INFORMATION TO USERS

This material was produced from a microfilm copy of the original document. While the most advanced technological means to photograph and reproduce this document have been used, the quality is heavily dependent upon the quality of the original submitted.

The following explanation of techniques is provided to help you understand markings or patterns which may appear on this reproduction.

1. The sign or "target" for pages apparently lacking from the document photographed is "Missing Page(s)". If it was possible to obtain the missing page(s) or section, they are spliced into the film along with adjacent pages. This may have necessitated cutting thru an image and duplicating adjacent pages to insure you complete continuity.

2. When an image on the film is obliterated with a large round black mark, it is an indication that the photographer suspected that the copy may have moved during exposure and thus cause a blurred image. You will find a good image of the page in the adjacent frame.

3. When a map, drawing or chart, etc., was part of the material being photographed the photographer followed a definite method in "sectioning" the material. It is customary to begin photoing at the upper left hand corner of a large sheet and to continue photoing from left to right in equal sections with a small overlap. If necessary, sectioning is continued again — beginning below the first row and continuing on until complete.

4. The majority of users indicate that the textual content is of greatest value, however, a somewhat higher quality reproduction could be made from "photographs" if essential to the understanding of the dissertation. Silver prints of "photographs" may be ordered at additional charge by writing the Order Department, giving the catalog number, title, author and specific pages you wish reproduced.

5. PLEASE NOTE: Some pages may have indistinct print. Filmed as received.

Xerox University Microfilms
300 North Zeeb Road
Ann Arbor, Michigan 48106

74-11,313

KURSHAN, Neil, 1948-
THE EIGHT YEAR STUDY: ORIGINS, IMPACT AND IMPLICATIONS.

Harvard University, Ed.D., 1973
Education, history

University Microfilms, A XEROX Company, Ann Arbor, Michigan

THIS DISSERTATION HAS BEEN MICROFILMED EXACTLY AS RECEIVED.

THE EIGHT YEAR STUDY

ORIGINS, IMPACT AND IMPLICATIONS

submitted by

NEIL KURSHAN

A Thesis Presented to the Faculty of the Graduate School of Education of Harvard University in partial fulfillment of the requirements for the degree of

Doctor of Education

1973

ACKNOWLEDGEMENTS

It is impossible in a brief space to thank all who made possible the writing of this thesis, but a few individuals deserve special mention.

Without the encouragement, understanding, and support of my parents and sister this thesis would never have been written.

I am also indebted to my principal adviser, Professor J. Featherstone who patiently read and re-read the thesis and whose criticism stimulated my own thinking and writing.

A special word of thanks is due Professor Marvin Lazerson who counseled me during my early years of doctoral study. Without his teaching, encouragement, and editing this thesis never would have been initiated let alone completed.

A note of thanks also to Professors Carol Gilligan and Stanley Bolster who made many helpful suggestions.

Without Dr. Francis Duehay's understanding and tolerance I would have never found the time away from work which I needed to complete this project.

I am thankful for James Anderson's crticism which shaped my thinking about the final chapter of the thesis.

Acknowledgements (cont.)

Lastly a note of thanks to my roommates and friends who bore with me during the moments of solitary research and of arguing ideas and whose forebearance and good humor prevented me from ever despairing of seeing the thesis completed.

TABLE OF CONTENTS

Abstract.....i
Introduction.....1
Chapter I
The Historical Context and Origins of The Eight Year Study
Historical Context.....1
Early Development of the Study.....33.
Chapter II
The Eight Year Study
Curriculum Reform.....50
Findings and Critiques.....73
Chapter III
The Impact of the Study.....83
Chapter IV
Beyond The Eight Year Study.....125
Appendix I
Original Members of Committee on College Entrance and Secondary Schools.....149
Appendix II
Participating Schools in the Eight Year Study.....151
Bibliography.....153
Vita.....162

ABSTRACT

THE EIGHT YEAR STUDY

ORIGINS, IMPACT, AND IMPLICATIONS

submitted by

NEIL KURSHAN

The thesis is an examination of the Eight Year Study as a case study in educational reform. The Eight Year Study was an experiment on the secondary school level--probably the most extensive ever--which commenced in 1932. The study, directed by the Commission on the Relation of School and College, involved the nation's major colleges and secondary schools, both public and private. The colleges agreed to suspend their normal admissions requirements for applicants from a limited number of secondary schools thereby allowing the thirty secondary schools to experiment freely with their curricula. The experimentation was carried out during the next eight years. During this period a majority of students participating in the study were evaluated with respect to their college performance.

In the first chapter the historical context of the Eight Year Study is examined with reference to the question of what set of historical circumstances converged in the late 1920's and 1930's to give rise to the Eight Year Study and shape its development. It is shown that the origins and development of the Eight Year Study can be understood in relation to three central ideological strands running through the progressive education movement. The Study began as an upward thrust

of the child-centered pedagogy of the 1930's. Leaders of the Eight Year Study sought to achieve on the secondary school level what had been achieved during the 1920's in a small number of primary schools. The development of the Eight Year Study in the 1930's was shaped by the social reformist emphasis of progressive education and by the empiricst strand of the movement. The social reformist strand shifted curriculum reform from the concern of the child-centered pedagogues with generating greater student interest to the context of strengthening democratic society. The empiricst strand led to a structuring of the study as a controlled scientific inquiry. Although scientific method was often applied to the schools to bring about greater efficiency and standardization in their operation, it was used in the Eight Year Study to buttress the argument for greater diversity and greater responsiveness to student interest.

The second chapter encompasses a summary of the Eight Year Study and its findings. The Study clearly demonstrated that students going through non-conventional programs did as well or better in college than their matched counterparts who studied within conventional curricula.

In the third chapter it is shown that the Eight Year Study had little sustained impact and the question is broached as to why, in spite of the clarity of its conclusions, the impact of the study was so limited. Suggested explanations are the lack of follow-up support subsequent to the study's completion; the outbreak of a world war which diverted the nation's attention, and most importantly a post-war climate hostile to progressive educational reform.

The fourth chapter includes a critical assessment of the Eight Year Study and an analysis of the limits of curriculum reform such as that undertaken in the Eight Year Study. It is suggested that the Eight Year Study can still serve as a model for reformers seeking to improve the quality of life in the schools, but that it is an inadequate model for those seeking to address the problem of student alienation. It is argued that this latter problem is religious in nature and can only be addressed through a revitalization of religious myth.

INTRODUCTION

During the past decade educational leaders and policy makers have viewed school reform as a tool for alleviating the problems of poverty and income inequality--problems which seemed to lie at the heart of America's social malaise. In a justified and necessary concern with the social class bias of education the issue of the quality of the educational process itself was often overlooked. Issues such as desegregation, community control, and equality of educational opportunity often shaped the research and intervention of reformers, although these issues were more political than pedagogical in nature. Christopher Jencks' recent study of the relationship of income inequality to education[1] may signal a return, however, to a concern with the quality of the educational process. The central conclusion of Jencks' study was that reform of the schools would not significantly contribute to a reduction of income inequality among adults. If incomes were to be equalized, Jencks asserted, a concerted public policy effort which directly aimed at reforming economic institutions would be necessary rather than an attack on a marginal institution such as the school. Jencks also suggested that the primary

---

[1]Christopher Jencks et. al., Inequality: A Reassessment of the Effect of Family and Schooling, (New York: Basic Books, 1972).

basis for evaluating educational reform should not be whether it contributed to adult success, but whether it made the school a more satisfying place to be. Jencks' findings will prove controversial and have already provoked much discussion. Furthermore, conservative policy makers are likely to use the book as an excuse for cutting back the funding of many innovative programs and reform efforts which were started during the late fifties and the decade of the sixties. However, a closer reading of the Jencks book would suggest that what is called for is not an abandonment of educational reform and innovation, but rather a return to the questions which were submerged during the last eight years. These questions might be framed as "What is worth knowing?" and once this has been determined, "How can it best be taught?"

It was to these questions that the Eight Year Study was addressed. The Eight Year Study was an outgrowth of the 1930 annual convention of the Progressive Education Association at which the problem of improving the nation's secondary education was discussed. At the convention it became clear that progressive educators felt educational experimentation on the secondary school level was hindered by rigidly prescribed college entrance requirements. As a result of the convention's discussion, a Committee on

College Entrance and Secondary Schools was established[2] to find ways to better coordinate high school and college curricula and to look into methods whereby secondary schools might be freed to experiment with their curricula.

One year later the committee made its report and submitted a proposal whereby the nation's three hundred best known and most selective colleges would suspend their normal subject and unit entrance requirements for applicants from a limited number of secondary schools beginning with the class of 1936 and ending with the class of 1941. The colleges would base their acceptances of these students on written records of the student's achievements in high school. The colleges thus had a chance to ally themselves with progressive innovation without risking a decline in the academic quality of their students. Thirty secondary schools, both public and private, were then chosen by the Commission on the Relation of School and College to participate in the study. Between 1933 and 1941 these secondary schools instituted a variety of experimental curricula as part of a study that soon became the most extensive study in educational reform ever carried out on the secondary school level. The study officially ended in 1941 although the colleges

---

[2]The Committee name was soon changed to the Commission on the Relation of School and College.

continued to waive their entrance requirements until 1943 to allow for admission of students who had begun secondary school during the experimental programs. During these years an enormous body of literature on curriculum reform was generated as well as extensive data on the college performance of all students participating in the study.

The story of the Eight Year Study has been told amply in five volumes totaling over 1,500 pages which were published by the Commission from 1941-43, and a simple retelling of the story is hardly warranted. However, an examination of the study as a case study in educational reform provides a number of areas for fruitful research. The first area regards the issue of the Eight Year Study in its historical context. How are particular educational experiments such as the Eight Year Study related to the historical context in which they are set? What convergence of historical forces gave rise to such an extensive experiment in educational reform? A second fruitful area of inquiry regards the issue of why the impact of the Eight Year Study was so limited. There was general agreement that the Eight Year Study had conclusively proven that

...the pattern of preparatory school program which

> concentrates on a preparation for a fixed set of entrance examinations is not the only satisfactory means of fitting a boy or girl for making the most out of the college experience. It looks as if the stimulus and initiative which the less conventional approach to secondary education affords sends on to college better human material than we have obtained in the past.[3]

In spite of this, the Eight Year Study seemed to have little impact. The colleges did not continue to experiment with their admissions requirements and a number of follow-up studies of the thirty schools showed that little experimentation persisted. In this respect the fate of the Eight Year Study was little different from the fate of many educational experiments which inspire enthusiasm and substantial reform for a number of years and then are forgotten by all but an occasional historian of education. A careful examination of the Eight Year Study in its historical context may help to clarify those factors which accounted for the study's limited impact as well as those factors which more generally impede the dissemination of empirical data which might guide educational policy.

A third area of inquiry posed by the Eight Year Study is the question of the limits of curriculum reform. Americans have traditionally viewed their educational

---

[3]Wilford Aikin, The Story of the Eight Year Study, Volume I (New York: Harper and Row, 1942) p. 115.

institutions as panaceas for a variety of non-educational problems such as vice, poverty, racial injustice and most recently student alienation and its expression through drugs. An attempt will thus be made to assess not only the potential of curriculum reform, but also its limitations.

An examination of the Eight Year Study would thus yield some insight into a number of broad historical questions. The subject is worthy of study for two additional reasons, however. Firstly secondary education is the level of education for which educators presently have the fewest answers. Much of recent educational experimentation has taken place on the primary school level.. Moreover, reform on the primary school level has often grown out of a comprehensive educational philosophy stressing freedom for the individual child to discover and create in an environment rich in resources and with a teacher serving as a guide, whereas reform on the secondary school level has often been born out of a sense of despair that anything would be better than what exists at present. Charles Silberman's comprehensive critique of American education, Crisis in the Classroom is illustrative.[4] In his book Silberman

---

[4]Charles Silberman, Crisis in the Classroom, (New York: Random House, 1971).

devotes twice as much space to reform of primary schools as he does to reform of the secondary schools. Furthermore Silberman's analysis of reform on the primary school level is an enthusiastic endorsement of the English system of informal education whereas his analysis of reform on the secondary school level is an examination of three provocative, but disparate and isolated studies in reform of the secondary schools. Secondly an increasing amount of diversity and experimentation on the secondary school level means that the issue of evaluating students for college takes on renewed importance.

These, then are the reasons for undertaking as extensive examination of the Eight Year Study. The first chapter of the thesis traces the impact of the ideology of the progressive education movement upon the origins of the Eight Year Study. and explores the early history of the experiment. The second chapter is a summary of the Eight Year Study and its findings. The third chapter is devoted to a survey of the follow-up literature conducted after the completion of the study and an analysis of the reasons for the study's limited impact. The fourth and final chapter is a critical assessment of the Eight Year

Study and an analysis of the limits of curriculum reform. It is suggested that the study can still serve as a model for reformers who seek to improve the quality of life in the schools, but that it is an inadequate model for reformers seeking to address the problem of student alienation.

The Eight Year Study remains today one of the most comprehensive and rigorous experiments in educational reform ever undertaken by reformers. An examination of its origins, impact, and limitations may shed some light on the future direction and potential of curriculum reform.

CHAPTER I

THE HISTORICAL CONTEXT AND ORIGINS OF THE EIGHT YEAR STUDY

HISTORICAL CONTEXT

> For education in the Century of the Child aims at nothing less than the production of individuality throught the integration of experience. The whole child is to be educated. Hence the materials of education are as broad and interrelated as life itself. For experience is not only an intellectual matter; it is physical rhythmic, emotional. Thus the vocabulary of the new school has coursing through it a unitary, integrating theme: individuality, personality, experience.
>
> Now personality evolves from within. It cannot be imposed from without. Individuality develops only through growth in the power of self-propulsion. The new school, therefore, is setting up a radical program of child-centered education.[5] (1928)

> If Progressive Education is to be genuinely progressive, it must emancipate itself from the influence of this class (the upper-middle class), face squarely and courageously every social issue, come to grips with life in all of its stark reality, establish an organic relation with the community, develop a realistic and comprehensive theory of welfare, fashion a compelling and challenging vision of human destiny, and become less frightened than it is today at the bogies of imposition and indoctrination. In a word Progressive Education cannot place its trust in a child-centered school.[6] (1932)

The historical context of the Eight Year Study cannot be understood apart from the progressive education movement. The impetus for the Eight Year Study as well as its development were bound up integrally with a movement that had shaped educational reform in America for thirty years

---

[5] Harold Rugg and Ann Shumaker, The Child-Centered School, (Yonkers on Hudson, N. Y: World Book Co, 1928) p. 5.

[6] George Counts, Dare the Schools Build a New Social Order? (New York: John Day Co., 1932) pp. 9-10.

prior to the study. Curiously it was a movement that was never clearly defined and which was often self-contradictory. Only four years separate the two statements at the opening of the chapter. Each was made by leading exponents of progressive education and each statement was characteristic of progressive education in the decade it was made. Yet their emphases sharply diverge. The first stresses the individual child and the unfolding of the child's personality from within. It pinpoints the child's creativity as the crux of the educational process. The second statement stresses the social nature of education and the relation of education to forces arising outside it. It pinpoints the cultural legacy to be passed on to the student as the crux of education.

The progressive education movement arose as part of a broader movement of social reform which wrought fundamental changes in national life during the late nineteenth and early twentieth centuries. Yet any attempt to define the movement precisely is difficult because of the movement's diversity. In his history of the progressive education movement, Lawrence Cremin has alluded to this problem. He writes,

> The reader will search these pages in vain for any capsule definition of progressive education

> None exists and none ever will; for throughout its history progressive education meant different things to different people, and these differences were only compounded by the remarkable diversity of American education.[7]

Only two things can be said in general about the movement. First, progressive educators recognized a need for the reform of the nation's schools from the primary school on up through the colleges in order that the schools be better matched to the needs of an emerging industrial society. Secondly this need for educational reform grew out of a reaction against the faculty psychology and the formalism which shaped much of nineteenth century pedagogy.

However, when one looks more specifically at particular writings of progressive educators, one is confronted by a maze of educational theories which frequently contradict one another and by a breadth of programs which defy generalization. Among the myriad accomplishments which Lawrence Cremin cites in his history of the movement are the introduction of industrial, vocational, and agriculturaltraining into the schools, the provision of health services by the schools, the efforts of the colleges to direct research toward

---

[7] Lawrence Cremin, The Transformation of the School (New York: Random House, 1961) p. x.

contemporary social problems, the growing ties between the school and the community, the articulation of a child-centered pedagogy, the development of a conception of the school as an agency of social reconstruction, the development of a science of education, and the professionalization of education.

Nevertheless, one can single out three central themes amidst this diversity which infused the progressive education movement and which profoundly shaped the course of the Eight Year Study. At times these themes countered one another, but they are constantly reiterated by progressive educators. The first was the child-centered theme of progressive educators, the attempt to have the schools respond to the developmental needs of children and adolescents. This theme was most pronounced in the 1920's and formed the intellectual backdrop for the Eight Year Study in addition to giving rise to a variety of innovative schools between 1905 and 1930.[8]

---

[8]Accounts of some of these schools may be found in the following works: John and Evelyn Dewey, Schools of Tomorrow; Marietta Johnson, Youth in a World of Tomorrow; Caroline Pratt, I Learn from Children; Margaret Naumberg, The Child and the World.

The second theme is social reformism. This theme was expressed in a variety of forms in the first two decades of the progressive education movement, but when it attained its greatest popularity in the 1930's it was expressed through two principal doctrines. In its more moderate form it was the notion that the primary responsibility of the school was to provide students with the critical intelligence they would need to reconstruct a vital democratic society. In its more radical form it was the attempt to enlist the schools and their teachers in the struggle to build a socialist order.

The third theme of progressive education was the empirical strand of the movement. It was the attempt to apply the scientific findings of the social and behavioral sciences to educational practice in the schools. It was a thrust of progressive education which retained its vigor throughout the development of the movement and which was one of the more enduring contributions of progressive education.

These three themes significantly shaped the Eight Year Study although their impact upon the education

profession at large was limited. Progressive education was part of a minority culture of protest which was most vocal during the decade of the twenties. Throughout the decades of the twenties and thirties the dominant slogan among educators was education for social efficiency and neither child-centered education nor education for social reconstruction had a pervasive impact upon the nation's schools, although the latter topic was widely discussed among educators in the 1930's. Nevertheless, the impact of all three themes upon the Eight Year Study is pronounced. The child-centered theme of progressive education provided the initial impetus for the study; the social reformist theme shifted the discussions of curriculum reofrm taking place in the thirty schools from a concern with generating greater student interest to an emphasis on strengthening democratic society; the scientific thrust of progressive education accounted for the study's experimental design and for the careful evaluation which was an integral part of the study.

The reformist zeal of the child-centered pedagogues wrought fundamental changes on the primary school level in progressive schools during the 1920's. In 1928 Harold Rugg and Ann Shumaker, two advocates of child-centered

education, published a book entitled The Child-Centered School which became the representative statement of child-centered pedagogy. Although Ann Shumaker had worked in child-centered schools and was later to serve as editor of Progressive Education, Harold Rugg was the better known figure of the pair. Trained initially as an engineer, Rugg's early work in education had centered upon the application ofstatistical techniques to education. However, upon receiving a faculty appointment at Teachers College, Rugg became acquainted with the New York progressives and became interested in child-centered education.

Rugg and Shumaker's book was both a survey and sympathetic critique of child-centered pedagogy and its stress on creative self-expression and individuality. At the end of the first section of their book Rugg and Shumaker set forth the central tenets of child-centered education. It was based on freedom rather than control. By this Rugg and Shumaker meant the "freedom to develop naturally, to be spontaneous, unaffected and unselfconscious".[9] The second article of faith of child centered pedagogy was the stress on child initiative over teacher initiative.

---

[9]Rugg and Shumaker op. cit. p. 56.

By this Rugg and Shumaker meant a stress on letting children govern themselves, share in the planning of programs and curricula, and share in conducting the life of the schools. The educational program's starting point was to be the student's interests rather than the teacher's interests, and the school was to be oriented around the child rather than around the subject matter. The third organizing principle of the child-centered school was that it was to be an active school. Freedom and pupil initiative were its keynote. The child's experience was to form the basis for the curriculum, and thus it was necessary to reproduce as much of real life experience in the schools as possible in order that the child have something to build upon. It was also necessary to furnish the child with experience in the community outside the school which could serve as the basis for school curricula. Fourthly the child's interest was to determine the curriculum. School subjects which were often far removed from the child's interests would be replaced by projects, work units, and informal group conferences which grew out of the child's interests. Curricula would be better integrated and only a few large subjects would be approached. The fifth tenet of the child-centered movement was its

stress on creative self-expression. Rugg and Shumaker were opposed to the older school's conception of conformity to the group. They emphasized the importance of bringing out the individuality of the child by allowing him to express himself through the arts. The assumption underlying this tenet was that every child had an innate capacity for creative self-expression which the schools could foster.

> The artist in Everyman's child is being discovered, not only in the unusual, the gifted, the genius;[10]

The child himself was to become the active artist rather than the passive admirer of those who preceded him. Lastly the child-centered school would provide an environment where the child could learn to live with others while retaining his own uniqueness. Instead of sacrificing the individual to group needs, the new school would foster individuality by having the student participate in cooperative efforts with others.

