EDUCATIONAL LEADERSHIP IN A TIME OF CRISIS, 1932-1940

Thesis for the Degree of Ph. D.
MICHIGAN STATE UNIVERSITY
JAMES EDWARD MEULENDYKE
1970

This is to certify that the

thesis entitled

EDUCATIONAL LEADERSHIP
IN A TIME OF CRISIS
1932-1940

presented by

JAMES EDWARD MEULENDYKE

has been accepted towards fulfillment
of the requirements for

Ph.D. degree in Educational Administration

James E. Heald
Major professor

Date August, 11, 1970

O-169

ABSTRACT

EDUCATIONAL LEADERSHIP IN A TIME OF CRISIS,
1932-1940

By

James Edward Meulendyke

The purpose of this study is to trace the history of educational leadership from 1932-1940. This period of history presents an opportunity to study the impact on education of forces generated by an economic and social crisis. Educators need to know more about why they act and react as they do. They need to know which social forces act as catalysts upon them and what traditions in education cause them to take the positions which they do. Education is an important part of social history and is best understood in context.

There are two major theses to this study. One is that education and the schools remained a refuge for individualism, pragmatism, and middle-class dominance in spite of trends in the political and economic sphere away from laissez faire toward a more planned society. The other hypothesis is that much of what schools do in

the name of change is for expediency and is mechanistic rather than philosophical.

The ideas of American social, intellectual, and educational historians were reviewed to assess the relationship of society to the schools. The writings of education professors were surveyed in order to ascertain changes which were being advocated--both social and curricular. A study of the U.S. Office of Education and state departments of education was undertaken to determine how and to what degree their roles changed and what their impact was on local school districts. Board proceedings, journals, annual reports, curriculum offerings were studied to determine the real effect of all of these forces on local administrators and to find evidence of change or resistance.

It was concluded that:

1. There was a dichotemy between theory and practice. Sufficient administrative theory had not been developed to combat the pragmatism and provincialism of the local administrator.

2. Democracy and ideal citizenship were never defined. While democracy was accepted as a method, the liberal values of educators kept them from defining it as an end. The individual was placed above institutions, resulting in iconoclasm rather than a positive attitude toward society. An education emphasizing immediate needs

encouraged isolationism in both time and space and did not provide a universal perspective.

3. The change which did take place was merely a shift from economic to social and political individualism. There was no real difference between liberals and conservatives in education. Neither abandoned individual rights nor self-realization. However, this doctrine had lost its relevancy to a technical, interdependent, and shrinking world. The schools not only failed to purge society of its old values, but they indoctrinated a new generation into them. Inequalities within the school were justified by a respect for individual differences.

4. The Depression experience showed that if change were to occur it probably would come from the government or some other outside agency. Educational leaders failed to use the opportunity presented by the crisis to change education from an institution developed for an agrarian society to one which could exalt universal human values and the common good in a complex, technological society.

EDUCATIONAL LEADERSHIP IN A TIME OF CRISIS 1932-1940

By

James Edward Meulendyke

A THESIS

Submitted to
Michigan State University
in partial fulfillment of the requirements
for the degree of

DOCTOR OF PHILOSOPHY

Department of Administration and Higher Education

1970

ACKNOWLEDGMENTS

I wish to express my deep gratitude to the chairman of my committee, Dr. James Heald, for not only giving me encouragement during my entire doctoral program, but for the invaluable assistance he gave in the writing of the dissertation. I want to especially thank him for his continued consideration and concern after his departure from this university. I also am indebted to the other members of my committee, Dr. Justin Kestenbaum of the History Department and Dr. Keith Anderson and Dr. Sam Moore of the College of Education. I also wish to thank my professors in the Department of Administration and Higher Education--Dr. Heald, Dr. Moore, Dr. Stan Hecker, Dr. Don Leu, Dr. John Suehr, and Dr. Fred Vescolani.

I would like to acknowledge the consideration given to me by the East Lansing Public Schools allowing me to take the time to complete my doctoral program. I wish to especially thank my colleague Jerry Kusler for his thoughtfulness and understanding.

My greatest appreciation is for my wife, Nancy, who not only gave me considerable assistance with several phases of this paper, but also gave the inspiration and support needed to complete such a project.

