Watson, *How Good Are Our Colleges?* (New York: Public Affairs Committee, 1938), 4.
[191] Howard J. Savage, *Fruit of an Impulse: Forty-Five Years of the Carnegie Foundation, 1905-1950* (New York: Harcourt, Brace and Company, 1953), 218.

foundation. Indeed, one of Learned and Wood's colleagues and contemporaries at the Carnegie Foundation, Howard J. Savage, would memorialize the Pennsylvania Study in a history of the Foundation written fifteen years after the Study ceased. "The Pennsylvania Study was one of the few educational inquiries," Savage wrote, "whether made by the Foundation or by any other agency, that can appropriately be called revolutionary, for it proposed a complete *bouleversement* of American higher education…Among educational studies it maintains [sic] very high place."[192]

Thus, in 1930 when a commission began in the Midwest with the purposes of examining the relationship between secondary and higher education with expressed interests in curriculum reform and in 1931 approached the Carnegie Foundation with a request for funding, the Foundation saw an opportunity to extend the success of the Pennsylvania Study.[193] The Carnegie Foundation provided a $20,000 grant and "ten days later a special committee on testing was announced for the study, and Learned sent to the chairman of the main group a batch of material pertaining to Pennsylvania Study tests."[194]

Learned and Wood became intimately involved with what was to become the Eight-Year Study in its initial four years. Their desire, however, was to use the tests of the Pennsylvania Study—particularly the General Culture Test. This was unacceptable to the school personnel who perceived Learned as simply representing a new type of rigidity. Put simply, they did not just throw off one set of shackles (the requirements of the colleges) for a new set (the tests developed by the Pennsylvania Study).[195] By 1934—just the first functional year of the Eight-Year Study—a standoff had emerged between the participating schools and the Evaluation team

---

[192] Ibid, 219-220.
[193] Much of the story of Learned and Wood's ouster and Tyler's early work with the Eight-Year Study is told in Echols, "The Rise" 242-248.
[194] Thigpen, "The Development and Evolution," 55-56; Savage, *Fruit of an Impulse*, 227.
[195] Lagemann, *Private Power for the Public Good*, 112-114.

headed by Learned and Wood. Ralph W. Tyler recalled the reaction of the Eight-Year Study participants to using a test developed by the Pennsylvania Study: "The schools rebelled; [the information on the test] wasn't what they were trying to teach, therefore it would not be a fair measure of their efforts. They threatened to drop out of the study. This produced a crisis in the summer of 1934 at the time of the annual meeting of the participants."[196]

As one commentator writing about secondary education in 1935 had perceptively observed, very little school reform or activity would occur in any capacity "beyond the degree voluntarily suffered or approved by the public school authorities themselves."[197] And so it proved. This issue was solved with the marginalization and eventual ouster of Learned and Wood from the Eight-Year Study. However, this put the funding and support given by the Carnegie Foundation in serious jeopardy.

The Appointment of Ralph W. Tyler and a New Quest for Philanthropic Funding

Deprived of a director and staff of evaluation as well as necessary philanthropic funding, the Eight-Year Study appeared to be doomed. However, the Directing Committee of the Study sought out Ralph W. Tyler, then a professor of education in his early-thirties at the Ohio State University.[198] He was well qualified to serve as a key leader in a cooperative study as he had considerable experience in working on these sorts of projects with one of his colleagues and

---

[196] Nowakowski, "An Interview," 10; Tyler, "What was Learned," 31; Tyler, "Education: Curriculum Development" esp. 72-73; Echols, "The Rise" 258-261.

[197] Matthew H. Willing, "Recent Trends in American Secondary Education" in *The Academic and Professional Preparation of Secondary-School Teachers* ed. William S. Gray (Chicago: University of Chicago Press, 1935), 10. The different approaches that were taken by Learned and Wood and Tyler mirrored a larger debate over forms of testing that had a longer history. "Progressive" educators tended to be suspicious of "objective" tests. On this see Gerard Giordano, *How Testing Came to Dominate the Schools: The History of Educational Assessment* (New York: Peter Lang, 2005), chapter 5, esp. 120-130.

[198] Echols, "The Rise" 261-264. On Tyler's career see George H. Lackey, Jr. and Michael D. Rowls, *Wisdom in Education: The Views of Ralph Tyler* (Columbia: Museum of Education, McKissick Museum, University of South Carolina, 1989); Morris Finder, *Educating America: How Ralph W. Tyler Taught America to Teach* (Westport, CT: Praeger, 2004); Daniel Tanner, *Crusade for Democracy: Progressive Education at the Crossroads* Revised Edition (Albany: State University of New York Press, 2015), chapter five.

mentors at Ohio State, Werrett Wallace (W.W.) Charters.[199] In working with Charters on these projects, Tyler learned not to "think of himself as a professional educator but rather as a social scientist who used its base disciplines to attack the problems of education."[200] Beyond experience in the management of human and intellectual resources, Tyler would also credit his early work on cooperative projects with Charters as the moment when he began to realize that it was necessary to start with the most practical issue that was being reported "from the trenches"—so to speak—and work one's way back to the major objectives being sought by the participants.[201] Indeed, up to this point Tyler's career had been focused on developing a new theory of educational evaluation. "In writing in 1934" he recalled shortly before his death in 1994, "I tried to point out how we tried to depend too much on one single assessment. [The problem is] to find out what data we want and how to do it best."[202] Though he was a colleague who was on good terms with Ben D. Wood, he did have considerably different views on evaluation.[203]

Upon Tyler's appointment, the Directing Committee and Tyler met with Frederick Keppel of the Carnegie Corporation to inquire about funding Tyler's directorship and providing resources for a staff. Keppel noted that he was unable to support the Evaluative portion of the

---

[199] On the career of Charters, see Sheldon A. Rosenstock, "The Educational Contributions of W(errett) W(allace) Charters" (PhD diss., Ohio State University, 1984).
[200] David R. Krathwohl, "Lessons Learned from Ralph W. Tyler" in *Teachers and Mentors: Profiles of Distinguished Twentieth-Century Professors of Education* eds. Craig Kridel, Robert V. Bullough, Jr., and Paul Shaker (New York: Garland, 1996), 40.
[201] Ralph W. Tyler, "The Leader of Major Educational Projects," *Educational Research Bulletin* 32 (1953): 42-52; Echols, "The Rise" 187-189. On Tyler's training with Charters see Antonelli, "Ralph W. Tyler," 144-150. Antonelli discusses the influences of George S. Counts, Franklin Bobbitt, and Charles S. Judd as well, 126-144.
[202] Rosalind Horowitz, "A 75-Year Legacy on Assessment: Reflections from an Interview with Ralph W. Tyler," *Journal of Educational Research* 89 (1995): 71.
[203] On Tyler's friendship with Ben D. Wood, see Ralph W. Tyler, interview by Isabel S. Grossener, June 7, 1969, transcript, p. 40-44. "Reminisces of Ralph Winifred Tyler—Carnegie Corporation Project, Oral History Research Office, Columbia University, 1969" Columbia Center for Oral History/Rare Book and Manuscript Library, Columbia University, New York, NY; Echols, "The Rise" 190. On Wood's views of evaluation see Lemann, *The Big Test*, esp. 34-39. For information on Wood, see Matthew T. Downey, *Ben D. Wood: Educational Reformer* (Princeton: Educational Testing Service, 1965).

Eight-Year Study. This was likely a result of the numerous objections raised by William S. Learned.[204] Ultimately, Keppel suggested that Carnegie might provide minimal support to the "Records and Reports Program—" the portion of the Study charged with keeping information on students. [205] As mentioned before, there were really only two options for major philanthropic funding: The Carnegie or Rockefeller philanthropies. Thus, Tyler and the larger Eight-Year Study were left with one option for philanthropic funding: The General Education Board. Keppel himself was aware of this fact as well and even agreed to assist toward this end by putting in a favorable word with Edmund Ezra Day, a high-ranking Rockefeller official. This was fortunate for the Eight-Year Study personnel as Keppel retired shortly thereafter and was succeeded by Walter A. Jessup, who had great empathy for Learned, Wood, and the Pennsylvania Study. Tyler himself would later report that he was unable to secure much funding from any Carnegie philanthropy for any project under Jessup's tenure.[206]

Turning to the General Education Board, the Eight-Year Study delegation found a foundation that had taken aim at "the standardized and academically focused high school curriculum that the Carnegie Foundation had helped bring about."[207] While Keppel's recommendation to Day was useful, the Eight-Year Study personnel—in particular Tyler—would require more contacts at the GEB in order to secure the level of funding necessary to execute Tyler's plan. At this time, the Carnegie and Rockefeller philanthropies relied on "key

---

[204] These concerns are discussed in Savage, *Fruit of an Impulse*, 227. Savage also notes a "delegation's seeking further 'Carnegie money' in the autumn of 1936" that was unsuccessful. Ibid. Lagemann also notes that the Eight-Year Study "certainly played an unstated but important role in the rupture" between the Carnegie Foundation and the Progressive Education Association. Lagemann, *Private Power for the Public Good*, 114.

[205] The meeting with Frederick Keppel is recounted in Tyler, interview by Grossener, "Reminisces," transcript, p. 6-10.

[206] Tyler, interview by Grossener, "Reminisces," transcript, p. 14-17.

[207] Pamela Barnhouse Walters and Emily A. Bowman, "Foundations and the Making of Public Education in the United States, 1867-1950" in *American Foundations: Roles and Contributions* eds. Helmut K. Anheier and David C. Hammack (Washington, D.C.: Brookings Institution Press, 2010), 45-46. The story of the Carnegie Unit can be seen in Ellsworth Tompkins and Walter H. Gaumnitz, *The Carnegie Unit: Its Origin, Status, and Trends* (Washington, D.C.: Government Printing Office, 1954); Valentine, *The College Board*; Harold S. Wechsler, "Eastern Standard Time: High School-College Collaboration and Admission to College, 1880-1930" in *A Faithful Mirror*, 43-79.

men" or "circuit riders" who were recruited from professions and industry and would lend their expertise in judging proposals for funding for their respective enterprises.[208] The more of these foundations officers that one knew, the more likely their work would be funded. Thinking of who he might contact at the GEB, Tyler recalled an educator who had taught his children science at the Ohio State University School: Robert J. Havighurst.[209]

Havighurst had been a teacher at a school that was participating in the Eight-Year Study. Tyler had a good rapport with Havighurst while he was a teacher and had worked with him closely to refine his teaching. In 1972, Havighurst would write to one historian regarding a moment when Tyler asked him about his objectives in teaching science. Havighurst noted that this had this made a tremendous impact on his teaching.[210] "From that time on," Havighurst told an interviewer in 1977, "I was buddy-buddy with Tyler. We have been close ever since, think a great deal alike."[211] Tyler wrote to his friend about the funding situation. Havighurst, as Assistant Director of the General Education Board (he would become Director in 1937), was able to provide $50,000 "for the evaluation staff to function. Salaries for the chairman and the regular staff ($12,000), salaries for research assistants ($12,000) and funds for travel and conferences ($15,000)" by 1936.[212] Havighurst was also later able to oversee a program where the GEB supported a number of cooperative studies "modeled largely after the Eight Year

---

[208] Patricia L. Rosenfield, *A World of Giving: Carnegie Corporation of New York—A Century of International Philanthropy* (New York: PublicAffairs, 2014), 98.
[209] Tyler, "Education: Curriculum Development," 73. Havighurst had been on staff at the Ohio State University School since its opening in 1932. On his tenure there and the history of the institution see Robert W. Butche, *Image of Excellence: The Ohio State University School* (New York: Peter Lang, 2000), 131-132. For biographical information on Havighurst, see Andrew T. Kopan, "Robert J. Havighurst: Pursuit of Excellence" in *Rethinking Urban Education* eds. Herbert J. Walberg and Andrew T. Kopan (San Francisco: Jossey-Bass, 1972), 317-324. Other essays in this *festschrift* also provide insight on Havighurst.
[210] "Robert J. Havighurst to James Phillip Echols" 5 January 1972. Cited in Echols, "The Rise" 268.
[211] "Robert J. Havighurst, interview with Joseph Anthony O'Shea, June 8, 1977" cited in Joseph Anthony O'Shea, "An Inquiry into the Development of the University of Chicago Evaluation Movement" (PhD diss., University of Illinois at Urbana-Champaign, 1979), 48.
[212] Ibid, 48-49.

Study." As early as 1941—a mere five years later—he was able to point to no fewer than twenty examples of cooperative studies financed by the GEB.[213]

While Havighurst was influential in his funding, he was instrumental in helping to refine the methods of the Eight-Year Study. Historian Joseph Anthony O'Shea lists three methods that were innovated by Tyler, Havighurst, and their associates. The first involved bringing teachers from each of the participating high schools to Columbus, Ohio to work with the evaluation staff that Tyler had created for the purposes of assisting the school personnel. The second involved visiting each individual school often for the purposes of on-site consultancy. O'Shea then suggests that the "third strategy for obtaining involvement was the development of the Summer Workshop. The purpose of these workshops was to train teachers in methods of evaluation. It was decided in the spring of 1936 by Tyler and Havighurst that the teachers should…participate in an 'institute.'"[214] By 1938, Tyler had accepted the chair of the Department of Education at the University of Chicago and Havighurst was able to facilitate enough funding for Tyler to relocate almost every staff member working on the Study from Ohio State to Chicago.[215]

Ralph W. Tyler and a New Approach to Educational Evaluation and Reform

In many ways, Tyler's approach to evaluation was developed from and refined through a series of experiments over the course of the Eight-Year Study and future cooperative studies to arrive at a theory of educational evaluation.[216] For this reason, one history of educational evaluation noted that Tyler is "often referred to, quite properly…as the father of educational

---

[213] Robert J. Havighurst, "Assistance Given to Cooperative Educational Experiments by Foundations," *Educational* Method 20 (1941): 331-334, esp. Tables 1 and 2.
[214] O'Shea, "An Inquiry into the Development" 49-52, quote on 52.
[215] Ralph W. Tyler to Frederick L. Redefer, 17 January 1942, Box 4, F: Evaluation in the Eight Year Study – Financial Statements, Progressive Education Association Papers, Record Series Number 10/6/20, Archives Research Center, University of Illinois at Urbana-Champaign, Champaign, IL. Hereafter cited as "PEA Papers."
[216] Ralph W. Tyler, "Toward Improved Curriculum Theory: The Inside Story," *Curriculum Inquiry* 6 (1977): 254; Rumjahn, "A Chronicle of the Professional Activities of Ralph W. Tyler," 87-88.

evaluation."[217] Though a concise statement of Tyler's views on educational evaluation would not appear until 1949 when the University of Chicago Press convinced him to expand a course syllabus into the classic *Basic Principles of Curriculum and Instruction*, his views were more or less applied throughout the Eight-Year Study.[218] Tyler's view of evaluation is briefly summarized by himself in the following passage:

> Unless instruction is to be merely a haphazard or intuitively guided process, it requires rational planning and execution in terms of the plans. Viewed in this way, instruction involves several steps. The first of these is to decide what ends to seek, that is, what objectives to aim at or, stated more precisely, what changes in students' behavior to try to bring about. The second step is to determine what content and learning experiences can be used that are likely to attain these ends, these changes in student behavior. The third step is to determine an effective organization of these learning experiences so that their cumulative effect will be such as to bring about the desired behavior changes in an efficient fashion. Finally, the fourth step is to appraise the effects of the learning experiences to find out in what ways they have been effective and in what respects they have not produced the results desired. Obviously, this fourth step is educational measurement, or achievement testing.[219]

Put simply, instructors must identify their objectives clearly. To describe objectives, Tyler noted that "each subject which is taught is offered with the expectation that students who take this subject will undergo certain desired changes as a result of the course."[220] Objectives were these "desired changes" that were expected by instructors. Any instructor, or better so,

---

[217] George F. Madaus and Daniel L. Stufflebeam, "Program Evaluation: A Historical Overview" in *Evaluation Models: Viewpoints on Educational and Human Services Evaluation* second edition eds. Daniel L. Stufflebeam, George F. Madaus, and Thomas Kellaghan (Boston: Kluwer Academic Publishers, 2000), 8. These authors also refer to the period between 1930 and 1945 as the "Tylerian Age."

[218] Ralph W. Tyler, *Basic Principles of Curriculum and Instruction* (Chicago: University of Chicago Press, 1949). Peter S. Hlebowitsh, Foreword to *Basic Principles of Curriculum and Instruction*, by Ralph W. Tyler (1949; Chicago: University of Chicago Press, 2013), vii-xii; Richard David Levy, "A Study of Ralph W. Tyler's Statement, Development, and Later Modifications of His Rationale as Set Forth in His *Basic Principles of Curriculum and Instruction* (Ed.D., Dissertation, Temple University, 1972). A broad synthesis, however, of Tyler's philosophy of evaluation appears in George F. Madaus and Daniel Stufflebeam, eds., *Educational Evaluation: Classic Works of Ralph W. Tyler* (Boston: Kluwer Academic Publishers, 1989), 4-5.

[219] Ralph W. Tyler, "The Functions of Measurement in Improving Instruction" in *Educational Leadership* ed. E.F. Lindquist (Washington, D.C.: American Council on Education, 1951), 48.

[220] R.W. Tyler, "Identification and Definition of the Objectives to be Measured" in *The Construction and Use of Achievement Examinations: A Manual for Secondary School Teachers Prepared Under the Auspices of a Committee of the American Council on Education* eds. Herbert E. Hawkes, E.F. Lindquist, and C.R. Mann (Boston: Houghton Mifflin, 1936), 4.

group of cooperative instructors working in a program or school could define so long as they created "a list of objectives which is reasonably complete" and explicated "the objectives in such clear and definite terms that they can serve as guides in the making of the examination questions."[221] Tests could be any "instrument which gives evidence of the degree to which students are reaching the objectives of teaching."[222] Tyler's view of evaluation was also iterative in that the assessments informed the objectives and *vice versa*.[223]

Tyler's view of evaluation provided a stark contrast to Learned and Wood and the Pennsylvania Study. Indeed, the foreword to the final report of the Pennsylvania Study noted that "It is a fundamental thesis of the volume that the student is of more importance than the curriculum. His growth in knowledge and in wisdom is at the core of the educational process."[224] In contrast, Tyler had proclaimed as early as 1931 that "Great improvement has taken place in recent years in the methods of examining by which we may find out how much students remember. Now we must go beyond that. Any comprehensive evidence of student achievement should reveal other aspects of learning in addition to the information recalled. The fundamental task in constructing achievement tests is to make certain that all of the important objectives of the subject and course are adequately measured."[225] Tyler believed that objectives could be broad enough to include "habits, skills, attitudes, *knowledge*, interests, appreciations, and ways of thinking…more effective study skills…a wider range of significant interests, social rather than selfish attitudes."[226]

---

[221] Ibid, 4, 8.
[222] Ibid, 4-5.
[223] Tyler, "The Functions of Measurement" in *Educational Leadership*, 49; Madaus and Stufflebeam, eds., *Educational Evaluation*, 91.
[224] Walter A. Jessup, Foreword to Learned and Wood, *The Student*, vii.
[225] Ralph W. Tyler, "The Development of Examinations at Ohio State University" in *Recent Trends in American College Education* ed. William S. Gray (Chicago: University of Chicago Press, 1931), 228.
[226] Ralph W. Tyler, "The School Curriculum in General" in *Grand Rapids School Survey, Grand Rapids, Michigan* eds. Committee on Field Services, Department of Education, University of Chicago (Grand Rapids, MI: Grand

Moreover, tests could take multiple forms. "Many people have limited the concept of an examination of a paper and pencil test." Tyler noted in 1936. "This is obviously a harmful limitation. Sometimes the best way to get evidence of the desirable changes which are taking place in students is through observation, or by other means."[227] This was anathema to Learned, who had referred to "one suggestion [by an Eight-Year Study participant] concerning the possibility of substituting committee appraisals for the results of achievement tests…as 'downright silly.'"[228] While Learned may have criticized these ideas as subjective, the teachers of the Eight-Year Study were expressing what may have been a common feeling among practitioners: test results were difficult to discern meaning from and were impractical. Conversely, Tyler believed that evaluation should provide meaningful assessments that did not sacrifice rigor. Tyler noted, "Records and judgments which are highly subjective need to be made more objective," but would later argue in the same essay "We need means for expressing results in terms of units which have some social significance. Test scores are commonly expressed in terms of abstract numbers. These can be treated mathematically and are useful for certain purposes, but they are not directly translatable into units of value of which we can readily apprehend."[229]

Clearly, then, Tyler not only had the ideas, but the human touch to take the Study in a different direction. Writing in 1936, shortly after the ousting of Learned and Wood, a likely disturbed Wilford M. Aikin noted that "The first years of the eight-year experiment have been

---

Rapids Board of Education, 1949), 184. (italics added for emphasis); Ralph W. Tyler, "Purposes and Procedures of the Evaluation Staff" in *Appraising and Recording*, 3.

[227] Tyler, "Identification and Definition," 4-5. A number of reflections and different testing methods are provided in Ralph W. Tyler, *Constructing Achievement Testing* (Columbus, OH: The Bureau of Educational Research at Ohio State University, 1934). For the history of *Constructing Achievement Testing* see Echols, "The Rise" 194-211.

[228] Lagemann, *Private Power for the Public Good*, 113.

[229] Ralph W. Tyler, "Needed Research in the Field of Tests and Examinations" in *Proceedings of the Institute for Administrative Officers of Higher Institutions, Volume VIII: Tests and Measurements in Higher Education* ed. William S. Gray (Chicago: University of Chicago Press, 1936), 234-236.

characterized by confident assurance and puzzled questioning; clear thinking and confused fumbling; fresh, vigorous attack upon our problems; straightened, constricted, ineffective, tradition-bound attempts to meet the challenge which our new freedom has brought."[230] The arrival of Tyler represented new life and purpose for the Eight-Year Study.

Ralph W. Tyler and Evaluation in the Eight-Year Study

Historian Carol M. Thigpen noted that "The significance of Tyler's appointment was that he brought together the problems of curriculum, control, testing, and evaluation through his unique and comprehensive approach to the direction of the evaluation study, and he introduced the element of scientific methodology into the study."[231] This section focuses on his approach to evaluation that ultimately proved influential upon the other issues that Thigpen noted. Upon his appointment to Director of Evaluation in the summer of 1934, Tyler pledged to visit each of the participating schools in the following year and succeeded in this task.[232] Much of the reason for these visits was to help schools identify weaknesses and to ultimately clarify their objectives as they moved forward to restructure their programs. The visits revolved around implementing a "general procedure" that resulted in an "evaluation program" for each school. This procedure "involved seven major steps… *Formulating Objectives…Classification of Objectives…Defining Objectives in Terms of Behavior…Suggesting Situations in Which the Achievement of Objectives Will Be Shown…Selecting and Trying Promising Evaluation Methods…Developing and Improving Appraisal Methods…Interpreting Results*."[233] This section traces how this procedure took place.

---

[230] Wilford M. Aikin, "The First Years of the Eight-Year Experimental Study," *Educational Record* 17 (1936): 71.
[231] Thigpen, "The Development and Evolution," 95.
[232] Aikin, "The First Years," 77.
[233] Tyler, "Purposes and Procedures," 15-25.

Of these particular issues, formulating objectives took precedent. Though the schools were well aware of what they considered to be their weaknesses, and had definite ideas about how they might like their restructured programs to function, their objectives proved to be quite broad. Aikin drew off of Tyler's early theoretical work to describe how schools worked closely with Tyler and the Evaluation Staff to revise their objectives. "Statements of objectives often have little meaning. Sometimes they are couched in such general terms that they provide no guidance." Aikin wrote, echoing Tyler's sentiments, "On the other hand," he continued, "so many detailed, specific objectives are often listed that no sense of direction is indicated. The member schools encountered both of these difficulties early in the Study. Later when they were asked to restate their objectives in terms of desirable changes in pupils—changes which could be observed or discovered objectively—meaningless generalization and multiplicity of purpose were much less in evidence in the revisions."[234] While Tyler and his Evaluation Staff had it in their minds to assist in clarifying objectives, this was accomplished by a dialogue. "The staff members raised questions and suggested directions for discussion which would define or clarify the given type of objective," Tyler explained, "but most of the defining was done by the representatives of the school which had emphasized this type of objective."[235]

Tyler's visits were considered successful by the summer of 1935. "Since Mr. Tyler's association with the project," Aikin remarked at the Third Annual Conference of the Study, "schools have stated more succinctly their objectives, and now we must determine whether or not we are moving in the right direction to accomplish these goals and purposes."[236] Eventually, this type of thinking filtered down to the school personnel themselves. Reflecting on their participation in the Eight-Year Study, the Denver public high school system noted that "One of

[234] Aikin, *The Story of the Eight-Year Study*, 132.
[235] Ralph W. Tyler, "Purposes and Procedures," 28.
[236] Commission on the Relation of School and College, "Report of the Third Annual Conference," 2.

the outcomes of the participation of the Denver secondary schools in the Eight-Year Study has been the increased emphasis given to the development of a school program in terms of clearly defined purposes…the whole program is likely to fall apart if there is no connection among the objectives of the school, the experiences of the boys and girls in the classroom, and evaluation instruments."[237]

After formulating objectives, a necessary curriculum would need to be put into place. Tyler was merely the Director of Evaluation and the Eight-Year Study had a curriculum committee headed up by Harold B. Alberty, a colleague of Tyler's at Ohio State University. Describing an interview he conducted with Ralph W. Tyler, historian Richard David Levy noted that Alberty and his Curriculum staff felt that their counterparts in Evaluation were much more effective and asked Tyler to come up with a similar theory and set of procedures for the Curriculum staff to use.[238] The resolution was that curriculum be tied to the very same objectives that each school had articulated to Tyler. Subsequently, the curriculum staff was trained in Tyler's burgeoning method. They also would end up speaking the same language as Tyler.

By the following year, Alberty would note in a piece distributed to the participating schools and the nation, "It is evident to all who have had experience in formulating educational objectives that there is frequently a wide gulf between the theory expressed in the objectives, and the practice of the school."[239] Writing in their final report of the Eight-Year Study, the curriculum staff observed that "The objectives of a school are the guide posts that indicate the direction in which the program is pointed. In order to give such direction clearly and forcibly,

---

[237] *Thirty Schools Tell*, 159, 186.
[238] Levy, "A Study of Ralph W. Tyler's Statement" 54. Tyler also describes this conversation in Ralph W. Tyler, "A Rationale for Program Evaluation" in *Evaluation Models*, 93. On the broader influence of Tyler on the curriculum staff see Bradford Robert Smith, "Curriculum Integration in the Eight-Year Study of the Progressive Education Association, 1932-1940: Three Schools Tell Their Story" (PhD diss., Pennsylvania State University, 1996), 108-110.
[239] Alberty, "The Social Philosophy," 7.

objectives need careful analysis and specific direction. The participation of the entire staff in defining the nature of the program is essential. A school staff must achieve both unity of purpose and cooperative action for the fulfillment of purpose."[240] Even the many reports devoted to individual subjects (e.g. social studies, mathematics) and produced for wide consumption shared Tyler's views. For instance, the report on social studies contained the following lines in its introduction: "The Committee has recognized, in preparing the Report, that social-studies teachers possess varying equipment, work under varying conditions, and face various problems. Therefore, no specific form of curriculum reorganization has been recommended as universally applicable, either in general or with particular respect to the social studies. Curriculum organization must take into account the specific situations and specific problems of particular teachers."[241]

Following the creation of curriculum, evaluation instruments needed to be produced and tested for each school. These evaluations were specific to each school. Faculty members and administrators from each school would assist in their development, experiment with them, and then provide feedback to the Evaluation Staff who would subsequently incorporate this feedback in their revisions to the instruments. "It is especially important," Tyler noted, "that every effort which offers promise be evaluated in terms of the purposes for which the program is adopted. Only by this means can we benefit from the experiences of the schools taking part in these significant educational experiments…No one uniform program of evaluation can be used in all schools…In so far as the purposes of individual schools differ, the plan of evaluation will differ accordingly."[242]

---

[240] Giles, McCutchen, and Zechiel, *Exploring the Curriculum*, 20.
[241] Committee on the Function of the Social Studies in General Education, *The Social Studies in General Education* (New York: D. Appleton-Century Company, 1940), vi.
[242] Tyler, "Evaluation: A Challenge," 9, 12.

The development of localized evaluation instruments and their constant evolution and revision based upon observations related to their implementation served one of the purposes of the evaluation program, which was to lend merit to the idea behind the Eight-Year Study itself. In particular, it lent merit to the idea that the Study could demonstrate to colleges that students prepared outside of the current "Carnegie Unit" schema would prosper in their postsecondary careers as well. The second type of merit that the evaluation program lent to the Eight-Year Study was aimed at having other schools across the nation see that this *method* of reform could work in local communities, thereby fulfilling the promise of the Eight-Year Study as generalizable.[243] As Tyler reported at the Third Annual Conference in 1935, "schools outside the experiment are awaiting the effectiveness of the program."[244] He would also observe in the final report of the Evaluation Staff that "This plan has wide applicability. It provides a way in which technicians in testing and evaluation may work constructively with teachers and school officers to develop an evaluation program. It avoids the danger on the one hand of having instruments constructed by technicians who are not clear about the curriculum and guidance program of the school, and on the other hand the formulation of an evaluation program by persons who are relatively unfamiliar with methods of describing measuring human behavior."[245] Tyler's phrase "this plan" is synonymous with the phrase I have been using thus far: "this method of working."

There was a wide market for these instruments as other schools wished to study them, and in some cases, tailor them to their own needs. As one author would note in 1942, "The 'P.E.A. tests' are now a household phrase among high-school teachers."[246] To ensure the wide availability of the "Eight-Year Study test materials" after the Study had completed, the

---

[243] Eunice Barnard, "Progressives Hail New Type School," *New York Times*, 1 August 1937.
[244] Commission on the Relation of School and College, "Report of the Third Annual Conference," 3.
[245] Ralph W. Tyler, "Purposes and Procedures of the Evaluation Staff" in *Appraising and Recording*, 29.
[246] "The Story of the Eight-Year Study," *School Review* 50 (1942): 328.

Cooperative Test Service—ironically and significantly the very same service which produced the "General Culture Test" for the Pennsylvania Study that the Eight-Year Study schools had rejected—purchased their copyrights.[247]

Ralph W. Tyler and the New Tree of Educational Reformers

The Evaluation Staff that Tyler nurtured and the Curriculum Staff that he assisted during the time in the Eight-Year Study would not only innovate and practice the methods of reform that would shape the general education movement, but would also train a generation of educational researchers who would go on to participate in—and in some instances lead—cooperative studies of general education on their own. As such, it is crucial to understand not just whom Tyler trained—a coterie that "consisted mostly of men and women who were young, untrained in techniques of measurement, and deeply committed to Tyler"—but also how they served as "'apostles and evangelists' for the new approach" not only to evaluation but to curriculum reform as a whole.[248] As one of Tyler's students put it, "Tyler's ideas, or at least the ideas we seem to identify closely with him, were conceived with a lot of people, who themselves were not only part of their creation but published on them too."[249] Therefore, this section will explore Tyler's views on training educational researchers (often through serving as an administrator and adviser) and provide a list of names that will certainly be reflected in the collegiate cooperative studies of general education discussed in further chapters. The list of names is quite significant not only to trace the influence of the ideas of Tyler on the general education movement, but to understand how the projects of the general education movement

[247] Vinal H. Tibbets to K.W. Vaughn, 10 September 1945, Box 4, F: Eight-Year Study Test – Copyrights, 1936, 1939, 1945, PEA Papers; Nowakowski, "An Interview," 10. On the Cooperative Test Service see Ann E. Jarvella Wilson, "Knowledge for Teachers: The National Teacher Examinations Program, 1940 to 1970" (PhD diss., University of Wisconsin, 1984), 74-84.
[248] Lagemann, *An Elusive Science*, 143.
[249] J. Thomas Hastings, "Tyler's Behavioral Objectives: Background Sources, Early Use, and Some Stream-Odds" in *Improving Inquiry in Social Science: A Volume in Honor of Lee J. Cronbach* eds. Richard E. Snow and David E. Wiley (Hillsdale, NJ: Lawrence Erlbaum Associates, 1991), 315.

generated broader theories about curriculum reform: ideas that would help to define the very matrix of influence discussed in chapter one.

At the age of ninety-one, having lost much of his hearing, and finally slowing down, Tyler was interviewed by James E. McLean. "I understand that [the Eight-Year Study] served as a training ground for a whole generation of educational researchers. Can you tell us a few of the people who worked on this study with you?" McLean asked. "Yes!" Tyler perked up. "I had three associate directors of evaluation-Oscar Buros, Louis Raths, and Maurice Hartung. Some of my other associates and assistants were Bruno Bettelheim, Hilda Taba, Harold Trimble, Christine McGuire, and Chester Harris. There were many others, but I cannot recall all their names right now."[250] This list may be supplemented by the following names that Tyler credited in a 1976 lecture: Harold Alberty, Benjamin Bloom, Lee Cronbach, Paul Diederich, H.H. Giles, Louis Heil, Donald McNassor, [and] George Sheviakov"[251]

Though Tyler drew a blank on many of the people he trained by 1993, his enthusiasm in his old age for the question showed exactly how crucial training educational researchers was to him. He looked at himself as an administrator who attempted to live up the idea that administration was "the art of the possible"—a quotation he frequently misattributed to Lord Acton.[252] "I conceive a task of the administrator to find what appears to be a bright and able young man, then not to put him into a nitch [sic]," he had reflected some years earlier, "but to

---

[250] James E. McLean, "Sixty Years of Research in the Schools: A Conversation with Ralph W. Tyler," *Research in the Schools* 1 (1994): 7. "Training ground" was the phrase also used by Madaus and Stufflebeam, *Educational Evaluation*, 90 to describe the Eight-Year Study.
[251] Tyler, "Educational Benchmarks in Retrospect" 41. Tyler also discusses those he trained in the Eight-Year Study in Tyler "Education: Curriculum Development," 102, 112-113.
[252] Tyler notes this quote and its influence on him in Kevin Ryan, John Johnston, and Katherine Newman, "An Interview with Ralph Tyler," *Phi Delta Kappan* 58 (1977): 547; Nowakowski, "An Interview," 20. Though Tyler attributed this quote to Lord Acton, Elizabeth Knowles has noted that this is frequently misattributed and should be credited to Otto Van Bismarck. See Elizabeth Knowles, ed., *What They Didn't Say: A Book of Misquotations* (New York: Oxford University Press, 2006), 88.

help him find himself and where he could use his talents and then support and encourage that."[253] A number of his associates and biographers have noted his ability as "a supreme delegator of responsibility" and a "superb nurturer of talent."[254] One scholar would even go as far as to proclaim that "Tyler had a remarkable aptitude for discovering and nurturing the talents of others…Tyler's uncanny instinct for high human capacity, together with his altruistic spirit and profound belief in the value of unfettering the best in others, was a formidable force."[255]

Major Innovations in General Education Reform

In this section, I trace the major innovations—or methods of working—that the Eight-Year Study employed. The term innovation can be a bit of a misnomer without considering the following qualification. In some cases, these methods of working were innovated and tried out on a wide scale for the very first time by the Eight-Year Study. In other cases, however, these methods were merely adapted from other contexts to suit the needs of the participating schools. In all cases, though, these methods were built upon in future cooperative studies of general education. I begin by examining the practice of school visits by consultants—who were either educational researchers, philanthropists, or fellow teachers—to participating schools. Next, I turn my attention to workshops and some of the evaluative tools that emerged from these workshops. I then explore student assistance to reform efforts. I conclude by examining the means by which information about reform was distributed between the schools as well as its advertisement to the wider educational and policy world.

Consultancies

---

[253] Nowakowski, "An Interview," 20.
[254] Krathwohl, "Lessons Learned" in *Teachers and Mentors*, 37, 36.
[255] Lou Rubin, "Ralph W. Tyler Remembered," *Educational Leadership* 51 (1994): 84. See also Gerald Ponder and Dixie D. Massey, "Nothing So Uncommon: Ralph W. Tyler and His Defining Perspective" in *Critical Times in Curriculum Thought: People, Politics, and Perspectives* ed. Marcella L. Kysilka (Charlotte, NC: Information Age Publishing, 2011), 51.

Though consultancies by educational researchers were not invented by the Eight-Year Study, it was their extensive usage here that popularized the practice in cooperative studies and in curriculum reform.[256] Consultancies involved utilizing members of the Eight-Year Study staff—equipped with either curricular or the evaluative expertise—who would visit schools to see what services they might render for the participants. The consultancy service was perhaps the most crucial to the success of the Study, as the "6 university schools, 8 of the 13 private schools, and 2 of the 10 public schools called for little or nothing" beyond the consultancy service.[257] As such, the consultants remained "on call," as opposed to taking a more systematic approach of visiting schools.[258] Much of the work of the curriculum consultants was reported in the final report by H.H. Giles, S.P. McCutchen, and A.N. Zeichel, *Exploring the Curriculum: The Work of the Thirty Schools from the Viewpoint of Curriculum Consultants*. However, their work can be distilled to saying that they assisted each school in clarifying their objectives to whatever extent they could and then worked closely to develop—and constantly reform—a curriculum that obtained those objectives.

As mentioned before, the Eight-Year Study staff was interested in ensuring the autonomy of the schools as they had promised. It was the consultants who were in greatest danger of violating this principle, so each consultant took pains to simply provide services as the schools requested. The final report of their work noted that the consultants "had no authority and no desire to impose a ready-made program" and as such, "its services were given and valued according to what could be done to help teachers and others improve their work."[259] Their

---

[256] Andrew Frederic Schott, "The Role of the Consultant in Curriculum Change: Selected Schools of the Eight Year Study of the Progressive Education Association and the Seven County Study of the Michigan Community Health Project: Volume I" (PhD diss., University of Wisconsin, 1952), esp. 1-3.
[257] H.H. Giles, S.P. McCutchen, and A.N. Zeichel, *Exploring the Curriculum*: *The Work of the Thirty Schools from the Viewpoint of the Curriculum Consultant* (New York: Harper and Brothers, 1942), 271.
[258] Schott, "The Role of the Consultant," esp. 14.
[259] Ibid, 270-271; Irwin, "The Eight Year" 57.

presence was constantly available to the participating schools and each school was required to fill out a report of the services rendered and to evaluate the consultants in terms of how they worked to meet the needs of the school. By 1937, Aikin was able to report in the *Thirty Schools Bulletin* that "The Curriculum Assistants have been visiting many of the schools, spending two or three days in each one. The reports which have come to me from the school show that the help rendered by the assistants has been real and of very great value. Many school heads have asked for their return and for longer periods. I trust that every school will feel at liberty to make all possible use of the help that these gentlemen can render."[260]

The final report also provided a brief list and description of the services rendered by the consultants. The first service was known as the "'Messenger-Boy' Service" in which "Oral reports were given of work in other schools; of trends in thinking, new materials and methods; of topics; of presentation and evaluation; and of recent literature for both professional improvement and class use."[261] This would help to keep the school personnel abreast of national developments in the general education movement and broader movement to reform curricula. Consultants were educational researchers who kept abreast of not only of national literature on curriculum reform, but also the latest educational literature related to their subject-matter area of interest (e.g. reading or social studies). As local implementation was constantly informed by, and informing national developments, seeing the latest educational literature was an opportunity to read about other similar experiments that were taking place. The "messenger-boy" service proved useful to the teachers. Borchers recalls that she and her fellow teachers at Wisconsin "read very widely—we had to read because our field was broader than it has been."[262]

---

[260] Aikin, "The Eight Year Study Moves," 2.
[261] Giles, McCutchen, and Zeichel, *Exploring the Curriculum*, 271.
[262] Borchers, interview.

The next service that the consultants offered were "class visits" whereby the consultants could visit individual classrooms and get a sense of the local issues and the students. Teachers were also offered advice on their teaching if they requested it, however this was kept to a minimum as teachers feared that they were being watched or evaluated upon their performance.[263] This also led to the desire by many teachers to have the consultants "teach demonstration lessons."[264] The consultants also provided "Talks and Lectures" on a variety of topics recommended by the schools and "advanced questions which the audience wished to hear discussed."[265] Here too, national discussions and insights from other schools were crucial to providing evidence about implementation and reform strategies. Finally, the curriculum consultants assisted in the creation and reforming of curricula.[266] The evaluation consultants did the same but for examinations—in particular new-style examinations designed "for getting at the 'intangibles'—the things that matter but are hard to measure or record."[267] These consultancies continued well into 1940.[268]

Workshops

Perhaps the most well-known and wholly original innovation of the Eight-Year Study was that of the workshop for in-service teacher and administrator development. It served as the "principal means of improvement of teachers in the thirty experimental schools, and the idea spread all over the country."[269] In the following section, I describe the origins of the idea to arrive at a broad definition of the workshop, examine the general characteristics of their

---

[263] Giles, McCutchen, and Zeichel, *Exploring the Curriculum*, 271.
[264] Ibid, 272.
[265] Ibid.
[266] The experiences of three schools in revising their curricula were reported and analyzed in Smith, "Curriculum Integration in the Eight-Year Study" chapters 4-6.
[267] Giles, McCutchen, and Zeichel, *Exploring the Curriculum*, 288.
[268] Wilford M. Aikin to Helen R. Kuyl, 16 February 1940, Box 3, F: Commission on Relation of School and College – Correspondence, 1938-41, PEA Papers.
[269] "The Story of," 328.

operation, describe requests by Study participants for further workshop and experiences, and finally discuss requests by other interested teachers to observe and join in the workshops.

The workshop idea was born out of both success and failure. Prior to the inception of the workshop idea in 1936, the Eight-Year Study had held annual conferences. The success of the annual conferences—which received philanthropic funding—lay in the fact that the staff noticed that teachers were able to share their experiences in how they were attacking the issues related to the reform of their own curricula. As useful as these conferences were, they were considered by the staff of the Study to be "not enough."[270] A conference lasting only a few days was particularly paltry when compared to the fact that few participating teachers were not even given a free period in their school day to consider reforming their own curricula and approaches.[271] Similarly, while the consultancies were useful to the schools, the curriculum and evaluation staffs were quickly overwhelmed by the amount of requests for their services and could not accommodate each of them.[272]

Ralph Tyler's visits to each of the schools confirmed that the individual participants needed far more time and assistance before they could identify their objectives, begin to reform their curricula, and ultimately develop evaluation instruments. The schools, he realized—much as others in the Study realized before him—were overwhelmed by the immense amount of freedom granted by the Study and were unsure of how to proceed. Tyler and Havighurst worked on the problem and realized that they needed to form some sort of an "institute." However, they elected to not to use the term "institute," and would later adopt the term "workshops," "to emphasize that it wasn't a didactic presentation" and "to be sure that it wasn't confused with just

---

[270] Ryan and Tyler, *Summer Workshops in Secondary Education*, 5.
[271] Samuel W. Watkins, "Social Studies in the Eight-Year Study and the New Social Studies Movement: A Comparison of Goals" (PhD diss., Auburn University, 1981), 25.
[272] Fraley, *Schooling and Innovation*, 122-123; Angela Eunice Fraley, "Core Curriculum: An Epic in the History of Educational Reform" (EdD diss., Teachers College, Columbia University, 1977), 34.

teacher institutes which were common in those days…[characterized by]…people lecturing…and [teachers] didn't come through with anything."[273] In contrast, this new type of institute, or workshop, needed to embody democracy and (interinstitutional) cooperation, in practice.[274] Equally as important, it needed to preserve the autonomy of teachers as well as meet their expressed needs. Keeping these ideas at the forefront, Tyler and Havighurst were ultimately able to create "a new model for teacher, administrator, and curriculum specialist collaboration in the development of curriculum."[275]

Havighurst was able to supply funding through his position at the General Education Board for an initial workshop held on the campus of Ohio State University in the summer of 1936. This was intended to last six weeks and bring together thirty teachers of math and science to work with the curriculum and evaluation staffs.[276] "The response to the Ohio Workshop was very favorable," historian John Smyth Iversen noted. He further reported that by October of that same year, participants of the Eight-Year Study who were able to make it to a Columbus conference asked for another, similar experience.[277]

The news of what had occurred in Columbus was carried to the other participants across the country by word-of-mouth as well as by an early 1937 article by Ruth K. Sayward, a teacher from Beaver County Day School that was distributed among the other participants. Sayward reflected that she

---

[273] Ralph W. Tyler, interview, 7 November 1982, quoted in Rumjahn, "A Chronicle of the Professional Activities of Ralph W. Tyler" 32. Also see John Smyth Iversen, "The Origin and History of the Workshop Movement in Education: 1936-1965" (EdD diss., Teachers College, Columbia University, 1973), 52.
[274] John Smyth Iversen argues that the origins of the workshop idea, and its subsequent success was influenced by, and given more force, by a movement spearheaded by educational researchers and others to understand group dynamics in a democracy. See Iversen, "The Origin and History of the Workshop Movement" 21-34.
[275] Marie Kirchner Stone, "Ralph W. Tyler's Principles of Curriculum, Instruction and Evaluation: Past Influences and Present Effects" (PhD diss., Loyola University Chicago, 1985), 69-70.
[276] The history of the early workshops can be seen in Ryan and Tyler, *Summer Workshops in Secondary Education*, chapter one; Kenneth L. Heaton, William G. Camp, and Paul B. Diederich, *Professional Education for Experienced Teachers: The Program of the Summer Workshop* (Chicago: University of Chicago Press, 1940), 1-15.
[277] "Minutes of the Progressive Education Association Board of Directors, January, 1937, Official Report Attached, p.5" quoted in Iversen, "The Origin and History of the Workshop Movement" 52.

> went to Columbus in order to get help in evaluating a unit on taxation. When I arrived, Dr. Tyler and Dr. Raths said, 'What is your problem?' I handed to them the mimeographed booklet and explained that I wished to know whether or not I was really teaching my students that which I was aiming for, as shown by the objectives and outlined materials in the booklet. They read the booklet and listed the evaluation instruments which they thought would be helpful for me to use in order to determine whether or not the students were attaining these goals. I stayed in Columbus for five days, and during that time I helped all that I could in developing instruments, and I learned an extraordinary amount about the approach to the solution of such problems and the techniques involved. I learned about entirely new ways to approach the subject matter of the course. I learned enough of the techniques of making tests so that now I can make fairly effective tests alone. I was made more conscious than ever before the principles and generalizations which underlie my course, and when I returned home I found that knowing this made some of my teaching procedures and techniques more successful.[278]

Stimulated by Sayward's story, others joined in calling for more workshops and by the following summer, a larger workshop was held on the campus of Sarah Lawrence College in Bronxville, NY. By 1938, another workshop was organized at Sarah Lawrence College to serve the participants of the Eight-Year Study who were located in the eastern portion of the country. Two other workshops, one held at Colorado Woman's College in Denver, and one held on the campus of Mills College in Oakland, CA were held in the summer of 1938 as well.[279] In each of the subsequent iterations, the workshops became larger and more organized. Yet, they continued to be funded by the General Education Board.

The question, then, was what constituted a workshop? The simple answer is that they evolved to preserve the autonomy of teachers and to meet their expressed needs.[280] However,

---

[278] Ruth K. Sayward, "A Teacher Develops an Evaluation Instrument," *Thirty Schools Bulletin: An Occasional Publication for the Teachers in the Study of the Relation of the School and College* 1 (1937): 31. A test laboratory also grew out of this experience where teachers could come to Columbus and experiment with evaluation instruments and work with available consultants. On this, see Ralph W. Tyler, "The Function of the Evaluation Staff," *Thirty Schools Bulletin: An Occasional Publication for the Teachers in the Study of the Relation of the School and College* 1 (1937): 5.

[279] Ryan and Tyler, *Summer Workshops in Secondary Education*, 7. A full table listing the date, length, number of participants, and focus of each summer workshop can be seen in Allison M. Ruda "Neither Gospel Nor Method: An Historical Case Study of Progressive Teachers Involved in the Eight-Year Study Summer Workshops, 1936-1939 (EdD diss., Northeastern University, 2013), 55. The three workshops were colloquially known as the "Eastern Workshop," the "Rocky Mountain Workshop," and the "Western Workshop" based on their geographical setting.

[280] An example of this can be seen in the expansion of the workshops in 1938 to consider the broad issues of student "general life adjustment." See George Sheviakov and Jean Friedberg, "Evaluation of Personal and Social

there were characteristics that each of the workshops had in common. Speaking to a reporter for the *New York Times*, Wilford Aikin observed that "Thousands of teachers crowd into summer schools to get credits. It seems to us that we're beginning to see here a different kind of Summer session. The uniqueness of this workshop lies in the fact that teachers come here with a definite project in mind growing out of their school work. Here they have the freedom under as good leadership as can be provided to work out their projects. We look for our idea to spread, not only under our auspices, but also in other schools and universities."[281] Aikin's statement more or less captured the major characteristics of the workshop idea as it was developed and operated in the Eight-Year Study. That is to say, the workshops contained elements of educational research (in the form of consultants who assisted the teachers as well as the graduate credit they received), interinstitutional cooperation (in the form of teachers from different schools working with each other), philanthropy (in the form of GEB financial support), autonomy (in the freedom granted to teachers to pursue their own interests), and the dissemination of this method of working and ideological assumptions through the matrix of influence.[282]

Aikin's points may be supplemented by his colleague, Louis Raths, who would later illustrate other common characteristics of each workshop. The first he pointed to was that—with the exception of the initial 1936 Ohio State University workshop—there was a diverse mix of educational researchers who specialized in the various subject areas. The educational researchers needed to reflect a diverse array of interests as the selection criteria for participating teachers was broad. Teachers needed only to "have demonstrated their ability to undertake the responsibilities

---

Adjustment: Report of Progress of the Study" (Chicago: Progressive Education Association, Evaluation in the Eight Year Study, 1939), 1.

[281] "Scholastic Principles Applied to Themselves by 150 Teachers: From the South and West they bring Projects to 'Workshop' at Sarah Lawrence College to Meet the Demand for Revised Curricula in Pre-College Years," *New York Times*, 1 August 1937, 77.

[282] Ralph W. Tyler, "The Summer Workshops," *Thirty Schools Bulletin: An Occasional Publication for the Teachers in the Study of the Relation of the School and College* 1 (1937): 37.

in their local school…need help on a particular problem or interest on which they could not be given as effective help through regular courses or instruction… [and] come from schools that encourage new developments and which will expect to put into practice plans which may be developed during the summer."[283]

A second characteristic that Raths discussed was that workshops should only consist of issues related to the practice of the teachers as they identified areas for improvement. This was due to a "friendly revolt" that had occurred when the Eight-Year Study staff had asked teachers at the 1937 workshop to read and comment on the drafts of the reports that the various Commissions of the Eight-Year Study were preparing for publication.[284] Teachers preferred to work on issues arising from their own practice. A sense of the frustration with working on the reports and information about the resulting resolution to allow teachers to work on issues that arose out of their own practice was captured in the materials prepared by the group that focused on English. "In the opening weeks of the Workshop," the materials noted, "much time was devoted to a study of the publications of the Committee on English of the Commission on the Secondary School Curriculum. The materials were read thoughtfully…and discussed at length." The author continued, "While these reports formed a substantial part of the program during the first two weeks of the Workshop, provision was also made to meet the purposes and needs of the English teachers who had come to discuss their problems with other teachers in the field."[285] The materials created by the group focused on Social Studies echoed a similar sentiment, "The guiding principle of the Workshop is that each participant is given opportunity to work on problems of concern to himself and his school with the assistance and criticism of the staff and

[283] Heaton, Camp, and Diederich, *Professional Education for Experienced Teachers*, 9.
[284] Ibid, 5.
[285] Progressive Education Association, "Materials Prepared by Participants in the English Group of the Progressive Education Association Summer Workshop, Sarah Lawrence College, Bronxville, New York, July 2 – August 13, 1937" (Columbus, OH: Progressive Education Association, Evaluation in the Eight Year Study, 1937), 1.

other participants. The meetings of the group were devoted to criticisms of the work of individuals and to those problems common to all members."[286]

Thus, the workshops became an opportunity for teachers (which Raths and others referred to as "students") to work on their problems with any and all of the human and other resources available. Teachers had freedom to opt out of large group activities, which were generally "discouraged" anyway, as they were seen as less effective than smaller groups with a focus on the individuals involved.[287] This freedom extended to teachers being allowed to change their schedules at their desire. Despite the wide freedom, there were group meetings to facilitate the sharing of resources. For example, the members of the group focused on Home Economics were occasionally gathered for "special showings of motion pictures and radio broadcasting."[288] Finally, teachers were, by and large, required to submit written reports to the one consultant (which Raths and others referred to as "faculty members") they had worked with most intimately as they were being graded for credit toward available graduate degrees.[289]

While it held true that most groups had generally agreed on the broader objectives of their subject matter, this was not true for each group. For instance, the group devoted to the Arts had experienced considerable disagreements over the various objectives and suggestions relating to youth and subject matter—in particular those related to what was meant by the term integration of the curriculum.[290] Therefore, "the principle activity of the Arts Group was the

---

[286] "Introduction" in "Materials Prepared by Participants in the Social Studies Group of the Progressive Education Association Summer Workshop, Sarah Lawrence College, Bronxville, New York, July 2 – August 13, 1937" (Columbus: Progressive Education Association, Evaluation in the Eight Year Study, 1937), 1.
[287] Tyler, "The Summer," 37.
[288] "Introduction" in "Materials Prepared by Participants in the Home Economics Group of the Progressive Education Association Summer Workshop, Sarah Lawrence College, Bronxville, New York, July 2 – August 13, 1937" (Columbus: Progressive Education Association, Evaluation in the Eight Year Study, 1937), 1-2.
[289] Louis Raths, "The Workshop," *Educational Research Bulletin* 20 (1941): 118-119.
[290] Paul B. Diederich, "Common Functions of the Arts in General Education" in "Materials Prepared by Participants in the Arts Group of the Progressive Education Association Summer Workshop, Sarah Lawrence College,

criticism, revision and extension of the Arts Report of the Thayer Commission."[291] By examining the high value that the Eight-Year Study staff placed on defining objectives and proceeding to discuss curriculum and examinations after, we can see that the main characteristic of the workshops was to apply the method developed by Tyler (determining objectives, etc.) to teachers in a cooperative enterprise of vast scale that preserved the autonomy of the teachers. "The workshops," historian Ellen Condliffe Lagemann observed, "were unprecedented in the latitude and autonomy they granted teachers. Whether or not the teacher knew the origins of the ideas, participation in these workshops, and more generally in the Eight-Year Study, familiarized hundreds of them with Tyler's thought" through an extension of the work that the Evaluation and Curriculum Staffs were doing.[292] Many of these teachers would go back to their own school systems to proselytize their colleagues and share insights—a feature that existed very much by design.[293]

Without dismissing the importance of the autonomous, philanthropic, and educational research-oriented features of the workshops, perhaps the most crucial was that of the interinstitutional cooperation that took place. Much has been written about this characteristic of the workshops.[294] Though each of the materials prepared by the various groups that participated in the various workshops speak to interinstitutional cooperation, we may see this in action through the Home Economics group (a group of ten teachers and various Staff members) of 1937.

Bronxville, New York, July 2 – August 13, 1937" (Columbus: Progressive Education Association, Evaluation in the Eight Year Study, 1937), 5.

[291] See for example Lawrence H. Conrad, "Creative Expression in the Integrated Program" in "Materials Prepared by Participants in the Arts Group" esp. 4.

[292] Lagemann, *An Elusive Science*, 143. Also see W. Carson Ryan, Jr., "Petition for Grant to make Possible Continuance of the Work of the Evaluation Staff of the Commission on School and College Relations, November 19, 1937" Box 5, F: General Education Board, 1933-45, PEA Papers.

[293] Iversen, "The Origin and History of the Workshop Movement" esp. 55.

[294] This literature is summarized in Bullough, Jr., "Professional Learning Communities," 168-180.

> The home economics group met daily for a discussion of…problems. Staff members of the Workshop were invited to lead and participate in discussions and in individual conferences. Later, in the course of the summer, home economics teachers gave reports of their progress before the group. General meetings were provided by the Commission on the Study of Adolescents, the Commission on Human Relations, the Commission on Intercultural Relations, the Curriculum Staff and the Evaluation Staff. Two meetings per week were arranged for a consideration of problems…Housing space was furnished for reference materials which were used extensively…The libraries of Sarah Lawrence College and Columbia University were available. The various members of the home economics group worked with larger groups interested in problems of integration, evaluation, and human relations. Small committees were formed for the consideration of special problems and the preparation of reports. Individual members from Denver, Des Moines, and Tulsa worked with their local school groups on curriculum and evaluation problems relating to the total curriculum of these schools. All members worked on individual problems as well. Informal discussions, likewise, constituted valuable experiences in exchanging and clarifying ideas.[295]

This represented cooperation without consensus in that teachers were not attempting to sway each other toward their preferred practices, but rather to gain larger insight. Even in the production of the materials—which were distributed to libraries and schools across the nation—as well as three bulletins that had been requested by teachers early in the course of the Study, teachers reported in great detail on the courses that they had developed, taught, and evolved during the Eight-Year Study.[296] For instance, Mabel D. Ely and Marjorie Jackson, two teachers at Shaker Heights High School described their course in the Creative Arts for students in the eleventh grade.[297] These specific course descriptions, course materials, and stories of reform could be discussed by teachers as they were encouraged to correspond with each other. Indeed, Edith Henry of East High School in Denver wrote that she would share materials and insights if people would write to her at the address she provided.[298] Not only were curriculum materials by

[295] "Introduction" in "Materials Prepared by Participants in the Home Economics Group" 1-2.
[296] Raths, "Bulletin No. 1," Title Page.
[297] Mabel D. Ely and Marjorie Jackson, "A Course in the Creative Arts for Eleventh Grade Students at Shaker Heights High School" in "Materials Prepared by Participants in the Arts Group" 16-22.
[298] Diederich, "Common Functions of the Arts" 10.

participating teachers considered, so too were materials produced by other cooperative studies. Before diving into their own work, the Social Studies Group in 1937, read "Miss Margaret Koopman's report on a unit of work, 'The Community: Its Nature, Functions and Problems' as she has developed it in the experimental curriculum at the Central State Teachers College, Mount Pleasant, Michigan."[299]

There were hundreds of thousands of connections that were made. Generally speaking, the workshop experience helped teachers realize what was possible for their localities. As Gladys Borchers remembers of her time at the Third Annual Conference of the Eight-Year Study,

> I remember that one time Mr. Ryan [her principal] took a group of us to Thousand Island Park where they were having a meeting…Some schools—see, there were representatives from every school there—and some schools were very conservative. They believed that the methods that been used were right, that people just didn't teach them well enough, and that they would be all right. There were others who believed that things should be very different. They shouldn't have the regular courses that they'd had, and they were going to do things very differently. So you had very interesting programs, and I used to think when they were doing this I'd love to go to each one of the schools and visit and see that they were like, what the schools were like.[300]

Not only were teachers who were affiliated with the Eight-Year Study interested, but also were teachers who were not directly involved. The 1937 workshops attracted almost two dozen teachers who were not part of the Eight-Year Study, including one from Great Britain.[301] The 1938 workshop also featured teachers not involved with the Eight-Year Study.[302] In each workshop, others "expressed their desire to attend" but could not for whatever reason.[303] Ultimately, the General Education Board would provide fellowships to facilitate the attendance of teachers who were not involved with the Eight-Year Study.

---

[299] "Introduction" in "Materials Prepared by Participants in the Social Studies Group" 4. Koopman was a faculty member at Central State Teachers College, later named Central Michigan University.
[300] Borchers, interview.
[301] "Introduction" in "Materials Prepared by Participants in the Social Studies Group" 1.
[302] Watkins, "Social Studies in the Eight-Year Study" 31.
[303] Heaton, Camp, and Diederich, *Professional Education for Experienced Teachers*, 8.

More important, other cooperative studies sought to co-sponsor workshops with the Eight-Year Study. For instance, the Commission on Teacher Education—of which Ralph Tyler was a member—functioning under the auspices of the American Council of Education, co-sponsored a workshop between the Eight-Year Study and their Cooperative Study in Teacher Education.[304] The workshops were considered a success and the Cooperative Study of Teacher Education continued their use.[305] Philanthropists from the General Education Board—who had been contacted for further funding—visited these workshops to check in on their investments and found themselves very pleased with the workshop model. Flora M. Rhind, the executive secretary of the General Education Board who made a number of funding decisions that would affect the general education movement, "visited six workshops, three of which…were cosponsored."[306]

By 1939, the Progressive Education Association developed a Committee on Workshops[307] that served not only the Cooperative Study in Teacher Education but also a workshop devoted to teacher education in the south under the auspices of the Southern Association of Colleges and Secondary Schools which resulted in three workshops "held at Vanderbilt University, the University of North Carolina, and Eastern Kentucky State Teachers College."[308] The idea of the workshop had also spread to school systems across the country who sponsored their own local workshops as their resources and needs dictated. "By 1940," curriculum theorist J. Minor Gwynn reported just seven years later,

---

[304] Ralph W. Tyler, "Co-Operation in Teacher Education as Related to Our War Effort" in *National Institutional Teacher Placement Association: Proceedings of the Ninth Annual Autumn Conference*. Chicago, November 27-28, 1942. [National Institutional Teacher Placement Association, n.d.], 15-21.
[305] Gwynn, *Curriculum Principles*, 463.
[306] Ruda "Neither Gospel Nor Method" 88. "Attention: Mr. Edmund E. Day, January 11, 1937" Box 5, F: General Education Board, 1933-45, PEA Papers. For a further discussion see Iversen, "The Origin and History of the Workshop Movement" 65-66.
[307] Kenneth L. Heaton, "Program of the Committee on Workshops," *Educational Method* 20 (1941): 292-296.
[308] Gwynn, *Curriculum Principles*, 460-462.

> the Progressive Education Association Workshop Committee had served and cooperated with the following institutions and educational organizations, either in their experimental programs or in the form of advisory, conference, or training program work: the University of Chicago, Claremont Colleges, Colorado State College of Education, University of Denver, Harvard University, University of Idaho, Northwestern University, Ohio State University, University of Pennsylvania, Pennsylvania State College, University of Pittsburgh, Stanford University, Syracuse University, Teachers College of Columbia University, University of Washington, University of Wisconsin, Milwaukee State Teachers College, the Commission on Secondary Schools of the Southern Association of Colleges and Secondary Schools, the Michigan Study of the Secondary School Curriculum, and the Commission on Resources and Education."[309]

By 1942, the PEA was able to report that "121 workshops were held in 39 states" mostly "sponsored by schools of education, teacher training institutions and the public schools themselves."[310]

Perhaps no service offered by the Progressive Education Association, however, would shape the general education movement in higher education more than the 1938 workshop of the Eight-Year Study, in which "Twenty-three faculty members from 16 different institutions of higher education were admitted in addition to the teachers from the experimental schools…[for] out of the work of these college faculty members grew the Cooperative Study in General Education of the American Council on Education, which held a workshop at the University of Chicago in 1940."[311]

Student Assistance with Curriculum Reform: Curriculum Councils

Another innovation of the Eight-Year Study was the use of student input in reform—particularly through the use of curriculum councils. The idea of consulting with students about curriculum reform grew out of the appreciation for democratic praxis that marked the progressive education movement. Teachers were granted autonomy and were given trust by the

---

[309] Ibid, 462.
[310] "Activities of the Progressive Education Association Since 1938" Box 8, F: PEA Headquarters, 1940-44, PEA Papers.
[311] Gwynn, *Curriculum Principles*, 460-461.

staff of the Eight-Year Study so that they might teach in a democratic manner. Teaching democratically and progressively involved students sharing in the "mini-community" of their school. "As application of the democratic principle of participation to general school life has expanded the realm of teacher action," Aikin noted in the final report of the Eight-Year Study, "so it has given the students a larger share in their own education. Because they know that young people develop strength by taking responsibilities, the Thirty Schools have provided greater opportunity for them to share in school management and curriculum planning."[312]

Beyond the ideological concern of progressive education, the Eight-Year Study staff—and many teachers—realized that they could only create relevant curriculums by involving the students in curricular reform. Aikin would note elsewhere in the final report that "The reasons for pupil participation are compelling. The schools have taken the position that the source of the curriculum is to be found in the concerns of youth and in the nature of the society which the school serves. Therefore, youth should have opportunity to ask that the schools heed their needs and to tell what some of those needs are."[313] In addition, the Eight-Year Study staff by and large noted and advertised that students were excited to participate in curriculum reform. In 1938, the PEA claimed that "The teachers are taking the pupils into their confidence at the beginning of the year's work and saying to them, 'This is what we have in mind. Let us investigate it together to see what its possibilities are and then work it out jointly.' Most students welcome the opportunity to share in this way, and their contributions are very much worth while [sic]. They engage in such undertakings with purpose and enthusiasm."[314]

Many schools made students near-equal participants in curricular reform. The Ohio State University School noted that it "held to the principle that curriculum making is the primary

---

[312] Aikin, *The Story of the Eight-Year Study*, 42. Also see Benedict, *Dare Our Secondary Schools*, 12, 15.
[313] Ibid, 135. Also see Hemming, *Teach Them*, 79.
[314] *Progressive Education Advances*, 31.

function of the teaching staff and the students, both groups drawing upon all the resources of the community. In practice this means that major curriculum problems of scope, sequence, and administration have been formulated and revised by the faculty as a whole after study and discussion."[315] The Lincoln School noted "the remarkable extent to which students and teachers share in the direction of classroom activities and in the planning committees which determine to a large degree, especially in the general courses, the choice of subject matter, the media in which students to work, the activities, and the order and method of procedure."[316]

But, what did student involvement in curriculum reform look like? In the case of the Eight-Year Study, the major innovation was the curriculum council. Similar to curriculum councils that involved state and local officials, curriculum councils varied by school but featured students who would advise teachers and other officials on desired curricular changes.

Distribution of Print Materials among the Participants

Another key characteristic of the Eight-Year Study was the way in which the staff and participants worked to distribute print materials about their experimentation to each other. Throughout this chapter, I have alluded to numerous instances and ways in which this operated. Here, I briefly review four major ways in which print material circulated among participants. The first way in which staff and participants communicated about their experiments through print matter were occasional bulletins that were circulated among the participating schools. These bulletins might also include information on studies that each committee of staff members were conducting and published portions of the reports. Each bulletin tended to focus on one specific issue or theme, they still made "mention…of the relationship of that theme to its setting in the total programs of the school," thereby making the bulletins useful for as many readers as

[315] *Thirty Schools Tell*, 737.
[316] Ibid, 475.

possible.[317] It also created an ongoing dialogue between the bulletins and over the course of time. That said, some of the bulletins were quick to point out that their greatest use was for certain populations. For instance, the bulletin on evaluation in mathematics was "addressed primarily to teachers of mathematics."[318]

The second type of print material circulated among the staff and participants was workshop materials. These materials were produced by staff materials and described a number of the activities that occurred in workshops. They often contained minutes of the meetings, course descriptions, and/or evaluation instruments. They were produced by subject matter. Third, general correspondence between teachers and staff members existed. Finally, publications in national outlets including scholarly and practitioner-oriented journals existed. While the staff produced a number of these pieces, a number of participating teachers were able to publish articles and book chapters that not only discussed their experimentations, but also maintained syllabi. Often, these teachers would reference these in correspondence or in discussing issues with their colleagues at workshops. The Fieldston School included a "list of articles and publications" by its faculty and administrators in its final report for the volume *Thirty Schools Tell Their Story*.[319] Other schools also followed suit. This is to say nothing of the many teacher contributions to the nearly 2,200 pages spread across five major reports that came out of the Eight-Year Study.[320]

Advertisement of the Eight-Year Study and Some of its Influence on Secondary Education

---

[317] Hilda Taba, "Bulletin No. 6, Social Sensitivity" (Columbus: Progressive Education Association, Evaluation in the Eight Year Study, Ohio State University, 1936), i.
[318] M.L. Hartung, "Bulletin No. 2, Evaluation in Mathematics" (Columbus: Progressive Education Association, Evaluation in the Eight Year Study, Ohio State University, 1935), Title Page.
[319] *Thirty Schools Tell*, 291-293.
[320] See the discussion on teacher contributions to the following reports, Lawrence H. Conrad, *Teaching Creative Writing* (New York: D. Appleton-Century Company, 1937), ix; Lois Hayden Meek, *The Personal-Social Development of Boys and Girls with Implications for Secondary Education* (New York: Committee on Workshops, Progressive Education Association, 1940), 5; Committee on the Function of English in General Education, *Language in General Education* (New York: D-Appleton-Century Company, 1940), vi.