The pedagogy of the child-centered school, as delineated by Rugg and Shumaker, was reminiscent of Rousseau's emphasis on the innate goodness of the child. Underlying child-centered pedagogy was an implicit assumption

---

[10] Ibid p. 63.

that if the teacher interfered less in the child's life, the child would naturally develop into a creative individual. The cornerstone of Rugg and Shumaker's philosophy was a stress on creative self-expression and maximal child growth. Although it is tempting to caricature Rugg and Shumaker's celebration of the child, they did recognize the necessity for a social referent in education. Individual growth was only one goal of education.

Yet in Rugg and Shumaker's writing the social purpose of education was always subordinated to the stress on developing the student to the utmost of his potentialialities. Rugg and Shumaker were suspicious of stressing social dimensions, for they feared that this would result in a more conservative educational philosophy--one which conceived the school's purpose in terms of adapting students to the existing social order and which meant the imposition of knowledge from without rather than the creative unfolding of the child from within. Implicit in Rugg and Shumaker's philosophy was the assumption that the most beneficent social order was one in which each individual's powers of self-expression were most fully developed. Utopia was a collection of "self-actualized" individuals rather than a society possessing a shared social philosophy.

The rise of child-centered pedagogy in the early

decades of the twentieth century was as much a reaction to the extreme rigidity of the pedagogy of the nineteenth and twentieth centuries with its stress on conformity to group norms as it was a creative attempt to forge a new educational philosophy. Rugg and Shumaker were extremely critical of the school in which desks were bolted to the floor, in which children passively sat with their arms folded and absorbed lessons in question and answer form, and in which the authority of the teacher was unquestioned. Recent curriculum reform, according to Rugg and Shumaker, had only perpetuated the rigidities of the school, but in a somewhat altered form.

Rugg and Shumaker traced the origins of authoritarian schools to a doctrine of discipline advocated by traditional pedagogues and subject matter specialists. As a counter-thrust to this philosophy, Rugg and Shumaker proffered a doctrine of growth which they traced to John Dewey. Rugg and Shumaker saw themselves as heirs to Dewey's philosophy although Dewey himself was sharply critical of much which was called child-centered pedagogy. There was, in fact, a sharp difference between Rugg and Shumaker's concept of growth and that of Dewey.

Rugg and Shumaker conceived of individual growth as a legitimate end in tiself, whereas for Dewey

individual development always had a social purpose. The social dimension of education was, for Dewey, the most important dimension of educational philosophy whereas for Rugg and Shumaker it was only important insofar as it enhanced individual development. Thus Rugg and Shumaker write,

> There is no quarrel between social adjustment and individual development. The new schools (child-centered schools) have cut straight through to this important generalization. They desire more than all else the development of individuality, but they know that the realization of one's best self can take place only through happy and successful social living.[11]

Dewey, in contrast, had written in 1934,

> Perhaps the greatest need of and for a philosophy of education at the present time is the urgent need that exists for making clear in idea and effective in practice that its end is social, and that the criterion to be applied in estimating the value of practices that exist in schools is also social.[12]

Dewey did not deny that education had to start with the immediate interests of the child, but unless it led the child to a wider social understanding it would only be partially effective. Individual potentiality was unrealized unless applied to social living. According to Dewey, a nation had only educated its citizens successfully

---

[11]Rugg and Shumaker, op. cit. p. 90.

[12]Reginald D. Archambault ed., John Dewey on Education (New York: Random House Inc., 1964) p. 12.

when each individual was able to contribute to the enhancement and liberation of his fellow-man.

Child-centered pedagogy, then, was a doctrine of education which acquired increasing popularity within the progressive education movement in the 1920's. It was a doctrine well suited to a minority culture of protest which arose in reaction to the material prosperity of the 1920's. Within this culture of protest individuality was celebrated and conformity condemned. A variety of intellectual and social crusades were launched to free the individual from the repressiveness of Victorian sexual morality, from the conventionality and vulgarity of small town Babittry, and from the standardization of an industrial economy. In an era when many could settle into lives of complacent prosperity and when intellectuals were celebrating individualism, social reformers were out of vogue. Thus it was hardly strange that Rugg and Shumaker would write

> The newer education regards the active child as the truly growing child. Not activity for activity's sake--energy exploding in ramdom movements--but activity which is a growing towards something more mature, a changing for the better.[13]

In a decade without a social vision of the future other

---

[13] Rugg and Shumaker, op. cit. p. 66.

than whatever vision was implicit in a continuation of prosperity, pedagogues did not set out to define that "something" which the individual was growing towards. Individual growth had become an end in itself.

Although child-centered pedagogy was both the primary interest of progressive educators in the 1920's and the primary impetus for the Eight Year Study, a doctrine more oriented toward the social implications of education was slowly emerging among progressive educators. A young man named George Counts who had received his doctorate from Chicago in 1915 was writing books on education in the twenties which reflected this trend.

In 1922 Counts published a study entitled The Selective Character of American Secondary Education, a pioneering work in which he showed that education perpetuated inequality of educational opportunity. Counts concluded from his research,

> In a very large measure participation in the privileges of a secondary education is contingent on social and economic status.[14]

Five years later Counts published The Social Composition of Boards of Education in which he showed that boards of education were composed mostly of highly educated

---

[14] George Counts, The Selective Character of American Secondary Education, (Chicago: University of Chicago Press, 1922) p. 149.

professionals. Counts wrote that

> The persons who are chosen for membership on the more powerful boards of education are those who have attended our secondary schools and colleges, and occupy the privileged positions in society. The occupations which they most frequently represent are those of the merchant, the lawyer, the banker, the manufacturer , and the physician. From the ranks of the less privileged classes few members are chosen.[14a]

Towards the end of the decade Counts published two more books--School and Society in Chicago and Secondary Education and Industrialism. The first work was a study of the political forces impinging upon the operation of the Chicago school system. Counts suggested that school systems were not immune from the political maelstrom surrounding them. He debunked the notion that innovations were introduced into the schools because they were pedagogically sound or becuase they contained some inherent claim of validity.

> To any social group educational thinking is acceptable not because of any claim to intrinsic validity, but rather because it serves that group in its struggle for rights, privileges, and a place in the sun.[14b]

In his final book of the decade Counts outlined the position that would become one of the ideological thrusts of progressive education in the 1930's. Counts criticized the schools for their failure to assess the educational

---

[14a] George Counts, The Social Composition of Boards of Education, (Chicago: University of Chicago Press, 1927) p. 83.

[14b] George Counts, School and Society in Chicago (New York: Harcourt Brace and Co., 1928) p. 344.

implications of industrial civilization. Counts suggested that the schools were preoccupied with the day to day administrative chores of school keeping rather than with the endeavor "to make the school function in the building of a new civilization".[15] He suggested that America's transition from an agrarian to an industrial order was irrevocable.

> Education must come to terms with industrial civilization and discover its tasks in the new age.[16]

Counts then proceeded to trace how a changed social order had altered the high school, and he concluded that the major outlines of the high school were being determined by industrial civilization. The high school was integrally tied to society, and thus any functional theory of education would depend upon a carefully framed theory of society, an axiom that those who formulated educational theory in the 1920's had all but ignored according to Counts. If education were not to drift aimlessly, it would be necessary to fashion an educational and social philosophy "which accepts the challenge of the fundamental social reconstruction of society in the light of a rational ideal".[17]

---

[15] George Counts, Secondary Education and Industrialism, (Cambridge: Harvard University Press, 1929) pp. 4-5.

[16] Ibid p. 12.

[17] Ibid p. 64.

Counts' writings, however, were far removed from the mainstream of progressive education in the 1920's, and the thrust of progressive education which he represented had little to do with the origins of the Eight Year Study, although it exercised a shaping influence on the study once it was undertaken. Counts had written in 1929,

> The major weakness of this (progressive education) movement is that it lacks a solid social foundation.[18]

Counts had accurately perceived that child-centered pedagogy lacked a social philosophy. The advocates of child-centered pedagogy had written eloquently about the individual child, but they betrayed an astonishing lack of concern about the social and political milieu in which education took place. It was only in the 1930's that those progressive educators formerly enamored of child-centered education took notice of Counts and that social reformism became a topic of discussion among them. With the onset of the Depression Counts' writings were suddenly heeded in progressive education circles. A nation which had wallowed in prosperity and frivolity for a decade suddenly found itself on the brink of economic collapse, and educators were profoundly effected by this precipitous change of circumstances.

Counts had been asked to address the 1932 annual

---

[18] Ibid p. 68.

convention of the Progressive Education Association. For over a decade the P. E. A. had been the major publicist for progressive innovations in the schools. Prior to 1932 the Association almost exclusively had been concerned with child-centered pedagogy and thus the invitation to Counts to address the convention represented a significant departure from the P. E. A's traditional concerns. Counts entitled his address "Dare Progressive Education Be Progressive?" and it generated much discussion.

Two months later Counts made some minor revisions in the speech and it was published under the title of Dare the Schools Build a New Social Order? along with two other speeches given that same year before the Department of Superintendance and the National Council of Education. Counts' tone in the three speeches was militant and contained a note of urgency not found in his earlier works. Counts chastized the schools for not facing their social responsibilities. He claimed that Americans had always looked to the schools to solve the social problems of vice, poverty, and wealth, but that the schools had been preoccupied with maintaining the status quo rather than social amelioration. It was only the progressive education movement which offered

the hope that the schools could meet the traditional expectations of Americans by contributing to the building of a new social order. Counts went on to praise the progressive education movement for renewing a concern among educators for the child, for stressing interest as a stimulant to learning, and for emphasizing the importance of learning from experience, but he qualified his approval with the warning that too often such advances led educators to champion activity for its own sake and to neglect a careful defintion of the social ends of education.

Counts suggested that progressive education had failed to articulate a social philosophy, in part, because it was a movement of the upper-middle class. This was a class that could be counted upon to protest outrageous instances of social cruelty, but which remained disturbingly complacent when confronted by the "accepted forms ofsocial injustice". For this class an exclusive focus on child interest proved attractive because it kept the child intererested in his studies while sheltering him from the grimmer aspects of industrial life.

Counts concluded that if progressive education

---

[19] George Counts, Dare the Schools Build a New Social Order? op. cit. p. 9.

were to make a lasting contribution to educational reform, it would have to develop a social philosophy. A minimally effective program in the schools would have to include this social philosophy as part of the educational program. In addition it would have to provide students with an understanding of the world and it would have to acknowledge that some imposition was necessary in education.

In the concluding portion of his essay Counts argued that it was possible for the schools to stand at the vanguard of social change. However, he believed in order to do so teachers would have to wrest power from professional educators committed to the status quo. Only then would the schools become a force for social reform.

Counts was not optimistic about the ability of younger teachers to wrest this control, but even if this came to pass the question would remain of what form of imposition teachers should embrace. The vision of the future which Counts wanted teachers to present to their students was that of a socialist democracy. Counts believed that such a form of social organization would build upon America's democratic tradition while combatting "all

forces tending to produce social distinctions and classes".[20] It would acknowledge the realities of industrial society while directing the use of material riches, industrial equipment, and technology from the privileged classes to the common man.

> If property rights can be diffused in industrial society, natural resources and all important forms of capital will have to be collectively owned.[21]

Here, then was a "new vision of American destiny". Counts wrote,

> Such a vision of what America might become in the industrial age I would introduce into our schools as the supreme imposition, but one to which our children are entitled--a priceless legacy which it should be the first concern of our profession to fashion and bequeath.[22]

Counts believed that such an imposition could be the core of the school's philosophy without a suppression of facts or an attempt to promote particular refroms.

> This does not mean that we should endeavor to promote particular reforms through the educational system. We should, however, give to our children a vision of the possibilities which lie ahead and endeavor to enlist their loyalties and enthusiasm in the realization of the vision.23

Although many other leaders of the progressive education movement in the 1930's shared Counts'

---

[20] Ibid p. 41.

[21] Ibid p. 45-46.

[22] Ibid p. 54.

[23] Ibid p. 37.

concern with the relation of education to its broader social context, few were willing to go so far as Counts and spell out in any detail the kind of social order which the schools should promote. Counts' belief that the schools could present a particular vision of the future to students was based on a Marxian assumption that historical forces inexorably were pushing America towards a socilized state. Thus Counts came to represent only one wing of social reformism in the 1930's. More pepresentative of the mainstream of social reformism were the long-time luminaries of the progressive education movement such as John Dewey, William Kilpatrick, and Boyd Bode. A representative statement of their philosophy is contained in The Educational Frontier, a volume published one year after Counts' call for a new social order. The Educational Frontier was a collaborative effort of several progressive educators and grew out of a request by the National Society of College Teachers of Education for a yearbook outlining a philosophy of education. William H. Kilpatrick of Columbia Teachers College chaired a committee which included Boyd H. Bode, John Childs, John Dewey, H. Gordon Hullfish, R. B. Raup

and V. T. Thayer. Different individuals were responsible for different chapters of the book, but a coherent point of view emerges from their writings. The orientation of the social reformists is most clearly articulated in a chapter of the book composed by John Dewey and John Childs, both professors of education at Columbia Teachers College.

The chapter opened with a historical analysis of the evolution of education since the end of the nineteenth century. Until the turn of the century, according to Dewey and Childs, the aims of education had been couched in terms of the individual, but with the onset of the twentieth century educators spoke increasingly of education in social terms. Education came to be seen as an important force for social reconstruction. While a change had occurred in the rhetoric of educators, practice had had not been effected. At best there was an emphasis on developing the creative individual who would be necessary for any effort of social reconstruction. There was little effort, however, to redirect policy and curriculum in the schools towards an altered conception of social ends. Dewey and Counts suggested that during the 1920's education had returned to a pre-twentieth century concern with the individual and an indifference toward the social

dimension of education.

On this point, however, Dewey and Childs were actually mistaking what was happening among progressive educators for what was happening in the education profession at large. For while there had been an unmistakable shift away from discussion about the social ends of education among progressive educators, the rest of the education profession seemed to be preoccupied by the question of how schools and curricula could better meet the social and economic needs of the country. Their primary concern was the production of efficient workers and pragmatic citizens who could advance the country's economic development, not with the development of creative individuals.

Nevertheless, Dewey and Childs located what they perceived as the failure of education to amend its practices in the failure of educational leaders to frame their social philosophies in reference to concrete social realities. Since a viable educational philosophy stemmed from an understanding of social reality, Childs and Dewey went on to trace those social arrangements which had shaped the nature of the educational process in the United States. For Dewey and Childs, as for counts, the fundamental change effecting education in

American society was the shift from a nineteenth century agrarian order stressing individualism to a twentieth century industrial state stressing interdependence and cooperative planning.

The crucial question facing the schools had thus become how to adapt to this shift. If the schools were to develop a meaningful academic program, they would have to acknowledge the fundamental changes that had been wrought in the social order and make them the basis of the curriculum. This would also necessitate "a better understanding by the teaching profession of social issues with the intellectual courage to face them".[24] This could be done, Childs and Dewey contended, if the schools as well as the broader society would adopt the scientific method of inquiry, discovery, and testing. If the experimental use of intelligence were to be applied to social problems as it had been applied to physical problems of the natural world, men could rationally begin to work toward their solution. Experimental method accompanied by the application of technology to social ends could usher in an era when material want would be banished. Childs and Dewey concluded,

---

[24] William Kilpatrick et. al., The Educational Frontier, (New York: Century Co, 1933) p. 52.

> This need for a society in which experimental inquiry and planning for social ends are organically contained is also the need for a new education. In one case as in the other there is supplied a new dynamicin conduct and there is required the cooperative use of intelligence on a social scale in behalf of social values.[25]

Education would be designed to provide people with the skills they needed to manage the conditions under which they would live, to give people an understanding of the forces which would effect them, and to give individuals the tools they would need to manage social forces. Methods for maintaining and enhancing the life of the community would become the core of the educational process. Only, then, would education become a progressive force in social reconstruction.

Thus one sees in the writings of many progressive educators of the 1930's a pronounced shift away from an exclusive focus on the individual to a concern with education in its broader social context. Child-centered pedagogues continued to write in the 1930's, but their voices were in the minority. The depression had rendered their concerns peripheral. The alleviation of the nation's social and economic problems rather than the enhancement of the individual's growth had become the new priority

---

[25] Ibid p. 64.

of the nation's progressive educators. Yet the social reformists like their progressive predecessors failed to frame a comprehensive treatment of education. Just as the child-centered pedagogues had failed to deal with education in its social context because of an almost exclusive focus on the micro-educational context of the classroom, the social reformists failed to offer concrete suggestions as to how to change the day to day realities of the classroom because of an almost exclusive concern with the macro-educational context. The child-centered pedagogues had provided the pedagogical methodology while ignoring the social ends of education; the social reformers had clarified the social context of education while failing to provide the pedagogical methodology. Moreover, the social reformers had betrayed an optimistic naivete about the relationship of the school to the social order. They gave little indication of how an institution traditionally committed to buttressing the status quo would suddenly shift its role to stand at the vanguard of social change and to become a vital force for social reconstruction. In part this naivete is understandable, for many of the progressive reformers turned to the school out of frustration over their failures

in the broader political arena. If struggle in the political arena had not brought about fundamental social and economic change, perhaps it could be brought about through a manipulation of the school. This hope, however, was not to be realized. The incorporation of a social philosophy into the Eight Year Study resulted in a watered down version of the social responsibilities of education that would consist of pious clichés and little intellectual vitality.

However, before dealing with this issue a word about the empiricist strand of progressive education is in order. Central to an understanding of the progressive education movement as well as to the Eight Year Study was the attempt to apply research in the social and behavioral sciences to pedagogical practice in the schools. The spirit of scientific inquiry in education was typified by the research of Edward L. Thorndike who had begun experimentation in animal learning while working on a Ph. D. thesis in psychology at Harvard at the turn of the century. Thorndike soon shifted his attention to wrestling with the problems of measuring human learning and educational outcomes. During a career of approximately forty years at Teachers College, much of Thorndike's research focused upon testing

and intelligence. In Thorndike's writings one finds a tremendous faith in the possibility of developing a science of education--a faith that grows with the passage of time. In his earlier writings Thorndike had merely argued that once the goals of education had been set forth, psychology could specify the best way to achieve them. In 1903 he wrote,

> A theory of education must decide two questions: 1) What ought people to be? 2) How shall we change them from what they are to what they ought to be?[26]

Thorndike initially claimed that a science of education could answer only the second question. The first question could be determined only be reference to ultimate values. As time went on, however, Thorndike came to believe that science could not only determine the means of education, but also define the ends of educational policy. In an address before the staff of Columbia Teachers College thirteen years later Thorndike suggested,

> Whichever should be the case I am convinced that just as soon as we develop men who are just recognized as educational experts, policies as well as their execution will be left largely to them. The world is learning rapidly that when a man of ability has studied a topic scientifically and makes his

---

26Edward Thorndike, Educational Psychology (New York: Science Press, 1903) p. 163.

> judgements about that topic in the impartial, impersonal fashion of the expert, it is wise to put on him every responsibility in that limited field that he will take.[27]

This tremendous faith in science was not limited to education. A faith in the power of scientific inquiry to solve social problems was one of the mainstays of the progressive reform movement. Within the field of education the application of science was manifested in a variety of ways. It inspired an extensive measurement movement which attempted to express in quantitative form factors ranging from individual intelligence to the outcome of schelling.....As part of this movement hundreds of aptitude and intelligence test were developed after 1910 to assess pupil development. Measurement and statistics were also heavily relied upon in the construction of school surveys--hundreds of which were conducted between 1910 and 1925 to explain the problems of the school to a concerned public and to obtain public support for school reform. Science was also used in attempts to design scientifically based curricula. All in all pedagogues took Thorndike's dictum seriously

> Whatever exists at all exists in some amount. To know it thoroughly involves knowing its quantity

---

[27] Edward Throndike, "Education for Initiative and Originality" Teachers College Record XVII (November, 1916) pp. 415-416.

as well as its quality.[28]

However, science's broadest public appeal grew out of the promise of greater economic efficiency. To the extent that the educational process could be quantified, the economic costs of achieving educational ends could be assessed.

The scientific movement had both its negative and positive effects although in retrospect its vices seem to outnumber its virtues. An exaggerated scientism often led educators to concern themselves with trivial pursuits merely because they were measurable and seemed to promise greater efficiency. One schoolman declared in 1931

> Every pupil should at every minute be doing something. For example, while pupils are at work, at the blackboards others may well be undergoing a drill of some kind. In many subjects it is advisable that some of the pupils sould work at the blackboard while others are performing tasks at their seats... Assignments for blackboard work should be made rapidly from the book, from sheets from cards. Too often valuable time is lost where groups are sent to the blackboards and their several tasks assigned to each one by one while all the rest wait their turn. As much as four minutes idle time is spent by some.[29]

In addition scientific methods were sometimes applied to

---

[28]Edward Thorndike, "The Nature, Pruposes, and General Methods of Measurements of Educational Products" in National Society for the Study of Education: Seventeenth Yearbook, Part II (Bloomington, Indiana, 1918) p. 18.