TABLE OF CONTENTS

CHAPTER I

INTRODUCTION

The purpose of this paper will be to trace the history of educational leadership during the period of 1932-1940, to analyze the impact of social and economic crisis upon schools and educators, and to examine the impact of schools and school leaders on society. During the depression period, the school administrator was surrounded by forces generated by a growing educational hierarchy and by a distressed society. The educational establishment consisted not only of a greater number of teachers and students, but also of an increasing number of influential university-connected educational scholars and specialists, state and federal bureaucrats, and local school administrators. At the same time, communities, states, and the nation were facing an economic crisis, political conflict, and social change.

The 1930's like 1970 were years of crisis and conflict. The country was on the verge of complete economic collapse. There was poverty amidst plenty. Economic and social justice had not been achieved by all segments of society. The nation had gone through a decade of material prosperity which raised questions about values

in the American democracy and brought about a disillusionment with the social, economic, and political systems. Totalitarianism threatened the world. Extremists on both fringes of the political spectrum were being heard and followed. There was a growing polarization over the best way to attack the economic problems and how to cure the social ills. The spirit of change was in the air and educators, in attempted to reevaluate the role of the school, were suggesting many curricular changes.

Schools were criticized both by society in general and by the leaders of the profession. Many of the leading educational theorists questioned the basic and traditional economic and political systems. Their ideas for changing and improving the system revolved around collectivism and the curtailing of individualism and competition. They sought to institute economic planning along collectivist lines, bringing about greater social and economic equality, and educating for cooperation and interdependence. Even the more moderate social reconstructionists thought that schools should intervene actively in the community to purge it of outworn values and that the problems of the community should form the core of the curriculum. The loss of faith in business created a leadership vacuum which some thought that the schools could fill. A few educators even advocated

indoctrinating children after the Soviet model in order to bring about a new social order.

After the first phase of the crisis and the passage of some of the reforms of the New Deal, the social reconstructionists were able to join with curriculum reformers in supporting "education for democracy." By the late thirties these former radicals had become doctrinaire liberals working within the system. The emphasis was anti-authoritarian. Schools were to be freed from all pressure groups and power structures. There was to be a complete absence of indoctrination, and controversial subjects and opposing points of view were to be encouraged. Students were to be actively involved in the planning of lessons and teachers were to have a share in curricular and administrative decisions. Friendliness, cooperation, and tolerance would replace such values as material success and individual striving. There should be an admission and realization that different economic, racial, vocational, and religious groups existed and that these groups should be recognized for their contribution. Likewise, they were to be involved in all of society's institutions.

On the other hand, there remained in the profession and within the general society a tradition of rugged individualism, and faith in capitalism and the profit system. There was also an a priori faith in the individual public servant at the local level and a suspicion of plans

by teams of experts handed down from "on high." Many educators also believed that education and the schools existed to pass on the social heritage, and that it was not within their sphere to attempt to change society or to indoctrinate students with new social and economic ideas.

Another prevailing argument was that educational opportunities and the nature of educational experiences should be the same for all. While there was little disagreement concerning opposition to totalitarianism, ideas of conventional school discipline remained. There also remained the tradition that education should train minds and not merely meet the needs of the students. The teaching of subject matter still was advocated by many.

Educators need to know more about why they act and react as they do. They should realize what forces in society act as catalysts or motivators. They should be aware of the forces in American society and in the tradition of American education which cause educators to take the positions and champion the causes which they do. Much has been learned about educational leaders through the techniques of social science. There is also a fertile field for the study of educators through historical research. The Encyclopedia of Educational Research (1960 edition) states that only 5 per cent of the research in educational administration is historical. More is needed. A period in history can serve a s a laboratory in which to study

educational leadership. Educators made statements and advocated courses of action while boards of education, local administrators, and teachers carried out educational programs. This was all done within the context of certain economic, political and social conditions. All of this can be viewed with a perspective which a contemporary does not possess in viewing his own time. The historical researcher does not have to pretend the same kind of objectivity which the statistical researcher must. And yet, he may be even more surprised at what he finds. He can get inside a situation or period in a way that a contemporary can only through drama or literature.

Education in any period needs to be examined as a part of social history. This paper will attempt to answer such questions as did educators play a significant role in meeting the challenges of the period, or did the schools follow society's mandate? What kind of changes were educational leaders in the universities and in departments of education advocating, and what kind of influence did this have on local administrators? What was the relationship of American education to American political thought? What philosophy and goals of American education could be seen emerging?