Advertisement of the Eight-Year Study to a wide public came in many forms. The first involved speeches to educators and other policymakers. By early 1935, Wilford Aikin had given a talk to "more than 100 school superintendents and educators" at the New York Regional Conference of Experimental Schools. The highlights of this speech were printed in the *New York Times*.[321] A steady stream of information would continue to be published in the *New York Times* until well into the early 1940s.[322] Articles describing the Study and its progress appeared in a number of academic, popular, and practitioner-oriented publications.[323]

While determining the influence of these newspaper reports on the shaping of tangible reforms is difficult, there are a number of contemporary (cooperative) studies of secondary general education that cited the Eight-Year Study as a major influence. This ultimately was one factor in helping to legitimize the ideological assumptions and innovative methods of working that the Study endorsed.[324] A list of these studies was printed in *School Review* as early as 1942. "This was the first attempt at co-operative experimentation by the schools," The piece noted of the Eight-Year Study. "It has found imitators" it continued,

> in the Michigan Study of the Secondary-School Curriculum; the Co-Operative Study between Secondary Schools and Colleges being carried on by the Commission on Curricular Problems and Research of the Southern Association of Colleges and Secondary Schools; the Secondary-School Study of the Association of Colleges and Secondary Schools for Negroes; the Ohio Schools Study; the study in progress under the sponsorship of the California Committee for the Study of Secondary and Collegiate Education; and, at the college level, the Co-operative Study in General Education of the American Council of Education, the co-operative study of the Commission on Teacher Education, and the study of the Commission on Junior College Terminal Education of the American Association of Junior Colleges.[325]

---

[321] "More Economic Study Urged for Schools: Emphasis Should Be Placed on Social Problems in Revised Curriculum, Says Educator" *New York Times*, 27 January 1935, N3.
[322] See for example, W.A. MacDonald, "Viewpoint on Education," *New York Times*, 16 November 1941; Aikin, "What's Wrong?"
[323] A comprehensive bibliography of these articles appears in Wilford M. Aikin, "Bibliography of Articles Describing the Work of the Commission of the Relation of School and College of the Progressive Education Association" Surviving copy is available at the Ohio State University Library, Columbus, Ohio.
[324] A number of these studies are summarized in Benedict, *Dare our Secondary Schools*, 34-40.
[325] "The Story of," 327.

What was crucial about this discussion is that it grouped studies in the categories of cooperative studies focusing solely on secondary schools, cooperative studies with a mixture of secondary institutions and institutions of higher learning, and finally cooperative studies done at the collegiate level. This was characteristic of the general education movement. It was a mixture of colleges working with colleges, colleges working with high schools, and high schools working with high schools. Each of these collaborations was influenced by the Eight-Year Study.[326]

Having an influence on other similar studies was certainly what the Eight-Year Study architects and staff hoped for. As early as 1936, Wilford M. Aikin would proclaim, "This particular Study in which we are now engaged is to end in 1941, but the movement which it represents will not end then. We hope to see much more clearly then than we do now the major responsibilities of our schools and colleges…But we shall not have reached the final solution of many of these problems. This kind of Study must go on continuously in the spirit of the democratic tradition of American education."[327]

To use a worn historian's cliché, the stage was set. The Cooperative Study in General Education—a study that one historian would call the "Eight Year Study Goes to College"—would be the next effort to move general education movement along.[328] It is the focus of the next chapter.

---

[326] Cooperative studies—many of which acknowledging their indebtedness to the Eight-Year Study—were the focus of an issue of the journal *Educational Method* (volume 20, no. 6, March, 1941).
[327] Aikin, "The First Years," 75.
[328] DePaola, "Managing National Educational Change" 203-211; Antonelli, "Ralph W. Tyler," 171.

Chapter 3

"No One Plan of General Education…Can Be Universally Appropriate": The Cooperative Study in General Education, 1938-1947

The significance of this study depends not only upon the importance of the problems that we attack but on the degree to which we can devise or utilize methods for cooperative study that really do capitalize on the potentialities of cooperation.[1]

—Ralph W. Tyler

The Cooperative Study sought to achieve progress through the cooperative action of teachers and college faculties who did **not** agree about such issues [involved in creating a general education program]. In the face of such disagreements, how was it possible to cooperate?[2]

—Final Report of the Cooperative Study in General Education

Though the frailties of human nature made all of us yearn for a simple blueprint, the thought and experiences of our colleges led them to be extremely distrustful of oracular pronouncements followed by simple prescriptions. On the other hand, they were equally fearful of vague generalities, which lead only to confusion or anarchy. We wished, if we could, to find a middle ground between the overvague and the oversimplified.[3]

—Harold B. Dunkel

Introduction: A Stratified System and the Complexities of Reform

As the Great Depression began to take its toll on institutions of higher education, a paradox was quickly identified by weary administrators and faculty across the land. Increased enrollments created the necessity for growth and comprehensive institutional reform; however, sources of funding were drying up.[4] For a select group of institutions—the so-called "modern" research universities—government contracts for research as well as their more traditional sources of funding were slowly allowing them to grow and embrace the future.[5] However, for small

---

[1] American Council on Education, *Annual Report, 1940* (Washington, D.C.: Author, 1941), 52.
[2] *Cooperation in General Education: A Final Report of the Executive Committee of the Cooperative Study in General Education* (Washington D.C.: American Council on Education, 1947), 44.
[3] Harold Baker Dunkel, *General Education in the Humanities* (Washington, D.C.: American Council on Education, 1947), 4.
[4] J. Harold Goldthorpe, "Trends in Philanthropy: Summary of Gifts to a Selected Group of Institutions of Higher Education in the Last Twenty Years," *Journal of Higher Education* 12 (1941): 73-80; J. Harold Goldthorpe, *Higher Education, Philanthropy, and Federal Tax Exemptions* (Washington, D.C.: American Council on Education, 1944); various chapters in *The Outlook for Higher Education* deal with issues related to endowment, philanthropy, and federal support of institutions of higher learning.
[5] Roger L. Geiger, *To Advance Knowledge: The Growth of American Research Universities, 1900-1940* (New York: Oxford University Press, 1986); Rebecca S. Lowen, *Creating the Cold War University: The Transformation of Stanford* (Berkeley: University of California Press, 1997), 26-66; Kersten Jacobson Biehn, "Improving Mankind:

liberal arts colleges, historically black colleges, junior (community) colleges, women's colleges, teachers' colleges, and small religious colleges, there was very little research that could be sold to the government on a scale large enough to affect their financial outlook.[6] These institutions would need to find different ways to facilitate, and more importantly to finance, the reforms necessitated by the social and institutional context covered in the last chapter. This was certainly the case for colleges in the aforementioned categories who sought to reform their general education programs. "Many institutions are eager to make a reappraisal of their work [in general education]," Earl J. McGrath noted in 1939, "but lack financial and human resources adequate to the task."[7]

One place where these sentiments came to the fore was the annual meetings of the North Central Association of Colleges and Schools (NCA). The NCA itself was an accreditation association that was made up of secondary and postsecondary institutions primarily located in the Midwest. The institutions that made up their membership were ones that were beginning to feel the effects of the Depression and seeking effective ways to reform their general education programs. They also had a growing understanding of America's "youth problem," that was often supplemented by constant reporting on the progress of the American Youth Commission in this venue as well as through articles in the *North Central Association Quarterly*.

Philanthropic Foundations and the Development of American University Research between the World Wars" (PhD diss., Rice University, 2006).

[6] A useful comparison between elite and non-elite institutions may be seen through the case study of the state of Massachusetts in Richard M. Freeland, *Academia's Golden Age: Universities in Massachusetts, 1945-1970* (New York: Oxford University Press, 1992), esp. 51-69.

[7] Earl J. McGrath, "The Cooperative Study in General Education," *Junior College Journal* 9 (1939): 501. Fosdick, Pringle, and Pringle, *Adventure in Giving*, 253. This is a perennial tension that was rendered more acute by the Great Depression. For a contemporary discussion of the relationship between desires to reform general education and the scarcity of resources for this task, see Ann S. Ferren and Ashby Kinch, "The Dollars and Sense Behind General Education Reform," *Peer Review* 5 (2003): 8-11. This did not prevent the general education movement from gaining steam and being marked by experimentalism. On this, see Gail Aileen Koch, "The General Education Movement in American Higher Education: An Account and Appraisal of its Principles and Practices and their Relation to Democratic Thought in Modern American Society" (PhD diss., University of Minnesota, 1979), esp. chapters 2, 4-5.

Members of the Association had also been learning about the Eight-Year Study in the same manner.[8] They heard one member of this study opine that while "experimentation on an extensive scale during depression times requires more than ordinary management to avoid excessive costs and public disapproval," it was still possible.[9] They also heard another member of the Eight-Year Study suggest that the study was occasionally "criticized because the thirty schools involved are not all doing the same thing, with the same question in mind," but that the members did "not regard that as a handicap, nor as something to discredit the experiment."[10]

In addition to being exposed to the experiments of others, members of the NCA were encouraged by their leaders to do their part to experiment and solve the youth problem. Indeed, after a 1936 presentation on the progress of the American Youth Commission at the annual meeting, NCA President L.N. McWhorter addressed the audience by noting that "it would be very appropriate that each of our three commissions, through some executive action, through some administrative procedure, through some study process, go deeply into this problem of the youth today." He continued by challenging individual members to work on a local scale. "As you go back to your communities and your institutions," he proclaimed "find there, in the conditions which surround you and find out in the country at large and in these students and movements that have taken place in relation this idea, some inspiration and some help for solving this problem."[11]

---

[8] For instance, see Wilford F. [sic] Aikin, "The Experiment as Directed by the Progressive Education Committee," *North Central Association Quarterly* 9 (1934): 350-352.
[9] J.E. Stonecipher, "The Administration of the Experiment—Some Representative Procedures: Practical Limitations of the Experiment," *North Central Association Quarterly* 9 (1934): 352.
[10] H.H. Ryan, "Experimenting with the Curriculum," *North Central Association Quarterly* 11 (1936): 222-226, Quote from 223
[11] "Proceedings: Forty First Annual Meeting of the North Central Association of Colleges and Secondary Schools, April 24-25, 1936, Stevens Hotel, Chicago, Illinois, p. 121" Admissions and Records, North Central Association of Colleges and Schools, Proceedings and Minutes, 1895-1993, Record Series Number 25/50/002, Archives Research Center, University of Illinois at Urbana-Champaign, Champaign, IL. Hereafter cited as "NCA Proceedings Collection." McWhorter was very much emphasizing the point made by Homer P. Rainey in his presentation on the

The sentiments expressed by McWhorter and others stimulated discussion, and representatives from colleges belonging to the NCA began "inquiring" during the mid-1930s "about the possibility of a survey of their [general education] programs."[12] These discussions eventually coalesced into a 1938 proposal sent to the American Council on Education—of which the NCA was a member—for a cooperative study related to the topic of general education at these colleges.

This proposal was attractive to the ACE administrators for two reasons. The first involved the burgeoning relationship between the ACE and the NCA. The ACE had begun to defer to the NCA in matters related to accreditation as well as those related to secondary education.[13] This coincided with the ACE presidency of George F. Zook (1935-1950)—a man who was introduced at the 1934 annual meeting of the NCA as "our good friend" and referred to in 1936 annual meeting as a man "whom so many of you know and who worked so faithfully with you here in the North Central for so many years."[14] Two critical factors drove the ACE's deference to the

---

American Youth Commission that the audience had just listened to. This speech—and in particular the point that the problems of youth should be handled on the local level—was also picked up by the *Chicago Sun Times*. "Youth Problems Local, Says Rainey" *Chicago Sun Times*, 26 April 1938.

[12] William P. Tolley, "Twenty-One Colleges Examine Themselves," *Educational Record* 22 (1941): 306.

[13] On the relationship of the NCA and the ACE—particularly under Zook's tenure, see *The American Council on Education: History and Activities* (Washington D.C.: American Council on Education, 1938), 50; Davis, *A History of the North Central Association*, esp. 168; David Williams, "A Historical Study of the Involvement of the North Central Association with Higher Education in the United States" (PhD diss., Wayne State University, 1972), esp. chapter six; Hawkins, *Banding Together*, 93, 122.

[14] The reference to George F. Zook as "our good friend" may be seen in "Minutes of the Annual Meeting," *North Central Association Quarterly* 9 (1934): 372. The second reference may be seen in "Proceedings: Forty First Annual Meeting of the North Central Association of Colleges and Secondary Schools April 24-25, 1936, Stevens Hotel, Chicago, Illinois, p. 118" Box 2, Folder, 1936, NCA Proceedings Collection. On Zook, see Fred W. Buddy, "George Frederick Zook: An Analysis of Selected Contributions of an American Educator" (PhD diss., University of Akron, 1990); John W. Rieken, "George Frederick Zook: Educational Leader in a Crucial Decade" (PhD diss., Georgia State University, 2005). For Zook's views on the NCA, see George F. Zook, "Accreditation of Secondary Schools in the Light of the North Central Association Report," *The Educational Record* 16 (1935): 70-81 (including introduction); "Dr. Zook's Blessing," *North Central Association Quarterly* 12 (1937): 169-171. Please note, however, the earlier discussion of ACE's failure to coordinate regional accreditation agencies in chapter one, note sixty-seven. In addition, see Clarence Stephen Marsh, ed., *Coordination of Accrediting Activities* (Washington, D.C.: American Council on Education, 1939); Clarence Stephen Marsh, ed., *Cooperation in Accrediting Procedures: Proceedings of the Second Conference on Accrediting* (Washington, D.C.: American Council on Education, 1941).

NCA on matters of accreditation. The first involved the NCA moving from rigid, quantitative measurements to more open-ended qualitative ones.[15] The second factor involved the very role that the NCA was playing in American higher education—or at the very least among the institutions within the association—as a catalyst of experimentation. Having faced harsh criticism over seemingly "arbitrary" standards that threatened the "autonomy" of institutions, the NCA transformed itself from an organization "solely concerned with assuring the quality of education to one which could serve as a stimulus to the various institutions in their experimentation and improvement."[16]

The second attraction to the project lay in the fact that the ACE, as discussed in the last chapter, was becoming an organization focused on engaging in studies—and as much as possible engaging in "cooperative" and "democratic" "implementation" studies—that might be funded by philanthropic organizations. The American Council on Education took pains to inform the North Central Association and its members of this change, including having scholars and administrators such as Charles Judd, Lotus D. Coffman, Henry M. Wriston, and H.M. Gage discuss the changes at the 1934 NCA annual meeting.[17] Further publications in the *Quarterly* supplemented this information.[18] For its part, the NCA had done much to link its new accrediting standards to experimentation to improve practice while respecting the uniqueness and autonomy

---

[15] Davis, *A History of the North Central Association*, 71-72.
[16] Wiley and Zald, "The Growth and Transformation of Educational Accrediting Agencies," 42-46, quote on 45; Davis, *A History of the North Central Association*, 100-101, 126-130. For a history of this move and a discussion of experiments undertaken, see C.R. Maxwell, "Value of Past Educational Experiments," *North Central Association Quarterly* 10 (1935): 445-447.
[17] "Minutes of the Annual Meeting," *North Central Association Quarterly* 9 (1934): 373-376.
[18] See, for instance, Henry M. Wriston, "The Work of the American Council," *North Central Association Quarterly* 10 (1935): 201-204; Geo. A. Works, "Report of the Meeting of the American Council on Education," *North Central Association Quarterly* 10 (1935): 205-206; J. Andrew Holley, "The American Council on Education: Report of Its Nineteenth Meeting," *North Central Association Quarterly* 12 (1937): 191-192. On Holley's reading see "Proceedings: Forty-Second Annual Meeting of the North Central Association of Colleges and Secondary Schools, April 7-10, 1937, Stevens Hotel, Chicago, Illinois, p. 146" Box 2, Folder, 1937, NCA Proceedings Collection.

of individual institutions.[19] Indeed, the NCA had noted that it sought "to observe such principles as will preserve whatever desirable individual qualities member institutions may have…Uniformity in every detail of institutional policies and practices is believed to be not only unnecessary, but undesirable. Well conceived experiments aimed to improve educational processes are considered essential to the growth of higher institutions and will be encouraged."[20] Given their views on experimentation, as well as the relationship of curriculum reform and issues of accreditation, the NCA institutions were in an ideal position to take on the issues of the burgeoning general education movement.[21]

A cooperative study on the very popular and salient issue of general education was definitely one worthy of favorable consideration. It was not a matter of whether or not to approve the study, but rather how to organize and execute it. The ACE and NCA members might have looked to the American Youth Commission as an example for how to conduct future cooperative studies. Indeed, the leadership of the ACE saw the Commission as a "cooperative enterprise" that featured "the cooperation of many thousands of persons in many parts of the country and at all stations in society."[22] However, there were a few issues with modeling a cooperative study related to general education on the American Youth Commission. The first was that curricular

---

[19] Melvin E. Haggerty, *The Evaluation of Higher Institutions: III. The Educational Program* (Chicago: University of Chicago Press, 1937).
[20] "Proceedings of the Commission on Institutions of Higher Education," *North Central Association Quarterly* 9 (1934): 41-42.
[21] The NCA did take general education seriously both on the secondary level and within institutions of higher learning. On the former, see Will French, "Curriculum Responsibilities of the North Central Association: What Initiative Shall the North Central Association Take in Relation to the Secondary School Curriculum?," *North Central Association Quarterly* 9 (1934): 317-321. On the latter, the NCA would suggest in a promotional pamphlet that institutions that operated on a for-profit basis or "do not include among their major functions the provision of general education" were the only two criteria that rendered an institution "not eligible for accreditation." See North Central Association of Colleges and Secondary Schools, *Know Your North Central Association*, (Ann Arbor, MI: Author, 1951), 14. Also, see Davis, *A History of the North Central Association*, esp. 22-23, 211-218.
[22] M.M. Chambers, "A Cooperative Research Enterprise: The American Youth Commission," *Educational Method* 20 (1941): 270, 274.

issues—in particular general education—were only a tangential concern to the Commission.[23] Further, it was not a study that involved the cooperation of colleges. Therefore, the type of cooperative study that the NCA proposed would require a different experimental design.

ACE administrators were, however, familiar with the ongoing Eight-Year Study and looked at it as an example of a cooperative study dealing with curricular reform.[24] The Eight-Year Study had consistent philanthropic support from the General Education Board and had innovated "cooperative" and "democratic" methods—all things that made it an attractive model for the ACE to emulate. What if—representatives of the ACE wondered—they might create a cooperative study on general education that functioned similarly to the Eight-Year Study? This seemed to be what the NCA representatives were looking for—it was this organization, after all, that provided the initial thrust for the Eight-Year Study—and it might raise the profile of the ACE to philanthropic groups, colleges, and others if the organization were seen to be aligned with the Eight-Year Study. This thought process occurred not only in the minds of Council administrators, but within the minds of many representatives across a myriad of other organizations. This would cause Robert J. Havighurst to remark in 1941 that "Other cooperative studies were organized, modeled largely after the Eight Year Study [and] several of them secured support from the General Education Board."[25]

ACE administrators—in particular ACE President George F. Zook—approached Ralph Tyler to see if he would be interested in serving as director of a cooperative study related to general education. Zook and other ACE members heavily encouraged Tyler to "'to follow the

[23] Flack, "The Work" esp. chapter four.
[24] On the relationship between ACE and the Eight-Year Study, see Kridel and Bullough, Jr., *Stories of the Eight-Year Study*, 28.
[25] Havighurst, "Assistance Given to Cooperative Educational Experiments," 331.

procedure that worked so well with the Eight-Year Study.'"[26] By this point in early 1938, Tyler had effectively redesigned the Eight-Year Study and had a staff at his disposal. He agreed and the Cooperative Study in General Education was born.[27] It embodied philanthropy in the organizations that funded it—ultimately receiving $142,000 from the General Education Board over the course of its lifetime.[28] It embodied educational research in the researchers—from a diverse range of academic interests and vocational positions and many of whom were available for the Eight-Year Study—who served on the Central Staff. Most importantly, however, it embodied institutional cooperation between and within the twenty-two diverse institutions of higher learning.

The Cooperative Study in General Education was a leading symbol of the general education movement. By the time its functions had ceased and its reports had gone to press in 1948, a contemporary member of the general education movement wrote, "The recent report of the Cooperative Study in General Education… and [its] companion volumes published by the American Council on Education will advance the general-education movement in another important step."[29] A Yale graduate student authoring a dissertation on the topic of general education echoed this sentiment, writing to Tyler that the Cooperative Study "was one of the more important studies" in the ongoing general education movement.[30] The Cooperative Study

---

[26] Robert J. Havighurst, "Interviews: Ralph W. Tyler" (December 27, 1939); S 102, B 285, F 2972 General Education Board Papers, Rockefeller Archive Center, Sleepy Hollow, New York quoted in Kridel and Bullough, *Stories of the Eight-Year Study*, 95.
[27] For brief descriptions of the Cooperative Study in General Education, see Echols, "The Rise" 349-355; McGrath, "The Cooperative Study," 500-506; Tolley, "Twenty-One Colleges," 303-312; William Pearson Tolley, "Cooperative Study in General Education: A College Experiment in Cooperation," *Educational Method* 20 (1941): 288-291; Ralph W. Ogan, "The Cooperative Study in General Education," *Educational Record* 23 (1942): 692-703.
[28] Fosdick, Pringle, and Pringle, *Adventure in Giving*, 252-253.
[29] G. Robert Koopman, "The Special Significance of the General-Education Movement in 1948," *School and Society* 68 (1948): 107.
[30] Keith Baker to Ralph W. Tyler, 4 April 1946. Box 1, Folder 11, Ralph W. Tyler Papers, Special Collections Research Center at the University of Chicago, Joseph Regenstein Library, Chicago, Illinois. Hereafter cited as "Tyler Papers." Baker would go on to write Baker, "The Evolution of the Concept."

was not merely symbolic; rather it was a tangible and functioning mechanism of reform that negotiated a number of tensions inherent to the American system of higher education.

Negotiating these tensions was perhaps the first step taken in the planning stages of the Study. As Tyler began to lay out the plans for the Cooperative Study in General Education, he confronted two significant differences between secondary and higher education: the latter featured a greater diversity of institutional types and guarded their institutional and individual autonomy more fiercely. These were issues that Tyler and others involved with the Eight-Year Study had dealt with, and in 1938, were still dealing with, to some extent. However, a number of historical and contextual factors made the situation of creating a cooperative study related to general education on the collegiate level more complex.

The historical development of each system had shaped its diversity and desires for autonomy in different ways. On the one hand, high schools were seen to have been recruited in the twentieth century to serve as "a further fulfillment of the democratic concept of a universal common school."[31] Their growth, diversification, and specialization had been justified—and lamented, at times—as responses to an industrializing world and a number of diverse expectations and demographic shifts.[32] This is not to say that high schools were ever "a monolithic institution"—nor were they considered as such by the educational researchers involved in the Eight-Year Study.[33] It is true that local control was always an issue and that different high schools had different emphases. Some were rural while others were urban. Some

---

[31] William M. Alexander and J. Galen Saylor, *Modern Secondary Education: Basic Principles and Practices* (New York: Holt, Rinehart and Winston, 1959), 147.

[32] Rather than attempt to systematically list each work on the history of secondary education and/or go through the expansive debates that historians of education have had over the purposes of secondary schooling, readers may see this point elaborated on in Jurgen Herbst, "The American People's College: The Lost Promise of Democracy in Education," *American Journal of Education* 100 (1992): 275-297; Herbst, *The Once and Future School*, esp. chapter twelve. On the historical evolution of the technical structure and functioning of secondary education, see Edward Ignas, "The Traditional American System" in *Comparative Educational Systems* ed. Edward Ignas (Itasca, IL: F.E. Peacock Publishing, 1981), 1-44.

[33] William J. Reese, *The Origins of the American High School* (New Haven: Yale University Press, 1995), xvi.

were more "traditional" while others were more "progressive." Some emphasized agricultural and vocational training while others were more or less glorified preparatory academies. There were hierarchies among the institutions, to be sure. The demographics reflected the locale and the curricula of high schools were often correlated to assumptions made about the political, economic, social, and cultural roles that their students were expected to play in American society. All things considered however, the very heart of the system lay in the ideal of one institutional type: the comprehensive high school.[34] Indeed, the development of secondary education involved folding in diverse missions and offerings into one institution. Thus, secondary educators met the charge of extending educational opportunities—with all of the democratic symbolism and paradoxes that carried—essentially by diversifying the capabilities of the comprehensive high school.

Conversely, the development of higher education involved the creation and maintenance of several institutional types with varying missions and demographics.[35] Ultimately, this system reflected a status hierarchy that was (and is) in some ways more acknowledged than that of the

---

[34] A succinct definition of the comprehensive high school and review of relevant historiography is presented in Barry M. Franklin and Gary McCulloch, "Introduction—The Death of the Comprehensive High School? Historical, Contemporary, and Comparative Perspectives" in *The Death of the Comprehensive High School?*, 3-16. The most thorough discussions of the Comprehensive High School appear in George H. Copa and Virginia H. Pease, "The Comprehensive High School: An Historical Perspective" (Berkeley, CA: National Center for Research in Vocational Education, 1992); Wraga, *Democracy's High School*.

[35] A discussion of varied missions may be seen in John C. Scott, "The Mission of the University: Medieval to Postmodern Transformations," *Journal of Higher Education* 77 (2006): 1-39. Perhaps the most succinct and clear discussion (if in some ways admittedly "reductive") of the American system of higher education up to 1945 appears in Hugh Davis Graham and Nancy Diamond, *The Rise of American Research Universities: Elites and Challengers in the Postwar Era* (Baltimore: Johns Hopkins University Press, 1997), chapter one. Graham and Diamond note the system of American higher education before 1945 was decentralized to respond to market forces and American pluralism. More thorough discussions of the origins of the variegated system of higher education can be seen in Roger L. Geiger, ed., *The American College in the Nineteenth Century* (Nashville: Vanderbilt University Press, 2000); David B. Potts, "Introductory Essay: A Land of Colleges" in his *Liberal Education for a Land of Colleges: Yale's* Reports *of 1828* (New York: Palgrave Macmillan, 2010), 1-73; David F. Labaree, "A System Without a Plan: Emergence of an American System of Higher Education in the Twentieth Century," *Bildungsgeschichte: International Journal for the Historiography of Education* 3 (2013): 46-59. Thorough and accessible discussions on the historical development and theoretical precepts of institutional diversity can be found in Michael S. Harris, "Understanding Institutional Diversity in American Higher Education," ASHE Higher Education Report Series, Volume 39, Issue 3 (San Francisco: Jossey-Bass, 2013).

secondary level. This variegated system carried so many institutional types that it would cause the president of Columbia University in 1931 to remark that America featured "a veritable hodgepodge of higher education institutions."[36] It was this "hodgepodge" met the charge of extending educational opportunity.[37] While some collegiate personnel were hesitant of "the democratization of higher education," others prided themselves on this project. Indeed, one comparative historian would refer to the expansion of higher education as not only unique to the United States but also the country's "greatest academic achievement."[38] Despite the range of opinion on "democratization," nearly all college personnel feared the concept of a comprehensive college and preferred a "division of labor between and within institutions."[39] To many of them, efforts toward centralization or even coordination in some cases, represented a "stifling of initiative, excessive standardization, and educational mediocrity."[40] Put simply,

---

[36] "Report for 1930-31," quoted in *The Rise of a University*, Volume II: *The University in Action* ed. Edward C. Elliott (New York: Columbia University Press, 1937), 59. The author of this quote was Nicholas Murray Butler.
[37] The diversification of higher education and its attempts to extend educational opportunities is a key point of discussion in the work of Martin A. Trow. See the many variations on this theme that Trow explored in Michael Burrage, ed., *Martin Trow: Twentieth-Century Higher Education: Elite to Mass to Universal* (Baltimore: Johns Hopkins University Press, 2010). Though not included in the volume edited by Burrage, a crucial distillation of institutional diversity and its relationship to mass education appears in Martin Trow, "American Higher Education: Past, Present, and Future," *Educational Researcher* 17 (1988): 13-23
[38] Harold Perkin, "The Historical Perspective" in *Perspectives on Higher Education: Eight Disciplinary and Comparative Views* ed. Burton R. Clark (Berkeley: University of California Press, 1984), 38. See also Graham and Diamond, *The Rise of American Research Universities*, 12-14. *A* positive view of the expansion of higher education by one professor may be seen in Henry Steele Commager, "Social, Political, Economic, and Personal Consequences" in *Universal Higher Education* ed. Earl J. McGrath (New York: McGraw-Hill, 1966), 1-18. The standard history to deal with collegiate expansion is Levine, *The American College*, esp. chapters eight and ten. Also see Guyotte III, "Liberal Education and the American Dream."
[39] Martin Trow, "Reflections on the Transition from Mass to Universal Higher Education," *Daedalus* 99 (1970): 4. Kenneth P. Mortimer and T.R. McConnell, *Sharing Authority Effectively: Participation, Interaction, and Discretion* (San Francisco: Jossey-Bass, 1978), chapter nine; Sheldon Rothblatt, "The American Modular System" in *Quality and Access in Higher Education: Comparing Britain and the United States* eds. Robert O. Berdahl, Graeme C. Moodie, and Irving J. Spitzberg, Jr. (Buckingham, UK: Society for Research in Higher Education, 1991), 129-141.
[40] T.R. McConnell, Foreword to *Autonomy of Public Colleges: The Challenge of Coordination*, by Lyman A. Glenny (New York: McGraw-Hill, 1959), x; T.R. McConnell, *A General Pattern for American Public Higher Education* (New York: McGraw-Hill, 1962), esp. 140-145. McConnell and Glenny's books provide great insight on the difficulties of coordination and cooperation. One may see many of the aversions of collegiate personnel to interinstitutional cooperation in Logan Wilson, "Myths and Realities of Institutional Independence" in *Emerging Patterns*, 18-28. Examples of, and complexities associated with, interinstitutional cooperation that had taken place primarily during the 1930s may be seen Dennis Sammis Sanford, Jr., *Inter-institutional Agreements in Higher Education: An Analysis of the Documents Relating to Inter-institutional Agreements with Special Reference to*

college personnel considered autonomy as crucial not only to maintaining their individual careers and roles, but the very system itself.

Not only did this raise concerns and complications for anyone attempting to engage a number of institutional types in curricular reform, it also raised a crucial question for Tyler and others: Was a cooperative study of general education feasible on the higher education level? Indeed, would the methods and characteristics of the Eight-Year Study translate to American colleges and universities? The context was similar, and the desire was present, to be sure. However, the very heart of such an enterprise—cooperation for curricular reform—would need to be ensured without harming the essential fabric of institutional diversity and autonomy.

I argue that the Cooperative Study in General Education (1939-1947) was conceived to effectively deal with the issues of institutional diversity and autonomy. In many ways, the Cooperative Study continued the assumptions and methods of general education reform set in place by the Eight-Year Study (e.g., workshops, student and teacher assisted reforms, and the creation of shared curricular materials). Moreover, it built on the philanthropic relationships already in place and conformed to the desires of the philanthropic foundations that funded it (most notably the General Education Board). It served as a site of tangible and consequential reforms and allowed various college personnel who had political, economic, social, cultural, and religious disagreements and who represented drastically different institutional types to cooperate without consensus and reform their general education programs. More important, it taught a generation of collegiate personnel the methods of approaching general education reform and further influenced reform in the general education movement in higher education. It represented

---

Coordination (New York: Bureau of Publications, Teachers College, Columbia University, 1934); *Cooperation and Coordination in Higher Education* (Washington, D.C.: American Council on Education, 1938).

philanthropy, educational research, and interinstitutional cooperation and was perhaps the pioneering example of cooperation without consensus.

To demonstrate how the Cooperative Study in General Education operated and accomplished these goals, I focus on the origins, funding, and functioning of the Study before turning my attention to the ways in which the Study negotiated the ambivalence—if not outright antipathy—toward general education during the Second World War. I then focus on the creation of the Basic College, a consequential reform that shaped the identity of Cooperative Study participant Michigan State College (MSC).[41]

Initial Planning Stages of the Cooperative Study in General Education

Seeking Initial Funding for General Education Reform in American Higher Education

The Cooperative Study in General Education built upon the success of the Eight-Year Study and is a representation of the relationship between the general education movement and philanthropic foundations. Not only did it negotiate the same political, economic, and social context as the Eight-Year Study, but it also navigated much of the same terrain when it came to seeking funding. Put simply, the expectations of the foundations were roughly the same. The researchers were expected to create an experiment worthy of the dollars marshalled for the cause of scientific philanthropy. They would have to constantly work with the philanthropic officers to adjust their experimental design.

The key differences between the Eight-Year Study and the Cooperative Study in General Education were factors that ultimately made the importance and influence of the General Education Board even more acute. The first difference involved the amount of funding sources. Whereas the Eight-Year Study had the opportunity to be funded by the Carnegie Corporation as

[41] The institution in East Lansing, MI underwent a name change from Michigan State College to Michigan State University in 1955.

well as the General Education Board, Tyler and his staff had more or less burned their bridges with the Carnegie philanthropies. This left the General Education Board as the only major philanthropic foundation that the leadership of the Cooperative Study could seek out. The next difference involved the major associations that were overseeing each study. Whereas the Eight-Year Study was run under the auspices of the Progressive Education Association, the Cooperative Study was overseen by the American Council on Education. Though all associations at the time relied upon philanthropic foundations (much as all researchers always rely upon funding agencies), the General Education Board held particular sway over the ACE until the end of the Second World War.[42] Therefore, they were likely to be influential in the design (or the revisions applied to the design) of most studies being run under the auspices of the ACE. The third key difference was that the Eight-Year Study operated in concert with a General Education Board project to fund projects related to general education. Conversely, the Cooperative Study was beginning as this philanthropic project was drawing to an end.[43] Though each of these points caused some tension over financing, the Cooperative Study in General Education was successful at continuing to strengthen the bond between the GEB and the general education movement. The following section elucidates the initial proposal for funding the Cooperative Study and the ways in which it was revised.

On April 24, 1938 ACE President George F. Zook phoned Robert J. Havighurst to discuss matters of funding for projects related to general education that were being overseen by the ACE. Zook discussed two projects with Havighurst: the first being a "proposal by a group of liberal arts colleges in the Middle West to start a cooperative program of evaluation and curriculum study in their junior divisions." Zook continued, "This group of colleges has

[42] Hawkins, *Banding Together*, esp. 115-117.
[43] Albert R. Mann, "The Program in 1941" in *General Education Board, Annual Report, 1941* (New York: General Education Board, 1941), 50; Havighurst, "Assistance Given to Cooperative Educational Experiments," 334.

combined with a similar group of Michigan colleges that was established last year, and is asking for recognition by the Council and support in requesting aid of approximately $30,000 a year, in addition to the $25,000 which they will contribute." The second proposal involved support for a journal devoted to general education. Zook intonated his intention to seek alternate funding sources that might supplement a possible grant from the GEB.[44] This particular exchange shows the opening discussion regarding the Cooperative Study in General Education (the first proposal). The group of colleges were the members of the North Central Association discussed earlier.

This discussion between Zook and Havighurst spoke to the relationship between the GEB and the ACE. Zook was well aware of rules that had been unspoken but strongly implied by GEB's administrators. In particular, he knew that "The GEB made it clear…that the ACE must develop other funding sources."[45] Similar to the Eight-Year Study, the participating institutions were required to contribute a set amount annually for the privilege of being part of the study.

Havighurst began by noting that he was impressed by the ability of the institutions to seek organization rather than approaching reform alone and was very open to their suggestion that they should seek to cover a portion of their costs. The first proposal—that for the eventual Cooperative Study in General Education—featured three elements crucial to its success: cooperation, the ability to sustain itself with other sources of funding, and the possibility for it to produce information that could be widely disseminated. As such, it was encouraged. These three factors were noted as crucial by Havighurst as he held up the Cooperative Study in General Education and other examples for a national audience in 1941 of how to sustain support for

[44] "Interviews: RJH with President George F. Zook, American Council on Education, Chicago" (April 24, 1938); Series 1, Sub-Series 3, Box 562, Folder 6005, General Education Board Archives, Rockefeller Archives Center, Sleepy Hollow, New York. Hereafter cited as "GEB Papers."
[45] Hawkins, *Banding Together*, 117.

educational experimentation—particularly as the General Education Board was beginning to pull back its support.[46]

The second proposal, for the journal related to general education, did not fare as well. Havighurst mentioned to Zook that "the Board, it if did become interested, could do so only for a period defined in advance, and only as a means of getting information on general education before educators during the next few years. The Board could not support such a journal with the expectation of continuing support indefinitely until it was paying its way."[47] This proposal was surely tabled as the *Journal of General Education* would not be founded until 1946.

Zook once again brought up the first proposal for the cooperative study on May 20th. He mentioned that an early "proposal is that a number of colleges should each pay a thousand dollars or more into a common fund which would be used to set up a central staff. The Council would sponsor this organization and would like to secure funds from the Board to supplement the money provided by the colleges themselves."[48] Havighurst continued to ponder the matter and suggested two possible alternatives:

> First, a grant in aid to the new association of approximately $5,000 for an exploratory year, together with an assurance that four or five people from the faculties of the cooperating colleges might be appointed on fellowships to work with the central staff. The second possibility would be that the Board should match the contributions of the participating colleges on a dollar for dollar basis, or on a smaller basis, over a period of about three years, with the understanding that in addition the Board would be prepared to grant fellowships for the training of a small number of faculty members from the participating colleges.[49]

Zook would relay this information back to the cooperating colleges who were in the process of drafting the proposal for the study. Seeking legitimacy for the study, Zook sought out Tyler to

---

[46] Robert J. Havighurst, "The Government and Educational Experimentation," *Teachers College Record* 7 (1941): 146-148.
[47] "Interviews: RJH with President George F. Zook, American Council on Education, Chicago" (April 24, 1938); Series 1, Sub-Series 3, Box 562, Folder 6005, GEB Papers.
[48] "Interviews: RJH with President George F. Zook of the American Council on Education" (May 20, 1938); Series 1, Sub-Series 3, Box 562, Folder 6005, GEB Papers.
[49] Ibid.

invite him to serve as Director of the Study. Zook then put Tyler in contact with key representatives from the NCA colleges interested in cooperating.

Several representatives and Tyler worked together to craft a proposal that painted the Cooperative Study as similar to the Eight-Year Study. It spoke to the three principles that marked the experimental design of the Eight-Year Study: multiple and internal funding sources, cooperation, and applicability. "Many institutions have not had the financial and human resources necessary to evaluation their own educational programs in terms of their professed objectives," the proposal stated "And there has been too little opportunity for the interchange among institutions of the results of experimentation within them. It seems clear, therefore, that a broad cooperative study of the problems of general education at this level would be of great value…These experiments would be critically appraised and the results made available to all American institutions of higher education."[50] In addition, the proposal noted that "Since general education should be the concern of all types of institutions it seems desirable to have represented in the group arts colleges within universities, four-year independent liberal arts colleges, junior colleges, and teachers colleges."[51]

Zook transmitted the proposal to Havighurst on May 28 and attempted to speak to the fact that he and others had heeded Havighurst's earlier advice. Zook underscored the fact that Havighurst's old friend, Ralph W. Tyler, had "indicated his willingness to serve as director of the project." This point would serve as the key Zook also suggested that members of the several interested colleges and Tyler "arrived at the conclusion that it should be fixed at $226,500. Of this sum $110,000 would be contributed by the higher institutions (if as many as twenty institutions participate) and not to exceed $116,500 by the General Education Board. The latter

[50] "Proposal for a Five-Year Cooperative Study in General Education at the Junior College Level" Series 1 Sub-Series: 3 Box 562 Folder 6005 GEB Papers.
[51] Ibid.

sum does not include provision for fellowships, which it is believed are necessary to the success of the project." Finally, Zook addressed the notion of the dissemination and applicability the results to be obtained from the study: "If it proves possible to carry on this project it seems clear that there will be a substantial benefit, not only to a considerable group of institutions participating in it, but to all other institutions over the country which will be stimulated by the example and results of this study"[52] Havighurst indicated his approval for the project by passing it on to the executive committee for further consideration.

While the decision to send the proposal to committee might have indicated complete approval by the GEB, the executive committee deliberated and its head W.W. Brierley provided the following decision to Zook on June 16:

> The Committee did not find it practicable to act favorably on the request as presented, but it did authorize an appropriation to the American Council on Education of $66,000…This appropriation was authorized with the understanding (1) that each college in the study will contribute a sum of approximately $1,000 a year to the project and that at least fifteen colleges will participate; (2) that the University of Chicago will provide housing for the central staff and other incidental facilities; and (3) that Professor R.W. Tyler, Head of the University's Department of Education and of the Evaluation Staff of the Eight Year Study of the Progressive Education Association, will be available for advice during the study…At the end of the three-year period the officers will review the situation with you.[53]

In only providing 57% of the funds requested by ACE for the Cooperative Study, the GEB was sending distinct messages to the ACE and the colleges. First, by reducing the study from its proposed one-time grant for five-years to one that would have to be reviewed after three years, the GEB sought to make sure that each college would need to support the cost on an annual basis. Doing this, the GEB reasoned, would determine which campuses were committed to sustained experimentation. Next, having Tyler direct the project would ensure that the

[52] George F. Zook to Robert J. Havighurst, 28 May 1938. Series 1, Sub-Series 3, Box 562, Folder 6005, GEB Papers.
[53] W.W. Brierley to George F. Zook, 16 June 1938. Series 1, Sub-Series 3, Box 562, Folder 6005, GEB Papers.

methods pioneered and applied in the Eight-Year Study would continue. He was trusted by the GEB (and Havighurst, in particular). Moreover, he had an office and a staff for the Eight-Year Study that was being currently being financed by the GEB.[54] Many of these staff members were recruited to work on the Cooperative Study and were able to find interrelations between their work in both studies. Indeed, this created instances of what we might label today as "synergy." An example of this was listed by Bruno Bettelheim in his curriculum vitae from 1942. After explaining his responsibilities in the Eight-Year Study, Bettelheim noted that he had "developed a new art test…which will be published in the report of the Study." He then described his work with the Cooperative Study and noted that he had "adapted for use at the college level the art test which [he] originally developed."[55]

The fact that Tyler was moving to the University of Chicago—an institution that was created and heavily subsidized by Rockefeller funding, and whose graduate programs in education were being pushed to focus primarily on educational research—was likely attractive to the GEB as well.[56] Many of the staff members that Tyler employed were familiar to the GEB—who had high regard for many of these researchers. This may be seen in the concern and the threat of reduced funding that was expressed in a meeting of GEB administrators upon hearing

---

[54] This "headquarters" of the Eight-Year Study (and later of the Cooperative Study in General Education) was an abandoned Universalist Church on 6010 Dorchester, near the campus of the University of Chicago. Tyler noted this in Tyler, "Education: Curriculum Development," 98.

[55] "Curriculum Vitae" Folder: Bruno Bettelheim, Individual Files, Rockford University Archives, Howard Colman Library, Rockford University, Rockford, IL. Also see the discussion of his time with both studies in Richard Pollak, *The Creation of Dr. B: A Biography of Bruno Bettelheim* (New York: Simon & Schuster, 1997), 98-108.

[56] On early Rockefeller support of the University of Chicago, see Thomas Wakefield Goodspeed, *A History of the University of Chicago Founded by John D. Rockefeller: The First Quarter-Century* (Chicago: University of Chicago Press, 1916); Kenneth W. Rose, "Why a University for Chicago and Not Cleveland?: Religion and John D. Rockefeller's Early Philanthropy, 1855-1900" (Unpublished Research Report, Rockefeller Archives Center, 1995). On the history of Rockefeller and broader philanthropic funding at the University of Chicago see John W. Boyer, *The "Persistence to Keep Everlastingly At It:" Fund-Raising and Philanthropy at Chicago in the Twentieth Century* (Chicago: College of the University of Chicago, 2004); David L. Seim, *Rockefeller Philanthropy and Modern Social Science* (London: Pickering and Chatto, 2013), 126-133. On the financial support of the GEB to the School of Education and their support of the School's broader strategies to focus almost exclusively on educational research see Woodie Thomas White, "The Study of Education at the University of Chicago, 1892-1958" (PhD diss., University of Chicago, 1977).

the news that two members of Tyler's staff left to pursue other opportunities. Tyler was certain to reassure GEB administrator Flora M. Rhind that he would "do everything possible to find strong staff replacements."[57]

To supplement Brierley's letter, Havighurst wrote an accompanying letter to Zook to clarify the committee's decision and to emphasize the need for applicable results. "The Board," Havighurst noted, "felt that the cooperating colleges should be pretty steadfastly held to defining their purposes clearly and then carrying through experimentation in such a way that definite results are obtained. And that only such institutions should be accepted into the association as give really good promise of being able to do sustained scientific work after the preliminary year."[58] This was a key influence on Zook asking Tyler to design the Cooperative Study so that it functioned similarly to the Eight-Year Study. With funding secured, and the expectations that funding carried acknowledged, the leadership began to create a generalizable sample of institutions.

Creating the Generalizable Sample

Under the same assumptions about saliency and cooperation that guided the Eight-Year Study, the administrators of the Cooperative Study in General Education sought to create a sample of institutions—and institutional types—that was representative of the entirety of American higher education. However, they had to deal with additional layers of complexity as the selection process involved institutions of higher learning. The following issues were confronted and reconciled: the requirements for participation, how to include institutions across the nation in the face of a limited budget, how to deal with institutions who refused to join due to

[57] "Interviews: FMR Workshop in General Education University of Chicago" (July 28-31, 1942), Series 1 Sub-Series: 3 Box 562, Folder 6006, GEB Papers.
[58] George F. Zook to Robert J. Havighurst, 16 June 1938. Series 1, Sub-Series 3, Box 562, Folder 6005, GEB Papers.

assumptions about the prestige of other participants, and how to refuse full participation to institutions while still offering them other forms of assistance.

In the initial planning sessions of the Cooperative Study in General Education, the leadership decided not only to include all the NCA institutions who had initially asked for the study but also to set forth selection criteria for other institutions that wished to join the study. In its first meeting, the leadership of the Cooperative Study "decided that its collective judgment concerning the qualifications of institutions, supplemented by such additional information as it seems desirable to collect, would furnish an adequate basis for the selection of the cooperating institutions."[59]

The leadership worked out specific criteria which were laid out in list-form in the 1938 annual report of the American Council on Education. Each of the six points listed spoke to a crucial issue and key characteristic of the Cooperative Study in General Education. "1. Each institution should present concrete evidence showing that it is seriously concerned with a study of its educational program." This requirement was, of course, no different than the guiding requirement for inclusion in the Eight-Year Study. Institutions had to have some considerations of their general education program on the table and some past experience in broaching the topic with administrators, faculty members, and students. They needed to be willing to experiment and cooperate in experimentation, rather than proselytize other institutions into accepting their already set curriculum. Put simply, "the committee sought institutions which could show evidence of educational vitality; that is, those in which some form of educational

[59] Minutes of the First Meeting of the Committee on the Cooperative Study in General Education, Held in Dean Works' office, the University of Chicago, on Wednesday Evening, July 13, 1938, Box 115, Folder 1, American Council on Education Records, Hoover Institution Library and Archives, Stanford, California. Hereafter cited as "ACE Papers."

experimentation had taken place."[60] Though this point bore similarities to the Eight-Year Study, it was taken especially seriously as it had been stressed by the GEB that their "Board authorized the release of the money by the executive officers on condition that they are satisfied with the excellent criteria for selection of cooperating colleges that are listed in the proposal have been successfully applied…And that only such institutions should be accepted into the association as give really good promise of being able to do sustained scientific work after the preliminary year."[61]

The next two points were intended to ensure that the faculty of each institution was on board with educational experimentation and that there were a few representatives at each institution who could serve as on-campus representatives of the Cooperative Study in General Education: "Each cooperating institution should demonstrate that it has potential leadership, both administrative and instructional, which will guarantee understanding of problems of education and active participation in the program of this study. 3. Each institution should show evidence that it has made its faculty familiar with the purposes of this project, and that the faculty understand the responsibilities which participation involves." These points were crucial given that faculty in higher education have broader responsibilities than their secondary counterparts.

Significantly, faculty participation was repeated again in the sixth and final point: "6. In each cooperating institution there should be on part of the faculty a desire and willingness to participate in a study of this kind, and there should also be a trustee action approving the participation by the college over a three-year period." In addition to faculty participation, trustee approval was also highlighted. Indeed, each institution was required to produce "a letter indicating that the trustees have taken favorable action and that the faculty has voted to

[60] McGrath, "The Cooperative Study," 503.
[61] Robert J. Havighurst to George F. Zook 16 June 1938 Series 1 Sub-Series: 3 Box 562, Folder 6005, GEB Papers.

participate."[62] These points ultimately sought to ensure participation without infringing upon the autonomy of individual administrators or faculty members.

The fourth point insisted that institutions allow the results of the experimentation to be published and disseminated in national publication outlets: a key and expressed purpose of the Cooperative Study in General Education. The end of this point and the fifth point while the fifth point was meant to allay institutions who feared that somehow the Cooperative Study in General Education would be used by other, perhaps less-prestigious participants to boost their national profile at their expense: "4. Each institution should publish, or permit to be published, the results of significant experimentation conducted as part of the work of the cooperative study. In institutional comparisons, however, the identify [sic] of institutions will not be revealed. 5. Each institution should agree not to use membership in the study for publicity purposes in recruiting students. The use of membership in this connection will be considered sufficient reason for asking the institution to withdraw from the study."[63] The need to assuage institutional concerns about their relationship to other participating counterparts will be a theme explored a bit later in this section.

In addition to the more philosophical issues of experimentation and methods of working, there were still practical concerns involved in admitting institutions. Institutions outside of the Midwest—where many of the NCA institutions and the headquarters of the Cooperative Study at the University of Chicago were located—wished to join the Study.[64] George Zook himself would note that "groups in California and in the south have shown an interest in a regional project of

[62] George A. Works to George F. Zook, 16 December 1938. Box 115, Folder 1, ACE Papers.
[63] American Council on Education, *Annual Report, 1938* (Washington, D.C.: Author, 1939), 18.
[64] On the geographical distribution of North Central Association institutions, see Donald M. Mackenzie, "Geographical Differences in the Educational Expenditures of North Central Association Colleges and Universities," *North Central Association Quarterly* 18 (1944): 261-271.

this sort."[65] While their inclusion would be desirable in creating a generalizable sample, it would have to be negotiated in a manner that did not put too much strain on already thin resources. Indeed, the initial budget of the Cooperative Study was "based on a contribution of $1,000 yearly by each of the cooperating institutions, and a similar amount contributed by the General Education Board."[66] Of this budget, which totaled $43,000, personnel costs accounted for $28,000, travel expenses accounted for $9,200, supplies and equipment accounted for $2,275, the accounting fee of the Council was $1,075, and finally a contingent fund of $2,000.[67] To provide perspective, the totals in 2016 dollars involve a total budget of over $706,000, of which the personnel costs accounted for nearly $460,000, travel expenses over $151,000, supplies over $37,000, and a contingent fund of nearly $33,000.

Indeed, the staff of the Eight-Year Study—many of whom, as previously mentioned, would be recruited to work on the "Central Staff" of the Cooperative Study in General Education—were already traveling to each of the schools for site visits and were being overwhelmed by requests by the high schools that they were serving.[68] The question became one of synergy and efficiency. Given that the educational researchers were often driving from school to school, they sought institutions that were relatively near each other while still including a broad selection of institutions geographically distributed throughout the country.[69] The Eight-Year Study had achieved this by having limited representation in the south and more or less neglecting the west coast. The same principles applied in the initial meeting of the Cooperative

[65] "Minutes of the Meeting of the Sub-Committee on General Education, November 29 and 30, 1938 at the Stevens Hotel, Chicago, Illinois, Box 115, Folder 1, ACE Papers.
[66] "Minutes of the Meeting of the Committee on the Cooperative Study in General Education at the Stevens Hotel, Chicago, Illinois, November 18, 1938" Box 115, Folder 1, ACE Papers.
[67] "Budget," Box 115, Folder 1, ACE Papers.
[68] Tyler opted not to have multiple commissions or section the Cooperative Study out into the areas of Evaluation and Curriculum as the Eight-Year Study had done, therefore all the researchers worked as part of a "Central Staff."
[69] A seemingly tangential but crucial factor to consider is that this took place prior to the advent of the interstate highway system.

Study: "The committee found it necessary" the minutes read "to select a majority of institutions from the states within the north central area, because of the expense involved in visitation to institutions by members of the Central Staff. However, several institutions outside the north central region were nominated in order to give the study a national complexion, and also with the purpose of stimulating activity in this field in other sections of the country."[70]

Therefore, when a group of colleges from California expressed interest in joining, "the committee decided that the resources available would not permit the inclusion of institutions on the west coast." However, George Zook broached the issue at a later meeting and convinced the administrators of the Cooperative Study that they needed to include institutions from California "on the grounds that the Council is a national organization and therefore, has the obligation to include institutions in the far west."[71] ACE was a national organization with a vested interest in ending "regionalism" of higher education, and this needed to be demonstrated through its selections.[72] However, practicality was still a defining point along which the institutions were selected. After all, what good was the Study if it exhausted its resources too quickly? Ultimately, institutions from California including Pasadena Junior College and Mills College were admitted along with the University of Denver in Colorado.

Another issue that the selection process revealed was how to negotiate issues of perceived prestige. The leadership of the Cooperative Study sought to build a sample that was representative of all institutional types. As such, they confronted representatives of institutions who did not want to be linked to the other participants of the Cooperative Study. Given the

---

[70] "Minutes of the First Meeting of the Committee on the Cooperative Study in General Education, Held in Dean Works' office, the University of Chicago, on Wednesday Evening, July 13, 1938, Box 115, Folder 1, ACE Papers.
[71] "Minutes of the Meeting of the Sub-Committee on General Education" Box 115, Folder 1, ACE Papers.
[72] This concern was expressed—albeit in the slightly different context of experiments taken by land-grant institutions—by O.J. Hagen, "The Concept of Regionalism in Higher Education," *Educational Record* 18 (1937): 147-158.

national reputation that Sarah Lawrence College and Vanderbilt University had for experimenting with their general education programs—and in the case of the former, the massive amount of GEB funding it had acquired for curriculum projects—the administrators of the Cooperative Study reached out to see if they would like to join.[73] They received negative responses from both institutions.

George A. Works, who served as the Study's initial director, wrote to Zook to confirm that "There is a possibility that Vanderbilt will not participate as I judge from Chancellor [Samuel P.] Capen's letter he is not particularly enthusiastic about it. I gathered from what Mr. [Earl] McGrath said that he felt the institutions were not quite up to the level of a group in which he would like to see Vanderbilt."[74] At a later meeting, Works reported that he was "disturbed by reasons given by some of the stronger institutions in refusing to join the group. Those were that: (1) the earlier representatives of the project had referred to the publicity value of membership in the group; (2) some of the institutions already members of the group were not of high quality; (3) some of the colleges of liberal arts stated that their programs of general education extended through four years, and therefore any program of evaluation limited to the junior college level would not be adequate to their needs."[75]

The leadership of the Cooperative Study continued to receive letters of interest as the Study was advertised. The selection committee needed two of each type of institution to assure

---

[73] On general education reforms at Sarah Lawrence College during the late 1930s and early 1940s, see Constance Warren, *A New Design for Women's Education* (New York: Frederick A. Stokes Company, 1940); Ruth L. Monroe, *Teaching the Individual* (New York: Columbia University Press, 1942); Louis T. Benezet, *General Education in the Progressive College* (New York: Arno Press, 1943/1971), chapter three; Joel Lehrfield, "Two Programs of Liberal Education: A Commonplace Analysis," *Journal of General Education* 30 (1979): 255-266. On the GEB funding for Sarah Lawrence College's curriculum efforts, see Steven R. Coleman, "To Promote Creativity, Democracy, and Community: The Progressive Colleges of the 1920s and 1930s" (PhD diss., Columbia University, 2000), 142. On general education reforms at Vanderbilt University during the late 1930s and early 1940s, see Paul K. Conkin assisted by Henry Lee Swint and Patricia S. Miletich, *Gone with the Ivy: A Biography of Vanderbilt University* (Knoxville: University of Tennessee Press, 1985), 392-414.

[74] George A. Works to George F. Zook, 30 December 1938. Box 115, Folder 1, ACE Papers.

[75] Minutes of the Meeting of the Committee on the Cooperative Study in General Education at the Stevens Hotel, Chicago, Illinois, November 18, 1938" Box 115, Folder 1, ACE Papers.

that they could include at least one in the Study. The minutes of an early meeting provide a glimpse of how the selection process may have functioned:

> Dr. Works read a letter from Oklahoma A. and M. College in which this institution expressed a desire to join the group. It was decided not to invite Oklahoma A. and M. The application of Portales College of New Mexico was also rejected. Mr. McGrath then reported on his visits to Allegheny College, Bethany College, Winthrop College, and Talladega College. Each of these institutions with the exception of Winthrop College was admitted. Milwaukee State Teachers College and Ball State Teachers College were discussed and the committee decided to extend an invitation to the latter institution. Several members of the committee urged the addition of another land grant institution. A preference was expressed for Iowa State College at Ames and Purdue University. Accordingly the Chairman was authorized to invite Iowa State College, and if this institution does not consider it desirable or feasibly to participate, the invitation will be extended to Purdue.[76]

Unfortunately, the historical record does not afford an opportunity to understand the reasos for acceptance or rejection for individual institutions. For the institutions whose applications were declined, the leadership suggested that select representatives might appeal to the General Education Board for fellowships to attend summer workshops organized by the Study.[77] Many of these institutions had intentions to undertake major reorganizations of their general education programs and required cooperative and financial assistance. As such, they sought whatever assistance they could, often by packaging and publishing their plans for distribution to other institutions across the country. One rejected institution, Oklahoma A&M (later Oklahoma State University), had begun a curriculum reorganization so multi-faceted that it would change the entire emphasis of the institution. The faculty committees created for this purpose had devoted an entire bulletin and distributed it widely across the nation.[78]

---

[76] Ibid.
[77] "Fellowships from the Summer Workshop" Box 29, Folder 6, Tyler Papers.
[78] On the curriculum reorganization at Oklahoma A&M, see "A Liberal College in the Making: Reports by Four Faculty Committees of the School of Science and Literatures." Special Issue. *Oklahoma Agriculture and Mechanical College Bulletin* 34 (1937): 1-44.

By the end of the selection process, the chairman of the Cooperative Study was able to report that the colleges "constitute almost a complete cross section of American higher education. The land-grant college, the municipal university, the state teachers college, the independent liberal arts college, the Catholic college, the Protestant church-related college, the Negro college, the four-year college for women, the junior college for women, and the coeducational junior college are all represented in the study."[79] Tyler later noted this diversity while trying to recall the twenty-two schools that participated, "It included two state universities, Michigan State and Iowa State;" he said "it included some excellent women's colleges, the College of St. Catherine, a Catholic women's college, in St. Paul, Mills College, and Stephen's [sic] College; it included Allegheny College, Methodist, and Bethany College, a Disciples school; it included the Centre College of Kentucky which is, as I recall, Episcopalian; it included the University of Louisville, which was then a municipal university."[80] In addition to including historically black colleges—a major advance over the Eight-Year Study which simply recommended that black high schools form their own cooperative study—the Cooperative Study in General Education brought together a Catholic college with several Protestant colleges of various denominations.[81]

Creating a diverse and generalizable sample was as crucial in this instance as it was in the Eight-Year Study—as was advertising it. In a national publication outlet, Earl J. McGrath, a major figure of the Cooperative Study in General Education suggested that the sample's "diversity should guarantee the widest possible application of the results of the study."[82]

---

[79] Tolley, "Twenty-One Colleges," 304-305.
[80] Tyler, "Education: Curriculum Development," 122.
[81] For histories of the "Secondary School Study," that involved sixteen southern black high schools, see Sharon Gay Pierson, *Laboratory of Learning: HBCU Laboratory Schools and Alabama State College Lab High in the Era of Jim Crow* (New York: Peter Lang, 2014), 69-80; Craig Kridel, *Progressive Education in Black High Schools: The Secondary School Study, 1940-1946* (Columbia, SC: Museum of Education, 2015).
[82] McGrath, "The Cooperative Study," 504.

Moreover, the diverse institutions that they had brought together were ones that appeared to be ready to engage in serious and sustained experimentation. Robert Havighurst had attended an initial meeting of the Cooperative Study in Chicago the following January (1939) and noted that the "colleges are already unusually well equipped by previous experience to study problems of education. With two or three exceptions, the statements by college representatives showed a background of much faculty thought and previous experimentation." After a comparison of "the statements of the representatives of the Thirty Schools in the Eight Year Study" to what he heard from the college representatives at that meeting, Havighurst was comfortable enough to "say that this group of colleges is a year or two in advance of the Thirty Schools (as they were in 1934) in preparation for evaluation of an experimentation with their programs."[83]

Functioning of the Study

As the institutions were being selected, the leadership of the Cooperative Study contended with ways to apply the assumptions and methods of the Eight-Year Study to assisting the colleges on "problems of the curriculum, problems of evaluation and measurement, and problems of student personnel and guidance."[84] The leadership began with four key assumptions that would mark the Cooperative Study as an experimental, sociological study that grappled with the tension between advocacy and objectivity, created and maintained a generalizable sample, obtained funding from participating school, ensured the autonomy of each institution and participant, and emphasized interdisciplinary cooperation and curricular coherence within each institution wherever possible.

The study's associate director, Ralph W. Ogan wrote these out for a national audience. He began by noting that "because of the differences among colleges, no one plan of general

[83] "Interviews: RJH: Meeting of the Cooperative College Study, Chicago, January 6-7, 1939" (February 2 1939), Series 1 Sub-Series: 3 Box 562, Folder 6005, GEB Papers.
[84] Ralph W. Tyler, "Co-Operation in the Study of Institutional Problems" in *The Outlook*, 230.

education and no one philosophy of education can be universally appropriate to the colleges." The second assumption guiding the leadership was "Each college shall exercise full autonomy" while the third reminded all involved that "Cooperative efforts are mutually helpful." The final assumption posited that "A continuous program of self-examination in each cooperating college is beneficial."[85] This coincided with four more tangible goals that were explained to the participating colleges themselves: the creation of evaluation instruments, faculty who are trained to lead studies of their general education programs, revision of the curriculums, and the expansion of personnel services.[86] Having adapted the assumptions of the Eight-Year Study to the unique issues of diversity and autonomy in American higher education, the leaders then began to adapt the methods of the Eight-Year Study. This began with consultancies.

The Role of the Central Staff

Members of the central staff were available to the cooperating colleges "on invitation" and saw themselves as "consultants, collaborators, and as coordinators among the several colleges."[87] Central staff members could either be dispatched to the particular colleges, could hold a correspondence with the college personnel, or even invite one or two faculty members to join them at the University of Chicago for an extended period. In any case, the particular expertise of each staff member was advertised to the colleges. In addition to their particular expertise, staff members were generally trained and equipped to be able to "bring together relevant studies" and "make appropriate use of digests for several institutions" on issues ranging

[85] Ogan, "The Cooperative Study," 692-693. These assumptions were also written out by another central staff member elsewhere in the very same volume of the *Educational Record*. See Louis M. Heil, "Determining Objectives of Science Instruction for General Education," *Educational Record* 23 (1942): 94-105, esp. 96-97.
[86] "The American Council on Education: A Cooperative Study in General Education" Box 345, Folder 7, St. Catherine's University Archives and Special Collections, St. Catherine University Library, St. Paul, Minnesota. Hereafter cited as "CSC Papers."
[87] Ralph W. Tyler, Foreword to *Cooperation in General Education*, ix. "The Workshop Group in Problems of Educational Administration" in *Proceedings of the Workshop in General Education, 1940, Volume IV: Educational Administration* (Chicago: Cooperative Study in General Education, 1941), 10.

from “the demands of modern society,” “various youth surveys,” “the demands of the particular communities into which the graduates of an individual institutions are going,” and general evaluation techniques as well as those used by other institutions.[88] Central staff members could also assist institutions in studies of “the abilities, the interests, the needs, and the aspirations of its own students,” general issues related to curriculum, and “organization and sequence”[89]

The policy of the central staff and of the Cooperative Study was that these projects would be shared so that “each college can have twenty times as many studies, reports, and projects at its command than would be the case if the work were done on an individual basis.”[90] In many cases, multiple members of the central staff were dispatched to one institution which created an opportunity for multiple faculty members to work cooperatively before breaking into smaller group. An instance of this occurred at the College of St. Catherine. A November 24th, 1939 article in the school’s newspaper, the *Catherine Wheel* announced that “a miniature workshop” would occur on the campus from December 8-10. The article provided a bit of context about the Cooperative Study before listing the names of the Central Staff members who would be coming and their expertise.[91]

The problems that the central staff was available to work on were stated in rather broad terms so that the participating institutions would be feel comfortable asking for assistance for any number of specific projects. Moreover, the central staff sought to be as value-neutral in their assistance as possible—but whether they succeeded is an entirely different matter. Their mantra

---

[88] An example of one of these bibliographies is “A Bibliography of Studies of Students’ Needs: February 1940” (Chicago: Cooperative Study in General Education, 1940), surviving copy is available at the Ohio State University Library, Columbus, Ohio.
[89] Tyler, “Co-Operation in the Study” 233-237.
[90] Ibid, 242.
[91] “Cooperative Study Staff Has Workshop” *The Catherine Wheel*, 24 November 1939.

involved using the embryonic ideas that would soon coalesce into the "Tyler Rationale."[92] "State your objectives in behavioral terms," Harold B. Dunkel, one of the key members of the Cooperative Study recalled in 1987, "what is the student to do; set up the situation where the student does what you say he should be able to do, see whether he can do it. Now, this is completely free of content, purpose, thrust; this is a very neutral thing. I just come in and say, 'I'm an evaluator. Now, tell me what you're doing and I'll help you find out how well you're doing it. I don't care what you're doing.'"[93] By adopting this attitude, the central staff attempted to preserve the autonomy of the institutions and limited their demands—thereby allowing the institutions to initiate any extended period of working with the central staff or other schools. This was repeated early and often throughout the Study. For instance, one circular distributed not only to the participating colleges but to others noted that the Cooperative Study "should preserve the autonomy of each college yet at the same time give every college some assistance in attacking its major problems."[94]

That said, the central staff did place four expectations on the institutions so that the former could better serve the latter. Personnel at the institutions were expected to "confer with officers and staffs in member institutions concerning problems in the field of general education…assist in organizing desirable institutional programs of investigations…devise such tests and other measuring instruments as are required to evaluate experimental projects within

---

[92] On the application of behavioral objectives to the Cooperative Study in General Education see George E. Barton, Jr., "The Derivation and Clarification of Objectives," *Journal of Educational Research* 41 (1948): 624-639. Works that speak to the Cooperative Study as a site where Tyler continued to evolve and apply the ideas that would become the rationale include Ralph W. Tyler, "New Dimensions in Curriculum Development," *Phi Delta Kappan* 48 (1966): 25; Kridel, "Implications for Initiating," 31; Marie Kirchner Stone, "Bibliography: Progressive Education (1880-1990)" in *Progressive Education for the 1990s*, 191.

[93] Harold B. Dunkel, interview by Thomas Roby, December 18, 1987, transcript published as *The Reminisces of Harold B. Dunkel*, p. 54, Special Collections Research Center at the University of Chicago, Joseph Regenstein Library, Chicago, Illinois.

[94] "Brief Summary of Activities of The Cooperative Study in General Education, October, 1941" Box 123, Folder 3, ACE Papers.

cooperating institutions…[and] prepare for publication reports on the results of this experimentation."[95] Having colleges continually reporting their progress to the central staff allowed for—among other things—an opportunity for the central staff to offer its services whenever possible. It was also helpful in securing a set of common problems that the colleges could cooperatively attack.

Workshops

Guided by these assumptions, the Cooperative Study in General Education held its first workshop at the University of Chicago between June 19 and June 22, 1939 which featured "seventy-seven representatives from the twenty-two colleges" and "all of the members of the central staff" along with "eight other staff members."[96] Much of this work centered on familiarizing the colleges with the ways of the workshop as well as continuing to hammer out the specific methods of working. "Ideas and suggestions had to be collected and fitted together; issues had to be defined." Harold Dunkel had noted, "But even more important, hypotheses and plans had to be developed, criticized, tried out, evaluated, revised, and tried again…To this end, the first eighteen months of the five years of the Study were devoted exclusively to projects of this kind."[97]

Defining general education was also crucial as it introduced the participants to the notion of stating general education goals in terms of behavioral objectives, thereby providing them with a guiding philosophy that would serve as the intellectual foundation for their more tangible goals involving methods of teaching, content selection, etc. One professor from New York University

---

[95] "The American Council on Education: A Cooperative Study in General Education" Box 345, Folder 7, CSC Papers.