[29]Theodore Mitchell, "Loss of Efficiency in the Recitation" Educational Review, XLV (January, 1913) pp. 14-15.

educational issues not because they promised more effective instruction or evaluation, but because they were expected to improve educators' status by providing a body of esoteric knowledge that could only be acquired through professional training. The use of science in education also tended to identify that which was measurable with that which was good. Many curriculum reformers in the 1920's sought to exhaustively identify what people did in their daily lives and then determine the abilities necessary to carry out those tasks. The curriculum was then designed to provide students with these abilities. The danger in such a notion of curriculum reform was that education would become committed to the status quo rather than a force contributing to social reform. Lastly science was applied toward the development of a massive body of intelligence tests--tests which served a positive function as diagnostic instruments, but which were used at times to legitimize social and economic inequalities.

Yet if the scientific movement in education had its negative effects, it also had a positive impact. It meant that better devices for diagnosing educational problems

---

[30] See Franklin Bobbitt, How to Make a Curriculum and the reports of the National Education Association's Committee on Economy of Time published in the Yearbook of the National Society for the Study of Education published in 1915, 1916, 1917, and 1918.
published in 1915, 1916, 1917, and 1918.

could be developed. It also led to an extensive inquiry into how to better teach traditional subject matter and established a tradition of careful evaluation of educational innovation. The careful evaluation of the Eight Year Study was only one example of the enlistment of science in the struggle to build more flexibility and diversity into high school curricula.

EARLY DEVELOPMENT OF THE STUDY

Child-centered education, social reconstructionism, and empiricism each profoundly effected the development of the Eight Year Study. In its narrowest sense, however, the study began as an attempt to grapple with the problem of articulation between high school and college. This problem had had been a central concern of educators ever since the closing decades of the nineteenth century. A student seeking admission to college around 1880 would have found that each college sought proficiency in different subjects for admission, and that most colleges devised their own examinations to measure the proficiency of students. In the 1890's uniformity became the catchword of those seeking to improve articulation of high schools and colleges, and some standardization of college admission

requirements took place between 1890 and 1910. Many colleges began to require a certain number of course units in specified subject areas and to require the standardized examinations of the College Entrance Examination Board which was established in 1900.

In 1928 the federal government financed a study of secondary schools costing $225,000. Part of the study was devoted to the problem of articulation, and government researchers found a situation that was confused and without well-formulated policy. Very few high schools had any notion of what happened to their students in college and a majority of high school students received no advice about their future education. Furthermore different institutions of higher education continued to use widely varying admissions policies.

Yet progressive educators were concerned with the problem of articulation from a different vantage point. Whereas reform of primary education had been vigorously carried out by child-centered pedagogues in the 1920's, they perceived their efforts to refrom secondary schools to be blocked by the subject and unit entrance requirements of American colleges. Rugg and Shumaker had been highly critical of the way in which college entrance requirements shaped the secondary school curriculum. They cited the

experience of the Francis W. Parker school in Chicago which had established a progressive curriculum on the primary school level, but which had been unable to alter the secondary school curriculum. Rugg and Shumaker wrote,

> Nevertheless the failure of this important educational experiment in the secondary grades should provide a distinct incentive to contemporary students of American education to free the high school from the stranglehold of the so-called liberal arts college.[31]

according to Rugg and Shumaker the Francis W. Parker School was unexceptional. In the concluding chapter of their book Rugg and Shumaker suggested,

> It appears to be impossible to find a school in America in which the child-centered philosopy is applied beyond the eigth grade.[32]

At the 1930 annual convention of the Progressive Education Association William Aikin, headmaster of the John Burroughs School in Clayton, Missouri, led a discussion of how the nation's secondary schools might improve their educational programs. According to Aikin many suggestions were made during the discussion, but a constant obstacle to any practical action was the

---

Rugg and Shumaker, op. cit. p. 45.

Ibid p. 318.

fear that meaningful reform would jeopardize students' chances of admission to college.

The discussion on secondary school reform at the P. E. A.'s annual convention coincided with a growing feeling in the association that it whould allocate a portion of its resources for research. Established in 1919 the P. E. A. had served during its first decade of existence as a clearing house for the reform efforts of the child-centered pedagogues. At an executive committee meeting of the P. E. A. held in June, 1930 at Vassar College, the Association decided to commit some of its resources to research aimed at solving a few immediate problems. The Association decided to appoint a committee which would enter into

> a thorough study of college entrance requirements, examinations and of the whole relationship between schools and colleges.[33]

William Aikin was appointed to head a committee composed of twenty-five other educators from colleges and secondary schools . It was an impressive list including the heads of some of the country's foremost progressive schools, the president of a progressive college, and a number of college deans.[34]

Some evidence of Aikin's attitudes toward secondary

---

[33] "Editorial; The Executive Committee Holds a Special Meeting" Progressive Education VII (June, 1930) p. 232.

[34] See Appendix I.

education can be gleaned from an article he wrote for Progressive Education in February, 1930. Many of the central tenets of child-centered pedagogy were incorporated into Aikin's philosophy. Throughout the article there is a stress on interest as the necessary basis of the adolescent's work. Aikin wrote,

> It seems to me that above everything else the work of these years should be full of meaning and significance to the secondary school student.[35]

The crucial problem, according to Aikin, was formulating an educational program in which the student was not simply accumulating credits, but was also taking an active interest in his work. It was necessary to end compulsion. Like many of the child-centered pedagogues Aikin stressed self-expression as an important goal of education.

> One's relations with others are of the utmost importance during the adolescent years. Schools must provide a great variety of opportunity for the exercise of all sorts of talents so that each member may find some medium of satisfying self-expression.[36]

Aikin was not prone to the excesses of many of the child-centered pedagogues. He was not advocating the elimination of intellectual content from the curriculum. New curriculum

---

[35] Wilford Aikin, "The Prospect in Secondary Education", Progressive Education, VII (February, 1930) p. 30.

[36] Ibid p. 20.

material was needed but it had to be well-organized, intellectually substantive, and related to the modern world. Curriculum researchers needed to inquire into how curricula could be better unified so as to provide students with a more coherent educational experience. Aikin urged other reforms which had been advocated previously by progressive educators such as restrained use of intelli-tests, and a greater involvement of students as active parts of the school community. The overall thrust of his article was toward making the curriculum responsive individual needs, a goal that Aikin felt could only be reached with the cooperation of the colleges. Before any experimentation could take place on the secondary school level colleges would have to reduce the number of units required for admission, allow for a greater number of electives, and help to develop better curriculum materials.

It is impossible to summarize the pedagogical views of the entire membership of the committee, but Aikin's desire for a more student-centered pedagogy was also shared by representatives of the colleges serving on the committee. Max McConn, a dean of Lehigh University,

and a member of the committee also suggested that interest should be the basis of the college curriculum. McConn explained the doctrine of interest to mean that students learned effectively (i. e. with long retention, with appreciation, and with understanding) only that which stemmed from self-perceived interest. Opposed to this doctrine was the notion that courses should be instituted on the basis of their value in helping one to earn a living or to adjust socially. According to McConn the latter doctrine was prevalent philosophy at all levels of education whereas the interest doctrine was only translated into practice in the earliest years of schooling.

Like Aikin, McConn was not advocating a shallow doctrine of relevance nor the elimiation of intellectual content from the curriculum. He was urging that admission to college be based upon demonstrated intellectual interest and that students be allowed to follow out their interests. Initially most students would have narrow interests, but McConn suggested that under the tutelage of an able faculty adviser students would eventually come to see how their interests were related to other fields of knowledge. By the end of his college

career the student would probably cover the identical material he would have mastered by fulfilling distribution requirements.

Over the next two years Aikin's committee, known as the Committee on College Entrance and Secondary Schools[37], met periodically to discuss how relations between the nation's schools and colleges could be improved. In reporting on a meeting held in New York in January, 1931 Aikin stated,

> We realize that the principles of progressive education have not yet found their way into practice fully in any secondary school. This, we know, is largely due to the restrictions placed upon the secondary schools by the colleges. We are confident that sooner or later these restrictions will be removed and that we shall be free to have the kind of secondary school we want to have.[38]

A critique of these restrictions was to provide the unifying theme of all of Aikin's public pronouncements on the Eight Year Study. Two months later in his first progress report to the P. E. A. Aikin restated this problem. According to Aikin revolutionary changes in the primary schools had been wrought in the last decade

---

[37] Soon after the name of the committee was changed to the Commission on the Relation of School and College.

[38] "News and Comments", Progressive Education VIII, (February, 1931) p. 158.

but it had been all but impossible to extend these to secondary schools because of college entrance requirements which had no "relation whatever to the student's needs and interests",[39].

Between 1930 and 1932 the committee discussed a number of research alternatives. Although the Eight Year Study was to become one of the most extensive experiments in reform of the secondary school curriculum, as late as 1932 the Committee on College Entrance and Secondary Schools did not see its primary responsibility to be a reconstruction of the secondary school curriculum. In April, 1932 Aikin had written,

> We are trying to keep our eyes steadily upon the goal that we set before us, that is, the changing of the relationship which exists between secondary schools and colleges, so that the secondary school can fulfill its obligation to its students. In other words we are not concerned primarily with the curriculum; the change in the relationship between secondary schools and colleges is our chief business.[40].

The committee's initial inquiries were directed into a variety of areas. Early in its deliberations the committee considered revising the curriculum of the first two years of college as well as the last two years

---

[39] "Report of the Committee on College Entrance and Secondary Schools," Progressive Education, VIII (April, 1931) pp. 318-320.

[40] Wilford Aikin, "Report of the Committee on the Relation of School and College" Progressive Education IX (April, 1932) p. 293.

of secondary school. Three sub-committees were eventually established to investigate facets of the problem of articulation. One committeee was established to inquire into ways in which students might better be selected for college. A second committee was established to examine the principles which should underlie reform of the secondary schools. A third committee sought to determine what curriculum changes might be anticipated if the secondary schools were given a greater amount of freedom. The most significant report to emerge from this committee was issued in 1931, and outlined the areas of secondary education which most needed improvement. For the most part the report was a reiteration of the liturgy of the child-centered pedagogues.

Firstly the committee contended that school experiences were not integrated. The schools lacked a coherent philosophy which could be used to build a unified curriculum. Subjects had been added to the curriculum without a coherent purpose, and thus students studied isolated subjects which bore little relationship to one another. Moreover there was little continuity in the curriculum from year to year. Secondly the curriculum was not based upon the interests of students. For most

students high school was a ritual of credit accumulation rather than a meaningful experience. Bright students were not challenged to achieve on their own and the schools ignored research on the ways young people learned. Classrooms were dominated by the interests of teachers who were satisfied when students learned by rote. Students were given little chance for active participation and the curriculum was far removed from their real concerns. Thirdly the curriculum did not allow for the creative self-expression of students. Students found themselves carrying out assignments rather than doing creative work. The creative arts were considered as peripheral to the curriculum or were non-existent.

Yet the Commission in its critique also acknowledged the social responsibilities of the secondary school. The schools were criticized for failing to provide students with an adequate appreciation of their American heritage.

> American youth left high school with diplomas, but without insight into the great political, social, and economic problems of our nation.[41]

Students also left school with little sense of community responsibility. Because schools were autocratic

---

[41] Wilford Aikin, The Story of the Eight Year Study, Volume I (New York: Harper and Brothers, 1942) p. 4.

students graduated with little sense of their capacity to assume social responsibilities.

This critique of the secondary schools was as close as the Commission would come to enunciating a philosophy of education. In spite of its acknowledgement that the problems of the schools stemmed, in part, from the absence of a coherent philosophy of education, the Commission itself was not willing to set forth that philosophy.

By 1932 the Commission was ready to announce a plan for experimentation which seemed to fuse its concerns. The plan was set forth in detail in the June, 1932 issue of School and Society and republished three months later in the journal of the P. E. A. During its deliberations over the previous two years, the committee had decided against a general protest of college entrance requirements or a total assault on the problem of articulation. The committee decided, on the contrary, to carry out a limited experiment involving a very small number of of secondary schools in order to find out whether students who were taught in non-conventional academic programs did better or worse than those who were taught in conventional programs. Under the plan the schools would enter into a special admissions arrangement with the nation's colleges for a period of five years beginning

in 1936 whereby the colleges would suspend their usual subject and unit entrance requirements. During the experimental period admission to college would be based upon the recommendations of the school principal and upon student records composed of aptitude and achievement tests and a list of interests and activities indicating the quality and quantity of the student's work.[42]

Thirty schools were selected to participate in the study.[43] Approximately one half of the schools were private and many of the public schools were located in affluent suburbs. A few school systems were located in solidly middle class towns such as Tulsa, Des Moines, and Denver, but on the whole the student population participating in the study came from wealthy families. The thirty schools were selected from an initial list of 200 schools which had been solicited from school and college personnel throughout the country. The Commission's eventual choice of thirty schools was based on little more, however, than the apparent desire of these schools to reform their curricula.

---

[42]Virtually all of the nation's colleges agreed to this arrangement with the exception of Harvard, Haverford, Princeton, and Yale which were unwilling to waive the College Entrance Board Examinations.

[43]See Appendix II.

In its plan the Commission also set forth a statement of the educational ideals underlying the study. For the most part the statement was simply a reformulation of the critique which the Commission had previously issued. The Commission urged a greater mastery of basic skills which would serve as a foundation for later study, more continuity of study, a greater integration of subject matter, the release of the creative energies of the child through a greater stress on the creative arts and through the encouragement of creative work.

It can thus be seen that the Eight Year Study originated as an upward thrust of the progressive education movement of the 1920's. Child-centered pedagogues had met with isolated success in reforming the nation's primary schools during the 1920's, but felt that their attempts to reform the nation's secondary schools had made no headway. Both Aikin's statements and the commission's critique of the secondary schools reflected a desire to implement many of the tenets of child-centered pedagogy.

Yet the Commission failed to articulate a comprehensive educational or social philosophy which might have guided the thirty schools in their attempts at reform and which ultimately might have served to provide a framework for other educational experiments. In part, this failure stemmed from the Commission's own vision of its role. It saw its central mission as wrestling with the problem of articulation between high school and college. Thus it was concerned with structuring an experiment which would test the hypothesis that students going through non-conventional programs in high school would perform adequately in college--a hypothesis that did not necessarily entail the articulation of a social philosophy. It was almost by chance that the Eight Year Study evolved into one of the most extensive experiments in secondary school reform ever undertaken.

In part, however, the Commission's failure to articulate a social or educational philosophy was a legacy of the child-centered pedagogues. The child-centered pedagogues always had a more clearly articulated notion of what they were against than what they were for. It was well and good for the Commission to say that interest should be the basis of the curriculum, but that hardly served to answer the more important and complex question of interest directed toward what ends.

The criterion of the social reformists that child-centered education had developed without reference to a social philosophy might as readily have been applied to the educational thought that characterized the Eight Year Study in its early years. It should be acknowledged that in 1930 and 1931 the urgency of Counts' social perspective had not yet been felt. Although the Depression had begun, its dimensions were not yet realized. A quick return to normalcy and prosperity was anticipated by most Americans. It was only in 1932 that the Depression's full severity was felt and that educators began to frame philosophies in terms of the broader social and political milieu.

The Commission on the Relation of School and College was thus given an unprecedented chance to test the assumption that there was no single manner of best preparing students for college, as well as being able to provide thirty schools with an unprecedented chance for curriculum innovation. In the early days of its efforts the Commission concentrated on the first task and failed to perceive clearly that the reforms which emerged from the thirty schools might prove to be the most lasting results of the study. In failing to lay

an adequate groundwork for a comprehensive experiment in secondary school reform, the Commission inadvertently foreclosed the possibility that the Eight Year Study could serve as a model for future reform.

CHAPTER II

THE EIGHT YEAR STUDY

CURRICULUM REFORM

An adventurous exploit of our ancestors was the dumping of British tea into Boston Harbor. That helped to bring on a revolution. In this article, we are privileged to learn about another adventurous exploit in which the tea of college entrance requirements is being dumped overboard by thirty selected high schools.[44]

(Editor's note preceding an article about the Eight Year Study)

In spite of everything certain philosophers who are veritable babes in the woods when it comes to experimentation continue to insist that we remodel our schools along lines suggested by the results of this fraudulent study. No one should be severely censured for believing that education is so important that we should not tolerate such goings on.[45]

(A criticism of the Eight Year Study)

The Eight Year Study officially lasted from 1933 to 1941. Over the course of these eight years the study gave rise to a wide ranging body of opinions among educators about its implications. Some educators saw it as a prelude to the reconstruction of American secondary education whereas others viewed it as a poorly designed attempt to foist progressive education upon an unsuspecting public. In retrospect the study proved

---

[44] Wilford Aikin, "Our Thirty Unshackled Schools", Clearing House, II (October, 1936), 78.

[45] Helmar Johnson, "Some Comments on the Eight Year Study", Progressive Education, XXVIII (March, 1951) 163.

neither to be a "fraudulent study" nor the initial step in an educational revolution. It attained the modest goals of effectively demonstrating its initial hypothesis that conventional academic programs in high school were not necessary for success in college, and it generated a substantial body of curriculum reform. Curiously enough, however, neither of these achievements would have a substantial impact on the nation's educational system.

It is not the purpose of this paper to summarize the development and the results of the Eight Year Study. The Commission more than adequately reported its findings in five volumes totaling over 1500 pages.[46] However, if one is to determine the extent of the Eight Year Study's impact, one must first understand both the nature of the curriculum reform undertaken in the thirty

---

[46] Volume I was a summary of the study. Volume II was a discussion of the curriculum reform that occurred in the thrity schools. Volume III was a description of the evaluative devices developed to measure the educational progress of students. Volume IV was a report of the follow-up study conducted in the colleges. Volume V was a compendium of the final reports of the thirty schools.

schools and the validity of the study's findings.

The Eight Year Study was undertaken to test the hypothesis that success in college was not contingent upon fulfillment of a specified set of course and unit requirements. The study sought to demonstrate that a student could be prepared adequately for college in a school that designed its program without reference to college entrance requirements. In order to test this hypothesis an extensive follow-up survey of the college achievements of the students who had graduated from the thirty schools was conducted.[47]

In his preface to the report of the follow-up study Max McConn suggested,

> It is a little difficult not to remember or believe, but it remains true that initially the major specific concern of the Commission on the Relation of School and College was with college entrance requirements. The very name of the Commission,

---

[47]There are many facets of the Eight Year Study that are not discussed in this paper. The Commission devoted one volume of its report on the study to the appraising and recording of student progress. Early in the study it became clear that existing instruments of appraisal would not be adequate for evaluating student progress. Most existing tests stressed the amount of knowledge acquired and proficiency in skills whereas the participating schools saw themselves as developing other talents. Thus there was a concern with developing methods to measure the student's ability to think, his ability to study effectively, social sensitivity, artistic appreciation, and breadth of information. During the eight years of the study the evaluation staff conducted extensive experimentation and developed over 200 tests. In addition to the development of better evaluative devices, the concept of the teachers' workshop was initiated and a variety of reports and records were developed to supplement traditional indicies of potential for college work.

in fact, commemorates the primacy of that concern.[48] What had happened as the Eight Year Study evolved and what McConn accurately perceived was that the study did not remain primarily an attempt to improve the articulation of high school and college. As the schools were given the freedom to experiment with their curricula, the problem of creating a vital educational program became the paramount issue in the study. By 1941 a study which had begun as a modest attempt to improve the articulation of high school and college was being spoken of by Aiken as a prelude to the reconstruction of secondary education in the United States.

The schools began their attempts to restructure their curricula in the Fall of 1933. The Commission sponsored annual conferences in 1933, 1934, and 1935 so that the schools could discuss their common problems and share their ideas. Each school was given autonomy to restructure its curriculum as it wished and no attempt was made by the Commission to set the study within the context of a particular educational philosophy. By 1936 it became clear that many of the schools desired

---

[48] Dean Chamberlin, et al., Did They Succeed in College?, Vol. IV (New York: Harper and Brothers, 1942) p. 11.

help in revising their curricula and the Commission provided a group of curriculum associates. Once again the Commission refused to advocate a particular educational philosophy and charged the curriculum staff with providing assistance in accordance with each of the school's own goals. Summer workshops were provided in 1936, 1937, and 1938 so that teachers from the thirty schools could meet together and work out problems that arose in classroom settings.

The Commission's reluctance to set down educational guidelines resulted in a tremendous diversity of reform among the thirty schools. Some schools hardly deviated from the traditional course of study while others rewrote their entire curricula. The Commission's reluctance stemmed from a fear of substituting a set of constraints for those the Commission had just eliminated by suspending college entrance requirements, although the Commission spoke of its reluctance in terms of avoiding regimentation and allowing the schools to adapt a program that would best suit the needs of their own students. In effect, the Commission's failure to set forth an educational or social philosophy meant that all manner of curriculum reform took place under the rubric of the study.

A tremendous range of educational philosophies and practices emerged from the thirty schools. Thus one public high school couched the rationale for its social studies curriculum in terms of the American marketplace.

> The work in social studies aims to develop pupils into effective producers, intelligent buyers, and good consumers.[49]

Another public high school, on the other, hand, explained its rationale for a social studies curriculum in more abstract terms that embodied the best of progressive education rhetoric.