There will be two major theses in this paper. One is that in spite of the feeling during the Depression by many political and intellectual leaders, including educators,

that Americans should accept the idea of a more planned, collective, and cooperative society; education and schools remained a refuge for individualism, pragmatism, and middle-class dominance. The other thesis is that much of what schools do in the name of change is for expediency and is mechanistic rather than philosophical. In spite of the crisis which briefly drew educators together to save the schools, educators had neither agreed upon goals and objectives for American education nor found a unity and cohesive sense of purpose.

The ideas of American social, intellectual, and educational historians will be reviewed in Chapter II with regard to the influence and development of education and the schools in the 1930's. The many differing points of view, interpretations, as well as the omissions of some of the social and intellectual historians will be placed in perspective. Some inferred relationships between educational developments on the one hand and social and political developments on the other will be considered.

The growth of the profession of education and educational administration in the education schools will be discussed in Chapter III. There will be brought together the varying points of view of the university professors who wrote and were active in the period. Their writings in various periodicals and organizational proceedings will be surveyed extensively, and some of the writings of the

more influential members of the profession will be examined in more depth. An attempt will be made to ascertain the extent to which social change was advocated as opposed to curricular changes or the restating of older ideas.

The changing leadership role of the federal and state educational agencies in improving or changing education in the thirties will be examined in Chapters IV and V. Publications of state departments of education and the U.S. Office of Education will be the primary references. Secondary sources will be consulted to help determine the influence of these governmental agencies.

Statements and action of local school administrators from as broad a spectrum as possible will be reviewed in Chapter VI. It will summarize many studies pertaining to their background and training. An extensive sampling of the writings of administrators in proceedings of their organizations and in various other education journals will be taken. Also to be reviewed are board proceedings, annual reports, and other data from several local school districts. In Chapter VII the curricula, methods, contents of courses, and in-service training will be examined for evidences of change and lack of change.

Chapter VIII will further summarize and interpret the research. Some conclusions will be stated and further research suggested.

CHAPTER II

THE SOCIAL AND INTELLECTUAL SETTING

The decade of the thirties was a time of domestic crisis and public soul-searching. For the first time in American history the national ideals of individualism, capitalism, and limited government were widely questioned. Political, social, and intellectual leaders were looking for new patterns and forms after which to model United States society. As economic and political reforms were sought, a hard look was also taken at education. For decades American educational institutions had been slighted by both American and foreign intellectuals. Now for the first time many hoped that domestic necessity would provide the social climate for general educational reforms which would bring a nineteenth-century agrarian institution more in line with the needs of an advanced industrial state. Social and intellectual history can help explain how and why American schools were lagging so far behind other American institutions, and whether during the social and economic crisis of the depression years, educators were able to seize leadership in establishing national goals.

Background

Most social and intellectual historians as well as other observers of American culture generally place the schools in a shirttail relationship to other aspects of American society. Education is regarded as a means of perpetuating the status quo instead of a catalyst for change. Many do not mention education in any more than a superficial way. Schools and what is taught in them are not presented as a spawning ground for political, social, or economic developments. General historians usually trace very briefly the evolution of the public school system before the Civil War and then comment cursorily in quantitative terms about the growth of the schools and the impact of industrialism upon them in the late nineteenth and early twentieth centuries. Social and intellectual historians, while devoting chapters to literature, law, and philosophy, barely skim over education. Even as the educational hierarchy mushroomed in the twenties and thirties, and writings by members of the profession became voluminous, historians seemed to deal with schools and education even less. Until ten years ago, the educational historians were virtually ignored by other intellectuals.

Merle Curti's The Social Ideas of American Educators is the standard historical reference on education. In it he related the ideas and accomplishments of American

educators to the social, economic, and political ideas of the times in which they lived. Curti believed that most educational spokesmen "aligned themselves with the established order and have asked for support from the dominant classes on the ground that they were protecting these classes from possible or even probably danger . . ."[1] He also stated that educators lagged behind in almost all reform movements; even liberal leaders like Horace Mann shied away from controversial issues.

The historian Bernard Bailyn advanced an interpretation to account for this subservience of American schools to society. His thesis was that in Europe education for the masses had taken place within the confines of the broad kinship community--that all of the necessary transmission of religious and cultural heritage, as well as the teaching of necessary skills, had occurred at the family level. It was only because that in the wilderness the extended family did not exist, that schools were needed to perform some of its functions. Therefore, schools were conceived of differently than in Europe. "The whole range of education had become instruments of deliberate social purpose."[2]

---

[1]Merle Curti, The Social Ideas of American Educators, With New Chapter on the Last Twenty-Five Years (Patterson, N.J.: Pageant Books, Inc., 1959), p. 583.