[96] American Council on Education, *Annual Report, 1939* (Washington, D.C.: Author, 1940), 40. This coincided with workshops held by the Eight-Year Study. On these workshops, see Ralph W. Tyler, "Workshops at the University of Chicago," *National Association of Secondary School Principals Bulletin* 25 (1941): 45-52.

[97] Dunkel, *General Education*, 5.

familiar with the workshops held by the Cooperative Study would later state this problem in the following terms: "Many colleges are still groping with their programs because they have not settled the question of what basic purposes general education should achieve." He continued, "Although many accept the idea that young people should behave differently after taking general education courses, there is need for spelling out specifically how they should behave and examining programs of general education in terms of those specific behaviors. Workshops can provide the atmosphere and the facilities for an effective study of this problem."[98]

At the first summer workshop, representatives from the institutions read a widely distributed document that suggested that "The Cooperative Study was organized for the purpose of assisting the cooperating colleges to re-examine and improve their programs of general education, i.e., the education appropriate for students before they have reached the level of specialized instruction, or 'education for the common life as distinguished from education for the specialist.'"[99]

Ultimately, the definition was broad, but served as a starting point that could stimulate discussions that would lead to "common threads running through many diverse projects…that would lend [themselves] to cooperative effort."[100] This was intended to suggest that while problems all have their local contexts which need to be taken into account, they are indicative of larger, perennial topics that could be discussed by different institutions negotiating a host of different contextual factors (e.g. religious affiliation, size, demographics, and financial situations).

---

[98] J. Darrell Barnard, "Workshops in General Education for College Teachers," *Journal of Educational Sociology* 24 (1951): 276.
[99] "Proceedings of the Workshop in General Education" Box 121, Folder 2, ACE Papers.
[100] "Proposed Emphases for the Study During 1939-40" Box 115, Folder 1, ACE Papers.

It also was intended to suggest that cooperation was *not* intended to create conformity. "Common needs" explained two members of the general education movement, "refer to those needs which all have in common to a greater or less degree. Common interests and common problems are thought of in a similar manner. 'Common' does not mean identical nor does it imply the same learnings, the same achievement for all. It suggests common desirable directions of development for the welfare of the individual and the citizen in a democracy."[101] Tyler would emphasize that working together on common problems would not mean conforming to a single standard or even dealing with the same problem in the same way. Upon being asked later in his life if schools can learn from each other, Tyler responded "we can learn from each other. But not universal principles."[102]

Indeed, the participants were encouraged to continue to seek out common issues where colleges could cooperate with each other—ultimately in the service of reaching their own objectives. An early Staff News Letter— a circular written by the central staff "issued periodically to cooperating colleges as a means of disseminating information regarding the Cooperative Study"—listed out some of these common issues and noted that "More and more, as faculty members and staff members work with rather specialized problems, it becomes clear that these problems have broad implications."[103] Moreover, institutions and their representatives were encouraged to specialize and narrow their focus on specific problems of interest. "Each school does not have to go after all facets or all problems" The participants were reminded at the first

[101] MacKenzie and Evans, "The Challenge of General Education," 67.
[102] Horowitz, "A 75-Year Legacy on Assessment," 73.
[103] "Staff News Letter, Vol. 2, No. 7, April 12, 1941" Box 121, Folder 1, ACE Papers. "Staff News Letter, Vol. 3 No. 2, November 19, 1941" Box 123, Folder 3, ACE Papers.

workshop "Choose the ones it wishes to choose. Then, pool the work of all colleges…and you will have something that is the very core of this Study."[104]

As these facets of the workshop were being tended to, the central staff of the Cooperative Study sought to create an experience where the colleges could cooperate with each other as "one purpose of the Study was to explore effective methods of cooperative effort as between the Central Staff and the twenty-two colleges, and between the participating colleges themselves."[105] This was particularly important to the central staff and the colleges as it seemed to be, for many, the *raison d'etre* of the Cooperative Study. This was facilitated largely by a "directory to show the specific interests of members of the college faculties and members of the central staff" that "would be useful (a) in promoting correspondence among faculty members who have similar interests and (b) in suggesting the personnel of inter-college committees which might be organized to work on certain problems of common concern."[106] Cooperation itself was not to be limited just between the participants of the Cooperative Study; rather the central staff made it clear that "an effort shall be made to coordinate activities of the Cooperative Study with related activities of other national groups. This will involve an attempt to discover what other national groups are doing and to seek coordination where their activities are related to major aspects of the Cooperative Study."[107] By 1941, cooperation between the colleges was being observed by the central staff to the extent that the chairman of the Cooperative Study, William Pearson Tolley,

[104] "Proposed Emphases for the Study During 1939-40" Box 115, Folder 1, ACE Papers.
[105] "Cooperative Study in General Education, Minutes of the Second Conference, October 23-24, 1939" Box 117, Folder 9, ACE Papers.
[106] "Directory of Interests of Faculty Members in the Colleges: September, 1940" (Chicago: Cooperative Study in General Education, 1940), Surviving copy is available at the Joseph Regenstein Library, University of Chicago, Chicago, Illinois. Quotes taken from the introduction of this document.
[107] "Proposed Emphases for the Study During 1939-40" Box 115, Folder 1, ACE Papers.

was able to proclaim that the workshops had "toned up the faculty morale and shattered provincialism and localism" to the education editor of the *New York Times*.[108]

But, what did cooperation look like at the 1939 workshop as well as subsequent sessions? Reconstructing the various experiences of a few specific faculty members may be beneficial for exploring how workshops operated and how common threads were identified by the central staff. The experience of Lorrayne Calkins of Pasadena Junior College provides an important lens and emphasizes just how multi-faceted these experiences could be as a person navigated the workshop. At the 1939 Summer Workshop, the faculty members were split into groups according to their interests. Calkins was placed in the Social Studies Group. There she joined Edward Sayler and Charles H. Haynes of Talladega College as well as Ardenia Chapman of the Drexel Institute in working on determining objectives for the social studies portion of their general education programs. Through this experience, they acknowledged a tension between seeking to reconstruct society while still offering curricula that were locally expedient. This caused them to question the relationship of this tension to determining objectives. These four faculty members began broadly suggesting that "a school, or the social sciences of a school may challenge the status quo, reject society's standards and purposes, and set up standards of its own that will stand in conflict with those of the larger community. If it does take such a step it will at once become more difficult to formulate its objectives; because whatever new or different objectives it may propose must be based upon new experiences and such new social problems which society has not yet accepted as valid or significant for general education."[109] This itself

---

[108] Benjamin Fine, "Colleges Unite in Broad Study of Own Needs: Resources Pooled by 21 to Survey Problems and Aid Education," *New York Times*, 8 June 1941. A small bulletin was even put out in the *Journal of Higher Education* that noted that college personnel outside of the Cooperative Study had joined the conference and found it useful. See "The Reporter," *Journal of Higher Education* 12 (1941): 280.

[109] Edward Sayler, et. al., "Objectives in the Social Studies" in *Materials Prepared by Participants in the Social Studies Group of the Cooperative Study in General Education Summer Workshop, University of Chicago, Chicago, Illinois, June 19—July 21, 1939* (Chicago: Cooperative Study in General Education, 1939), 9.

was a particularly risky statement for a professor at a historically black college such as Talladega to make in such a crowd. However, the record shows no one challenging him in an attempt to work out objectives for his institution and his students.

The other issue illuminated in this exchange, namely, how do faculty determine objectives for our general education programs, seemed to speak to a common issue that would be faced by other faculty members and was one that Calkins carried into other sessions. For instance, one central staff member noted that the first conference made it "clear" to members of the science group "that to determine objectives of science instruction it is necessary to go beyond the subject matter of science itself."[110] Later in the workshop, Calkins found herself on the committee "to consider types of courses, content of courses and the organization of content in the social sciences" who believed that student needs should determine objectives, not necessarily social reconstruction (though there is certainly a connection between the two).[111] In this endeavor she was joined by faculty members from Muskingum College, Antioch College, University of Denver, Talladega College, and Mercer University. There, she and the others discussed ways in which to organize and teach a successful introductory course in the social sciences.

Still later, Calkins was able to craft her own course and proposed questions that needed to be tackled. These questions were not only constructively critiqued by others at the Summer Workshop, but were also published for any interested person to purchase. Her course was entitled "Introduction to Employer-Employee Relations." Her three main questions were "What do young people prepare to do and what are the chance of their being employed in California?...How can I reasonably be sure that I am selecting the kind of work that is best for

[110] Heil, "Determining Objectives of Science Instruction," 95.
[111] S.H. McGuire, et. al., "Types, Content and Organization of Courses in the Social Sciences" in *Materials Prepared by Participants in the Social Studies Group*, 20.

me?...What are possible future opportunities for California youth?"[112] Calkins was then able to attach a list of readings that she wished to read to help her answer these questions.

Calkins's experiences speak to the work of defining objectives. The experiences of Granville D. Davis of Little Rock Junior College, on the other hand, speak to the more tangible work involving the construction of curriculum materials. At the 1939 workshop, he joined future secretary of state Dean Rusk (then of Mills College in Oakland, CA) and a few others in putting together papers on scientific method and two biographies to assist faculty members in creating courses for social sciences.[113]

The experiences of Ruby Baxter of nearby Frances Shimer Junior College provide a lens to see how educational research, inventories, and exams were in steady supply and used during the workshops. In the Physical Sciences and Mathematics Group of the workshop, she worked her way through a syllabus of an introductory Physical Science Course. Baxter's plan of attack did not simply include writing out curriculum materials, but she also suggested that she would use inventories and checklists innovated by the Cooperative Study in General Education and a few other studies (e.g. "Commission of the Secondary School Curriculum of the P[rogressive] E[ducation] A[ssociation], the American Youth Commission of the American Council on Education, University of California Studies.)"[114] These were likely drawn from the "comprehensive test file" of "evaluation instruments" that the central staff maintained.[115]

---

[112] Lorrayne Calkins, "Introduction to Employer-Employee Relations" in *Materials Prepared by Participants in the Social Studies Group*, 51.
[113] Dean Rusk, et. al., "The Nature of the Social Sciences" in *Materials Prepared by Participants in the Social Studies Group*, 29.
[114] Ruby Baxter, "Tentative Statements of Objectives and Suggested Method of Procedure in a Physical Science Course" in *Materials Prepared by Participants in the Physical Science and Mathematics Groups of the Cooperative Study in General Education Summer Workshop, University of Chicago, Chicago, Illinois, June 19—July 21, 1939* (Chicago: Cooperative Study in General Education, 1939), 2.
[115] Tyler, "Co-Operation in the Study" 238.

A similar path was taken by Blanche Martin of Little Rock Junior College who created her own physical science course entitled "Unit of Astronomy."[116] Martin would also cooperate with faculty members from Antioch College, Hendrix College, Bethany College, and even the University of Chicago to attempt to write a syllabus for a terminal mathematics course.[117] The very next year, Martin returned to continue her work on mathematics courses. This time, she was interested in assessment measures. Working with faculty members from Macalester College, the University of Chicago, Hendrix College, and Muskingum College she not only worked out a philosophy of assessment but also provided "sample exercises" for instructors to implement in their own classrooms.[118] In 1940, however, Blanche Martin was not alone at the workshop and convinced a colleague named Mary E. Pape to join. Pape was able to work on the syllabus for a portion (source unit) of a course that included "Conservation and Economic Importance of Organisms."[119] Ultimately, this snapshot of the workshops only scratches the surface on the diversity of cooperation that occurred. This cooperation will be explored further in the chapter as the focus shifts to Michigan State College. However, the cooperation that took place in 1940 and 1941 was soon to be threatened by the American entry into the Second World War.

The General Education Movement and the Second World War

Historian Charles Dorn, in his study of the relationship between the Second World War, K-12 and higher education, and the idea of democracy noted that the war placed pressure on schools to serve as "*weapons* in the nation's *arsenal* of democracy rather than *citadels*"

---

[116] Blanche Martin, "Physical Science Course – Unit of Astronomy" in *Materials Prepared by Participants in the Physical Science and Mathematics Groups*, 11.
[117] Blanche Martin, et al., "Outline of a Proposed Terminal Course in Mathematics for Liberal Arts Students" in *Materials Prepared by Participants in the Physical Science and Mathematics Groups*, 22.
[118] E.J. Camp, et. al., "Test Questions for Mathematics in General Education" in *Proceedings of the Workshop in Genera Education, University of Chicago, 1940, Volume VI: Science* (Chicago: Cooperative Study in General Education, 1941), 239-246.
[119] Mary E. Pape, "Source Unit on Conservation and Economic Importance of Organisms" in *Proceedings of the Workshop in General Education, University of Chicago, 1940, Volume VI: Science*, 93-99.

committed to promoting a whole host of democratic aims.[120] Dorn wrote about, and effectively illustrated, how this tension impacted a host of issues facing schools at all levels across the United States. Institutions of higher learning were very aware of this pressure and considered it paramount to retain the identity of their institutions while still providing critical support to the war effort. At a conference of selected higher education personnel called as something of a "crisis meeting" at the University of Chicago over the holidays of 1942, a member of the general education movement noted, "The American college today is seeking to perform two important and somewhat conflicting functions: the wholehearted assistance to the war effort and the maintenance of those cultural and intellectual values so necessary for a successful peace and reconstruction." He then concluded that "Institutions vary widely in the character of their adjustments, making generalization virtually impossible."[121] This section discusses the pressures that the general education movement faced during the Second World War to abandon its work, and the many concurrent responses it—and the Cooperative Study in General Education—provided as they negotiated the hostile terrain created by these pressures.

The Pressure to Turn Away from General Education and Embrace Militarization

Indeed, the Second World War affected most every aspect of higher education and led to reforms including the "creation of faculty-led, war committees, implementation of a 'defense' curriculum, growth of intentional enrolment management, [and the] militarization of campus[es]" as well as the "modification of curricula," "counseling of students," creation of

---

[120] Charles Dorn, *American Education, Democracy, and the Second World War* (New York: Palgrave Macmillan, 2007), 6.

[121] Russell M. Cooper, "How Colleges are Meeting the Emergency" in *The Colleges in Wartime: New Responsibilities: Proceedings of a Conference of Invited College Representatives Held at the University of Chicago, December 29 and 30, 1942* ed. John Dale Russell (Chicago: Privately Published by the University of Chicago, 1943), 30. Box 392, Volume 244, Floyd W. Reeves Papers (UA2.1.12.1), University Archives and Historical Collections, Michigan State University, East Lansing, MI. Hereafter cited as "Reeves Papers." On the notion that different institutions experienced and responded to the war differently, see Clarence L. Mohr, "World War II and the Transformation of Southern Higher Education" in *Remaking Dixie: The Impact of World War II on the American South* ed. Neil R. McMillen (Jackson: University Press of Mississippi, 1997), 33-55.

"short-term and extracurricular courses" and the evolution of "research."[122] Anxieties and tensions ran rampant as higher education officials were, in the words of one rustled academic, "desperately—sometimes hysterically—trying to adapt education to the needs of a nation faced with an elemental struggle for existence."[123]

Of all of the issues associated with higher education, the issue of general education—an umbrella that covered issues related to non-vocational, liberal, and humanistic curricular measures in the minds of many Americans then as now—was perhaps the most contested. "The Japanese attack upon Pearl Harbor on December 7, 1941 not only thrust America into a world war, but also precipitated a totally new situation in the field of general education," one member of the Cooperative Study in General Education noted, "these problems extended to all levels of the educational enterprise, but in no field did they offer a more serious challenge than in that of general education."[124] For some, the threat that the war posed to the liberal arts and the humanities—and their close cousins, liberal and general education—was quite pronounced. "The war has emphasized the liberal values by endangering them," proclaimed the President of Bennington College.[125] With the pressure to create and adopt vocational and war-related curricula, the liberal arts were being portrayed by some as a luxury that was to be rationed.

First Response: Interpreting and Contextualizing the Pressure

---

[122] Quotes are taken from Jordan R. Humphrey, "Liberal Arts Colleges in the Tumultuous 1940s: Institutional Identity and the Challenges of War and Peace" (PhD diss., Pennsylvania State University, 2010), esp. 285-293; Clarence Stephen Marsh, ed., *Higher Education Cooperates in National Defense: The Report of a Conference of Government Representatives and College and University Administrators, Held in Washington, D.C., July 30-31, 1941* (Washington, D.C.: American Council on Education,) 18. The ways that higher education was affected by the war is discussed by Cardozier, *Colleges and Universities*.

[123] Louis B. Wright, "Humanistic Education and the Democratic State," *American Association of University Professors Bulletin* 30 (1944): 59.

[124] Albert William Levi, *General Education in the Social Studies* (Washington, D.C.: American Council on Education, 1948), 95.

[125] Lewis Webster Jones, "The Reconstruction of Liberal Education," *American Association of University Professors Bulletin* 30 (1944): 320.

Many academics were particularly troubled by the attacks on liberal and general education, and saw more than just their jobs at stake. "In the emergency," one disturbed academic proclaimed, "opportunists among educational administrators are proposing a scheme that plays diabolically into the hands of Fascist sympathizers. They propose to discard all pretense of humanistic education for the duration of the war and to turn the vast school system into training centers in subjects useful to the war effort."[126] Robert M. Hutchins himself opened the aforementioned "crisis meeting" conference by speaking out against the "prevailing governing doctrine…that the only education useful in wartime is an education designed to produce large quantities of low-grade mechanics and small quantities of high-grade ones."[127] Still another academic at this conference opined that an Allied victory was needed by 1943 or 1944 for the country "to survive the complete transformation of our colleges into vocational schools."[128] This level of anxiety and fears of some type of larger conspiracy was one interpretation made by members of the general education movement toward the threat posed by the Second World War.

The other interpretation was merely to see the war as no more than a "catalytic agent which speeded up the reaction time and precipitated long-contemplated curriculum alterations."[129] Indeed, the war was seen by some as having "merely intensified a continuing process."[130] That "continuing process" was comprehensive curriculum reform. "For the past two decades," one scholar noted in 1944, "'the higher learning' has been in constant change. The war, I think, has done little more than accelerate the pace. The restudy of curriculum and of

---

[126] Wright, "Humanistic Education," 59.
[127] Robert M. Hutchins, "Opening Remarks" in *The Colleges in Wartime*, 1. Box 392, Volume 244, Reeves Papers.
[128] Floyd W. Reeves, "Problems Created for Colleges by the Manpower Situation" in *The Colleges in Wartime*, 13. Box 392, Volume 244, Reeves Papers.
[129] J. Hillis Miller and Dorothy V.N. Brooks, *The Role of Higher Education in War and After* (New York: Harper and Brothers, 1944), 93.
[130] Ibid, 88.

educational aims started in earnest abut fifteen years ago."[131] Ralph W. Tyler, in the closing remarks of the aforementioned University of Chicago conference, noted that the "increasing conflict between the demands of vocational and general education…[has] been with us for a long time," before noting that the tensions attain "critical proportions during wartime" but the tension itself is "not [a product] of a war."[132]

Regardless of the interpretation, the war offered an opportunity for the general education movement to effect larger change on the landscape of the undergraduate curriculum and to restate the importance of general and liberal education. This all resulted in a number of reports attempting to defend the role of liberal education—in its many forms— and suggesting it was indispensable for preserving democracy during and after the war.[133] Much as Russell M. Cooper noted that institutions dealt with the war differently, institutions responded by reforming their general education programs in different ways.[134] This was justified as healthy for a "democratic society" as "diversity in policy, may, in fact, represent a healthy experimentalism."[135] On the whole, institutions of higher learning had actually—according to an extensive survey conducted during the war—adjusted their curricula to suit the war less than their K-12 counterparts.[136]

---

[131] Dwight E. Stevenson, "The Shape of Things to Come on the Campus of Tomorrow," *Association of American Colleges Bulletin* 30 (1944): 526.
[132] Ralph W. Tyler, "Summary of the Conference" *The Colleges in Wartime*, 75. Box 392, Volume 244, Reeves Papers.
[133] These reports are discussed in-depth in John William Tresch, Jr., "The Impact of the Second World War on Liberal Arts Education in the United States" (EdD diss., Oklahoma State University, 1986); Dorn, *American Education, Democracy*, esp. 45-55.
[134] Examples of curricular reforms that institutions undertook in response to the war may be seen in Humphrey, "Liberal Arts Colleges in the Tumultuous 1940s;" James P. Baxter, III and J.R.N. Maxwell, "Reconstruction of Liberal Education," *Association of American Colleges Bulletin* 30 (1944): 76-82.
[135] Ordway Tead, "Trends in Curriculum-Building: A Nation-wide View by a Careful Observer," *Journal of Higher Education* 17 (1946): 284.
[136] "Impact of War on the Schools," *Journal of Educational Sociology* 16 (1943): 428-431. On the impact of the war on K-12 curricula, see Andrew Spaull, "World War II and the Secondary School Curriculum: A Comparative Study of the USA and Australia" in *Education and the Second World War: Studies in Schooling and Social Change* (Washington, D.C.: The Falmer Press, 1992), 159-176; Gerard Giordano, *Wartime Schools: How World War II Changed American Education* (New York: Peter Lang, 2004); Dorn, *American Education, Democracy*.

Through the larger reports and the tangible curricular reform, the general education movement attempted to speak to the importance of general education during wartime and after. The views of many general education movement members can be summed up in Ralph Tyler's views that "the basic purposes of general education are the same in wartime as in peacetime" and "the needs for general education in wartime cannot be restricted to the immediate problems but must also consider appropriate preparation for the post-war period."[137] For the members of the general education movement—and indeed for many academics during the war—the question became how to justify their work—the reports and the reform—in light of the new circumstances created by the war. For the general education movement—and the Cooperative Study in General Education—the issue involved tying general education to democracy and the war effort. To do so, they turned their attention in the same direction as the military: toward Germany.

Second Response: Tying Germany to the Specter of Overspecialization

American academics in all fields in the late nineteenth to mid-twentieth century made understanding German universities a priority. Indeed, many of them traced their intellectual lineage as well as the notion of the "modern research university" to German examples.[138] A number of academics (and later, historians) would note and react to the late nineteenth and early twentieth century shift in American higher education as moving away from the English "Oxbridge" model—or the "English college on the American frontier," as historian Frederick

---

[137] Ralph W. Tyler, "The Role of the Schools in the Nation's War Efforts" in *War and Post-War Responsibilities of American Schools* ed. William C. Reavis (Chicago: University of Chicago Press, 1943), 7, 5.

[138] However, it would be best to keep in mind—as many specialists of German-American university informational and cultural transfers have argued—that many have been too simplistic in describing the nature of the transfers. Consider historian Konrad H. Jarausch who suggests "The influence of the German university on American higher education has more often been posited than proven." See his chapter "American Students in Germany, 1815-1914: The Structure of German and U.S. Matriculants at Gottingen University" in *German Influences on Education in the United States to 1917* eds. Henry Geitz, Jurgen Heideking, and Jurgen Herbst (New York: Cambridge University Press, 1995), 195. Also consider historian Scott Spillman who reminds readers "The 'German model' of higher education has actually referred to multiple models" in his article "Institutional Limits: Christine Ladd-Franklin, Fellowships, and American Women's Academic Careers, 1880-1920," *History of Education Quarterly* 52 (2012): 197.

Rudolph once called it—toward adopting the German research university model.[139] For some, the most important implications of this shift were rooted firmly in the rise of research or increased professionalization. For others, including some members of the general education movement, it represented something of a threat to the continued existence of their liberal arts colleges. However, for nearly all members of the general education movement, this shift signified something about the undergraduate curriculum. Specifically, it marked the continually diminished role of general education—and its civic aims—in institutions of higher learning. This argument was well stated by Joseph J. Schwab in a 1942 article published in the *Atlantic Monthly*: "The early American college attempted to train men to be good men and able citizens. It sought to imbue the student with a knowledge of and a passion for the ideals the country served…They are the ends of the American college no longer. The American college has been engulfed by the backwash of an American version of the German ideal of exhaustive, factual, and specialized research.[140] There were, according to Schwab and others, reverberating effects to the increase in research and attention paid to professionalization.

Fundamental to the general education movement—a movement whose key characteristic was a negative reaction to "overspecialization"—was understanding and explicating the negative effects of the primacy of the German research university. This was, of course, a reaction that had always been present in the general education movement and had appeared well before hostilities

---

[139] Rudolph, *Curriculum: A History*, 44. On the English origins of American colleges, see J. David Hoeveler, *Creating the American Mind: Intellect and Politics in the Colonial Colleges* (Lanham, MD: Rowman and Littlefield, 2002). On the (German) origins of the "research university," see William Clark, *Academic Charisma and the Origins of the Research University* (Chicago: University of Chicago Press, 2006). On the influence of German universities on American higher education, see Hermann Röhrs, *The Classical German Concept of the University and Its Influence on Higher Education in the United States* (Frankfurt: Peter Lang, 1995). The broader competing English and German influences are discussed in James Axtell, *Wisdom's Workshop: The Rise of the Modern University* (Princeton: Princeton University Press, 2016), esp. chapters 4-5.

[140] Joseph J. Schwab, "The Fight for Education," *Atlantic Monthly* 169 (1942): 727. For a discussion of the curriculum in colonial colleges and how this perpetuated a system of "general" education, see David Robson, *Educating Republicans: The College in the Era of the American Revolution, 1750-1800* (Westport, CT: Greenwood Press, 1985).

broke out in Europe. For instance, one member of the Cooperative Study in General Education even spent six weeks studying German universities in the fall of 1934 and condemned specialization as well as other concerning issues (e.g. violations of academic freedom) that were occurring.[141] However, the war provided members of the general education movement a chance to make their familiar arguments while doing their part to justify general education in the eyes of Americans who were eager to have high-minded and detached academics join the war effort.

Indeed, the members of the movement had a nearly universal consensus on the notion that a major cause of German tyranny—and the subsequent Nazi takeover of the universities—was due to the abandonment of general education in favor of a strict focus on specialization.[142] Their interpretation rested on a notion that the German system of higher education in the nineteenth century had provided liberal education that prepared students to be citizens who were on guard against demagoguery and other factors that might precipitate a totalitarian regime.[143] As the research university continued to take hold, general and liberal education measures were pushed aside for specialization—ultimately leaving "Germans susceptible, but not predestined, to

---

[141] George A. Works, "German Universities in the Autumn of 1934," *Educational Record* 16 (1935): 181-187. Works would continue his criticism in other forums later in the 1930s. For instance, see George A. Works, "Accrediting of Institutions of Higher Learning" in *Cooperation in Accrediting Procedures*, 13.

[142] There is a massive literature base on the Nazi takeover of German universities. For a good overview of the Nazi takeover of the universities see Michael Gruttner, "German Universities Under the Swastika" in *Universities Under Dictatorship* eds. John Connelly and Michael Gruttner (University Park: Pennsylvania State University Press, 2005), 75-112. For an explanation of the American theory on specialization, see Craig K. Pepin, "Dilettantes and Over-specialization: Diagnosing and Treating Nazism at West German Universities After World War II," *History of Education Quarterly* 45 (2005): 604-614; Steven P. Remy, "'We Are No Longer the University of the Liberal Age:' The Humanities and National Socialism at Heidelberg" in *Nazi Germany and the Humanities* ed. Wolfgang Bialas and Anson Rabinbach (Oxford: Oneworld, 2007), 21-49. Contemporary articles by members of the general education movement expressing this point are Donald P. Cottrell, "The University and General Education," *Social Frontier* 5 (1938): 9-15; and Mortimer J. Adler, "Freedom Through Discipline: Elective System Defeats Purpose of Liberal Education," *Vital Speeches of the Day* 10 (1944): 380-82.

[143] Later scholarship would suggest that this interpretation was somewhat overblown. Konrad H. Jarausch has argued that German students of the nineteenth century tended to be socialized to accept political norms rather than critically question them. See his article "Liberal Education as Illiberal Socialization: The Case of Students in Imperial Germany," *Journal of Modern History* 50 (1978): 609-630. On the approach of nineteenth-century German universities to specialization and their (pedagogical) methods of organizing information for their students, see Chad Wellmon, *Organizing Enlightenment: Information Overload and the Invention of the Modern Research University* (Baltimore: Johns Hopkins University Press, 2015).

authoritarianism."[144] The lack of general education was being marshalled as a key factor to explain what had been on the minds of many Americans—just how did such a "modern," scientifically-oriented, and artistically rich nation such as Germany give way to a totalitarian regime that represented barbarism and human vice in their more pure forms?[145]

To combat this situation, general education measures that trained the mind for rational thought and critical reasoning were claimed to be crucial. Indeed, general education was offered as the ultimate intellectual "*weapon*" to defend democracy. General education was education *for* democracy.[146] This argument fit well within in a context where "the role of schooling in the present and future preservation of democracy was constantly discussed and argued…[and]… it was not entirely clear what democracy meant."[147] In many ways, the argument made by the general education movement harkened back to Thomas Jefferson's theories on civic education.[148] Put simply, democracy requires citizenship education to keep autocratic and despotic regimes at bay—be they English kings or German dictators.[149]

---

[144] Pepin, "Dilettantes and Over-Specialization," 607.
[145] Michaela Hoenicke Moore, *Know Your Enemy: The American Debate on Nazism, 1933-1945* (New York: Cambridge University Press, 2010).
[146] The term democracy was used in a wide variety of contexts (including higher education) during the time period to express a number of competing views. Often, institutional actions were justified as defending democracy in the face of a Totalitarian or "other" enemy. See Gleason, *Totalitarianism*; Alpers, *Dictators, Democracy, and American Public Culture;* Frezza, *The Leader and the Crowd*, esp. chapters 7-8; Vials, *Haunted by Hitler*, chapters 1-3. For the link between higher education and the rhetoric of democracy, see Loss, *Between Citizens and the State*, Part II.
[147] Ronald D. Cohen, "Schooling Uncle Sam's Children: Education in the USA, 1941-1945" in *Education and the Second World War*, 54.
[148] A connection between the general education movement and Jefferson's ideals was made by Baker, "The Evolution of the Concept." On Thomas Jefferson's theories related to general education and its civic purposes, see Lorraine Smith Pangle and Thomas L. Pangle, *The Learning of Liberty: The Educational Ideals of the American Founders* (Lawrence: University Press of Kansas, 1993); James Carpenter, "Thomas Jefferson and the Ideology of Democratic Schooling," *Democracy & Education* 21 (2013): 1-11. For Jefferson's writings on general and civic education, see Gordon C. Lee, ed., *Crusade Against Ignorance: Thomas Jefferson on Education* (New York: Bureau of Publications, Teachers College, Columbia University, 1961); Wilson Smith, ed., *Theories of Education in Early America,1655-1819* (Indianapolis: The Bobbs-Merrill Company, 1973).
[149] A broader discussion of how the American founders felt about the necessity of liberal education can be found in Eugene F. Miller, "On the American Founders' Defense of Liberal Education in a Republic," *Review of Politics* 46 (1984): 65-90.

This argument was extended to include the point that general education would be just as crucial for the postwar world. "It requires no great wisdom to see that good schools prepare for tomorrow as well as today. In educating youth for change," the chairman of the Cooperative Study argued in 1944, "we must do more than equip them with the skills needed for their first jobs. In a slave state, vocational training may be education enough. Of the education of free men much more is required."[150] Of course, this argument continued well after the war not only as a means of discussing how to reconstruct the German educational system, but also the American system.[151] The final report of the Cooperative Study, published in 1947, also made similar arguments.[152] However, these arguments alone were not able to protect institutions of higher learning from feeling the immense pressure to shift their focus away from the general education movement. Indeed, the general education movement—and the larger Cooperative Study in General Education—offered other arguments that solidified the connection between general education and democracy. A key ambassador for these arguments was the American Council on Education.

Third Response: The American Council on Education Supports Democratic Cooperation and General Education

Single institutions had difficulty not succumbing to the demands of the military and thus relied on their collective presence to represent a source of strength. This meant turning to the American Council on Education—seen both as "the spokesman for all of higher education" and,

---

[150] William Pearson Tolley, "Education for Tomorrow," *Association of American Colleges Bulletin* 30 (1944): 211. See also T.R. McConnell, "Liberal Education After the War," *Annals of the American Academy of Political and Social Science* 231 (1944): 81-87.

[151] Examples of this argument can be seen in I.L. Kandel, *The Impact of the War Upon American Education* (Chapel Hill: University of North Carolina Press, 1948), 189; Alonzo G. Grace, "Education Under Hitler" in *Leadership in American Education* ed. Alonzo G. Grace (Chicago: University of Chicago Press, 1950), 2; Harold Benjamin, "The Curriculum and Social Education" in *Opportunities for Education in the Next Decade* ed. E.T. McSwain and Jack R. Childress (Chicago: University of Chicago, 1951), esp. 25-26.

[152] *Cooperation in General Education*, 13–16

particularly for smaller institutions, "the guardian of these colleges."[153] Many historians have pointed to the statement that the Council put out just prior to the war entitled, "Education and the National Defense" as the statement of ideals that all educational institutions would attempt to stand by during what was likely to be a war. Early in the report, the authors stressed the importance of liberal and general education to maintaining a democratic citizenry. "If Americans are to preserve their belief in democracy," the report stated, "if they are to comprehend their national problems, if they are to understand what resources are available for dealing with those problems, if they are to know how those resources may be effectively employed and are to have determination so to employ them, if—finally—they are to solve their problems together in free democratic fashion, then education must be heavily, even principally, relied upon."[154] This would be a boost to all institutions who were working toward reforming their general education programs as well as the larger general education movement.

The ACE statement also put a premium on cooperation between educational and other agencies. Cooperation—albeit between educational institutions and the government—was put at the forefront and it was strongly intimated that cooperation among institutions was crucial as it was democratic, "The principle of cooperation, characteristic of periods when no emergency exists," the report observed, "should be consistently maintained during any period of emergency whether of peace or of war."[155] This would serve as a foundation of support to the Cooperative Study in General Education which had been engaging in a process of democratic cooperation while exploring the reform of general education—the curricular measures attempting to become synonymous with democracy. The statement was not the only way that the ACE attempted to

---

[153] Cardozier, *Colleges and Universities*, 4; Clarence Stephen Marsh, "Higher Education and National Defense," *Journal of the American Association of Collegiate Registrars* 16 (1941): 385.
[154] *Education and the National Defense* (Washington, D.C.: American Council on Education, 1940), 10.
[155] Ibid, 8.

make their case to members of the government, industry, and the military. During a meeting between government officials and higher education personnel in Washington, D.C. the following summer, one ACE spokesman noted that "There was an interesting and highly significant consistency in the attitudes of the representatives of military and industrial defense. Both continually emphasized the absolute necessary of continuance by colleges and universities of their basic program of cultural and professional training."[156] In many ways, the ACE was paving the way for the general education movement to continue during the war period. However, once the war broke out, the Cooperative Study in General Education members knew that the pressure that had been mounting in the mobilization would soon reach a fever pitch. Less than one month after Pearl Harbor, the leadership called a meeting of the entire central staff and key representatives from each of the colleges.

Initial Response of the Cooperative Study to the Mobilization Pressure: The Meeting of January 4, 1942

This meeting featured "considerable discussion in regard to whether the colleges and the Central Staff should devote their energies to the central problems of general education or whether [they] should minimize this interest and do more in the way of preparation for war time conditions." Ultimately, the central staff and the colleges reached a "general consensus of opinion" that they "should continue working on the problems of general education."[157] Inherent in this decision was the notion that general education reform could and possibly even should speak to issues raised by the war. Without seeking to impose any form of attention on, or

[156] Clarence Stephen Marsh, ed., *Higher Education Cooperates in National Defense: The Report of a Conference of Government Representatives and College and University Administrators, Held in Washington, D.C., July 30-31, 1941* (Washington, D.C.: American Council on Education,) 18. On this conference, see George F. Zook, "How the Colleges Went to War," *Annals of the American Academy of Political and Social Science* 231 (1944): 4-5.
[157] "Called Meeting of Representatives of the Colleges in the Cooperative Study in General Education" Box 123, Folder 4, ACE Papers.

response to, the war, "it was agreed by common consent that colleges should be sure to send in to the Central Staff any information regarding organization of student activities, courses, community projects growing out of the emergency…[and that] materials should be exchanged among the colleges."[158] The meeting also made it clear that the Study would need to "maintain a certain continuity and consistency of program" even as there was "considerable turnover both in the faculties of the cooperating colleges and in the central staff" related to the war.[159] Following this meeting, the Cooperative Study members continued working while expending their purview to include issues raised by the Second World War.

Further Responses of the Cooperative Study in General Education to the Pressure

The central staff spent much of 1942 creating materials that would speak to their belief that "the chief demands which the war makes upon general education result in a re-emphasis upon those great objectives with which general education has always been concerned. These are not new objectives. The criteria of a good curriculum are as valid now as before the war."[160] In particular, the central staff put out a bulletin—aimed not only at participating colleges, but a national audience—on October 22, 1942 entitled "The College Curriculum and the War" in which they intended to make the point that general education was imperative to the war effort and the postwar world. They began by citing a letter from commander-in-chief Franklin D. Roosevelt to the President of the American Association of Colleges, Guy E. Snavely. "Winning the war is now the sole imperative. But we may seem to win it and yet lose it in fact unless the people everywhere are prepared for a peace worthy of the sacrifices of war," Roosevelt had written, "Furthermore, the real test of victory may well be found in what the people of the

[158] Ibid.
[159] Levi, *General Education*, xi.
[160] The Staff of the Cooperative Study in General Education, "The College Curriculum and the War, October 22 1942" Box 126, Folder 1, ACE Papers.

victorious United Nations are prepared to make the 'United' concept live and grow in the decades following the peace. Education, world-wide education, especially liberal education, must provide the final answer. Colleges can render a fundamental service to the cause of lasting freedom."[161]

The central staff members who wrote the bulletin sought to build on Roosevelt's points by offering the following commentary: "If liberal education is to provide the kind of persons our president hopes it will, it can become neither a hodge podge of unrelated courses nor a mere duplication of the training which the Army will provide more effectively. War does not change the aims of general education. The good life, the good man, the good society—these educational aims must not be pushed aside. Rather we must continue to meet these educational demands under new and critical conditions.[162] Using the words of the President—the highest ranking military officer—the Cooperative Study in General Education was able to justify its existence and efforts during the war.

The bulletin continued by noting that the war had created student-driven concerns and questions that newly conceived and/or reformed general education measures could speak to. The Cooperative Study, the authors of the bulletin insisted that the Study was crucial for "those educators who are asked by students, as was the master in the fable, 'How shall we care for our bodies?', How shall we work together?', How shall we live with our fellow men?' and 'For what ends shall we live?' and who are unwilling to believe that 'their learning touches not these things' frequently feel that a treatment of these problems which transcends departmental barriers

[161] The quote was reprinted in "The College Curriculum and the War." The letter in its entirety was widely available in a number of publication outlets as well as in the aforementioned document. Examples include *School and Society* 62 (1942): 423; *Comparative Literature News-Letter* I (1942): 1; "Queries, News, and Notes," *The French Review* 16 (1942): 177.
[162] "The College Curriculum and the War: The Staff of the Cooperative Study in General Education" Box 126, Folder 1, ACE Papers.

produces more efficient result than the traditional compartmentalization by departments."[163] The Cooperative Study, it was clearly argued, was crucial to the students during the war.

This is not to say that the central staff did not run into considerable resistance from military personnel. Just a month before the bulletin appeared, a shaken member of the Central Staff, Ralph W. Ogan wrote to George F. Zook on to explain a situation that had transpired at a recent conference:

> Let me give you some of the facts that have stimulated me to write you. First, I read the enclosed paper titled, 'Wartime Problems of Students,' at the Institute for the Society of Social Research which met at Chicago August 14 and 15. While the paper provoked much discussion and favorable comment, one person Mr. A.J. Jaffe, Research Division, Navy Department, rose to criticize my emphasis upon the importance of doing whatever our resources would permit us to do to preserve the values of general education…Although I can only quote his comments from memory, he said something as follows: 'I am no longer under the influence of Mr. Hutchins. I don't know much about educational philosophy nor am I interested in it. I do believe, however, that it is high time for us to recognize that we are in a war, that we are in danger of losing this war, and that a large portion of so-called liberal arts education…are not worth a damn and should be stopped. Colleges must begin to train people as scientists and technologists. By technologists I mean trained stenographers, radio technicians, and the like.'[164]

Zook encouraged Ogan and the others to stay the course. The paper that Ogan had read—which had been circulated as a *Staff News* Letter on February 16, 1942—was cited in his article that appeared in the December issue of the *Journal of Higher Education*. Entitled "Wartime Opportunities in General Education," it was partially a report on a project of the Cooperative Study conducted in February where "900 students in seven colleges" wrote free form responses to the questions that the war had raised in their minds.[165] These questions, of course, were similar to the ones that had been presented in "The College Curriculum and the War" and would become part of a larger Cooperative Study project attempting to gauge student reactions to the war.

---

[163] Ibid.
[164] Ralph W. Ogan to George F. Zook, 25 September 1942. Box 126, Folder 1, ACE Papers.
[165] Ralph W. Ogan, "Wartime Opportunities in General Education," *Journal of Higher Education* 13 (1942): 457-462, 504. Quotes from 457.

This project was in full swing by the following November, when "more than 1,500 students representing the four undergraduate classes of thirteen colleges of the Study, wrote essays in response to the question, 'What difficulties or concerns have you experienced or do you expect to face as a result of the war.'"[166] Ultimately, the Cooperative Study would develop "An Inventory of Beliefs about Postwar Reconstruction" where colleges could see the responses of the students in the Cooperative Study in General Education to a number of questions about the postwar world. Blank copies were also available so that this inventory could be administered by any college that so wished. Again, this line of work was not forced upon the cooperating colleges. Certain colleges had embraced reform related to the war wholeheartedly, while others chose not to engage as much.[167] Some institutions that did engage in the work published their findings for not only other colleges in the Cooperative Study, but for a national audience.[168]

Returning to Ogan's article, its main thrust was to position general education as a pressing and immediate need of the war. "In the first place, the war has tremendously intensified many student needs for which general education has responsibility," he wrote, "Furthermore, these needs are immediate; provision of educational resources must be timely."[169] Among the issues that Ogan identified as stultifying general education reform—including lax faculties and lacking leadership—was the "tendency" of too many "to give too exclusive attention to the imperative demands of war for specialized training for Army, Navy, and Civilian Defense needs." Ogan put the risks of following such a course bluntly: "Colleges, in many instances, seem deliberately to adopt the policy of 'forgetting about general education until the war is over.'

---

[166] Levi, *General Education*, 96.
[167] Ibid, 98.
[168] Charles R. Hoffer and Paul L. Dressel "Special Issue: Students' Beliefs About Post-War Problems" *Michigan State College Bulletin* 38 (1944): 1-33.
[169] Ogan, "Wartime Opportunities," 457.

By so doing they are losing important values instead of conserving them."[170] Ogan repeated his plea at the close of the piece: "Colleges can do much to avert the tragedy of forgetting about general education for the duration."[171]

To attract attention and to continue their work, the Cooperative Study continued to push these student responses—and the fact that students were being asked to grapple with the meaning and consequences of the war—as speaking to the major aims of general education. This project continued to be included in issues of the *Staff News Letter*. For instance, the Staff News Letter of July 13, 1943 began by noting,

> The war has affected dramatically many concerns of students. As reported in the Staff News Letter (Vol. 4, No. 10, May 20, 1943), students expressed such feelings such as, 'The war makes you want to determine what you are living for.' 'I have great difficulty becoming enthused about our fighting for democracy when we have Jim Crow sections and poll taxes.' 'How can we have good government without moving from democracy to dictatorship?' 'Some way must be found to reduce the poisonous hatreds generated by this war.' Such statements taken in the context of the essays in which they appear show for large numbers of students the war has accentuated concerns with issues of enduring importance in general education.[172]

The circulation of the *Staff News Letter* issues was fairly wide. However, the central staff of the Cooperative Study sought to preach to more than just the converted choir that made up their participating colleges. One example of this was the previously discussed conference that had taken place at the University of Chicago in late December, 1942. The Cooperative Study maintained a large presence at this conference and central staff member Harold B. Dunkel gave one out of only a handful of presentations. His topic was how the Cooperative Study and its participating colleges were negotiating general education reform in the face of the war pressure.

He began by giving many of the college personnel the good news that the participating "colleges have a definite commitment to general education." He then proceeded to quote a

---

[170] Ibid, 459.
[171] Ibid, 504.
[172] "Staff News Letter, Vol. 4, No. 13, July 13 1943, Box 129, Folder 13, ACE Papers.

number of "liaison officers" (or the person each college had elected to be their top representative to the Study)—about their commitment to general education during the war. He read:

> As one liaison officer writes, 'There is no likelihood that we shall forget general education for the duration.' Or, as another puts it, 'We have no intention of abandoning these courses until we are forced to do it by edict or circumstances.' Still a third says: 'We are anxious to co-operate 100 per cent in any program that will facilitate the victory in the present war. At the same time, we believe definitely in a program of general education and liberal training. Committees of the faculty are engaged and will be engaged in a study of desirable changes in the educational program based, as far as possible, on the needs of students as indicated in the various studies carried on the college as well as in the other institutions participating in the Co-operative Study. A common point of view is stated by a fourth liaison officer: 'This college will make every effort to continue its program of liberal education. As long as we can find any students for such a program, we shall carry on. The fewer they are, the more valuable they will be after the war when the country will be flooded with half-educated men trained only in a narrow fashion for some robot function.'[173]

These responses gave a sense as to how committed the college personnel were not only to the Cooperative Study in General Education, but the larger general education movement it represented. Dunkel moved forward to reassure the present company of the viability of general education reform as a wartime pursuit. "General education," he argued, "is even more important in wartime than in peacetime. The war has not, we feel, changed the objectives of general education. War has simply given new urgency and emphasis and, in some cases, a slightly different context to those basic educational needs which have always been the concern of general education."[174] Dunkel very much summed up the feelings of the Cooperative Study staff and participants to general education.

However, the Study operated within no more than twenty-two campuses. Aside from being a small minority, how could it compete with the massive changes taking over American

[173] Harold B. Dunkel, "How the Colleges in the Co-Operative Study in General Education Are Meeting the Emergency" *The Colleges in Wartime* 37. Box 392, Volume 244, Reeves Papers.
[174] Ibid, 35.

campuses? Even the conference where Dunkel's paper had been delivered featured an audience that was sympathetic to general education. This raises the question, how could the Cooperative Study—or even the larger general education movement—reach the massive number of Americans already ensconced in the military—both the leadership and the men and women whom might benefit from receiving general education? This was largely out of the hands of the central staff. However, the Director of the Cooperative Study, Ralph W. Tyler, had the credibility and connections to bring the assumptions and methods that the Cooperative Study in General Education held about reforming general education to the military itself.

The General Education Movement Provides Support to the Military

During the war, Tyler was just as vocal as his staff about the place of general education during and after wartime. At a 1943 conference discussing the relation of schools to the Second World War and postwar society, Tyler chose to focus on general education. In particular, he noted the role that the military had in promoting general education. "Educational needs in wartime are not confined to vocational training." He argued. "The conditions of life in a crisis make general education not less but more important than ever. The effective co-operation and co-ordination both of civilian and military personnel are largely dependent upon their understanding of its origin, and the kinds of demands it makes upon all members of society. This understanding is a common need of our people and its development is a task of general education."[175] These words would be prescient.

As discussed earlier, the American Council on Education had been meeting regularly with top military personnel and had offered any educational services that they could provide to the war effort. Soon, the ACE was approached by the United States Armed Forces Institute, who, by 1943, was "serv[ing] all branches of the military services… [and] made available

[175] Tyler, "The Role of the Schools," 3.

approximately 400 correspondence courses regularly offered by the extension divisions of about 80 colleges and universities; about 300 of these courses [were offered] on the college level and 100 on the high school level." It had "also prepared its own self-teaching courses designed specifically to meet the needs of persons in the services; these courses are offered in 63 high school and vocational subjects."[176] The Institute was interested in creating general education curricula for service members that would translate (and transfer) to institutions of higher learning during and especially after the war. What they needed was a method of working and some ideas for potential courses. Zook helped to put together a committee under Chairman T.R. McConnell that featured "not only representatives of the Commission on Liberal Education of the Association of American Colleges," but Tyler himself. Introducing this project at a conference related to the experiences of higher education during the war in 1943, McConnell noted that he was fortunate that Tyler was able to bring with him "other members of the central staff of the Cooperative Study, and members of the faculties of several of the participating colleges," for this allowed the committee "to draw upon the experience of persons who have been working intensively on problems of general education and student counseling."[177] Zook would follow McConnell shortly after in introducing the committee and the influence of the Cooperative Study to the fourth general session of the North Central Association.[178]

What impact did the Cooperative Study have on this project that assisted "thousands of men and women [use] part of their leisure time voluntarily to continue their education?"[179] In reading McConnell's discussion of "the committee's procedure," we see assumptions and

---

[176] *A Design for General Education: For Members of the Armed Forces* ed. Dorothy Leemon McGrath (Washington, D.C.: American Council on Education, 1944), 3.
[177] T.R. McConnell, "A Program of General Education for Members of the Armed Forces" in *Higher Education Under War Conditions* ed. John Dale Russell (Chicago: Privately Published by University of Chicago, 1943), 15.
[178] George F. Zook, "The Federal Government and Education in Wartime," *North Central Association Quarterly* 18 (1943): 227.
[179] *A Design for General Education*, 3.

methods of working that are similar—if not the same as—those employed in the Cooperative Study in General Education. This procedure was described by McConnell: "first, to agree upon the broad outcomes of general education, stated in terms of performance, or in terms of the ways 'in which educated men might properly be expected to behave.' Then the committee turned to the statement of more detailed objectives, instrumental to the general outcomes. It decided to express these more specific objectives in terms of knowledge and understanding, skills and abilities, and attitudes and appreciations." This, of course, was beginning by defining general education by stating it in terms of behavioral objectives—much as the Cooperative Study had done.

McConnell continued "As a beginning on this rather difficult but essential task, the committee divided into small groups, representing the academic background and particular educational experiences of the members."[180] This was similar to the workshop experiences of the Cooperative Study as well as the listing of the expertise held by the respective central staff members. These methods were bolstered by the expressed statement that "in establishing the committee, there was no intention whatever that the armed forces of the American Council on Education would attempt to prescribe a plan of general education for any educational institution as an outgrowth of the project of designing a program of general education for the military services."[181]

Ultimately, the project simply sought to "outline the kind of program that would be not only appropriate to meet the needs of men and women in the service but at the same time broad enough to be sufficiently in accord with college and university curricula for general education in order that the institutions could subsequently give credit for the satisfactory completion of the

[180] McConnell, "A Program of General Education," 16.
[181] *A Design for General Education*, 6.

courses offered."[182] This, of course, was the exact notion that the Cooperative Study employed in that they would not force any predetermined curricula on any institution. Once the courses were outlined, "The design and the course outlines were to be transmitted by the American Council on Education to the appropriate branches of the armed services for the actual preparation of teaching materials for use in correspondence study and group instruction."[183] These outlines helped to create a program that was implemented by the Institute. A final report of this committee was published by the American Council on Education in 1944. In this report, Tyler and the Cooperative Study in General Education were effusively thanked for their service. In the foreword, Zook noted that the expertise of the American Council on Education in general education reform rested with the fact that they had "been concerned [with general education reform]…for a number of years" before providing the example that the "Council's Cooperative Study in General Education, under the direction of Ralph W. Tyler, is the cooperative attempt of twenty-one colleges to work out their problems in general education."[184] He later noted that "Through Dr. Tyler, the committee received the benefits of the planning and experimentation of the staff and the colleges associated in the Council's Cooperative Study in General Education."[185]

This, of course, was not Tyler's only contribution to general education measures delivered by the military.[186] His relationship to general education for the military seems to have been influential in bringing the assumptions and methods of the general education movement to the military. Beyond the Armed Forces Institute project, the military itself worked hard to bring general education to its personnel. One postwar author, reviewing the many projects that the

---

[182] Ibid.
[183] McConnell, "A Program of General Education," 16.
[184] George F. Zook, Foreword to *A Design for General Education*, iii.
[185] Ibid, v.
[186] For Tyler's publications related to wartime issues, see Finder, *Educating America*, 180-183.

military had undertaken during the war years related to general education noted that "out of the experience of the armed services in the training of 12,000,000 men it is not clear that new concepts have emerged to take their places beside our presently held concepts in general education about the importance of the objective, the need for curricular revision in the light of social change and scientific advancement, [and] the desirability of adjusting the curriculum to the individual."[187] Of course, these concepts could be traced directly back to the general education movement—if not directly to the work the Cooperative Study in General Education and the Eight-Year Study. The latter study is often said to have been made irrelevant by the war. However, one wonders if its legacy was not all that more extensive due to the war. Ultimately, the Cooperative Study in General Education continued throughout the war. Having written much about how the Cooperative Study in General Education functioned and worked with institutions, and how it fostered clear examples of cooperation without consensus, I now turn my attention to a case study of how Michigan State College (later University) was able to completely restructure its general education measures through the Cooperative Study in General Education.

Michigan State College is one of the more well-known examples of successful reform during the general education movement. However, its experiences were largely similar to a variety of institutional types in the general education movement. More important, Michigan State College did not see itself as widely influential, but rather as one institution in the national movement. As Dean of the Basic College Thomas H. Hamilton wrote in 1955, "The movement to develop curricula which would serve common individual and social educational needs of all students and which would be required for all was not launched by one institution."[188] It also saw

[187] Alonzo G. Grace, *Educational Lessons from Wartime Training* (Washington, D.C.: American Council on Education, 1948), 99.
[188] Thomas H. Hamilton, "Organization of the Basic College" in Thomas H. Hamilton and Edward A. Blackman, eds., *The Basic College of Michigan State* (East Lansing: Michigan State University Press, 1955), 3.

itself as similar to the many other normal schools, women's colleges, historically black colleges, community colleges, and liberal arts colleges. Indeed, Hamilton offered a diverse list of institutions (many of which would fall into the aforementioned categories) that were conducting experiments in the mid-1950s and proclaimed, "It is among these institutions that Michigan State College takes its place in the history of collegiate general education in the United States."[189]

In the following section, I focus on the history of Michigan State's experiences with the general education movement and the Cooperative Study and how this influenced the creation of their administrative unit responsible for general education: the "Basic College." The section also focuses on how the Basic College dealt with issues of meritocracy through a process of sectioning. It also examines the experiences of returning veterans and how they were enrolled in the Basic College before finally exploring methods of how the Basic College was advertised to the citizens of Michigan.

The Origins of the Basic College at Michigan State College[190]

To understand why Michigan State College chose to participate in the general education movement on a national level, it is crucial to place the institution's earlier history and traditions of general and liberal education in context. Founded as an agricultural college in 1855 (and operational in 1857) MSC had the expressed purposes of training farmers' sons and disseminating a new body of scientific knowledge in the agricultural and mechanical fields to local practitioners across the state. Despite its well documented advances in agricultural research, it was notable in its time for combining a "liberal" course of study with a strong emphasis on agricultural education. Indeed, historian Christopher J. Lucas has suggested that the Morrill Land Grant of 1862's clause regarding the inclusion of all forms of study may have been influenced by

[189] Ibid, 4.
[190] This section revises and updates material that appeared in Zayed, "Reform in the General Education Movement."

"the model of the Michigan State College of Agriculture in East Lansing."[191] Although influential across the United States, MSC had its fair share of detractors, ranging from local farming interests to the University of Michigan. Criticism often led to heated debates that left the school on the defensive and occasionally a few steps away from complete elimination.

Administrator Eldon L. Johnson once cautioned historians against seeing the state's influence as too overbearing on the early land grant college.[192] Yet, Michigan State College's early years often included ideological battles with the State Board of Agriculture (its governing body), and growing voices of discontent in the Michigan agricultural community.[193] Each of these arguments centered on the "purpose" of the school. Arguably, no issue so divided the state and its institution as the issue of curriculum. This was quite common as Michigan State operated in what one historian called "an eclectic land-grant college landscape" shaped by "the ambiguity of the Morrill Act of 1862—which seemingly allowed any educational scheme by incorporating agricultural and mechanical instruction alongside classical and scientific studies."[194]

---

[191] Christopher J. Lucas, *American Higher Education: A History* second ed. (New York: St. Martin's Press, 2006), 154.

[192] Eldon L. Johnson, "Misconceptions About the Early Land-Grant Colleges," *Journal of Higher Education* 52 (1981): 342-346.

[193] The history of these debates can be seen in Lowell R. Ecklund, "A Century of Service: An Historical Analysis of the Service Function of a State University" (PhD diss., Syracuse University, 1956); Herbert Andrew Berg, *The State of Michigan and the Morrill Land Grant Act of 1862* (East Lansing: Michigan State University Press, 1965); Herbert Andrew Berg, *Financial Support of Michigan Agricultural College During Formative Years with Emphasis on the College Swamp Lands* (East Lansing: Michigan State University Press, 1966); Keith R. Widder, *Michigan Agricultural College: The Evolution of a Land-Grant Philosophy* (East Lansing: Michigan State University Press, 2005). The agricultural community of the United States "had little interest and some hostility toward" the land grants—or at the very least, for the way in which they were operating. This is not to say that they did not have quite an interest in higher education that served modeled upon their needs. This story and some contextual information on the debates broached here are provided in Richard S. Kirkendall, "The Agricultural Colleges: Between Tradition and Modernization," *Agricultural History* 60 (1986): 3-21, quote from 7. Also see Alan I. Marcus, "The Ivory Silo: Farmer-Agricultural College Tensions in the 1870s and 1880s," *Agricultural History* 60 (1986): 22-36; Scott Gelber, "The Populist Vision for Land-Grant Universities, 1880-1900" in "Special Issue: The Land-Grant Colleges and the Reshaping of American Higher Education" *Perspectives on the History of Higher Education* 30 (2013): 165-194.

[194] Nathan M. Sorber, "The Rise and Fall of Grange's Yankee Land-Grant Colleges, 1873-1901" in *Science as Service: Establishing and Reformulating Land-Grant Universities, 1865-1930* ed. Alan I. Marcus (Tuscaloosa, University of Alabama Press, 2015), 62. On the "ambiguity" of the Morrill Land Grant Act, also see Daniel W. Lang, "Amos Brown and the Educational Meaning of the American Agricultural College Act," *History of Education* 31 (2002): 139-165.

In the late nineteenth and early twentieth centuries, many feared that liberal education was being "displaced" by vocational and other types of education.[195] Yet, MSC had always bucked this trend and would not allow the liberal portion of its curriculum to go down without a fight.[196] This liberal portion of the curriculum was defended by its first president, Joseph Williams, and was executed by Professor—and later President—Theophilius Capen Abbott. In a speech given around the state, Abbot declared "A new age has dawned upon the farmer, an age that demands of him, reading, discussion, thought."[197]

These words were put into practice in the classroom. One student, and later professor of Botany, Albert John Cook, exclaimed, "How Tennyson, and Milton, and greatest of all Shakespeare, took on new life as he opened their treasure to our dazed appreciation."[198] Albert Bamber, a contemporary of Cook writing a history of the class of 1883, echoed this sentiment,

> We believed it was our duty, to lend a helping hand to the literary art and sciences. And there was instilled into the better part of our nature this great universal truth 'Knowledge is Power.' These are the reasons that we members of Class '83 are joined into a solid phalanx for our common good; that we might closely pursue the studies in the course of the State Agr'l of Michigan and thus obtain the framework of an education that is necessary in this enlightened age, to make us fine scholars, good citizens, and a power in society.[199]

Bamber illustrated a desire to fight for a "general education" curriculum against a concerned population. This is also illustrated in a letter that President Abbot wrote to the father of another

---

[195] Earl F. Cheit, *The Useful Arts and the Liberal Tradition* (Washington D.C.: The Carnegie Foundation for the Advancement of Teaching, 1975); David F. Labaree, "Mutual Subversion: A Short History of the Liberal and the Professional in American Higher Education," *History of Education Quarterly* 46 (2006): 1-15. The latter author uses the term "displaced."

[196] Widder, *Michigan Agricultural College*, esp. 39-43. This was in line with many other land grant colleges of the time period. On this and larger curricular debates at land grants see Roger L. Williams, *The Origins of Federal Support for Higher Education: George W. Atherton and the Land-Grant College Movement* (University Park: Pennsylvania State University Press, 1991), 181-186.

[197] Theophilius Capen Abbot, "Education and Seeing" Given on three separate occasions between 1872 and 1874 in the towns of Ionia, Marshall, and Charlotte, MI. Theophilius Capen Abbot Papers, UA2.1.3. Box 861, Folder 66, University Archives and Historical Collections, Michigan State University, East Lansing, MI.

[198] Albert John Cook, "Members of the Early Faculty" in *Semi-Centennial Celebration of Michigan State Agricultural College, 1857-1907* (Chicago: University of Chicago Press, 1908), 76.

[199] Albert Bamber, "History of MAC Class of 1883" Folder 3, Bamber Family Papers, c.00046, University Archives and Historical Collections, Michigan State University, East Lansing, MI.

student, "We think we have just the right course of study now for farmer's sons."[200] This trend would continue as the institution grew. Yet, the incorporation of general education into the essential fabric of the institution was a gradual process. "No one can say with complete assurance," MSC professor Paul L. Dressel once wrote, "just when general education appeared at Michigan State College."[201]

As the years went on and survival seemed more certain, expansion occurred. Michigan State College followed the larger trend of enrollment increases and the resulting expansion of other collegiate accoutrements. All in all, MSC was happy to have the increased enrollment.[202] But, growing numbers of students placed considerable pressure on MSC's officials to solidify their collegiate purpose and curricular structures. In this sense, the college was, much like other American institutions of higher learning: still working out its identity.

After the uncertainty with regards to finances and enrollment during the Depression years however, even the dynamic new president John A. Hannah was somewhat wary of growth.[203] Shortly after his election in late 1940, Hannah told a reporter from the *Detroit News*, "Should the growth curve continue at its present rate we will have more than 10,000 students by 1946. Personally, I hope that day never comes." Though Hannah was publicly pensive, he was privately resolute that his institution *could* handle more students. One of the areas that Hannah deemed absolutely crucial was the notion of a general education curriculum. As Hannah took the

---

[200] T.C. Abbot to the father of Charles A. Jewell, 1 December 1862, Charles A. Jewell Papers, UA10.3.5, Folder 1, University Archives and Historical Collections, Michigan State University, East Lansing, MI.
[201] Dressel, *College to University*, 114.
[202] Madison Kuhn, *Michigan State: The First Hundred Years, 1855-1955* (East Lansing: Michigan State University Press, 1955), 198-199, 204, 237.
[203] MSC suffered heavily during the Depression. See Kuhn, *Michigan State*, 333-399. This was in line with the experiences of other institutions of higher education.

reins, he was aware that many other campuses were dealing with similar challenges. He also knew that a national discussion was underway about the issue of general education.[204]

Therefore, when an opportunity came for MSC to join the Cooperative Study, it seized upon it, setting in course the events that would lead to the Basic College at MSC. The initial dean of the Basic College and member of the Executive Committee of the Cooperative Study, Lloyd C. Emmons, acknowledged MSC's debt to the Cooperative Study. Upon the completion of the Study's experimental work in 1946, Emmons wrote to Ralph Tyler to say, "I have enjoyed my long association with the study and have learned a great deal from it, much of which has been put into operation here at Michigan State College."[205] Though it may seem like no more than a polite utterance, Emmons recalled nearly a decade later that the Cooperative Study "was valuable as background when Michigan State University came to begin its own experiments."[206]

Early in the Study—as the central staff asked participating institutions to identify their objectives and provide a working definition of "general education,"—Michigan State College struggled. The fact that it had difficulty coming to a definition of general education was illustrated by their experiences at a Regional Conference at Olivet College (MI) in 1939. As a small conference of "Forty-four persons…representing Ball State Teachers College, Hope College, Michigan State College, and Olivet College," it was merely a fraction of the entire Study's participants.[207] However, the MSC representatives were eager to begin the process and work out a definition.

---

[204] John A. Hannah quoted in Kuhn, *Michigan State*, 403.
[205] Lloyd C. Emmons to Ralph W. Tyler, 14 December 1946. Box 1, Folder 11, Tyler Papers.
[206] Floyd V. Monaghan, "Backgrounds of General Education at Michigan State University" (unpublished essay written May, 1955) Box 470, Folder 36, University College Collection, UA15.5, University Archives and Historical Collections, Michigan State University, East Lansing, MI. Hereafter referred to as "Univ. Coll. Papers."
[207] "Minutes of the Regional Conference Cooperative General Education Study, Olivet College, March 2, 1939" Box 534, Folder 102. Department of Geology Records, UA16.53, University Archives and Historical Collections, Michigan State University, East Lansing, MI. Hereafter referred to as "GS Records."

Ralph Tyler began the conference by describing a previous regional conference held at participating Muskingum College (OH) a few weeks before. "He expressed the hope that the Olivet Conference would provide an opportunity for the representatives present to formulate their problems more clearly and to agree upon plans of work that might be carried on during the next few months."[208] But the representatives articulated vastly different problems with which they were dealing. Within the common topics of "Curriculum and Instructional Problems," "Personnel and Guidance Problems," and "Problems of Evaluation" MSC seemed confused just about how they wished to move forward.[209]

This was expected by the central staff and each common topic ended with an assignment for the college representatives present before further cooperative work was to take place. To support the MSC representatives, the central staff was responsible for preparing a relevant bibliography to send to them. Keeping abreast of the latest educational literature, the central staff agreed, would "help in the clarification of those problems."[210] Further, Michigan State College representatives as well as the other participants "agreed to state their problems…in more specific terms."[211] This was the issue of stating one's objectives in behavioral terms. MSC representatives had returned to East Lansing to identify core objectives (along the aforementioned three common lines) and define "general education."

Creating the "Basic College" at MSC

Led by Lloyd C. Emmons, the MSC professors set about the task. Such an assignment was daunting. "I certainly do not pretend to know precisely what the objectives of a liberal arts training should be" Emmons had written in an article just a few years earlier, "But no one could

[208] Ibid.
[209] Ibid.
[210] Ibid.
[211] Ibid.

stay long in an administrative position in a college without having some rather definite opinions on these questions."[212] Emmons concluded the article by noting, "In a rather disconnected way I have tried to present an argument for a liberal training with a practical appeal. I firmly believe that the tax-supported college must keep such an appeal before the taxpayer and the student."[213] These statements reflected how Emmons and his colleagues were thinking about the task at hand and foreshadowed how they would complete their current assignments. It would also foreshadow the later advertisement of the Basic College to the citizens of the state.

The professors organized themselves into three groups to reflect their interests and participation at the Olivet conference. "The Curriculum in General Education" group was comprised of R.S. Linton and A.J. Clark. "The Evaluation of Efforts to Attain Objectives Set Forth in the Curriculum" was comprised of L.M. Turk, S.G. Berquist, and Chairman Donald Hayworth, and F.T. Mitchell would handle "Guidance and Personnel Problems During and After General Education."[214] These groups met with several pre-written definitions of "general education" on the table. Eventually, they selected the following definition: "A general education trains one to attack problems logically, to evaluate evidence intelligently, to meet unusual situations with poise, to mingle with diverse social groups harmoniously, and gives a sufficient acquaintance with environmental factors both social and physical to enable one to be reasonably intelligent concerning topics of conversation common to an educated person."[215] This definition

[212] Lloyd C. Emmons, "Are There Aims That Are Peculiar to the Tax-Supported Colleges?," *Bulletin of the American Association of Colleges* 22 (1936): 99.
[213] Ibid, 104.
[214] Committee names and personnel derived from "Statement For Those Who Have Been Appointed By Their Departmental Heads to Cooperate With the Evaluation Group" Box 534, Folder 101, GS Records.
[215] "To the Evaluation Group" Box 534, Folder 100, GS Records.

was approved "with the understanding that it be subjected to modification as deemed necessary."[216]

The next move was to seek approval from the larger faculty body at MSC. Though these professors were the most active representatives, many professors on campus were aware of the Cooperative Study. The MSC representatives sought to catalyze that potential into action. The Evaluation Group took the lead in drafting a letter to department heads around the campus. Pointing to their recently drafted definition of "general education" they wrote, "Undoubtedly, with such a definition, every department has something to contribute to general education. The purpose of this note is to invite heads of such departments as have significant contributions for general education to select someone to represent the department…This is a five-year study. The committee would appreciate the appointment of individuals who will be interested in giving serious and continued attention."[217] This involvement was, as the letter seems to indicate, intended to be prolonged with incremental and lasting reform as a desired result.[218]

Thus, the work began, and MSC was at the heart of the general education movement. Working with the Cooperative Study brought MSC into the complex matrix of educational research, philanthropy, and intra-institutional cooperation that characterized the movement. Given its complexity, involvement seemingly had to be slow and prolonged. But, with the Depression on and enrollments steadily increasing, there appeared to be nothing but time.