> The school should be an agency for promotion and reconstruction of society in the development of characteristics of behavior which will enable the individual to foster the achievement of democratic values.[50]

In 1933 at the first meeting of the thirty schools to discuss tentative plans for restructuring the curriculum, course proposals ranging from "The Progress of Man Through the Ages" to "Football from the Spectator's Point of View" were discussed according to Aikin. While it is impossible to summarize the reports of each of

---

[49] Thirty Schools Tell Their Story, Vol. V (New York: Harper and Brothers, 1943) p. 572.

[50] Ibid p. 172.

the thirty schools, an examination of three schools which differed widely in the nature of their reforms will give some indication of the diversity of curriculum reform which occurred in the thirty schools.

The Dalton School was a private school on the upper east side of New York City. It was coeducational through the eigth grade, and it was an all girls school on the high school level. Even before the study began the Dalton School had a somewhat non-conventional academic program. Students and faculty met at the beginning of each year to discuss and modify the tentative course offerings. Classes met only twice per week, and the students were free the rest of the time to work on their own. Each month the students would prepare study guides which their adviser would check periodically. School government was run on a democratic basis with students and teachers meeting together to make policy decisions.

Because of college entrance requirements, however, most courses were organized around subject disciplines. When these requirements were suspended, the Dalton School began to develop new courses within its former structure.

The school decided to substitute centers of orientation for traditional subject disciplines. In so doing the schools erected a model which followed Dewey's dictum that experience must begin with the child and then gradually build outward to the broadest possible apprehension of civilization. Thus the center of orientation for the first year was the immediate Yorkville community within which the children lived. For the second year it was the role of science in civilization. The third year was oriented around the world of human thought and action. By this the school meant an attempt to broaden the student's background from an awareness of New York to a consideration of perennial social issues and to a consideration of how America's social problems contrasted with those of other civilizations. The fourth year was built around an understanding of the individual as a social being. In this year the school attempted to help the student gain an understanding of his social responsibilities in light of modern social, economic, and political considerations. Within these centers of orientation the student's interest was to determine the method of her approach.

At the outset of the study there was much confusion, and the school retreated from its initial plans

by having the students devote one-half of their time to traditional subject areas and one-half of their time to carrying out traditional assignments within the center of orientation course. Throughout the next eight years, however, the centers of orientation were continually modified as the school attempted to build a more unified curriculum within them.

The modification of the course of orientation for the ninth graders will serve as an example. During the early years of the Eight Year Study, New York City had been the basis of the student's science, social studies, and artistic study. Thus topics such as the climate of the city, housing problems in the city, and the folklore of various ethnic groups had been studied. In addition there was a nursery connected with the Dalton School in which the ninth graders each spent a week taking care of the infants. In part because of problems stemming from the material in the New York City curriculum and in part because of the interest expressed by the girls in the nursey work, it was decided to make this work the basis of the ninth grade curriculum. Biology was taught in relation to the student's work in the nursery and social studies became a focus on the city as a place where young children grew up. Beginning

with the student's immediate interest, there was an attempt to move toward a wider intellectual orientation.

As the study evolved there were modifications of the other centers of orientation. Underlying these modifications, however, was a continuing attempt to meet student needs without sacrificing intellectual rigor.

The Denver school system in contrast to the Dalton School was a large public school system with a more traditional academic program. A selected group from each of the city's five high schools was chosen to participate in the Eight Year Study. Much of the traditional curriculum was retained with the exception of the areas of English and social studies which were replaced by a core curriculum. The core curriculum was based on a statement of purpose by the Denver school system which included such goals as helping adolescents to become oriented to the economic world as producers and consumers and developing the ability to make choices in the light of consequences. Several areas were chosen for careful examination such as personal living, immediate personal-social relationships, social-civic relationships, and economic relationships. Two or three periods a day were set aside for the examination of these issues and the school system described its rationale for the

program in the following terms.

> In order to understand the kinds of experiences which the core curriculum attempts to provide for high school pupils, one must recognize that the program is concerned with a continuous attack upon the problems which are persistent in the lives of adolescents as members of a democratic society. Units developed around such significant problems become the program of studies.[51]

In its final report to the Commission the Denver school system presented a list of the specific problems which were examined in the core curriculum. Under the heading of personal-social relationships issues were discussed such as boy-girl relationships, the criteria for friendship, the nature of the small groups to which one belongs, preparation for marriage, and the care of the child. Within the area of social-civic relationships issues such as recreation, the history of city government, and planning for orderliness and beauty were the topics of discussion. Within the area of economic relationships studies were made of the provision of food, water and power, of consumer problems, of installment buying, and of the quality of goods and advertising. There were portions of the curriculum that were more academic such as a unit comparing American democracy to other methods of political organization, but on the whole,

---

[51] Ibid p. 172.

the curriculum was non-intellectual in nature.

Shaker Heights High School was a public high school located in an affluent suburb of Cleveland. With the advent of the Eight Year Study the high school decided to make English and social studies the only required portions of the curriculum and to restructure the content within these three areas. The central tenet of the philosophy underlying this restructuring was an attempt to maintain before the students a sense "of unchanging values in the midst of changing conditions"[52]. In contrast to the Dalton and Denver curricula which were organized around student interest, the Shaker Heights curriculum was more oriented to great ideas and great themes in history. The English curriculum was conceived as a three year sequence progressing from the tenth until the twelth grade. During the first year the themes of leadership and social justice were discussed. The biographies of the great leaders of the last one hundred years were studied in order to ascertain what characteristics seemed to be present in all these leaders. In the second year the "pageant of America" was the subject of study. Using a variety of historical and

---

[52] Ibid p. 585.

literary materials an attempt was made to provide an understanding of the American character. In the twelth grade the individual and his relationships were the principle subject of study. Unlike Denver, where topics such as boy-girl relationships were examined, the Shaker Heights system used works such as Hamlet and Plato's essays to serve as a catalyst for discussions about the eternal themes of friendship, love, happiness, and ambition.

Thus one begins to gain a sense of the diversity of reform which took place in the thirty schools. Amidst this diversity, however, certain curriculum reforms occurred more frequently than others. The most striking tendency was the shift away from academic disciplines as the organizing focus of the curriculum to a thematic or culture-epoch form of organization. A particular epoch in history was selected such as modern America and Europe and examined from a political, economic, technological, artistic, and literary point of view. A core curriculum often was established with all the work revolving around that core. Where subject disciplines were retained, there was usually an attempt to structure them more broadly. Thus areas of study as the arts and social studies became more common. There

were attempts to provide greater unity in the entire curriculum and to provide more continuity from year to year. Greater attention was paid to student interest and there was more latitude for individualized courses of instruction.

With regard to subject areas themselves, Robert Leigh, a member of the Commission and president of Bennington College outlined the major trends. Social studies took on an unprecedented importance in the curriculum. Most social studies curricula stressed an examination of America's democratic institutions in contrast to the non-democratic institutions of foreign countries. According to Leigh literature and English played a less central role in the curriculum and were more often taught in the context of examining an entire civilization. There was less stress on foreign languages and mathematics and more of a stress on science. The creative arts which were formerly offered only on an extracurricular basis became central features of the curriculum. In addition new subjects were introduced such as homemaking for girls and courses in personal and social adjustment.

There were a hodgepodge of other innovations such as more cooperative planning in curriculum development

among administrators, faculty, and students, a greater stress on counseling by teachers, an increase in guidance services, and a greater integration of the school and the community both by enabling students to leave the schools and explore the community and by using the community as a resource for classroom instruction. In many respects the curriculum reforms which took place under the auspicies of the Eight Year Study were simply the logical upward extension of the reforms which had been instituted in a few primary schools by the child-centered pedagogues of the 1920's. More integration of subject matter, more continuity, a greater stress on the creative arts, more attention to individual needs, and a better integration of the school and the community had all been central tenets of the child-centered pedagogues.

Underlying these general areas of curriculum reform, however, are two striking themes. Over and over again they are alluded to in the reports of the thirty schools, and they seem to provide the rationale for much of the curriculum reform which took place during the Eight Year Study. The first was a stress on shaping the curriculum to meet the needs of adolescents. By this most schools meant goals such as helping adolescents to cope with

the problems of everyday life, helping adolescents to understand their families, helping adolescents find a way to live happily, and helping adolescents to adjust to their environment. Here, then, was the extension of child-centered pedagogy into the secondary school, although the effusive rhetoric of the child-centered pedagogues took on a certain blandness in curriculum statements of "adolescent centered" secondary schools. Underlying the needs-of-adolescence rhetoric was the question of how to help adolescents adjust to their environment. There was little attempt to assess the needs of adolescence within a developmental psychology framework, but rather a focus on how to aid adolescents in solving their social and emotional crises. Translated into curriculum reform needs-of-adolescents menat a greater stress on student interest rather than subject areas as the basis of the course of study. In some cases this focus on student interest was conceived as only a starting point for a curriculum dealing with the perennial issue of civilization; in others it was both a beginning and end point in curriculum development. A concern with the needs-of-adolescence thus was used to justify the reading of Plato's essays as well as discussions of boy-girl relationships.

The second organizing theme of the curriculum reform in the thirty schools was a stress on preparation for a democratic way of life, and it is through this theme that the renewed concern of progressive educators in the 1930's with the school in its social context becomes most noticeable in the Eight Year Study

Aikin's public pronouncements about the Eight Year Study indicated how the notion of preparation for a democratic way of life came to supplement the needs-of-adolescents themes. Aikin's early pronouncements had stressed only the necessity of the school to contribute to the needs and growth of adolescents, but in a 1935 speech he suggested that while many schools succeeded in producing a way of life conducive to growth, the student often found a society when he left school which thwarted that very growth.

Aikin wrote,

> Education, therefore must address itself to the task of erecting a human society in which men and women may, by living and sharing in it, continue their own growth and discover new meanings in life. Isn't that the American dream? That, it seems to me is the democratic way of life.[53]

By 1937 Aikin described the thirty schools as being

---

[53] Wilford Aikin, "The Purposes of the Eight Year Experimental Study", Educational Record, XIV (October, 1937), p. 114.

engaged in a concerted effort to examine the implications of democratic society for curriculum reform. Aikin wrote,

> The schools are seeing more clearly the nature of a democratic society and the responsibility of secondary education in that setting. They are trying to discover the meaning of democracy and its implications for the work of the schools. Almost all of the schools are now making that subject the object of most serious study.[54]

In his summary of the study written in 1942 Aikin suggested that the democratic ideal, in fact, had become the unifying philosophy of the Eight Year Study.

The final reports of the thirty schools bear out Aikin's contention. There is hardly one that does not repeatedly use phrases such as democratic living and the democratic way of life. In most cases, however, references to a democratic way of life are couched in terms which are so general that they serve as a catch-all for all varieties of curriculum reform. Thus the University School of Ohio State University included in its definition of the democratic way of life such things as the development of a distinctive personality, proper nourishment, proper shelter, proper clothing, proper medical care, responsibility in planning one's life, and the use of intelligence in arriving at social

---

54 Wilford Aikin, "Commission on the Relation of School and College", Progressive Education, XIV (October, 1937) p. 456.

solutions. In most cases rhetoric about democracy in the reports of the thirty schools was a blend of paeans to the individual and a more somber assessment of the individual's responsibility in social living. The statement of the Denver public schools is a case in point.

> The Denver public schools regard human beings as dynamic and purposive with a capacity for growth and the ability to develop through experience. The schools of Denver believe that a democratic society is the society most congenial to the optimum development of such individuals. Democracy so conceived, is a way of life. This includes at all times (1) The free play of intelligence (2) Respect for the worth of individuals, placing, human values first (3) The participation of all inidividuals in social living which is broadly interpreted to include all human relationships.[55]

In general, when the thirty schools spoke of democracy, they were alluding to several themes such as the worth and uniqueness of the individual, the development of the individual's capacities to the fullest possible extent, freedom with responsibility, the necessity for cooperation in solving social problems, participatory democracy, and the application of intelligence to social problems.

At no point during the course of the Eight Year

---

[55] Thirty Schools Tell Their Story, op. cit. p. 157.

Study, however, was it clear to what specific educational program a commitment to a democratic way of life led. It most clearly pointed towards an emphasis on social studies curricula and more specifically to units contrasting American democracy to the totalitarian regimes of foreign countries. It also pointed towards a greater involvement of faculty and students in educational policy making. Beyond this, however, statements about democracy were so general that they served as justifications for the inclusion of almost anything in the curriculum. In the statements of philosophy of the thirty schools there was little of the careful historical analysis of the evolution of democracy that had characterized the work of Dewey and Counts. In effect a commitment to a democratic way of life was a vehicle for giving voice to the renewed concern over education in its social context which Dewey and Counts had been urging without raising controversial questions about the role of the schools in restructuring the social order. With the rise of facism in Italy and Spain and the rise of national socialism in Germany, democracy became a non-controversial rallying cry for Americans. The schools simply adopted the rhetoric that was in vogue and superimposed it upon their educational reforms.

Rhetoric about the democratic way of life, in fact, was a return to a very traditional theme in American education which could trace its roots to Jefferson's tenets that democracy was only as strong as the education of the common man. Counts' call for the schools to build a new social order had already become slighly archaic.by the late thirties. The upswing in the economy in the middle and late thirties, Roosevelt's modifications of what a post-depression generation perceived as laissez-faire capitalism, and a deteriorating international situation, led the thirty schools to translate Dewey and Counts' social reformism into a trumpeting of the virtues of democracy,

Yet a call for the schools to prepare the young for a democratic way of life did not preclude careful social analysis. The educational writings of Dewey and Counts embodied meticulous examinations of the evolution of democracy from rural eighteenth America to highly industrialized twentieth century America. The thirty schools, however, failed to go beyond pious cliches about the virtues of democracy in their statements of philosophy. Counts had written in 1929,

Rhetoric about the democratic way of life, in fact, was a return to a very traditional theme in American education which could trace its roots to Jefferson's tenets that democracy was only as strong as the education of the common man. Counts' call for the schools to build a new social order had already become slightly archaic by the late thrities. The upswing in the economy in the middle and late thirties, Roosevelt's modifications of what a post depression generation perceived as laissez-faire capitalism, and a deteriorating international situation led the thirty schools to translate Dewey and Counts' social reformism into a trumpeting of the virtues of democracy.

Yet a call for the schools to prepare the young for a democratic way of life did not preclude careful social analysis. The educational writing of Dewey and Counts embodied meticulous examinations of the evolution of democracy from rural eighteenth America to highly industrialized twentieth century America. The thirty schools, however, failed to go beyond pious clichés about the virtues of democracy in their statements of philosophy. Counts had written in 1929,

> When we refer to democracy we too commonly use phrases put into our mouths by the old agrarian civilization. Before setting up democracy as the

> goal of the secondary school we must determine at least for ourselves what brand of democracy is possible and desirable in industrial society. Certainly it must be quite different from that primitive equalitarian individualistic democracy produced by the log cabin, free lands, and social isolation.[56]

Faced, however, by a deteriorating international situation, neither the schools nor American society were interested in making such fine distinctions. In the end, then, neither the theme of needs-of-adolescence nor the theme of democracy was carefully defined. Needs-of-adolescence became a catchword for those attacking curricula deemed irrelevant to student interest, and democracy became a catchword for those seeking a stamp of propriety for curriculum reform proposals.

The calls of the early thirties for the schools to reconstruct the social order were translated during the Eight Year Study into non-political appeals for the reconstruction of the secondary school curriculum. By the time the study was completed Aikin was speaking of the Eight Year Study as a prelude to the reconstruction of American secondary education.

> This takes us then to the heart of the matter. The democratic ideal of life and society demands a dynamic high school whose purposes and practices

---

[56]George Counts, Secondary Education and Industrialism, op. cit. p. 53.

> are consistent with that ideal. This we have not yet fully achieved, either among the thirty schools or elsewhere. Its achievement requires a fundamental reconstruction of secondary education.[57]

FINDINGS AND CRITIQUES

The restructuring of the high school curriculum, however, had not been the original intent of the Eight Year Study. The Commission's initial interest had been in demonstrating that students did not have to meet a specified set of subject and unit requirements to succeed in college. Although this interest was superseded by the problems that the schools faced in restructuring their curricula, the Commission, nevertheless, devoted a substantial portion of its resources to a college follow-up study of those students who had graduated from the thirty schools.[58] Selected students of the graduating classes of the thirty schools were chosen to participate in the follow-up study. The class of 1936 was followed throughout the four years of its college career, the class of 1937 through three years of college, the class of 1938 for two years, and the

---

[57] Wilford Aikin, "Some Implications of the Eight Year Study for all High Schools and Colleges", North Central Association Quarterly, XVII (January, 1943) p. 278.

[58] The full report of this follow-up study is contained in Volume IV ofthe Commission's report.

class of 1939 for one year. In total 1475 students were chosen for study from the experimental schools. Each of these students was matched with a student who had gone to a conventional school. In order that curricula be the only uncontrolled variable the matching students were chosen with regard to scholastic aptitude test scores, socio-economic background, age, sex, race, and interests. Success in college was defined to include such items as grades earned and other criteria of intellectual competence including curiosity, motivation, scientific approach, and study skills. Non-academic items such as participation in extra-curricular activities, clarity of vocational interest, and concern about social issues were also measured. All in all, students were judged on the basis of sixty different areas of achievement from sources of data including transcripts, questionnaires, interviews, and comments from those who knew the students. On almost all measures students from the thirty schools came out as well or a little ahead of the students from the comparison schools. Their grades were slightly better and they received slightly more academic honors. The students from the thirty schools were also judged to have more intellectual curiosity, to be more precise and systematic in their thinking, and they demonstrated

a more active concern for social issues.

The follow-up staff's conclusions were phrased as follows,

> It is quite obvious from these data that the Thirty Schools graduates as a group, have done a somewhat better job than the comparison group whether success is judged by college standards, by the student's contemporaries, or by the individual students.[59]

Since the thirty schools differed widely in their degree of experimentation, another comparison was made between students from the six most experimental schools and students from the six least experimental schools.in relation to the comparison groups. On almost all measures students from the six most experimental were "strikingly more successful".[60] than their counterparts. The students from the least experimental schools, on the other hand, were hardly distinguishable from those to whom they were matched. A third study was done using students from the two most experimental schools. It was found that the differences between these students and their counterparts were greater than those of any other comparison. The follow-up staff drew a number of conclusions from this data. The first was

---

[59] Dean Chamberlin et. al., op. cit., p. 208.

[60] Ibid p. 309.

that success in college was not dependent upon a study of certain prescribed subjects and that, therefore, the colleges should reassess their current admissions policy. The second was that public schools could be trusted with a greater amount of freedom in formulating their objectives.

The Commission asked a group of college officials to evaluate independently its findings in 1940. The committee was chaired by Harold Hawkes, dean of Columbia College, and included the presidents of Lawrence College and Bryn Mawr, and deans and officials of Harvard, Chicago, and Swarthmore. After reviewing the follow-up data, the committee concluded,

> The results of this study seem to indicate that the pattern of preparatory school program which concentrates on a preparation for a fixed set of entrance requirements is not the only satisfactory means of fitting a boy or girl for making the most out of the college experience. It looks as if the stimulus and initiative which the less conventional approach to secondary school education affords sends onto college better human material than we have obtained in the past.[61]

The Commission's findings, however, were not immune from criticism. In 1941 Henry Chauncey, an assistant dean at Harvard, criticized the Hawkes paper for a statistical oversight in matching the experimental group to the control group on the basis of aptitude test scores. Chauncey concluded, nevertheless, that even if the

---

[61]Wilford Aikin, The Story of the Eight Year Study, op. cit. p. 150.

oversight were taken into account the study showed that students from the experimental schools did as well as students from the non-experimental schools in terms of academic success, and that they had a greater degree of intellectual interest and better defined vocational interests. Chauncey merely disputed the Hawkes contention that students from the experimental schools were better material than students from the non-experimental schools.

In a series of articles written in the mid-forties and early fifties, Helmar Johnson, a professor at the University of Minnesota, elaborated upon Chauncey's critique and suggested that there were a number of additional areas in which the study was weak. The Johnson and Chauncey critique centered upon the procedure for matching students in the experimental group to students in the control group on the basis of aptitude test scores. Chauncey and Johnson suggested that the intellectual ability of the comparison group had been overestimated by aptitude test scores. In order to be matched to the experimental group the average on the aptitude test scores for the non-experimental group had to be in the sixty-seventh percentile, well above the national mean. In effect this meant that students from the comparison group had scored well above the national

average, and since there were likely to be some students in any above average group who scored higher than their ability warranted, the intelligence of some students in the comparison group was overrated. Johnson went on to suggest that the mental ability of the experimental group was underestimated by the test scores. Johnson claimed that performance on aptitude tests was the product of training received in secondary schools and that the students in the thirty schools had not received an education that was geared to effective performance on tests. It was thus possible that the aptitude tests had underestimated the mental ability of these students.

Johnson also suggested that there were other factors which were not controlled in matching the students from the two groups. Johnson contended that students from the thirty schools who had been recommended for admission to college by their principals were likely to be ranked high in qualities such as application, initiative, and "good personality" and that students from the comparison group should also be matched with respect to these qualities. Johnson thus concluded that differences in college success might have been due to differences other than those related to the curriculum. Johnson ended his critique of the study with a rather strongly worded cautionary note.