[2]Bernard Bailyn, Education in the Forming of American Society: Needs and Opportunities for Study (New York: Vintage Books, 1960), p. 22.

At the close of the nineteenth century, I. W. Howarth and his colleague John Dewey had viewed the schools in a similar manner. They, too, saw the schools as a substitute for disappearing institutions of society. They believed that previously rural, village, and small town societies had provided the socializing functions necessary in a democracy. With the growth of the impersonal urban society, schools were needed to usurp and preserve this socializing function.

This sensitivity to community pressure continued down to the present. Samuel Eliot Morison emphasized that education was to be "a training for citizenship and service in a civilized state, rather than as a vehicle for sectarian propaganda or 'caste' dominance."[3] Schools were to be in every sense public and middle-class.

Another unique development of the colonial period was a shift to forced taxation for the support of the schools after the old world practices of endowments, contributions, and land rents had failed. Bailyn pointed out that an economic basis for self-direction failed to develop, and therefore schools came under the "direct control, not of those responsible for instruction, but of those who had created and maintained the institutions."[4]

---

[3]Samuel Eliot Morison, The Intellecutal Life of Colonial New England (Ithaca, N.Y.: Great Seal Books, A Division of Cornell University Press, 1956), p. 67.

[4]Bailyn, Education in American Society, p. 44.

Other historians emphasized the utilitarian and anti-intellectual nature of American education. Richard Hofstadter saw the development of mass education as utilitarian rather than for the training of the mind. This is a perpetual reason for despair on the part of many educational reformers.[5] Popular attitudes are not conducive to the development of a profession which can overcome this.[6] Schools for intellectuals, therefore, never became integrated into the school system. Hofstadter used some of Curti's ideas to develop his thesis of anti-intellectualism. Many other intellectuals have observed the emphasis on quantity and utility rather than on excellence. Max Lerner brought attention to the anti-intellectualism of the American public along with its great reliance on and faith in "education."[7]

Foreign observers, while marveling at the comprehensiveness of the schools and the physical plants and sometimes even admiring the informal pedagogy, almost uniformly are critical of the lack of scholarly discipline. One of the most recent professional observers of American

---

[5]Richard Hofstadter, Anti-Intellectualism in American Life (New York: Alfred A. Knopf, 1964), p. 301.

[6]Ibid., p. 309.

[7]Max Lerner, America as a Civilization: Life and Thought in the United States Today (New York: Simon and Schuster, 1957), p. 733.

life, D. W. Brogan agreed with others that American education was more of an indoctrination into American life than training of the mind.[8] A visitor from England, William Orton, criticizing American schools said that the value of education should not be merely for life as it is currently lived. Education looses and democracy does not gain when mathematics is taught as only that computing necessary for life, or when spelling or grammar are ignored because they are not what the students actually use.[9]

Another never-ending theme about American education as well as about American society in general is individualism as opposed to collectivism. Rush Welter stated that individualism was advocated by early educational reformers, not only because of economic and political liberty, but also to maintain a spiritual freedom which would insure a sound morality.[10] Many of the historians of the Progressive school have pointed out that education, as an adjunct of big business, has promoted individualism. Charles A. Beard traced the origins of the very word back to a translation of Alexis de

---

[8]D. W. Brogan, The American Character (New York: A. A. Knopf, 1944), p. 135.

[9]William Orton, America in Search of Culture (Boston: Little, Brown and Company, 1933), p. 270.

[10]Rush Welter, Popular Education and Democratic Thought in America (New York: Columbia University Press, 1967), pp. 90-97.

Tocqueville who found it necessary to coin a word to describe this American idiosyncrasy. Social Darwinism reinforced individualism, according to Beard, and educational leaders promoted it.[11] The virtues of work and "getting ahead" were stressed in all of nineteenth- and early twentieth-century education. James Truslow Adams thought that education had given people neither values nor intellectual training, but had emphasized only individualism.[12] Some of the more recent historians go even further. They believe that progressive education gave more impetus to individualism than formalism had, not in the sense of competition, but in the unwillingness to accept external restraints.[13] This lack of restraint was even further supported by the American Protestant heritage--private interpretation of Scripture, and the Puritan ethic of moral righteousness.

Historians are not anti-education. They all admire the development of America's vast public education system which has striven toward making schooling an increasingly better and more meaningful kind of experience.