As the work of the Study was just getting off the ground and moving at a deliberate pace, John A. Hannah ascended to the presidency at MSC. The year was 1941. It may well be a

---

[216] "Minutes of the Meeting of the Evaluation Group, Tuesday, May 16, 1939, at 4 o'clock in Room 101, Morrill Hall" Box 534, Folder 101. GS Records

[217] L.M. Turk, S.G. Bergquist, and Donald Hayworth to Heads of Departments, date unlisted, Box 534, Folder 101, GS Records.

[218] Yet this reform was not meant to be dogmatic in nature. As is shown through the process of cooperation thus far engaged in by the MSC professors, it was seemingly democratic and open to revision.

historian's cliché that crisis breeds the opportunity for a leader to arise and transform a situation—or fail miserably trying to do so. Yet, more often than not, the historical record has revealed that crisis simply provides the opportunity for transformative leadership to apply ideas that were articulated before the crisis.[219] The case of reform at MSC and the general education movement is reminiscent of the latter type. Simply put, the United States' entry into World War II merely added a new layer of complexity for members of the general education movement to consider—as previously discussed. It did not begin the movement, galvanize it, or single-handedly sustain it. Hannah, while charismatic, was no more effective in terms of tangible reforms than the numerous faculty members who were already participating in the Cooperative Study in General Education and the general education movement as a whole. By examining Hannah's approach, however, we can not only explore MSC's engagement in the general education movement beyond the Cooperative Study, but also gain insight into the social context that helped to bring about the Basic College at MSC.

Upon first glance, Hannah's career trajectory might seem similar to that of his colleague Lloyd C. Emmons. Hannah and Emmons were cut from the same cloth. Both were homegrown MSC administrators who began their careers in MSC's Agricultural Extension programs. Hannah married Sarah May Shaw, the daughter of President Robert S. Shaw (in office from 1928-1941), and spent many years being mentored by his father-in-law. He sacrificed salary and prestige by turning down job offers from the public and private sector to remain in MSC's administration and be groomed for the presidency. And when his chance to lead came, he took it. "Never had the transition from one presidency to the next been accomplished with so little violence to past

[219] It is imperative to avoid slipping into a reductive narrative where the college president is seen as the key catalyst of reform.

principles," campus historian Madison Kuhn wrote.[220] Put another way, he did not arrive at MSC in 1941 in shining armor with radically different ideas and iconoclastic approaches. His reputation was one of a hands-on manager with a precise understanding of the campus and an approach that was both cerebral and collegial. While he certainly had his views, general education reform was not a pre-conceived priority for him. He felt it to be as crucial and as important a priority as any, but he was eager to assist each of the reform tendencies that had characterized the campus during Shaw's final years. Hannah's impact was not immediate, and not always direct.

When Hannah began his presidency he immediately began to survey the landscape. He saw the Cooperative Study in action and ensured MSC's participation through active funding. He furthered the aims of the Cooperative Study by hiring University of Chicago Professor of Education Floyd W. Reeves "as a part-time consultant" in the fall of 1943.[221] A friend of Hannah's, Reeves was instructed on the reform efforts already underway and advised to pay careful attention to the desires of the campus community. As Reeves later recalled about Hannah's initial briefings to him, "he suggested that I begin this work with a series of extended conversations with faculty members, department heads and deans, and students and alumni. From such conversations, I might secure ideas both about needs for improvements and ways of meeting such needs."[222] Though Reeves was from the University of Chicago, he was not seen as the *voice* of reform. Rather, he was, as his profession suggests, an educational researcher. He was

[220] Kuhn, *Michigan State*, 403.
[221] On Reeves's career see Barbara Ann Nicholas, "Floyd W. Reeves on Curriculum" (PhD diss., Michigan State University, 1971); Richard O. Niehoff, *Floyd W. Reeves: Innovative Educator and Distinguished Practitioner of the Art of Public Administration* (Lanham, MD: University Press of America, 1991).
[222] Floyd W. Reeves, "General Education at a State University," *Basic College Quarterly* 1 (1955): 6.

skilled in organizational restructuring, a colleague of Ralph Tyler's, and a believer in Tyler's doctrines.[223]

Reeves was not a missionary for general education reform. He noted: "I accepted President Hannah's suggestion. It seemed to me that it would not be necessary for me to come forth with any great ideas of my own. My job was primarily that of taking other people's ideas and, with their help, assembling them into some orderly arrangement for the consideration of the authorities of the institution."[224] This points to a crucial aspect of reform in the general education movement: the role of the University of Chicago. The Cooperative Study in General Education was housed at the University of Chicago. Several members of the Central Staff were professors at Chicago. Indeed, its director Ralph Tyler would be named Dean of the Division of Social Sciences at Chicago a few years later. Yet, both Reeves and Tyler influenced the methods more than the content of general education reforms.

In a sense, the University of Chicago was a major center in the general education movement, *not* because of the ideas of Robert M. Hutchins, but rather because of the educational researchers it housed. However, it would seem that mere associations with the University of Chicago indicated influence to some commentators. Lewis B. Mayhew, himself a professor at Michigan State College for a time, would later note that "The influence of the Chicago general education program on the national movement was profound…at Michigan State University, the personal consultant to the president was Floyd W. Reeves, who had long served on the faculty at Chicago. The first director of the Board of Examiners at Michigan State University had been exposed to the Chicago way of thinking through workshops and participation in the Cooperative

[223] Richard O. Niehoff points to evidence of Tyler recognizing Reeves's beliefs in Tyler's ideas, but suggests that Reeves had a greater desire to consult as opposed to publish when compared to Tyler. This is cited by Niehoff as one of the major reasons Reeves left Chicago for a faculty position at MSC. See Niehoff, *Floyd W. Reeves*, 23-27.
[224] Reeves, "General Education," 6.

Study of [sic] General Education, which had its headquarters at the University of Chicago and was directed by Ralph W. Tyler."[225] Yet, seeing the ways in which Reeves and the Cooperative Study in General Education operated, it is obvious that they were not missionaries. Any similarities that Michigan State bore to Chicago were more or less the product of similar values, rather than of active proselytization.

Reeves completed his discussions with the MSC campus community and set forth his recommendations. Tellingly, his two major recommendations focused on evaluation and organizational structure (his academic areas of interest). He argued that MSC needed "a more effective program of general education… [and that]…the structure of the College needed to be modified."[226] He justified his arguments based on the desire for the curricular structure to meliorate the tension of the growing pains of enrollment. He wrote: "This modification was needed both to provide for the needed changes in general education and to create an organization that would be suitable for an institution that was almost certain to become, in the period the war, one of America's largest universities."[227]

The Structure and Purpose of the Basic College

The ensuing reorganization gave birth to the modern institution known as Michigan State University. Committees comprised of faculty and administrators created new colleges with specialized curricula for upper-classmen and core preparatory measures for under-classmen. Most important, an administrative body charged with providing the entire campus a core curriculum came into being and was named the Basic College. As Hannah later recalled "The Michigan State College faculty voted unanimously to make the Basic College the educational

[225] Lewis B. Mayhew, Patrick J. Ford, and Dean L. Hubbard, *The Quest for Quality: The Challenge for Undergraduate Education in the 1990s* (San Francisco: Jossey-Bass, 1990), 50.
[226] Reeves, "General Education," 6.
[227] Ibid.

foundation of the postwar university."[228] It contained seven major courses, of which students were to select five in order to pass their general requirements.[229] These courses were offered on a trimester system at three credits per unit (nine per course), which accounted roughly for two years of academic study. The courses were entitled "Written and Spoken English, Physical Science, Biological Science, Social Science, Effective Living, History of Civilization, and Literature and Fine Arts."[230] As MSC Professor of Education Paul Dressel recalled, "Every student was required to take Written and Spoken English, one of the two sciences, one of the two social sciences, either History or Literature and Fine Arts, and finally, any one of the three courses not already taken."[231] All professors regardless of rank were assigned to teach these courses and as such they had a vested interest in them. As a MSC faculty member boasted in a national publication nearly two decades later, "It is the policy of the Basic College general education program at Michigan State to use senior faculty members as instructors."[232]

It would not be an overstatement to suggest that the Basic College was an institution wide project. Describing this process, Floyd Reeves remembered,

> The period during which these changes took place was one of intense activity on the part of both faculty members and administrative officers. The general committee responsible

---

[228] Hannah, *A Memoir*, 90.

[229] Information on the Basic College ranging from its history, curricula, and methods of testing were released both locally and nationally. See for instance, Hamilton and Blackman, eds., *The Basic College*; Edward A. Carlin and Edward Blackman, eds., *Curriculum Building in General Education* (Dubuque, IA.: W.C. Brown, 1960); *Comprehensive Examinations in a Program of General Education*, (East Lansing: Michigan State College Press, 1949); Paul L. Dressel, ed., *Evaluation in the Basic College at Michigan State University* (New York: Harper and Brothers, 1958). The administrative unit also maintained a journal called the *Basic College Quarterly* (later *University College Quarterly*) that ran from 1955 until the demise of the administrative unit in 1980 that provided evidence of its workings as well as a treasure trove of thought on general education from and for a national audience. The Unit was reorganized in 1953, to restrict all electives and reduce the number of courses down to five. As Dean Edward A. Carlin argued, "One has no great difficulty in identifying the educational philosophy upon which the proposed reorganization rested. The program in existence in the Basic College was a modified area elective system. The proposed reorganization would result in an entirely prescribed general education program for all students." See Edward A. Carlin, "Reorganization of the Basic College" in *Curriculum Building*, 5.

[230] Dressel, *College to University*, 122.

[231] Ibid.

[232] Douglas Dunham, "Social Science at Michigan State University" in *Social Science in General Education* Lewis B. Mayhew, ed. (Dubuque, IA: Wm. C. Brown Co., 1960), 96.

> for the development of the Basic College plan reported to the Faculty at its May 22 [1944] meeting that it had held a total of thirty-three meetings since its appointment, that it had been assisted by eight sub-committees composed of a very large number of faculty members, and that these sub-committees had also held a very large number of meetings. Many committee and sub-committee members had been released from a part of their regular teaching loads in order that they might participate in committee activities. *The development of this plan was in every sense a cooperative enterprise*.[233]

To assist in the reform efforts underway, Reeves guided the faculty to the work of educational researchers and to that of other experimenting colleges. At one meeting, for example, he:

> brought to the attention of the members of the committee the following materials for study and consideration…1. The January, 1944, annals, "Higher Education and the War" 2. The Biennial Report of the Committee of Research of the University of Minnesota, 1942, "Studies in Higher Education" 3. The Catalog of the University of Florida 4. Spafford and Others "Building a Curriculum for General Education". Minneapolis, 1943. 5. Regents Plan for Post-War Education in the State of New York, 1944.[234]

Among these examples, there are no polemics by Robert Hutchins and no mention of Harvard or Columbia. Rather, there is a range of institutions and writings that—with the possible exception of the General College at Minnesota—have long been neglected in the history of higher education. Through this snapshot we are not only treated to another example of educational research affecting reform (Reeves had consulting experience with the SUNY system and the University of Florida), but also to the diversity that made up the sources of reform.

Indeed, the Cooperative Study was not the only lens through which national issues were understood. Nor was participation in the Study the only way in which national dialogues were brought to MSC. The sources that take a vaunted place in the historiography of general education reform; journal literature, educational philosophy, polemics, and presidents, were influential only

---

[233] Reeves, "General Education," 7. Italics added for emphasis.

[234] Minutes of the Basic Education Planning Committee, March 14, 1944, Box 464, Folder 1, Univ. Coll. Papers. Some of the titles of these works were abbreviated by the stenographer of the meeting, Harry H. Kimber, in his notes and I will provide full bibliographical information for these texts. 1. "Special Issue: Higher Education and the War" *Annals of the Academy of Political and Social Science* 231 (1944). 2. Self-Explanatory. 3. Self-Explanatory (though it is implied that this was to be the most current catalog, (1944). 4. Ivol Spafford, et. al., *Building a Curriculum for General Education: A Description of the General College Program* (Minneapolis: University of Minnesota Press, 1943). 5. *Regents Plan for Postwar Education in the State of New York* (Albany: The State University of New York, 1944).

to a degree in the movement and at MSC. As the implementation of the Basic College continued, Hannah began to participate intensely in campus discussions. In one particular meeting, he opened the meeting with an excerpt from a recent article published by Hamilton College President W.H. Cowley.[235] Hannah gripped the participants with a powerful oration: "What are the purposes of our institutions of Higher Education and of our students? The answer is abundantly obvious: By and large their purposes are primarily vocational and therefore of limited social desirability. Vocational purposes are vital, but they are not primary to the welfare of society. They must obviously be cultivated vigorously, but they must take second place to the purpose of educating an enlightened, social-minded citizenry." In this penetrating opening, Hannah recalled the liberal-vocational divide that had marked the history of curriculum reform at MSC. Yet, this was not simply a recitation of a perennial issue. Hannah claimed that liberal purposes must take center stage and that vocational purposes, while crucial, must be de-emphasized. In this sense, he was throwing full support behind the Basic College. Hannah continued:

> By and large our colleges and universities and our students have but a pale imitation of citizenship-purpose. We train technicians and 'professional men' but not citizens. We prepare our students in small educational or vocational compartments, but the vast majority of them have the vaguest notions of the nature of American democracy and therefore no deep emotional ties to its welfare. We stimulate and cultivate the career purposes of our students, but we largely ignore the social and political purposes that must be aroused if democracy is to be sustained.

By reaffirming general education for citizenship and other social purposes, Cowley and Hannah felt that they were reaffirming the value of institutions of higher education to society. He was

[235] This story was related in Floyd V. Monaghan, "Backgrounds of General Education at Michigan State University" (unpublished essay written May, 1955) Box 470, Folder 36, Univ. Coll. Papers. The passage was quoted from W.H. Cowley, "Freedom and Discipline," *Educational Record* 25 (1944): 5-22.

also lending his voice to others in the general education movement on the importance of general education during and after the war. Hannah continued:

> The war has given American education a great historic opportunity. We shall kick it out the window unless we redefine the purposes of our colleges and universities so soundly and so clearly that the nation will understand, approve, and zealously support them. For a century education has been the chief religion of the American people, but today discontent and criticism abound. Catastrophe lies ahead unless we return to the fundamental purpose of educating our students first as citizens and second as vocational specialists.

While the general education movement was functioning long before the Second World War, members of the movement used the rhetoric (particularly the term "democracy") surrounding the war to add intensity, significance, and salience to their points. Crisis provided an opportunity to implement the ideas articulated during peacetime. If the nation and higher education was to change after the war, why shouldn't the general education movement take part in the reconstruction? Hannah concluded:

> Freedom must always be checked by discipline, and higher education must therefore rededicate itself to the high purpose of social and civic devotion to the ongoing of democratic America. This requires limiting the freedom of student course selection by a discipline which gives first place to education for enlightened citizenship. It also requires inspired teaching bearing directly upon harmonizing the purposes of students with the best interests of society. In a word, freedom is possible only in terms of discipline: The discipline of the purposes of the whole self in the interest of the whole of society.

Freedom, democracy, liberty, and society: all had to be protected through a vigorous general education. Indeed, freedom in life could only be accomplished by curricular restriction. It was a fascinating argument that members of the general education movement often made. While the elective system had long since been considered the torch-bearer of curricular and individual liberty, members of the general education movement felt it necessary to appropriate the

shibboleth of "liberty" for their own curricular views.[236] In this case it was an enormous rhetorical justification of the Basic College. These broad social ideas from the pens and mouths of presidents influenced the curricular philosophy of the Basic College somewhat.

Following the lead of Tyler and Reeves, MSC professors sought to nail down curricular philosophy in the form of mission statements. What was the definition of general education at MSC?[237] After considerable debate, the faculty and administrators agreed upon the following definitions:

> Basic Education, as proposed for Michigan State College, is designed to provide students with a sound foundation on which to build intelligent interest in personal, family, vocational, social, and civic problems, a better understanding of these problems, and a greater ability to cope with them.
>
> Basic Education, should give students an opportunity to explore broad areas, should aid them in the discovery of their own interests and aptitudes, and should equip them better to assume their responsibilities as individuals and as citizens of a democracy.[238]

Released in the final report of the committee planning the Basic College, these definitions sought a broad approach to ensure consensus as well as future flexibility. These definitions were also strikingly similar to the definitions that the MSC professors initially wrote to respond to Tyler's assignment. Given that the earlier definition of general education was the intellectual heart and soul of reform at MSC, it is logical that the final definitions carried forth many of the same ideas.

Yet, this raises an important question. Were the reform measures and resulting definitions that helped to create the Basic College actually implemented at the time? There is significant

---

[236] See Adler, "Freedom Through Discipline" on this point. On the rise of the elective system/curricular specialization in early twentieth century American higher education and the rhetoric justifying it as "the system of liberty," see Hugh Hawkins, *Between Harvard and America: The Educational Leadership of Charles W. Eliot* (New York: Oxford University Press, 1972), chapter 3.

[237] Rather than use the term general education, MSC attempted to use the term "Basic Education." One might speculate that it was an effort to brand their approach to gen. ed. given that the administrative unit was called the "Basic College." It may have been important to distinguish between the Basic College and the University of Minnesota's General College. Similarly, it may have been important to distinguish between Basic Education and Minnesota's General Education.

[238] "The Functions of Basic Education" in "Report of the Committee Appointed 'For Study and Recommendation' Concerning Basic Education at Michigan State College" Box 470, Folder 36, Univ. Coll. Papers.

cause to believe they were as the definitions produced in the Final Report were published nationally by Reeves in 1955, who concluded that the definitions (which he called the preamble of the report), "still serves as a guide for general education at Michigan State."[239]

The origins of the Basic College suggests that reform in the general education movement often functioned in a matrix of influence with sources including institutional cooperation, philanthropy, and educational research. National discussions occurring in a variety of venues influenced, *and were influenced by*, local actors and reforms. This resulted in an iterative process of reform. It also resulted in a set of reforms that were sensitive to local interests and anxieties. Among these anxieties, for example, was a fear that growing college enrollments might dilute the intellectual quality of the undergraduate enterprise.

Meritocratic Practices: Veterans and Sectioning in the Basic College

In an era when American higher education was negotiating the perceived tension between equality and excellence with great vigor, the general education movement found itself with members in competing camps.[240] General education, like K-12 schooling, had the opportunity to increase democratic equality, function as a tool of social efficiency, and promote social mobility.[241] Members in the movement were divided over these goals which destroyed the semblance of a unified movement. What united most proponents of general education, however, was an anxiety that somehow the extension of college access was diluting tradition and excellence. This anxiety—which had certainly predated even the creation of public schools in the United States—was captured well in a 1949 article where one academic opined, "In a sense we

[239] Reeves, "General Education," 7.
[240] This had been a pervasive theme in higher education that was inherited by the general education movement. See Levine, *The American College*, esp. chapter five; William G. Bowen, Martin A. Kurzweil, and Eugene M. Tobin, *Equity and Excellence in American Higher Education* (Charlottesville: University of Virginia Press, 2005), chapter 2. This theme has a rich and often disturbing history as it has been the justification behind *both* an expansion of educational opportunities and a detrimental limitation of access based upon race, gender, and other factors with histories of discrimination.
[241] The following terms and the tensions between them were introduced by Labaree, "Public Goods, Private Goods."

have swung from one extreme to another. Education was once designed exclusively for the few, and hence not altogether suited to the many. But now we have a diet for the many and forget the man—the man, who cannot be many—who is the potential scholar and philosopher."[242] To negotiate this tension and assuage these fears, the Basic College was very much attuned to meritocracy and actively built these practices into its administrative and curricular structures.[243]

Sectioning—or placing students into sections based upon perceived ability—was the method of choice for balancing equity with meritocracy. Indeed, it was an idea that emerged with strong favor in the planning sessions, as illustrated by a letter from Hannah to Howard C. Rather (Emmons's future successor as Dean of the Basic College). Hannah wrote,

> There are only three points I would like to raise with your people. *First, I should like to emphasize again the importance of working out a program that will section students…on the basis of ability.* Second, I should like to emphasize the importance of having incorporated in the core courses the emphasis upon the importance of every American's continuous personal interest in his government in all levels. And third, I should like to see throughout the Basic College…a policy of making accuracy in the use of the English language, both written and spoken, a matter of concern.[244]

While the other two points had been acknowledged in the definitions of Basic Education, sectioning was not articulated. It was, however, worked into every facet of the organizational structure of the Basic College. The aim was not only to organize students according to perceived ability, but also to provide opportunities to those deemed to be "superior" to subvert their general requirements in favor of extended specialization. This would allow MSC to grow, while alleviating fears of intellectual mediocrity and drift.

Sectioning was anything but simple. Students would be accepted into MSC and then placed into the hands of an "enrollment officer" who would determine where students stood in

---

[242] Robert B. Heilman, "Lowest-Common-Denominator Education," *Journal of Higher Education* 20 (1949): 230.
[243] Other institutions of higher learning were also perceiving the issue of merit this way and responded in a manner similar to MSC. On this see Joseph F. Kett, *Merit: The History of a Founding Ideal from the American Revolution to the 21st Century* (Ithaca: Cornell University Press, 2013), esp. chapter 8.
[244] John A. Hannah to Howard C. Rather, 10 May 1945, Box 470, Folder 36, Univ. Coll. Papers. (italics added).

the constructed hierarchy.[245] Enrollment officers were instructed via their handbook that "The enrollment officer has every right, indeed is obliged, to tell a student who has superior performance that he should begin immediately to prepare himself to be unique in whatever field he plans to enter. He should tell this student that he has an obligation to his family-to-be, the profession he is to enter, and to the rest of the world to use his God-given intelligence to its fullest by specializing thoroughly and becoming expert."[246] Sectioning in the Basic College did not necessarily mean that gifted students would be placed in classes together. Some of the most "talented" could skip courses entirely. Students who had received A's in the first two terms could skip the third.[247] But skipping was no easy task, as the Basic College required that "The distribution of term grades should conform as closely as possible to the percentage distribution A 7-11, B 25-29, C 45-49, D 12-16, F, 0-5."[248] This grading curve allowed only a few to avoid general education measures and created a pretense that competition would produce those allowed to move on to rarer opportunities for specialization.

Another notable group to be sectioned was returning veterans. As a group, they not only demonstrate sectioning in the Basic College, but also show how the Basic College was justified to the public. American veterans had garnered much respect during the war and were to be a major source of policy innovation in postwar American life.[249] Yet, as historian Daniel A. Clark

---

[245] For information on the role of the enrollment officer, see Howard C. Rather, "Organization for Basic General Education at Michigan State College" in *Organization and Administration of General Education* W. Hugh Stickler ed. (Dubuque, IA: Wm. C. Brown, 1951), 44-45.
[246] *The Basic College Enrollment Officer's Handbook 1954-1955* (East Lansing: Michigan State College, 1954), 2. Surviving copy is available at the Michigan State University Library, East Lansing, MI.
[247] On this policy, see Harry H. Kimber to Clifford Erickson, 28 December 1951, Box 468, Folder 3, Univ. Coll. Papers.
[248] "Basic Educational Research Committee: The Assignment of Term Marks in the Basic College." Quoted in Leonard S. Laws, "A Comparative Study of Basic College Grades and Effort-Interest-Attitude Ratings for Low Ability Students" (PhD Diss., Michigan State College, 1953), 6. Laws's dissertation also provides an excellent lens to view meritocratic thought and sectioning practices in the Basic College.
[249] Suzanne Mettler, *Soldiers to Citizens: The G.I. Bill and the Making of the Greatest Generation* (New York: Oxford University Press, 2005); Glenn C. Altschuler and Stuart M. Blumin, *The GI Bill: A New Deal for Veterans*

has discussed, "GI Joe was an average American, and as prewar images revealed, average Americans did not go to college."[250] But, with the GI Bill, the undergraduate curriculum was altered to accommodate them. "In many ways" Clark suggests, "the impact of the successful college veteran drastically altered the traditional perceptions of the nature of the college experience, guiding the curriculum even more than in prewar years toward more practical and vocational applications."[251] While this may have been true in the grander scheme of the undergraduate curriculum, MSC administrators sought to marry their already worked out Basic College with what they argued were veterans' interests. They connected "general education" with the desire of veterans to gain employment.

Veterans took time to adjust to college life. In 1945, President Hannah spoke to the state of Michigan in a radio address: "We have many students, particularly those who have been in the air forces, who came to us a few months ago unable to sit still in a chair for more than a very few minutes, highly nervous and keyed up, who, in a few weeks, are returned to normalcy and act and behave like other college students. This…requires sympathetic understanding from instructors and all others counseling these men, but it is well worth the effort and patience."[252] Hannah was not only sympathetic to the mental state of the veterans, he was also shrewd in linking sectioning and MSC's already decided structures to the veterans. He suggested that the administrative and curricular theory underlying the entire Basic College was essential for the

---

(New York: Oxford University Press, 2009); Kathleen J. Frydl, *The GI Bill* (New York: Cambridge University Press, 2009).

[250] Daniel A. Clark, "'The Two Joes Meet, Joe College, Joe Veteran': The G.I. Bill, College Education, and Postwar American Culture," *History of Education Quarterly* 38 (1998): 174.

[251] Ibid, 177.

[252] John A. Hannah, "Volume 39, No. 20, February 18, 1945" in *The President's Message Over WKAR* (East Lansing: Michigan State College Press, 1945), 6-7. The role of the perceptions of the veterans' psyches and their influence on American higher education is covered in Christopher P. Loss, "'The Most Wonderful Thing Has Happened to Me in the Army': Psychology, Citizenship, and American Higher Education in World War II," *Journal of American History* 92 (2005): 864-891; Willard W. Blaesser, et al., *Student Personnel Work in the Postwar College* (Washington, D.C.: American Council on Education, 1945); Norman Frederiksen and W.B. Schrader, *Adjustment to College: A Study of 10,000 Veteran and Nonveteran Students in Sixteen American Colleges* (Princeton, NJ: Educational Testing Service, 1950).

veterans, and was in fact, the only type of curriculum the veterans would accept. He continued in the same speech, "Many of them will not be older in years than our civilian college students, but they will be more mature in experience and will be less sympathetic with time-consuming, time-wasting, dawdling programs."[253] The theme of this speech was repeated shortly thereafter in other venues.[254] All this was done while Basic College officials ensured that these veterans would be properly sectioned and then reintegrated, which was also aided by providing veterans college credit. MSC had made it clear that in light of postwar growth, it was ready to provide its version of general education. But, how did MSC administrators and faculty go about alerting the state of Michigan about the development of the Basic College?

Informing the Public: Advertising the Basic College in Michigan

Michigan State College officials were well aware that curricular negotiation had been a major theme in the college's history. The liberal arts—or any other curricula that smacked of "liberal education,"—had long been met with hostility by farming interests and MSC's governing body: The Michigan State Board of Agriculture. Yet, by 1944, Michigan was a different state. Though still heavily agricultural, the state economy had become primarily industrial and required a diverse workforce.[255] College enrollments were expected to boom in the postwar years and there was already talk of federal measures to assist in growing American higher education. The context had changed, and MSC's shift to a major research university with

[253] Hannah, "Volume 39, No. 20, February 18, 1945" in *The President's Message*, 14.
[254] "Speaker Tells How Veterans Can Be Aided," *Lansing State Journal*, 29 March 1945.
[255] Alan Clive, *State of War: Michigan in World War II* (Ann Arbor: University of Michigan Press, 1979); Thomas J. Sugrue, *The Origins of the Urban Crisis: Race and Inequality in Postwar Detroit* (Princeton: Princeton University Press, 1996), chapter one. See the useful discussion on population growth and migratory trends into Michigan during the war in Dominic J. Capeci, Jr., *Race Relations in Wartime Detroit* (Philadelphia: Temple University Press, 1984), 28-29.

agriculture as a strong tradition was seen as beneficial for the state.[256] Rather than subverting the State Board of Agriculture as their predecessors had done, the MSC administrators of this era were eager to present their plan to the Board.

With the State Board's approval in 1944, MSC sought to spread the message of the Basic College across the state by diverse means. They had gotten a head start by strategically placing articles in newspapers announcing the "revolutionary change in curriculum" that "will result in more effective training and improved education of students."[257] These articles—some placed by MSC officials and others giving accounts of local speeches by MSC administrators at churches, Rotary clubs, Farmers' clubs and elsewhere—continued well into 1945.[258] MSC spoke directly to its regular clientele (the farmers) even as it sought to recruit other students.

MSC continued this advertisement campaign through radio addresses. Each week, Hannah took to the airwaves to inform Michigan on the state of the College. A particularly poignant speech from January 20, 1945 showed Hannah reconciling the general education offered by the Basic College with the original Morrill Land Grant ideology that helped to create the institution. "Michigan State College as the land-grant college for Michigan," he began "is dedicated to the liberal and practical education for all of our people in the several pursuits and professions of life…More than 300 years ago John Milton gave us a most adequate definition of an education in these words: 'I call, therefore, a complete and generous education that which fits

---

[256] For contextual information on how the climate had favored smaller institutions becoming major research universities, see Freeland, *Academia's Golden Age*, 51-96. Ultimately, Freeland argues, a number of policies and available federal support assisted a number of colleges in transitioning to larger, more comprehensive, universities.
[257] "Revolutionary Change is Voted in Curriculum by Faculty at MSU," *Sturgis Journal*, 23 May 1944. See also "MSC Freshmen Will Enter Basic School," *Milan Leader*, 21 July 1944.
[258] "State College Dean Will be at Farmers Club Meeting," *Tuscola County Advertiser*, 25 February 1945. This particular source is significant in the sense that it shows Howard C. Rather, a dean who, like Hannah and Emmons, had begun his MSC career working with the University's extension service, selling the idea to the farm interests. "MSU Education Aims Explained to Lions" *Jackson Citizen-Patriot*, 18 July 1944; "'Art of Living' Told Rotarians," *Bay City Times*, 7 March 1945; "MSC Alumni to Hear Two Speakers Wednesday Night," *Jackson Citizen-Patriot*, 18 February 1945.

a man to perform justly, skillfully, and magnanimously all the offices, both private and public, of peace and war."[259]

Using the language of "liberal and practical" education that had been included in the original Morrill Land Grant Act of 1862, Hannah argued through Milton's definition for the curricular and institutional philosophy that not only underlay the Basic College, but indeed, the Michigan State College curricular experience.[260] Hannah continued his speech by showing that he was profoundly influenced by the writing of W.H. Cowley, claiming, "It is not enough that our young people be outstanding technicians. The first and never-forgotten objective must be that every product of our educational system must be given that training which will enable him to be an effective citizen, appreciating his opportunities and fully willing to assume his responsibilities in a great democracy."[261] And while the liberal-vocational divide was being reconciled for citizens of the state of Michigan in the radio addresses in 1945, Hannah had begun preaching this message a year earlier in newspaper articles. He was quoted in the *Milan Leader* saying, "Michigan State College believes that basic education will give students an opportunity to explore broad areas…and will equip them better to assume their responsibilities as individuals and as citizens in a democracy."[262]

Newspapers and radio stories brought MSC's message to the masses. MSC faculty and administrators brought the same message to high schools. A particularly moving account came in the form of a personal letter from the principal of Ann Arbor Senior High School Nicholas A. Schreiber, who wrote,

---

[259] John A. Hannah, volume 39, No. 16, January 20, 1945 in *The President's Message Over WKAR*, 3.
[260] For the appropriate section of the First Morrill Land Grant Act see Richard Hofstadter and Wilson Smith, eds., *American Higher Education: A Documentary History* Volume II (Chicago: University of Chicago Press, 1961), 568-569.
[261] John A. Hannah, volume 39, No. 16, January 20, 1945 in *The President's Message Over WKAR*, 6.
[262] "MSC Freshmen Will Enter Basic School," *Milan Leader*, 21 July 1944.

> We were so impressed with the presentations of Dean Rather and Registrar Linton at a recent meeting with our faculty that I want to express our appreciation to you directly. These men gave us a much needed insight into the function and objectives of the Basic College. We have a new concept and wholesome respect for Michigan State College…I merely want, in this note, to say that Dean Rather and Registrar Linton…sold Michigan State College to our faculty.[263]

Dean Rather was, of course, Howard C. Rather, the immediate successor of Lloyd C. Emmons and the head administrator in charge of the Basic College. Registrar Linton was Professor R.S. Linton who had participated in very first meetings of the Cooperative Study in General Education six years earlier. Faculty and administrators who had spent years creating the Basic College now fought to get their message of general education across. They gave speeches, wrote letters, and more. If the Schreiber letter is any indication, the Basic College was well received. Certainly enrollment figures can speak to this point as well. "It is true that Michigan State College has become a large university" Rather wrote in 1949, "Its highest pre-war enrollment was 7,000. In 1946-47 it enrolled more than 13,400 students, 8,530 of them in the Basic College."[264]

Conclusion

The experiences of Michigan State College were not unique. Rather, its success was the careful work of many members of the general education movement and the Cooperative Study in General Education. The methods that they had learned, the many experiments they had read about, and the consultations they had received exemplify just how indebted curriculum reform in the general education movement was to educational researchers, philanthropists, and interinstitutional cooperation. As the Second World War drew to a close in 1945, the arguments of the general education movement had succeeded and general education became even more of a

[263] Nicholas Schreiber to John A. Hannah, 22 February 1947, Box 470, Folder 1, Univ. Coll. Papers.
[264] Howard C. Rather, "The General Education Program of Michigan State College" in *Comprehensive Examinations*, 6.

national concern. More important, its methods were fully codified. This played a hand in the general education movement catching the eye of the federal government, who would soon make a broad statement about the importance of higher education to a democratic society. This statement was made by the "Truman Commission," a presidential commission conceived to set national goals for higher education. Ultimately, the importance of general education did not escape the commission. Neither did the importance of community colleges as an institutional type that could help to bring about an even more broadly educated public. The movement responded with yet another cooperative study, this time aimed at California colleges. This cooperative study, the California Study of General Education in the Junior College, is the focus of the next chapter.

Chapter 4

"Expending Energy on the Nebulous Whimsy of General Education": The California Study of General Education in the Junior College, 1948-1952[1]

General education has become the new shibboleth of American colleges, and everybody—or nearly everybody—wants to get into the act…Any attempt to give the answer by stating a prescribed curriculum or content is likely to prove futile. The immense differences in resources between various colleges and universities the different levels of training possessed by students entering higher institutions, the varying aims of various schools, and other factors all conspire to rule out prepared scripts. In addition, general education itself is not a matter of content only. Rather, it is an aim, a purpose, a philosophy, which may be realized in different ways on different stages in different communities. It is a matter of objectives, rather than of subjects taught; a matter of a total effect to be gained, rather than of the devices used to get this effect.[2]

—William N. Chambers

The junior college now has squarely before it the problem of examining its own rather dramatic shortcomings in the area of general-education and of doing something about it. Even if it desired to escape responsibility for improving its general-education program, the junior college could hardly do so today. In addition to public concern, there are now also extreme pressures from both above and below the thirteenth and the fourteenth school years.[3]

—Alexander Frazier

On-going, day-to-day experimentation in better ways to cause student learning is vital to the future of the community college, for on the excellence of its instruction, it will stand or fall. Community colleges, by their very nature, can 'tinker' with all sorts of ideas for the improvement of the teaching-learning act and put them to work in their learning laboratories.[4]

—B. Lamar Johnson

Introduction: The Truman Commission and the General Education Movement

By the end of the Second World War, general education had become the "most discussed movement in higher education" and the "most prominent subject in contemporary educational literature."[5] The success of the general education movement in the first half of its lifespan had

---

[1] This chapter uses the terms "community college" and "junior college" interchangeably.

[2] William N. Chambers, "General Education—Philosophy and Patterns, Part I" in *Current Trends in Higher Education: 1949, Official Group Reports of the Fourth Annual National Conference on Higher Education, Held at Chicago, Illinois, April 4-7, 1949* ed. Ralph W. MacDonald (Washington, D.C.: Department of Higher Education, National Education Association of the United States, 1949), 45.

[3] Alexander Frazier, "General Education in the Junior College: Lessons from the High School" *School Review* 58 (1950): 201.

[4] B. Lamar Johnson, "An Emphasis and a Thrust," *Jottings* from the League for Innovation in the Community College no. 10, April 24, 1972: 8.

[5] Hugh S. Brown and Lewis B. Mayhew, *American Higher Education* (New York: The Center for Applied Research in Education, 1965), 51; Earl J. McGrath, "The Purposes of General Education," *Journal of the American Association of Collegiate Registrars* 21 (1946): 157.

brought a degree of national acclaim to many of its individual leaders—a number of whom had intimate involvement with the Cooperative Study in General Education. Indeed, many of these scholars—including Earl J. McGrath, T.R. McConnell, and Ralph W. Tyler—would broaden their foci, hold vaunted leadership positions, and spearhead reform efforts that would have an immense impact on secondary and higher education during the postwar era. However, even as these opportunities opened up for these scholars, each chose to maintain a steady interest in general education.

This was certainly the case for McGrath and Tyler in 1946. In that year, the former secured funding and launched the *Journal of General Education*. The latter was set to lead nineteen colleges in a new cooperative study on general education called The Cooperative Organization of Colleges and Universities. Some of these colleges, including Iowa State, Michigan State, and the University of Louisville had participated in the original Cooperative Study in General Education, while other institutions such as the University of Wyoming, University of Illinois, Syracuse University, and Knox College (IL) had not. Nevertheless, these institutions still displayed an avid interest in the general education movement and were inspired to seek out a second cooperative study.[6] Institutions who did not participate still learned of this planned experiment through national advertisements.[7] More important, the methods of working pioneered by Tyler and his associates that marked the cooperative studies had become a trademark of the general education movement and were replicated often—albeit on a smaller scale. One author, after conducting a thorough literature review of the movement from 1945-1956 found that the "cooperative process" as displayed by workshops and the desire to discuss

[6] Box 13, F: Cooperative Organization of Colleges and Universities 1946 (General Education), Record Series Number 5/1/1, Archives Research Center, University of Illinois at Urbana-Champaign, Champaign, IL; Box 7, Folders 7-8, Tyler Papers. Ultimately, and for reasons undiscernible from the historical record, this cooperative study never went beyond the planning stage.
[7] "Interuniversity Co-Operation in Programs of General Education," *School and Society* 63 (1946): 372.

and delineate objectives was a key method of reforming general education in the United States.[8] It would seem that the methods used by the Cooperative Study in General Education, and the larger movement they symbolized, were having a tangible impact on institutions of higher learning across the nation.

In addition to their work on college campuses, many members of the movement had earned credibility and raised their profile from their support of the military during the war.[9] As mentioned in the last chapter, the American Council on Education was sought out by the United States Armed Forces Institute (USAFI) to assist in bringing the methods of the general education movement to the military. The head of the resulting project, T.R. McConnell, more or less replicated the methods being used Tyler and the Cooperative Study in General Education. This project—which culminated in a report entitled *A Design for General Education*—would prove not only prescient, but crucial in proving that the general education movement could respond to the changing political, economic, social, and institutional context of the postwar era.[10] More

---

[8] William Lawrence Griffen, "The General Education Movement in American Higher Education: An Analysis of the Literature, 1945-1956" (M.A. Thesis, Cornell University, 1957). This viewpoint is also argued and substantiated in Russell M. Cooper, "Faculty Adventures in Educational Planning," *Journal of General Education* 2 (1947): 35-40.

[9] Similar relationships, that is to say, relationships between universities and the military forged during World War II, would lead to the growth of universities and research in the postwar era. On this trend see Freeland, *Academia's Golden Age*; Roger L. Geiger, *Research and Relevant Knowledge: American Research and Universities Since World War II* (New York: Oxford University Press, 1993); Stuart W. Leslie, *The Cold War and American Science: The Military-Industrial-Academic Complex at MIT and Stanford* (New York: Columbia University Press, 1993); Lowen, *Creating the Cold War University*; Graham and Diamond, *The Rise of American Research Universities*; Jewett, *Science, Democracy*; Loss, *Between Citizens and the State*; Mark Solovey and Hamilton Cravens, eds., *Cold War Social Science: Knowledge Production, Liberal Democracy, and Human Nature* (New York: Palgrave Macmillan, 2012); Solovey, *Shaky Foundations*; Cohen-Cole, *The Open Mind*.

[10] Social factors—largely stemming from the emerging Cold War—included the desire to reaffirm a rhetoric of democracy and to promote western political and economic ideals for the "third world," the end of the Great Depression and a period of expected economic prosperity, and the Soviet tactic of scoring moral points by exposing the hypocrisy inherent in historical and contemporary American social relations in that the nation preached equality, yet treated African Americans as second-class citizens. On the desire to promote western political and economic ideals the "third world," see Elizabeth Borgwardt, *A New Deal for the World: America's Vision for Human Rights* (Cambridge: The Belknap Press of Harvard University Press, 2005). On the expectation of extended economic prosperity see Lizabeth Cohen, *A Consumers' Republic: The Politics of Mass Consumption in Postwar America* (New York: Vintage Books, 2003). On soviet discussions of race relations and their influence on federal policies see Azza Salama Layton, *International Politics and Civil Rights Policies in the United States, 1941-1960* (New York: Cambridge University Press, 2000); Mary L. Dudziak, *Cold War Civil Rights: Race and the Image of American*

specifically, it showed that the general education movement could foster healthy relationships with both the military and the federal government. Sound relationships in this arena would be crucial in the postwar era as the federal government took a decidedly larger interest in higher education and had the potential to provide the general education movement with resources that "vastly superseded" those of philanthropic foundations.[11]

Both the federal interest in higher education and the government's intersection with the general education movement were best exemplified by the Commission appointed by President Harry S. Truman to craft a statement of goals for higher education in 1946, dubbed the Truman Commission. It not only produced a six-volume study of higher education in 1947, but created a "national rhetoric" on higher education—or a "well crafted- and deliberate attempt to persuade national, state, and institutional policymakers about the purposes and needs of higher education."[12] The objectives of the Truman Commission involved "expanding access by eliminating financial, race, sex, and religious barriers" so as to promote "equal opportunity as a

---

Democracy (Princeton: Princeton University Press, 2000). Institutional factors included emerging influx of government funding—discussed in the works provided in the previous footnote—and the influx of veterans due to the GI Bill.

[11] Alison R. Bernstein, *Funding the Future: Philanthropy's Influence on American Higher Education* (Lanham, MD: Rowman and Littlefield Education, 2014), 64. On the federal government's relationship with higher education, see Freeland, *Academia's Golden Age*; Marvin Lazerson, "The Disappointments of Success: Higher Education After World War II," *Annals of the American Academy of Political and Social Science* 559 (1998): 64-76; Philo A. Hutcheson and Ralph D. Kidder, "In the National Interest: The College and University in the United States in the Post-World War II Era" in *Higher Education: Handbook of Theory and Research, Volume 26* eds. John C. Smart and Michael B. Paulsen (Dordrecht: Springer, 2011), 221-264; Rebecca Frances Isaacs, "Schooling for Success: The US Federal Government, the American Education System and the Cold War, 1947-1957" (PhD diss., University of Birmingham, 2014).

[12] Philo Hutcheson, "The 1947 President's Commission on Higher Education and the National Rhetoric on Higher Education Policy," *History of Higher Education Annual* 22 (2002): 91-109, quote from 92. For a discussion of how the Commission functioned, see Kerr-Terner, "From Truman to Johnson" chapter 2. The larger influence of this report and the evolution of the "national rhetoric" were later explored by Philo Hutcheson, "Setting the Nation's Agenda for Higher Education: A Review of Selected National Commission Reports, 1947-2006," *History of Education Quarterly* 47 (2007): 359-367; Julie Renee Posselt, "The Rise and Fall of Need-Based Grants: A Critical Review of Presidential Discourses on Higher Education, 1964-1984" in *Higher Education: Handbook of Theory and Research, Volume 24* ed. John C. Smart (Dordrecht: Springer, 2009), 183-225; Daylanne Markwardt, "From Sputnik to the Spellings Commission: The Rhetoric of Higher Education Reform" (PhD diss., University of Arizona, 2012).

social and economic good," and to reform the curriculum to that it might produce "an educated citizenry" that were part of a "common culture and citizenship."[13]

These objectives rested on two pillars of action. The first was to use public institutions—especially public junior colleges which the Commission would recast as "community colleges"—"as one key institutional means to increasing access and efficiency."[14] The second was the widespread implementation and reform of "general education" "not only in transfer programs but also in programs of terminal education."[15] This topic was reflected heavily in the Commission's final report, entitled *Higher Education for American Democracy*.[16] "The greater part of one entire chapter in the first volume," one Commission member reminded readers of the *Journal of Educational Sociology* in 1949, "is devoted to a discussion of general education, the needs for it, its objectives, the methods by which it may best be given, and the interrelationship between general and vocational education."[17] This first volume, entitled "Establishing the Goals," serves as a distillation of the ideology of the President's Commission.

---

[13] Quotes taken from Claire Krendl Gilbert and Donald E. Heller, "Access, Equity, and Community Colleges: The Truman Commission and Federal Higher Education Policy from 1947 to 2011," *Journal of Higher Education* 84 (2013): 431; Hutcheson, "Goals for United States Higher Education," 45; Thomas Bender, "Politics, Intellect, and the American University, 1945-1995," *Daedalus* 126 (1997): 5. As I will not be dealing extensively with the Truman Commission's vision for college access, I will refer readers to the aforementioned piece by Gilbert and Heller as well as Dongbin Kim and John L. Rury, "The Changing Profile of College Access: The Truman Commission and Enrollment Patterns in the Postwar Era," *History of Education Quarterly* 47 (2007): 302-327; Philo Hutcheson, Marybeth Gasman, and Kijua Sanders-McMurtry, "Race and Equality in the Academy: Rethinking Higher Education Actors and the Struggle for Equality in the Post-World War II Period," *Journal of Higher Education* 82 (2011): esp. 121-131.

[14] Philo Hutcheson, "Shared Goals, Different Politics, and Differing Outcomes: The Truman Commission and the Dewey Commission" in *SUNY at Sixty: The Promise of the State University of New York* eds. John B. Clark, W. Bruce Leslie, and Kenneth P. O'Brien (Albany: State University of New York Press, 2010), 5. On the relationship between the Truman Commission and community colleges, see Gilbert and Heller, "Access, Equity, and Community Colleges," esp. 431; Steven Brint and Jerome Karabel, *The Diverted Dream: Community Colleges and the Promise of Educational Opportunity in America, 1900-1985* (New York: Oxford University Press, 1989), chapter three; Kenneth M. Meier, "The Community College Mission: History and Theory, 1930-2000" (PhD diss., University of Arizona, 2008), chapter 3.

[15] Clifton F. Conrad, "At the Crossroads: General Education in Community Colleges" (Washington, D.C.: American Association of Community and Junior Colleges, 1983), 52.

[16] *Higher Education for American Democracy: A Report V. 1-6* (Washington, D.C.: U.S. Govt. Printing Off., 1947).

[17] John Dale Russell, "Basic Conclusions and Recommendations of the President's Commission on Higher Education," *Journal of Educational Sociology* 22 (1949): 501.

Many scholars have noted the focus of the Truman Commission on general education; however, few have made the explicit link between the roster of the Truman Commission and the general education movement.[18] Indeed, many of the members of the Commission were themselves well-established members of the general education movement writ large. More specifically, they were people with working knowledge of, and direct experience with, the Cooperative Study in General Education. As such, members of the Truman Commission, rather than articulating an entirely new vision of general education reform for the nation, were more so rearticulating and reaffirming the esteem that academia had for general education prior to the Second World War. Ultimately, the Commission was, in some ways, a reflection of the ideals of the general education movement.

Its chairman was George F. Zook—the President of the American Council on Education.[19] As mentioned in chapter one, the American Council on Education worked closely with the White House to recommend commission members. Zook himself was quite familiar with the general education movement and had sympathy not only for the concept, but also for reform methods codified in the first fifteen years of the movement's existence. It was Zook's organization that had overseen the Cooperative Study and it was him personally who had served as a liaison between the Study's leadership and their primary financier, the General Education Board.[20]

---

[18] LeBlanc, "The Concept of General Education" 128-129; Miller, *The Meaning of General Education*, 121-126.
[19] For Zook's experiences as head of the Truman Commission, see Rieken, "George Frederick Zook," chapter 3. For Zook's work with junior colleges and its relationship to his experiences on the Truman Commission, see George B. Vaughan, "Historical Perspective: President Truman Endorsed Community College Manifesto," *Community and Junior College Journal* 53 (1983): 22; Buddy, "George Frederick Zook," chapter 3; Clifford P. Harbour, *John Dewey and the Future of Community College Education* (London: Bloomsbury Academic, 2015), 67-68.
[20] In discussing Zook's credentials for serving as head of the Commission, Alison R. Bernstein points to Zook's previous work with commissions financed by philanthropists, his stance as "an educational populist," and his work with accreditation and general education. Bernstein, *Funding the Future*, 64-67.

The Commission also featured T.R. McConnell, who, as previously discussed, brought forth the ideals of the Study to the USAFI project reported on in *A Design for General Education*. In addition to McConnell, there was Earl J. McGrath, who also sat on the executive committee of the Cooperative Study, helped to draft its final report, and who was now—as previously mentioned—the editor of the *Journal of General Education*. Finally, there was Algo D. Henderson, president of Antioch College. Not only had his institution participated in the Cooperative Study, he had directly attended a number of meetings. Moreover, Henderson and Antioch were attracting national attention during the mid-1940s for producing reports on their general education curriculum.[21]

Certainly there were others on the Commission who were arguably as equally experienced with the general education movement, but did not have an affiliation with the Cooperative Study. For instance, the President's Commission included Alvin C. Eurich, who in 1947 was affiliated with Stanford University. Eurich was notable for producing key chapters and articles on general education and for his previous affiliation with the General College of the University of Minnesota.[22] However, what makes the aforementioned veterans of the cooperative study in general education notable can be seen when we look at the rosters of the advisory

[21] Algo D. Henderson, "Antioch College Looks Ahead," *Progressive Education* 21 (1944): 213-214, 236-237; Algo D. Henderson, *Vitalizing Liberal Education: A Study of the Liberal Arts Program* (New York: Harper Bros., 1944); Algo D. Henderson and Dorothy Smith, *Antioch College: Its Design for Liberal Education* (New York: Harper and Brothers, 1946). For a discussion of Henderson's work during the general education movement and specifically on the Truman Commission, see Nicholas M. Strohl, "'Vitalizing Liberal Education:' Algo D. Henderson and General Education Reform, 1935-1948." (presentation, Annual Meeting of the History of Education Society, St. Louis, MO, November 2015). Henderson would maintain an interest in the general education efforts of community colleges. Indeed, his final publication (co-authored with his wife) was on the topic. See Algo D. Henderson and Jean G. Henderson, "Revitalizing General Education in the Community College" (presentation, Forum on Future Purposes, Content, and Formats for the General Education of Community College Students, Montgomery College, Maryland, May 22, 1978).

[22] Alvin C. Eurich, "A Renewed Emphasis Upon General Education" in *General Education in the American College*, 3-14.

committees that made up the President's Commission.[23] Perhaps the most relevant committee was the Aims and Objectives Committee, as they "set the stage and tone for the entire Commission report."[24] The only members of this committee with experience in the general education movement had experience with the Cooperative Study. Indeed, the members that made up the Aims and Objectives Committee were as follows: McConnell as Chairman, Henderson, philosopher Horace M. Kallen, McGrath, businessman Murray D. Lincoln, and former First Lady Eleanor Roosevelt (who never attended any of the meetings and resigned before the end of the project).[25] This might well suggest that it was predestined for the indirect influence of the Cooperative Study in General Education to permeate the Truman Commission. However, by 1946, there was a different and powerful vision for general education being articulated by Harvard University that brought the Truman Commission to an intellectual fork in the road.

The idea for the project that produced the Harvard Report entitled *General Education in a Free Society*, began with a conversation between W.H. Cowley and Harvard President James Bryant Conant. Cowley told Conant that Harvard was simply not doing enough to claim any leadership role in the general education movement. It was a topic, Cowley contended, that Harvard was far too silent on. He then suggested that a major report by Harvard might well provide smaller schools a model to emulate and/or bring further credibility to the general education movement as a whole. The argument was persuasive and Conant appointed a faculty-

---

[23] The Commission members and the Advisory Committees are reproduced in Robertson, "Access to Success" 186-188.
[24] Eugene M. Chintala, "Professional Education Associations' Involvement in President Truman's Commission Report on Higher Education" (PhD diss., Bowling Green State University, 1998), 13-19, quote from 15.
[25] McGrath would detail the views on general education held by the Commission in Earl J. McGrath, "General Education and the Report of the President's Commission on Higher Education" in *General Education: A University Program in Action* eds. W. Hugh Stickler, James Paul Stoakes, and Louis Shores (Dubuque, IA: Wm. C. Brown, 1950), 30-41.

wide committee to produce a report on general education that was intended to influence the whole of secondary and higher education.[26]

The place of the Harvard Report in the general education movement was discussed in chapter one and does not bear repeating. However, the relevance of the Report to the present discussion lies in the fact that it articulated a vision for general education reform that differed greatly from the vision put forth by *A Design for General Education*—the report of the USAFI project that was, for all intents and purposes, representative of the general education movement as I have discussed it up to this point. *A Design* represented the general education movement of the cooperative studies, not of the Great Books ideology that emanated from Columbia University and the University of Chicago. Put simply, *A Design* was the general education movement of reform methods, not of proscriptive curricula. It stood in sharp contrast to what Harvard was trying to achieve. Indeed, members of the Harvard Committee responsible for producing *General Education in a Free Society* believed that *A Design for General Education* represented their main competition as they sought to push the general education movement in a different direction.[27] The wide distribution and ease of applicability of both reports made each of them appealing to those interested in having general education play a larger role in secondary and higher education.

---

[26] Smith, *The Harvard Century*, 160-161.

[27] This is evidenced by two of their meetings being devoted to discussing *A Design for General Education*. The minutes of these meetings survive: "September 7, 1943 Meeting Minutes, Harvard University, Committee on the Objectives of a General Education in a Free Society," *Material Presented to the Committee*, 1943-1945 (*inclusive*), UA110.528.10, Box 1, Serial Numbers 1-17, Harvard University Archives, Harvard University, Cambridge, MA. Hereafter cited as "Harvard Committee Papers." "February 4, 1944 Meeting Minutes Harvard University, Committee on the Objectives of a General Education in a Free Society," *Material Presented to the Committee*, 1943-1945 (*inclusive*), UA110.528.10, Box 1, Serial Numbers 79-89, Harvard Committee Papers. I gratefully acknowledge historian Bryan McAllister-Grande who had previously photographed these minutes and shared them with me.

The Director of the USAFI project, T.R. McConnell, had served as an outside consultant to the Harvard committee, and as such, he had a hand in both reports.[28] Just a short while later, McConnell was serving as chairman of the Aims and Objectives Committee of the President's Commission. He and others were certain that they wished to incorporate a vision of general education and its reform into the final report(s) of the Truman Commission. The question was, of course, which of the two visions? Ultimately, McConnell and the Commission "incorporated many ideas" from *A Design for General Education* and rearticulated a vision of general education (reform) that had been building for the previous fifteen years—a vision that would continue to mark the general education movement.[29] The resulting marginalization of the Redbook's theories by the President's Commission created a situation where the Commission and the Redbook were seen as embodying two separate views not only in the realm of general education, but for secondary and higher education writ large.[30]

But, what was the vision of general education advocated by the President's Commission? It was generally similar to that of the cooperative studies that had come before it, but also featured key differences. Historian Philo Hutcheson has suggested that the term "general education" was used by Commission members in a manner similar to the way some have used the term "liberal education." The key issue, to Hutcheson, was that the President's Commission

---

[28] The record of McConnell's interview by the Harvard Committee is featured in "March 24, 1944 Meeting Minutes Harvard University, Committee on the Objectives of a General Education in a Free Society," *Material Presented to the Committee*, 1943-1945 (*inclusive*), UA110.528.10, Box 1, Serial Numbers 90-98, Harvard Committee Papers. Interestingly, when the Harvard committee interviewed McConnell, they neglected to ask him about the USAFI project, but rather focused on his time at the General College of the University of Minnesota. On McConnell's experiences with the Harvard Committee, also see Angela S. Fanelli, "General Education in the American College" (EdD diss., Rutgers University, 1997), 220-221.

[29] Russell M. Cooper and Margaret B. Fisher, *The Vision of a Contemporary University: A Case Study of Expansion and Development in American Higher Education, 1950-1975* (Tampa: University Presses of Florida, 1982), 85-86.

[30] Freeland, *Academia's Golden Age*, 77-80; Loss, *Between Citizens and the State*, 138. Loss also notes on page 147 that correspondence study was seen as a useful method of dealing with the massive enrollment influxes. Of course, the model of general education being suggested by *A Design*, which was created specifically for correspondence study, made good sense to apply in this situation.

advocated a unity of knowledge, but not necessarily a similarity of experience.[31] Indeed, the Commission called "for a unity in the program of studies that a uniform system of courses cannot supply." The unity must come, instead," they argued, "from a consistency of aim that will infuse and harmonize all teaching and all campus activities."[32] They would reassert this point again, arguing that "The objectives of general education are not to be achieved by prescribing any single pattern of courses for all students. Seeking to gain common goals for all, general education nonetheless approaches the goals through different avenues of subject matter and experience. These avenues must be as numerous and varied as the wide differences among students."[33] Moreover, though the Commission had "much to say about the subject-matter of higher education" the recommendations were made simply for the consideration of academic faculties as they reformed their own programs, "for no suggestion [was] made…for any interference in curriculum affairs by outside authorities."[34]

These principles—openness to varied forms of curricula and general respect for institutional autonomy—were surely in line with the general education movement as it was represented by the cooperative studies. So too, was their view on experimentation and cooperation. "If all students are to attain common goals," the Commission argued, "much experimentation with new types of courses and teaching materials will be required. Only as these are developed, appraised, and modified to meet the widely varied abilities and needs of students in a democracy can all attain common objectives."[35] This was part of the Commission's larger call for "cooperat[ion] for common ends" in all phases of life.[36]

---

[31] Philo A. Hutcheson, "The Truman Commission's View of the Future," *Thought and Action* 23 (2007): 107-115.
[32] *Higher Education for American Democracy: A Report of the President's Commission on Higher Education: Volume I: Establishing the Goals* (Washington, D.C.: U.S. Government Printing Office, 1947), 49.
[33] Ibid, 58.
[34] Russell, "Basic Conclusions and Recommendations," 501.
[35] *Establishing the Goals*, 58.
[36] Ibid, 50.

However, a key difference worth highlighting between the cooperative studies and the Truman Commission can be seen by grappling with the discussion of the latter by historian Ethan Schrum. "*Higher Education for American Democracy* manifested a philosophy of education, crafted largely by John Dewey," Schrum argued, "which defined democracy as a quality of communal experience and set this understanding of democracy as the ultimate goal of human existence and the proper end of all education." Schrum would also note that the curriculum envisioned by the Commission members was merely an instrument to enliven and sharpen student capabilities for democratic praxis and communal living. This was a belief that he linked to the "methodological instrumentalist" wing of the general education movement—a group of educators who were influenced by John Dewey and favored curricula that was suited to the needs of students.[37] This raises a critical issue in our discussion of the general education movement: Were the cooperative studies merely promoting "methodological instrumentalism" with the hopes of promoting a fuzzy conception of democratic praxis? Further, was this the influence that was being brought to bear on—and represented by—the President's Commission? Not exactly.

The President's Commission put its *faith* in democracy and public institutions in ways that the Cooperative Study in General Education—and many in the general education movement—did not. The backlash that the Commission received from Catholic educators is a valuable lens through which to illustrate this key difference between the Commission and the general education movement. It also provides evidence that the cooperative studies were not simply an example of "methodological instrumentalism," but allowed a spectrum of curricular

[37] Ethan Schrum, "Establishing a Democratic Religion: Metaphysics and Democracy in the Debates Over the President's Commission on Higher Education," *History of Education Quarterly* 47 (2007): 277-301, quotes from 278, 287. Schrum derives his discussion of this group from Miller, *The Meaning of General Education*, esp. chapter 4.

thought to flourish and benefit from their curricular reform techniques—even those not built on the shibboleth of democracy.[38] The Cooperative Study in General Education featured a number of private institutions—one of which was Catholic: The College of St. Catherine (CSC). Throughout the Study, members of this college sought to make it clear to the central staff that their cooperation was reliant upon the notion that they were not subjected to the philosophies that undergirded curricular instrumentalism or political pragmatism. For example, Sister Annette Walter, the liaison officer of CSC, wrote to Ralph Ogan to say that "The faculty is united in its rejection of anything savouring of pragmatism and relativism, and feels that it cannot do business with anyone who does not recognize the existence of a natural law."[39]

The Study's leaders remained sensitive to these concerns and sought to create cooperation among institutions—even those with religious differences. Sister Annette would later write to Ogan after her campus was visited by faculty members from Muskingum College—a Presbyterian institution. "We felt, in visiting with these people, that we were talking to old friends," she wrote, "and that we were getting more ideas from them than they were getting from us. At any rate, we enjoyed the day very much and are now more than ever convinced that the ideals of the Muskingum faculty are very similar to our own."[40] That said, the College of St. Catherine continued to derive their "aims and ideals of a Catholic Women's College" from "the

[38] On the backlash that the Commission received from Catholic educators, see Chintala, "Professional Education Associations'"; Hutcheson, "The 1947 President's Commission," 96-98; Schrum, "Establishing a Democratic Religion," 282-284.
[39] Sister Annette Walter to Ralph W. Ogan, 23 January 1943. Box 345, Folder 5, CSC Papers. For more information on Sister Annette and her understanding of human nature, see Eileen A. Gavin, "Sister Annette Walter's Unfinished Dream: 'To Make the Universe a Home'" in *Women of Vision: Their Psychology, Circumstances, and Success* eds. Eileen A. Gavin, Aphrodite Clamar, Mary Anne Siderits (New York: Springer, 2007), 159-176.
[40] Sister Annette to Ralph W. Ogan, 29 November 1940, Box: 345 F: 7 CSC Papers. These instances of cooperation are documented in Kevin S. Zayed, "'We felt that we were talking to old friends:' Cooperation among Catholic and Protestant Colleges, 1938-1945." (presentation, Annual Meeting of the History of Education Society, Nashville, TN, October 2013).

Pope's Encyclicals" and reformed their curriculum as such.[41] Ultimately, a Catholic institution had flourished and reformed its curriculum on a foundation other than democratic praxis. This example proves that for institutions during the general education movement, curriculum "could be…arbitrarily selected, or not so arbitrarily."[42]

The example also suggests that the President's Commission can be seen as having some influence from the Cooperative Study in General Education and the general education movement up to 1946-1947, but that *Higher Education for American Democracy* ultimately emphasized curricular *ends* (democratic praxis) and a strong investment in public institutions, while the general education movement itself was more notable for advancing a *means* of curriculum reform among the diverse institutions of higher education (cooperation without consensus).[43] The broader movement ultimately held philosophies about philosophical, institutional, and curricular autonomy that allowed it to be more inclusive of the diversity of higher education and ultimately led to more tangible reform on the ground.

That said, the Truman Commission did stimulate a limited amount tangible reform on the ground and helped to sustain the movement at a crucial turning point.[44] Once *Higher Education for American Democracy* had been published in 1947, members of the Truman Commission went forth to carry their messages to institutions across the nation. In particular, members sought to alert the faculties of community colleges—the institutional type that received perhaps the most attention from the Commission—that they should begin to rethink and reform

---

[41] Mother Eucharista Galvin, "College Teachers Meeting, January, 28, 1939" Box 345, Folder 2, CSC Papers.
[42] D. Ivan Dykstra, "An Introduction to Liberal Education" (Unpublished Manuscript, n.d.), p. 415. Box 1, Hope College, "H88-0048. Dykstra, D. Ivan (1915-1999). Papers, 1946-1999." (2012). *Collection Registers and Abstracts.* Paper 3. http://digitalcommons.hope.edu/collection_registers/3. Accessed March 1, 2015.
[43] It is still crucial to note that the Commission and its report were given a largely positive reception by key members of the general education movement, including John Hannah and William P. Tolley. On this, see Hawkins, *Banding Together*, 172-173. Of course, there was an acknowledged relationship between cooperation without consensus and democratic praxis, but it was more about the former than the latter for those in the cooperative studies.
[44] Russell L. Jenkins, "A Synthesis of Studies in General Education," *Journal of General Education* 8 (1955): 205.

their general education offerings. This was crucial, for as historian John Thelin reminds us, the Truman Commission was more about providing a vision, and "it was state governments, private foundations, and individual colleges and universities that took the initiative in the late 1940s and early 1950s to carry out" this vision.[45] Often, these institutions were inspired by outreach work done by Commission members. For instance, one member of the Commission, John Dale Russell, explained the vision of the Commission to junior college educators representing several institutions at Montgomery Junior College outside of Washington, D.C. on December 6, 1947 and challenged them to reform their general education offerings.[46]

Writing in the *Junior College Journal* in that same year, Commission member Ordway Tead used the concept of general education in the junior college as a lens to argue that higher education was ripe for fundamental change. "What confronts us is nothing less than a complete review of every aspect of the questions: What kind of adults do we want our young people to be, and how do we propose to help them become persons of that kind? How may we better assure that what we are trying to do produces the kind of young American men and women we want to see emerge from the educational process," Tead asserted.[47] His larger argument—echoing *Higher Education for American Democracy*—was that general education reform was the ultimate manifestation of the objectives created by answering the aforementioned questions. "We do not need more courses in junior colleges to fulfill the mandate of general education," he continued, "Rather we need a simplification of the curricular offering... aim for the cultivation of general human capabilities necessary for effective living. And the teachers' and the students' scholarly attainment is, from now on, to be seen less in academic terms than in terms of the

[45] Thelin, *A History of American*, 270.
[46] "General Education in the Junior College, Outline of Remarks for Meeting of Junior College Group at Montgomery Junior College, Bethesda-Chevy Chase, Maryland, Saturday, December 6, 1947" Box 9, John D. Russell Papers, Harry S. Truman Library and Museum, Independence, Missouri.
[47] Ordway Tead, "The Role of General Education in the Junior College," *Junior College Journal* 18 (1947): 267.

developing of these broader human capabilities."[48] These messages ultimately inspired community college leaders to refocus on their attention on an issue that had concerned many of them since the very origins of the community college—the role of general education in defining the very role and mission(s) of that particular institutional type.[49]

The notion that the general education programs of community colleges should be reformed was certainly not new in 1947. Community colleges had a role in the first half of the general education movement. However, the impetus created by the Truman Commission brought increased—and in this case, national—pressure to bear on the issue. Ultimately, the Commission affirmed the important question that community college personnel had been facing: How would general education reform function given the "long and carefully nurtured history of local control" that public community colleges had?[50]

---

[48] Ibid, 273.

[49] This is not to say that community colleges had not given considerable attention to reforming their general education programs before the Truman Commission. Indeed, a history of reform efforts is provided in Ralph R. Fields, *The Community College Movement* (New York: McGraw-Hill, 1962), 72; J. Derek Harrison, "General Education in the Community College: A Recent View," *Journal of General Education* 25 (1973): 85-88; James O. Hammons, "General Education: A Missed Opportunity Returns," *New Directions for Community Colleges* 25 (1979): 63-73; Sprague, "The Development of General Education." On the importance of general education in determining the institutional focus of individual community colleges and the institutional type as a whole see Arthur M. Cohen, "The Case for General Education in Community Colleges" (presentation, Forum on Future Purposes, Content, and Formats for the General Education of Community College Students, Montgomery College, Maryland, May 22, 1978); Chester H. Case, "Reformulating General Education Programs" in *Issues for Community College Leaders in a New Era* eds. George B. Vaughan and Associates (San Francisco: Jossey-Bass, 1983), 100-121; Higginbottom, "The Civic Ground of Collegiate General Education"; Kevin J. Dougherty, *The Contradictory College: The Conflicting Origins, Impacts, and Futures of the Community College* (Albany: State University of New York Press, 1994), esp. 250; Gwyer Schuyler, "A Historical and Contemporary View of the Community College Curriculum," *New Directions for Community Colleges* 108 (1999): 3-15; Kevin J. Dougherty and Barbara K. Townsend, "Community College Missions: A Theoretical and Historical Perspective," *New Directions for Community Colleges* 136 (2006): 5-13; George H. Higginbottom and Richard M. Romano, "Appraising the Efficacy of Civic Education at the Community College," *New Directions for Community Colleges* 136 (2006): 23-32.