The only implication that it is safe to note from

> the study at present is the implication for investigators to be more careful of their methods in experimental research.
>
> In this day and age we preach tolerance for this and tolerance for that. There is one thing which we should not tolerate, however: unwarranted conclusions from "experiments" in education.[62]

Johnson's pointed comments about the Eight Year Study, however, were based on more than a simple critique of its measures, for the innovations of the Eight Year Study were fundamentally opposed to the type of education which he advocated. Johnson believed in the importance for all students of a broad general education including a strong dosage of history, science and mathematics. He suggested that such a program of study was more valuable than dealing with current student problems and world affairs. Johnson contended that a student who spent all of his time in school discussing "When should I go steady?" was not likely to make a lasting contribution to national progress. He argued that out of a concern for a few students who might have dropped out of high school, progressive educators had turned the school into an amusement center, and he suggested that progressive education be reserved for the lowest academic quartile of the population. Other students, Johnson argued, should be given the training in

---

[62]Helmar Johnson, "Weaknesses in the Eight Year Study", School and Society, LXIII (June, 1946) p.419.

science and math which they would need for survival in a scientific age. Both the tone and content of Johnson's criticism were to become characteristic of the attacks launched against progressive education in the 1950's.

There was relatively little additional criticism of the methodology of the Eight Year Study. W. H. Lancelot, a professor at Iowa State, suggested that differences between the experimental and non-experimental groups did not necessarily result from better curriculum material, but from the fact that more per capita money was spent in the experimental schools than in the conventional schools thereby resulting in better teachers and better pupil-teacher ratios.

The Commission responded to many of the criticisms leveled against it. In response to Lancelot, Ralph Tyler, research director of the evaluation staff, pointed out that although pupil-teacher ratios and cost per pupil had not been controlled, the fact that students in the experimental schools were matched to other students from schools of the same economic type and community meant that there was no discrepancy. Tyler also suggested that although the ability of teachers was not controlled, it was unlikely that teachers in the experimental and conventional schools were of comparable ability since

a similarity in per pupil expenditures for the schools of the two groups meant that salary levels were probably the same.

In reply to Johnson, Paul Diederich, a member of the evaluation staff, suggested that principals of the thirty schools did not recommend an exceptionally able body of students for college, but rather recommended those who would have been also recommended using traditional admissions criteria. Diederich did not frame an adequate reply to the Chauncey and Johnson critique that the study embodied statistical errors, but he did suggest that the Commission was only making the modest claim that students who went through academic programs unrelated to college entrance requirements did just as well as students who went through traditional programs, a claim that was consistent with Chauncey's conclusion. It was difficult, however, to refute directly Johnson's critique, since Johnson never indicated how his critique of the study's methodology might have effected the outcome of the study.

In the end, however, the debate between the Commission and its small number of critics was somewhat irrelevant to the future course of the study. With the exception of Johnson there was little disagreement with the Commission's

conclusion that students who went through non-conventional academic programs could succeed in college. At the conclusion of the study a number of two day presentations of the study's findings were made for representatives of the nation's colleges. None of the college representatives seriously questioned the Commission's findings. Thus if the impact of the study was limited, it was not because the critiques of the study were taken seriously. If one is to understand the study's limited impact, one must look elsewhere for an explanation.

CHAPTER III

THE IMPACT OF THE STUDY

The Eight Year Study officially ended in 1941. Two years later, When Aikin completed the preface to the final volume of the Commission's report, he was optimistic about the potential impact of the study. In his preface to this volume he confidently stated,

> New curriculum content and organization and new ways of teaching will endure in these schools, and other schools will use them and build upon them.[63]

One decade later, however, a note of pessism had crept into Aikin's writing. In an article netitled "The Eight Year Study: If We Were to do it Again" which appeared in the Progressive Education journal, Aikin set forth the changes he would make if he were to undertake once again a similar study. With regard to the study's inception he suggested that he would have more carefully selected the participating schools on the basis of whether they were likely to engage in substantial curriculum reform and that he would have provided a group of curriculum consultants from the outset of the study. With regard to the termination of the study Aikin suggested that he would have secured commitments from college officials that they would reform admissions policies; he would have provided continued support for the thirty schools after the

---

[63] Thirty Schools Tell Their Story, op. cit. p. XV.

completion of the study and he would have followed up the students not going on to college. All in all, the tone of Aikin's article was subdued, and it hinted that the Eight Year Study had not brought about the reconstruction of secondary education for which he had initially hoped.

There was evidence of a more concrete nature, however, that the impact of the Eight Year Study had been limited. A survey of college admissions requirements was conducted by students in education classes in the University of Chicago in 1948. The survey showed that there had been almost no change in the admissions requirements of the nation's colleges since the completion of the Eight Year Study. Most colleges required four years of English, two or three years of mathematics, three years of one foreign language and two years of another, one year of laboratory science, and one year of social studies. only three or four electives were permitted, and these had to be within certain academic areas. Some college catalogues went so far as to provide guidelines on how subjects were to be studied in high school. In contrast to the prevailing pattern, the University of Chicago had altered its admissions requirements in light

of the findings of the Eight Year Study. In place of subject requirements the University of Chicago selected students on the basis of a three hour test measuring reading and writing ability and general intelligence. However, Chicago had been known since the presidency of Robert Hutchins in the 1930's the University of Chicago had been known as an academic maverick, and admissions policies at most other colleges were far less experimental.

Not only had college admissions requirements remained largely unchanged, but the impact of the Eight Year Study on curriculum revision had been limited. In 1947 Agnes Benedict prepared a pamphlet for the American Education Fellowship entitled "Dare Our Secondary Schools Face the Atomic Age?" in which she argued that the Eight Year Study could provide a model for the reconstruction of the nation's secondary schools. The bulk of Miss Benedict's tract was documentation of the ways in which the schools had failed to educate the young. Over one-half of the students entering high school dropped out before graduation, according to Miss Benedict, and many of those who remained

---

[64] In 1944 the Progressive Education Association changed its name to the American Education Fellowship in order to escape the pejorative connotations which the term progressive education had taken on during the early 1940's. Unable, however, to overcome its declining fortunes by a simple shift in name, the organization changed its name back to the Progressive Education Association in 1953, two years before it was officially dissolved.

were deficient in basic skills. Citing the very facts that would be used to launch an attack on progressive education in the early fifties, Miss Benedict argued for "less bookish" curricula, less authoritarian schools, and academic programs based clearly on the child's interests.

In the remainder of her study Miss Benedict described the Eight Year Study, summarized its conclusions, and then proceeded to ascertain what had been the impact of the study in the six years since its completion. On the basis of responses to a questionnaire Miss Benedict cited two state plans for revamping secondary education and examples from five of the thirty schools which suggested that the spirit of the study was still alive. Miss Benedict acknowledged, however, that although the two state plans embodied the spirit of the Eight Year Study, there was no evidence that the plans had been influenced by the study itself. Furthermore, Miss Benedict was able to find only five examples of progress worthy of citation among the thirty schools queried. Even among these schools, however, it was difficult to assess how much substantial pedagogical reform remained.

The superintendent of the Des Moines schools had written,

> The most important emphasis on the value of the individual and on the implementation of a democratic way of living and working together survives as a part of the basic philosophy of teachers who strive to make these objectives evident in their curriculum plans, their classroom activities, and their professional relationships.[65]

Whether any meaningful pedagogical reform underlay what was essentially a restatement of the Commission on School and College Relations early pronouncements was difficult to say.

Nevertheless, there were other more specific indications that the impact of study had been limited. Chester F. Protheroe, who had served on the faculty of the Beaver Country Day School during the Eight Year Study submitted a series of five questions to principals and headmasters of the thirty schools[66]. Protheroe received replies from eighteen of the thirty schools and according to Redefer many expressed "doubts of continuing educational progress"[67].

Perhaps even more indicative of the limited impact of the eight Year Study was an informal conference held in New York in February, 1950 for which the heads of the thirty schools and staffs were invited to submit reports of progress achieved since the completion

---

[65] Agnes E. Benedict, Dare Our Secondary Schools Face the Atomic Age? (New York: Hinds, Hayden, and Eldredge, 1945) p. 41.

[66] I am indebted for my account of the Protheroe study to Frederick Redefer's The Eight Year Study--Eight Years Later.

Frederick Redefer, The Eight Year Study--Eight Years Later (Unpublished doctoral thesis, Teachers College, Columbia University, 1951)

of the Eight Year Study. Frederick Redefer, a former executive secretary of the P. E. A. reported upon the discussion which took place at the meeting in February, 1950 issue of the Progressive Education journal. Fifteen of the schools sent representatives to the meeting to discuss what had happened in the thrity schools since the study's completion.[68]

A variety of opinions were given, but on the whole comments regarding progress made since the completion of the study were pessimistic. No schools reported that the needs of adolescents were a primary consideration in curriculum planning. Only two of the fifteen schools represented at the conference stated that the spirit of the Eight Year Study remained in their schools. Many representatives of the schools stated that their schools had retreated to the traditional college preparatory program. The major positive effect deriving from the study seemed to be that the schools continued to allow teachers to be involved actively in the policy making process. There was some discussion as to why the Eight

---

[68]There were actually only twenty-seven schools of the original thirty left in 1950. One school had dropped out of the Eight Year Study during the experiment and two other schools had ceased operations since the completion of the study.

Year Study had less impact than had originally been foreseen. Many representatives cited the attacks on progressive education which arose in the forties as a contributing factor, and others cited the failure to involve parents, college officials, and boards of education more deeply in the study.

Yet the most extensive follow-up of the Eight Year Study was carried out in 1951 by Frederick Redefer, a former private school teacher and public school superintendent as well as the executive secretary and director of the Progressive Education Association from 1932 to 1943. In a doctoral thesis written for Columbia University in 1951 Redefer conducted three major surveys in order to assess the impact of the Eight Year Study ten years after its official completion. The first survey consisted of a visit in 1950-51 to sixteen of the thirty schools to determine how the present program differed from the program that was reported at the conclusion of the study. The second was a series of conferences with over one hundred principals, headmasters, and faculty who participated in the study. Representatives from eighteen schools responded to a series of sixteen questions. The third questionnaire was submitted to those active in the

thirty schools at the time of the experiment and still associated with the schools. Individuals from twenty of the twenty-six schools responded.

On the basis of this evidence Redefer concluded that progress in the thirty schools had been limited. Most principals and headmasters stated that the purposes of their schools had become clearer since the completion of the Eight Year Study, but few schools had issued statements of philosophy. Redefer found little evidence of more democracy in the schools and little or no evidence of efforts to develop better evaluative devices for measuring the progress of students. Upon completion of the study the arts were relegated to a less central position in most of the thirty schools. Core curricula tended to disappear and be replaced by the old subject area distinctions as a renewed stress upon preparing students for college developed. The social focus of the curriculum was not as strong as it had been. One school, according to Redefer, had discontinued its units on China and the U. S. S. R., it seemed, because of the tensions of the Coled War. There was little noticeable community involvement of students from the thirty schools. Nevertheless, Redefer found some evidence of the continuing impact of the study. Redefer

noted that more attention was paid to individual needs. The schools had more psychologists on their staffs and greater freedom had been given to individual students. A conception of adolescent needs seemed to influence discussions in many of the thirty schools. On the whole, however, Redefer was discouraged by what he had found, and he summed up his talk with principals and headmasters and his visits to the schools in the following manner,

> According to the verbal statements by principals and directors confirmed by brief observation and faculty conferences, the thirty schools that cooperated in the Eight Year Study have not made consistent educational progress since the conclusion of the study. Although there have been reported gains made in understanding and appreciating the unique personalities of boys and girls, the translation of this recognition into educational progress has been spotty. There has been a marked tendency to fall back into patterns of educational organization not too dissimilar to what exists in the majority of secondary schools. Although individual teachers who took part in the Eight Year Study have carried over some of the class techniques developed during the study, school-wide there has been a return to subject matter organization in the curriculum. In some areas such as evolution, the arts, the social sciences there has been little if any marked progress since the end of the Eight Year Study.[69]

The results of the survey of teachers who had been in the thirty schools were somewhat more mixed. The majority of teachers who responded to the questionnaire had reported that the Eight Year Study had made an impact

---

[69]Frederick Redefer, The Eight Year Study--Eight Years Later, op. cit., pp. 60-61.

on their practices. Redefer pointed out, however, that these improvements had been mainly related to teaching methodology rather than curriculum content. Only one third of the teachers indicated that they were still active in educational experimentation, but there was general agreement that the schools were giving more attention to the individual needs of youth. The teachers were about evenly split over whether the spirit of experimentation was stronger now than before the Eight Year Study, but Redefer suggested that the teacher responses indicated in general that there had been a return to a traditional curriculum based on subject area distinctions.

The teachers were also asked to list those forces which had impeded progress and to describe those aspects of the Eight Year Study which they found most questionable. Surprisingly most teachers did not feel that a return to college entrance examinations and requirements had impeded progress. They felt that progress had been impeded by forces outside the school such as "war and lowered morale, community pressure, press oppostion to anything associated with progressive education, general social insecurity, and fear." With regard to what they

---

[70] Ibid p. 156.

found most questionable about the study the teachers noted a lack of purpose in the study and an absence of knowledge about how to achieve a purpose once it had been defined. Redefer concluded that most teachers had found the Eight Year Study thought-provoking, but that little progress had been made in the thirty schools. Redefer wrote,

> From the answers given by these teachers, from observations and personal conferences, it would seem that the thirty schools are not breaking frontiers today in creating a better and improved curriculum that has a definite philosophic base and that overcomes traditional patterns of school organization. Individually, teachers may have learned much from the Eight Year Study but the schools as schools have not lived up to the expectation of the Eight Year Study.[71]

As evidence that the schools had not lived up to the promise of the Eight Year Study, Redefer cited a return to traditional departmental patterns of curriculum organization, the ready susceptibility of school policy to broader social conflicts, and the influence upon the school of the widespread criticism of progressive education.

In 1963, twelve years after Redefer had completed his study, a series of education conferences was held at Goddard College one of which was devoted to an assessment of the implications of the Eight Year Study for the decade of the sixties. Although the Goddard Conference

---

[71] Ibid p. 171c.

was not a follow-up study, a number of small group discussions during the conference broached the issue of the impact of the study and provided some additional insight into the study's long-term effects. Over one hundred school and college teachers and administrators were present at the conference which opened with a series of presentations by members of the Commission on the Relation of School and College. For the most part the presentations were reminiscences about the Eight Year Study, but the following day topics bearing upon the impact of the Eight Year Study were submitted for small group discussions. One small group focusing upon the appraisal of students concluded that traditional measures such as grades and class rank were still the most widely used and important measures of educational progress. Students were still expected by colleges to take a certain set of courses and the entrance requirements of some colleges were being increased. Another group focusing upon school and college relations concluded that the autonomy of secondary schools in planning their curricula was limited by college expectations as well as by anxious parents, retired navy admirals, and other segments of the public. There was general agreement that there was a lack of communication between

colleges and secondary schools and that as the post-war baby boom made the college admissions situation more competitive, the colleges were becoming less flexible in their admissions policies. A third small group examining the degree and quality of experimentation in the schools found much experimentation, but little examination of basic assumptions. The experiments that were taking place in the schools were located in four major areas: 1) the modification of subject matter including the reorganization of the curriculum, the introduction of new subject matter, and the modification of subject matter to fit different ability levels 2) modifications of teaching methodology 3) a few experiments examining the conditions under which learning took place 4) experiments with technological aids. The group on experimentation concluded,

> There is much experimentation going on, mainly in or among subject matter fields, but there is little that seems broad or unified.[72]

By sifting through this evidence one can begin to ascertain the impact of the Eight Year Study during the post-war era. It was clear from the follow-up studies that there had been only spotty progress in the thirty

---

[72]Wilford Hamlin, ed., Teacher-School-Child, (Plainfield, Vermont: Goddard College, 1963) p. 69.

schools which had participated in the study, although the Goddard conference seemed to indicate that much experimentation was goin on in other schools. Even this experimentation, however, could not be traced to the Eight Year Study. In 1950 there were 24,000 secondary schools in the United States staffed by 325,000 secondary school teachers and there were 500 teacher training institutes. However, the first volume of the Commission's study describing the nature of the study sold only 6,400 copies and the last volume describing the curriculum reforms which had taken place in the thirty schools sold a mere 1,800 copies[73]. While it is difficult to trace the impact of the Eight Year Study upon the nation's secondary schools, the small number of copies sold of the two major volumes of the report would seem to indicate that its impact was limited[74].

---

[73] Frederick Redefer, "The Eight Year Study--After Eight Years", Progressive Education, XXVIII (Nov. 1950) p. 35.

[74] Total sales of the five volumes of the Commission by July, 1951 were as follows:
Volume I (Story of the Eight Year Study)--7,400
Volume II (Exploring the Curriculum)--4,650
Volume III (Appraising and Recording Student Progress)--7,545
Volume IV (Did They Succeed in College)--2,545
Volume V (Thirty Schools Tell Their Story)--1,775
Figures are from Redefer; The Eight Year Study: Eight Years Later op. cit. p. 208.

Furthermore, during the post-war era the schools seemed to be influenced by events more significant than the Eight Year Study. If one is to understand these events, however, one must first gain a sense of what was taking place in America during the 1940's and 1950's.

The post-war era is a particularly difficult time in America's history to characterize, for it was a period filled with contradictions.

The era was a time of both war and peace, albeit a tenuous peace in light of the tensions between America and the Communist bloc. The decade was also one of unprecedented and almost continuous prosperity amidst an often hidden, but pervasive poverty. In 1958 over 14% of American families earned less than $2,000 annually[75]. The era was a time of increasing church membership, but also a time when some observers suggested that religion was growing more secular[76]. Lastly the post-war era was a time that in light of the social unrest and dislocation of the 1960's seemed to be an era of consensus and tranquillity. Nevertheless, the fiction of the era suggested a social malaise underlying whatever placidity

---

[75] Arthur Link and William Catton, A History of the United States Since the 1890's, Volume III 1938-1966 (New York: Random House, 1961) p. 603.

[76] Ibid p. 661. See also Will Herberg, Protestant, Catholic, Jew (New York: Doubleday and Co., 1955) p. 260.

there may have been.

> Much of the postwar writing was vigorous and forceful, but it reflected indecision and a failure to find intellectual and moral bearings.. The overriding concern, in one form or another, was a familiar one in twentieth-century American literature: the attempt to discover how the isolated individual might survive in an increasingly impersonal and complex society.[77]

The themes which pervaded education during the era were as diverse as the social context in which they were set. In the late forties and early fifties fears of an aggressive and expansionist Communist foreign policy and the atmosphere of the McCarthy hearings spilled into the educational system as an outcry against the use of subversive texts in classrooms and into questions regarding the loyalty of teachers. Throughout the post-war era there was debate over whether children were adequately learning basic skills, whether reading, writing, and arithmetic were being adequately taught and how they could best be taught. In the higher levels of education this concern was translated into the question of whether the nation's educational system was producing the scientific and technical manpower which the country needed. Throughout the era the issue of teacher and classroom shortages caused by the high birthrate of the postwar years led to an extensive discussion of how to attract greater numbers

of teachers into the profession and of whether the use of technology in education might be a possible solution to the nation's teacher shortage. The Supreme Court decision of 1954 which outlawed separate but equal schools generated an initial optimism that segregated education was to become a relic, but this initial optimism was tempered by the violence which erupted after the admission of the first black student to the University of Alabama. The Supreme Court decision, nevertheless, thrust the integration of schools into the forefront of educational debate and led to a growing interest in urban schooling. Lastly extensive discussion focussed around the role of the federal government in education. The question was broached of whether federal money should be provided for the public schools in light of the stresses on local and federal budgets. Opponents of federal aid argued that aid would lead inexorably to the federal control of schools.

Amidst this diversity there were two features of the postwar era, in particular, which had an impact on the direction of educational reform. The first was what Lawrence Cremin has called the loss of "intellectual Vitality"[78] of the progressive education movement. Reform

---

[78] Lawrence Cremin, op. cit. pp. 332-3.

Reform movements such as the life-adjustment movement which arose under the banner of progressive education in the late forties and mid-fifties typified this decline in intellectual vitality. The life-adjustment movement was an attempt to address the needs of high school students who were neither in college preparatory nor vocational education programs, a number that was set at 60% by the movement's leaders. In the words of themovement's leaders secondary education was "failing to provide adequately and properly for the life-adjustment of perhaps a major fraction of the persons of secondary-school age".[79] They went on to add,

> ...functional experiences in the areas of practical arts, home and family life, health and physical fitness, and civic competence are basic in any program designed to meet the needs of youth today[80].

Under the auspicies of the U. S. Office of Education two commissions on life adjustment education for youth were created in an attempt to create programs which would have "greater value, meaning, and appeal"[81] to youth of high school age. However, the movement was shortlived, hardly a decade, and Cremin explains its demise in the

---

[79] U. S. Office of Education, "Life Adjustment Education for Every Youth", Bulletin #22 (Washington, D. C., U. S. Government Printing Office, 1951) p. 18.

[80] Ibid, p. 28.

[81] Ibid p. 1.

following terms.

> The terribly unfortunate choice of name--life adjustment education coupled with the unmistakable emphasis on adjustment to existing conditions, was more than enough to damn the movement in the eyes of a generation increasingly concerned with conformity in American life and thought.[82]

Thus did a post-war progressive education philosophy stressing the needs of youth become synonomous with a movement that also seemed to stress conformity and contain an absence of intellectual rigor.