---

[11]Charles A. Beard and Mary R. Beard, The American Spirit: A Study in the Idea of Civilization in the U.S. (New York: The MacMillan Co., 1942), pp. 33-35.

[12]James Truslow Adams, The Epic of America (Boston: Little, Brown and Company, 1931), p. 322.

[13]Oscar Handlin, The Americans: A New History of the People of the United States (Boston: Little, Brown and Company, 1963), p. 360.

They are not even consistent in seeing schools as institutions where traditions and the status quo are preserved. Curti pointed out that there were systematic social thinkers among educational leaders.[14] Bailyn saw education as an agency of rapid social change because it responded to the immediate pressures of society.[15] Henry Steele Commager said: "Schools were not only an expression of American philosophy; they were the most effective agent in its formulation and dissemination.[16]

Intellectuals and the Schools

Turning now to the thirties, intellectuals, partly lured by foundation grants and also disturbed by the national disarray, enjoyed a brief flirtation with the schools. A group of historians who wrote for or served on the American Historical Association Commission on the Social Studies in the Schools took an active, though critical, interest in public education. This organization, endowed by the Carnegie Foundation, published several volumes concerning social studies and education all through the thirties. Philosophically and politically these historians hovered close to the liberal and radical group

---

[14]Curti, Social Ideas, p. 581.

[15]Bailyn, Education in American Society, p. 48.

[16]Henry Steele Commager, The American Mind: An Interpretation of American Thought and Character Since the 1880's (New Haven: Yale University Press, 1950), p. 38.

of educators at Teachers College. However, they did not view education as optimistically nor as the same panacea that the educators did.

The Social Ideas of American Educators was a part of this series. Writing in 1935, which Curti called the late stage of the depression, he observed that outside of the ranks of the radicals, educators were confused. At first they were shocked and nonplussed that business had let them down, but then resumed, as they had one hundred years earlier, in seeking business support by selling middle-class America on the idea that the best way to prevent revolution and to produce a mass of high-grade consumers was through public education.[17]

Howard K. Beale wrote two books for the series. In these volumes Beale traced the various political and social pressures brought to bear on teachers and what they taught. He saw administrators as an inhibiting force in the freeing of teachers because of their primary devotion to efficiency--a non-educational goal. He characterized them as psychologically oriented to the carrying out of mandates from above, and thus they also wanted tractable teachers.[18] He was of the opinion that even though during

---

[17]Curti, Social Ideas, p. 576-77.

[18]Howard K. Beale, Are American Teachers Free?: An Analysis of Restraints Upon the Freedom of Teaching in American Schools, Report of the Committee on Social Studies of the American Historical Association, Part XII (New York: Charles Scribners Sons, 1936), pp. 744, 686, 475, 489.

the depression more criticism from teachers was tolerated, there was a greater imposition of the administrative will than ever before.[19] "As the technique and personnel of administration developed, its control over the teacher became greater." There was a "growing slavery to pedagogical theory, too great a faith in the power of the 'scientific' method. . ."[20]

Charles A. Beard, one of the seminal thinkers of the twentieth century, was also a leading member of the Commission and generally is regarded as being responsible for the Conclusions and Recommendations of the Commission. Published in 1934, Conclusions, not unanimously endorsed by the Commission members, reflected both Beard and the educational radicals. A scathing attack was unleashed on individualism. Society was seen as marching toward an interdependent collectivism. The implication of this for educators would be to get the current generation to recognize "that the old order is passing, that the new order is emerging and that knowledge of realities and capacity to cooperate are indispensable to the development of American

---

[19]Howard K. Beale, A History of Freedom of Teaching in American Schools, Report of the Commission on the Social Studies of the American Historical Association, Part XVI (New York: Charles Scribners Sons, 1941), xi.

[20]Ibid., p. 170.

society."[21] At the same time, Beard and his colleagues did not have a high regard for educational administrators; underneath they were nostalgic for old-time leaders who had been learned men. The demise of social philosophers and statesmen in the ranks of educational administrators was lamented. To upgrade educational administration and to develop leadership, they urged that social science, social philosophy, and statecraft replace or supplement mere technical skills in graduate training.[22]

All during the thirties, even after other historians lost interest, Beard continued to be one of the few academicians who rose above the apathy toward the schools. Perhaps it was because he was not connected with any university. As to educational purpose and method, Beard was more of an essentialist believing that the primary function of education is the training of the mind and the dissemination of knowledge and that schools do and should follow the dictates of society.