[50] Gerald C. Hayward, "California's $30 Million Course Cuts," *New Directions for Community Colleges* 64 (1988): 31. On the issue of community colleges and state and local control across the country see Edward A. Gallagher, "Alexis Lange, Progressivism and Junior College Functions," *Michigan Academician* 7 (1974): 111-122; Edward A. Gallagher, "Alexis Lange and the Origin of the Occupational Education Function in California Junior Colleges," *Michigan Academician* 22 (1990): 241-257; Edward A. Gallagher, "Revisionist Nonsense and the Junior College: Early California Development," *Michigan Academician* 26 (1995): 215-228; Robert Pedersen, "State Government and the Junior College, 1901-1946," *Community College Review* 14 (1987): 48-52; "Two-Year College Development in Five Midwestern States" Special Issue. *Community College Journal of Research and Practice* 23:1

The head of the President's Commission, George F. Zook, had dealt with this and other similar questions nearly a decade earlier. "There is no battle in the educational world which is raging more furiously at the present time than that which revolves around the question of the character of general education on the junior college level" Zook had written, perhaps hyperbolically, in a *Junior College Journal* editorial in 1939.[51] "I know of no way" he continued, "to approach the solution of this problem than the thoroughly democratic method commonly used in the solution of all social, including educational problems in American life, namely, widespread experimentation with and consideration of various concepts and processes of instruction in general education."[52] To give readers a sense of what he meant by "widespread experimentation," he pointed to the Cooperative Study in General Education. "Widespread experimentation" he contended, "such as is now going on among the twenty-two institutions, three of them being junior colleges which are engaging in a cooperative study of general education in the junior college level under the auspices of the American Council on Education."[53]

Ultimately, Zook tied experimentation to the notion of cooperative studies and suggested the need for something of a cooperative study in which community colleges might feature more prominently. Zook clearly felt that community colleges would benefit from such a study and were well-equipped to carry it out. McGrath also shared Zook's view on the need for experimentation. However, he went a step farther and contended that community colleges were more experimental with their general education programs than liberal arts colleges.[54]

(1999): 1-145; Robert Patrick Pedersen, "The Origins and Development of the Early Public Junior College, 1900-1940" (PhD diss., Columbia University, 2000). This issue obviously does not apply to private junior colleges.

[51] George F. Zook, "General Education at Junior College Level," *Junior College Journal* 9 (1939): 353.

[52] Ibid, 354.

[53] Ibid.

[54] Earl J. McGrath to Fred J. Kelly, 12 July 1947. Goodrich Cook White Papers, Manuscript, Archive, and Rare Book Library, Emory University, Atlanta, GA, cited in Robertson, "Access to Success" 97. McGrath would have

"Widespread experimentation" on general education at the community college level would be realized by The California Study of General Education in the Junior College (1948-1952). This cooperative study serves as the focus of the present chapter—which explores the general education movement through the lens of the community college. Though community colleges had participated in the Cooperative Study in General Education (as Zook had noted), the California Study brought the resources of a state that was both invested in the community college concept and growing rapidly.[55] Indeed, as early as 1940, California was being touted in the contemporary literature as a state that not only innovated the concept of a community college—though there is a vigorous debate over the origins of the concept and what constituted the "first" community college—but also as a system that was influential nationally.[56] It was also a system

---

had a number of examples to substantiate his assertion. On community college participation in experimental studies up to 1946, see "Programs of the Cooperating Secondary Schools in California" Special Issue. *Bulletin of the California State Department of Education* 3 (1939): i-82; Phebe Ward, *Terminal Education in the Junior College* (New York: Harper and Brothers, 1946); Tyrus Hillway, *The American Two-Year College* (New York: Harper & Brothers, 1958), esp. 99-103. This argument continued to be made throughout the twentieth century. See James L. Wattanbarger and Sandra Scaggs, "Curriculum Revision and the Process of Change," *New Directions for Community Colleges* 25 (1979): 1-10.

[55] A graph charting junior college enrollment with California compared to the combination of other states from 1930-1955 is particularly revealing, this graph is provided in Walter Crosby Eells, "A Progress Report on California's Junior Colleges," *School Executive* 76 (1955): 61. On the history and proliferation of California community colleges see Carl G. Winter, "History of the Junior College Movement in California" (Sacramento: California State Department of Education, 1964); Alban Elwell Reid, Jr., "A History of the California Public Junior College Movement" (EdD diss., University of Southern California, 1966); James L. Wattenbarger and Allan A. Witt, "Origins of the California System: How the Junior College Movement Came to California" *Community College Review* 22 (1995): 17-25; John Aubrey Douglass, *The California Idea and American Higher Education: 1850 to the 1960 Master Plan* (Stanford: Stanford University Press, 2000), esp. chapter 4; J.M. Beach, *Gateway to Opportunity: A History of the Community College in the United States* (Sterling, VA: Stylus Publishing, 2010), chapter 3.

[56] Important examples of literature that depict California as influential or original are Carl E. Seashore, *The Junior College Movement* (New York: Henry Holt and Company, 1940), chapter 2; Charles M. Rodecker, "Pacemakers: California's Community Colleges," *California Journal of Secondary Education* 31 (1956): 217-220; Burton R. Clark, *The Open Door College: A Case Study* (New York: McGraw-Hill, 1960); Paul Robert Kneisel, "The Transfer Purpose of the Public Community Junior College in California Higher Education: A Study in Purpose and Development" (EdD diss., University of Southern California, 1973), 116-132; Levine, *The American College*, 169-173; Brint and Karabel, *The Diverted Dream*, 86-92; John H. Frye, *The Vision of the Public Junior College, 1900-1940: Professional Goals and Popular Aspirations* (Westport, CT: Greenwood Press, 1992), 74; Allan A. Witt, et. al., *America's Community Colleges: The First Century* (Washington, D.C.: American Association of Community Colleges, 1994); Arthur M. Cohen, Florence B. Brawer, and Carrie B. Kisker, *The American Community College*, sixth edition (San Francisco: Jossey-Bass, 2014), 19-22. Indeed, the expressed dominance of California junior colleges by early commentators was so fulsome that it likely colored the views of historians of higher education and others who would later write on community colleges. This argument is expressed by Hutcheson, "Reconsidering the

that had developed at a more rapidly than the community college systems of other states.[57] The sheer size of California's system of junior colleges made it attractive for a cooperative study. Indeed, by 1950, "The sixty [public junior] colleges of the California system had approximately 250,000 full-time and part-time students in 1950, or more than 50 per cent of the nation's junior college enrollment."[58] Of this number, over 60,000 were full time students.[59]

However, community college personnel in California had as much if not more difficulty in reforming their curriculums as their counterparts in other states. This difficulty was the result of local control—an issue that hampered not only general education reform but curriculum reform as well. "The advancement of vocational education in California has definitely been retarded" one California educator wrote, "by the hampering effect of the school district organization which is still too prevalent in the state…Co-operation and co-ordination clearly are necessary in order to meet the demands of California's population and industries."[60]

I argue that the California Study of General Education in the Junior College was conceived to negotiate the thorny issue of local control, to stimulate cooperation without consensus among the community college personnel across the state of California, and to serve as an influential symbol of general education reform for a nation that was seeking to place more faith in the community college concept. In many ways, the California Study continued the cooperative study research design that had marked the previous cooperative studies discussed.

Community"; Robert Pedersen, "Conflicting Interests in the Funding of the Early Two-Year College," *New Directions for Community Colleges* 132 (2005): 9.

[57] Dougherty, *The Contradictory College*, 118.

[58] Clark, *The Open Door College*, 4.

[59] *A Report of a Survey of the Needs of California in Higher Education* (Sacramento, 1948), 1.

[60] *Vocational Education in the Junior College: A Handbook* (Sacramento: California State Department of Education, 1949), 16-17. On the district and state-level policies governing the function of California's community colleges historically, see Gallagher, "Alexis Lange, Progressivism;" Gallagher, "Alexis Lange and the Origin;" Gallaher, "Revisionist Nonsense;" Hugh G. Price, *California Public Junior Colleges* (Sacramento: California State Department of Education, 1958), esp. chapter two. For a later discussion on how these policies affected curriculum and instruction see Arthur M. Cohen, "Political Influences on Curriculum and Instruction," *New Directions for Community Colleges* 7 (1974): 39-53.

Moreover, it earned quite a bit of philanthropic support even as foundations were placing less of a priority on general education reform. To place the California Study of General Education in the Junior College in the context of the larger general education movement, I describe the operation of the California Study of General Education in the Junior College—through a discussion of its origins, funding, and functioning of the Study—and then respond to the later criticism that the Study received.

Initial Planning Stages of the California Study of General Education in the Junior College

Origins and Initial Funding of the Study

Though the California Study came on the heels of the Truman Commission, the leaders of this Study took pains to explain that "The development of the California Study of General Education in the Junior College, from idea to actuality did not occur overnight." Rather, they argued that the Study "emerged from the cooperative work and planning of California junior college leaders over a period of years; it came about through the patient efforts of a group who recognized the special importance of general education for the junior college youth of California and who believed that a state-wide cooperative study offered the most promising approach to the development of a general education program."[61] Indeed, the Study itself was a natural outgrowth of the general education movement, rather than a quick response to the Truman Commission. The Study's leadership referred to their Study as a "grass roots study" and further noted that they were heirs to a tradition of cooperative studies on general education that had taken place during the general education movement (and even some that predated the movement). Often, they

[61] "The Study and the Workshop" in *Problems and Proposals Concerning General Education in California Junior Colleges: A Preliminary Report by The Summer Workshop of the California Study of General Education in the Junior College, June 26 – August 4, 1950* (Los Angeles: The California Study of General Education in the Junior College, 1950), 1.

acknowledged these studies.[62] The leadership of the Study did, however, credit the Truman Commission with "reinforce[ing] us in our conviction regarding the urgency of general education" and occasionally cited certain passages related to general education contained in its first volume.[63]

The direct origins of the California Study lay in the desire of the membership of the California State Junior College Association to have a cooperative study on the topic of general education in California junior colleges. The Association's President John L. Lounsbury worked closely with Edwin A. Lee, a professor of education at the University of California, Los Angeles (UCLA), in early 1948 to develop the idea.[64] Ultimately, Lounsbury and Lee, with support from their respective places of employment conceptualized a cooperative study that would involve "instructors and administrators of California junior colleges and cooperating representatives from the high schools, colleges, and universities of the state" and would be carried out under the auspices of "the California State Junior College Association with its three regional associations, the Pacific Coast Committee of the American Council on Education, the School of Education at the University of California at Los Angeles."[65]

From the very outset, the Study carried forth the type of assumptions that had undergirded previous cooperative studies. In particular, its leadership felt strongly that the Study ought to allow for, and even encourage, diverse approaches to general education. "The strength

---

[62] B. Lamar Johnson, "The California Study of General Education," *California Journal of Secondary Education* 25 (1950): 341. Grace V. Bird, "Appendix A: The Meaning of General Education" in *Problems and Proposals Concerning General Education*, 87-89.
[63] "The Need for Characteristics of General Education: From a Statement by B. Lamar Johnson at a Workshop Session on June 27, 1950" in *Problems and Proposals Concerning General Education*, 18-19.
[64] John L. Lounsbury to Lynn White, 11 October 1949. Series III.A Grant Files, Box 75, Folder 6, Carnegie Corporation of New York Records, Rare Book and Manuscript Library. Butler Library, Columbia University, New York, NY. Hereafter cited as "CCNY Papers." It is worth noting here that both the association and UCLA had a history of engaging in the general education movement prior to this. For UCLA's work during the general education movement, see W.H. Cowley, "Six Plans for General Education" in *Utah Conference on Higher Education: A New Era in Higher Education 1946* (Salt Lake City: Utah State Department of Public Instruction, 1946), 21.
[65] "The Study," 2.

of the study is not, it seems to me," Lounsbury explained to his executive committee colleague, Mills College President and former Cooperative Study participant, Lynn White, Jr., "in the dictation of one individual's opinion but in the synthesization of many points of view, which will result in a final statement that will be a definite statement of a program of action for the junior colleges of the state. I do not think that anyone has a preconceived notion regarding the development of general education for junior colleges in California, and no one is starting with any particular idea that must be incorporated in the final results of the study."[66] Lounsbury and Lee also saw to it that the California Study carried the notion of generalizability that had marked earlier cooperative studies. Though the Study was to be limited to institutions in California, the leadership of the Study would later remark that "an interest in and a concern for general education is not confined to California" and later would proclaim that "Our study of general education in California junior colleges is indeed a part of a nation-wide concern and movement"[67]

With these foundational concepts in place, the idea for the California Study was proposed to the Pacific Coast Committee (PCC) of the American Council on Education who put together an executive committee—composed of members from the aforementioned organizations overseeing the study as well as a number of educators from high schools, junior colleges, and universities across the state—that was able to develop a proposal.[68] This proposal noted the changing context of the postwar world and the importance of general education in junior colleges. In many ways, these sentiments were similar to arguments articulated by *Higher*

---

[66] John L. Lounsbury to Lynn White, 11 October 1949. Series III.A Grant Files, Box 75, Folder 6, CCNY Papers.
[67] "Goals of General Education: Proposals and Comments: A Report of the Goals Committee, Richard C. Robbins, Chairman" in *Problems and Proposals Concerning General Education*, 28.
[68] The names of the Executive Committee members are listed in B. Lamar Johnson, *General Education in Action: A Report of the California Study of General Education in the Junior College* (Washington, D.C.: American Council on Education, 1952), ii.

Education for American Democracy. "Democratic citizenship in the atomic age demands a much broader preparation" the proposal argued, "than was needed in earlier years."[69] Indeed, the Truman Commission and other developments in New York were cited as justifications as to the timeliness of the Study. "The widespread interest in the development of community colleges" the proposal read "as evidenced by the reports of the President's Commission on Higher Education and of the New York State Commission on the Need for a State University makes such a study timely."[70] The proposal then argued that the California system of junior colleges was the most developed, and as such, was in a prime position to influence other states across the nation. "California is the most promising locale," it opined, "since the state has a larger number of junior colleges than any other state. The officers of the Corporation believe that such a study would throw light on the needs of community colleges not only in California but throughout the country. Those responsible for planning the study have agreed to broaden its scope to include representation from other states."[71] The proposal then noted the staggering size of the system, which featured "Over 12% of the nation's junior colleges, with 41% of all junior college students [in the US enrolled in]...57 public junior colleges with a current enrollment in excess of 61,000" as well as "10 evening junior colleges…serving both youth and adult alike, with an approximate

[69] "Request for a Grant to be used in the Development of a Program of General Education for the Junior Colleges of California" Series III.A Grant Files, Box 75, Folder 6, CCNY Papers.
[70] "Carnegie Foundation for the Advancement of Teaching: Grant of $30,000 for Study of General Education in Community Colleges" Subseries III.A: Organizations, 1875-1989, Box 43, F: American Council on Education: Study of General Education in Community Colleges, 1949-1952, Carnegie Foundation for the Advancement of Teaching Records, 1904-1989, Rare Book and Manuscript Library, Columbia University, New York, NY. Hereafter cited as "CFAT Records." On the proliferation of community colleges in New York at the same time, see Clark, Leslie, and O'Brien, eds., *SUNY at Sixty*, esp. chapters 4 and 6.
[71] "Carnegie Foundation for the Advancement of Teaching: Grant of $30,000 for Study of General Education in Community Colleges" Subseries III.A: Organizations, 1875-1989, Box 43, F: American Council on Education: Study of General Education in Community Colleges, 1949-1952, CFAT Records.

enrolment of 110,000." All told, the proposal concluded that "The total enrollment in all junior colleges of the state is in excess of 175,000."[72]

Of greater significance, however, was the fact that the proposal argued that *all* junior college students would need general education regardless of whether they were intending to pursue further education. Indeed, the proposal noted that only one quarter of California junior college students would eventually transfer to other institutions of higher learning and that "For 75% of the student body, junior colleges offer the only college experience the student will have. The junior college must give the majority their final in skills, knowledge, and attitudes."[73]

Next, the proposal laid out the general plan of the Study, which was similar to cooperative studies that had preceded it (though it featured an abbreviated timeline). "The project embraces" it noted, "summer workshops at the University of California, Los Angeles, during the summer sessions of 1950 and 1951, a number of regional conferences to be held on the campuses of junior colleges located in all sections of the state, state meetings of junior college leaders, and participation of faculty groups from all junior colleges of the state."[74] Finally, the proposal spoke to the potential of the Study to produce useful materials as well as "the development of a charter or statement of fundamental ideas and philosophy which will serve as the basis for the organization and development of general education, including curriculum, guidance, student activities, and all phases of the educational program."[75]

With this proposal drafted, the PCC looked to ACE President George Zook to assist in obtaining philanthropic funding for their Study. Zook had considerable experience and credibility in seeking these grants, but he faced two issues that would make securing a grant for

---

[72] "Request for a Grant to be used in the Development of a Program of General Education for the Junior Colleges of California" Series III.A Grant Files, Box 75, Folder 6, CCNY Papers.
[73] Ibid.
[74] Ibid.
[75] Ibid.

this project particularly difficult. The first issue was the fact that philanthropic foundations did not often provide grants to junior colleges.[76] The second, and perhaps more distressing issue, involved the fact that the traditional sources of philanthropic support, the Carnegie and Rockefeller foundations, had "minimized their aid to the ACE" to the point where they each simply made a general grant of $150,000 to cover all possible requests in 1950 and 1951, as opposed to funding proposed projects as they had done in the past.[77] Moreover, the General Education Board, in particular, had become resolute in their view that they no longer wished to support projects related to general education reform. This left Zook to look to the Carnegie philanthropies for possible support.

As such, Zook transmitted the proposal to the Carnegie Foundation for the Advancement of Teaching (CFAT). "I am sure" Zook wrote to CFAT President Oliver C. Carmichael, "that it is not necessary for me to emphasize the importance of further study of general education at the junior college level and of the peculiar opportunities there are in carrying on such a study in California. I am convinced, as outlined in the proposal that it will be possible to carry on a very important piece of work."[78] In a lunch meeting with Carmichael on February 14, 1950, Zook was initially told of the $150,000 and the fact that it was made with the belief that the Carnegie Foundation could not fulfill many other smaller requests that had come to them.[79] Though initially placated by this news, Zook broached the topic of the California Study once again in a

---

[76] Clyde E. Blocker, Floyd S. Elkins, and Fred H. Bremer, *Philanthropy for American Junior Colleges* (Washington, D.C.: American Association of Junior Colleges, 1965), esp. 1. Indeed, as recently as 2014, two scholars of community college finance had remarked that recent grants by external philanthropic foundations such as the Lumina Foundation and the Bill and Melinda Gates Foundation were a promising, *new* trend that should be encouraged. See Carlee Drummer and Roxann Marshburn, "Philanthropy and Private Foundations: Expanding Revenue Sources," *New Directions for Community Colleges* 168 (2014): 77-89.
[77] Hawkins, *Banding Together*, 211. On Zook's broader difficulties in securing philanthropic funding in the late 1940s, see Rieken, "George Frederick Zook," chapter 5.
[78] George F. Zook to O.C. Carmichael, 14 June 1949. Series III.A Grant Files, Box 75, Folder 6, CCNY Papers.
[79] "Carnegie Corporation of New York: Record of Interview, OCC and George F. Zook, February 14, 1950" Series III.A Grant Files, Box 22, Folder 3, CCNY Papers.

letter to Carmichael the following August. Carmichael once again reminded Zook that "when the Corporation made the commitment of $150,000 to the Council, it was understood that this would take the place of small grants. I believe it was on that condition that the commitment was made by the Trustees. In view of that fact, I do not believe the officers would feel justified now in asking for additional grants to the Council however worthy the projects." Carmichael then noted Zook's upcoming departure as ACE President and was emphatic in writing, "I do not believe that you can count on further support at this time from the Corporation."[80]

Despite being rebuffed, Zook continued to stay in contact with Carmichael about the project and the latter continued to advise the former on how the Study might be executed.[81] Zook also saw to it that the executive committee had representation beyond simply educators based in California—a characteristic that he believed would be useful as they continued to push for philanthropic support. Specifically, he recommended that Alvin C. Eurich—his colleague from the President's Commission and now president of the new state university system in New York—join the committee. Eurich would ultimately contribute a great deal to the California Study. Zook's persistence paid off when the Carnegie Foundation chose to accept a limited timeline for the execution of the Study and agreed to provide $30,000 to be administered as a "special fund of the American Council on Education" for a study that would last fourteen months.[82]

The Search for a Director

---

[80] O.C. Carmichael to George F. Zook, 2 August 1950. Series III.A Grant Files, Box 22, Folder 3, CCNY Papers.
[81] Oliver C. Carmichael to George F. Zook, 29 September 1949. Series III.A Grant Files, Box 75, Folder 6, CCNY Papers.
[82] "F.W. Larentz & Co. to American Council on Education" 4 December 1951. Subseries III.A: Organizations, 1875-1989, Box 43, F: American Council on Education: Study of General Education in Community Colleges, 1949-1952, CFAT Records.

Once the funding was secured, the executive committee overseeing the California Study began the search for a director. They had considered some options before, but neglected to select a director before funding was assured. The first choice of the committee was T.R. McConnell. However, the committee was aware "that the chances of getting [McConnell were] slim."[83] Russell M. Cooper was also considered. Both men fit the criteria that the committee had put forth earlier: an individual "with a strong interest in general education but with some experience in a teacher training institution."[84]

Ultimately, it would not be until the executive committee held its second meeting in San Francisco on March 18, 1950—with Carmichael present—that they selected a director.[85] After much deliberation, the committee considered offering the directorship to B. Lamar Johnson, a professor at Stephens College, an innovative private junior college for women in Missouri. Many of the committee members, however, had a lukewarm reaction to this suggestion—primarily because of the fear that he would have difficulty in writing a compelling and synthesized report of the Study. This reservation was outweighed by the belief that Johnson would work well with faculty members and other participants in the California Study, and he was offered the directorship. "While there was not great enthusiasm for Johnson on the part of all members present," the minutes of the meeting noted, "there was general consensus that he was the best available person and that he would do a thoroughly acceptable job."[86] Grace V. Bird—who was also invited to serve as director but declined due to other professional responsibilities—was asked to provide as much support as possible to Johnson.

---

[83] "Record of Interview: CD and Lynn White, October 14, 1949" Series III.A Grant Files, Box 75, Folder 6, CCNY Papers.
[84] Ibid.
[85] "The Study," 2. The minutes of the meeting indicate that while Carmichael was present, he did not have any strong influence over the selection of a director for the California Study. He did, however, have many questions about Johnson that those present answered.
[86] "Meeting of Executive Committee on the Study of General Education in the Junior Colleges, March 18, 1950" Series III.A Grant Files, Box 75, Folder 6, CCNY Papers.

The lukewarm reception to B. Lamar Johnson might also have had much to do with his lack of name recognition outside of higher education circles. Yet, the arguments made during the meeting about his interpersonal skills were compelling—and were shared by others who knew Johnson well. "Johnson was friendly and gracious," one of his colleagues reflected, "he liked people, was an effective public speaker, and had the patience and tolerance to listen to the viewpoints of others. He was a prodigious worker, a fact which his friends jokingly attributed to his having no vices and few hobbies."[87] More important, his credentials and experience with both general education and junior colleges—as well as his considerations of the role of general education *in* the junior college—were impeccable. The following section traces Johnson's early training, his early work on general education in the late 1930s and early 1940s, his intimate participation in the Cooperative Study in General Education, and his work at Stephens College to suggest that he was not only qualified, but also held views similar to many others (most notably Ralph W. Tyler) who worked on previous cooperative studies. Ultimately, this section helps us to understand why, in 1989, Johnson was referred to by one colleague as "that grand patriarch of the community college movement and the philosopher of its general education component."[88]

B. Lamar Johnson and General Education Movement

Johnson's interest in community colleges began during his graduate career at the University of Minnesota in the late 1920s when he took a course on the subject with Leonard V. Koos, perhaps the foremost expert on the subject at the time.[89] Just a year after earning his doctorate in 1930, Johnson joined Stephens College as Dean of Instruction and Librarian and

---

[87] John C. Crighton, *Stephens: A Story of Educational Innovation* (Columbia, MO: The American Press 1970), 215.
[88] George B. Vaughan, "General Education: The Community College's Unfulfilled Agenda" (paper prepared for a conference on "General Studies: Continuing Issues and Emerging Prospects," Nelsonville, Ohio, April 17, 1989), 2. ERIC, ED 305 966.
[89] Johnson, "An Emphasis," 8. On Koos's work on junior colleges and his relationship with Johnson, see Gregory Lang Goodwin, "The Historical Development of the Community-Junior College Ideology: An Analysis and Interpretation of the Writings of Selected Community-Junior College Leaders From 1890-1970" (PhD diss., University of Illinois at Urbana-Champaign, 1971), 95-104.

stayed until 1952 when he took up the position of professor of higher education at UCLA (a position that the University agreed to offer to the Director of the California Study—whoever that may have been—at the end of the Study).[90] In joining Stephens, Johnson became a member of a college that one scholar has suggested was the first to engage in "institutional research."[91] This institutional research was specifically focused on general education to the extent that one historian noted that "The history of Stephens College since 1921 is the record of an adventure in general education designed to meet the needs of women in modern society."[92] Ultimately, the institutional research that marked Stephens "contributed to two main streams in American education during the first half of the twentieth century" one faculty member explained. The first contribution was to the "general education movement with its emphasis upon individual needs and differences as well as upon the needs of society" and the second contribution was to "the development of junior colleges."[93]

---

[90] "UCLA Faculty Increased by 12 Full Professors," *Los Angeles Times*, 12 October 1952. In many ways, this move created something of a "second career" for Johnson. On this see Joseph W. Fordyce, "B. Lamar Johnson's Bibliographical Contributions," *Community College Review* 6 (1978): 8-11, quote from 9; Denise B. Kurtzman, "The Publications of B. Lamar Johnson, 1932-1974: An Annotated Bibliography" (MLS Thesis, University of California at Los Angeles, 1975).

[91] Frederick deW. Bolman, "University Reform and Institutional Research," *Journal of Higher Education* 41 (1970): 86. Lewis B. Mayhew has noted that while Stephens was not the first institution to engage in "institutional research," it was innovative in the sense that it was the first to appoint a "Director of Research" (W.W. Charters in 1921). See Lewis B. Mayhew, "Imperatives for Institutional Research" in *Research on Academic Input: Proceedings of Sixth Annual Forum of the Association for Institutional Research, May 2-5, 1966* ed. Clarence H. Bagley (Athens, GA: The Association for Institutional Research, 1966), 1. ERIC, ED 044 786. Another work to note the innovativeness of Stephens, particularly on the junior college level is Robert V. Kovach, "Institutional Research in the Community College" (unpublished course essay, Michigan State University, November 30, 1971), ERIC, ED 088 554.

[92] Roy Ivan Johnson, *Explorations in General Education: The Experiences of Stephens College* (New York: Harper and Brothers, 1947), 3. On the broader Stephens program, see Ward Elwood Ankrum, "The Implementation of Educational Philosophy and a Program of Educational Research in the Curricular Growth of Stephens College" (EdD diss., University of Missouri, 1951); B. Lamar Johnson and W.S. Litterick, "Stephens College: Functional General Education for Women" in *Organization and Administration of General*, 254-276; B. Lamar Johnson, Ralph Leyden, and Zay Rusk Sullens, "Individualization: A Must in General Education" in *Accent on Teaching: Experiments in General Education* ed. Sidney J. French (New York: Harper and Brothers, 1954), 92-106; LeBlanc "The Concept of General Education" 376-396.

[93] Ralph C. Leyden, "The Stephens College Program" in *Experimental Colleges: Their Role in American Higher Education* ed. W. Hugh Stickler (Tallahassee, Florida State University, 1964), 34.

The work being done in this area by Stephens not only brought a sense of prestige to the college, but created an audience for reports on the experimentation that occurred. Malcolm S. MacLean, a prominent member of the General College at the University of Minnesota and later Professor of Higher Education at UCLA, introduced a book written by B. Lamar Johnson on the role of the librarian in general education by saying "A constant complaint by many of us, concerned with general education in the American junior college, has been against Stephens College. The source of this complaint was the fact that reports on its dynamic and effective experimentation were issued in a thin trickle when we wanted a brawling flood."[94] Of course, MacLean would also note that he was sensitive to the fact that the faculty at Stephens was often too busy conducting experiments to write about them.

Regardless of how much they wrote of their work, faculty members did engage in consultancies across the country and influenced other institutions in whatever way they could. Indeed, in the late 1920s (just before Johnson arrived), Stephens, with the support of the North Central Association, implemented a course of study known as the 6-4-4 plan intended to shorten the length of time to obtain a college degree and to reorganize the relationship between secondary education and junior colleges.[95] This drew the attention of a group of California junior college educators spearheaded by John Harbeson at Pasadena Junior College, who worked with educators at Stephens to implement the plan at Pasadena.[96]

---

[94] Malcolm S. MacLean, Foreword to *The Librarian and the Teacher in General Education: A Report of Library-Instructional Activities at Stephens College*, by B. Lamar Johnson and Eloise Lindstrom (Chicago: American Library Association, 1948), v.

[95] On the 6-4-4 plan and its promotion by Koos, see Carrie B. Kisker, "Integrating High School and the Community College: Previous Efforts and Current Possibilities," *Community College Review* 34 (2006): 68-86.

[96] Crighton, *Stephens: A Story*, 266-269; James M. Wood, "The Four-Year Junior College" in *Problems of College Education: Studies in Administration, Student Personnel, Curriculum, and Instruction* ed. Earl Hudelson (Minneapolis: University of Minnesota Press, 1928), 153-163. See a discussion of Pasadena's experiences with the 6-4-4 plan in John W. Harbeson, "Curricular Organization of Pasadena Junior College" in *What About Survey*, 184-199; John A. Sexson and John W. Harbeson, *The New American College: The Four-Year Junior Colleges Grades 11 to 14 Inclusive Organized and Administered as a Single Institution* (New York: Harper and Brothers, 1946). On

Much of this experimentation was the brainchild of W.W. Charters, who looked at his work at Stephens as a form of "'educational engineering'" or "research designed to be plowed right back into the educational program in order to improve the overall operation of the college."[97] Charters, who had been influential to Ralph Tyler—particularly in his work during the Eight-Year Study and Cooperative Study in General Education—was also influential to B. Lamar Johnson. "It was my good fortune," Johnson wrote, "for a period of more than twenty years at Stephens College to be associated with Mr. Charters in work on a pioneering educational program which was dear to him and for which he was largely responsible."[98] Johnson would also praise Charters by noting that "More than any other educator known to the writer, Mr. Charters took leadership in applying the principles of scientific construction and the techniques of research to the curriculum in higher education."[99] In addition to his profound impact on Tyler and Johnson, Charters himself would become a national voice on general education reform during the height of the general education movement.[100]

Once established at Stephens, B. Lamar Johnson began to engage with the general education program.[101] Much of his early work at Stephens focused on the relationship between

---

Pasadena's program see E.D. Cornelison, "Terminal Education in the Pasadena Program" in *Terminal Education in Higher Institutions: With Special Reference to the Readjustment of Higher Education to Meet Current National Needs* ed. John Dale Russell (Chicago: University of Chicago Press, 1942), 109-114; Stephen B. Reichert, "The Four-Year Junior College Movement in California" (EdD diss., University of California, Los Angeles, 1957), chapters 2-5; Andrew H. Kirkun, "Teaching the 'People's Music' at the 'People's College': A Historical Survey of American Popular Music in the American Junior/Community College Curriculum, 1924-1955" (PhD diss., New York University, 2014), chapter 4. It is also worth noting that this was one of the few places where this plan was tried. On this fact, see Pedersen, "The Origins" 65.

[97] Stickler, "The Expanding Role," 546. On the Charter's broader experimentation at Stephens, see Crighton, *Stephens: A Story*, chapter 7.

[98] B. Lamar Johnson, "Werrett Wallace Charters: Particularly his Contributions to Higher Education," *Journal of Higher Education* 24 (1953): 239.

[99] Ibid, 236.

[100] Examples of Charters's writing on general education reform include W.W. Charters, "Four Convergent Trends in General Education" *Journal of Higher Education* 15 (1944): 307-314, 342; W.W. Charters, "Patterns of Courses in General Education," *Journal of General Education* 1 (1946): 58-63.

[101] An early example of this work is B. Lamar Johnson, "Liberalization of the Curriculum," *Junior College Journal* 6 (1935): 21-25.

the college library and the objectives of general education—a focus that he maintained until his departure from Stephens.[102] While much of his work on library instruction was drawn directly from his role as librarian at Stephens, Johnson began in the late 1930s to engage the budding general education movement and would soon become one of its most notable figures. In 1937, he taught "a graduate seminar on survey courses—their philosophy, their content, and their administration" at Northwestern University. Out of this seminar, he edited a volume entitled *What About Survey Courses?*[103] The table of contents features a number of experimental institutions that had strong records of general education reform.

The following year, Johnson published two articles on general education in the *Journal of Higher Education*. By examining both in unison, we are able to see Johnson laying out ideas about general education that were similar to those being echoed by Tyler as the latter began his work as Director of Evaluation in the Eight-Year Study (discussed in chapter two). The similarities between the two scholars involved their views on the clientele for general education, its objectives, evaluation, and methods of reform. Johnson's philosophy can be seen in his praise for the following characteristics of the general education movement: "first, general education stresses development in terms of the objectives of the individual student; second, general education fosters an open-minded, experimental attack on its problems; and third, general education accepts the philosophy that education goes beyond knowledge to function in everyday living."[104]

---

[102] This early line of work produced a number of articles discussed by Denise B. Kurtzman and culminated in B. Lamar Johnson, *Vitalizing a College Library* (Chicago: American Library Association, 1939).
[103] B. Lamar Johnson, Preface to *What About Survey Courses?* ed. B. Lamar Johnson (New York: Henry Holt and Company, 1937), v. Many of these institutions would go on to join the Cooperative Study in General Education.
[104] B. Lamar Johnson, "Strengths and Weaknesses of General Education: Illustrations Chosen from the Various Institutions Typifying this Organization," *Journal of Higher Education* 9 (1938): 76

For Johnson as for Tyler, general education was something that each individual could benefit from. More important, each man recognized the variegated system of higher education. In some centers," Johnson argued, "general education is provided for only a chosen few. The admission requirements at Chicago and Columbia College are such that these institutions have highly selected students. In other colleges, general education is frankly provided for students of limited ability who would not succeed in a traditional curriculum."[105] Implied in this statement—and substantiated by the fact that Johnson examined the Universities of Florida, Minnesota, and Mount Pleasant State Teachers College in Michigan (later Central Michigan University) in the piece—was Johnson's belief that each student would benefit from having a general education. Indeed, his view on this issue is more eloquently stated by Johnson in a passage from a 1946 article on the topic of general education. "Despite the differences in institution, however," Johnson argued, "there is one factor which we all need to recognize. It is this: No matter whether a student is a terminal or a college-preparatory student, he needs a general education. Regardless of whether he is going to be a lawyer or a filling-station operator, a librarian or a secretary, he will be a citizen. He will need the type of training that will make him a better citizen, a more effective member of the family circle. He needs a general education."[106]

Johnson was also similar to Tyler in his belief of the importance of clarifying and stating the objectives of general education. Johnson noted in some detail that many of the problems of general education stem from superficial definitions and solely content-oriented and content-driven objectives. "Essential to a discussion of college changes resulting from the general-

[105] Ibid, 73.
[106] B. Lamar Johnson, "Patterns of General Education," *Junior College Journal* 17 (1946): 45.

education movement," Johnson argued, "is an understanding of the term *general education*."[107] Another similarity between Tyler and Johnson was the latter's view that objectives should be stated as changes in student behavior. "General education functions," Johnson wrote in one article, "only as changes occur in the lives of students—changes which help the individual adjust to the complex world in which he lives."[108] "The one essential in general education" he argued in another article, "is the adjustment of the individual to his environment."[109] He contrasted this to some who had created general education objectives that put "too much emphasis upon intellectual attainments at the expense of other equally significant ends."[110]

Though Johnson held the general education movement in high esteem, he was similar to Tyler in feeling that the movement could only progress if general education outcomes were properly evaluated. "The general-education movement" Johnson began, "is indeed changing the college—its philosophy, its curriculum, and its administration. To the writer, those changes, by and large, appear to be in the right direction." However, Johnson warned that general education must involve an iterative process of reflection. "General education must soon submit, however," he continued, "to an evaluation in terms of the lives lived by its students. Such an evaluation will be a stupendous task, but it must be made. We must know the effect of general education upon the leisure of men and women—their reading habits, their radio-listening habits, their hobbies; we must know the effect of general education upon vocational success, upon professional standing, upon habits of work; we must know the effect of general education upon health habits, upon family adjustment, upon social attitudes, upon a philosophy of life."[111] Though Johnson

---

[107] B. Lamar Johnson, "General Education Changes the College: Changes Its Philosophy, Its Curriculum, and Its Administration," *Journal of Higher Education* 9 (1938): 18. This piece was also published in *Bulletin of the Association of American Colleges* 24 (1938): 229-234.
[108] Johnson, "Strengths and Weaknesses," 71.
[109] Johnson, "General Education Changes," 18.
[110] Johnson, "Strengths and Weaknesses," 72.
[111] Johnson, "General Education Changes," 22.

commented on the general education movement as a whole, he showed a tendency to derive his conclusions from his work at Stephens College. This invariably led to him approaching the movement from the perspective of a junior college educator.

Johnson became notable for this perspective and he soon was regarded as a national expert on general education in the junior college. In 1939, when the National Society for the Study of Education (NSSE) put together its yearbook on general education, the officers of the Society tapped Johnson to write the chapter on the topic as it applied to American junior colleges. Johnson used this opportunity not only to talk about Stephens, but also the program that the faculty of Stephens had influenced at Pasadena Junior College. In the fall of that same year, Johnson was tapped by the Commission on Curricula of Secondary Schools and Institutions of Higher Education of the North Central Association to serve on a committee devoted to the issue of general education on the high school level and was being chaired by Malcolm S. MacLean. By the following summer, MacLean had taken up the presidency of the Hampton Institute and Johnson was elected to succeed him as chairman. The Committee—which included a number of educators with experience in the Eight-Year Study—was charged with creating a volume that would provide a "comprehensive treatment of general education" in the high school, and to serve as a companion volume to the NSSE yearbook.[112] Johnson would help to edit and write the introduction of this volume, entitled *General Education in the American High School*.[113] Johnson had also participated in a roundtable discussion related to general education with Charles H. Judd, Henry M. Wriston, Roscoe Pulliam, Grayson N. Kefauver, and Bertie Backus that was published in *The Educational Record*.[114]

---

[112] B. Lamar Johnson, "General Education" in *General Education in the American High*, xiv.
[113] Johnson, ed., *General Education in the American High.*
[114] "General Education in the United States: A Panel," esp. 451-452.

Johnson's work helped to raise the national profile of Stephens College to the extent that the newly formed Cooperative Study in General Education asked if Stephens wished to participate in the Study. The faculty of the college agreed and their participation "stimulated increased research activity on part of the local staff." "Objectives in various departments were reviewed," Roy Ivan Johnson noted in his history of general education reform at Stephens "new objective measures were set up and refined, and a faculty council on evaluation was established. Frequent interviews were arranged with directors of the co-operative program."[115] Participation in the Cooperative Study provided not only an opportunity for faculty members at Stephens to continue their work and share it with others, but also served a crucial training ground for some of the faculty members who would assist with the California Study. For instance, Marjorie Carpenter, a Stephens faculty member who would serve as a member of staff on the California Study, participated actively in the Cooperative Study.[116] Johnson himself sat on the executive committee of the Cooperative Study and was intimately involved in its execution. During much of the Study, Johnson actively pursued his interest in general education by focusing on the relationship between general education and junior colleges—which led to a number of conclusions that he would seek to share with others during the California Study. Ultimately, Johnson came to the conclusion that junior colleges were not entirely invested in the transfer

[115] Johnson, *Explorations in General Education*, 37. The experiences of Stephens College in the Cooperative Study are also described in William S. Litterick, "Evaluation at Stephens College" in *Evaluation in General Education* ed. Paul L. Dressel (Dubuque, IA: Wm. C. Brown Company, 1954), 156.

[116] On Carpenter's impact at Stephens, see W.S. Litterick to B. Lamar Johnson, 24 July 1950." B. Lamar Johnson Papers, Special Collections and University Archives, Pepperdine University, Malibu, CA. Hereafter cited as "Johnson Papers." At the time of this writing, the collection of B. Lamar Johnson had been processed by the archivists at Pepperdine University. However, in corresponding with the head archivist, Kelsey Knox, I was told that the collection may soon be reorganized and to simply refer to all documents as coming from the collection as a whole. Carpenter would go on to be an active participant in the general education movement in the late 1940s before joining the California Study. An example of her work in this area is Marjorie Carpenter, "The General Course in Humanities at Stephens College" in *The Humanities in General Education* ed. Earl J. McGrath (Dubuque, IA: Wm. C. Brown Company, 1949), 137-151.

function.[117] Even after accepting this, Johnson believed that the purpose of the community college was to provide general education for the "terminal student" as he felt this would stimulate what we might call "lifelong learning" today.[118]

At a conference dedicated to the issue of "terminal education" in 1942, Johnson noted the irony of the concept by arguing that "The greatest function which our schools can hope to achieve is so to stimulate and train students that they will be not only eager to continue their personal development, their education, throughout life—and yet we talk of terminal education."[119] He then noted the importance of general education measures that were designed *specifically* for the junior college, as opposed to emulating the general education programs of four-year institutions. "It is easy for the junior-college faculty to model its course of study after that offered in most colleges and universities." Johnson argued, "Traditional curriculums can be modeled after courses which most teachers took in their undergraduate days. The offering of general-education courses requires, on the other hand, the development of new materials of instructions, the reorganization of course content, and the development of teaching procedures adapted to the new materials and goals."[120] Again, Johnson appeared to be calling for general education that was designed to meet the individual needs of junior college students. Ironically, in making this argument, he was addressing an issue that later commentators would note as a

---

[117] Johnson would also make this argument in "Implications of Democracy for the Junior College," *Bulletin of the National Association of Secondary School Principals* 24 (1940): 134-149; "Junior-College Trends," *School Review* 52 (1944): 606-610. It is notable that Johnson came to this conclusion prior to the coining of the phrase "the cooling-out function" by his future UCLA colleague, sociologist Burton R. Clark in 1960. For Clark's work on the cooling-out function, see Burton R. Clark, *On Higher Education: Selected Writings, 1956-2006* (Baltimore: Johns Hopkins University Press, 2008), esp. chapters 2-3.
[118] For visions of adult education and lifelong learning during the time period see Joseph F. Kett, *The Pursuit of Knowledge Under Difficulties: From Self-Improvement to Adult Education in America, 1750-1990* (Stanford: Stanford University Press, 1994).
[119] B. Lamar Johnson, "Issues in Terminal Education" in *Terminal Education in Higher Institutions*, 2.
[120] Ibid, 8.

detriment to the general education mission of the community college.[121] Johnson's other work in the Cooperative Study not only brought him to the question of the role of general education in the junior college, but provided a number of additional avenues to experiment and write about the topic. Near the end of the Study in late 1946, Tyler himself allowed Johnson considerable editorial input on the final report.[122] Needless to say, this experience in particular would be useful as he served as Director for the California Study.

Johnson continued to ponder the issue of general education in the junior college once the Cooperative Study ended in 1947. He also read the published report of the Truman Commission with great interest. On March 31, 1949 he read a prepared speech entitled "General Education in the Junior College" before the joint meeting of the Commission on Colleges and Universities and the Commission on Research and Service in Chicago. He began by pointing out that the junior college was the only institutional type that the program chairs had organized a discussion on general education for. He tied this to the growth of junior colleges, but also noted that "The junior college today is the most dynamic unit in American education, and it is confronted with general education problems that are both unique and challenging."[123] Johnson then turned his attention to the challenge that the Truman Commission offered junior colleges and suggested that the "implications…stagger the imagination."[124] After reaffirming the argument of the Truman Commission that general education in the junior college was an issue of great significance, he

---

[121] On the argument that emulation of the general education curricula offered at four-year institutions hampered the general education mission of the community college see H.T. Morse, "Between the Ivory Tower and the Market Place," *Junior College Journal* 35 (1965): 16-20; Virginia Lee Scigliano, "On General Education," *Community College Review* 4 (1976): esp. 41-42; Sebastian J. Vasta, "Curriculum Development for General Education in the Community College" (EdD diss., Rutgers University, 1986), esp. chapter 2; Dennis McGrath and Martin B. Spear, *The Academic Crisis of the Community College* (Albany: State University of New York Press, 1991), 93; Neal A. Raisman, "Creating Philosopher Bricklayers: Redefining General Education and the Liberal Arts," *Community, Technical, and Junior College Journal* 62 (1991-92): 18.
[122] B. Lamar Johnson to Ralph W. Tyler 26 December 1946 Box 1, Folder 11, Tyler Papers.
[123] B. Lamar Johnson, "General Education in the Junior College," *North Central Association Quarterly* 24 (1950): 357.
[124] Ibid.

mapped out three critical "obstacles to general education which those of us in junior colleges must face and overcome: 1. The University Halo 2. The Vocational Urge 3. The Tradition of Verbalism."[125]

The first of these obstacles suggested "that the heavy hand of university domination has retarded junior college curriculum development"[126] Johnson's recommendation was to limit the practice of fashioning general education courses on those offered at the undergraduate level at four-year institutions—ultimately repeating the argument he had made in 1942. Next, Johnson pointed to the pressure created by external forces to provide vocational education and skills training. Again, this was later identified by commentators as a detriment to general education development and reform.[127] Rather than portraying a dichotomous relationship between general and vocational education, Johnson recommended a resolution. "The vocational urge cannot, and should not, be denied." He argued, "But, in utilizing it as a motivating factor for general education, we can make a virtue of necessity. Let us not set general education over against occupational training."[128]

---

[125] Ibid, 358.
[126] Ibid, 359.
[127] On vocational pressures limiting the importance assigned to general education in the community college see Robert R. Wiegman, *General Education in Occupational Education Programs Offered by Junior Colleges* (Washington, D.C.: American Association of Junior Colleges, 1969); K. Patricia Cross, "Thirty Years Have Passed: Trends in General Education," *New Directions for Community Colleges* 40 (1982): 14; Raisman, "Creating Philosopher Bricklayers," 16-20; Chad Hanson, "What Happened to the Liberal Arts?" *New Directions for Community Colleges* 163 (2013): 11-19; J.M. Anderson, "Why Community College Students Need Great Books," *New Directions for Community Colleges* 163 (2013): 41-50; Sheldon Rothblatt, "Old Wine in New Bottles, or New Wine in Old Bottles?: The Humanities and Liberal Education in Today's Universities" in *A New Deal for the Humanities: Liberal Arts and the Future of Public Higher Education* eds. Gordon Hunter and Feisal G. Mohamed (New Brunswick, NJ: Rutgers University Press, 2016), 32; Kathleen Woodward, "We Are All Nontraditional Learners Now: Community Colleges, Long-Life Learning, and Problem-Solving Humanities" in *A New Deal for the Humanities*, 51-71. For an insightful chart of external forces that affect curriculum change in the community college, see Clyde E. Blocker, Robert H. Plummer, and Richard C. Richardson, Jr., *The Two-Year College: A Social Synthesis* (Englewood Cliffs, NJ: Prentice-Hall, 1965), 205, Fig. 8-1. On external forces affecting effective reform of the curriculum, particularly in California, see "External Influences on the Curriculum" eds. David B. Wolf and Mary Lou Zoglin, Special Issue. *New Directions for Community Colleges* 64 (1988): 1-93.
[128] Johnson, "General Education in the Junior," 361.

Finally, Johnson attacked "the tradition of verbalism" as an impediment to general education reform on the junior college. After citing a similar argument made by the Truman Commission, Johnson argued, "Upon occasion proponents of general education assume that general education is and must by definition be, verbal in content and approach. This assumption, is in my opinion, completely erroneous. The basic concepts of general education demand that each student be given an opportunity to prepare for effective living. The particular method of achievement will vary from college to college, from class to class, and even from student to student."[129] This was a rehash of the arguments he made in his 1938 articles in the *Journal of Higher Education*.

While a number of these arguments were made by Johnson before, he used the opportunity to make an argument about how to go about reforming general education curriculums in junior colleges. Much like Tyler and the others he had worked with in the previous twenty years, Johnson felt that each institution must have autonomy from internal and external forces to provide a curriculum that would suit their students as they saw fit. Ultimately, his experience and outlook would have suggested to members of the executive committee of the California Study that he was likely to lead a cooperative study in a manner similar to others in the general education movement—including their earlier choices of T.R. McConnell and Russell M. Cooper. However, Johnson's advantage over these individuals lay in his heightened sensitivity to the particular needs of junior colleges. This was articulated by Johnson in an open letter that he sent to the "Chief Administrator" of each institution participating in the California Study: "The factor which most insures, the success of the General Education Study" he wrote, "is its initiation by the California State Junior College Association. The executive committee has

[129] Ibid, 362.

made it perfectly clear to me that this is a study of, for, and by the junior colleges of California. It was these considerations which motivated me to accept the directorship."[130]

Once Johnson was selected by the executive committee, he worked closely with them on the research design of the California Study. Much of this work was accomplished in a special meeting of the executive committee, Johnson, and "representatives of the regional associations" held at Bakersfield College on April 22nd and 23rd, 1950. At this meeting, those present decided on "two summer workshops, the first in 1950 to open the study, and the second in 1951, to close the study and bring together its findings."[131] Though the activities of the 1951 workshop were left somewhat vague to account for what might happen in the intervening time, the participants decided that the 1950 workshop should focus on "identify[ing] common student needs as a basis for developing a general education program…[and] describ[ing] selected experiences (including class, extra-class, and guidance) designed to achieve these behaviour [sic] goals."[132]

Functioning of the California Study

In terms of execution, the California Study of General Education in the Junior College was similar to the Eight-Year Study and the Cooperative Study in General Education. It involved a director and a staff who consulted with institutions, held small regional conferences, put on summer workshops, helped to produce a circulating newsletter, and worked to organize curricular materials before producing a final report. This section describes the functioning of the California Study by focusing on each of these characteristics.

Preparations for the 1950 Summer Workshop

---

[130] "B. Lamar Johnson to The Chief Administrator" 7 June 1950. Subseries III.A: Organizations, 1875-1989, Box 43, F: American Council on Education: Study of General Education in Community Colleges, 1949-1952, CFAT Records.
[131] "The Study" 2.
[132] Ibid, 5.

The early work of the California Study began with the selection of a staff.[133] Unlike the previous cooperative studies that tended to hire consultants with specialized expertise in various areas of educational research, Johnson looked for individuals with broad experience in community colleges. Some of these individuals were members of the executive committee (e.g. James W. Thornton, Jr., Grace V. Bird), while others were colleagues from Stephens (e.g. Marjorie Carpenter). Though many of these individuals were more advanced in their careers than their earlier counterparts, a number of these scholars, most notably Thornton, Jr. (himself already a community college president), would go on to illustrious careers as scholars of community colleges.[134] While some would continue to focus on general education, others would shift their foci. For instance, Eason Monroe, who was fired from his position as a faculty member from San Francisco State College shortly after joining the California Study for refusing to sign a loyalty oath, would go on a long career with the American Civil Liberties Union before returning to his former post in the early 1970s.[135]

Once the staff was selected, Johnson and the newly appointed members began to sharpen their understanding of preceding cooperative studies as well as some other notable experiments of the general education movement. An important instance of this research was Bird's attempt to create a nearly comprehensive list of general education definitions that had appeared during the movement. This list included definitions by "McGrath, Minnesota: [Russell M.] Cooper,

---

[133] Though the California Study relied on assistance from dozens of consultants, the main staff members were Grace V. Bird, Marjorie Carpenter, Eason Monroe, James W. Thornton, Jr., and A.L. Vaughn.

[134] On the contributions and importance of James W. Thornton, Jr. to community colleges, see Robert Boyd Young, "The Community College Identity: Ten Leaders" (PhD diss., University of Illinois at Urbana-Champaign, 1975), esp. 7, Table 1. Thornton Jr.'s later work on general education in the community college includes James W. Thronton, Jr., "General Education" in *The Public Junior College: The Fifty-fifty Yearbook of the National Society for the Study of Education, Part I* (Chicago: University of Chicago Press, 1956), 118-139; James W. Thornton, Jr., *The Community Junior College* (New York: John Wiley and Sons, 1960), esp. chapter 14.

[135] Al Martinez, "A Teacher's 22-Year Exile Ends: ACLU's Eason Monroe, Fired on Loyalty Oath, to Return to S.F. State," *Los Angeles Times*, 30 May 1972; "Safeguarding Civil Liberties: Oral History Transcript," Eason Monroe Interviewed by Joel Gardner, July-August, 1972 (Los Angeles: Oral History Program, University of California, Los Angeles, 1974).

McConnell, American Council on Education's Committee on a Design for General Education, Inter-Professions Conference on Education, Conferences on Higher Education, Harvard Report, Harvard Program, [Sidney] Hook, and Hutchins."[136]

The next step in preparing for the 1950 workshop was to alert participating community college administrators and faculty members that their active engagement and leadership was critical not only to the success of the workshop, but also the Study itself. An early step toward this end was sending a letter urging "junior college administrators [to] employ the participants from their colleges for an additional month during the summer of 1950, with assignment to the workshop in order to encourage qualified persons to attend."[137] In addition to this note, Johnson wrote an open letter to faculty participants. "The success of the project will depend largely" Johnson asserted "on you and the other junior college faculty members who will comprise the workshop and who will, throughout the year, provide leadership in their own colleges and sections of the state."[138]

Johnson also wrote the previously mentioned open letter to the "chief administrator" of the participating institutions. In addition to introducing himself, he sought information on the issues that each junior college was dealing with. "I wish you would write me," Johnson implored, "at the School of Education at U.C.L.A. regarding any suggestions that you have for our summer workshop and for the remainder of the study. I would especially appreciate comments or suggestions regarding problems which you feel the study should work on. Do let

[136] Bird, "Appendix A" 91-92.
[137] "Executive Committee: California Study of General Education in the Junior College, Minutes, Bakersfield Meeting, April 22, 1950" Subseries III.A: Organizations, 1875-1989, Box 43, F: American Council on Education: Study of General Education in Community Colleges, 1949-1952, CFAT Records.
[138] "B. Lamar Johnson to Junior College Colleague" 7 June 1950. Subseries III.A: Organizations, 1875-1989, Box 43, F: American Council on Education: Study of General Education in Community Colleges, 1949-1952, CFAT Records.

me hear from you!"[139] In addition to asking for possible issues to tackle at the workshops, Johnson provided an open invitation to the 1950 workshop for each administrator. "Nothing would please me more, of course," Johnson wrote "than to have you, yourself, as one of the representatives of your institution. Throughout the study, we shall need to look at you and the other administrators of the state for leadership…You will undoubtedly next fall expect our participants in the summer workshop to take leadership in the development of various phase of your general education program. I do hope that you will do everything possible to plan ahead for such leadership—including anything that can be done for the individual teacher's schedule and load."[140] Finally, Johnson worked with the UCLA administration to not only secure space, but access to campus resources.[141] In his open letter to administrators, Johnson continued, "The administration at the University of California in Los Angeles is putting the resources of the entire university at our disposal. We shall be free to draw upon the services of faculty members as well as to use the library and other physical facilities of the university."[142] After writing to the participating administrators and faculty, Johnson and the staff sought out others who would be able to speak to general education. Their efforts led to the attendance and strong engagement of Paul L. Dressel, a professor of education at Michigan State College and Director of the Cooperative Study of Evaluation in General Education and Malcolm MacLean.[143]

The 1950 Summer Workshop: Securing a Definition

---

[139] "B. Lamar Johnson to The Chief Administrator" 7 June 1950. Subseries III.A: Organizations, 1875-1989, Box 43, F: American Council on Education: Study of General Education in Community Colleges, 1949-1952, CFAT Records.

[140] Ibid.

[141] In addition to this work, Johnson also participated in a conference held by the university for "School Executives," and read a speech he had written entitled "The Job of the Junior College in the Next Half Century" on July 6, 1950. A copy of this is in the Johnson Papers.

[142] "B. Lamar Johnson to The Chief Administrator" 7 June 1950. Subseries III.A: Organizations, 1875-1989, Box 43, F: American Council on Education: Study of General Education in Community Colleges, 1949-1952, CFAT

[143] "The Study" 6-7. On the Cooperative Study of Evaluation in General Education see Paul L. Dressel and Lewis B. Mayhew, *General Education: Explorations in Evaluation: The Final Report of the Cooperative Study of Evaluation in General Education of the American Council on Education* (Washington, D.C.: American Council on Education, 1954).

The 1950 summer workshop was a six-week workshop that occurred on the campus of UCLA from June 26th to August 4th that featured representatives from twenty-five of the fifty-nine (42%) of the junior colleges in California.[144] Ultimately, it was considered successful not only by the leadership of the Study, but also many of the participating administrators and faculty members. Indeed, one participant noted that the workshop (among other facets of the California Study) had provided "'opportunities for community contact and relationships which we otherwise could not achieve in a ten-year period.'"[145]

Taking a cue from earlier cooperative studies, the first task of the workshop participants was to agree on a definition of general education. Eventually, this would lead to the formulation of general education objectives for each specific institution, course, etc. Johnson would later describe this process in a discussion at the "Utah Conference on Higher Education" in 1953. "The workshop which opened the California study of general education in the junior college early recognized," Johnson suggested "the importance of defining general education. The workshop was, however aware of the dangers inherent in becoming involved in hairsplitting arguments over definition. 'Perhaps,' argued some members of the group, 'general education cannot be adequately defined in one succinct statement. Perhaps it can only be described.' This viewpoint soon prevailed as members of the workshop agreed that general education can be best defined through a statement of its own goals."[146]

---

[144] B. Lamar Johnson, "The California Study of General Education in the Junior College, Sept. 4, 1950" Johnson Papers. "Participation in California Study of General Education in the Junior College, 6/15/51" Subseries III.A: Organizations, 1875-1989, Box 43, F: American Council on Education: Study of General Education in Community Colleges, 1949-1952, CFAT Records.

[145] "Junior College General Education Newsletter: From the California Study of General Education in the Junior College, Issue No. 2, February 12, 1951" Subseries III.A: Organizations, 1875-1989, Box 43, F: American Council on Education: Study of General Education in Community Colleges, 1949-1952, CFAT Records.

[146] B. Lamar Johnson, "Methods of Teaching in General Education" in *Utah Conference on Higher Education: Democracy and Higher Education September 13-14-15, 1953* (Salt Lake City: Utah State Agricultural College, 1953), 21. Also see the discussion of this process in B. Lamar Johnson, "Toward General Education in the Junior College," *Junior College Journal* 30 (1960): 517-524.

However, there was the even larger issue of how to create some sort of definition of general education that could be applied to the statewide system without infringing on the autonomy and local control of the individual institutions. To deal with this issue, the California Study essentially produced two definitions of general education. One would be a broader list of competencies that would serve as the building blocks for each California junior college. This list of twelve junior college general education goals was repeated often during and after the Study and remains perhaps its longest lasting legacy. The "statement of goals" is as follows:

> Students in California Public Junior Colleges differ greatly in experiences, needs, capacities, aspirations, and interests. The general education program aims to help each student increase his competence in 1. Exercising the privileges and responsibilities of democratic citizenship. 2. Developing a set of sound moral and spiritual values by which he guides his life. 3. Expressing his thoughts clearly in speaking and writing and in reading and listening with understanding. 4. Using the basic mathematical and mechanical skills necessary in everyday life. 5. Using methods of critical thinking for the solution of problems and for the discrimination among values. 6. Understanding his cultural heritage so that he may gain a perspective of his time and place in the world. 7. Understanding his interaction with his biological and physical environment so that he may better adjust to and improve that environment. 8. Maintaining good mental and physical health for himself, his family, and his community. 9. Developing a balanced personal and social adjustment. 10. Sharing in the development of a satisfactory home and family life. 11. Achieving a satisfactory vocational adjustment. 12. Taking part in some form of satisfying creative activity and in appreciating the creative activities of others.[147]

Johnson saw this definition as malleable and in no way universal. Before introducing this list to his audience at the Utah Conference, he referred to it as "A (note that I did not say THE) definition of general education."[148]

The second definition would be crafted by each individual institution. In this manner, the California Study was able to craft a system-wide structure for general education that was broad

---

[147] Johnson, *General Education in Action*, 21-22. Terry O'Banion has noted that this statement has been reproduced many times over. See his article, "A Brief History of General Education," *Community College Journal of Research and Practice* 40 (2016): 330. Indeed, this statement has even found its way into a prominent book associated with community colleges that generations of community college leaders have been familiar with: Cohen, Brawer, and Kisker, *The American Community*, 291-292.
[148] Johnson, "Methods of Teaching" 21.

enough for each individual institution to provide the type of curriculum that they wished for their students. Ultimately, this was how the California Study dealt with the issue of local control. By keeping its state-wide pronouncement of goals broad and derived from actual practitioners on the ground, no junior college would feel as though it had its autonomy infringed upon. Moreover, each individual institution could develop their own goals based upon their own communities and students.

Though the individual definitions of the institutions varied, the method of coming up with them was essentially similar. "Members of the workshop" Johnson recalled, "drew upon varied studies of students and adults; upon community surveys; upon formulations by national, state, and local leaders; and upon their own rich and varied experience with students and communities." Ultimately, this information served "as a basis" for each school to base its objectives upon.[149] Part of the background knowledge that participants were given included the aforementioned list of general education definitions compiled by Grace Bird. Along with this list, Bird included the following message: "How does all this apply to the California Junior College and our coming study? First, it reminds us that there is already wide-spread common understanding of what general education means and what it seeks to do…Second, our borrowed definitions tell us that, while they are differences in the means used to reach the common goals, <u>all</u> of the <u>means</u> embrace education" as common understandings promoted to diverse students.[150]

The participants also "drew upon the studies of students and adults carried on at the General College at the University of Minnesota, at Stephens College, at San Francisco State College; they examined California studies of students' characteristics and community surveys, including those at Bakersfield, Ventura, Stockton, Modesto, and San Francisco; and they

[149] Ibid.
[150] Bird, "Appendix A" 92.

analyzed the formulations by the President's Commission on Higher Education, by the Educational Policies Commission of the National Education Association, and by the California Framework Committee."[151] While background information was crucial, it was important to the Study's leadership that it was combined with each participant's "own rich and varied experience with students, and communities."[152] The participants "further agreed," Johnson recalled, "that these objectives must be based both upon the needs and other characteristics of students, and upon the characteristics, needs, and demands of the society in which they live and of which they are a part."[153]

Once these objectives were stated, it was made clear to the participants that they must cooperate not only with people at other institutions, but with their colleagues at their own institution. Ultimately, the staff believed that the 1950 workshop had "merely broken ground for the overall structure" of general education reform at the participating institutions. "The actual building process must" the staff contended "be done by each college staff in its own way, adopting the method of construction most adaptable to the specific characteristics of each individual college and its component community."[154] It also noted that each institution was in a different place—an issue that earlier cooperative studies had navigated. "Already some junior colleges have activated definite general education curricula;" the staff noted, "all reveal some aspects of General Education… In any case, the individual institution must begin at the level where it now stands, with personnel and materials it now has, and evolve its own program of

[151] Johnson, *General Education in Action*, 20.
[152] Ibid.
[153] Johnson, "Methods of Teaching" 21.
[154] "Next Steps in General Education: A Report Prepared by Two Committees" in *Problems and Proposals Concerning General Education*, 81.

General Education therefrom."[155] This work would also take place at the 1950 workshop, particularly as participants were separated by their particular interests and teaching specialties.

The 1950 Workshop: Preparing Materials for Broader Distribution

The workshop produced four proceedings (as well as one preliminary report) on the following topics: communication; natural science, mathematics, and health; personnel services; and humanities, creative arts, and foreign languages. In addition to including a number of experiments and related teaching materials that were developed and/or revised at the workshop, each included a bibliography of relevant readings. Each proceeding also contained the aforementioned twelve junior college general education goals. Moreover, there was a letter of transmittal that carried the following four principles that defined the California Study: "1. General education is best defined by a statement of its goals…2. The curriculum consists of the sum total of student's college experience….3. General education occurs at any point in a student's experience at which he progresses toward the achievement of one or more of the goals of general education…4. Specific courses directed to particular goals of general education are needed in such fields as family living, communication, social studies, natural sciences, humanities, and personal adjustment."[156] In these principles, we see the California Study committed to general education taking place both in curricular and extra-curricular modes and to producing new courses in a host of traditional and nontraditional disciplinary fields.

In addition to these commitments, the California Study emphasized the autonomy of each institution to create a general education program that would be useful to its individual students and communities. "Emphasis is here placed" each letter of transmittal read, "on specific practices

---

[155] Ibid.

[156] The California Study of General Education in the Junior College, "Letter of Transmittal" in *An Exploratory Compilation of Resource Materials for Humanities, Creative Arts, and Foreign Languages in General Education,* iii.

and materials for teaching rather than upon philosophy. These pages are not, however, placed in your hands to indicate the approach to general education. On the contrary, these pages are simply suggestive of representative approaches, practices, and materials which members of the workshop committee preparing this brochure believe contribute to the general education of junior college students."[157] This was a message that was continually repeated to participants. "We are admittedly very much in the dark as to what the ideal curriculum for science, mathematics, and health should be" one staff member wrote, "for college students. It is clear, however, that the courses should be composed of the type of content that will help realize the objectives outlined in Chapter II. There is little doubt but that these objectives cannot be met without a considerable change in the content of most science courses being offered in colleges today."[158]

By tying curriculum reform to the broader goals of general education that the participants had created, the California Study leadership was providing participants and their institutions to define their curricula as they saw fit. A similar approach was taken by those not working directly with the curriculum, but rather with personnel services. Indeed, the proceedings devoted to this topic noted that "No college will wish to introduce every practice reported here. Rather, the Committee…hopes that this manual may serve as a stimulus to study and planning within colleges so that each staff may be able to develop more adequate personnel services in accordance with its resources, its faculty, its present organization, and its own student needs."[159]

The proceedings also made an effort to list the latest research the particular subjects they covered. In many cases, the proceedings listed works that had been done by previous cooperative

---

[157] Ibid.
[158] Paul DeH. Hurd, "The Selection of Content for General Education Courses in Science, Mathematics, and Health" in *An Exploratory Compilation of Resource Materials for Science, Mathematics and Health in General Education, Prepared by the Workshop at the University of California, Los Angeles* eds. Workshop Committee on Science, Mathematics and Health (Los Angeles: The California Study of General Education in the Junior College, 1951), 13.
[159] "Personnel Services in General Education" in *An Exploratory Compilation of Resource Materials for Personnel Services in General Education* ed. Workshop Committee on Personnel Services (Los Angeles: The California Study of General Education in the Junior College, 1951), 3-4.

studies. Discussions of evaluation often noted the availability of tests developed by the Eight-Year Study and Cooperative Study in General Education.[160] The bibliography of the proceedings on humanities, creative arts, and foreign languages, cited Harold B. Dunkel's Cooperative Study in General Education report on the humanities that had been published in 1947.[161] "The term humanities," one staff member wrote, "as it is employed in curricular materials, is subject to a variety of interpretations. Harold B. Dunkel described this condition in his book, General Education in the Humanities, published in 1947"[162]

Though some of the bibliographies listed scholarly works, there was a wide variety of other resources recommended. The very same proceeding described relevant lecture series, bulletins, extra-curricular activities, and gallery experiences that participants could attend or order.[163] Examples included thematic exhibits and shows that were being held at East Los Angeles Junior College and a newly formed bulletin entitled the Quarterly "published by the Art Teachers Association of Southern California." "This is a new venture," the proceeding read "the first issue having been issued in May of 1951. Persons wishing to receive this bulletin should write to Michael Andrews, Art Department, U.S.C…The bulletin is being edited by Joseph

---

[160] Workshop Committee on Humanities, Creative Arts and Foreign Languages, "Evaluation in the Humanities" in *An Exploratory Compilation of Resource Materials for Humanities, Creative Arts, and Foreign Languages in General Education*, 41-42. This was also true of the proceedings on the natural sciences. See Paul DeH. Hurd, "Evaluation of the Objectives of Science, Mathematics and Health in General Education" in *An Exploratory Compilation of Resource Materials for Science, Mathematics and Health in General Education*, 76-80; "Selected Bibliography" in *An Exploratory Compilation of Resource Materials for Science, Mathematics and Health in General Education*, 80-81.