The second feature of post-war America which shaped the critique of progressive education was the launching of Sputnik in 1957. The launching of the Russian satellite served as a catalyst to a theme which had pervaded educational discussion throughout the late forties and fifties--the theme of whether the schools were providing the scientific and technical manpower demanded by a rapidly expanding industrial economy. With the launching of Sputnik the adequate provision of scientific and technical personnel became even more explicitly a matter of national security. Sputnik led to an abundance of comparisons between the Russian and American educational systems.

---

[82] Cremin op. cit. p. 336.

The question of whether the American educational system was "soft" in comparison with the more tightly structured Russian system was broached in mass-circulation magazines. Cremin writes of the reaction to Sputnik,

> When the Russians launched the first space satellite in the autumn of 1957, a shocked and humbled nation embarked on a bitter orgy of pedagogical soul-searching.[83]

One year after Sputnik, Congress passed the National Defense Education Act which was designed, in part, to upgrade the quality of education in the sciences, mathematics, and foreign languages.

Here, then, was the social context in which the future of the Eight Year Study would be forged, and one can now begin to understand in retrospect the reasons for the Eight Year Study's limited impact. Some reasons inhere in the structure of the study itself. The Eight Year Study officially ended in 1941, and upon its conclusion a series of regional conferences for representatives of the nation's colleges were sponsored to convey the results of the study. Other than these conferences, however, there were no follow-up studies made by the Commission on the Relation of School and College. The thirty schools were left on their own to continue whatever reforms they had instituted during the Eight Year Study, but without the

---

[83] Ibid p. 347.

support of the Commission's curriculum consultants and without the suspension of traditional college entrance requirements. The colleges, for their part, were urged merely to attend one of the regional presentations and then left free to ignore the implications of the study. Furthermore it was not clear that the Progressive Education Association, still the primary clearinghouse for progressive educational experimentation, would have been an effective vehicle for the dissemination of the results of the study even if the Commission decided to use it in such a fashion. The Progressive Education Association's prestige and influence were on the wane and it had lost its grass-roots membership. An organization which in the early twenties had drawn its membership from teachers and private school administrators increasingly drew its membership from professors of education located in teachers colleges and universities.

Yet the lack of any effective follow-up support is not a sufficient explanation for the limited impact of the study. Had the nation's educators been eager for progressive educational reform, the Eight Year Study would not have died as quietly as it did. A plausible reason for the study's limited impact was that World War II had led to the demise of the spirit of the Eight Year Study, At the 1950 New York meeting of representatives

of the thirty schools one teacher suggested,

> The Eight Year Study was a war casualty. American education was never fully aware of its results nor did it make practical use of them.[84]

In her history of the Progressive Education Association Patricia Graham suggested that the Eight Year Study appeared in "virtual obscurity".[85] There is little question that the war, in fact, provided a partial explanation for the study's limited impact. There were plans by Harper's to give the publication of the Commission's five volumes extensive press publicity, but war news crowded out that publicity. The war also had an impact in a more general fashion. The war led to less interest in curriculum experimentation and to a greater stress on the vocational education necessary to provide for the nation's war-time agricultural and industrial needs and to a stress on the technical education necessary to meet the armed forces' needs. The question of whether the curriculum was meeting adolescent needs was subordinate to the question of whether the curriculum would boost war morale and help to win the war. Furthermore, the war

---

[84] The Eight Year Study--After Eight Years op. cit. p. 34.

[85] Graham, op. cit. p. 110.

led to a concern with whether the schools were adequately teaching basic skills since a large number of men were being rejected from the army because of illiteracy. During the war 676,000 men were rejected from the army because of mental or educational deficiencies and 350,000 registrants signed their names with an "X". There was also an acute shortage of personnel skilled in mathematics, science, and foreign languages. In an entrance examination for the NROTC training program given at 27 of the nation's leading universities, 68% of the students were unable to pass the arithmetic reasoning test. The same lack was found among midshipmen in training. All this led to a renewed questioning of whether progressive education had sacrificed the teaching of basic skills on the altar of child interest.

The war also had an impact on the effects of the Eight Year Study in a more direct fashion. In 1944 Thedore Roosevelt signed into law the Serviceman's Readjustment Act which came to be known popularly as the G. I. Bill of Rights. It applied to veterans serving 90 days or more in World War II and allowed them to pursue education for one year plus their time in active service for up to a period of four years. Educational

institutions would be paid instructional fees up to five hundred dollars for the school year. As of 1946, 53.7% of the students enrolled in college were veterans. By 1951, 2, 350,000 veterans had received a college education under the act. The influx of veterans into the nation's colleges in addition to postwar prosperity led to expanding enrollments in the colleges and overcrowding. Between 1944 and 1950 college enrollments increased from 1,115,272 to 2,659,021 and strains on university facilities took precedence over any interest in reforming college admissions procedures.

The war, then, put pressure on the schools to revert to a more traditional pattern of teaching basic skills within subject matter disciplines and contributed to a reduced pressure on the colleges to substantially alter their college admissions requirements.

Yet the war did not provide the entire explanation for the Eight Year Study's limited impact. In the final reckoning the impact of the Eight Year Study was limited by a sustained critique of progressive education which arose in the 1940's and reached its peak in the 1950's and by the absence of a clearly articulated social and educational philosophy which could withstand that critique.

The membership of the P. E. A. reached its peak in 1938, the same year in which Frederick Redefer appeared on the cover of Time Magazine in an issue in which the cover story was devoted to an overview of progressive education[86]. Time Magazine's presentation was a balanced, but generally complementary portrait of the movement. Yet there were growing signs of dissension within the ranks of progressive education and a growing attack on progressive education in the popular press. In the same year of Time's cover story, Boyd Bode, one of the leading intellectuals of the progressive education movement, published a book entitled Progressive Education at the Crossroads in which he wrote,

> World events during recent years are serving grim notice that education must be based on a philosophy of social organization if it is to be a worthy occupation for grownups. By implication the insistense on respect for personality and maximum development is a fighting doctrine. It commits the progressive movement to a point of view which, in ancient phrase, makes man the measure of things.
>
> Progressive education must either become a challenge to all the basic beliefs and attitudes which have been dominant for so long in every important domain of human interest, or else retreat to the nursery.[87]

Although Bode thus suggested that progressive education

---

[86]"Progressive Progress", Time XXXII (October 31, 1938) pp. 31-35.

[87]Boyd Bode, Progressive Education at the Crossroads, (New York: Newson and Co., 1938) pp. 4-5.

was at a point in its development at which it was necessary for its leaders to make certain basic choices, dissension within the movement was nothing new. What was different was the amount and virulence of the criticism in the popular press. Ann Crockett's article in the Saturday Evening Post entitled "Lollypops versus Learning" was representative. Ann Crockett, a former progressive school teacher, sharply criticized the P. E. A. for not articulating a clear statement of purpose. She suggested that progressive education as originally conceived had much to offer, but that excesses were now being committed in its name. Children were not learning basic skills and they were spending time on activity rather than study. She suggested that in an attempt to make learning pleasaht progressive educators had eliminated the drudgery which necessarily underlay any worthwhile achievement. Ms. Crockett wrote,

> I accuse progressive edcators of preparing their charges for the grim realities of modern life on a diet of lollipops. The theory seems to be that children can't swallow knowledge unless it is heavily flavored with vanilla. I grant that the hickory

---

[88]Ann Crockett, "Lollipops vs. Learning", Saturday Evening Post, March 16, 1940 pp. 29, 105-106.

stick was seldom an effective teacher, but I submit that the present day rush to the opposite extreme is even worse.[89]

Criticism of progressive education while not ceasing was muted during the war and broke out again with renewed vigor and virulence during the postwar years--this time led by highly educated laymen, professional academics, and national leaders.[90] Among the most articulate members of this group were university academicians representing their subject disciplines and the newly prestigious universities.

Arthur Bestor's critique was representative. Arthur Bestor was a historian on the faculty of the University of Illinois when he published Educational Wastelands in 1953. He had previously taught at Yale, Columbia Teachers College, and Stanford prior to the publication of Educational Wastelands and had written a number of

---

89 Ibid p. 105.

90 The most notable works which made up this postwar critique of progressive education were Bernard Iddings Bell, Crisis in Education (1949); Mortimer Smith, And Madly Teach (1949); Albert Lynd, Quackery in the Public Schools (1953); Arthur Bestor Educational Wastelands (1953) and The Restoration of Learning (1955); Robert Hutchins, The Conflict in Education (1953); Paul Woodring, Let's Talk Sense About Our Schools (1953); H. G. Rickover, Education and Freedom, (1959).

articles in national journals that were highly critical of the life-adjustment movement. Two years after the publication of Educational Wastelands, Bestor published The Restoration of Learning in which he incorporated parts of Educational Wastelands and elaborated upon many of the ideas presented in that work.

In the opening chpater of Educational Wastelands, Bestor set forth his understanding of the goals of education and a critique of professional educators. He asserted that the aim of education was intellectual training and that the purpose of the schools was to teach people how to think. Through programs such as the life-adjustment movement, Bestor continued, professional educators had "sponsored school and college programs which make no substantial contribution to knowledge or clear thinking and which could not conceivably make such a contribution."[91] Professional educators had lowered the standards of education and removed intellectual discipline from the schools.

That form of education which would train a man

---

[91]Arthur Bestor, Educational Wastelands, (Urbana, Illinois: University of Illinois Press, 1953) p. 2.

how to think, Bestor went on to explain, was a liberal education with its goal of "the deliberate cultivation of the power to think" [92]. Bestor believed that a liberal education could best be transmitted through the academic disciplines which had evolved historically as the best way man had found to logically organize knowledge.

> The disciplines represent the various ways which man has discovered for achieving intellectual mastery and hence practical power over the various problems that confront him.[93]

Bestor cautioned that in urging that the schools transmit a liberal education, he was not inferring that the ability to think was the most important in human life. He simply was suggesting that training in the ability to think was the role that the schools were uniquely designed to serve. If other institutions such as the family and the church failed to meet other needs of adolescents, it was not the responsibility of the school to assume these functions. If the school did not assume responsibility for intellectual training, no other institution would.

Bestor's conception of disciplined intellectual training as the central focus of the school rested upon three central assumptions. First, Bestor contended, a democracy required a people capable of rational and critical thought who were able to choose intelligently

---

[92]Arthur Bestor, The Restoration of Learning, (New York: Alfred A. Knopf, 1955) p. 36.

[93]Arthur Bestor, Educational Wastelands op. cit. p. 19.

with regard to the vital public issues confronting them. Here, Bestor echoed an argument that had been made by Thomas Jefferson and Horace Mann in their arguments for universal public schooling. In a democracy it was necessary to have an educated citizenry if that citizenry was to be capable of choosing wisely. A democratic nation could not be both ignorant and free. The founders of the public school system, Bestor explained, had realized the importance of education, for they knew that

> So great would be the benefit to the state from such a diffusion of knowledge and intelligence that it was legitimate to support the educational system by taxation, and even to use the coercive authority of law to compel every future citizen to secure an education by attending school for a substantial period of time.[94]

In a world that in the one hundred years since these words were written had grown increasingly complex and technological, a sound intellectual education was even more important if citizens were to be able to exercise their capacity to choose wisely.

Secondly, Bestor suggested, disciplined intellectual training was important because the schools had the responsi-

---

[94]Ibid p. 3.

bility along with institutions of higher education for laying the groundwork for future professional training.

> If the schools fail to do their part in this, the nation is threatened with the loss of intellectual strength and, as a direct consequence, the loss of industrial prosperity and military security.[95]

And thirdly, disciplined intellectual training was important if the cultural values of the nation were to be preserved. Bestor, in fact, suggested that one source of evidence that the schools were adequately serving the purpose of intellectual training would be a rise in the intellectual tastes of the nation.

In the remainder of Educational Wastelands Bestor elaborated upon his conception of a liberal education, set forth a critique of much of recent educational reform, and suggested a number of proposals for reform. With regard to his conception of a liberal education, he emphasized that it should be universal. Bestor suggested that to restrict a liberal education was to work towards the maintenance of an intellectual elite, a notion that was incompatible with a commitment to a democratic society. By extending a liberal education to all one would democratize the intellectual life of the nation.

---

[95] Ibid p. 13.

Implicit in this commitment to a universal liberal education was Bestor's critique of the life-adjustment movement which he contended made the false assumption that only a certain portion of the young were capable of intellectual training, and in so doing emphasized the non-intellectual everyday concerns of the young and neglected the academic disciplines.

Bestor went on to explain that although he was critical of much of recent educational reform and in particular of the life-adjustment movement, he was not indicting progressive education. Instead he suggested that progressive education, as Dewey had originally conceived it, had much to recommend it. It was, he believed, an attempt to improve the teaching of the basic disciplines in light of what was known of pedagogy and psychology. However, in time progressive education divorced itself from anything related to the training of the intellect. A focus on pedagogy became an end in itself rather than an attempt to better provide a liberal education. Educators began to equate the fact that students seemed interested in their work with the notion that they were actually learning something. The test of a school, according to Bestor, should be how much children actually learned.

The elevation of extracurricular activities to a point where they became as important as academic subjects and the failure of educators to distinguish between those studies which expanded the analytical and critical powers of the mind and those which constricted them had led to an aimlessness in education.

Just as pedagogy had become an end in itself, the perceived needs of adolescents had become ends in themselves.

> An attempt is being made to define education exclusively in terms of the needs of youth without reference to the capabilities of the school...It is not the job--it cannot possibly be the job--of the school to meet the common and specific needs of youth. If it were, then the school should undertake to meet needs even more basic than any mentioned in the list: All youth need food, clothing, and shelter.[96]

Although Bestor acknowledged that a liberal education might begin of necessity with that which was of immediate interest to the child, it was inadequate if it did not lead the student to higher levels of abstraction and generalization. The central concern of the schools was not "the personal problems of adolescents",[97] for these were only incidental to disciplined intellectual training. Moreover, a concern with the personal problems of adolescents failed to prepare the young for the responsibilities of adulthood.

---

[96] Ibid p. 75.

[97] Ibid p. 76.

> The purpose of the school, however, is not primarily to teach children to solve children's problems, but to prepare them to solve the problems of the men and women which they are to become.[98]

There is thus a future-time orientation in much of Bestor's writing. Education is designed to prepare the adult, not to serve the needs of the adolescent.

> To focus upon the felt needs of adolescents was to waste time in the immediate and to neglect the real-life needs that will come later and that will put to the test all the resources of a mature and disciplined intelligence.[99]

Furthermore, to define the aims of schooling in terms of the needs of youth was to ignore the needs of the nation.

> One must, however, point out that the needs of the nation, not the needs of young people alone, are at stake.[100]

Bestor suggested that reform in three areas was necessary in order to restore disciplined intellectual training to a central position in the school.. He urged greater involvement of university scholars and scientists in educational policy making. Since man had organized his thoughts into academic disciplines

---

[98] Ibid p. 74.

[99] Ibid p. 77.

[100] Ibid p. 74.

and since it was professionally trained scholars and scientists who were most familiar with the content of the academic disciplines, it was important that they cooperate with educators to define the content of the curriculum. Secondly Bestor urged that the process of teacher training be reformed. He proposed the elimination of a fixed number of hours of courses in pedagogy in favor of a liberal education on both the undergraduate and graduate levels and a demonstrated competence in teaching. Thirdly Bestor proposed a rigorous system of college entrance examinations which would exert pressure on high schools to upgrade the intellectual content of the curricula.

Thus in Bestor's writings the central themes of the critics of progressive education are represented. There is an attempt to establish the training of the intellect as the central focus of the school. Following from this concern is an emphasis upon upgrading the quality of the curriculum within the schools. Education is discussed in terms of schooling and an attempt is made to define as precisely as possible those functions which the school and only the school can serve. Most importantly there is the implicit assumption that a conception of

adolescence has little relevance for developing proposals for educational reform. Philosophies of education are primarily justified in terms of societal needs--either with an emphasis on the needs of the democratic state, as in Bestor's case or in terms of national security needs as in the case of Rickover who was writing in the climate of post-Sputnik America. They are not justified in terms of the nature of adolescence. Although Bestor acknowledges that an understanding of what he terms the needs of adolescents might be a starting point for education, there is little reference to anything else that an understanding of adolescence might contribute. More important than the question of what the adolescent is by virtue of his adolescence is the question of what an adult in democratic society ought to be. Here, then, were the themes which would be reiterated by the other critics of progressive education.

The critique of progressive education set forth by Bestor and others set the tone and direction for much of educational reform during the postwar era. In a time of expanding industrial production and omnipresent tensions between Russia and the United States, education was conceived as preparation for the future. Educational reform in the late fifties and early sixties most often

took the form of upgrading curricula, particularly in the sciences, foreign languages, and mathematics. Improvement of the schools was conceived in terms of attracting better personnel, developing new curriculum materials, and developing new methods of teaching. Courses formerly taught only on the university level such as psychology, sociology, and economics were introduced into high schools. Educational technology was incorporated into the classroom do as better to convey subject matter. Underlying these reforms was the notion of the critics of progressive education that the exclusive purpose of the schools was the training of the intellect. The central question was simply how this could better be accomplished.

Although the critics of progressive education did not specifically address themselves to the Eight Year Study, their criticism and the climate of reform which it generated limited the impact of the study. Although the Eight Year Study had not been structured as an experiment in progressive education, it had taken place under the auspicies of the Progressive Education Association. Moreover, the curriculum reform which had taken place in the thirty schools had been clearly progressive in nature. Like any reform which was labeled progressive in the 1950's it fared badly. The thrust of curriculum reform in the 1950's was directed at a reintroduction

of subject matter disciplines and the upgrading of teaching within those disciplines.

Moreover statements of educational philosophy by the critics of progressive education in the post-war era diverged sharply from those implicit in the Eight Year Study. While still stressing the notion of education for a democratic state, statements of educational philosophy in the forties and fifties were not paeans to America's virtues. Statements about democracy by the critics of progressive education specifically referred to transmitting to the young the basic skills which were necessary for intelligent participation in a democratic state. Formulations about the needs of adolescents which had pervaded the statements of philosophy of the thirty schools were almost entirely absent from post-war American education except when they were cited for attack. In the minds of many educators such statements had become associated with a trivialization of the curriculum and a non-intellectual emphasis in curriculum reform.

The Eight Year Study and even the Progressive Education Association might have withstood these attacks if there had been a clearly articulated progressive philosophy of education which could have been offered in debate against them. However, the Progressive Education Association

was unable to attain a consensus in its attempts to articulate a philosophy and the leaders of the Eight Year Study were unwilling to set forth a philosophy to guide the Eight Year Study. Without an educational philosophy the Eight Year Study had no defense to offer against the critics of progressive education. The study appeared to be thirty disparate studies in school experimentation some of which clearly embodied the very reforms which Bestor and the other critics of progressive education had passionately attacked. While it was true that Bestor and his fellow critics had rightly chastized progressive educators for their neglect of academic rigor, the harshness and generality of their critique resulted in a sweeping indictment of the progressive education movement. Their critique resulted in an imposition of the university model of curriculum structure upon the high schools--a structure that while reintroducing academic rigor also resulted in the balkanization of studies which progressive educators had sought to overcome.

Thus one begins to understand that the Eight Year Study was a victim of circumstances beyond its control. Although it had been one of the most extensive and carefully designed experiments ever conducted on the

secondary school level, professional educators and the public during the post-war era were not making judgements about educational policy on the basis of the degree of empirirical rigor underlying those policies. The Eight Year Study was completed and then left untended by an age critical of progressive educational reform.

The Eight Year Study thus suggests a number of lessons for those who would seek to undertake educational experimentation. A rigorous experimental design is not a sufficient guarantee that the results of the study will be translated into educational practice. Educational reform is always carried out in a specific political and cultural milieu and is more often the product of compromises made by contending interest groups than it is the unadulterated result of educational research. The Eight Year Study was not ignored because of flaws in its research design, but because it was implemented at a time when the public and professional educators were hostile to all educational reform which smacked of proressivism. The development of the Eight Year Study itself was an indication of the way in which educational reformis shaped by the political and cultural milieu in which it occurs. The Eight Year Study was an outgrowth of a particular strand

of progressive education which arose in the 1920's and which could trace its precipitating conditions back to nineteenth century pedagogy. As the thirties progressed the experiment became responsive to other pressures in the progressive education movement which stressed an emphasis on the social dimension of education. in the forties and fifties the fate of the Eight Year Study was bound up in a conservative shift in educational thought.

Secondly the Eight Year Study demonstrates the importance of framing a clearly defined statement of of educational philosophy to serve as a backdrop for experimentation. It is unlikely that such a statement would have altered the immediate impact of the Eight Year Study, but it might have served to provide a viable basis for educational reform at a later date.

Thirdly the Eight Year Study highlights the significance and importance of follow-up support after an intervention has taken place. Upon completion of the Eight Year Study the thirty schools were left without counter support against a social climate that was growing increasingly inhospitable to educational experimentation and without counter supports against a return to traditional college entrance requirements.

The schools were left to fend for themselves in a milieu that was hostile to any experimentation tinged with the label "progressive education". The thirty schools could have benefitted from a follow-up committee which would have sought to assess and work towards a revision of college entrance requirements. and which would have provided continued aid and support for curriculum reform in schools seeking to adopt reforms in the spirit of the Eight Year Study.

CHAPTER IV

BEYOND THE EIGHT YEAR STUDY

The Eight Year Study was completed over twenty years ago, and the reformer of the seventies must ask if it still provides guidelines for contemporary educational practice. The schools are always shaped by political and social pressures, and as these change so do a society's expectations of the educational system. Dewey showed early in the century that the crucial task then besetting the schools was a redefintion of their role in an America that had shifted from an agrarian to an industrial society[101]. Two decades later in a study of the Chicago school system, Counts demonstrated that pedagogical reforms were more often instituted as a result of political pressures than because of any intrinsic merit[102]. The decade of the fifties is a clear example of the way in which technological society shaped the schools.

However, an interpretation of school reform which labels it the consequence of broader social and political pressures can lead to an easy and over-simplified fatalism. Although schools are undeniably the product of social forces, they are also within limits a shaper of social

---

[101]See John Dewey, School and Society,(Chicago: University of Chicago Press, 1900).

[102]See George Counts, School and Society in Chicago op. cit.

values and ideals. Thus in any examination of a venture in educational reform it is important to distinguish between that which bears only passing relevance and that which is of lasting value.

The final reports of the thirty schools are contained in the fifth volume of the report of the study published by the Commission. Each of the reports of the thirty schools contains a summary of the curriculum reform which was undertaken as a part of the Eight Year Study. The most common pitfall which the schools encountered in reforming their curricula was the tendency to weaken the intellectual ontent of the curriculum. Thus a few schools would poll student interests and then build a curriculum around those interests whether they were intellectual or not. In an attempt to pay greater attention to adolescent needs and student interests curricula were sometimes instituted which failed to lead students to a wider comprehension of subject matter or which failed to provide a base upon which further learning could be built. Thus a survey of student interest all too often resulted in a curriculum stressing boy-girl relationships, consumer problems, vocational choice, and family living. The distinction between therapist and teacher often became fuzzy, and the student was left at a point in his apprehension

little beyond that from which he had started.

Such a pattern, however, was only followed by a small number of the thirty schools. In most schools there was an attempt to restructure the curriculum in ways that would be responsive to student interest while not compromising intellectual rigor and quality. Thus through a greater integration of subject areas it was possible to give students a more unitary sense of their cultural heritage than had been possible through instruction in discrete subject areas which were sometimes no more than the artificial boundaries of the academy. By allowing for individualized instruction there was an attempt to let the student himself provide the integration which a curriculum no matter how well structured could never guarantee. Thus some schools set aside times when students could read what they wanted, and other schools allowed students to pursue individual projects and topics at length. As part of an attempt to give student interest more reign, some schools evinced a willingness to accept forms of work other than research work. Credit was given for work in the creative arts, and in some academic courses credit was given for non-verbal modes of expression. Lastly and perhaps most importatnly, attempts were made

to integrate the school and the community. When subjects bearing upon life in the community were discussed in the classroom expertise was sought from the community. More importantly, students were encouraged to use the community as a resource for their study. In the reports of the thirty schools there are numerous examples of students supplementing their classroom experience with research in the community. Thus one ninth grade biology class conducted a health survey of the surrounding town. In the same school weekly roundtable discussions growing out of classroom discussion were broadcast to the community over the radio. In conjunction with a study of community life, another school encouraged its students to work in local social service agencies.

Much of what occurred during the Eight Year Study is stikingly similar, then, to changes occurring under the banner of educational reform today. Attempts to improve the academic quality of instruction, interdisciplinary studies, affective education, and field studies programs are all variations of reform initiated during the eight Year Study and bear witness to the enduring relevance of the study.

Still, there are many areas of educational reform

not broached in the Eight Year Study which remain fertile ground for contemporary reformers. Thus there is a crucial need to reform the credentialing process for teachers and administrators so that more stress is placed upon ability to teach and knowledge of subject areas--not necessarily academic disciplines--rather than upon the amassing of credits in education. There is also a need to open the schools to professionals, other than teachers, who have fields of expertise to share with the young. Perhaps most importantly there is a need for schools to build flexibility into their programs to allow adolescents the opportunity to perform significant work in the community which is not necessarily related to their academic course of study. Erik Erikson's psycho-biographical research as well as his clinical work lend theoretical support for the singular importance of this last area of reform. To the extent that adolescence is a period in life when an individual attempts to ascertain who he is in the world in which he lives there is a crucial need for adolescents to be offered meaningful work opportunities in the community where they can put their abilities to a test. Schools only allow for the expression of a limited range of abilities and talents and may not allow significant numbers of adolescents to uncover

the point in their existence at which they can affirm "This is the real me! the mark of a healthy resolution of identity.

Furthermore, an overall assessment of the Eight Year Study's adequacy as a model for contemporary educational reform must address itself to the change in social and intellectual conditions since the 1930's. In the wake of the Vietnam War the paeans to America as a defender of democracy which underlay much of the curriculum reform in the Eight Year Study ring hollow. Moreover, it is impossible to define the needs of adolescence solely in terms of heterosexual awkwardness and vocational indecision as was often the case in the Eight Year Study.

The work of Erik Erikson more than that of any single writer has changed both the popular image of adolescence and that of the professional educator, and thus the concept of adolescence which arises from his work merits examination. Erikson's work is difficult to discuss analytically, for it more often embodies the nuances and suggestive strokes of an artist than the empirical and sharply hewn conclusions of a scientist. He more often suggests than defines, and he paints contexts rather than alluding to facts and data. Furthermore, only a small portion of his work is devoted to adolescence.

Erikson, in effect offers a way of viewing life. Life is presented as a series of eight invariantly ordered sequential stages of development which span the entire life cycle. Each stage is organized around a polarity between positive and negative feelings about the self, and each stage potentially leads toward the emergence of a particular strength, or, to use Erikson's term a virtue. In each stage a "crisis" has to beresolved, for each stage embodies a critical moment or turning point when development must move one was or another. A crisis is thus a turning point from which a resolution in one direction or another necessarily results. It is a time both of exceptional vulnerability and heightened potential. Resolution in one direct on may lead to greater integration and the capacity for further growth along with the emergence of a particular strength or virtue inherent to the particular stage of the life cycle, whereas "resolution" in the other direction may lead to a retardation of growth and stunted development. Resolution in a positive direction lays the groundwork for the resolution of future turning points whereas"resolution" in the other direction may aggravate future crises. Resolution is never totally in one direction or another, but occurs as a ratio in favor of one or the other

direction. Thus to take but two examples, infancy results in a crisis in which basic trust must outweigh basic mistrust, and old age results in a crisis in which integrity must outweigh despair.

The polarity peculiar to the stage of adolescence is identity versus role confusion. It is difficult to grasp what Erikson means by identity, for in his later work he never explicitly defines the concept. Identity, for Erikson, is simply a concept which he found increasingly necessary for explaining a sense of things which he observed in his clinical work and research. Thus Erikson simply tries to suggest what it feels like to have a sense of identity rather than to define the term explicitly. Erikson, himself, alludes to this problem of definition in his preface to Identity, Youth and Crisis.

> The more one writes about this subject (identity), the more the word becomes a term for something as unfathomable as it is all-pervasive. One can only explore it by establishing its indispensability in various contexts.[103]

Perhaps it is best to briefly follow Erikson's exploration of the concept of identity. Erikson suggests that the essence of a sense of identity is a "subjective

---

[103]Erik Erikson, Identity, Youth and Crisis (New York: W. W. Norton and Co., 1968) p. 19

sense of an invigorating sameness and continuity".[104] In the midst of change one knows that one will endure. It is a sense which unifies the past, present, and future into a coherent whole. It is a linkage from what the adolescent knows he has become during childhood to the vision of an anticipated future. To feel optimally a sense of identity is to have "a feeling of being at home in one's body, a sense of 'knowing where one is going' and an inner assuredness of anticipated recognition of those who count."[105] It is thus marked by a quality of "unselfconscious living"[106]. In attempting to suggest the tone that a sense of identity has for an individual Erikson quotes William James.

> A man's character is discernable in the mental or moral attitude in which, when it came upon him, he felt himself most deeply and intensely active and alive. At such moments there is a voice inside which speaks and says: This is the real me![107]

---

[104] Ibid p. 19.

[105] Ibid p. 165

[106] Erik Erikson, "Autobiographic Notes on the Identity Crisis", Daedalus, XCIX (Fall, 1970) p. 732.

[107] Erikson, Identity, Youth and Crisis p. 19.

What is essential in the above quotation is the capacity to say, "This is me" and to know that one really means it. Moreover, an individual with a sense of identity feels that this "me" has a continuity over time not only in the way he perceives himself, but also in the way others perceive him.

The other half of the polarity of adolescence is identity confusion. Identity confusion is a sense of not being able to keep oneself together and feeling the absence of an abiding sense of unity. It is a sense of not knowing which "me" is the real "me". It may be accompanied by a feeling of not wanting to be alone, for in the absence of others there is a sense of one's own presence having no substance or continuity. In its acute form identity confusion may be indicated by a continuing anxiety and a feeling of emptiness whereby one can stand outside oneself and look into a hollow shell. There is a reluctance to make any commitments out of fear of prematurely closing options and being locked into an alien role. Time takes on a uniform quality and dropping off to sleep as well as getting up become burdensome. Concentration becomes difficult. Identity confusion may result in a temporary over-identification

with leaders, heroes, or cliques in order that the self be held together. It may also result in a form of love which serves the purpose of reflecting one's fragmented image upon the other in order that it be reflected back and clarified. Identity confusion is most often expressed in terms of difficulty in settling upon an occupational identity, and Erikson quotes Biff of Arthur Miller's Death of a Salesman to describe a sense of identity confusion. Biff declares,

> I just can't take hold, Mom. I can't take hold of some kind of life.[108]

The potential strength--Erikson prefers the term virtue--which emerges from adolescence is fidelity. A few words to explain what Erikson means by virtue are in order before discussing that virtue which is peculiar to adolescence. By virtue Erikson means a positive goal inherent and built into each stage of the life cycle. A virtue is a quality "which animates man pervasively during successive stages of his life"[109]. It is a pervading strength which gives "potency" and vitality to the values of the individual. Erikson describes fidelity as that particular virtue of adolescence which

---

[108] Ibid p. 131

[109] Ibid p. 233.

is the "ability to sustain loyalties freely pledged in spite of the inevitable contradictions of value systems".[110] The search for fidelity is the search of the adolescent "for men and ideas to have faith in, which also means men and ideas in whose service it would seem worthwhile to prove oneself trustworthy"[111]. It is the "search for something and somebody to be true to"[112], and it is the "cornerstone of identity"[113]. Although devotions and commitments may shift often, there is a search for "durability in change"[114]. The quest for fidelity is embodied in the question, "To what can I say yes?". The strength of fidelity is manifested in the capacity to say,"Here I stand!", or"Here is what I say yes to! despite the knowledge that the affirmations of others may run counter to one's own. The adolescent looks for things he can believe in and not be let down by. It follows from this that the adolescent is by nature a philosopher[115]. In his quest for people and ideals to

---

[110]Erik Erikson, Insight and Responsibility (New York: W. W. Norton and Co., 1958) p. 125.

[111]Erikson, Identity, Youth and Crisis, op. cit., pp. 128-129.

[112]Ibid p. 235.

[113]Erikson, Insight and Responsibility op. cit. p. 125.

[114]Erikson, Identity, Youth and Crisis op. cit. p. 235.

[115]Lawrence Kohlberg and Carol Gilligan, "The Adolescent as a Philosopher", Daedalus, C (Fall, 1971).

which he can commit himself he implicitly raises questions about the value and meaning of life.

Further complicating the definition of identity is the fact that identity is always generated out of the interaction of an individual with other individuals, with the community, and with the broader culture. For Erikson the developmental process is always the intersection of the individual and the social context, and no discussion of identity formation is, therefore, complete without reference to a social context. Identity thus has both a psychological and social dimension. The psychological dimension of identity has already been alluded to. The social dimension refers to the communal and historical context in which identity formation occurs. Erikson srites, "No ego is an island to itself."[116]. Erikson goes on to describe the complex interplay between individual and culture in the following manner.

> ...we deal with a process "located" in the core of the individual and yet also in the core of his communal culture, a process which establishes, in fact, the identity of these two identities.[117]

The individual's life history and the broader cultural

---

[116]Erikson,"Autobiographical Notes..." op. cit. p. 732.

[117]Erikson, "Identity, Youth and Crisis" op. cit. p. 23.

history are thus inextricably intertwined, each continually acting upon and shaping the other. Identity is thus at once psychosocial and psychohistorical. Erikson explains this further,

> And finally, in discussing identity, as we now see, we cannot separate personal growth and communal change, nor can we separate (as I tried to demonstrate in Young Man Luther) the identity crisis in individual life and contemporary crises in historical development because the two help to define each other and are truly relative to each other.[118]

In Erikson's writing adolescence thus takes on a complexity lacking in the Eight Year Study. It is a period in an individual's life when values are tested, significant adult models sought, and tentative commitments made. Although the notion of identity was not explicitly conceptualized at the time of the Eight Year Study, there was much to enhance the formation of identity in the reforms undertaken by the thirty schools. Many schools participating in the study attempted to individualize the curriculum and narrow the gap between the community and the school resulting in a greater number of contexts in which values could be tested and significant models could be found. Although some schools reduced the academic

---

[118] Ibid p.23.

content of their curricula, others such as the Shaker Heights system, strengthened elements of a liberal education in the curriculum, once again resulting in a situation in which values could be tested. For it is a liberal education which allows the student to explore the faiths, ideologies, and mythologies which have inspired men in the past and to select those which have meaning for himself.

However, adolescence at the present juncture in history involves a very problematical quest for identity, and an education which responds to the needs of adolescence consequently must move beyond the model of curriculum reform offered by the Eight Year Study. Many generations of adolescents have questioned facets of adult life, but unprecedented is a questioning of work and upward mobility--values which have been at the core of conventional adulthood. Erikson in much of his writing points toward the problematical nature of identity formation in the contemporary world. He writes,

> In looking at the youth of today, one is apt to forget that identity formation while being critical in youth is really a <u>generational issue.</u> So we must not overlook what appears to be a certain abrogation of responsibility on the part of the older generation in providing those forceful ideals which must antedate identity formation in the next generation--

> if only so that youth can rebel against a well-defined set of older values.[119]

Not only do many of the young lack adults who can serve as significant models, but they also lack the confidence that there exist any saving faiths which can extricate man from his present dilemmas. In contrasting his own youthful days to those of contemporary youth Erikson writes,

> All the warring ideologies of our young years harbored some saving scheme which was to dominate foreverafter--just one more war, just one more revolution, just one more new deal. It is only in our lifetime that the faith in change has gradually given way to a widespread fear of change itself--and a suspicion of faith itself. Identity problems and even the symptoms of identity confusion probably changed accordingly.[120]

The absenc of compelling adult models and saving faiths is not peculiar to this generation's life experience, however. Erikson explains:

> There are periods in history which are identity-vacua, when a sudden sense of alienation is widespread. Our time shares with Luther's an alienation composed of corresponding elements: fears aroused by discoveries and inventions (including weapons) radically expanding and changing the space-time quality of the world image; inner anxieties aggravated by the decay of existing institutions which have provided the historical anchor of an elite's identity; and the dread of an existential vacuum. It is in such periods that leaders'

---

[119] Ibid p. 30.

[120] Erikson, Autobiographia Notes... op. cit. p. 745.

> deep conflicts and special gifts have found their "activities on a large scale," and that they have been found and chosen by contemporaries possessed of analogous conflicts and corresponding needs[121].

Erikson has not been the only observer to notice the cultural vacuum in which the contemporary young grow toward maturity. Others who have worked with the young professionally have suggested that the young have nothing to believe in and no interpretive scheme or mythology which can give coherence to the present or hope for the future. Andrew Greeley, a Catholic priest and Director of the Center for the Study of American Pluralism, has called this phenomenon despair. He writes of the young,

> They are young people without a faith, without a sacred, without an interpretive scheme, without a community. They do not know who they are, where they are going, or why they live.[122]

Others point to a similar phenomenon. Peter Marin, a former director of an alternative high school and a contributor to the Saturday Review paints a picture of young people casting about in a cultural void.

> It (the problem) is, put simply, that "social reality" seems to have vanished altogether. One finds among the young a profound and befuddled sense of loss--as if they had been traumatized and betrayed by an entire world. What is release and

---

[121]Erikson, Insight and Responsibility, op. cit. p. 204.

[122]Andrew Greeley, Unsecular Man (New York: Schocken Books, 1972) p.261.

> space for some is for others a constant sense of separation and vertigo--a void in which the self can float or soar but in which one can also drift unmoored and fall; and when one falls, it is forever, for there is nothing underneath, no culture, no net of meaning, nothing else.[123]

Paul Goodman writes from an experience in 1967 as a teacher of graduate students in a seminar on professionalism at the New School for Social Research.

> Suddenly I realized that they (the students) did not believe there was a nature of things. Somehow all functions could be reduced to interpersonal relations and power...To be required to learn something was a trap by which the young were put down and co-opted. Then I knew that I could not get through to them. I had imagined that the worldwide student protest had to do with changing political and moral institutions, to which I was sympathetic, but I now saw that we had to do with a religious crisis of the magnitude of the Reformation in the fifteen hundreds, when not only all institutions but all learning had been corrupted by the whore of Babylon.[124]

Common to all these observations is the notion that for many of America's most thoughtful young people history has lost its significance and reality has vanished. No certain explanations of the meaning of human existence remain. In a word, these young people suffer from despair.

Certainly the number of despairing adolescents is small, but they point toward many more of their peers

---

[123]Peter Marin, "Children of the Apocalypse", Saturday Review, September 19, 1970 p. 72.

[124]Paul Goodman, "The New Reformation", New York Times Magazine. September 14, 1969 p.33.

who fail to despair only because they have ceased to care deeply. Although not despairing, these are young people who are apathetic, bored and unable to imagine a future better than the present. Furthermore their ranks include bo th the affluent and the non-affluent. Writing in the Saturday Review Wallace Roberts describes the youth of Winnetka, Illinois, a wealthy suburb of Chicago. According to Roberts the young people in Winnetka, while not opposed to their parents' values and life-styles, do not see them as inspiring visions of the future. They may choose to live like their parents, but it does not seem to be a choice made with any enthusiasm or deeply held commitments; it is a choice made in the face of what are perceived as limited options. One psychiatric social worker from a community neighboring Winnetka describes these young people in the following manner.

> There are not very many without problems, even the ones who appear to accept it all. The questioning of values is almost a fad, you're just not with it if you don't question values. And they do, and they're left alone helpless to find their own values with nothing certain to strengthen them.[125]

And despite the school's exceptionally fine equipment and facilities, its liberal and often humane administrators

---

[125]Wallace Roberts, "No Place to Grow", Saturday Review, March 21, 1970 p. 80.

its electives and ungraded classes, and its creative teachers, a subtle hollowness seems to persist. The school fails to provide the young with any compelling vision of the future.

Nor is the lack of a compelling vision of the future confined to the offspring of the affluent. In a description of the working class young of Bethlehem, Pennsylvania, Peter Schrag, a journalist, writes

> And yet the life that he and many others imagine is almost identical to the life of the present. As today opens up a little--a better home, a car, a television set, and a steady job--tomorrow seems to close down. Modesty in achievement and ambition is matched by an inability to imagine anything richer--in experience or possessions, or in the world at large. The generation gap--for rich, for poor, for all--is precisely this: that many kids, for the first time, are growing up without a sense of the future. And that, for America, is new.[126]

The young people described by Roberts and Schrag like their counterparts described by Greeley, Marin, and Goodman are bereft of any faiths or values worthy of sacrifice. They are young people lacking that strength which Erikson calls fidelity.

Contemporary educators are thus confronted by a situation radically different from that which faced those involved in the Eight Year Study. In the 1930's democracy

---

[126]Peter Schrag, "Growing Up on Mechanic Street", Saturday Review, March 21, 1970, p. 79.

still appeared to be a saving faith, and a newly-emerging sense of adolescence as a stage of human development seemed to promise that an examination of the needs-of-adolescence could generate the basis for a curriculum. Neither belief, however, survived the sixties. The glaring social and economic inequities highlighted by the civil rights movement and a disillusioning involvement in a prolonged war shattered an innocent faith in democracy. Erikson's work on adolescence demonstrated that it was not an isolated psychological construct that could serve as a substantive basis for curriculum development; adolescence was rather a stage in human development integrally bound up in a historical context and cultural milieu. In and of itself it failed to answer the question of what is worth knowing.

Unlike his predecessor in the thirties, the contemporary educator is thus confronted by a significant group of young people cast adrift--young people free to work at almost anything, but who are paradoxically shackled by a world lacking significant work; he is confronted by young people without a faith, without a community, and without heroes--young people who have everything to live for, but nothing worth dying for. Cut off from any social and cultural network, they are young people

without a sense of the ultimately real.