[161] Workshop Committee on Humanities, Creative Arts and Foreign Languages, "Humanities, Creative Arts, Foreign Language in General Education" in *An Exploratory Compilation of Resource Materials for Humanities, Creative Arts, and Foreign Languages in General Education*, 1.

[162] Ibid.

[163] Workshop Committee on Humanities, Creative Arts and Foreign Languages, "Some Devices Used as Extensions of Classroom Activities or as Supplements to Them" in *An Exploratory Compilation of Resource Materials for Humanities, Creative Arts, and Foreign Languages in General Education*, 13.

Krause of John Muir College and Thomas Jennings of Los Angeles City College."[164] The editors were themselves participants of the California Study.

A number of courses were either developed or revised at the 1950 workshop. For example, a number of instructors of communication sought to build a general (survey) course that might be adapted for their local needs. Their discussions emphasized, among other things, methods by which student input could assist in the shaping and evolution of the course.[165] These discussions and some rough sketches were provided in the workshop proceedings. There were also examples of separate units (as opposed to entire courses) being reformed and presented as well. Instances include a sample unit on heredity from a biology course at Ventura Junior College as well as a sample unit from a course in physical sciences from a similar institution.[166] Though there was a wide range of diversity in these courses presented in the proceedings, all were presented with the notion that they could (and likely should) be adapted to suit each individual institution and instructor.

The 1950 Summer Workshop: "Our Task Ahead"

The final two days of the 1950 Summer Workshop were devoted to a "conference" on the issues in general education that all participants shared in common as well as the execution of the Study itself. The conference included not only "members of the workshop" but also a number of

---

[164] Ibid.

[165] Workshop Committee on Communication, "Teachers and Students Build a General Communication Course" in *An Exploratory Compilation of Resource Materials for Communication in General Education, Prepared by the Workshop at the University of California, Los Angeles* (Los Angeles: The California Study of General Education in the Junior College, 1951), 3-8.

[166] Paul DeH. Hurd, "The Place of Science, Mathematics and Health in General Education: Objectives" in *An Exploratory Compilation of Resource Materials for Science, Mathematics and Health in General Education,* 1.

[166] Clinton Schonberger and Philander Powers, "Biology in General Education" in *An Exploratory Compilation of Resource Materials for Science, Mathematics and Health in General Education, Prepared by the Workshop at the University of California, Los Angeles* eds. Workshop Committee on Science, Mathematics and Health (Los Angeles: The California Study of General Education in the Junior College, 1951), 25-32; Bailey Howard, "Physical Science in General Education" ibid, 34-44.

"educational leaders from all sections" of California.[167] On the final day of the 1950 Summer Workshop, B. Lamar Johnson gathered all in attendance and spoke about the work of the California Study between the opening and closing workshops. He focused specifically on what participants could "do at the grass roots, in individual classrooms, in separate junior colleges"[168] Johnson began his speech by describing his observations of the previous six weeks: "In getting ready to chart the task ahead in the California Study of General Education in the Junior College, members of the workshop have worked hard and effectively. Forty-nine faculty from twenty-six junior colleges, six staff members, and many visiting consultants have together weighed and considered the problems of general education."[169] After providing a sense of the magnitude of individual efforts during the workshop, Johnson suggested, that the participants were part of a larger legacy of the ongoing general education movement. In doing so, he not only noted the great advantage that the California Study had in being one of the later projects conducted during movement, but also displayed a sense of how the California Study and its participants understood their efforts.

"We have probed the past. We have examined the literature. We have tried to observe the local, state, national, and world forces in society and in education which have generated and nourished the general education movement." He continued,

> We have studied the ideas and actions of men and institutions who plowed the first furrows, who experimented, toiled and fought against the forces of indifference and reaction in curriculum making for American youth. We have looked to the sociologists, historians, psychologists, and educators for an understanding of junior college students and of the men and women they are to be, and of the kinds of societies they have made and yet might make…We have analyzed curricula, projects, courses of study, syllabi in

[167] "B. Lamar Johnson to Oliver C. Carmichael" 7 August 1950. Subseries III.A: Organizations, 1875-1989, Box 43, F: American Council on Education: Study of General Education in Community Colleges, 1949-1952, CFAT Records.
[168] B. Lamar Johnson, "The Task Ahead: General Education Conference, UCLA, August 4, 1950" Johnson Papers. This address would also be reprinted in *Problems and Proposals Concerning General Education*.
[169] Ibid.

> California junior colleges and in institutions such as Michigan State, Minnesota, Stephens, and the technical institutes of New York.[170]

Much as others in the general education movement had done previously, he pointed to the vast array of theories about general education that had proliferated. He also pointed to tangible reform efforts that had been studied.

It is significant that Johnson concluded that the key achievement of the workshop was not necessarily the research that the participants had conducted, but rather the cooperation that it stimulated. "We have battled" he announced, "over theory and philosophy…Out of necessary initial confusion and conflict, we have achieved a high degree of cooperation, a measure of agreement, and a sense of teamwork that gives promise that the action in general education begun here may be extended over the coming months to all of the junior college teachers and students everywhere. That is the essence of our hope. It is the basis of our planning for the task ahead."[171] In making this argument, Johnson demonstrated that he had understood the reform strategies of the general education movement well. He pointed to the educational research and though he did not use this speech to discuss philanthropy, he pointed to the concept of cooperation.

Johnson then reviewed the points of agreement that the Study participants had come to and many of these points would be reviewed in the proceedings and final report of the Study. More important, he challenged the participants to take an active role in their own institutions. "The purpose of the Study as stated in the request for the grant is 'to develop a comprehensive program of general education for the junior colleges of California.'" Johnson began. "In their work this summer, members of the workshop have not interpreted this statement of purpose to imply the preparation of pronouncements or directives to be addressed to the junior college

[170] Ibid.
[171] Ibid.

faculties of the state. On the contrary, the workshop has recognized that any comprehensive program of general education must be developed by faculties themselves, in their own individual institutions, but with all of the stimulus, assistance, and cross-fertilization that can be generated by conference and discussion."[172]

But, what were the benefits of these discussions? Certainly, an enormous amount of reading had been suggested and some courses had even been drafted. Yet, Johnson argued that participants should return to their institutions *not only* with these tangible tools, but also with the reform methods that had been demonstrated in the workshop. "As these workshop participants return their faculties," Johnson suggested, "they are not taking with them final fiats and decisions made by this summer's group. They do, to be sure, have materials which they have developed and which they hope will be suggestive to their colleagues. More important than any materials which may have been developed, however, is a point of view and attitude which we hope will guide our thinking and work this coming year."[173]

At the heart of the reform methods was the issue of cooperation without consensus. The point of view was described by Johnson: "This recognition of the individuality of each junior college must in no sense be permitted to hinder cooperation or to discourage joint study and work on problems and issues of common concern. From the study of such common problems as are already beginning to emerge, we may anticipate an increase in unity—a unity, however, not imposed from without but one developed from within."[174] Finally, Johnson closed his speech by reminding participants of the importance of general education in postwar world. "The ends of general education for which you and I are working are not simply fads and frills; these general

[172] Ibid.
[173] Ibid.
[174] Ibid.

education goals come very close to representing the preservation of human life and continuation of civilization. Ours indeed is an important task."[175]

These messages were repeated by other staff members of the California Study. For instance, two committees composed of staff members and other consultants prepared a report entitled "Next Steps in General Education" recommending methods by which cooperation between faculty members; community college personnel and community members; community college personnel and district high school personnel; and community college personnel and other higher education personnel could occur.[176] This was published in the 1950 conference proceedings, which would later see wide distribution in the state, and was supplemented by an additional piece by James W. Thornton, Jr. "How can we in our colleges exert leadership?" he asked. "We must create dissatisfaction…The second step can be to help our faculties to see that general education is purely and simply a realistic attempt to improve instruction…The third step might well be a concerted drive to gather facts, and to present facts in meaningful relationships…Plan to do something creative…Keep in touch with similar experiences in other colleges."[177]

Between the Workshops: The Role of the Staff, Regional Conferences, and the Newsletter

The California Study of General Education in the Junior College relied upon the methods used by the Eight-Year Study and the Cooperative Study in General Education. The staff conducted campus visits, participants met in smaller regional conferences, and newsletters were frequently issued and found wide circulation. These strategies were adapted to assist the

---

[175] Ibid. It is notable that Johnson used the term "fads and frills" as it was a term that had been in use at least since the 1930s to denounce educational reform movements (particularly progressive ones). On this point, see the article by Eight-Year Study staff member V.T. Thayer, "Fads and Frills," *Social Frontier* 2 (1935): 50-53.
[176] "Next Steps in General Education: A Report Prepared by Two Committees" in *Problems and Proposals Concerning General Education*, 81-85.
[177] James W. Thornton, Jr., "Next Steps in the Individual College" in *Problems and Proposals Concerning General Education*, 104-105.

California Study which differed from the earlier studies in terms of the amount of institutions that participated and their geographic distribution. Each strategy was considered equally important by the executive committee. "It is generally agreed," reported Lynn White, Jr., "that if the rank and file of the faculties is to be reached and their brains tapped this should be done not only by Lamar Johnson's visits to individual colleges and his meetings with the regional junior college groups, but also through the proposed news letter."[178] These methods ultimately proved effective. As the California Study drew to a close, Johnson estimated that of the fifty-nine junior colleges in California, twenty-five had been represented at the 1950 workshop and forty-five were participating in programs and conferences in 1950. Twelve were considered "very active," twenty-one were considered "active," eleven were considered "somewhat active," thirteen had "little participation," and two junior colleges (unnamed institutions in San Jose and Santa Barbara) did not participate at all.[179]

Campus consultancies were somewhat difficult for the California Study as they did not possess the type of funding necessary to maintain a large staff. However, a limited number of consultancies did occur. In addition, B. Lamar Johnson made it a point to visit as many campuses as possible. By the fall of 1950, he had "visited the campuses of 32 junior colleges."[180] Because of the limited time scale of the Study and the perception that Johnson would be unable to produce the final report by the end of the Study (a deadline that would have been a lot to ask of anyone), many on the executive committee began to wonder if Johnson should be spending his time visiting individual campuses or preparing the report. The former was necessary to glean

---

[178] Lynn White, Jr. to Oliver C. Carmichael, 3 October 1950. Series III.A Grant Files, Box 75, Folder 6, CCNY Papers.

[179] "Participation in California Study of General Education in the Junior College, 6/15/51" Subseries III.A: Organizations, 1875-1989, Box 43, F: American Council on Education: Study of General Education in Community Colleges, 1949-1952, CFAT Records

[180] "Junior College General Education Newsletter: From the California Study of General Education in the Junior College, Issue No. 2, February 12, 1951" Subseries III.A: Organizations, 1875-1989, Box 43, F: American Council on Education: Study of General Education in Community Colleges, 1949-1952, CFAT Records.

information for the report, but the latter needed to be produced as quickly as possible to capitalize on the momentum that the Study had been created.[181] Johnson was able to strike a balance between the two tasks, and by the end of the Study, he had "visited 40 of the campuses…representing 94% of the junior college enrollment in the state." [182]

The director and others on the staff encouraged participants to hold regional and sub-regional conferences that would be sponsored by the California Study.[183] These regional conferences "were held at Sacramento, San Mateo, San Bernandino, Riverside and Santa Monica" and were "attended by 3225 junior college faculty members from 57 different junior colleges."[184] They also led to instances of interinstitutional cooperation on a much smaller scale. For instance, "six faculty members in the Southland met…at Santa Monica City College to develop plans for a survey of communications teaching" shortly after meeting at the Santa Monica regional conference.[185] Ultimately, the many instances of cooperation would lead to tangible reform on the ground. One participant of the Study, "Lucille Freed of Pierce Junior College" reflected after one conference that the experience "would be a big aid in planning her own courses" and was certain that "others would feel the same."[186]

Johnson was also able to report to educational associations and organizations across the state on the work of the participating colleges—particularly in the regional conferences that were taking place. For example, on November 8, he gave an address to the California State Junior

---

[181] O.C. Carmichael to John L. Lounsbury" 23 October 1950; "John L. Lounsbury to Oliver C. Carmichael" 17 October 1950. Subseries III.A: Organizations, 1875-1989, Box 43, F: American Council on Education: Study of General Education in Community Colleges, 1949-1952, CFAT Records.
[182] "OCC's Notes on Steering Committee Meetings, June 16-18, 1951" Subseries III.A: Organizations, 1875-1989, Box 43, F: American Council on Education: Study of General Education in Community Colleges, 1949-1952, CFAT Records.
[183] "The California Study of General Education in The Junior Colleges, 12/5/50" Johnson Papers.
[184] "Junior College General Education Newsletter: From the California Study of General Education in the Junior College, Issue No. 2, February 12, 1951" Subseries III.A: Organizations, 1875-1989, Box 43, F: American Council on Education: Study of General Education in Community Colleges, 1949-1952, CFAT Records.
[185] Ibid.
[186] Ibid.

College Association where he provided several examples of specific projects being undertaken.[187]

These regional conferences and the information being disseminated by the leadership of the California Study also stimulated "regional associations" who offered resources and assisted in organizing other cooperative opportunities based upon the subject matter interests of faculty.[188] In addition to "regional associations," educational researchers from across the state offered their support in various ways. For instance, Frank B. Gillette, an assistant professor of education at Stanford University offered a semester-long graduate seminar on the "problems of science teaching in the junior college" and encouraged "faculty members in the Bay Area" to join.[189] Following the success of this seminar, Gillette worked with his dean A. John Bartky to lead a two-day workshop on "community leadership…held in the Stanford School of Education."[190] A number of the staff members also offered a series of summer seminars for participants through the University of California, Berkeley.[191] However, these examples were not unique to the California Study, rather they supplemented the efforts of universities across the nation to provide opportunities for junior college faculty to collaborate and/or learn. Indeed, the previous summer "twenty-seven universities provided for workshops, seminars, or regular

---

[187] "General Education in California Junior Colleges, Selected Preliminary Observations: An Address given at the Annual Fall Meeting of the California State Junior College Association, Yosemite National Park, November 8, 1950" Johnson Papers.
[188] James W. Thornton, Jr., "General Education Accomplishments in California" *California Journal of Secondary Education* 26 (1951): 400.
[189] "Junior College General Education Newsletter: From the California Study of General Education in the Junior College, Issue No. 2, February 12, 1951" Subseries III.A: Organizations, 1875-1989, Box 43, F: American Council on Education: Study of General Education in Community Colleges, 1949-1952, CFAT Records.
[190] "Dr. Gillette to Aid in Ed Workshop," *The Stanford Daily*, Volume 119A, Issue 15, 10 August 1951.
[191] *University of California Register, 1950-1951 with Announcements for 1951-1952 in Two Volumes: Volume II* (Berkeley: University of California Press, 1951), 57.

courses of study in community-college education."[192] Wherever possible, the staff attempted to advertise these opportunities.

A major source of advertising for these opportunities was a monthly newsletter maintained by the California Study. Each issue saw wide distribution. Indeed, one particular issue noted that "More than 5,000 copies…are being sent to junior college faculty members in the state."[193] This newsletter served the purpose of disseminating information between the participants and others with a particular focus on ongoing experimentation in the cooperating colleges. The Study's leadership saw the newsletter as a tool that would both hold individual colleges accountable for reporting on their progress, stimulated by reading about experiments in other institutions, and open to soliciting advice from each other. Newsletters relied upon progress reports (reforms being undertaken) and problem reports (areas and issues identified by institutions worthy of reform and possibilities for cooperation). By January, 1952, fifty-five (out of fifty-nine) colleges had responded and sent in 215 progress reports and 146 problem reports to the staff.[194] Space considerations limited how many projects could be discussed in each individual issue.[195] A typical example of a progress report involved a "functional course in logic, with emphasis on ability to think critically about current situations" that was being designed by Rodney D. Smith at Palomar College. Smith noted that "editorials, advertisements political speeches and statements made by radio commentators [would be] analyzed as part of the course."[196] A typical example of a problem report came from Harry F. Clinton, director of the

[192] Jesse Parker Bogue, *The Community College* (New York: McGraw-Hill, 1950), 162.
[193] "Junior College General Education Newsletter: From the California Study of General Education in the Junior College, Issue No. 2, February 12, 1951" Subseries III.A: Organizations, 1875-1989, Box 43, F: American Council on Education: Study of General Education in Community Colleges, 1949-1952, CFAT Records.
[194] Ibid.
[195] Ibid.
[196] Ibid.

Student Store at Yuba College, who was beginning study on "student judgment regarding the general education values received as the result of courses in distributive education."[197]

As mentioned previously, George Zook had "urged the importance of" having outside consultants and experts, specifically "general education leaders from outside of California" to the executive committee and Johnson himself.[198] The Study's leadership responded by bringing in a number of outside experts and summarizing the contributions of these individuals in the newsletter. For instance, a speech given by George McCune, Chairman of the Social Studies Division of the General College at the University of Minnesota, to the faculties of seven participating colleges was summarized.[199] The newsletters also featured information on current trends affecting junior colleges. In one newsletter, B. Lamar Johnson noted that "Enrollment figures for 1949 showed that more than twice as many men as women attended California public junior colleges. Of 69,896 full time students, 23,288 were women and 46,608 were men." In light of this data, Johnson then asked "whether or not junior college curriculum offerings may be planned more particularly for men than for women?"[200]

Johnson, as Director of the California Study, also made an effort to keep the morale and engagement of participants at a high level. "This Study is financed for fourteen months," he noted in one newsletter, "But what happens in California junior colleges during the next fourteen years, and beyond, is vitally more important than what happens during these fourteen months. What happens during the present fourteen months, however, can largely condition developments

---

[197] Ibid.
[198] B. Lamar Johnson to Oliver C. Carmichael, 2 October 1950. Series III.A Grant Files, Box 75, Folder 6, CCNY Papers.
[199] "Junior College General Education Newsletter: From the California Study of General Education in the Junior College, Issue No. 3, April 16, 1951" Subseries III.A: Organizations, 1875-1989, Box 43, F: American Council on Education: Study of General Education in Community Colleges, 1949-1952, CFAT Records.
[200] "Junior College General Education Newsletter: From the California Study of General Education in the Junior College, Issue No. 2, February 12, 1951" Subseries III.A: Organizations, 1875-1989, Box 43, F: American Council on Education: Study of General Education in Community Colleges, 1949-1952, CFAT Records.

over the next fourteen years. With this in mind the opportunities for work together during the coming six months loom particularly important."[201] Johnson also used a portion of each newsletter to answer questions received from participants. One question in particular became something of a rallying cry for Johnson and the California Study. A postcard sent by an instructor in one of the participating colleges who had just finished reading an early newsletter asked "In a time of advanced technology when specialized training is necessary for national survival and individual employment, why are you expending energy on the nebulous whimsy of general education?"[202] Johnson provided his own detailed response that ultimately suggested that while he respected vocational training and national security, "General Education must give…people something to live by."[203] He then challenged participants: "Because of the timely importance and because of its pertinence to the General Education Study, you, our readers, are invited to send your answers and comments to the editors of this Newsletter. Quotations from replies will be included in the May issue of the Newsletter."[204]

Johnson considered this question of such vital importance that he sent a form letter introducing the California Study, providing the question, and soliciting a response to influential people across the nation. Writing to scholar Lewis Mumford, Johnson noted "In all good faith this question was recently asked by a junior college faculty member" and after providing the aforementioned question, he asked, "How would you reply?" Then added, "This question is important. And it is as pertinent in Connecticut as it is in California, in Minnesota as in Mississippi. In one form or another, it lurks in the minds of many people: educators, members of

[201] Ibid.
[202] Johnson, *General Education in Action*, 3.
[203] Ibid, 5.
[204] "Junior College General Education Newsletter: From the California Study of General Education in the Junior College, Issue No. 3, April 16, 1951" Subseries III.A: Organizations, 1875-1989, Box 43, F: American Council on Education: Study of General Education in Community Colleges, 1949-1952, CFAT Records.

boards, employers, workers, legislators, and other thoughtful laymen."[205] Mumford responded with a question of his own: "Why survive merely as a technologist?"[206] Including Mumford's response, Johnson received "eighty-two answers from university presidents, labor leaders, college instructors, editors, practicing psychiatrists, industrialists, authors, and others." The respondents included psychiatrist Erich Fromm, author Pearl S. Buck, labor leader Walter P. Reuther, and the president of Time, Inc., Roy E. Larsen. Johnson would publish a number of responses in the final report and organized them in such a way as to make a variety of arguments about the importance of general education.[207] Moreover, while editing a 1982 volume of *New Directions for Community Colleges* devoted to general education in the past thirty years since the California Study, Johnson singled out this question and some of the responses received as a way to introduce the Study to a younger audience.[208]

A Request for Further Funding

While the consultancies, regional conferences, workshops, and the newsletters proved useful, they quickly exhausted the initial grant of $30,000 that the Carnegie Foundation had provided.[209] As such, the executive committee, Johnson, and the staff set about requesting further funding from O.C. Carmichael—who had kept in touch with Johnson and the Committee, but had not yet made it out to California to observe any facet of the Study.[210] Their attempt involved sending a request for an additional $15,000 and several letters of support that would help to

---

[205] B. Lamar Johnson to Lewis Mumford, 2 April 1951, MS. Coll. 2, Series I, Container 9, Folder 713, Lewis Mumford Papers, Annenberg Rare Book and Manuscript Library, University of Pennsylvania, Philadelphia, PA.
[206] Johnson, *General Education in Action*, 7.
[207] Ibid, 6.
[208] B. Lamar Johnson, "'General Education in Action:' Revisited After Thirty Years," *New Directions for Community Colleges* 40 (1982): 5-9.
[209] B. Lamar Johnson to Oliver C. Carmichael, 2 October 1950. Series III.A Grant Files, Box 75, Folder 6, CCNY Papers.
[210] "CFAT—General Education in the Junior Colleges in Calif. OCC and B. Lamar Johnson, September 12, 1950" Subseries III.A: Organizations, 1875-1989, Box 43, F: American Council on Education: Study of General Education in Community Colleges, 1949-1952, CFAT Records; "O.C. Carmichael to B. Lamar Johnson" 1 September 1950. Subseries III.A: Organizations, 1875-1989, Box 43, F: American Council on Education: Study of General Education in Community Colleges, 1949-1952, CFAT Records.

contextualize the situation and reassure Carmichael that the Carnegie Foundation was getting a good return on their initial investment.

The first letter of support came from one of the architects of the California Study, John L. Lounsbury. The nature of his inquiry showed that he was in touch with the desires of philanthropic leaders. "As an individual who has had something to do with the direction of the study," he began a letter to Carmichael, "may I say quite frankly that had I known of the interest generated in such work and the scope to which such a study would develop, the original request would have been for a larger sum."[211] Noting that he underestimated the interest on part of California junior colleges for such a study, he then laid out how the participating institutions were helping to fund the Study—thereby making the request for philanthropic funding a supplemental one. This tactic, as previously mentioned, was required by both the Rockefeller and Carnegie philanthropies before they would disperse any funds. "I am pleased to report" he continued, "that the junior colleges of California are profoundly interested in this study and many of them are making substantial contributions to the work that is going on through official delegates sent to conferences in various places. As a typical example, may I say that several colleges paid the major portion of the expenses of their representatives at the workshop this summer."[212]

Lounsbury then described how the California Study was already proving of interest to other states, particularly New York, who, as previously mentioned, were also developing a strong system of junior colleges. "It may be of interest to you" Lounsbury continued, "to know that I have invited Dr. Alvin Eurich, President of the University of the State of New York, to be our guest of honor and speaker at one or two of the meetings scheduled to be held at San

[211] John L. Lounsbury to Oliver C. Carmichael, 29 September 1950. Series III.A Grant Files, Box 75, Folder 6, CCNY Papers.
[212] Ibid.

Bernandino Valley College…I am sure that Dr. Eurich will be able to make a profound contribution to our discussions and our thinking."[213] A similar point was reflected in the formal request. The Committee had pointed out that Carmichael "met with the executive committee of the study last spring and has recently conferred with Mr. E.E. Day, consultant in general education to the University of the State of New York, who has been participating in the California as a consultant. The officers believe, and Mr. Day concurs, that this study is of great importance not only to California, but to junior colleges throughout the country."[214]

Similar points were made by Lynn White, Jr. who wrote to Carmichael to say that Zook had asked him if he "might give…[White's] personal impressions of the situation." It is always embarrassing and humiliating to confess," White, Jr. commented, "that one has not foreseen completely all of the potentialities and pitfalls of an adventure of this sort. Dr. Day…who participated in our discussions and whose presence was immensely valuable, remarked that when he had seen the original application he had wondered how we expected to do so much for the amount requested!"[215] White, Jr. then sought to reassure Carmichael that the "Carnegie Foundation is going to get value received for its generous gift of $30,000. But the four members of the Pacific Coast Committee of the ACE were…led to the conclusion that an additional $15,000 would increase the value of the study by considerably more than fifty percent, and this

[213] Ibid.
[214] "Grant of $15,000 for Study of General Education in Community Colleges" Series III.A Grant Files, Box 75, Folder 6, CCNY Papers. In addition to serving as a high level Rockefeller officer, Day was concurrently preparing a volume of his essays, many of which dealt with general education. It was published shortly after his death on March 23, 1951. See Edmund Ezra Day, *Education for Freedom and Responsibility: Selected Essays* (Freeport, NY: Books for Libraries Press, 1952/1971). Day was also president of Cornell University and very much involved with the American Council on Education.
[215] Lynn White, Jr. to Oliver C. Carmichael, 3 October 1950. Series III.A Grant Files, Box 75, Folder 6, CCNY Papers.

led us, although with understandable qualms, to conclude that the Pacific Coast Committee…should back" the request.[216]

Each of the points raised by Lounsbury and White were included in the grant request: the underestimation of the popularity of the California Study, the insufficiency of funds to cover the costs of outside consultancies, staff travel, and printing costs, and sources of funding coming from the participating institutions (as well as UCLA). The grant request also stressed the increased interest on the part of California junior colleges to participate as time went on. These letters of support, the grant request, and a separate assurance from Johnson that he would be able to produce a completed draft of the final report by June 1, 1951 helped the California Study to secure the additional $15,000 grant. The assurance from Johnson responded to the Carmichael's belief that a fully drafted report would be "very useful in focusing the discussion on the critical issues at the final workshop and conference"[217]

The leadership of the California Study responded by celebrating the additional grant with an announcement in the next newsletter. "'In the first place,' the newsletter quoted Lounsbury, 'requests for additional funds are not too often approved. Such approval demonstrates the interest the Foundation has in the project and the national importance of the Study.'"[218] Though this was seen as a victory by the California Study, it was also a sign that the general education movement was losing its grip on philanthropic support and would need to adapt their methods both in reform and in securing support. Ultimately, the Carnegie and Rockefeller foundations had sustained the movement since its inception in the 1930s, and they were now actively pulling

[216] Ibid.
[217] Oliver C. Carmichael to B. Lamar Johnson, 13 October 1950. Series III.A Grant Files, Box 75, Folder 6, CCNY Papers.
[218] "Junior College General Education Newsletter: From the California Study of General Education in the Junior College, Issue No. 2, February 12, 1951" Subseries III.A: Organizations, 1875-1989, Box 43, F: American Council on Education: Study of General Education in Community Colleges, 1949-1952, CFAT Records.

back. The movement itself could not engage in the type of tangible reform symbolized by the cooperative studies in the absence of strong philanthropic support. The $45,000 that the California Study received—and the expectation that nearly sixty institutions were to reform their general education programs largely within the space of one calendar year—was rather scant when compared to the immense resources (measured both in funding and time) that the General Education Board had bestowed upon the Eight-Year Study and the Cooperative Study in General Education. Despite the limited resources, the California Study was able to advertise its work in much the same way that the earlier cooperative studies had.

Advertising the California Study of General Education in the Junior College

As early as the Bakersfield meeting of April, 1950, the leadership of the California Study had noticed that there was a desire on part of educators across the nation to learn about the Study. Indeed, as soon as the Study was announced, "several publishing companies" expressed desire in "publishing the report of the study."[219] To respond to this demand prior to the publication of the final report, the Study was advertised through a variety of venues. These included academic journals and broader outlets with national coverage. This section will focus on ways in which conference proceedings materials were advertised and sold, how the Study was described in academic journals, and finally the reception garnered by the final report, *General Education in Action*.

The materials produced by the 1950 workshop were printed and distributed to the participating institutions, and were also available for purchase from the UCLA Student's store.[220]

[219] "Executive Committee: California Study of General Education in the Junior College, Minutes, Bakersfield Meeting, April 22, 1950" Subseries III.A: Organizations, 1875-1989, Box 43, F: American Council on Education: Study of General Education in Community Colleges, 1949-1952, CFAT Records.
[220] "Junior College General Education Newsletter: From the California Study of General Education in the Junior College, Issue No. 2, February 12, 1951" Subseries III.A: Organizations, 1875-1989, Box 43, F: American Council on Education: Study of General Education in Community Colleges, 1949-1952, CFAT Records

Moreover, some of the speeches presented in the final two days of the workshop were reprinted for state-wide and national audiences.[221] While publishing work related to the Study was seen as a useful advertising tool, the Study's leaders welcomed feedback. For instance, an article by B. Lamar Johnson published in the *California Journal of Secondary Education* (CJSE) described the Study, the 1950 conference, and the list of goals that the participants had devised. A footnote advised that "readers of this article are invited to send the writer (in care of the School of Education at the University of California, Los Angeles) their criticisms of the statement of goals and suggestions for strengthening it."[222]

This conversation continued, particularly in the *CJSE*. As mentioned in chapter one, much of the 1951 volume of the *CJSE* was devoted to discussing the California Study and specific projects that had arisen from it. The California Study was also described in national outlets. For example, the Study was briefly described in the *Journal of the National Education Association*.[223] The Study was also used as a basis to discuss the citizenship component of general education in the *Junior College Journal*.[224] Moreover, specific portions of the final report were reprinted or adapted for a number of journals with specific foci. For instance, the chapters dealing with administration and advising were separately adapted for publication in the *Bulletin of the National Association of Secondary-School Principals*, the portion of the final report dealing with articulation was adapted for *The School Review*, and a chapter dealing with a variety of approaches to general education was adapted for *The Educational Record*.[225]

---

[221] An example of this is B. Lamar Johnson, "General Education in Action" *California Journal of Secondary Education* 26 (1951): 385-396.
[222] Johnson, "The California Study," 343.
[223] B. Lamar Johnson, "General Education in Junior Colleges," *Journal of the National Education Association* 41 (1952): 429-430.
[224] B. Lamar Johnson, "General Education for Citizenship," *Junior College Journal* 23 (1952): 91-97.
[225] B. Lamar Johnson, "Administration: Facilitating General Education in the Junior College," *Bulletin of the National Association of Secondary-School Principals* 36 (1952): 23-45; B. Lamar Johnson, "The Advising, Guidance, and Counseling of Junior College Students," *Bulletin of the National Association of Secondary-School*

In 1952, the final report appeared.[226] It was published by the American Council on Education, featured an introduction written by Earl J. McGrath, and the back cover suggested the volumes of the Cooperative Study in General Education as additional works of possible interest. Ultimately, 3,091 copies of were printed and "1,216 complementary copies were distributed to members of the Council and participating colleges in California."[227] The report was positively reviewed by the education editor of the *New York Times* as well as by the *Los Angeles Times*.[228] The report was also positively reviewed by educators such as Paul L. Dressel and Issac L. Kandel.[229] Moreover, it was positively reviewed by a number of community college faculty. For instance, the report was reviewed by Ruth E. Scarborough of Centenary Junior College Library in Hackettstown, N.J.[230]

Over the next few decades, a number of scholars pointed to the influence of the California Study, and the "widely read" final report both in the state and across the nation.[231] One scholar suggested that the California Study (and particularly the list of goals) "greatly affected the junior colleges of California. An examination of the sixty-four catalogs and forty accreditation studies received from the public junior colleges revealed either an exact quotation of general education purposes and objectives as stated in the report…or a rephrasing of them or

---

Principals 37 (1953): 19-36; B. Lamar Johnson, "Toward Better Relationships between Junior Colleges and High Schools," *The School Review* 60 (1952): 77-83; B. Lamar Johnson, "Approaches to General Education: A Report from California Junior Colleges," *The Educational Record* 33 (1952): 71-90.

[226] For a full discussion of the report, see Donald R. Matthews, Jr., "Perspective: General Education at the Community College, 1952-1978." (unpublished course essay, University of Florida, 1979), ERIC, ED 178 127.

[227] Arthur S. Adams to Robert M. Lester, 6 November 1952. Series III.A Grant Files, Box 75, Folder 6, CCNY Papers.

[228] Benjamin Fine, "Study of Junior Colleges Suggests Methods to Provide a Better 'General Education,'" *New York Times*, 20 July 1952; "State's Junior College Enrollment Tops Nation," *Los Angeles Times*, 18 August 1952.

[229] Paul L. Dressel, "Valuable Reading" review of *General Education in Action*, by B. Lamar Johnson, *Journal of Higher Education* 24 (1953): 221-222; Isaac L. Kandel, "Review of *General Education in Action*" Series III.A Grant Files, Box 75, Folder 6, CCNY Papers.

[230] Ruth E. Scarborough, 'General Education" review of *General Education in Action*, by B. Lamar Johnson, *College and Research Libraries* 14 (1953): 104-107.

[231] William Charles Himstreet, "A Study of Business Education in the Public Junior Colleges of California" (EdD diss., University of Southern California, 1955), 34.

statement similar to them. Of the sixty-four colleges studied, thirty-nine gave an exact quotation and twenty-five either paraphrased the statement found in Johnson's publication or had a statement which was found to be similar to it."[232] Another scholar discussing health education in community colleges noted that the report spurred a great deal of reform that moved the field of health education forward.[233]

However, there were some scholars who found that the influence of the California Study waned over time. In particular, A. James Hudson reviewed 103 community college catalogs in the early 1970s and found that while the California Study goals were often reproduced wholesale or inspired similar statements of objectives, institutions did not necessarily put these ideas into practice.[234] Hudson's study raises a larger point about general education reform. In many ways, it is no different than dusting one's house. One dusts, and at some point, dust will once again accumulate and settle. Does this suggest that the initial dusting was unsuccessful? Not really. It just suggests something about the nature of dust and dusting. This is the nature of dust: it reaccumulates after some time, both on shelves and curricula. Dusting is an enterprise where the results have limited shelf-life and the action must be repeated. The California Study leadership and many in the general education movement understood this, and recommended that reform be a constant and going concern and enterprise.

Conclusion

Despite those who believed its influence had waned by the early 1970s, the California Study of General Education in the Junior College was ultimately able to stimulate a fair bit of

---

[232] Malcolm Ray Robertson, "A Comparative Analysis of the General Education Programs in Church Related Colleges and Public Junior Colleges of California" (EdD diss., University of Southern California, 1967), 41.
[233] Sara Louise Smith, "Education Against Quackery at the College Level," *Journal of School Health* 34 (1964): 232.
[234] A. James Hudson, "A Descriptive Study of General Education in the Community Colleges in California—1972-73" (EdD diss., Brigham Young University, 1974); A. James Hudson and Ralph B. Smith, "Does General Education Have a Future?," *Community College Review* 4 (1976): 57-62.

tangible general education reform on the ground for institutions whose history of local control had often kept them from cooperating on that issue (and many others). It responded to the new political, economic, social, and cultural context of the postwar era and demonstrated that the community college was a viable institution capable of reforming its general education offerings to meet student demand. Perhaps its most impressive feat is how much it accomplished given the time and resources provided by philanthropic foundations. Conversely, the limited amount of support received suggested that a sea change was afoot and that members of the general education movement needed to rethink the way they would go about accomplishing their goals.

Chapter 5

Avoiding a Premature Obituary: The "Spirit" of the General Education Movement

> We don't recognize that there are wide varieties of schools, different kinds of children, backgrounds, conditions, different resources. We cannot talk about ideal things here without raising the question, what is my school like and how can I help improve it. My experience in the 77 years that I've been involved in education has been that you need to identify what it is that can be done in your own school, what resources you've got, and what steps are next…My experience is you start with the particular school, not with the general notion, and try to see what can be done step by step to improve it.[1]
>
> —Ralph W. Tyler

As the California Study of General Education in the Junior College completed its work and its report was released in 1952, the general education movement was still considered to be vibrant. Indeed, the movement itself would continue to capture interest and attention throughout the decade. One member, Murl C. Shawver, would reflect in a 1957 article that the movement "has been described as the single most important feature of American higher education today."[2] In addition to widespread interest, there was a healthy and multiplying body of literature that was created during much of the 1950s. "If the volume of literature on College curricular reorganization is an index," Shawver continued, "it would seem that most college faculties in American are re-examining certain of their aims and purposes in the light of general education objectives."[3] He was not alone in his assessment. In the 1968 Baldwin Lecture delivered at Northeast Missouri State College, Lewis B. Mayhew argued that "During the 1950s the general education movement generated perhaps the most vital literature of any concerned with higher education. Journals such as the *Journal of General Education, Journal of Higher Education and the Basic College Quarterly* were filled with discussions of new courses, approaches to teaching or the objectives of general education. Conference proceedings, anthologies of course

---

[1] Louis Rabin, Lee Shulman, John Goodlad, and Ralph Tyler, "Featured Symposium: Froth, Tinsel, and Substance in Teacher Education" in *Collaboration: Building Common*, 226.
[2] Murl C. Shawver, "A Few Issues Concerning Biology in General Education," *Science Education* 41 (1957): 219.
[3] Ibid.

descriptions and a number of monographs and research reports added volume and frequently insight to this literature."[4]

However, even as the journal literature was robust, the movement itself was beginning to suffer under the weight of a number of issues. Ultimately, these issues affected the engines that drove the movement: philanthropy, educational research, and inter and intra institutional cooperation. The first domino to fall was the shift of philanthropic foundations away from funding projects associated with the general education movement. Ultimately, the financial sustenance of the movement depended on the delicate interplay between the Rockefeller and Carnegie philanthropies. The burden shifted between each philanthropic group before both eventually stepped away. Though the Ford Foundation entered the higher education scene in 1952, general education reform was not one of its early interests.[5] This left the movement with little philanthropic support, thereby ensuring that general education reform was only possible on a small scale. Thus, intrainstitutional cooperation could be accomplished on a far more limited basis. Perhaps college teachers might attend a conference on teaching here or there, or perhaps a session on teaching might be offered at a disciplinary conference. Without heavy philanthropic funding, however, there would be no six-week workshops. There would also be fewer educational researchers to perform consultancies. Moreover, there would be fewer educational

[4] Lewis B. Mayhew, *General Education: A Reassessment, The Baldwin Lecture* (Kirksville, MO: Northeast Missouri State College/Simpson Printing Company, 1968), 11.

[5] For the early history of the Ford Foundation and its lack of emphasis on general education reform, see "Program Area Four: Education in a Democratic Society" in *Report of the Study for the Ford Foundation on Policy and Program* (Detroit: Ford Foundation, 1949), 79-89; Dwight Macdonald, *The Ford Foundation: The Men and the Millions* (New York: Reynal and Company, 1956), esp. chapter 4; Richard Magat, *The Ford Foundation at Work: Philanthropic Choices, Methods, and Styles* (New York: Plenum Press, 1979); Gregory K. Raynor, "Engineering Social Reform: The Rise of the Ford Foundation and Cold War Liberalism, 1908-1959" (PhD diss., New York University, 2000); Verne S. Atwater and Evelyn C. Walsh, *A Memoir of The Ford Foundation: The Early Years, 1936-1968, An Insider View of the Impact of Wealth and Good Intentions* (New York: Vantage Press, 2011), esp. chapter 6; Inderjeet Parmar, *Foundations of the American Century: The Ford, Carnegie, and Rockefeller Foundations in the Rise of American Power* (New York: Columbia University Press, 2012), esp. chapters 1-4; Thelin and Trollinger, *Philanthropy*, 81-83.

researchers trained in the methods of general education reform and applying for grants to apply these methods to other institutions.

Unsurprisingly, the curricula that were pioneered during the cooperative studies would need to be revised. Far too often, those revisions neglected to take into account the larger insights provided by the cooperative studies and the larger movement. Piecemeal revisions and faculty compromises without thought to overarching objectives would, in many cases, undo much of the work of the movement. This was often due to newer faculty members who were unfamiliar with the movement or had antipathy toward it. Historian Alston Chase termed this process "The Devolution of General Education." Describing the 1950s and 1960s, Chase noted that "General education was ambitious and demanded much of both students and faculty. It was time-consuming and interfered with preprofessional studies. Team-teaching difficulty to organize. The concept of core courses…was hard to realize. These logistical problems could be overcome, and often were. But they would seem insurmountable to those who did not accept or understand the goals of general education…The retirement of older faculty who had understood the (sometimes unspoken) intentions of general education also diminished support for it."[6] The curricula that emerged from these processes continued to be considered general education and products of the movement. As Chase correctly suggests, the movement was unrecognizable to its friends and its foes. Therefore, it was internally weakened by the time the student protests of the mid to late 1960s took aim at general education.

In the late 1960s, obituaries for the general education movement abounded. Under attack by various student movements, faculty apathy, and a plethora of other internal and external factors, general education seemed to be all but buried. Clark Kerr—both an astute observer of higher education and an administrator who found himself embroiled in the politics of the student

[6] Alston Chase, "The Rise and Fall of General Education, 1945-1980," *Academic Questions* 6 (1993): 30.

movements—would lay the blame on student protesters when he later recalled that "The near demise of general education was the greatest of the 'popular' academic 'reforms' of the 1960s."[7] Kerr, however, was not alone in his assessment. Many of his contemporaries held similar assumptions about student antipathy toward general education. Indeed, to many commentators, the existence of the student movements correlated strongly with the weakening of general education.[8] Students, it was believed, lived on a spectrum between apathy and antipathy in their views of general education. Regardless of the possible cause(s), the end of the general education movement seemed clear to all. By the early 1970s, general education had "almost disappeared from the higher education scene," with a commentator no less sympathetic than Earl J. McGrath warning that "one who resurrects this concept…does so at his own peril."[9] In the absence of "the image of general education as a national movement," there emerged "a diversity of specific programs that often had little in common."[10]

However, it is imperative to resist the urge to relegate the general education movement to a simple "rise and fall" story as so many have before. Rather, the movement continues to be, as one member noted in 1949, "a spirit, an ideal, and a way of life in the classroom which are of the essence of democracy. General education is achieved to the degree that a faculty 'catches' this spirit and feels the exhilaration of cooperating with other teachers and with students in a

---

[7] Kerr, *The Great Transformation in Higher Education*, 331.

[8] Kerr would be neither the first nor the last to suggest that the student protesters, conceived broadly, found general education to be anathema. See Samuel E. Kellams, "Students and the Decline of General Education," *Journal of General Education* 24 (1973): 217-230. See also the discussion of the issue in Robert A. Rhoades, "Student Protest and Multicultural Reform: Making Sense of Campus Unrest in the 1990s," *Journal of Higher Education* 69 (1998): 621-646.

[9] LeBlanc, "The Concept of General Education" 148; Earl J. McGrath, "Bring Back General Education!" *Change: The Magazine of Higher Learning* 4 (1972): 8.

[10] Miller, *The Meaning of General Education*, 143. These programs are discussed in Arthur Levine and John Weingart, *Reform of Undergraduate Education* (San Francisco: Jossey-Bass, 1973); Cornell University Center for Improvement of Undergraduate Education, *The Yellow Pages of Undergraduate Innovations* (Ithaca, NY: Cornell University, 1974); Gerald Grant and David Riesman, *The Perpetual Dream: Reform and Experiment in the American College* (Chicago: University of Chicago Press, 1978); Arthur Levine, *Handbook of the Undergraduate Curriculum* (San Francisco: Jossey-Bass, 1978); Alex Duke, *Importing Oxbridge: English Residential Colleges and American Universities* (New Haven: Yale University Press, 1996).

continuous learning process for all concerned. General education is not a finished achievement but a continuous quest."[11] Any campus that is dealing with the reform of general education curricula can learn much from the movement.

The first lesson of the movement was that the reform of general education—and all that it represents about having one's curricula be a reflection of their ideals—was not merely something that elite institutions were privileged to contest among themselves. Nor were the diverse institutions and individuals that made up secondary and postsecondary education simply passive recipients of curricula. The second lesson of the movement was the reform of the general education would need to negotiate the prime tension of democratic society: how to create a society that features the many benefits of collective action and common culture that is both inclusive of, and respectful of, individual autonomy.

The third lesson can be understood through a review of Craig Kridel and Robert V. Bullough, Jr.'s book *Stories of the Eight-Year Study* by historian Joseph Watras. In his review, Watras provided a light criticism in asking why "the model of reform from the Eight-Year Study fell out of popularity…why or how did authoritarian models of school reform replace the idea of cooperative curriculum planning? What is so attractive about the search for best practices that all schools should adopt?"[12] The answer: authoritarianism is intellectually and practically easier than democracy. Standardization of education is far easier than attempting to meet individual needs. Ultimately, authoritarianism and standardization skirt the tension of individuality and community, while providing the veneer of efficiency and, in some cases, fairness. This is why so many hold the "assumption…that standardization, efficiency, mobility, and equality are a set of

---

[11] Clarence E. Ficken, "General Education—Philosophy and Patterns, II" in *Current Trends in Higher Education: 1949*, 55.
[12] Joseph Watras, review of *Stories of the Eight-Year Study: Reexamining Secondary Education in America* by Craig Kridel and Robert V. Bullough, Jr., *History of Education Quarterly* 48 (2008): 325.

dominoes that will logically fall in that particular order."[13] The general education movement—with its national discussions and local implementation—sought to live up to democratic principles. Ultimately, it attempted to provide efficient methods to accomplish an inefficient task: the continual reform of general education.

[13] Kevin S. Zayed, review of *The Standardization of American Schooling: Linking Secondary and Higher Education, 1870-1910* by Mark A. VanOverbeke, *American Educational History Journal* 40 (2013): 383.

Appendix: The Cooperative Studies of General Education

Cooperative Study	Participating Institutions	Philanthropic Support	Organizational Support
Eight-Year Study	Altoona Senior High School, The Baldwin School, Beaver Country Day School, Bronxville High School, Cheltenham Township High School, The Dalton School, Denver Senior and Junior High Schools, Des Moines Senior and Junior High Schools, Eagle Rock High School, The Fieldston School, Francis W. Parker School, Friends' Central School, The George School, Germantown Friends School, The Horace Mann School for Girls, John Burroughs School, Lincoln School of Teachers College, Milton Academy, New Trier Township High School, North Shore Country Day School, Pelham High School, Radnor High School, Shaker High School, Tower Hill School, Tulsa Senior and Junior High Schools, University of Chicago High School, University High School, The University School of Ohio State University, Windsor School, Wisconsin High School[1]	Carnegie Foundation for the Advancement of Teaching, General Education Board of the Rockefeller Foundation	Progressive Education Association, Ohio State University, University of Chicago
Cooperative Study in General Education	Allegheny College, Antioch College, Ball State Teachers College, Bethany College, University of Denver, Hendrix College, Hiram College, Hope College, Iowa State College, Little Rock Junior College, University of Louisville, Michigan State College, Mills College, Muskingum College, Northwest Missouri State Teachers College, Olivet College, Park College, Pasadena Junior College, College of St. Catherine, Stephens College,	General Education Board of the Rockefeller Foundation	American Council on Education, North Central Association of Colleges and Universities, University of Chicago

[1] List taken from Kridel and Bullough Jr., "Appendix A: The Thirty Schools of the Commission on the Relation of School and College" in *Stories of the Eight-Year Study*, 225-235.

	Talladega College, and the College of Wooster. During the course of the Study, the following colleges withdrew: Bethany College, University of Denver, Hiram College, Hope College, Mills College, Olivet College, and the College of Wooster. The following colleges were not originally members of the Study but joined it: Centre College of Kentucky, Fisk University, and Macalester College.[2]		
California Study of General Education in the Junior College	Fifty-seven of the following fifty-nine institutions participated: Antelope Valley Junior College, Bakersfield College, Central Junior College, Chaffey College, Citrus Junior College, City College of San Francisco, Coalinga College, College of Marin, College of the Sequoias, Compton College, East Contra Costa Junior College, East Los Angeles Junior College, El Camino College, Fresno Junior College, Fullerton Junior College, Glendale College, Grant Technical College, Hartnell College, John Muir College, Lassen Junior College, Long Beach City College, Los Angeles City College, Los Angeles Harbor Junior College, Los Angeles Metropolitan Junior College, Los Angeles Trade-Technical Junior College, Los Angeles Valley Junior College, Modesto Junior College, Monterey Junior College, Mount San Antonio College, Napa Junior College, Oceanside-Carlsbad College, Orange Coast College, Palomar College, Palo Verde College, Pasadena City College, Pierce School of Agriculture, Placer College, Porterville College, Reedley College, Riverside College, Sacramento Junior College, San Benito County Junior	Carnegie Foundation for the Advancement of Teaching	American Council on Education, California State Junior College Association, California State Department of Education, School of Education of the University of California at Los Angeles

[2] List taken from *Cooperation in General Education*, ix.

	College, San Bernardino Valley College, San Diego Junior College, San Jose District Junior College, San Luis Obispo Junior College, San Mateo Junior College, Santa Ana College, Santa Barbara Junior College, Santa Maria Junior College, Santa Monica Junior College, Santa Rosa Junior College, Shasta College, Stockton College, Taft Junior College, Vallejo College, Ventura Junior College, West Contra Costa Junior College, Yuba College. The University of California at Los Angeles, the University of California at Berkeley, Stanford University, and the University of Southern California also sent representatives to join in the discussions.[3]		

[3] List taken from Johnson, "Appendix: List of California Junior Colleges" in *General Education in Action*, 399-400.

Bibliography

"A Bibliography of Studies of Students' Needs: February 1940." Chicago: Cooperative Study in General Education, 1940.

"A Liberal College in the Making: Reports by Four Faculty Committees of the School of Science and Literatures." Special Issue. *Oklahoma Agriculture and Mechanical College Bulletin* 34 (1937): 1-44.

Adler, Mortimer J. "Freedom Through Discipline: Elective System Defeats Purpose of Liberal Education." *Vital Speeches of the Day* 10 (1944): 380-82.

Aikin, Wilford M. Foreword to *Appraising and Recording Student Progress*, edited by Eugene R. Smith, Ralph W. Tyler, and the evaluation staff, xvii-xix. New York: Harper and Brothers, 1942.

———. *The Story of the Eight-Year Study: With Conclusions and Recommendations.* New York: Harper & Brothers, 1942.

———. "What's Wrong with our Schools?" *New York Times,* Sept. 7, 1941.

———. "The Eight Year Study Moves Forward." *Thirty Schools Bulletin: An Occasional Publication for the Teachers in the Study of the Relation of the School and College* 1 (1937): 1-2.

———. "The First Years of the Eight-Year Experimental Study." *Educational Record* 17 (1936): 70-77.

———. "The Purposes of the Eight-Year Experimental Study." *Educational Record* 16 (1935): 107-120.

———. "Study Plan Tried Out." *New York Times,* March 17, 1935.

———. "20 Schools Picked for Modern Test" *New York Times*, Jan. 15, 1933.

———. "Leeway for the Schools." *New York Times*, Sept. 25, 1932.

———. "High Schools Begin a Big Experiment." *New York Times*, June 4, 1933.

———. "Bibliography of Articles Describing the Work of the Commission of the Relation of School and College of the Progressive Education Association." Unpublished. Ohio State University Library. Columbus, Ohio.

Aikin, Wilford F. (sic). "The Experiment as Directed by the Progressive Education Committee." *North Central Association Quarterly* 9 (1934): 350-352.

Aikin, Wilford and Marjorie Aikin. "The Eight-Year Study of the Progressive Education Association: The Thirty Schools Have Some Evidence." *Educational Method* 20 (1941): 307-311.

Alberty, H.B. "The Social Philosophy of the School." *Thirty Schools Bulletin: An Occasional Publication for the Teachers in the Study of the Relation of the School and College* 1 (1937): 6-11.

Alexander, Jennifer Karns. *The Mantra of Efficiency: From Waterwheel to Social Control*. Baltimore: Johns Hopkins University Press, 2008.

Alexander, William M. and J. Galen Saylor. *Modern Secondary Education: Basic Principles and Practices.* New York: Holt, Rinehart and Winston, 1959.

Alirangues, Leon. “The Experimentalist Curriculum Paradigm.” PhD diss., Rutgers University. 2002).

Allardyce, Gilbert. “The Rise and Fall of the Western Civilization Course.” *American Historical Review* 87 (1982): 695-725.

———. “The Rise and Fall of the Western Civilization Course: A Reply.” *American Historical Review* 87 (1982): 739-743.

Allen, James Sloan. *The Romance of Commerce and Culture: Capitalism. Modernism. and the Chicago-Aspen Crusade for Cultural Reform* revised edition (Boulder: University Press of Colorado. 2002).

Allison, Clinton B. “Early Professors of Education: Three Case Studies” in *The Professors of Teaching: An Inquiry*, edited by Richard Wisniewski and Edward R. Ducharme, 29-51. Albany: State University of New York Press, 1989

Alonzo G. Grace. “Education Under Hitler.” In *Leadership in American Education*, ed. Alonzo G. Grace, 1-6. Chicago: University of Chicago Press, 1950.

Alpers, Benjamin L. *Dictators. Democracy. and American Public Culture: Envisioning the Totalitarian Enemy. 1920s–1950s*. Chapel Hill: University of North Carolina Press, 2003.

Altbach, Philip G., Robert O. Berdahl and Patricia J. Gumport. *Higher Education in American Society*. Amherst, NY: Prometheus Books, 1994.

Altbach, Philip G. *Student Politics in America: A Historical Analysis*. New Brunswick, NJ: Transaction Publishers, 1974/1997.

Altschuler, Glenn C. and Stuart M. Blumin. *The GI Bill: A New Deal for Veterans*. New York: Oxford University Press, 2009.

American Council on Education. *Cooperation in General Education: A Final Report of the Executive Committee of the Cooperative Study in General Education*, Washington D.C.: American Council on Education, 1947.

———. *Annual Report, 1940*. Washington, D.C.: American Council on Education, 1941.

———. *Annual Report, 1939.* Washington, D.C.: Author, 1940

———. *Annual Report, 1938.* Washington, D.C.: Author, 1939.

———. History and Activities. Washington, D.C.: American Council on Education, 1938.

An Exploratory Compilation of Resource Materials for Science. Mathematics and Health in General Education. Prepared by the Workshop at the University of California. Los Angeles, edited by Workshop Committee on Science, Mathematics and Health. Los Angeles: The California Study of General Education in the Junior College, 1951.

Anderson, Betty S. *The American University of Beirut: Arab Nationalism and Liberal Education* (Austin: University of Texas Press, 2011)

Anderson, J.M. “Why Community College Students Need Great Books.” *New Directions for Community Colleges* 163 (2013): 41-50.

Angus, David L. and Jeffrey E. Mirel. *The Failed Promise of the American High School, 1890-1995* New York: Teachers College Press, 1999.

Ankrum, Ward Elwood. "The Implementation of Educational Philosophy and a Program of Educational Research in the Curricular Growth of Stephens College." EdD diss., University of Missouri, 1951.

Antonelli, George A. "Ralph W. Tyler and the Curriculum Arena: A Historical Interpretation." PhD diss., Southern Illinois University, 1971.

Arnold, Gordon B. "Symbolic Politics and Institutional Boundaries in Curriculum Reform: The Case of National Sectarian University." *Journal of Higher Education* 75 (2004): 572-593.

'"Art of Living' Told Rotarians." *Bay City Times*. 7 March 1945.

Arthur, Mikaila Mariel Lemonik. *Student Activism and Curricular Change in Higher Education.* Burlington, VT: Ashgate, 2011.

Ashmore, Harry S. *The Higher Learning in America*. New Brunswick, NJ: Transaction Publishers, 1995.

Atwater, Verne S. and Evelyn C. Walsh. *A Memoir of the Ford Foundation: The Early Years, 1936-1968. An Insider View of the Impact of Wealth and Good Intentions.* New York: Vantage Press, 2011.

Awbrey, Susan M. "General Education Reform as Organizational Change: Integrating Cultural and Structural Change." *Journal of General Education* 54 (2004): 1-21.

Axtell, James. *Wisdom's Workshop: The Rise of the Modern University.* Princeton: Princeton University Press, 2016.

Baker, James Keith. "The Evolution of the Concept of General Education." PhD diss., Yale University, 1947.

Badger, Anthony J. *The New Deal: The Depression Years, 1933-1940.* Chicago: Ivan R. Dee, 1989.

Barnard, Eunice. "Progressives Hail New Type School." *New York Times,* Aug. 1, 1937.

Barnard, J. Darrell. "Workshops in General Education for College Teachers." *Journal of Educational Sociology* 24 (1951): 272-277.

Barnes, Richard A. "Discovering Student Needs: A Questionnaire Study Including Alumni and Undergraduate Opinion." *Journal of Higher Education* 12 (1941): 469-472.

Barton, Jr., George E. Jr. "The Derivation and Clarification of Objectives." *Journal of Educational Research* 41 (1948): 624-639.

The Basic College Enrollment Officer's Handbook 1954-1955. East Lansing: Michigan State College, 1954.

Bastedo, Michael N. "Curriculum in Higher Education: The Organizational Dynamics of Academic Reform." In *American Higher Education in the Twenty-First Century: Social, Political, and Economic Challenges,* fourth edition, edited by Michael N. Bastedo, Philip G. Altbach, and Patricia J. Gumport, 60-83. Baltimore: Johns Hopkins University Press, 2016.

Baum, Eugene Lyle. "History of the Commission on Relation of School and College of the Progressive Education Association. 1930-1942." PhD diss., Washington University, 1969.

Baxter, James P. III and J.R.N. Maxwell. "Reconstruction of Liberal Education." *Association of American Colleges Bulletin* 30 (1944): 76-82.

Bayley. David H. "The Emptiness of Curriculum Reform." *Journal of Higher Education* 43 (1972): 591-600.

Beach, J.M. *Gateway to Opportunity: A History of the Community College in the United States.* Sterling, VA: Stylus Publishing, 2010.

Bell, Daniel. *The Reforming of General Education: The Columbia College Experience in its National Setting.* New York: Columbia University Press, 1966.

Benander, Ruth. "Redesigning Courses from the Ground Up: From Outcomes to Assessment to Activities." In *Developing Faculty Learning Communities at Two-Year Colleges: Collaborative Models to Improve Teaching and Learning,* edited by Susan Sipple and Robin Lightner, 60-76. Sterling. VA: Stylus Publishing, 2013.

Bender, Thomas. "Politics. Intellect. and the American University. 1945-1995." *Daedalus* 126 (1997): 1-38.

———. "The Cultures of Intellectual Life: The City and the Professions." In *Intellect and Public Life, Between Radicalism and Reform,* edited by Leon Fink, Stephen T. Leonard, and Donald M. Reid, 3-15. Ithaca: Cornell University Press, 1996.

———. *Intellect and Public Life: Essays on the Social History of Academic Intellectuals in the United States*. Baltimore: Johns Hopkins University Press, 1993.

Benjamin, Harold. "The Curriculum and Social Education." In *Opportunities for Education in the Next Decade,* edited by E.T. McSwain and Jack R. Childress, 23-28. Chicago: University of Chicago, 1951.

Benedict, Agnes E. *Dare our Secondary Schools Face the Atomic Age?: A Stirring Challenge Based on the Eight-Year Study.* New York: Hinds, Hayden & Eldredge, 1947.

Benezet, Louis T. *General Education in the Progressive College*. New York: Arno Press, 1943/1971.

Berg, Herbert Andrew. *Financial Support of Michigan Agricultural College During Formative Years with Emphasis on the College Swamp Lands*. East Lansing: Michigan State University Press, 1966.

———. *The State of Michigan and the Morrill Land Grant Act of 1862*. East Lansing: Michigan State University Press, 1965.

Bergman, George J. "Definitions of General Education." *Journal of Educational Administration and Supervision* 33 (1947): 460-468.

Bergstresser, John L. "Evaluating Our Students in Colleges." *Thirty Schools Bulletin: An Occasional Publication for the Teachers in the Study of the Relation of the School and College* 1 (1937): 20-23.

Bernstein, Alison R. *Funding the Future: Philanthropy's Influence on American Higher Education.* Lanham, MD: Rowman and Littlefield Education, 2014.

Biebel, Charles D. "Private Foundations and Public Policy: The Case of Secondary Education during the Great Depression." *History of Education Quarterly* 16 (1976): 3-33.

Biehn, Kersten Jacobson. “Improving Mankind: Philanthropic Foundations and the Development of American University Research between the World Wars.” PhD diss., Rice University, 2006.

Birnbaum, Robert and Frank Shushok, Jr. “The ‘Crisis’ Crisis in Higher Education: Is that a Wolf or a Pussycat at the Academy’s Door?” In *In Defense of American Higher Education,* edited by Philip G. Altbach, Patricia J. Gumport, and D. Bruce Johnstone, 59-84. Baltimore: Johns Hopkins University Press, 2001.

Bisesi, Michael Ralph. “General Education: Case Studies and Policy Implications for Texas Colleges and Universities” PhD diss., University of Houston, 1980.

———. “Historical Developments in American Undergraduate Education: General Education and the Core Curriculum.” *British Journal of Educational Studies* 30 (1982): 199-212

Blackburn, Robert, et al. “Changing Practices in Undergraduate Education.” Berkeley: Carnegie Council on Policy Studies in Higher Education, 1976.

Blackmore, Paul and Camille B. Kandiko, eds. *Strategic Curriculum Change: Global Trends in Universities.* New York: Routledge, 2012.

Blaesser, Willard W. et al. *Student Personnel Work in the Postwar College.* Washington, D.C.: American Council on Education, 1945.

Blocker, Clyde E. Floyd S. Elkins. and Fred H. Bremer. *Philanthropy for American Junior Colleges.* Washington, D.C.: American Association of Junior Colleges, 1965.

Blocker, Clyde E., Robert H. Plummer. and Richard C. Richardson. Jr.. *The Two-Year College: A Social Synthesis.* Englewood Cliffs, NJ: Prentice-Hall, 1965.

Bloland, Harland G. *Creating the Council for Higher Education Accreditation (CHEA)*. Phoenix: Oryx Press, 2001.

Bobbitt, Franklin. “General Education in the High School.” *School Review* 43 (1935): 257-267.

Bogue, Jesse Parker. *The Community College.* New York: McGraw-Hill, 1950.

Bolman, Frederick deW. “University Reform and Institutional Research.” *Journal of Higher Education* 41 (1970): 85-97.

Boning, Kenneth J. “Assessing Coherence in General Education Programs” PhD diss., Saint Louis University, 2006.

———. “Coherence in General Education: A Historical Look.” *Journal of General Education* 56 (2007): 1-16.

Borchers, Gladys L. Interview by Donna S. Taylor. September-November. 1972. University of Wisconsin University Archives Oral History Project. transcript. University of Wisconsin-Madison University Archive. Madison. WI.

Borgwardt, Elizabeth. *A New Deal for the World: America’s Vision for Human Rights.* Cambridge: The Belknap Press of Harvard University Press, 2005.

Botstein, Leon. “Wisdom Reconsidered: Robert Maynard Hutchins’ *The Higher Learning in America* Revisited.” In *Philosophy for Education,* edited by Seymour Fox, 17-38. Jerusalem: The Van Leer Jerusalem Foundation, 1983.

Bower, Kevin P. "'A Favored Child of the State': Federal Student Aid at Ohio Colleges and Universities, 1934-1943." *History of Education Quarterly* 44 (2004): 364-387.

Bowers, C.A. *The Progressive Educator and the Depression: The Radical Years.* New York: Random House, 1969.

The Boyer Commission on Educating Undergraduates in the Research Universities. *Reinventing Undergraduate Education: A Blueprint for America's Research Universities.* Stony Brook, NY: Author, 1998.

Boyer, Ernest L. *Common Learning: A Carnegie Colloquium on General Education.* Washington, D.C.: The Carnegie Foundation for the Advancement of Teaching, 1981.

Boyer, Ernest L. and Arthur Levine. *A Quest for Common Learning: The Aims of General Education*. Washington, D.C.: The Carnegie Foundation for the Advancement of Teaching, 1981.

Boyer, John W. *The University of Chicago: A History.* Chicago: University of Chicago Press, 2015.

———. *A Twentieth-Century Cosmos: The New Plan and the Origins of General Education at Chicago*. Chicago: College of the University of Chicago, 2007.

———. *The "Persistence to Keep Everlastingly At It:" Fund-Raising and Philanthropy at Chicago in the Twentieth Century*. Chicago: College of the University of Chicago, 2004.

Brandser, Gry Cathrin. "The Harvard Report and the Limits of Liberal Education: Lessons for Europe." In *Academic Identities—Academic Challenges?: American and European Experience of the Transformation of Higher Education and Research,* edited by Tor Halvorsen and Atle Nyhagen, 294-339. Newcastle upon Tyne: Cambridge Scholars Publishing, 2011.

Bremner, Robert H. *American Philanthropy,* 2nd ed. Chicago: University of Chicago Press, 1988.

Bresciani, Marilee J. "The Challenges of Assessing General Education: Questions to Consider." In *Assessing Student Learning in General Education: Good Practice Case Studies,* edited by Marilee J. Bresciani, 1-15. Bolton. MA: Anker Publishing Company, 2007.

Brewer, Joseph and Donald Heiges. "The Search for Unity in Higher Education." *Harvard Educational Review* 16 (1946): 21-43.

Briggs, Charlotte L. "Curriculum Collaboration: A Key to Continuous Program Renewal." *Journal of Higher Education* 78 (2007): 676-711.

Brint, Steven. "Focus on the Classroom: Movements to Reform College Teaching and Learning. 1980-2008." In *The American Academic Profession: Transformation in Contemporary Higher Education,* edited by Joseph C. Hermanowicz, 44-91. Baltimore: Johns Hopkins University Press, 2011.

Brint, Steven, et al. "General Education Models: Continuity and Change in the U.S. Undergraduate Curriculum. 1975-2000." *Journal of Higher Education* 80 (2009): 605-642.

Brint, Steven, et. al. “From the Liberal to the Practical Arts in American Colleges and Universities: Organizational Analysis and Curricular Change.” *Journal of Higher Education* 76 (2005): 151-180.

Brint, Steven and Jerome Karabel. *The Diverted Dream: Community Colleges and the Promise of Educational Opportunity in America. 1900-1985.* New York: Oxford University Press, 1989.

Broad, T.H. “Democracy in Administration and the New Curriculum.” *High School Journal* 22 (1939): 295-298.

Brown, Hugh S. and Lewis B. Mayhew. *American Higher Education.* New York: The Center for Applied Research in Education, 1965.

Brubacher, John S. “The Challenge to Philosophize about Education.” In *Modern Philosophies and Education: The Fifty-fourth Yearbook of the National Society for the Study of Education, Part I,* edited by Nelson B. Henry, 4-16. Chicago: University of Chicago Press, 1955.

Brumbaugh, Aaron J. “The Purpose and Scope of General Education.” In *Administrative Adjustments Required by Socio-Economic Change,* edited by William C. Reavis, 57-68. Chicago: University of Chicago Press, 1941.

Buddy, Fred W. “George Frederick Zook: An Analysis of Selected Contributions of an American Educator.” PhD diss., University of Akron, 1990.

Bullough, Jr., Robert V. “Professional Learning Communities and the Eight-Year Study.” *Educational Horizons* 85 (2007): 168-180.

———. *Democracy in Education: Boyd H. Bode.* Bayside, NY: General Hall, 1981.

Bullough, Jr., Robert V. and Craig Kridel. “Adolescent Needs. Curriculum and the Eight-Year Study.” *Journal of Curriculum Studies* 35 (2003): 151-169.

Burrage, Michael, ed. *Martin Trow: Twentieth-Century Higher Education: Elite to Mass to Universal.* Baltimore: Johns Hopkins University Press, 2010.

Butche, Robert W. *Image of Excellence: The Ohio State University School.* New York: Peter Lang, 2000.

Butts, R. Freeman. *The College Charts Its Course: Historical Conceptions and Current Proposals*. New York: McGraw-Hill Book Company, 1939.

Buxton, William J. “Communication Practice and Theory in the ‘New Humanities’ and ‘New General-Education’ Programs of Rockefeller Philanthropy.” In *Patronizing the Public: American Philanthropy’s Transformation of Communication, Culture, and the Humanities,* edited by William J. Buxton, 65-76. Lanham. MD: Lexington Books, 2009.

Caldwell, Brenda Sue. “W.H. Cowley: A Life in Higher Education” PhD diss., University of Oklahoma, 1983.

California Postsecondary Education Commission. “One World in Common: General Education in Historical, National, and Statewide Context. Commission Report 81-27” Sacramento: Author, 1981.