Although many professionals working with young people have pointed to this phenomenon, few with the exception of Paul Goodman and Andrew Greeley have identified it for what it is. In actuality it is a religious crisis, for at its root lie the unanswered questions: For what purpose do I exist? What gives life significance? What is ultimately real? Although the absence of answers to these questions is troubling in adulthood, it is all the more troubling during the period of adolescence when identity reaches its normative crisis. In their search for the ultimately real and for a meaningful vision of the future, young people confront an external community which does not provide compelling answers. Consequently many search for reality within themselves using the catalyst of drugs.

Rollo May, a psychotherapist who has worked with patients sufficiently troubled by an absence of meaning in life to seek professional help, suggests that the central myths of Western culture which traditionally conveyed a sense of what was fundamentally real have broken down.

> Now what we find typically in our patients in this decade is that no symbols seem to have compelling power and meaning to grip them anymore--not "God" nor "father" nor the "stars and stripes". A decade

> or so ago the symbols related to "competitive success" and "love" did have power to grasp people and elicit their allegiance; but there is reason for believing that these symbols too have lost their power.[127]

Much of the literature of the last century reflects a similar breakdown of cultural myths. At the core of existentialist literature is the dilemma of how to live and commit oneself in a world devoid of ultimate meaning. Modern literature itself can be regarded as the attempt of the individual artist to invent his own private meaning system in the absence of a communally shared system of values which provides a secure foundation.

However, identifying the malaise of the young as religious, does not imply ipso facto that the educator should send them off to religious school under a released time plan. While it is true that the myths of secular culture are broken at the core, it is also true that religious myths have lost their power to convey ultimate meaning. Just as the secular myths of scientism, marxism, and nationalism have failed to provide man with a sense of the meaning of human or historical destiny, so, too, have religious myths. To cite the most obvious example, God is now more often spoken of as a concept or symbol which has outlived its usefulness and died than in the

---

[127]Rollo May, ed., Symbolism in Religion and Literature, (New York: George Braziller Inc., 1960) p. 23.

than in the Bibilical sense of a living presence.

Those educational reformers who seek to transform the secondary schools into institutions holding meaning and compelling importance for the young are thus confronted with a dilemma far broader than that which faced the designers of the Eight Year Study. Reforms which are extensions of the Eight Year Study such as interdisciplinary courses, affective education, and field studies programs will undoubtedly improve the quality of life in the schools and make them more satisfying places in which to be. The Eight Year Study thus continues to serve as a model for those educators with the modest goal of providing better and more meaningful frameworks for transmitting knowledge. However, those educators with the more ambitious goal of addressing the crisis of meaning confronted by the young will have to look elsewhere, since the solution to this problem depends upon nothing less than the revitalization of religious myth. There is an urgent need for modern man to uncover once again that which gives life significance--an issue which the designers of the Eight Year Study never had to confront. It is an issue which contemporary reformers cannot afford to ignore, for its solution will determine whether the coming generation feels that the world it has inherited is worthy of preservation.

APPENDIX I

ORIGINAL MEMBERS OF COMMITTEE ON COLLEGE ENTRANCE AND SECONDARY SCHOOLS

Mr. Burton P. Fowler
President of Progressive Education Association
Headmaster of the Tower Hill School
Wilmington, Delaware

Mr. Willard Beatty
Superintendent of Schools
Bronxville, N. Y.

Miss Flora Cook
Director of the Francis W. Parker School
Chicago, Illinois

Mr. Robert Leigh
President, Bennington College
Bennington, Vermont

Mr. John A. Lester
Assistant Headmaster.
The Hill School
Pottstown, Pennsylvania

Dr. W. Carson Ryan, Jr.
Director of Education in the Indian Service
Professor of Education, Swarthmore College
Swarthmore, Pennsylvania

Dr. Jesse Newlon
Director, Lincoln School
New York City

Bruce Bliven
Editor, New Republic
New York City

Dr. Josephine Gleason
Chairman of Admissions
Vassar College
Poughkeepsie, New York

Dr. Harold Rugg
Teachers College
New York City

Mr. E. N. Sipple
Director of the Park School
Baltimore, Maryland

Dr. Raymond Walters
Dean of Swarthmore College
Swarthmore, Pennsylvania

Dean Max McConn
Lehigh University
Easton, Pennsylvania

Dr. Ben D. Wood
Collegiate Educational Research
Columbia University
New York City

Dr. W. S. Learned
Carnegie Foundation
New York City

Dr. Goodwin Watson
Teachers College
New York City

Miss Ann Shumaker
Editor, Progressive Education
Washington, D. C.

APPENDIX I (cont.)

Mr. Wilford W. Aikin (Chairman)
John Burroughs School
St. Louis, Missouri

Miss Katherine Taylor
Director of the Shady Hill School
Cambridge, Massachusetts

Dr. Leonard V. Koos
Director of the National Survey of Secondary Education
U. S. Department of the Interior
Washington, D. C.

Dean C. S. Boucher
University of Chicago
Chicago, Illinois

Professor Walter Agard
University of Wisconsin
Madison, Wisconsin

Mr. A. J. Burton
Principal, East High School
Des Moines, Iowa

Mr. Harold Fergueson
Principal, Montclair High School
Montclair, N. J.

Dr. Vivian Thayer
Ethical Culture School
New York City

APPENDIX II

PARTICIPATING SCHOOLS IN THE EIGHT YEAR STUDY

Altoona Senior High School
Altoona, Pennsylvania

Baldwin School
Bryn Mawr, Pennsylvania

Beaver Country Day School
Chestnut Hill, Massachusetts

Bronxville High School
Bronxville, N. Y.

Cheltenham Township High School
Elkins Park, Pennsylvania

Dalton Schools
New York, N. Y.

Denver Senior and Junior High Schools

Des Moines Senior and Junior High Schools
Des Moines, Iowa

Eagle Rock High School
Los Angeles, California

Fieldston School
New York, N. Y.

Francis W. Parker School
Chicago, Illinois

Friends Central School
Overbrook, Pennsylvania

George School
George School, Pennsylvania

Germantown Friends School
Germantown, Pennsylvania

Horace Mann School
New York, N. Y.

John Burroughs School
Clayton, Missouri

Lincoln School of Teachers College
New York, N. Y.

Milton Academy
Milton, Massachusetts

New Trier Township High School
Winnetka, Illinois

North Shore Country Day School
Winnetka, Illinois

Pelham Manor
Pelham, New York[128]

Radnor High School
Wayne, Pennsylvania

Shaker High School
Shaker Heights, Ohio

Tower Hill School
Wilmington, Delaware

Tulsa Senior and Junior High Schools
Tulsa, Oklahoma

University of Chicago High School
Chicago, Illinois

---

[128]Pelham Manor withdrew from the study in 1936.

APPENDIX II (cont.)

University High School
Oakland, California

University School of Ohio
State University
Columbus, Ohio

Windsor School
Boston, Massachusetts

Wisconsin High School
Madison, Wisconsin

BIBLIOGRAPHY

BOOKS

Aikin, Wilford M. The Story of the Eight Year Study, Vol. I. New York: Harper and Brothers, 1942.

Allen, Frederick L. Only Yesterday. New York: Harper and Brothers, 1931.

_____. Since Yesterday. New Yrok: Harper and Brothers 1939.

Archambault, Reginald D., ed. John Dewey on Education. New York: Random House, 1964.

Benedict, A. E. Dare Our Secondary Schools Face the Atomic Age. New York: Hinds, Hayden and Eldredge, 1945.

Bestor, Arthur E. Educational Wastelands. Urbana, Illinois: University of Illinois Press, 1953.

_____. The Restoration of Learning. New York: Alfred A. Knopf, 1955.

Bode, Boyd. Progressive Education at the Crossroads. New York: Newson and Co., 1938.

Bowers, C. A. The Progressive Educator and the Depression: The Radical Years. New York: Random House, 1969.

Brubacher, John S., and Willis, Rudy. Higher Education in Transition. New York: Harper and Row, 1958.

Bobbitt, Franklin. How to Make a Curriculum. Cambridge, Massachusetts: Riverside Press, 1924.

Butts, R. F., and Cremin, Lawrence A. A History of Education in American Culture, New York: Henry, Holt and Co., 1953.

Callahan, Raymond E. Education and the Cult of Efficiency. Chicago: University of Chicago Press, 1962.

Chamberlin, Dean; Chamberlin Enid S.; Drought, Neil E.; and Scott, William E. Did They Succeed in College, Vol. II. New York: Harper and Brothers, 1942.

Cohen, Arthur A. Humanistic Education and Western Civilization. New York: Holt Rinehart and Winston, 1964.

Coles, Robert. Erik Erikson: The Growth of His Work. New York: Little, Brown and Co., 1970.

Counts, George S. Dare the Schools Build a New Social Order. New York: John Day Co., 1932.

_____. School and Society in Chicago. New York: Harcourt Brace and Co., 1928.

_____. Secondary Education and Industrialism. Cambridge, Massachusetts: Harvard University Press, 1929.

_____. The Selective Character of American Secondary Education. Chicago: University of Chicago Press, 1922.

_____. The Social Composition of Boards of Education. Chicago: University of Chicago Press, 1927.

Cremin, Lawrence A. The Transformation of the School. New York: Random House, 1961.

Curti, Merle. The Social Ideas of American Educators. Paterson, New Jersey: Littlefield, adams and Co., 1961.

Dewey, John. A Common Faith. New Haven, Connecticut: Yale University Press, 1967.

_____. Education and Experience. New York: Macmillan Co., 1938.

_____. The School and Society. Chicago: University of Chicago Press, 1900.

Erikson, Erik H., ed. The Challenge of Youth. Garden City, New York: Doubleday and Co., 1963.

_____. Childhood and Society. New York: W. W. Norton and Co., 1950.

_____. Identity, Youth and Crisis. New York: W. W. Norton and Co., 1968.

_____. Insight and Responsibility. New York: W. W. Norton and Co., 1958.

_____. Young Man Luther. New York: W. W. Norton and Co., 1958.

Evans, Richard.L. Dialogue with Erik Erikson. New York: E. P. Dutton and Co., 1967.

Featherstone, Joseph. Schools Where Children Learn. New York: Liveright, 1971.

Friedman, Maurice. To Deny Our Nothingness. New York: Dell Publishing Co., 1967.

Giles, H. H.; McCutchen, S. P.; and Zechiel, A. N. Exploring the Curriculum, Vol. 2. New York: Harper and Brothers, 1942.

Graham, Patricia A. Progressive Education: From Arcady to Academe. New York: Columbia Teachers College Press, 1967.

Greeley, Andrew M. Unsecular Man: The Persistence of Religion, New York: Schocken Books, 1972.

Hamlin, Wilford G., ed. Teacher-School-Child. Plainfield, Vermont: Goddard College, 1963.

Hemming, James. Teach Them to Live. London: Heinemann, 1948.

Herberg, Will. Judaism and Modern Man. Philadelphia: Jewish Publication Society of America, 1951

_____. Protestant-Catholic-Jew. New York: Doubleday and Co., 1955.

Heschel, Abraham J. The Insecurity of Freedom. New York: Farrar, Strauss and Giroux, 1967.

Hutchins, Robert M. The Conflict in Education in a Democratic Society. New York: Harper and Brothers, 1953.

Jencks, Christopher. Inequality; A Reassessment of the Effect of Family and Schooling. New York: Basic Books, 1972.

Joncich, Geraldine M., ed. Psychology and the Science of Education: Selceted Writings of Edward L. Thorndike, New York: Coulumbia Teachers College Press, 1962.

Kandel, I. L. The Impact of the War on American Education. Chapel Hill, N. C.: University of North Carolina Press, 1948.

_____. Twenty-five Years of American Education. New York: Macmillan Co., 1924.

Keniston, Kenneth. Youth and Dissent. New York: Harcourt, Brace Jofanovich Inc., 1971.

Kilpatrick, William H., ed., The Educational Frontier. New York: Century Co., 1933.

Krug, Edward A. The Shaping of the American High School, Volumes I and II. Madison, Wisconsin: University of Wisconsin Press, 1964-1972.

Link, Arthur S., and Catton, William B. American Epoch: A History of the United States Since the 1890's, Vol. 3, 2nd ed. New York: Alfred A. Knopf Inc., 1963.

Lynd, Albert. Quackery in the Public Schools. New York: Grosset and Dunlap, 1950.

May, Rollo, ed. Symbolism in Religion and Literature. New York: George Braziller Inc., 1960.

Miller, Arthur. Death of a Salesman. New York: Viking Press Inc., 1949.

Perkinson, Henry J. The Imperfect Panacea: American Faith in Education.1865-1965. New York: Random House, 1968.

Rickover, H. G. Education and Freedom. New York: E. P. Dutton and Co., 1960.

Rousseau, Jean Jacques. Emile. New York: Dutton, 1966.

Rugg, Harold and Shumaker, Ann. The Child-Centered School. Yonkers on Hudson, New York: World Book Co., 1928.

Scott, Nathan A., The Unquiet Vision: Mirrors of Man in Existentialism. New York: World Publishing Co., 1969.

Silberman, Charles E., Crisis in the Classroom. New York: Random House, 1971.

Sleeper, James A., and Mintz Alan.L, eds. The New Jews. New York: Random House, 1971.

Smith, Eugene R. Education Moves Ahead. Boston: Atlantic Monthly Press, 1924.

Smith, Eugene R.; Tyler, Ralph W.; and Evaluation Staff. Appraising and Recording Student Progress, Vol. 3, New York, Harper and Brothers, 1943.

Thirty Schools Tell Their Story, Vol 5. New York: Harper and Brothers, 1943.

Thorndike, E. L. Educational Psychology. New York: Science Press, 1903.

Were We Guinea Pigs. New York: Henry Holt and Co., 1938.

Willis, Margaret. The Guinea Pigs After Twenty Years. Columbus, Ohio: Ohio State University Press, 1961.

JOURNALS AND PERIODICALS

Aikin, Wilford M. "Commission on the Relation of School and College." Progressive Education XIV (October, 1937), 456-457

_____. "Commission on the Relation of School and College." Educational Research Bulletin, XVII (November 16, 1938), 209-221.

_____. "Committee on the Relation of School and College." School and Society, XXXIII (February 21, 1931), 274-276.

_____. "The Eight Year Study: If We Were to Do it Again." Progressive Education, XXXI (October, 1953), 11-14.

_____. "The Experiment As Directed By the Progressive Education Committee." North Central Association Quarterly, IX (January, 1935), 350-352.

_____. "The First Year of the Eight Year Experimental Study." Educational Record XVII, Supplement 9 (January, 1936) 70-77.

_____. "Our Thirty Unshackled Schools" Clearing House. II (October, 1936), 78-83.

_____. "The Prospect in Secondary Education." Progressive Education, VII (February, 1930) 28-33.

_____. "The Purposes of the Eight Year Experimental Study." Educational Record, XVI (January, 1935) 107-20.

_____. "Report of the Committee on College Entrance and Secondary Schools." Progressive Education, VIII (April, 1931), 318-20.

_____. "Report of the Committee on the Relation of School and College." Progressive Education, IX (April, 1932), 291-294.

_____. "Some Implications of the Eight Year Study for all High Schools and Colleges." North Central Association Quarterly, XVII (January, 1943), 274-280.

_____. "Toward School-College Cooperation." Progressive Education, XII (November, 1935) 435-440.

Bane, Mary Jo, and Jencks, Christopher. "The Schools and Equal Opportunity." Saturday Review of Education, October, 1972, pp. 37-42.

Barnard, Eunice F., "They Made Good in College: The Eight Year Study of Progressive School Graduates." Progressive Education, XX (December, 1943) 356-59.

Brickman, William W. "The Secondary School." School and Society, LXXII (August 5, 1950) 84-91.

Chauncey, Henry "Some Observations on Evaluation in the Eight Year Study" North Central Association Quarterly, XV (January, 1941) 257-264.

"Committee on School and College Relations." The School Review, XL (April, 1932) 241-245.

"Coordination of School and College Work." School and Society XXXV (June 18, 1932) 841-845.

Crockett, Ann L. "Lollipops vs. Learning." Saturday Evening Post, March 16, 1940, pp. 29, 105-106.

Diederich, Paul B. "The Eight Year Study: More Comments." Progressive Education, XXVIII (March, 1951) 163-164.

Erikson, Erik H. "Autobiographic Notes on the Identity Crisis." Daedalus, XCIX (Fall, 1970), 730-759.

"Experimental College Entrance Units." North Central Association Quarterly, IX (January, 1935), 350-363.

Goodman, Paul. "The New Reformation." New York Times Magazine, September 14, 1969, pp. 33, 142-155.

Herberg, Will. "Toward a Biblical Theology of Education." The Christian Scholar, XXXVI (December, 1953), 259-272.

Jensen, Gale E. "Correspondance; Basic Questions for an Evaluation of the Eight Year Study." School and Society, LXIV (November 16, 1946) 348-350.

Johnson, Helmar G. "Here We Go Again." School and Society, LXXIV (July 21, 1951), 41-42.

_____. "Some Comments on the Eight Year Study." Progressive Education, XXVIII (March, 1951), 161-163.

_____. "Weaknesses in the Eight Year Study." School and Society, LXIII (June 15, 1946), 417-419.

Kohlberg, Lawrence, and Gilligan, Carol. "The Adolescent as a Philosopher: The Discovery of Self in a Post-Conventional World." Daedalus, C (Fall, 1971), 1051-1086

Lancelot, W. H. "The Eight-Year Study Still Awaits Fair Appraisal." LXII (November 3, 1945) 281-282.

_____. "A Close-UP of the Eight Year Study." School and Society, LVIII (December 11, 1943) 449-451.

Leigh, Robert D., "Twenty-Seven Senior High School Plans." Progressive Education, X (November, 1933) 373-380.

McConn, Max. "Freeing the Secondary School for Experimentation." Progressive Education, X (November, 1933) 368-72.

_____. "The Problem of Interest at the College Level." Progressive Education, VIII (December, 1931) 680-684.

Marin, Peter. "Children of the Apocalypse." Saturday Review, September 19, 1970, pp. 71-73, 89.

Mitchell, Theodroe C. "Loss of Efficiency in the Recitation." Educational Review. XLV (January, 1913), 10-28.

Progressive Education. Editorial, VII (June, 1930), 251-252.

Progressive Education. Editorial, VII (December, 1930), 412-413

Progressive Education. News and Comments, VIII (February, 1931), 158-163.

"Progressives' Progress". Time, October 31, 1938, 31-38.

Raths, Louis E. "The October Conference." Thirty Schools Bulletin, I (April, 1937), 24-29.

Redefer, Frederick L. "The Eight Year Study...After Eight Years", Progressive Education, XXVIII (November, 1950), 33-35.

_____. "Resolutions, Reactions, and Reminiscences." Progressive Education, XXVI (April, 1949), 187-191.

Ritchie, C. C. "Eight Year Study--Can We Afford to Ignore It?" Educational Leadership, SSVIII (February, 1971), 484-489.

Roberts, Wallace. "No Place to Grow." Saturday Review, March 21, 1970, pp. 62-64, 80.

Schrag, Peter. "Growing Up on Mechanic Street", Saturday Review March 21, 1970, pp. 59-61, 78-79.

Smith, Eugene Randolph. "The Eight Year Experimental Study of the Progressive Education Association." Harvard Teachers Record, VI (April, 1936), 63-74.

Thorndike, Edward L. "Education for Initiative and Originality", Teachers College Record, XVII (November, 1916) 405-416.

Tyler, R. W. "A Comment on Professor Lancelot's Criticism of the Eight Year Study." School and Society, LIX (June, 1944), p.396.

MANUSCRIPTS, REPORTS, AND YEARBOOKS

Brammell, Roy P., U. S. Deaprtment of Interior, Office of Educatio "Articulation of High School and College", Bulletin 17, Monograph 10, Washington D. C.: Government Printing Office, 1932.

Eight Year Study: A Report of the Ohio State University School by the Faculty of the School. n. p. Columbus, Ohio, 1940.

Korashan, Marc S. " The Educational Process: A New Look at Progressive Education." Unpublished B. A. thesis, Harvard College, March, 1972.

"Life Adjustment Education for Every Youth." U. S. Office of Education. Bulletin No. 22, Washington D. C.: Government Printing Office, 1951.

Newmann, Fred M., and Oliver, Donald W. Education and Community. Cambridge, Massachusetts: Harvard R and D Center on Educational Differences, 1966.

Redefer, Frederick L. "The Eight Year Study--Eight Years Later." Unpublished Ed. D. Thesis, Teachers College, Columbia University, 1952.

Thorndike, Edward L. "The Nature, Purposes and General Methods of Educational Products." Seventeenth Yearbook of the National Society for the Study of Education, Part II. Bloomington, Indiana: 1918.

VITA

1969	Intern, Planning Division--N. J. Department of Higher Education
1970	B. A.--Princeton University--Woodrow Wilson School of Public and International Affairs
1970	Phillips Andover Academy--Teaching Assistant and Dormitory Counselor
1970-	Harvard Graduate School of Education--Doctoral candidate in History of Education
1971	Brookline High School--Teacher, Course on Education
1971	Princeton University--Research staff member of the Committee on the Future of the College
1972	Needham High School--Teacher, Course on American Civilization
1972	Newton College of the Sacred Heart--Co-leader of teacher training seminar
1972-73	Harvard Graduate School of Education--Assistant to the Dean of Admissions