Callahan, Raymond E. *Education and the Cult of Efficiency: A Study of the Social Forces that have Shaped the Administration of the Public Schools.* Chicago: University of Chicago Press, 1962.

Camp, E.J. et. al. "Test Questions for Mathematics in General Education." In *Proceedings of the Workshop in Genera Education. University of Chicago, 1940. Volume VI: Science*, 239-246. Chicago: Cooperative Study in General Education, 1941.

Capeci, Jr., Dominic J. *Race Relations in Wartime Detroit*. Philadelphia: Temple University Press, 1984.

Cardozier, V.R. *Colleges and Universities in World War II*. Westport, CT.: Praeger, 1993.

Carlin, Edward A. and Edward Blackman, eds. *Curriculum Building in General Education.* Dubuque, IA.: W.C. Brown, 1960.

Carnochan, W.B. *The Battleground of the Curriculum: Liberal Education and American Experience*. Stanford: Stanford University Press, 1993.

Carpenter, James. "Thomas Jefferson and the Ideology of Democratic Schooling." *Democracy & Education* 21 (2013): 1-11.

Carpenter, Marjorie. "The General Course in Humanities at Stephens College." In *The Humanities in General Education*, edited by Earl J. McGrath, 137-151. Dubuque, IA: Wm. C. Brown Company, 1949.

Case, Chester H. "Reformulating General Education Programs." In *Issues for Community College Leaders in a New Era,* edited by George B. Vaughan and Associates, 100-121. San Francisco: Jossey-Bass, 1983.

Casey, Steven. *Cautious Crusade: Franklin D. Roosevelt. American Public Opinion. and the War Against Nazi Germany.* New York: Oxford University Press, 2001.

Center for Studies in Higher Education at the University of California. Berkeley. "General Education in the 21st Century: A Report of the University of California Commission on General Education in the 21st Century." Berkeley: Author, 2007.

Chaddock, Katherine E. and Anna Janosik Cooke. "Endurance Testing: Histories of Liberal Education in U.S. Higher Education." In *Higher Education: Handbook of Theory and Research. Volume 30*, 187-244, edited by Michael B. Paulsen, Dordrecht: Springer, 2015.

Chaddock, Katherine Elise. *The Multi-Talented Mr. Erskine: Shaping Mass Culture Through Great Books and Fine Music*. New York: Palgrave Macmillan, 2012.

Chambers, M.M. "A Cooperative Research Enterprise: The American Youth Commission." *Educational Method* 20 (1941): 270-274.

Chambers, William N. "General Education—Philosophy and Patterns. Part I." In *Current Trends in Higher Education: 1949. Official Group Reports of the Fourth Annual National Conference on Higher Education. Held at Chicago. Illinois. April 4-7. 1949*, edited by Ralph W. MacDonald, 45-50. Washington, D.C.: Department of Higher Education, National Education Association of the United States, 1949.

Charters, W.W. "Four Convergent Trends in General Education." *Journal of Higher Education* 15 (1944): 307-314.

———. “Patterns of Courses in General Education.” *Journal of General Education* 1 (1946): 58-63.

Chase, Alston. “The Rise and Fall of General Education, 1945-1980.” *Academic Questions* 6 (1993): 21-36.

Cheit, Earl F. *The Useful Arts and the Liberal Tradition*. Washington D.C.: The Carnegie Foundation for the Advancement of Teaching, 1975.

Chintala, Eugene M. “Professional Education Associations’ Involvement in President Truman’s Commission Report on Higher Education.” PhD diss., Bowling Green State University, 1998.

Ciepley, David. *Liberalism in the Shadow of Totalitarianism.* Cambridge: Harvard University Press, 2006.

Cisneros, Jes Raul. “The Civilian Conservation Corps as Educational Technology, 1933-1942.” PhD diss., Northern Illinois University, 2010.

Clark, Burton R. *On Higher Education: Selected Writings, 1956-2006.* Baltimore: Johns Hopkins University Press, 2008.

———. *The Open Door College: A Case Study*. New York: McGraw-Hill, 1960.

Clark, Daniel A. “‘The Two Joes Meet, Joe College, Joe Veteran’: The G.I. Bill, College Education, and Postwar American Culture.” *History of Education Quarterly* 38 (1998): 165-189.

Clark, William. *Academic Charisma and the Origins of the Research University*. Chicago: University of Chicago Press, 2006.

Clive, Alan. *State of War: Michigan in World War II*. Ann Arbor: University of Michigan Press, 1979.

Coffman, Lotus D. “The Efficacy of the Depression in Promoting Self-Examination.” In *Needed Readjustments in Higher Education*, edited by William S. Gray, 10-24. Chicago: University of Chicago Press, 1933.

Cohen, Arthur M, Florence B. Brawer. and Carrie B. Kisker. *The American Community College*. Sixth edition. San Francisco: Jossey-Bass, 2014.

Cohen, Arthur M. “The Case for General Education in Community Colleges.” (Paper presented at the Forum on Future Purposes, Content, and Formats for the General Education of Community College Students, Montgomery College, Maryland, May 22, 1978).

———. “Political Influences on Curriculum and Instruction.” *New Directions for Community Colleges* 7 (1974): 39-53.

Cohen, Lizabeth. *A Consumers’ Republic: The Politics of Mass Consumption in Postwar America.* New York: Vintage Books, 2003.

———. *Making a New Deal: Industrial Workers in Chicago, 1919-1939.* New York: Cambridge University Press, 1990.

Cohen, Michael D. and James G. March. *Leadership and Ambiguity: The American College President*, 2nd ed. Boston: Harvard Business School Press, 1986.

Cohen, Ronald D. *Children of the Mill: Schooling and Society in Gary, Indiana, 1906-1960*. Bloomington: Indiana University Press, 1990.

Cole, Wade M. "Mandated Multiculturalism: An Analysis of Core Curricula at Tribal and Historically Black Colleges." *Poetics: Journal of Empirical Research on Culture, the Media and the Arts* 38 (2010): 485.

Coleman, Steven R. "To Promote Creativity. Democracy. and Community: The Progressive Colleges of the 1920s and 1930s" PhD diss., Columbia University, 2000.

Commager, Henry Steele. "Social, Political, Economic, and Personal Consequences." In *Universal Higher Education,* edited by Earl J. McGrath, 1-18. New York: McGraw-Hill, 1966.

Commission on the Relation of School and College of the Progressive Education Association. "Report of the Third Annual Conference of the Eight Year Study: Thousand Island Park, New York, June 24-28, 1935." Columbus, OH: The Spahr Glenn Company, 1935.

Commission on the Relation of School and College. "Report of the Third Annual Conference." *Journal of Higher Education* 6 (1935): 387-392.

Committee on the Function of English in General Education. *Language in General Education.* New York: D-Appleton-Century Company, 1940.

Committee on the Function of Mathematics in General Education. *Mathematics in General Education.* New York: D. Appleton-Century, 1940.

Committee on the Function of the Social Studies in General Education. *The Social Studies in General Education*. New York: D. Appleton-Century Company, 1940.

Committee on the Objectives of a General Education in a Free Society. *General Education in a Free Society: Report of the Harvard Committee.* Cambridge: Harvard University Press, 1945.

Conkin, Paul K. with Henry Lee Swint and Patricia S. Miletich. *Gone with the Ivy: A Biography of Vanderbilt University.* Knoxville: University of Tennessee Press, 1985.

Conrad, Clifton F. "At the Crossroads: General Education in Community Colleges." Washington, D.C.: American Association of Community and Junior Colleges, 1983.

———. *The Undergraduate Curriculum: A Guide to Innovation and Reform.* Boulder: Westview Press, 1978.

Conrad, Lawrence H. *Teaching Creative Writing*. New York: D. Appleton-Century Company, 1937.

"Constitution of the American Council on Education: As Amended at the Annual Meeting of the Council, May 5, 1933" *Educational Record* 14 (1933): 434-436.

Cook, Albert John. "Members of the Early Faculty." In *Semi-Centennial Celebration of Michigan State Agricultural College. 1857-1907,* 71-81. Chicago: University of Chicago Press, 1908.

Cooney, Terry A. *Balancing Acts: American Thought and Culture in the 1930s.* New York: Twayne Publishers, 1995.

Cooper, Russell M. “The Rise of General Education.” *Journal of the National Education Association* 39 (1950): 30-31.

———. “Faculty Adventures in Educational Planning.” *Journal of General Education* 2 (1947): 35-40.

———. “How Colleges Are Meeting the Emergency.” In *The Colleges in Wartime: New Responsibilities: Proceedings of a Conference of Invited College Representatives Held at the University of Chicago, December 29 and 30. 1942*, edited by John Dale Russell, 30-32. Chicago: University of Chicago, 1943.

Cooper, Russell M. and Margaret B. Fisher. *The Vision of a Contemporary University: A Case Study of Expansion and Development in American Higher Education. 1950-1975.* Tampa: University Presses of Florida, 1982.

“Cooperative Study Staff Has Workshop” *The Catherine Wheel*. 24 November 1939.

Copa, George H. and Virginia H. Pease. “The Comprehensive High School: An Historical Perspective.” Berkeley, CA: National Center for Research in Vocational Education, 1992.

Corey, Stephen M. “Co-Operative Staff Work.” *School Review* 52 (1944): 336-345.

Cornelison, E.D. “Terminal Education in the Pasadena Program.” In *Terminal Education in Higher Institutions: With Special Reference to the Readjustment of Higher Education to Meet Current National Needs,* edited by John Dale Russell, 109-114. Chicago: University of Chicago Press, 1942.

Cornell University Center for Improvement of Undergraduate Education. *The Yellow Pages of Undergraduate Innovations.* Ithaca, NY: Cornell University, 1974.

Cottrell, Donald P. “The University and General Education.” *Social Frontier* 5 (1938): 9-15.

Cowley, W.H. “Two and a Half Centuries of Institutional Research.” In *College Self Study: Lectures on Institutional Research,* edited by Richard G. Axt and Hall T. Sprague, 1-16. Boulder, CO: Western Interstate Commission for Higher Education, 1959.

———. “Six Plans for General Education” in *Utah Conference on Higher Education: A New Era in Higher Education 1946*, 21-35. Salt Lake City: Utah State Department of Public Instruction, 1946.

———. “Freedom and Discipline.” *Educational Record* 25 (1944): 5-22.

———. “Financial Retrenchment and Lower Grade Students.” *Journal of Higher Education* 27 (1934): 430-434

Cox, Rebecca D. *The College Fear Factor: How Students and Professors Misunderstand One Another.* Cambridge: Harvard University Press, 2009.

Cremin, Lawrence A. *The Transformation of the School: Progressivism in American Education. 1876-1957.* New York: Vintage Books, 1961.

Crighton, John C. *Stephens: A Story of Educational Innovation.* Columbia, MO: The American Press, 1970.

Cross, K. Patricia. “Thirty Years Have Passed: Trends in General Education.” *New Directions for Community Colleges* 40 (1982): 11-20.

Cross, Timothy P. *An Oasis of Order: The Core Curriculum at Columbia College*. New York: Office of the Deanm Columbia College, 1995.

Cuban, Larry. *Inside the Black Box of Classroom Practice: Change Without Reform in American Education.* Cambridge: Harvard Education Press, 2013.

———. *Hugging the Middle: How Teachers Teach in an Era of Testing and Accountability*. New York: Teachers College Press, 2009.

———. *How Scholars Trumped Teachers: Change Without Reform in University Curriculum, Teaching, and Research, 1890-1990*. New York: Teachers College Press, 1999.

———. *How Teachers Taught: Constancy and Change in American Classrooms, 1880-1990,* 2nd ed. New York: Teachers College Press, 1993.

David, Jane L. and Larry Cuban. *Cutting Through the Hype: The Essential Guide to School Reform,* revised, expanded. and updated edition. Cambridge: Harvard Education Press, 2010.

Davis, Calvin Olin. *A History of the North Central Association of Colleges and Secondary Schools. 1895-1945.* Ann Arbor. MI: The North Central Association of Colleges and Secondary Schools, 1945.

———. *The North Central Association of Colleges and Secondary Schools: Aims. Organization. Activities.* Ann Arbor. MI: The North Central Association of Colleges and Secondary Schools, 1932.

Davis, Harvey H. "Organization of the Faculty for Effective Instruction, Student Relations, and Research." In *The Administration of Higher Institutions Under Changing Conditions,* edited by Norman Burns, 85-91. Chicago: University of Chicago Press, 1947.

Davis, Jr., O.L. "The American School Curriculum Goes to War, 1941-1945: Oversight. Neglect, and Discovery." *Journal of Curriculum and Supervision* 8 (1993): 112-127.

Day, Edmund Ezra. *Education for Freedom and Responsibility: Selected Essays*. Freeport, NY: Books for Libraries Press,1952/1971.

de Bary, Wm. Theodore. *The Great Civilized Conversation: Education for a World Community.* New York: Columbia University Press, 2013.

DePaola, Pier Luigi Gregory. "Managing National Educational Change: The Case of the Eight Year Study." PhD diss., Indiana University, 1977.

Desrosieres, Alain. "The Part in Relation to the Whole: How to Generalise?: The Prehistory of Representative Sampling." In *The Social Survey in Historical Perspective, 1880-1940,* edited by Martin Bulmer, Kevin Bales, and Kathryn Kish Sklar, 217-244. New York: Cambridge University Press, 1991.

Diederich, Paul B. *Thirty Schools Tell Their Story*. New York: Harper and Brothers, 1943.

"Directory of Interests of Faculty Members in the Colleges: September, 1940." Chicago: Cooperative Study in General Education, 1940

Dongerkery, S.R. *Some Experiments in General Education.* Bombay: University of Bombay, 1955.

Dorn, Charles. *American Education, Democracy, and the Second World War.* New York: Palgrave Macmillan, 2007.

Dougherty, Kevin J. *The Contradictory College: The Conflicting Origins. Impacts. and Futures of the Community College.* Albany: State University of New York Press, 1994.

Dougherty, Kevin J. and Barbara K. Townsend. "Community College Missions: A Theoretical and Historical Perspective." *New Directions for Community Colleges* 136 (2006): 5-13.

Douglass, Harl R. "The College's Interest in the Secondary School." *Educational Record* 20 (1939): 229-240.

Douglass, John Aubrey. *The California Idea and American Higher Education: 1850 to the 1960 Master Plan*. Stanford: Stanford University Press, 2000.

Downey, Matthew T. *Ben D. Wood: Educational Reformer*. Princeton: Educational Testing Service, 1965.

"Dr. Gillette to Aid in Ed Workshop." *The Stanford Daily*, Aug. 10, 1951.

Dressel, Paul L. *College to University: The Hannah Years at Michigan State. 1935-1969*. East Lansing: Michigan State University Publications, 1987.

———, ed. *Evaluation in the Basic College at Michigan State University*. New York: Harper and Brothers, 1958.

———. *Comprehensive Examinations in a Program of General Education*. East Lansing: Michigan State College Press, 1949.

Dressel, Paul L. and Lewis B. Mayhew. *General Education: Explorations in Evaluation: The Final Report of the Cooperative Study of Evaluation in General Education of the American Council on Education*. Washington, D.C.: American Council on Education, 1954.

Drummer, Carlee and Roxann Marshburn. "Philanthropy and Private Foundations: Expanding Revenue Sources." *New Directions for Community Colleges* 168 (2014): 77-89.

Dudziak, Mary L. *Cold War Civil Rights: Race and the Image of American Democracy.* Princeton: Princeton University Press, 2000.

Dule, John. "Conversations on Undergraduate Education, Paper #80." Michigan State University, 1979. Morris Library, Southern Illinois University, Carbondale, IL.

Dunham, Douglas. "Social Science at Michigan State University." In *Social Science in General Education*, edited by Lewis B. Mayhew, 87-98. Dubuque, IA: Wm. C. Brown Co., 1960.

Dunkel, Harold B. *The Reminisces of Harold B. Dunkel*. By Thomas Roby, Dec. 18, 1987. Special Collections Research Center at the University of Chicago, Joseph Regenstein Library, Chicago, Illinois.

———. *General Education in the Humanities.* Washington, D.C.: American Council on Education, 1947.

Dzuback, Mary Ann. *Robert M. Hutchins: Portrait of an Educator*. Chicago: University of Chicago Press, 1991.

———. "Hutchins, Adler, and the University of Chicago: A Critical Juncture." *American Journal of Education* 99 (1990): 57-76.

Echols, James Phillip. “The Rise of the Evaluation Movement: 1920-1942.” PhD diss., Stanford University, 1973.

Ecklund, Lowell R. “A Century of Service: An Historical Analysis of the Service Function of a State University.” PhD diss., Syracuse University, 1956.

Education and the National Defense (Washington, D.C.: American Council on Education, 1940).

“Educators Stress Specialized Study,” *New York Times*, Nov. 3, 1934.

Edwards, Newton. “Factors Affecting Future Trends in Student Enrolments.” In *The Outlook for Higher Education*, edited by John Dale Russell, 51-60. Chicago: University of Chicago Press, 1939.

Eells, Walter Crosby. “A Progress Report on California’s Junior Colleges.” *School Executive* 76 (1956): 60-61.

Eisenmann, Linda. “‘Making Better Colleges:’ AAC’s Century of Change and Commitment.” *Liberal Education* 101 (2015): 30-37.

———. “Practicing What I Teach: Does a Career as a Higher Education Professor Inform My Work as a Dean?” *Review of Higher Education* 32 (2009): 515-535.

———. “Integrating Disciplinary Perspectives into Higher Education Research: The Example of History.” *Journal of Higher Education* 75 (2004): 7-22

Eisenmann, Lnda, Philo A. Hutcheson, and Jana Nidiffer. “A Conversation: Historiographic Issues in American Higher Education.” *History of Education Quarterly* 39 (1999): 291-294.

Elliott, Edward C., ed. *The Rise of a University*. Volume II: *The University in Action*. New York: Columbia University Press, 1937.

Emmons, Lloyd C. “Are There Aims That Are Peculiar to the Tax-Supported Colleges?” *Bulletin of the American Association of Colleges* 22 (1936): 99-104.

Eubanks, David A. “Assessing the General Education Elephant.” *Assessment Update* 20 (2008): 4-6.

Ewell, Peter. “General Education and the Assessment Reform Agenda.” Washington, D.C.: Association of American Colleges and Universities, 2004.

Fagan, Thomas K. “Compulsory Schooling, Child Study, Clinical Psychology, and Special Education: Origins of School Psychology.” *American Psychologist* 47 (1992): 236-243.

Fanelli, Angela S. “General Education in the American College.” EdD diss., Rutgers University, 1997.

Fass, Paula S. *Outside In: Minorities and the Transformation of American Education.* New York: Oxford University Press, 1989.

———. “Without Design: Education Policy in the New Deal.” *American Journal of Education* 91 (1982): 36-64.

Feldman, Mary Jane. “A Strategy for Using Student Perceptions in the Assessment of General Education.” *Journal of General Education* 43 (1994): 151-167.

Ferren, Ann S. and Ashby Kinch. “The Dollars and Sense Behind General Education Reform.” *Peer Review* 5 (2003): 8-11.

Ferren, Ann S. and Kay Mussell. “Leading Curriculum Renewal.” In *Leading Academic Change: Essential Roles for Department Chairs,* edited by Ann F. Lucas and Associates, 254-262. San Francisco: Jossey-Bass, 2000.

Fields, Ralph R. *The Community College Movement.* New York: McGraw-Hill, 1962.

Finder, Morris. *Educating America: How Ralph W. Tyler Taught America to Teach.* Westport, CT: Praeger, 2004.

Fine, Benjamin. “Study of Junior Colleges Suggests Methods to Provide a Better ‘General Education.’” *New York Times,* July 20, 1952.

———. “Colleges Unite in Broad Study of Own Needs: Resources Pooled by 21 to Survey Problems and Aid Education.” *New York Times,* June 8, 1941.

Fink, Leon. *Progressive Intellectuals and the Dilemmas of Democratic Commitment*. Cambridge: Harvard University Press, 1997.

Fischetti, John and Elizabeth Aaronsohn. “Cooperation Starts Inside Schools of Education: Teacher Educators as Collaborators.” In *Collaboration: Building Common Agendas,* edited by Henrietta S. Schwartz, 138-144. Washington. DC: American Association of Colleges for Teacher Education, 1990.

Flack, Bruce Clayton. “The Work of the American Youth Commission. 1935-1942.” PhD diss., Ohio State University, 1969.

Fordyce, Joseph W. “B. Lamar Johnson’s Bibliographical Contributions.” *Community College Review* 6 (1978): 8-11.

Fosdick, Raymond B., Henry F. Pringle and Katharine Douglas Pringle. *Adventure in Giving: The Story of the General Education Board*. New York: Harper and Row Publishers, 1962.

Fraley, Angela E. *Schooling and Innovation: The Rhetoric and the Reality*. New York: Tyler Gibson Publishers, 1981.

———. “Core Curriculum: An Epic in the History of Educational Reform.” EdD diss., Teachers College, Columbia University, 1977.

Franklin, Barry M. “Education for an Urban America: Ralph Tyler and the Curriculum Field,” 277-296. In *International Perspectives in Curriculum History,* edited by Ivor Goodson. Wolfeboro, NH: Croom Helm, 1987.

Frazier, Alexander. “General Education in the Junior College: Lessons from the High School” *School Review* 58 (1950): 201-210.

Frederiksen, Norman and W.B. Schrader. *Adjustment to College: A Study of 10,000 Veteran and Nonveteran Students in Sixteen American Colleges*. Princeton. NJ: Educational Testing Service, 1950.

Freeland, Richard M. *Academia’s Golden Age: Universities in Massachusetts, 1945-1970.* New York: Oxford University Press, 1992.

French, Will. “Curriculum Responsibilities of the North Central Association: What Initiative Shall the North Central Association Take in Relation to the Secondary School Curriculum?” *North Central Association Quarterly* 9 (1934): 317-321.

Frezza, Daria. *The Leader and the Crowd: Democracy in American Public Discourse, 1880-1941*, trans. Martha King. Athens: University of Georgia Press, 2007.

Frydl, Kathleen J. *The GI Bill*. New York: Cambridge University Press, 2009.

Frye, John H. *The Vision of the Public Junior College. 1900-1940: Professional Goals and Popular Aspirations.* Westport, CT: Greenwood Press, 1992.

Fuess, Jr., Scott M. and Nancy D. Mitchell. "General Education Reform: Opportunities for Institutional Alignment." *Journal of General Education* 60 (2011): 1-15.

Furner, Mary O. *Advocacy and Objectivity: A Crisis in the Professionalization of American Social Science, 1865-1905.* Lexington: University Press of Kentucky, 2010.

Gaff, Jerry G. "What is a Generally Educated Person?" *Peer Review* 7 (2004): 4-7.

———. "General Education in a Contemporary Context." *Current Issues in Higher Education* 2 (1980): 1-5.

———. "Historical and Contemporary Perspectives." In *General Education: Issues and Resources,* edited by Jerry G. Gaff. et al., 17-30. *The Project on General Education Models*. Washington, D.C.: Society for Values in Higher Education, 1980.

Gallagher, Edward A. "Revisionist Nonsense and the Junior College: Early California Development." *Michigan Academician* 26 (1995): 215-228.

———. "Alexis Lange and the Origin of the Occupational Education Function in California Junior Colleges." *Michigan Academician* 22 (1990): 241-257.

———. "Alexis Lange, Progressivism and Junior College Functions." *Michigan Academician* 7 (1974): 111-122.

Gano-Phillips, Susan and Robert W. Barnett, eds. *A Process Approach to General Education Reform: Transforming Institutional Culture in Higher Education*. Madison, WI: Atwood Publishing, 2010.

Gaston, Paul L. and Jerry G. Gaff. *Revising General Education—And Avoiding the Potholes: A Guide for Curricular Change.* Washington, D.C.: Association of American Colleges and Universities, 2009.

Gavin, Eileen A. "Sister Annette Walter's Unfinished Dream: 'To Make the Universe a Home.'" In *Women of Vision: Their Psychology, Circumstances, and Success,* edited by Eileen A. Gavin, Aphrodite Clamar and Mary Anne Siderits, 159-176. New York: Springer, 2007.

Geiger, Roger L. *The History of American Higher Education: Learning and Culture from the Founding to World War II.* Princeton: Princeton University Press, 2015.

———, ed. *The American College in the Nineteenth Century.* Nashville: Vanderbilt University Press, 2000.

———. *Research and Relevant Knowledge: American Research and Universities Since World War II.* New York: Oxford University Press, 1993.

———. *To Advance Knowledge: The Growth of American Research Universities, 1900-1940*. New York: Oxford University Press, 1986.

Geis, George L. "Student Participation in Instruction: Student Choice." *Journal of Higher Education* 47 (1976): 249-273.

Gelber, Scott. “The Populist Vision for Land-Grant Universities. 1880-1900.” In “The Land-Grant Colleges and the Reshaping of American Higher Education,” Special Issue. *Perspectives on the History of Higher Education* 30 (2013): 165-194.

General Education Board. *Review and Final Report, 1902-1964.* New York: Author, 1964.

———. *Annual Report of the General Education Board: 1933-1934.* New York: General Education Board, 1935.

Geyer, Michael. “Multiculturalism and the Politics of General Education.” *Critical Inquiry* 19 (1993): 499-533.

Gibson, J’Nelle Smoak. “The Eight-Year Study: A Limited View of College Admission Reform” PhD diss., University of Michigan, 1974.

Gilbert, Claire Krendl, and Donald E. Heller. “Access, Equity, and Community Colleges: The Truman Commission and Federal Higher Education Policy from 1947 to 2011.” *Journal of Higher Education* 84 (2013): 417-443.

Giles, H.H. “The Urgent Need in Secondary Education.” *Phi Delta Kappan* 17 (1935): 210-211, 250.

Giles, H.H. and S.P. McCutchen. and A.N. Zechiel. *Exploring the Curriculum: The Work of the Thirty Schools from the Viewpoint of Curriculum Consultants*. New York: Harper & Brothers, 1942.

Giordano, Gerard. *How Testing Came to Dominate the Schools: The History of Educational Assessment.* New York: Peter Lang, 2005.

———. *Wartime Schools: How World War II Changed American Education.* New York: Peter Lang, 2004.

Gleason, Abbott. *Totalitarianism: The Inner History of the Cold War.* New York: Oxford University, 1995.

Glynn, Shawn M., Lori Price Altman, and Ashley M. Owens. “Motivation to Learn in General Education Programs.” *Journal of General Education* 54 (2005): 150-170.

Gold, David. *Rhetoric at the Margins: Revising the History of Writing Instruction in American Colleges. 1873-1947.* Carbondale: Southern Illinois University Press, 2008.

Goldin, Claudia and Lawrence F. Katz. *The Race Between Education and Technology*. Cambridge: Belknap Press, 2008.

Goldthorpe, J. Harold. *Higher Education, Philanthropy, and Federal Tax Exemptions*. Washington, D.C.: American Council on Education, 1944.

———. “Trends in Philanthropy: Summary of Gifts to a Selected Group of Institutions of Higher Education in the Last Twenty Years.” *Journal of Higher Education* 12 (1941): 73-80.

Good, Carter V. “Organized Research in Education: Foundations. Commissions. and Committees.” *Review of Educational Research* 9 (1939): 569-575.

Goodspeed, Thomas Wakefield. *A History of the University of Chicago Founded by John D. Rockefeller: The First Quarter-Century.* Chicago: University of Chicago Press, 1916.

Goodwin, Gregory Lang. “The Historical Development of the Community-Junior College Ideology: An Analysis and Interpretation of the Writings of Selected Community-Junior College Leaders From 1890-1970.” PhD diss., University of Illinois at Urbana-Champaign, 1971.

Grace, Alonzo G. *Educational Lessons from Wartime Training.* Washington, D.C.: American Council on Education, 1948.

Graebner, William. *The Engineering of Consent: Democracy and Authority in Twentieth-Century America.* Madison: University of Wisconsin Press, 1987.

Graff, Gerald. *Clueless in Academe: How Schooling Obscures the Life of the Mind.* New Haven: Yale University Press, 2003.

———. *Professing Literature: An Institutional History*. Chicago: University of Chicago Press, 1987.

Graham, Hugh Davis and Nancy Diamond. *The Rise of American Research Universities: Elites and Challengers in the Postwar Era.* Baltimore: Johns Hopkins University Press, 1997.

Graham, Patricia Albjerg. *Schooling America: How the Public Schools Meet the Nation’s Changing Needs.* New York: Oxford University Press, 2005.

———. *Progressive Education from Arcady to Academe: A History of the Progressive Education Association 1919-1955.* New York: Teachers College Press, 1967.

Grant, Gerald and David Riesman. *The Perpetual Dream: Reform and Experiment in the American College.* Chicago: University of Chicago Press, 1978.

Gray, Hannah Holborn. *Searching for Utopia: Universities and Their Histories.* Berkeley: University of California Press, 2012.

Gray, J. Glenn. “The Philosophical Basis of General Education.” *Journal of General Education* 12 (1959): 131-138.

Gray, William S., ed. *Provision for the Individual in College Education.* Chicago: University of Chicago Press, 1932.

Griffen, William Lawrence. “The General Education Movement in American Higher Education: An Analysis of the Literature. 1945-1956.” M.A. Thesis, Cornell University, 1957.

Gross, Steven Jay. “Civic Hands Upon the Land: Diverse Patterns of Social Education in the Civilian Conservation Corps and its Analogues.” In *Social Education in the Twentieth Century: Curriculum and Context for Citizenship,* edited by Christine Woyshner, Joseph Watras, and Margaret Smith Crocco, 42-56. New York: Peter Lang, 2004.

Gruttner, Michael. “German Universities Under the Swastika.” In *Universities Under Dictatorship,* edited by John Connelly and Michael Gruttner, 75-112. University Park: Pennsylvania State University Press, 2005.

Guillory, John. “Who’s Afraid of Marcel Proust?: The Failure of General Education in the American University.” In *The Humanities and the Dynamics of Inclusion Since World War II,* edited by David A. Hollinger, 25-49. Baltimore: Johns Hopkins University Press, 2006.

Guyotte, Roland L. “Liberal Education and the American Dream: Public Attitudes and the Emergence of Mass Higher Education, 1920–1950.” Ph.D. diss., Northwestern University, 1980.

Gwynn, J.Minor. *Curriculum Principles and Social Trends.* New York: The Macmillan Company, 1947.

Haarlow, William N. *Great Books. Honors Programs. and Hidden Origins: The Virginia Plan and the University of Virginia in the Liberal Arts Movement*. New York: RoutledgeFalmer, 2003.

Hagen, O.J. “The Concept of Regionalism in Higher Education.” *Educational Record* 18 (1937): 147-158.

Haggerty, Melvin E. *The Evaluation of Higher Institutions: III. The Educational Program*. Chicago: University of Chicago Press, 1937.

Hamilton, Thomas H. “Organization of the Basic College” In *The Basic College of Michigan State*, edited by Thomas H. Hamilton and Edward A. Blackman, 1-21. East Lansing: Michigan State University Press, 1955.

Hammack, David C. “American Debates on the Legitimacy of Foundations.” In *The Legitimacy of Philanthropic Foundations: United States and European Perspectives*, edited by Kenneth Prewitt, et al., 49-98. New York: Russell Sage Foundation, 2006.

———. “Failure and Resilience: Pushing the Limits in Depression and Wartime.” In *Charity, Philanthropy, and Civility in American History*, edited by Lawrence J. Friedman and Mark D. McGarvie, 264-280. New York: Cambridge University Press, 2003.

Hammack, David C. and Helmut K. Anheier. *A Versatile American Institution: The Changing Ideals and Realities of Philanthropic Foundations.* Washington, D.C.: Brookings Institute Press, 2013.

Hammons, James O. “General Education: A Missed Opportunity Returns.” *New Directions for Community Colleges* 25 (1979): 63-73.

Hand, Harold C. “Children and Youth—Pawns or Sacred Entities?” In *Curriculum Innovations 1966: Trends and Issues*, edited by Paul M. Halverson, 1-15. Syracuse, NY: School of Education. Syracuse University, 1966.

Hannah, John A. *A Memoir*. East Lansing: Michigan State University Press, 1980.

———. “Volume 39, No. 20, February 18, 1945.” In *The President’s Message Over WKAR*, 6-7. East Lansing: Michigan State College Press, 1945.

Hanson, Chad. “What Happened to the Liberal Arts?” *New Directions for Community Colleges* 163 (2013): 11-19.

Hanstedt, Paul. *General Education Essentials: A Guide for College Faculty.* San Francisco: Jossey-Bass, 2012.

Harbour, Clifford P. *John Dewey and the Future of Community College Education.* London: Bloomsbury Academic, 2015.

Harris, Michael S. “Understanding Institutional Diversity in American Higher Education.” ASHE Higher Education Report Series, Volume 39, Issue 3. San Francisco: Jossey-Bass, 2013.

———. “Out Out, Damned Spot: General Education in a Market-Driven Institution.” *Journal of General Education* 55 (2006): 186-200.

Harrison, J. Derek. “General Education in the Community College: A Recent View.” *Journal of General Education* 25 (1973): 83-93.

Hart Research Associates. “Trends and Emerging Practices in General Education Based on a Survey Among Members of the Association of American Colleges and Universities.” Washington, D.C.: Association of American Colleges and Universities, 2009.

Hartman, Andrew. *A War for the Soul of America: A History of the Culture Wars*. Chicago: University of Chicago Press, 2015.

Hartung, M.L. “Bulletin No. 2. Evaluation in Mathematics.” Columbus: Progressive Education Association, Evaluation in the Eight Year Study, Ohio State University, 1935.

Hastings, J. Thomas. “Tyler’s Behavioral Objectives: Background Sources, Early Use, and Some Stream-Odds.” In *Improving Inquiry in Social Science: A Volume in Honor of Lee J. Cronbach*, edited by Richard E. Snow and David E. Wiley, 305-324. Hillsdale, NJ: Lawrence Erlbaum Associates, 1991.

Havighurst, Robert J. “Philanthropic Foundations as Interest Groups.” *Education and Urban Society* 13 (1981): 193-218.

———. “Assistance Given to Cooperative Educational Experiments by Foundations.” *Educational* Method 20 (1941): 331-334.

———. “The Government and Educational Experimentation.” *Teachers College Record* 7 (1941): 146-148.

———. “Report on the Program in General Education.” In *General Education Board: Annual Report for 1938*, 65-104. New York: General Education Board, 1938.

Hawkins, Hugh. *Banding Together: The Rise of National Associations in American Higher Education, 1887-1950.* Baltimore: Johns Hopkins University Press, 1992.

———. “The Higher Learning in Chicago.” *Reviews in American History* 20 (1992): 378-385.

———. *Between Harvard and America: The Educational Leadership of Charles W. Eliot.* New York: Oxford University Press, 1972.

Hayward, Gerald C. “California’s $30 Million Course Cuts.” *New Directions for Community Colleges* 64 (1988): 31-41.

Heaton, Kenneth L. “Program of the Committee on Workshops.” *Educational Method* 20 (1941): 292-296.

Heaton, Kenneth L., William G. Camp. and Paul B. Diederich. *Professional Education for Experienced Teachers: The Program of the Summer Workshop.* Chicago: University of Chicago Press, 1940.

Heil, Louis M. “Determining Objectives of Science Instruction for General Education.” *Educational Record* 23 (1942): 94-105.

Heilman, Robert B. “Lowest-Common-Denominator Education.” *Journal of Higher Education* 20 (1949): 227-233, 280.

Hemming, James. *Teach Them to Live,* 2nd ed. New York: Longmans, Green and Co., 1957.

Henderson, Algo D. “Antioch College Looks Ahead.” *Progressive Education* 21 (1944): 213-237.

———. *Vitalizing Liberal Education: A Study of the Liberal Arts Program.* New York: Harper and Brothers, 1944.

Henderson, Algo D. and Dorothy Smith. *Antioch College: Its Design for Liberal Education.* New York: Harper and Brothers, 1946.

Henderson, Algo D. and Jean G. “Revitalizing General Education in the Community College.” (Paper presented at the Forum on Future Purposes, Content, and Formats for the General Education of Community College Students, Montgomery College, Maryland, May 22, 1978).

Herbst, Jurgen. *The Once and Future School: Three Hundred and Fifty Years of American Secondary Education,* New York: Routledge, 1996.

———. “The American People’s College: The Lost Promise of Democracy in Education.” *American Journal of Education* 100 (1992): 275-297.

Higginbottom, George Hjelm. “The Civic Ground of Collegiate General Education and the Community College.” PhD diss., Cornell University, 1991.

Higginbottom, George H. and Richard M. Romano. “Appraising the Efficacy of Civic Education at the Community College.” *New Directions for Community Colleges* 136 (2006): 23-32.

Higher Education for American Democracy: A Report V. 1-6. Washington, D.C.: U.S. Government Printing Office, 1947.

Higher Education for American Democracy: A Report of the President’s Commission on Higher Education: Volume I: Establishing the Goals. Washington, D.C.: U.S. Government Printing Office, 1947.

Hiley, David R. “The Democratic Purposes of General Education.” *Liberal Education* 82 (1996): 20-26.

Hill, Marshall A. “Who Wants Coherence?” In “General Education in an Age of Student Mobility: An Invitation to Discuss Systematic Curricular Planning,” 11-12. Washington, D.C.: Association of American Colleges and Universities, 2001).

Hillway, Tyrus. *The American Two-Year College.* New York: Harper & Brothers, 1958.

Himstreet, William Charles. “A Study of Business Education in the Public Junior Colleges of California” EdD diss., University of Southern California, 1955.

Hlebowitsh, Peter S. Foreword to *Basic Principles of Curriculum and Instruction*, edited by Ralph W. Tyler, vii-xii. Chicago: University of Chicago Press, 2013.

Hodgson, Godfrey, ed. *America in Our Time: From World War II to Nixon—What Happened and Why.* Princeton: Princeton University Press, 1976/2005.

Hoeveler, J. David. *Creating the American Mind: Intellect and Politics in the Colonial Colleges.* Lanham, MD: Rowman and Littlefield, 2002.

Hoffer, Charles R. and Paul L. Dressel. "Special Issue: Students' Beliefs About Post-War Problems." *Michigan State College Bulletin* 38 (1944): 1-33.

Hofstadter, Richard and Wilson Smith, eds. *American Higher Education: A Documentary History* Volume II. Chicago: University of Chicago Press, 1961.

Hofstetter, Rita and Bernard Schneuwly. "Progressive Education and Educational Sciences: The Tumultuous Relations of an Indissociable and Irreconcilable Couple." In *Passion, Fusion, Tension: New Education and Educational Science, End 19th – Middle 20th Century/Education nouvelle et Sciences de l'education, Fin du 19e-milieu du 20e siècle,* edited by Rita Hofstetter and Bernard Schneuwly, 1-15. Bern: Peter Lang, 2006.

Holley, J. Andrew. "The American Council on Education: Report of Its Nineteenth Meeting." *North Central Association Quarterly* 12 (1937): 191-204.

Hollinger, David A. "Two NYUs and 'The Obligation of Universities to the Social Order' in the Great Depression." In *The University and the City: From Medieval Origins to the Present,* edited by Thomas Bender, 249-265. New York: Oxford University Press, 1988.

Hollis, Ernest Victor. "Evolution of the Philanthropic Foundation." *Educational Record* 20 (1939): 575-588.

———. *Philanthropic Foundations and Higher Education.* New York: Columbia University Press, 1938.

Horowitz, Rosalind. "A 75-Year Legacy on Assessment: Reflections from an Interview with Ralph W. Tyler." *Journal of Educational Research* 89 (1995): 68-75.

Howard, Craig C. *Theories of General Education: A Critical Approach*. New York: St. Martin's Press, 1992.

Hudson, A. James. "A Descriptive Study of General Education in the Community Colleges in California—1972-73." EdD diss., Brigham Young University, 1974.

Hudson, A. James and Ralph B. Smith. "Does General Education Have a Future?." *Community College Review* 4 (1976): 57-62.

Hughes, R.M. "The Chairman's Address: The Future American Council on Education." *Educational Record* 14 (1933): 278-286.

Hullfish, H. Gordon. "The Functions of the Faculty in the Administrative Process" In *The Administration of Higher Institutions Under Changing Conditions,* edited by Norman Burns, 72-84. Chicago: University of Chicago Press, 1947.

Humphrey, Jordan R. "Liberal Arts Colleges in the Tumultuous 1940s: Institutional Identity and the Challenges of War and Peace." PhD diss., Pennsylvania State University, 2010.

Hutcheson, Philo. "Goals for United States Higher Education: From Democracy to Globalisation." *History of Education* 40 (2011): 45-57.

———. "Shared Goals, Different Politics, and Differing Outcomes: The Truman Commission and the Dewey Commission." *SUNY at Sixty: The Promise of the State University of New York*, edited by John B. Clark, W. Bruce Leslie and Kenneth P. O'Brien, 3-15. Albany: State University of New York Press, 2010.

———. “Setting the Nation’s Agenda for Higher Education: A Review of Selected National Commission Reports. 1947-2006.” *History of Education Quarterly* 47 (2007): 359-367.

———. “The Truman Commission’s View of the Future.” *Thought and Action* 23 (2007): 107-115.

———. “The 1947 President’s Commission on Higher Education and the National Rhetoric on Higher Education Policy.” *History of Higher Education Annual* 22 (2002): 91-109.

———. “Reconsidering the Community College.” *History of Education Quarterly* 39 (1999): 307-320.

———. “In the President’s Opinion: Robert Hutchins and the University of Chicago History Department.” *History of Higher Education Annual* 17 (1997): 33-52.

Hutcheson, Philo A. and Donna Adair Breault. “National Higher Education Policy Commissions in the Post-World War II Era: Issues of Representation.” *The Sophist’s Bane* 2 (2003): 19-29.

Hutcheson, Philo, and Marybeth Gasman and Kijua Sanders-McMurtry. “Race and Equality in the Academy: Rethinking Higher Education Actors and the Struggle for Equality in the Post-World War II Period.” *Journal of Higher Education* 82 (2011): 121-153.

Hutcheson, Philo A. and Ralph D. Kidder. “In the National Interest: The College and University in the United States in the Post-World War II Era.” In *Higher Education: Handbook of Theory and Research. Volume 26,* edited by John C. Smart and Michael B. Paulsen, 221-264. Dordrecht: Springer, 2011.

Hutchings, Pat. “From Idea to Prototype: The Peer Review of Teaching.” In *Reconnecting Education and Foundations: Turning Good Intentions into Educational Capital,* edited by Ray Bacchetti and Thomas Ehrlich, 303-322. San Francisco: Jossey-Bass, 2007.

Hutchings, Pat, Ted Marchese and Barbara Wright. “Using Assessment to Strengthen General Education.” Washington, D.C.: The Assessment Forum of the American Association for Higher Education, 1991.

Hutchins, Robert M. *The Higher Learning in America*. New Haven: Yale University Press, 1936.

Ignas, Edward. “The Traditional American System.” In *Comparative Educational Systems,* edited by Edward Ignas, 1-44. Itasca. IL: F.E. Peacock Publishing, 1981.

Igo, Sarah E. *The Averaged American: Surveys, Citizens, and the Making of a Mass Public.* Cambridge: Harvard University Press, 2007.

Ikenberry, Stanley O. “The Academy and General Education.” *Journal of General Education* 23 (1971): 175-189.

“Impact of War on the Schools.” *Journal of Educational Sociology* 16 (1943): 424-450.

“Interuniversity Co-Operation in Programs of General Education.” *School and Society* 63 (1946): 372.

Irvin, Glenn. “The Plight of General Education.” *The Educational Forum* 54 (1990): 371-387.

Irwin, Kathy. “The Eight Year Study.” In *Progressive Education for the 1990s: Transforming Practice*, edited by Kathe Jervis and Carol Montag, 51-60. New York: Teachers College Press, 1991.

Isaacs, Rebecca Frances. “Schooling for Success: The US Federal Government, the American Education System and the Cold War, 1947-1957.” PhD diss., University of Birmingham, 2014.

Ivan, Dykstra. D. “An Introduction to Liberal Education” (Unpublished Manuscript, n.d.). D. Ivan Dykstra Papers. Hope College. H88-0048. (2012). *Collection Registers and Abstracts.* Paper 3. http://digitalcommons.hope.edu/collection_registers/3.

Iversen, John Smyth. “The Origin and History of the Workshop Movement in Education: 1936-1965.” EdD diss., Teachers College, Columbia University, 1973.

Jackson, Brian and Thomas P. Miller. “The Progressive Education Movement: A Case Study in Coalition Politics.” In *Active Voices: Composing a Rhetoric of Social Movements,* edited by Sharon McKenzie Stevens and Patricia Malesh, 93-114. Albany: State University of New York Press, 2009.

Jacoby, Susan. *The Age of American Unreason,* revised and updated edition. New York: Vintage Books, 2009.

Jarausch, Konrad H. “American Students in Germany, 1815-1914: The Structure of German and U.S. Matriculants at Gottingen University.” In *German Influences on Education in the United States to 1917,* edited by Henry Geitz, Jurgen Heideking, and Jurgen Herbst, 195-211. New York: Cambridge University Press, 1995.

———. “Liberal Education as Illiberal Socialization: The Case of Students in Imperial Germany.” *Journal of Modern History* 50 (1978): 609-630.

Jenkins, Edward C. *Philanthropy in America: An Introduction to the Practices and Prospects of Organizations Supported by Gifts and Endowments.* New York: Association Press, 1950.

Jenkins, Russell L. “A Synthesis of Studies in General Education.” *Journal of General Education* 8 (1955): 205-210.

Jessup, Walter A. “Some Implications of the Survey of Education in Pennsylvania.” *Educational Record* 17 (1936): 24-31.

Jewett, Andrew. *Science. Democracy. and the American University: From the Civil War to the Cold War*. New York: Cambridge University Press, 2012.

Johanek, Michael C. ed. *A Faithful Mirror: Reflections on the College Board and Education in America.* New York: College Entrance Examination Board, 2001.

Johnson, B. Lamar. “‘General Education in Action:’ Revisited After Thirty Years.” *New Directions for Community Colleges* 40 (1982): 5-9.

———. “An Emphasis and a Thrust.” *Jottings from the League for Innovation in the Community College* 10 (April 24, 1972): 8.

———. “Toward General Education in the Junior College.” *Junior College Journal* 30 (1960): 517-524.

———. “The Advising. Guidance. and Counseling of Junior College Students.” *Bulletin of the National Association of Secondary-School Principals* 37 (1953): 19-36.

———. “Methods of Teaching in General Education.” In *Utah Conference on Higher Education: Democracy and Higher Education September 13-14-15, 1953,* 19-31. Salt Lake City: Utah State Agricultural College, 1953.
———. “Werrett Wallace Charters: Particularly His Contributions to Higher Education.” *Journal of Higher Education* 24 (1953): 236-240.
———. “Administration: Facilitating General Education in the Junior College.” *Bulletin of the National Association of Secondary-School Principals* 36 (1952): 23-45.
———. “Approaches to General Education: A Report from California Junior Colleges.” *The Educational Record* 33 (1952): 71-90.
———. “General Education for Citizenship.” *Junior College Journal* 23 (1952): 91-97.
———. *General Education in Action: A Report of the California Study of General Education in the Junior College.* Washington, D.C.: American Council on Education, 1952.
———. “General Education in Junior Colleges.” *Journal of the National Education Association* 41 (1952): 429-430.
———. “Toward Better Relationships between Junior Colleges and High Schools.” *The School Review* 60 (1952): 77-83.
———. “General Education in Action.” *California Journal of Secondary Education* 26 (1951): 385-396.
———. “Next Steps in the General Education Study.” *California Journal of Secondary Education* 26 (1951): 47-52.
———. “The California Study of General Education.” *California Journal of Secondary Education* 25 (1950): 341-346.
———. “General Education in the Junior College.” *North Central Association Quarterly* 24 (1950): 357-363.
———. “Patterns of General Education.” *Junior College Journal* 17 (1946): 45-52.
———. “Junior-College Trends.” *School Review* 52 (1944): 606-610.
———. “General Education—What Is It and Why?” In *General Education in the American High School,* edited by the Sub-Committee of the General Education Committee, xii. Commission on Curricula of Secondary Schools and Institutions of Higher Education of the North Central Association of Colleges and Secondary Schools. Chicago: Scott Foresman and Company, 1942.
———. “Implications of Democracy for the Junior College.” *Bulletin of the National Association of Secondary School Principals* 24 (1940): 134-149.
———. *Vitalizing a College Library.* Chicago: American Library Association, 1939.
———. “General Education Changes the College: Changes Its Philosophy, Its Curriculum, and Its Administration.” *Journal of Higher Education* 9 (1938): 18-22.
———. “General Education Changes the College.” *Bulletin of the Association of American Colleges* 24 (1938): 229-234.
———. “Strengths and Weaknesses of General Education: Illustrations Chosen from the Various Institutions Typifying this Organization.” *Journal of Higher Education* 9 (1938): 71-76.

———, ed. *What About Survey Courses?* New York: Henry Holt and Company, 1937.
———. "Liberalization of the Curriculum." *Junior College Journal* 6 (1935): 21-25.
Johnson, B. Lamar, Ralph Leyden and Zay Rusk Sullens. "Individualization: A Must in General Education." In *Accent on Teaching: Experiments in General Education,* edited by Sidney J. French, 376-396. New York: Harper and Brothers, 1954.
Johnson, D. Kent and James L. Ratcliff. "Creating Coherence: The Unfinished Agenda." *New Directions for Higher Education* 125 (2004): 85-95.
Johnson, Eldon L. "Misconceptions About the Early Land-Grant Colleges." *Journal of Higher Education* 52 (1981): 333-351.
Johnson, Jr., Henry C. and Johanningmeier, Erwin V. *Teachers for the Prairie: The University of Illinois and the Schools, 1868-1945.* Urbana: University of Illinois Press, 1972.
Johnson, Roy Ivan. *Explorations in General Education: The Experiences of Stephens College*. New York: Harper and Brothers, 1947.
Jonas, Gerald. *The Circuit Riders: Rockefeller Money and the Rise of Modern Science.* New York: W.W. Norton, 1989.
Jones, Lewis Webster. "The Reconstruction of Liberal Education." *American Association of University Professors Bulletin* 30 (1944): 317-329.
Jordan, John M. *Machine-Age Ideology: Social Engineering and American Liberalism. 1911-1939*. Chapel Hill: University of North Carolina Press, 1994.
———. "'To Educate Public Opinion': John D. Rockefeller, Jr. and the Origins of Social Scientific Fact-Finding." *New England Quarterly* 64 (1991): 292-297.
Kahne, Joseph. *Reframing Educational Policy: Democracy, Community, and the Individual.* New York: Teachers College Press, 1996.
Kandel, I.L. *The Impact of the War Upon American Education.* Chapel Hill: University of North Carolina Press, 1948.
Karl, Barry D. "Presidential Planning and Social Science Research: Mr. Hoover's Experts." *Perspectives in American History* 3 (1969): 347-409.
Kates, Susan. *Activist Rhetorics and American Higher Education. 1885-1937.* Carbondale: Southern Illinois University Press, 2001.
Katkin, Wendy. "The Boyer Commission Report and Its Impact on Undergraduate Research." *New Directions for Teaching and Learning* 93 (2003): 19-38.
Kellams, Samuel E. "Students and the Decline of General Education." *Journal of General Education* 24 (1973): 217-230.
Keller, Morton and Phyllis Keller. *Making Harvard Modern: The Rise of America's University.* New York: Oxford University Press, 2001.
Kelley, Earl C. *The Workshop Way of Learning.* New York: Harper and Brothers, 1951.
Kent, Lori Ann. "The Expansion of American Higher Education. 1880-1920: Status Maintenance for the Elite or Human Resource Development for the Country?" PhD diss., University of Washington, 1984.

Kerr-Tener, Janet Cecile. “From Truman to Johnson: Ad-Hoc Policy Formulation in Higher Education” PhD diss., University of Virginia, 1985.

Kerr, Clark. *The Great Transformation in Higher Education, 1960-1980*. Albany: State University of New York Press, 1991.

———. “Liberal Learning: A Record of Presidential Neglect.” *Change: The Magazine for Higher Education* 16 (1984): 32-36.

Kett, Joseph F. *Merit: The History of a Founding Ideal from the American Revolution to the 21st Century*. Ithaca: Cornell University Press, 2013.

———. *The Pursuit of Knowledge Under Difficulties: From Self-Improvement to Adult Education in America, 1750-1990.* Stanford: Stanford University Press, 1994.

Kimball, Bruce A. *Orators and Philosophers: A History of the Idea of Liberal Education*, expanded edition. New York: The College Board, 1986/1995.

———. “The Education for Those Who Are Free.” *History of Education Quarterly* 28 (1988): 243-256.

Kirk-Kuwaye, Michael and Dominic Sano-Franchini. “‘Why Do I have to take this Course?’: How Academic Advisers Can Help Students Find Personal Meaning and Purpose in General Education.” *Journal of General Education* 64 (2015): 99-105.

Kirkendall, Richard S. “The Agricultural Colleges: Between Tradition and Modernization.” *Agricultural History* 60 (1986): 3-21.

Kirkun, Andrew H.. “Teaching the ‘People’s Music’ at the ‘People’s College’: A Historical Survey of American Popular Music in the American Junior/Community College Curriculum. 1924-1955” PhD diss., New York University, 2014.

Kisker, Carrie B. “Integrating High School and the Community College: Previous Efforts and Current Possibilities.” *Community College Review* 34 (2006): 68-86.

Klein, Julie Thompson. *Humanities, Culture, and Interdisciplinarity*: *The Changing American Academy*. Albany: State University of New York Press, 2005.

Klein, Thomas and Jerry Gaff. “Reforming General Education: A Survey.” Washington, D.C.: Association of American Colleges, 1982.

Kliebard, Herbert M. *The Struggle for the American Curriculum, 1893-1958*. 3rd ed. New York: RoutledgeFalmer, 2004.

———. “Introduction” In *Forging the American Curriculum: Essays in Curriculum History and Theory*, by Herbert M. Kliebard, xi-xv. New York: Routledge, 1992.

———. “A Century of Growing Antagonism in High School-College Relations.” *Journal of Curriculum and Supervision* 3 (1987): 61-70.

Kneisel, Paul Robert. “The Transfer Purpose of the Public Community Junior College in California Higher Education: A Study in Purpose and Development.” EdD diss., University of Southern California, 1973.

Knowles, Elizabeth, ed. *What They Didn’t Say: A Book of Misquotations.* New York: Oxford University Press, 2006.

Koch, Gail Aileen. “The General Education Movement in American Higher Education: An Account and Appraisal of its Principles and Practices and their Relation to Democratic Thought in Modern American Society.” PhD diss., University of Minnesota, 1979.

Koopman, G. Robert. “The Special Significance of the General-Education Movement in 1948.” *School and Society* 68 (1948): 107.

Kopan, Andrew T. “Robert J. Havighurst: Pursuit of Excellence.” In *Rethinking Urban Education,* edited by Herbert J. Walberg and Andrew T. Kopan, 317-324. San Francisco: Jossey-Bass, 1972.

Kovach, Robert V. “Institutional Research in the Community College.” Course essay, Michigan State University, November 30. 1971. ERIC. ED 088 554.

Krathwohl, David R. “Lessons Learned from Ralph W. Tyler.” In *Teachers and Mentors: Profiles of Distinguished Twentieth-Century Professors of Education,* edited by Craig Kridel. Robert V. Bullough. Jr.. and Paul Shaker, 29-44. New York: Garland, 1996.

Kravitz, Anita Faye. “The Harvard Report of 1945: An Historical Ethnography” PhD diss., University of Pennsylvania, 1994.

Kridel, Craig. *Progressive Education in Black High Schools: The Secondary School Study, 1940-1946.* Columbia, SC: Museum of Education, 2015.

———. “Progressive Education in the Black High School: The General Education Board’s Black High School Study. 1940-1948.” The Rockefeller Archive Center Publications Research Reports, 2013.

———. “Aikin/Aiken: Dashed Hopes and a Legacy Misspelled.” *Journal of Curriculum Theorizing* 13 (1997): 38-39.

———. “Reconsiderations: *The Story of the Eight-Year Study: With Conclusions and Recommendations*.” *Educational Studies* 25 (1994): 101-114.

———. “Student Participation in General Education Reform: A Retrospective Glance at the Harvard Redbook.” *Journal of General Education* 35 (1983): 154-164.

———. “Toward a Theoretical Base for General Education Curricular Design.” PhD diss., Ohio State University, 1980.

Kridel, Craig and Robert V. Bullough, Jr. *Stories of the Eight-Year Study: Reexamining Secondary Education in America.* Albany: State University of New York Press, 2007.

———. “Conceptions and Misperceptions of the Eight-Year Study.” *Journal of Curriculum and Supervision* 18 (2002): 63-82.

Kroepsch, Robert H. and M. Stephen Kaplan. “Interstate Cooperation and Coordination in Higher Education.” In *Emerging Patterns in American Higher Education,* edited by Logan Wilson, 174-190. Washington, D.C.: American Council on Education, 1965.

Krug, Edward A. *The Shaping of the American High School*. *Volume 2. 1920-1941*. Madison: University of Wisconsin Press, 1972.

Kuhn, Madison. *Michigan State: The First Hundred Years. 1855-1955*. East Lansing: Michigan State University Press, 1955.

Kurshan, Neil. “The Eight Year Study: Origins. Impact. and Implications.” Ed.D. diss., Harvard University, 1973.

Kurtzman, Denise B. “The Publications of Johnson, B. Lamar. 1932-1974: An Annotated Bibliography.” MLS Thesis, University of California at Los Angeles, 1975.

Kurzweil, Martin A., and Eugene M. Tobin. *Equity and Excellence in American Higher Education* Charlottesville: University of Virginia Press, 2005.

Labaree, David F. “A System Without a Plan: Emergence of an American System of Higher Education in the Twentieth Century.” *Bildungsgeschichte: International Journal for the Historiography of Education* 3 (2013): 46-59.

———. “Understanding the Rise of American Higher Education: How Complexity Breeds Autonomy. May 24. 2010.” *Peking University Educational Review* (2010) 31:3. Accessed December 29, 2015. https://people.stanford.edu/dlabaree/selected-papers.

———. “Mutual Subversion: A Short History of the Liberal and the Professional in American Higher Education.” *History of Education Quarterly* 46 (2006): 1-15.

———. *The Trouble with Ed Schools*. New Haven: Yale University Press, 2004.

———. “The Chronic Failure of Curriculum Reform.” *Education Week* 16 (1999): 42-44.

———. “Public Goods. Private Goods: The American Struggle over Educational Goals.” *American Education Research Journal* 34 (1997): 39-81.

———. “Politics, Markets, and the Compromised Curriculum.” *Harvard Educational Review* 57 (1987): 483-494.

Lackey, Jr., George H. and Michael D. Rowls. *Wisdom in Education: The Views of Ralph Tyler.* Columbia: Museum of Education, McKissick Museum, University of South Carolina, 1989.

Lacy, Tim. *The Dream of a Democratic Culture: Mortimer J. Adler and the Great Books Idea.* New York: Palgrave Macmillan, 2013.

Lagemann, Ellen Condliffe. *An Elusive Science: The Troubling History of Education Research*. Chicago: University of Chicago Press, 2000.

———. *Private Power for the Public Good: A History of The Carnegie Foundation for the Advancement of Teaching,* Middletown, CT: Wesleyan University Press, 1983.

Lagemann, Ellen Condliffe and Jennifer de Forest. “What Might Andrew Carnegie Want to Tell Bill Gates?: Reflections on the Hundredth Anniversary of the Carnegie Foundation for the Advancement of Teaching.” In *Reconnecting Education and Foundations: Turning Good Intentions into Educational Capital,* edited by Ray Bacchetti and Thomas Ehrlich, 49-67. San Francisco: Jossey-Bass, 2007.

Laird, Thomas F. Nelson. Amanda Suniti Niskode-Dossett. and George D. Kuh. “What General Education Courses Contribute to Essential Learning Outcomes.” *Journal of General Education* 58 (2009): 65-84.

Lang, Daniel W. “A Lexicon of Inter-Institutional Cooperation.” *Higher Education* 44 (2002): 153-183.

———. “Amos Brown and the Educational Meaning of the American Agricultural College Act.” *History of Education* 31 (2002): 139-165.

Lasher, William F. “The History of Institutional Research and Its Role in American Higher Education Over the Past 50 Years.” In *AIR: The Association for Institutional Research: The First 50 Years,* edited by Gary Rice, Mary Ann Coughlin and Richard Howard, 9-54. Tallahassee. FL: Association for Institutional Research, 2011.

Lattuca, Lisa and Joan S. Stark. *Shaping the College Curriculum: Academic Plans in Context.* 2nd ed. San Francisco: Jossey-Bass, 2009.

Laws, Leonard S. “A Comparative Study of Basic College Grades and Effort-Interest-Attitude Ratings for Low Ability Students.” PhD diss., Michigan State College, 1953.

Layton, Azza Salama. *International Politics and Civil Rights Policies in the United States, 1941-1960.* New York: Cambridge University Press, 2000.

Lazerson, Marvin. *Higher Education and the American Dream: Success and its Discontents.* Budapest: Central European University Press, 2010.

———. “The Disappointments of Success: Higher Education After World War II.” *Annals of the American Academy of Political and Social Science* 559 (1998): 64-76.

Learned, William S. and Anna Rose Hawkes. “An Experiment in Responsible Learning.” In *The Carnegie Foundation for the Advancement of Teaching Thirty-Fourth Annual Report,* 45-75. Boston: The Merrymount Press, 1939.

Learned, William S. and Ben D. Wood. *The Student and His Knowledge*. New York: The Carnegie Foundation for the Advancement of Teaching, 1938.

LeBlanc, M. Elizabeth. “The Concept of General Education in Colleges and Universities, 1945-1979” PhD diss., Rutgers University, 1980.

Lee, Gordon C., ed. *Crusade Against Ignorance: Thomas Jefferson on Education.* New York: Bureau of Publications, Teachers College, Columbia University, 1961.

Leese, David Joseph. “The Pragmatic Vision: Columbia College and the Progressive Reorganization of the Liberal Core—The Formative Years, 1880-1941” PhD diss., Columbia University, 1987.

Lehrfield, Joel. “Two Programs of Liberal Education: A Commonplace Analysis.” *Journal of General Education* 30 (1979): 255-266.

Lemann, Nicholas. *The Big Test: The Secret History of the American Meritocracy.* New York: Farrar, Straus, and Giroux, 1999.

Leonard, Stephen T. “Introduction: A Genealogy of the Politicized Intellectual.” In *Intellectuals and Public Life: Between Radicalism and Reform,* edited by Leon Fink, Stephen T. Leonard and Donald M. Reid, 1-25. Ithaca: Cornell University Press, 1996.

Leslie, Stuart W. *The Cold War and American Science: The Military-Industrial-Academic Complex at MIT and Stanford.* New York: Columbia University Press, 1993.

Levi, Albert William. *General Education in the Social Studies.* Washington, D.C.: American Council on Education, 1948.

Levine, Arthur. *Handbook of the Undergraduate Curriculum.* San Francisco: Jossey-Bass, 1978.

Levine, Arthur and Jana Nidiffer. “Key Turning Points in the Evolving Curriculum.” In *Handbook of the Undergraduate Curriculum: A Comprehensive Guide to Purposes, Structures, Practices, and Change,* edited by Jerry G. Gaff, James L. Ratcliff, and Associates, 53-85. San Francisco: Jossey-Bass, 1996.

Levine, Arthur and John Weingart. *Reform of Undergraduate Education.* San Francisco: Jossey-Bass, 1973.

Levine, David O. *The American College and the Culture of Aspiration, 1915-1940*. Ithaca. NY: Cornell University Press, 1986.

Levine, Donald N. *Powers of the Mind: The Reinvention of Liberal Learning in America*. Chicago: University of Chicago Press, 2006.

———. Preface to *The Idea and Practice of General Education: An Account of the College of the University of Chicago,* by Present and Former Members of the Faculty, v-vii. Centennial edition. Chicago: University of Chicago Press, 1950/1992.

Levy, Richard David. “A Study of Ralph W. Tyler’s Statement, Development, and Later Modifications of His Rationale as Set Forth in His *Basic Principles of Curriculum and Instruction.* Ed.D. diss., Temple University, 1972.

Leyden, Ralph C. “The Stephens College Program.” In *Experimental Colleges: Their Role in American Higher Education,* edited by W. Hugh Stickler, 33-47. Tallahassee: Florida State University, 1964.

Limbert, Paul M. “Trends and Patterns in the Changing College Curriculum.” *Teachers College Record* 40 (1939): 669-684.

Lipka, Richard P., et al. *The Eight-Year Study Revisited: Lessons from the Past for the Present.* Columbus, OH: National Middle School Association, 1998.

Litterick, William S. “Evaluation at Stephens College.” In *Evaluation in General Education,* edited by Paul L. Dressel, 142-162. Dubuque, IA: Wm. C. Brown Company, 1954.

Locke, Lawrence. “General Education: In Search of Facts.” *Change: The Magazine of Higher Learning* 21 (1989): 21-23.

Loss, Christopher P. *Between Citizens and the State: The Politics of American Higher Education in the 20th Century.* Princeton: Princeton University Press, 2012.

———. “‘The Most Wonderful Thing Has Happened to Me in the Army’: Psychology, Citizenship, and American Higher Education in World War II.” *Journal of American History* 92 (2005): 864-891.

Lowen, Rebecca S. *Creating the Cold War University: The Transformation of Stanford.* Berkeley: University of California Press, 1997.

Lucas, Christopher J. *American Higher Education: A History*, 2nd ed. New York: St. Martin’s Press, 2006.

———. *Crisis in the Academy: Rethinking Higher Education in America.* New York: St. Martin’s Press, 1996.

Macdonald, Dwight. *The Ford Foundation: The Men and the Millions.* New York: Reynal and Company, 1956.

MacDonald, W.A. "Viewpoint on Education." *New York Times*, Nov. 16, 1941.

Mackenzie, Donald M. "Geographical Differences in the Educational Expenditures of North Central Association Colleges and Universities." *North Central Association Quarterly* 18 (1944): 261-271.

MacKenzie, Gordon N. "Youth and the High School" in *The Thirty-Eighth Yearbook of the National Society for the Study of Education: General Education in the American College*, edited by Guy Montrose Whipple, 49-71. Bloomington, IL: Public School Publishing Company, 1939.

MacKenzie, Gordon N. and Evans, Hubert. "The Challenge of General Education for the Secondary Schools." *Journal of General Education* 1 (1946): 64-71.

MacLean, Malcolm S. Foreword to *The Librarian and the Teacher in General Education: A Report of Library-Instructional Activities at Stephens College*, edited by B. Lamar Johnson and Eloise Lindstrom, v-vii. Chicago: American Library Association, 1948.

Madaus, George F. and Daniel L. Stufflebeam. "Program Evaluation: A Historical Overview" in *Evaluation Models: Viewpoints on Educational and Human Services Evaluation*, 2nd ed., edited by Daniel L. Stufflebeam. George F. Madaus. and Thomas Kellaghan. Boston: Kluwer Academic Publishers, 2000.

Madaus, George F. and Daniel Stufflebeam, eds. *Educational Evaluation: Classic Works of Ralph W. Tyler.* Boston: Kluwer Academic Publishers, 1989.

Magat, Richard. *The Ford Foundation at Work: Philanthropic Choices, Methods, and Styles.* New York: Plenum Press, 1979.

Mann, Albert R. "The Program in 1941." In *General Education Board. Annual Report, 1941*, 5-89. (New York: General Education Board, 1941.

Marcus, Alan I. "The Ivory Silo: Farmer-Agricultural College Tensions in the 1870s and 1880s." *Agricultural History* 60 (1986): 22-36.

Marie, Hildegarde. "Initiating a Cooperative Study Among Catholic Women's Colleges." *National Catholic Educational Association Bulletin* 49 (1952): 238-239.

Marinara, Martha, Kuppalapalle Vajravelu, and Denise L. Young. "Making Sense of the 'Loose Baggy Monster': Assessing Learning in a General Education Program is a Whale of a Task." *Journal of General Education* 53 (2004): 1-19.

Mark Solovey and Hamilton Cravens, eds. *Cold War Social Science: Knowledge Production. Liberal Democracy. and Human Nature.* New York: Palgrave Macmillan, 2012.

Markwardt, Daylanne. "From Sputnik to the Spellings Commission: The Rhetoric of Higher Education Reform." PhD diss., University of Arizona, 2012.

Marsh, Clarence Stephen, ed. *Cooperation in Accrediting Procedures: Proceedings of the Second Conference on Accrediting*. Washington, D.C.: American Council on Education, 1941.

———. "Higher Education and National Defense." *Journal of the American Association of Collegiate Registrars* 16 (1941): 371-386.

———, ed. *Higher Education Cooperates in National Defense: The Report of a Conference of Government Representatives and College and University Administrators. Held in Washington, D.C., July 30-31, 1941.* Washington, D.C.: American Council on Education, 1941.

———, ed. *Coordination of Accrediting Activities.* Washington, D.C.: American Council on Education, 1939.

Martinez, Al. "A Teacher's 22-Year Exile Ends: ACLU's Eason Monroe, Fired on Loyalty Oath, to Return to S.F. State." *Los Angeles Times*, May 30, 1972.

Materials Prepared by Participants in the Social Studies Group of the Cooperative Study in General Education Summer Workshop, University of Chicago, Chicago, Illinois. June 19—July 21. 1939. Chicago: Cooperative Study in General Education, 1939.

Matthews, Jr., Donald R. "Perspective: General Education at the Community College, 1952-1978." Course essay. University of Florida, 1979. ERIC. ED 178 127.

Maxwell, C.R. "Value of Past Educational Experiments." *North Central Association Quarterly* 10 (1935): 445-447.

May, Mark A, Charles H. Judd, Henry M. Wriston, Roscoe Pulliam, Grayson N. Kefauver, Bertie Backus, and Johnson, B. Lamar. "General Education in the United States: A Panel Discussion." *Educational Record* 20 (1939): 437-452.

Mayhew, Lewis B. *General Education: A Reassessment. The Baldwin Lecture.* Kirksville, MO: Northeast Missouri State College/Simpson Printing Company, 1968.

———. "Imperatives for Institutional Research." In *Research on Academic Input: Proceedings of Sixth Annual Forum of the Association for Institutional Research, May 2-5. 1966*, edited by Clarence H. Bagley, 1-7. Athens, GA: The Association for Institutional Research, 1966.

———. *General Education: An Account and Appraisal: A Guide for College Faculties.* New York: Harper and Brothers, 1960.

Mayhew, Lewis B., Patrick J. Ford, and and Dean L. Hubbard. *The Quest for Quality: The Challenge for Undergraduate Education in the 1990s.* San Francisco: Jossey-Bass, 1990.

McArthur, Benjamin. "Revisiting Hutchins and *The Higher Learning in America*." *History of Higher Education Annual* 7 (1987): 8-28.

McCarthy, Kathleen D. "From Cold War to Cultural Development: The International Cultural Activities of the Ford Foundation. 1950-1980." *Daedalus* 116 (1987): 93-117.

McCaughey, Robert A. *Stand Columbia: A History of Columbia University in the City of New York, 1754-2004*. New York: Columbia University Press, 2003.

McClay, Wilfred M. "Institutional Diversity and the Future of American Higher Education: Reconsidering the Vision of David Riesman." In *The Relevance of Higher Education: Exploring a Contested Notion,* edited by Timothy L. Simpson, 199-212. Lanham, MD: Lexington Books, 2013.

McClintock, Robbie. *Homeless in the House of Intellect: Formative Justice and Education as an Academic Study.* New York: Laboratory for Liberal Learning, 2005.

McComb, Mary C. *Great Depression and the Middle Class: Experts, Collegiate Youth, and Business Ideology, 1929-1941*. New York: Routledge, 2006.

McConn, Max. "The Dilemma of Democratic Education: Academic Standards vs. Individual Differences." *Vital Speeches of the Day* 2 (1936): 225-228.

McConnell, T.R. "A Program of General Education for Members of the Armed Forces." In *Higher Education Under War Conditions*, edited by John Dale Russell, 13-26. Chicago: Privately Published by University of Chicago, 1943.

McConnell, T.R. *A General Pattern for American Public Higher Education.* New York: McGraw-Hill, 1962.

———. Foreword to *Autonomy of Public Colleges: The Challenge of Coordination*. by Lyman A. Glenny. New York: McGraw-Hill, 1959.

———. "Liberal Education After the War." *Annals of the American Academy of Political and Social Science* 231 (1944): 81-87.

McCreight, James L. "Human Living: An Integrated Course in Psychology, Philosophy, and Religion." *The Journal of the American Academy of Religion* 16 (1948): 151-154.

McCutchen, S.P. "The Study of Contemporary Problems." *Thirty Schools Bulletin: An Occasional Publication for the Teachers in the Study of the Relation of the School and College* 1 (1937): 16-19.

McDonald, Ralph W. "Fundamental Issues in General Education." *Journal of General Education* 4 (1949): 32-39.

McGrath, Dennis and Martin B. Spear. *The Academic Crisis of the Community College.* Albany: State University of New York Press, 1991.

McGrath, Dorothy Leemon, ed. *Design for General Education: For Members of the Armed Forces* ed. Washington, D.C.: American Council on Education, 1944.

McGrath, Earl J. "Fifty Years in Higher Education: Personal Influences on My Professional Development." *Journal of Higher Education* 51 (1980): 76-93.

———. "Bring Back General Education!" *Change: The Magazine of Higher Learning* 4 (1972): 8-9, 64.

———. "General Education and the Report of the President's Commission on Higher Education." In *General Education: A University Program in Action*, edited by W. Hugh Stickler, James Paul Stoakes and Louis Shores, 30-41. Dubuque. IA: Wm. C. Brown, 1950.

———. "The General Education Movement: An Editorial." *Journal of General Education* 1 (1946): 3-8.

———. "The Purposes of General Education." *Journal of the American Association of Collegiate Registrars* 21 (1946): 157-167.

———. "A Bibliography on General Education." *Educational Record* 21 (1940): 96-118.

———. "The Cooperative Study in General Education," *Junior College Journal* 9 (1939): 500-506.

McLean, James E. “Sixty Years of Research in the Schools: A Conversation with Ralph W. Tyler.” *Research in the Schools* 1 (1994): 1-8.

Meek, Lois Hayden. *The Personal-Social Development of Boys and Girls with Implications for Secondary Education.* New York: Committee on Workshops, Progressive Education Association, 1940.

Mehta, Jal. *The Allure of Order: High Hopes, Dashed Expectations, and the Troubled Quest to Remake American Schooling.* New York: Oxford University Press, 2013.

Meier, Kenneth M. “The Community College Mission: History and Theory, 1930-2000” PhD diss., University of Arizona, 2008.

Menand, Louis. *The Marketplace of Ideas: Reform and Resistance in the American University.* New York: W.W. Norton, 2010.

Merrifield, Susan R. *Readin’ and Writin’ for the Hard-Hat Crowd: Curriculum Policy at an Urban University.* New York: Peter Lang, 2005.

Mettler, Suzanne. *Soldiers to Citizens: The G.I. Bill and the Making of the Greatest Generation*. New York: Oxford University Press, 2005.

Meyer, John W. et al. “Public Education as Nation-Building in America: Enrollments and Bureaucratization in the American States, 1870-1930.” *American Journal of Sociology* 85 (1979): 591-613.

Miel, Alice. *Changing the Curriculum: A Social Process.* New York: Appleton-Century-Crofts, 1946.

Miller, Eugene F. “On the American Founders’ Defense of Liberal Education in a Republic.” *Review of Politics* 46 (1984): 65-90.

Miller, Gary E. *The Meaning of General Education: The Emergence of a Curriculum Paradigm*. New York: Teacher’s College Press, 1988.

Miller, J. Hillis and Dorothy V.N. Brooks. *The Role of Higher Education in War and After.* New York: Harper and Brothers, 1944.

Mirel, Jeffrey E. *Patriotic Pluralism: Americanization Education and European Immigrants.* Cambridge: Harvard University Press, 2010.

———. *The Rise and Fall of an Urban School System. Detroit. 1907-1981*, 2nd ed. Ann Arbor: University of Michigan Press, 1999.

———. “The Politics of Educational Retrenchment in Detroit. 1929-1935.” *History of Education Quarterly* 24 (1984): 323-358.

Mitchell, Theodore R. and Lawrence A. Torres. “‘Something, But Not Very Much’: School-University Partnerships in Historical Perspective.” In *Higher Education and School Reform*, edited by P. Michael Timpane and Lori S. White, 15-39. San Francisco: Jossey-Bass, 1998.

Modell, John. *Into One’s Own: From Youth to Adulthood in the United States, 1920-1975.* Berkeley: University of California Press, 1989.

Mohr, Clarence L. "World War II and the Transformation of Southern Higher Education." In *Remaking Dixie: The Impact of World War II on the American South,* edited by Neil R. McMillen, 33-55. Jackson: University Press of Mississippi, 1997.

Monroe, Eason. Interviewed by Joel Gardner. "Safeguarding Civil Liberties: Oral History Transcript." July-Aug. 1972. Los Angeles: Oral History Program, University of California at Los Angeles, 1974.

Monroe, Ruth L. *Teaching the Individual.* New York: Columbia University Press, 1942.

Moore, David Walter. "Liberalism and Liberal Education at Columbia University: The Columbia Careers of Jacques Barzun, Lionel Trilling, Richard Hofstadter, Daniel Bell, and C. Wright Mills." PhD diss., University of Maryland, 1978.

Moore, Michaela Hoenicke. *Know Your Enemy: The American Debate on Nazism, 1933-1945.* New York: Cambridge University Press, 2010.

"More Economic Study Urged for Schools: Emphasis Should Be Placed on Social Problems in Revised Curriculum. Says Educator." *New York Times*, Jan. 27, 1935.

Moreo, Dominic W. *Schools in the Great Depression.* New York: Garland Publishing, 1996.

Morison, Robert S. "Foundations and Universities." *Daedalus* 93 (1964): 1109-1141.

Morse, H.T. "Between the Ivory Tower and the Market Place." *Junior College Journal* 35 (1965): 16-20.

Mortimer, Kenneth P. and T.R. McConnell. *Sharing Authority Effectively: Participation, Interaction, and Discretion.* San Francisco: Jossey-Bass, 1978.

"MSC Alumni to Hear Two Speakers Wednesday Night." *Jackson Citizen-Patriot*, Feb. 18, 1945.

"MSC Freshmen Will Enter Basic School." *Milan Leader*, July 21, 1944.

"MSU Education Aims Explained to Lions" *Jackson Citizen-Patriot*, July 18, 1944.

Mulcahy, D.G. *The Educated Person: Toward a New Paradigm for Liberal Education.* Lanham, MD: Rowman and Littlefield Publishers, 2008.

Murandu, Margaret S. "An Investigation of Undergraduate Students' Perceptions Regarding the General Education Program at Idaho State University." PhD diss., Idaho State University, 2004.

National Association of Scholars for Reasoned Scholarship in a Free Society. "The Dissolution of General Education: 1914-1993." Princeton, NJ: Author, 1996.

National Education Association. "A Directory of National Deliberative Committees in Education: Prepared for the Joint Commission on the Emergency in Education." Washington, D.C.: Author, 1934.

Nelson-Jones, Richard Colin. "General Education in American Higher Education, 1955-56 to 1964-65." PhD diss., Stanford University, 1967.

Nelson-Laird, Thomas F. and Amy K. Garver. "The Effect of Teaching General Education Courses on Deep Approaches to Learning: How Disciplinary Context Matters." *Research in Higher Education* 51 (2010): 248-265.

Nelson, Adam R. *Education and Democracy: The Meaning of Alexander Meiklejohn, 1872-1964*. Madison: University of Wisconsin Press, 2001

Nelson, Michael. "Alive at the Core: Programs and Issues." In *Alive at the Core: Exemplary Approaches to General Education in the Humanities*, edited by Michael Nelson and Associates, 1-19. San Francisco: Jossey-Bass, 2000.

Nichols, James O. and Karen W. Nichols. *General Education Assessment for Improvement of Student Academic Achievement: Guidance for Academic Departments and Committees.* New York: Agathon Press, 2001.

Nicholas, Barbara Ann. "Floyd W. Reeves on Curriculum" PhD diss., Michigan State University, 1971.

Niehoff, Richard O. *Floyd W. Reeves: Innovative Educator and Distinguished Practitioner of the Art of Public Administration*. Lanham, MD: University Press of America, 1991.

Nieli, Russell K. "From Christian Gentleman to Bewildered Seeker: The Transformation of American Higher Education." *Academic Questions* 20 (2007): 311-331.

North Central Association of Colleges and Secondary Schools. *Know Your North Central Association*. Ann Arbor, MI: Author, 1951.

———. "Minutes of the Annual Meeting." *North Central Association Quarterly* 9 (1934): 364-379.

Nowakowski, Jeri Ridings. "An Interview with Ralph Tyler." Occasional Paper Series, Paper # 13. Evaluation Center. Kalamazoo: College of Education, Western Michigan University, Kalamazoo, 1981.

Nuss, Kenneth E. "Student Perceptions of General Education at a Comprehensive University and Implications" EdD diss., University of Northern Iowa, 1997.

O'Banion, Terry. "A Brief History of General Education." *Community College Journal of Research and Practice* 40 (2016): 327-334.

O'Shea, Joseph Anthony. "An Inquiry into the Development of the University of Chicago Evaluation Movement." PhD diss., University of Illinois at Urbana-Champaign, 1979.

Ogan, Ralph W. "The Cooperative Study in General Education, " *Educational Record* 23 (1942): 692-703.

———. "Wartime Opportunities in General Education." *Journal of Higher Education* 13 (1942): 457-504.

Ogren, Christine A. "Sites, Students, Scholarship, and Structures: The Historiography of American Higher Education in the Post-Revisionist Era." In *Rethinking the History of American Education*, edited by William J. Reese and John L. Rury, 187-222. New York: Palgrave MacMillan, 2008.

———. *The American State Normal School: "An Instrument of Great Good."* New York: Palgrave Macmillan, 2005.

Ohio State University School, The Faculty of the School. "Eight-Year Study: A Report of the Ohio State University School to The Commission on the Relation of School and College

of the Progressive Education Association." Columbus. OH: Ohio State University School, 1940.

Orth, Andrew Park. "The History of General Education as a Philosophical Development in American Higher Education." PhD diss., Pennsylvania State University, 1952.

Pace, C. Robert. *Measuring Outcomes of College: Fifty Years of Findings and Recommendations for the Future*. San Francisco: Jossey-Bass, 1979.

Pangle, Lorraine Smith and Thomas L. *The Learning of Liberty: The Educational Ideals of the American Founders*. Lawrence: University Press of Kansas, 1993.

Parmar, Inderjeet. *Foundations of the American Century: The Ford, Carnegie, and Rockefeller Foundations in the Rise of American Power.* New York: Columbia University Press, 2012.

Patterson, James T. "'Culture Wars' and 'Decline' in the 1990s." In *Restless Giant: The United States from Watergate to Bush v. Gore,* 254-291. New York: Oxford University Press, 2005.

Patterson, W. Brown. "Defining the Educated Person: From Harvard to Harvard." *Soundings: An Interdisciplinary Journal* 66 (1983): 192-217.

Pedersen, Robert. "Conflicting Interests in the Funding of the Early Two-Year College." *New Directions for Community Colleges* 132 (2005): 5-17.

———. "The Origins and Development of the Early Public Junior College. 1900-1940." PhD diss., Columbia University, 2000.

———. "State Government and the Junior College. 1901-1946." *Community College Review* 14 (1987): 48-52.

Pells, Richard H. *Radical Visions and American Dreams: Culture and Social Thought in the Depression Years*. Urbana: University of Illinois Press, 1973/1998.

Penn, Jeremy D. "The Case for Assessing Complex General Education Student Learning Outcomes." *New Directions for Institutional Research* no. 149 (2011): 5-14.

The Penn State Symposium on General Education. "Students in the Balance: General Education in the Research University." University Park: Pennsylvania State University, 2002.

Pepin, Craig K. "Dilettantes and Over-specialization: Diagnosing and Treating Nazism at West German Universities After World War II." *History of Education Quarterly* 45 (2005): 604-614.

Perkin, Harold. "The Historical Perspective." In *Perspectives on Higher Education: Eight Disciplinary and Comparative Views,* edited by Burton R. Clark, 17-50. Berkeley: University of California Press, 1984.

Perlmann, Joel. *Ethnic Differences: Schooling and Social Structure Among the Irish, Italians, Jews & Blacks in an American City, 1880-1935.* New York: Cambridge University Press, 1988.

Peterson, Paul E. *The Politics of School Reform. 1870-1940*. Chicago: University of Chicago Press, 1985.

Piereson, James. “Columbia Beats Harvard.” In *Shattered Consensus: The Rise and Decline of America’s Postwar Political Order*, by James Piereson, 321-334. New York: Encounter Books, 2015.

Pierson, Sharon Gay. *Laboratory of Learning: HBCU Laboratory Schools and Alabama State College Lab High in the Era of Jim Crow*. New York: Peter Lang, 2014.

Plath, Paul John. “The Fox and the Hedgehog: Liberal Education at the University of Chicago.” PhD diss., University of Illinois at Urbana-Champaign, 1989.

Pollak, Richard. *The Creation of Dr. B: A Biography of Bruno Bettelheim.* New York: Simon & Schuster, 1997.

Ponder, Gerald and Dixie D. Massey. “Nothing So Uncommon: Ralph W. Tyler and His Defining Perspective.” In *Critical Times in Curriculum Thought: People, Politics, and Perspectives,* edited by Marcella L. Kysilka, 51-66. Charlotte, NC: Information Age Publishing, 2011.

Porter, Theodore M. *Trust in Numbers: The Pursuit of Objectivity in Science and Public Life.* Princeton: Princeton University Press, 1995.

Posselt, Julie Renee. “The Rise and Fall of Need-Based Grants: A Critical Review of Presidential Discourses on Higher Education, 1964-1984.” In *Higher Education: Handbook of Theory and Research. Volume 24*, edited by John C. Smart, 183-225. Dordrecht: Springer, 2009.

Potts, David B. *Liberal Education for a Land of Colleges: Yale’s* Reports *of 1828*. New York: Palgrave Macmillan, 2010.

Prator, Ralph. “The Counseling-Guidance Plan at Bakersfield College.” *California Journal of Secondary Education* 26 (1951): 426-429.

Price, Hugh G. *California Public Junior Colleges.* Sacramento: California State Department of Education, 1958.

Problems and Proposals Concerning General Education in California Junior Colleges: A Preliminary Report by The Summer Workshop of the California Study of General Education in the Junior College. June 26 – Aug. 4. 1950. Los Angeles: The California Study of General Education in the Junior College, 1950.

“Proceedings of the Commission on Institutions of Higher Education.” *North Central Association Quarterly* 9 (1934): 37-59.

“Programs of the Cooperating Secondary Schools in California.” Special Issue. *Bulletin of the California State Department of Education* 3 (1939): 1-82

Progressive Education Advances: Report on a Program to Educate American Youth for Present-Day Living. New York: Appleton-Century Co., 1938.

Progressive Education Association. “Materials Prepared by Participants in the English Group of the Progressive Education Association Summer Workshop, Sarah Lawrence College. Bronxville, New York, July 2 – Aug. 13, 1937.” Columbus, OH: Progressive Education Association, Evaluation in the Eight Year Study, 1937.

Raisman, Neal A. “Creating Philosopher Bricklayers: Redefining General Education and the Liberal Arts.” *Community, Technical, and Junior College Journal* 62 (1991-92): 16-20.

Ramanathan, Gopalakrishna. *The Quest for General Education: Reflections on the Harvard Report.* Bombay: Asia Publishing House, 1968.

Ratcliffe, James L. et al. "The Status of General Education in the Year 2000: Summary of a National Survey." Washington, D.C.: Association of American Colleges and Universities, 2001.

Rather, Howard C. "Organization for Basic General Education at Michigan State College." In *Organization and Administration of General Education,* edited by W. Hugh Stickler, 40-49. Dubuque, IA: Wm. C. Brown, 1951.

Raths, Louis. "The Workshop." *Educational Research Bulletin* 20 (1941): 115-121.

———. "Progressive Education Association, Evaluation in the Eight Year Study, Bulletin No. 1., Anecdotal Records. Columbus: Progressive Education Association, Evaluation in the Eight Year Study, Ohio State University, 1935.

Rattigan, Bernard T. "A Critical Study of the General Education Movement." PhD diss., The Catholic University of America, 1952.

Raubinger, Frederick M. et al., eds. *The Development of Secondary Education*. New York: The Macmillan Company, 1969.

Ravitch, Diane. *Left Back: A Century of Battles over School Reform.* New York: Simon and Schuster, 2000.

Rawick, George P. "The New Deal and Youth: The Civilian Conservation Corps. the National Youth Administration and the American Youth Congress." PhD diss., University of Wisconsin, 1957.

Raynor, Gregory K. "Engineering Social Reform: The Rise of the Ford Foundation and Cold War Liberalism, 1908-1959" PhD diss., New York University, 2000.

Redefer, Frederick L. "American Education Becomes Youth Conscious." *High School Journal* 22 (1939): 265-268.

Reese, William J. "American Education in the Twentieth Century: Progressive Legacies." *Paedagogica Historica* 39 (2003): 415-416.

———. *The Origins of the American High School.* New Haven: Yale University Press, 1995.

———. *Power and the Promise of School Reform: Grass-roots Movements During the Progressive Era*. Boston: Routledge & Kegan Paul, 1986.

Reeves, Floyd W. "General Education at a State University." *Basic College Quarterly* 1 (1955): 5-10.

Reeves, Mary Garwood. "Economic Depression in Higher Education: Emory University. the University of Georgia and Georgia Tech, 1930-1940." PhD diss., Georgia State University, 1985.

Regents Plan for Postwar Education in the State of New York. Albany: The State University of New York, 1944.

Reichard, Donald J. "The History of Institutional Research." In *The Handbook of Institutional Research,* edited by Richard D. Howard et al., 3-21. San Francisco: Jossey-Bass, 2012.

Reichert, Stephen B. “The Four-Year Junior College Movement in California” EdD diss., University of California at Los Angeles, 1957.

Reid, John Young. “The Public Career of Earl James McGrath: Vindicating Education for Holistic Man.” PhD diss., University of Arizona, 1978.

Reid, Jr., Alban Elwell. “A History of the California Public Junior College Movement.” EdD diss., University of Southern California, 1966.

Reiman, Richard A. *The New Deal and American Youth: Ideas and Ideals in a Depression Decade.* Athens: University of Georgia Press, 1992.

Remy, Steven P. “‘We Are No Longer the University of the Liberal Age:’ The Humanities and National Socialism at Heidelberg.” In *Nazi Germany and the Humanities,* edited by Wolfgang Bialas and Anson Rabinbach, 21-49. Oxford: Oneworld, 2007.

Report of the Study for the Ford Foundation on Policy and Program. Detroit: Ford Foundation, 1949.

“Revolutionary Change is Voted in Curriculum by Faculty at MSU.” *Sturgis Journal*, May 23, 1944.

Reuben, Julie A. and Linda Perkins. “Introduction: Commemorating the Sixtieth Anniversary of the President’s Commission Report. *Higher Education for Democracy*.” *History of Education Quarterly* 47 (2007): 267.

Reynolds, Katherine Chaddock. “A Canon of Democratic Intent: Reinterpreting the Roots of the Great Books Movement.” *History of Higher Education Annual* 22 (2002): 5-32.

Rhoades, Robert A. “Student Protest and Multicultural Reform: Making Sense of Campus Unrest in the 1990s.” *Journal of Higher Education* 69 (1998): 621-646.

Richardson, Theresa and Donald Fisher. *The Development of the Social Sciences in the United States and Canada: The Role of Philanthropy*, Stamford. CT: Ablex, 1999.

Richardson, Theresa M. “Rethinking Progressive High School Reform in the 1930s: Youth, Mental Hygiene, and General Education.” *American Educational History Journal* 33 (2006): 77-87.

———. “Refiguring Schools as Child Welfare Agencies: Rockefeller Boards and the New Program in General Education at the Secondary Level.” *American Educational History Journal* 32 (2005): 122-130.

Rieken, John W. “George Frederick Zook: Educational Leader in a Crucial Decade.” PhD diss., Georgia State University, 2005.

Riesman, David. *On Higher Education: The Academic Enterprise in an Era of Rising Student Consumerism*. New Brunswick, NJ: Transaction Publishers, 1980/1998.

———. *Constraint and Variety in American Education* Landmark Edition of 1977. Lincoln: University of Nebraska Press, 1956/1977.

Rippa, S. Alexander. “Retrenchment in a Period of Defensive Opposition to the New Deal: The Business Community and the Public Schools, 1932-1934.” *History of Education Quarterly* 2 (1962): 76-82.

Ritter, Kelly. *To Know Her Own History: Writing at the Woman's College.* Pittsburgh: University of Pittsburgh Press, 2012.

Roberts, Helen M. "Issues Relating to and Principles Underlying an Adequate Reading Program: In High Schools." In *Co-Operative Efforts in Schools to Improve Reading,* edited by William S. Gray, 73-78. Chicago: University of Chicago, published in conjunction with *The School Review* and *The Elementary School Journal*, 1942.

Robertson, Malcolm Ray. "A Comparative Analysis of the General Education Programs in Church Related Colleges and Public Junior Colleges of California." EdD diss., University of Southern California, 1967.

Robertson, Thashundray C. "Access to Success: Truman, Obama, and the Evolution of Presidential Agendas for Community Colleges." PhD diss., University of South Carolina, 2011.

Robinson, Karen Jeong. "The Rise of Choice in the U.S. University and College, 1910-2005." *Sociological Forum* 26 (2011): 601-622.

Robson, David. *Educating Republicans: The College in the Era of the American Revolution, 1750-1800*. Westport, CT: Greenwood Press, 1985.

Rodecker, Charles M. "Pacemakers: California's Community Colleges." *California Journal of Secondary Education* 31 (1956): 217-220.

Röhrs, Hermann. *The Classical German Concept of the University and Its Influence on Higher Education in the United States*. Frankfurt: Peter Lang, 1995.

Rose, Kenneth W. "Why a University for Chicago and Not Cleveland?: Religion and John D. Rockefeller's Early Philanthropy, 1855-1900" Research Report, Rockefeller Archives Center, 1995.

Rosenfield, Patricia L. *A World of Giving: Carnegie Corporation of New York—A Century of International Philanthropy.* New York: Public Affairs, 2014.

Rosenstock, Sheldon A. "The Educational Contributions of W(errett) W(allace) Charters." PhD diss., Ohio State University, 1984.

Rothblatt, Sheldon. "Old Wine in New Bottles, or New Wine in Old Bottles?: The Humanities and Liberal Education in Today's Universities." In *A New Deal for the Humanities: Liberal Arts and the Future of Public Higher Education,* edited by Gordon Hunter and Feisal G. Mohamed, 31-50. New Brunswick. NJ: Rutgers University Press, 2016.

———. "The American Modular System." In *Quality and Access in Higher Education: Comparing Britain and the United States,* edited by Robert O. Berdahl, Graeme C. Moodie and Irving J. Spitzberg. Jr., 129-141. Buckingham, UK: Society for Research in Higher Education, 1991.

Rowland, Sydney V. "Cooperative Study of Eighteen Pennsylvania Secondary Schools." *Educational Method* 20 (1941): 312-315

Rubin, Lou. "Ralph W. Tyler Remembered." *Educational Leadership* 51 (1994): 84.

Ruda, Allison M. “Neither Gospel Nor Method: An Historical Case Study of Progressive Teachers Involved in the Eight-Year Study Summer Workshops, 1936-1939.” EdD diss., Northeastern University, 2013.

Rudolph, Frederick. Foreword to *Revitalizing General Education in a Time of Scarcity: A Navigational Chart for Administrators and Faculty* by Sandra L. Kanter et. al, x-xiv. Needham Heights, MA: Allyn & Bacon, 1997.

———. “The Power of Professors: The Impact of Specialization and Professionalization on the Curriculum.” *Change: The Magazine for Higher Education* 16 (1984): 12-17, 41.

———. *Curriculum: A History of the American Undergraduate Course of Study Since 1636*. San Francisco: Jossey-Bass, 1977.

Rumjahn, Miriam Cassandra. “A Chronicle of the Professional Activities of Ralph W. Tyler: An Oral History.” EdD diss., Pepperdine University, 1984.

Rury, John L. “The Changing Profile of College Access: The Truman Commission and Enrollment Patterns in the Postwar Era.” *History of Education Quarterly* 47 (2007): 302-327.

Russell, Charles Hoover. “The Required Programs of General Education in the Social Sciences at Columbia College. the College of the University of Chicago, and Harvard College.” PhD diss., Columbia University, 1961.

Russell, John Dale. “Basic Conclusions and Recommendations of the President’s Commission on Higher Education.” *Journal of Educational Sociology* 22 (1949): 493-508.

———. “Change in Composition and Character of the School Population.” In *Critical Issues in Educational Administration,* edited by William C. Reavis, 3-19. Chicago: University of Chicago Press, 1938.

Ryan, H.H. “Experimenting with the Curriculum.” *North Central Association Quarterly* 11 (1936): 222-226.

Ryan, Kevin, John Johnston and Katherine Newman. “An Interview with Ralph Tyler.” *Phi Delta Kappan* 58 (1977): 544-547.

Ryan, W. Carson and Tyler, Ralph W. *Summer Workshops in Secondary Education: An Experiment in the In-Service Training of Teachers and other Educational Workers*. New York: Progressive Education Association, 1939.

Sanford, Jr., Dennis Sammis. *Cooperation and Coordination in Higher Education.* Washington, D.C.: American Council on Education, 1938.

———. *Inter-institutional Agreements in Higher Education: An Analysis of the Documents Relating to Inter-institutional Agreements with Special Reference to Coordination.* New York: Bureau of Publications, Teachers College Columbia University, 1934.

Sarason, Seymour B. *Revisiting “The Culture of the School and the Problem of Change.”* New York: Teachers College Press, 1996.

Savage, Howard J. *Fruit of an Impulse: Forty-Five Years of the Carnegie Foundation, 1905-1950.* New York: Harcourt, Brace and Company, 1953.

Sayward, Ruth K. “A Teacher Develops an Evaluation Instrument.” In *Thirty Schools Bulletin: An Occasional Publication for the Teachers in the Study of the Relation of the School and College* 1 (1937): 30-32.

Scarborough, Ruth E. “General Education,” review of *General Education in Action*, by B. Lamar Johnson, *College and Research Libraries* 14 (1953): 104-107.

Schaefer, Robert J. “Footnotes on Callahan’s Teachers College” In *Shaping the Superintendency: A Reexamination of Callahan and the Cult of Efficiency*, edited by William Edward Eaton, 36-66. New York: Teachers College Press, 1990.

“Scholastic Principles Applied to Themselves by 150 Teachers: From the South and West they bring Projects to ‘Workshop’ at Sarah Lawrence College to Meet the Demand for Revised Curricula in Pre-College Years.” *New York Times*, Aug. 1, 1937.

Schott, Andrew Frederic. “The Role of the Consultant in Curriculum Change: Selected Schools of the Eight Year Study of the Progressive Education Association and the Seven County Study of the Michigan Community Health Project: Volume I.” PhD diss., University of Wisconsin, 1952.

Schrum, Ethan. “Establishing a Democratic Religion: Metaphysics and Democracy in the Debates Over the President’s Commission on Higher Education.” *History of Education Quarterly* 47 (2007): 277-301.

Schubert, William H., et al. *Curriculum Books: The First Hundred Years*, 2nd ed. New York: Peter Lang, 2002.

Schuyler, Gwyer. “A Historical and Contemporary View of the Community College Curriculum.” *New Directions for Community Colleges* 108 (1999): 3-15.

Schwab, Joseph J. “The Fight for Education.” *Atlantic Monthly* 169 (1942): 727-731.

Scigliano, Virginia Lee. “On General Education.” *Community College Review* 4 (1976): 40-42.

Scott, Joan W. “The Rhetoric of Crisis in Higher Education.” In *Higher Education Under Fire: Politics, Economics, and the Crisis of the Humanities*, edited by Michael Bérubé and Cary Nelson, 293-304. New York: Routledge, 1995.

Scott, John C. “The Mission of the University: Medieval to Postmodern Transformations.” *Journal of Higher Education* 77 (2006): 1-39.

Sealander, Judith. “Curing Evils at Their Source: The Arrival of Scientific Giving.” In *Charity, Philanthropy, and Civility in American History*, edited by Lawrence J. Friedman and Mark D. McGarvie, 217-239. New York: Cambridge University Press, 2002.

Seashore, Carl E. *The Junior College Movement*. New York: Henry Holt and Company, 1940.

Segal, Daniel. “‘Western Civ’ and the Staging of History in American Higher Education.” *American Historical Review* 105 (2000): 770-805.

Seim, David L. *Rockefeller Philanthropy and Modern Social Science*. London: Pickering and Chatto, 2013.

Sellers, Nona Joyce. “A Description of Faculty Perceptions Concerning General Education and the Means of Satisfying General Education Requirements by Undergraduate Students in a

Liberal Arts School and a Professional School at a Typical Institution of Higher Education." PhD diss., University of Alabama, 1989.

Sexson, John A. and John W. Harbeson. *The New American College: The Four-Year Junior Colleges Grades 11 to 14 Inclusive Organized and Administered as a Single Institution.* New York: Harper and Brothers, 1946.

Shavelson, Richard J. *Measuring College Learning Responsibly: Accountability in a New Era.* Stanford: Stanford University Press, 2010.

———. "A Brief History of Student Learning Assessment: How We Got Where We Are and a Proposal for Where to Go Next." Washington, D.C.: Association for American Colleges and Universities, 2007.

Shaw, Ruth G. "Curriculum Change in the Community College: Pendulum Swing or Spiral Soar?" In *Innovation in the Community College,* edited by Terry O'Banion, 23-45. New York: MacMillan, 1989.

Shawver, Murl C. "A Few Issues Concerning Biology in General Education." *Science Education* 41 (1957): 219-223.

Sheviakov, George and Jean Friedberg. "Evaluation of Personal and Social Adjustment: Report of Progress of the Study." Chicago: Progressive Education Association, Evaluation in the Eight Year Study, 1939.

Silliman, Matthew R. and David Kenneth Johnson. *Bridges to Autonomy: Paradoxes in Teaching and Learning.* Williamstown, MA: Piraeus Books, 2011.

Slaughter, Sheila. "The Political Economy of Curriculum-Making in American Universities." In *The Future of the City of Intellect: The Changing American University,* edited by Steven Brint, 260-289. Stanford: Stanford University Press, 2002.

———. "Class. Race and Gender and the Construction of Post-secondary Curricula in the United States: Social Movement. Professionalization and Political Economic Theories of Curricular Change." *Journal of Curriculum Studies* 29 (1997): 1-30.

Sloan, Douglas. "The Teaching of Ethics in the American Undergraduate Curriculum. 1876-1976" In *Ethics Teaching in Higher Education,* edited by Daniel Callahan and Sissela Bok, 1-57. New York: Plenum Press, 1980.

Smith, Bradford Robert. "Curriculum Integration in the Eight-Year Study of the Progressive Education Association. 1932-1940: Three Schools Tell Their Story." PhD diss., Pennsylvania State University, 1996.

Smith, Gilbert E. *The Limits of Reform: Politics and Federal Aid to Education, 1937-1950.* New York: Garland Publishing, 1982.

Smith, Gordon Wayne. "Rationales for General Education: A Critical Analysis" PhD diss., University of California at Los Angeles, 1984.

Smith, Mark C. *Social Science in the Crucible: The American Debate over Objectivity and Purpose, 1918-1941.* Durham: Duke University Press, 1994.

Smith, Richard Norton. *The Harvard Century: The Making of a University to a Nation.* New York: Simon and Schuster, 1986.

Smith, Sara Louise. “Education Against Quackery at the College Level.” *Journal of School Health* 34 (1964): 227-234.

Smith, Wilson, ed. *Theories of Education in Early America, 1655-1819.* Indianapolis: The Bobbs-Merrill Company, 1973.

Snow, Louis Franklin. *The College Curriculum in the United States*. New York: Teachers College, Columbia University/AMS Press: 1907/1972.

Snyder, Thomas D., ed. *120 Years of American Education: A Statistical Portrait.* Washington, D.C.: National Center for Education Statistics, 1993.

Solovey, Mark. *Shaky Foundations: The Politics-Patronage-Social Science Nexus in Cold War America.* New Brunswick, NJ: Rutgers University Press, 2013.

Sorber, Nathan M. “The Rise and Fall of Grange’s Yankee Land-Grant Colleges, 1873-1901.” In *Science as Service: Establishing and Reformulating Land-Grant Universities, 1865-1930*, edited by Alan I. Marcus, 61-92. Tuscaloosa: University of Alabama Press, 2015.

Spaeth, Robert L. “Individualism vs. Liberal Arts Education: The Understanding of Old Subjects.” *Vital Speeches of the Day* 54 (1987): 22-26.

Spafford, Ivol. et. al. *Building a Curriculum for General Education: A Description of the General College Program*. Minneapolis: University of Minnesota Press, 1943.

Spaull, Andrew. “World War II and the Secondary School Curriculum: A Comparative Study of the USA and Australia.” In *Education and the Second World War: Studies in Schooling and Social Change,* 159-176. Washington, D.C.: The Falmer Press, 1992.

“Speaker Tells How Veterans Can Be Aided.” *Lansing State Journal*, March 29, 1945.

Special Committee on the Secondary School Curriculum. *What the High Schools Ought to Teach: The Report of a Special Committee on the Secondary School Curriculum Prepared for the American Youth Commission and Other Cooperating Organizations.* Washington, D.C.: American Council on Education, 1940.

Spillman, Scott. “Institutional Limits: Christine Ladd-Franklin, Fellowships, and American Women’s Academic Careers, 1880-1920.” *History of Education Quarterly* 52 (2012): 196-221.

Spitzberg, Jr., Irving J. “It’s Academic: The Politics of the Curriculum.” In *Higher Education in American Society,* 3rd ed., edited by Philip G. Altbach, Robert O. Berdahl and Patricia J. Gumport, 289-305. Amherst, NY: Prometheus Books, 1994.

Sprague, Brinton. “The Development of General Education in Washington Community Colleges.” PhD diss., University of Washington, 1987.

Spring, Joel H. *Education and the Rise of the Corporate State.* Boston: Beacon Press, 1972.

“State College Dean Will be at Farmers Club Meeting.” *Tuscola County Advertiser*, Feb. 25, 1945.

“State’s Junior College Enrollment Tops Nation.” *Los Angeles Times*, Aug. 18, 1952.

Steffes, Tracy L. *School. Society. & State: A New Education to Govern Modern America.* Chicago: University of Chicago Press, 2012.

Stephan, Frederick F. “History of the Uses of Modern Sampling Procedures.” *Journal of the American Statistical Association* 43 (1948): 12-39.

Stevens, Anne H. “The Philosophy of General Education and Its Contradictions: The Influence of Hutchins.” *Journal of General Education* 50 (2001): 165-191.

Stevenson, Dwight E. “The Shape of Things to Come on the Campus of Tomorrow.” *Association of American Colleges Bulletin* 30 (1944): 526-533.

Stewart, Donald Mitchell. “The Politics of Higher Education and Public Policy: A Study of the American Council on Education.” PhD diss., Harvard University, 1975.

Stickler, W. Hugh. “The Expanding Role of Institutional Research in American Junior Colleges.” *Junior College Journal* 31 (1961): 542-548.

———. “Whence and Whither General Education? A Consensus of Educators and Laymen.” *Journal of Higher Education* 28 (1957): 195-201, 235-236.

Stone, Marie Kirchner. *The Progressive Legacy: Chicago’s Francis W. Parker School, (1901-2001).* New York: Peter Lang, 2001.

———. “Bibliography: Progressive Education (1880-1990).” In *Progressive Education for the 1990s: Transforming Practice*, edited by Kathe Jervis and Carol Montag, 189-196. New York: Teachers College Press, 1991.

———. “Ralph W. Tyler’s Principles of Curriculum, Instruction and Evaluation: Past Influences and Present Effects.” PhD diss., Loyola University Chicago, 1985.

Stonecipher, J.E.. “The Administration of the Experiment—Some Representative Procedures: Practical Limitations of the Experiment.” *North Central Association Quarterly* 9 (1934): 352-356.

Streit, Victor Henry. “A Study of Some Curriculum Problems of the Thirty Schools in the Eight Year Study.” M.A. Thesis, Adelphi College, 1951.

Strohl, Nicholas M. “‘Vitalizing Liberal Education:’ Algo D. Henderson and General Education Reform. 1935-1948.” (Paper presented at the annual meeting of the History of Education Society, St. Louis, Missouri, November 2015).

Stromquist, Shelton. *Reinventing “The People:” The Progressive Movement, the Class Problem, and the Origins of Modern Liberalism.* Urbana: University of Illinois Press, 2006.

“Strong Foundations: Twelve Principles for Effective General Education Programs.” Washington, D.C.: Association of American Colleges, 1994.

Sugrue, Thomas J. *The Origins of the Urban Crisis: Race and Inequality in Postwar Detroit*. Princeton: Princeton University Press, 1996.

Sullivan, William M. *Work and Integrity: The Crisis and Promise of Professionalism in America* 2nd ed. San Francisco: Jossey-Bass, 2005.

Szostak, Rick. “‘Comprehensive’ Curricular Reform: Providing Students with a Map of the Scholarly Enterprise.” *Journal of General Education* 52 (2003): 27-49.

Taba, Hilda. “Bulletin No. 6. Social Sensitivity.” Columbus: Progressive Education Association, Evaluation in the Eight Year Study, Ohio State University, 1936.

Tanner, Daniel. *Crusade for Democracy: Progressive Education at the Crossroads*. Rev. edition. Albany: State University of New York Press, 2015.

Tanner, Daniel. *Secondary Education: Perspectives and Prospects.* New York: The Macmillan Company, 1972.

Task Group on General Education. "Enlisting Students as Coinquirers." In "A New Vitality in General Education," 37-39. Washington, D.C.: Association of American Colleges, 1988.

Taylor, Harold. "The Individual Student." In *Essays on Teaching,* edited by Harold Taylor, 212-234. Freeport, NY: Books for Libraries Press, 1950/1971.

Taylor, Harold. *Students Without Teachers: The Crisis in the University.* New York: McGraw-Hill, 1969.

Tead, Ordway. "The Role of General Education in the Junior College." *Junior College Journal* 18 (1947): 267-277.

———. "Trends in Curriculum-Building: A Nation-wide View by a Careful Observer." *Journal of Higher Education* 17 (1946): 283-293, 336-337.

Terzian, Sevan G. "Custodialism and Career Preparation in a Comprehensive High School, 1929-1942." In *The Death of the Comprehensive High School?: Historical, Contemporary, and Comparative Perspectives,* edited by Barry M. Franklin and Gary McCulloch, 19-36. New York: Palgrave Macmillan, 2007.

Tetlow, William L. "Institutional Research: The Emergence of a Staff Function in Higher Education." PhD diss., Cornell University, 1973.

Thayer, V.T. "Fads and Frills." *Social Frontier* 2 (1935): 50-53.

Thayer, V.T., Caroline B. Zachry. and Ruth Kotinsky. *Reorganizing Secondary Education.* New York: Appleton-Century-Crofts, 1939.

"The Reporter." *Journal of Higher Education* 12 (1941): 280.

"The Sixteenth Annual Meeting of the American Council on Education" *Educational Record* 14 (1933): 259-266.

"The Story of the Eight-Year Study." *School Review* 50 (1942): 326-328.

Thelin, John R. *A History of American Higher Education,* 2nd ed. Baltimore: Johns Hopkins University Press, 2011.

———. "A Legacy of Lethargy?: Curricular Change in Historical Perspective." *Peer Review* 2 (2000): 9-14.

———. "The Anatomy of Institutions: Historians and the Search for the Unwritten Curriculum." In *Curriculum History: Conference Presentations from the Society for the Study of Curriculum History,* edited by Craig Kridel, 66-70. Lanham, MD: University Press of America, 1989.

———. *Higher Education and Its Useful Past: Applied History in Research and Planning.* Cambridge: Schenkman Publishing Company, 1982.

Thelin, John R. and Amy S. Hirschy. "College Students and the Curriculum: The Fantastic Voyage of Higher Education, 1636 to the Present." *NACADA Journal* 29 (2009): 9-17.

Thelin, John and Christopher Miller. "Review: *American Higher Education Transformed, 1940-2005: Documenting the National Discourse*." *Teachers College Record Online*, July 30, 2008.

Thelin, John R. and Richard W. Trollinger. *Philanthropy and American Higher Education.* New York: Palgrave Macmillan, 2014.

Thigpen, Carol M. The Development and Evolution of the Eight Year Study." PhD diss., University of North Carolina at Chapel Hill, 1978.

Thomas, David A. *Michigan State College: John Hannah and the Creation of a World University, 1926-1969* East Lansing: Michigan State University Press, 2008

Thomas, Russell. *The Search for a Common Learning: General Education, 1800-1960*. New York: McGraw-Hill Book Company, 1962.

Thompson, Clarissa A. Michele Eodice, and Phuoc Tran. "Student Perceptions of General Education Requirements at a Large Public University: No Surprises?" *Journal of General Education* 64 (2015): 278-293.

Thonton, Jr., James W. *The Community Junior College*. New York: John Wiley and Sons, 1960.

———. "General Education." In *The Public Junior College: The Fifty-fifty Yearbook of the National Society for the Study of Education. Part I,* 118-139. Chicago: University of Chicago Press, 1956.

———. "General Education Accomplishments in California." *California Journal of Secondary Education* 26 (1951): 397-401.

Thursfield, Richard Emmons. *Henry Barnard's American Journal of Education*. Baltimore: Johns Hopkins Press, 1945.

Tierney, William G. *Curricular Landscapes, Democratic Vistas: Transformative Leadership in Higher Education*. Westport, CT: Praeger, 1989.

Tolley, William Pearson. "Education for Tomorrow." *Association of American Colleges Bulletin* 30 (1944): 210-215.

———. "Cooperative Study in General Education: A College Experiment in Cooperation." *Educational Method* 20 (1941): 288-291.

———. "Twenty-One Colleges Examine Themselves." *Educational Record* 22 (1941): 303-312.

Tompkins, Ellsworth and Walter H. Gaumnitz. *The Carnegie Unit: Its Origin, Status, and Trends.* Washington, D.C.: Government Printing Office, 1954.

Toombs, William, Marilyn J. Amey, and Alexander Chen. "General Education: An Analysis of Contemporary Practice." *Journal of General Education* 40 (1991): 102-118.

Travers, Robert M.W. *How Research Has Changed American Schools: A History from 1840 to the Present*. Kalamazoo, MI: Mythos Press, 1983.

Tresch. Jr., John William. "The Impact of the Second World War on Liberal Arts Education in the United States." EdD diss., Oklahoma State University, 1986.

Trow, Martin. "American Higher Education: Past. Present. and Future." *Educational Researcher* 17 (1988): 13-23.

———. “Reflections on the Transition from Mass to Universal Higher Education.” *Daedalus* 99 (1970): 1-42.

Troy, Gil. *Morning in America: How Ronald Reagan Invented the 1980s.* Princeton: Princeton University Press, 2005.

Tuinman, Jaap. “Productive Co-Operation and Collaboration Among Educational Institutions of Perceived Unequal Status: Practical Fundamentals.” *Tertiary Education and Management* 1 (1995): 38-48.

Twombly, Susan B. “Student Perspectives on General Education in a Research University: An Exploratory Study.” *Journal of General Education* 41 (1992): 238-272

———. “General Education: The Insiders’ View.” *New Directions for Higher Education* 80 (1992): 91-103

“Two-Year College Development in Five Midwestern States.” Special Issue. *Community College Journal of Research and Practice* 23:1 (1999): 1-145.

“Tyler for Judd” *Time*, Feb. 28, 1938.

Tyack, David B. *The One Best System: A History of American Urban Education*. Cambridge: Harvard University Press, 1974.

Tyack, David and Elisabeth Hansot. *Managers of Virtue: Public School Leadership in America. 1820-1980.* New York: Basic Books, 1982.

Tyack, David B. and Larry Cuban. *Tinkering Toward Utopia: A Century of Public School Reform.* Cambridge: Harvard University Press, 1995.

Tyack, David, Robert Lowe, and Elisabeth Hansot. *Public Schools in Hard Times: The Great Depression and Recent Years*. Cambridge: Harvard University Press, 1984.

Tyler, Ralph W. “Education: Curriculum Development and Evaluation.” Interview conducted by Malca Chall. Oral history. Regional Oral History Office, The Bancroft Library, University of California t Berkeley, 1987.

———. “The Five Most Significant Curriculum Events in the Twentieth Century.” *Educational Leadership* 44 (1986): 36-38.

———. “What Was Learned from the Eight-Year Study.” *New York University Education Quarterly* 11 (1980): 29-32.

———. “Toward Improved Curriculum Theory: The Inside Story.” *Curriculum Inquiry* 6 (1977): 251-256.

———. “Educational Benchmarks in Retrospect: Educational Change Since 1915.” In *Perspectives on American Education: Reflections on the Past…Challenges for the Future*, by Ralph W. Tyler, 26-47. Chicago: Science Research Associates, 1976.

———. “Curriculum Development in the Twenties and Thirties.” In *The Curriculum: Retrospect and Prospect: The Seventieth Yearbook of the National Society for the Study of Education, Part I.* Chicago: University of Chicago Press, 1971.

———. “Reminisces of Ralph Winifred Tyler—Carnegie Corporation Project. Oral History Research Office, Columbia University, 1969.” Interview by Isabel S. Grossener. Oral

History. Columbia Center for Oral History/Rare Book and Manuscript Library, Columbia University, New York, NY, June 7, 1969.

———. "New Dimensions in Curriculum Development." *Phi Delta Kappan* 48 (1966): 25-28.

———. "The Leader of Major Educational Projects." *Educational Research Bulletin* 32 (1953): 42-52.

———. "The Functions of Measurement in Improving Instruction." In *Educational Leadership,* edited by E.F. Lindquist, 47-67. Washington, D.C.: American Council on Education, 1951.

———. *Basic Principles of Curriculum and Instruction*. Chicago: University of Chicago Press, 1949.

———. "The School Curriculum in General" in *Grand Rapids School Survey. Grand Rapids. Michigan* eds. Committee on Field Services. Department of Education. University of Chicago, 183-191. (Grand Rapids. MI: Grand Rapids Board of Education. 1949).

———. "The Role of the Schools in the Nation's War Efforts." In *War and Post-War Responsibilities of American Schools*, ed. William C. Reavis, 2-12. Chicago: University of Chicago Press, 1943.

———. "Co-Operation in Teacher Education as Related to Our War Effort." In *National Institutional Teacher Placement Association: Proceedings of the Ninth Annual Autumn Conference, Chicago, November 27-28, 1942*, 15-21. National Institutional Teacher Placement Association, n.d.

———. "Workshops at the University of Chicago," *National Association of Secondary School Principals Bulletin* 25 (1941): 45-52.

———. "The Workshop Group in Problems of Educational Administration" in *Proceedings of the Workshop in General Education. 1940. Volume IV: Educational Administration*. Chicago: Cooperative Study in General Education, 1941.

———. "Co-Operation in the Study of Institutional Problems." In *The Outlook for Higher Education,* edited by John Dale Russell, 230-243. Chicago: University of Chicago Press, 1939.

———. "The Function of the Evaluation Staff." *Thirty Schools Bulletin: An Occasional Publication for the Teachers in the Study of the Relation of the School and College* 1 (1937): 3-5.

———. "The Summer Workshops." *Thirty Schools Bulletin: An Occasional Publication for the Teachers in the Study of the Relation of the School and College* 1 (1937): 37.

———. "Defining and Measuring Objectives of Progressive Education." *Educational Record* 17 (1936): 78-85.

———. "Identification and Definition of the Objectives to be Measured." In *The Construction and Use of Achievement Examinations: A Manual for Secondary School Teachers Prepared Under the Auspices of a Committee of the American Council on Education,* edited by Herbert E. Hawkes, E.F. Lindquist, and C.R. Mann, 3-16. Boston: Houghton Mifflin, 1936.

———. “Needed Research in the Field of Tests and Examinations.” In *Proceedings of the Institute for Administrative Officers of Higher Institutions, Volume VIII: Tests and Measurements in Higher Education*, edited by William S. Gray, 234-236. Chicago: University of Chicago Press, 1936.

———. “Evaluation: A Challenge to Progressive Education.” *Educational Research Bulletin* 14 (1935): 9-16.

———. *Constructing Achievement Testing.* Columbus, OH: The Bureau of Educational Research at Ohio State University, 1934.

———. “The Development of Examinations at Ohio State University.” In *Recent Trends in American College Education*, edited by William S. Gray, 228-238. Chicago: University of Chicago Press, 1931.

“UCLA Faculty Increased by 12 Full Professors.” *Los Angeles Times*, Oct. 12, 1952.

University of California Register, 1950-1951 with Announcements for 1951-1952 in Two Volumes: Volume II. Berkeley: University of California Press, 1951.

Valentine, John A. *The College Board and the School Curriculum.* New York: College Entrance Examination Board, 1987.

Valentine, P.F., ed. *The American College.* New York: Philosophical Library: 1949.

VanOverbeke, Marc A. *The Standardization of American Schooling: Linking Secondary and Higher Education, 1870-1910.* New York: Palgrave Macmillan, 2008.

Vasta, Sebastian J. “Curriculum Development for General Education in the Community College.” EdD diss., Rutgers University, 1986.

Vaughan, George B. “General Education: The Community College’s Unfulfilled Agenda.” (Paper prepared for a conference on “General Studies: Continuing Issues and Emerging Prospects,” Nelsonville, Ohio, April 17, 1989).

———. “Historical Perspective: President Truman Endorsed Community College Manifesto.” *Community and Junior College Journal* 53 (1983): 21-24.

Vaughan, George B. and Charles R. Dassance. “The Missing Link in the Student Consumer Movement.” *New Directions for Community Colleges* 39 (1982): 31-40.

Vials, Christopher. *Haunted by Hitler: Liberals, The Left, and the Fight Against Fascism in the United States.* Amherst: University of Massachusetts Press, 2014.

Vocational Education in the Junior College: A Handbook. Sacramento: California State Department of Education, 1949.

Vrettas, Arthur Thomas. “John A. Hannah’s University College: A General Education Model.” PhD diss., University of Akron, 1991.

Waldron, Mary Richardine. “A Study of the Curricula in the Adrian Dominican High Schools and Their Conformity to the Recommendations and Suggestions of the Harvard Report.” PhD diss., DePaul University, 1948.

Wall, Wendy L. *Inventing the “American Way”: The Politics of Consensus from the New Deal to the Civil Rights Movement*. New York: Oxford University Press, 2008.

Wallace, James M. *Liberal Journalism and American Education, 1914-1941*. New Brunswick, NJ: Rutgers University Press, 1991.

Walters, Pamela Barnhouse and Emily A. Bowman. "Foundations and the Making of Public Education in the United States, 1867-1950." In *American Foundations: Roles and Contributions,* edited by Helmut K. Anheier and David C. Hammack, 31-50. Washington, D.C.: Brookings Institution Press, 2010.

Walters, Raymond. *Four Decades of U.S. College Enrollments*. New York: Society for the Advancement of Education, 1960.

———. "Recent Trends in Student Enrollments." In *The Outlook for Higher Education,* edited by John Dale Russell, 29-50. Chicago: University of Chicago Press, 1939.

Walton, John. "The Apostasy of Robert M. Hutchins." *Educational Theory* 3 (1953): 162-165

Walvoord, Barbara E. *Assessment Clear and Simple: A Practical Guide for Institutions, Departments, and General Education,* 2nd ed. San Francisco: Jossey-Bass, 2010.

Ward, F. Champion. "Requiem for the Hutchins College: Recalling a Great Experiment in General Education." *Change: The Magazine for Higher Education* 21 (1989): 25-33.

Ward, Phebe. *Terminal Education in the Junior College.* New York: Harper and Brothers, 1946.

Warren, Constance. *A New Design for Women's Education.* New York: Frederick A. Stokes Company, 1940.

Warren, Helen B. "Recent Themes in General Education: A Bibliographic Essay." *Journal of General Education* 34 (1982): 271-291.

Watkins, Samuel W. "Social Studies in the Eight-Year Study and the New Social Studies Movement: A Comparison of Goals." PhD diss., Auburn University, 1981.

Watras, Joseph. Review of *Stories of the Eight-Year Study: Reexamining Secondary Education in America* by Craig Kridel and Robert V. Bullough. Jr. In *History of Education Quarterly* 48 (2008): 321-325.

———. "The Eight-Year Study: From Evaluative Research to Demonstration Project. 1930-1940." *Education Policy Analysis Archives* 14 (2002): n.p. Retrieved from http://epaa.asu.edu/epaa/v14n21/.

Watson, Goodwin. *How Good Are Our Colleges?* New York: Public Affairs Committee, 1938.

Wattenbarger, James L. and Allan A. Witt. "Origins of the California System: How the Junior College Movement Came to California." *Community College Review* 22 (1995): 17-25

Wattanbarger, James L. and Sandra Scaggs. "Curriculum Revision and the Process of Change." *New Directions for Community Colleges* 25 (1979): 1-10..

Wauhkonen, Robert William. "How General Education Changes Students: Understandings of the Attainment of General Education Learning Goals." PhD diss., Boston University, 2008.

Weaver, Warren. *U.S. Philanthropic Foundations: Their History. Structure. Management. and Record.* New York: Harper & Row, 1967.

Wechsler, Harold S. *Access to Success in the Urban High School: The Middle College Movement.* New York: Teachers College Press, 2001.

———. “Comment on ‘My Education in Soc 2’ by David Riesman.” In *General Education in the Social Sciences: Centennial Reflections of the University of Chicago,* edited by John J. MacAloon, 217-222. Chicago: University of Chicago Press, 1992.

Wellmon, Chad. *Organizing Enlightenment: Information Overload and the Invention of the Modern Research University*. Baltimore: Johns Hopkins University Press, 2015.

Wells, Cynthia A. “Realizing General Education: Reconsidering Conceptions and Renewing Practice.” *ASHE Higher Education Report Series* 42:2. San Francisco: Jossey-Bass, 2016.

———. “General Education and the Quest for Purpose.” In *Ernest L. Boyer: Hope for Today’s Universities,* edited by Todd C. Ream and John M. Braxton, 35-41. Albany: State University of New York Press, 2015.

Westhoff, Laura M. “The Popularization of Knowledge: John Dewey on Experts and American Democracy.” *History of Education Quarterly* 35 (1995): 27-47.

White, Dorrance S. “The General Education Movement and the Classics.” *The Classical Journal* 44 (1948): 85-94.

White, Woodie Thomas. “The Study of Education at the University of Chicago, 1892-1958.” PhD diss., University of Chicago, 1977.

Widder, Keith R. *Michigan Agricultural College: The Evolution of a Land-Grant Philosophy*. East Lansing: Michigan State University Press, 2005.

Wiegman, Robert R. *General Education in Occupational Education Programs Offered by Junior Colleges.* Washington, D.C.: American Association of Junior Colleges, 1969.

Wiley, Mary Glenn and Mayer N. Zald. “The Growth and Transformation of Educational Accrediting Agencies: An Exploratory Study in Social Control of Institutions.” *Sociology of Education* 41 (1968): 36-56.

Wilkins, Ernest Hatch. *The College and Society: Proposals for Changes in the American Plan of Higher Education.* New York: The Century Co., 1932.

Willey, Malcolm M. *Depression. Recovery. and Higher Education: A Report by Committee Y of the American Association of University Professors.* New York: McGraw-Hill Book Company, 1937.

Williams, David. “A Historical Study of the Involvement of the North Central Association with Higher Education in the United States.” PhD diss., Wayne State University, 1972.

Williams, Donald T., ed. *Presidents, Professors, and Trustees: The Evolution of American Academic Government.* San Francisco: Jossey-Bass, 1980.

Williams, Roger L. *The Origins of Federal Support for Higher Education: George W. Atherton and the Land-Grant College Movement.* University Park: Pennsylvania State University Press, 1991.

Williamson, Joy Ann. *Black Power on Campus: The University of Illinois, 1965-1975*. Champaign: University of Illinois Press, 2003.

Willing, Matthew H. “Recent Trends in American Secondary Education.” In *The Academic and Professional Preparation of Secondary-School Teachers,* edited by William S. Gray. Chicago: University of Chicago Press, 1935.

Wilson, Ann E. Jarvella. “Knowledge for Teachers: The National Teacher Examinations Program. 1940 to 1970.” PhD diss., University of Wisconsin, 1984.

Winter, Carl G. “History of the Junior College Movement in California.” Sacramento: California State Department of Education, 1964.

Witt, Allan A. et. al. *America’s Community Colleges: The First Century*. Washington, D.C.: American Association of Community Colleges, 1994.

Wolanin, Thomas R. *Presidential Advisory Commissions: Truman to Nixon.* Madison: University of Wisconsin Press, 1975.

Wood, James M. “The Four-Year Junior College.” In *Problems of College Education: Studies in Administration, Student Personnel, Curriculum, and Instruction*, edited by Earl Hudelson, 153-163. Minneapolis: University of Minnesota Press, 1928.

Woodward, Kathleen, “We Are All Nontraditional Learners Now: Community Colleges, Long-Life Learning, and Problem-Solving Humanities” In *A New Deal for the Humanities: Liberal Arts and the Future of Public Higher Education,* edited by Gordon Hunter and Feisal G. Mohamed, 51-71. New Brunswick. NJ: Rutgers University Press, 2016.

Wolf, David B., and Mary Lou Zoglin, eds. “External Influences on the Curriculum” Special Issue. *New Directions for Community Colleges* 64 (1988): 1-93.

Word, Andrea. “General Education for the 21st Century: A Quest for Common Principles.” PhD diss., University of Alabama, 2012.

Works, Geo. A. “Report of the Meeting of the American Council on Education.” *North Central Association Quarterly* 10 (1935): 205-206.

———. “German Universities in the Autumn of 1934.” *Educational Record* 16 (1935): 181-187.

Wraga, William G. “Left Out, The Villainization of Progressive Education in the United States.” Review of *Left Back: A Century of Failed School Reforms,* by Diane Ravitch, *Educational Researcher* 30 (2001): 36-37.

———. “The Progressive Vision of General Education and the American Common School Ideal: Implications for Curriculum Policy, Practice, and Theory.” *Journal of Curriculum Studies* 31 (1999): 523-544.

———. “A Century of Interdisciplinary Curricula in American Schools.” In *Annual Review of Research for School Leaders,* Volume 1, edited by Peter S. Hlebowitsh and William G. Wraga, 117-145. New York: National Association of Secondary School Principals/Scholastic Leadership Policy Research, 1996.

———. *Democracy’s High School: The Comprehensive High School and Educational Reform in the United States.* Lanham, MD: University Press of America, 1994.

Wright, Louis B. “Humanistic Education and the Democratic State.” *American Association of University Professors Bulletin* 30 (1944): 59-71.

Wriston, Henry M. “A Critical Appraisal of Experiments in General Education.” In *The Thirty-Eighth Yearbook of the National Society for the Study of Education: General Education in the American College,* edited by Guy Montrose Whipple, 297-321. Bloomington, IL: Public School Publishing Company, 1939.

———. “The Work of the American Council.” *North Central Association Quarterly* 10 (1935): 201-204.

Wynne, John P. *General Education in Theory and Practice.* New York: Bookman Associates, 1952.

Yamane, David. “The Battle of the Books at Berkeley: In Search of the Culture Wars in Debates Over Multiculturalism.” In *The American Culture Wars: Current Contests and Future Prospects,* edited by James L. Nolan, Jr., 3-34. Charlottesville: University Press of Virginia, 2005.

———. *Student Movements for Multiculturalism: Challenging the Curricular Color Line in Higher Education.* Baltimore: Johns Hopkins University Press, 2001.

Yonan, Jonathan. “Majoring in Servitude: Liberal Arts and the Formation of Citizens.” In *Civic Education and the Future of American Citizenship,* edited by Elizabeth Kaufer Busch and Jonathan W. White, 111-123. Lanham, MD: Lexington Books, 2013.

Young, Robert Boyd. “The Community College Identity: Ten Leaders.” PhD diss., University of Illinois at Urbana-Champaign, 1975.

“Youth Problems Local, Says Rainey.” *Chicago Sun Times,* April 26, 1938.

Zapotocky, David Andrew. “The Contribution of the Concept of Historical Synthesis in the Design and Implementation of a General Education Undergraduate Curriculum—Liberal Arts Tripod—At Columbia University During the Period 1919-1946.” PhD diss., New York University, 1996.

Zayed, Kevin S. “The Paradox of Mortimer J. Adler: Revisiting the Distinction between Liberal and General Education.” *Comparative and International Higher Education* 5 (2013): 41-46.

———. Review of *The Standardization of American Schooling: Linking Secondary and Higher Education. 1870-1910* by Mark A. VanOverbeke. In *American Educational History Journal* 40 (2013): 383.

———. “‘We felt that we were talking to old friends:’ Cooperation among Catholic and Protestant Colleges, 1938-1945.” (Paper presented at the annual meeting of the History of Education Society, Nashville, Tennessee, October 2013).

———. “Reform in the General Education Movement: The Case of Michigan State College, 1938-1952.” *Journal of General Education* 61 (2012): 141-175.

Zeitlin, Harry. “Federal Relations in American Education. 1933-1943: A Study of New Deal Efforts and Innovations” PhD diss., Columbia University. 1958)

Zirbes, Laura. “The Function of the Curriculum.” In *The Changing Curriculum,* edited by The Joint Committee on Curriculum. New York: D. Appleton-Century Company, 1937.

Zook, George F. “How the Colleges Went to War.” *Annals of the American Academy of Political and Social Science* 231 (1944): 1-7.

———. “The Federal Government and Education in Wartime.” *North Central Association Quarterly* 18 (1943): 225-233.

———. “General Education at Junior College Level.” *Junior College Journal* 9 (1939): 353-354.
———. “Dr. Zook’s Blessing.” *North Central Association Quarterly* 12 (1937): 169-171.
———. “Accreditation of Secondary Schools in the Light of the North Central Association Report.” *The Educational Record* 16 (1935): 70-81.
Zunz, Oliver. *Philanthropy in America: A History.* Princeton: Princeton University Press, 2012.

Select Archival Collections Consulted

The Bancroft Library, University of California, Berkeley, CA.
Regional Oral History Office—Oral histories of Ralph W. Tyler

Special Collections and University Archives, Pepperdine University, Malibu, CA.
B. Lamar Johnson Papers

Hoover Institution Library and Archives, Hoover Institution, Stanford, CA.
American Council on Education Records

Archives Research Center, University of Illinois, Champaign, IL.
Admissions and Records, North Central Association of Colleges and Schools, Proceedings and Minutes, 1895-1993, Record Series Number 25/50/002
Progressive Education Association Papers, Record Series Number 10/6/20
Provost’s Office, Subject File, 1932-64 5/1/1

Special Collections Research Center, Joseph Regenstein Library, University of Chicago, Chicago, IL.
Ralph W. Tyler Papers
Reminisces of Harold B. Dunkel

Rockford University Archives, Howard Colman Library, Rockford University, Rockford IL.
Individual Files (of Faculty)

University Archives, Harvard University, Cambridge, MA.
Material Presented to the Committee, UA110.528.10

University Archives and Historical Collections, Michigan State University, East Lansing, MI.
Theophilius Capen Abbot Papers, UA2.1.3
Bamber Family Papers, c.00046
Department of Geology Records, UA16.53
Charles A. Jewell Papers, UA10.3.5
Floyd W. Reeves Papers, UA2.1.12.1
University College Collection, UA15.5

St. Catherine University Archives and Special Collections, St. Catherine University Library, St. Paul, MN.

Harry S. Truman Library and Museum, Independence, MO.
John D. Russell Papers

Oral History Research Office, Columbia University, New York, NY.
Reminisces of Ralph W. Tyler

Rare Book and Manuscript Library, Butler Library, Columbia University, New York, NY.
Carnegie Foundation for the Advancement of Teaching Records, 1904-1989
Carnegie Corporation of New York Records

Rockefeller Archives Center, Sleepy Hollow, NY
General Education Board Archives

Ohio State University Archives, The Ohio State University, Columbus, OH.
Donald Peery Cottrell Papers (RG.40.51)

Annenberg Rare Book and Manuscript Library, University of Pennsylvania, Philadelphia, PA.
Lewis Mumford Papers

University of Wisconsin University Archives, University of Wisconsin-Madison, Madison, WI.
University Archives Oral History Project—Interview of Gladys L. Borchers

Newspapers

New York Times

Chicago Sun Times

The Catherine Wheel

Lansing State Journal

Sturgis Journal

Milan Leader

Tuscola County Advertiser

Jackson Citizen-Patriot

Bay City Times

Los Angeles Times

The Stanford Daily

The Daily Illini