As the thirties came to a close and World War II and the forties began, the breech widened again between historians and the educational establishment. While Beard emphasized his ideas on education in his 1939 book

---

[21] American Historical Association Commission on the Social Studies, Conclusions and Recommendations of the Commission (New York: Charles Scribners Sons, 1934), p. 35.

[22] Ibid., pp. 141-43.

America in Mid-passage,[23] by 1942 when he wrote The American Spirit, a history of American thought, he had little to say about education. Curti's range in The Growth of American Thought, published in 1943, is so broad that he is able to do little more than briefly mention the ideas of his old associate George Counts. In the 1959 edition of The Social Ideas of American Educators, he suggested that to follow social ideas of educational leaders from the late thirties on was difficult because: "The whole school business became so big and complex, and professional training so narrow that the educator approach was more and more restricted."[24]

The breech between educators and other intellectuals was never greater than in the thirties. One searches in vain in historical journals of the thirties and forties for articles or reviews pertaining to the history of education. "Professionalization" of subject matter was advocated by many in the schools of education. Educators had come to believe that academic English, or mathematics, or philosophy were not relevant to the needs of future teachers, so the schools of education began to teach subject matter in a more applicable fashion. The history of education was written by education specialist. This elicited

---

[23]Charles A. Beard and Mary R. Beard, America in Midpassage (New York: The MacMillan Company, 1939), p. 903.

[24]Curti, Social Ideas, p. xxv.

acrimonious criticism from the liberal arts faculty. Leaders of the "professionalization" movement retorted that it was this critical spirit among the academicians against teachers colleges and education professors which stimulated education faculties to teach more and more subjects by more sympathetic personnel.[25] While Bailyn correctly assessed the purposes of these histories which were read in normal school classes as a means to "dignify a newly self-conscious profession,"[26] he also pointed out that this left the educational historical field "in almost total isolation from major influences shaping the minds of twentieth century historiography."[27] Cremin pointed out the almost total insulation of the entire Teachers College from the rest of Columbia University during the thirties.[28] Hofstadter concluded: "Professional educators were left to develop their ideas without being subjected to the intellectual discipline which might have come out of a dialogue with university scholars."[29] Historians with

---

[25]Bailyn, Education in American Society, p. 7.

[26]O. K. Latham, "The Teachers College Versus the Liberal Arts College in the Education of Teachers," National Education Association, Proceedings, Vol. LXXIV (Washington, D.C.: National Education Association, 1936), 141.

[27]Ibid., p. 9.

[28]Lawrence Cremin, The Transformation of the Schools: Progressivism in American Education, 1976-1957 (New York: Alfred A. Knopf, 1961), p. 176.

[29]Hofstadter, Anti-Intellectualism, p. 338.

such views were not apt to include schools or educational leaders as catalysts in the development of ideas and institutions. This chasm has begun to be closed within the past ten years with a greater acceptance of the scholarship of educators, and the renewed interest (aided by grants) of liberal arts professors in elementary and secondary education. It also should be pointed out that the present-day professors of educational history have met the charges of the academic historians head on. They have pointed out the lack of expertise of the general and intellectual historians, their reliance on histories by educationists, and have deprecated their poor scholarship.[30] However, even in the post-Sputnik era, historians tend to be more obsessed with the critics of education than with education in any positive sense.

Social and Political Forces

Although education seemed to develop at least in partial isolation from other intellectual forces, it could not escape the political and economic forces of the times. The Depression affected education as it did other industries. Educational leaders faced economic crises, read

[30]William Brickman, "Revisionism and the Study of the History of Education," History of Education Quarterly, IV (December, 1964), 209-223; William Brickman, "Conant, Koerner, and the History of Education," School and Society, XCII (March 21, 1969), 135-39; H. Graham Lewis, "Bailyn and Cremin on Cubberley and the History of Education," Educational Theory, XVII (June, 1967), 56-59.

newspapers and magazines, voted, and went to church. The political and social backgrounds of educational leaders will be taken up in a later chapter. The historian's interpretations of the social forces operating in this period can be briefly stated here.

Political Progressivism, which gave impetus to progressive education, was dying. Even in 1930, Vernon Parrington saw liberals as mourners at their own funerals--liberalism had died in the cynicism of the twenties.[31] The old liberalism of the Progressives with its logical, principled, moralistic kinds of reforms was fading and was being replaced by a more realistic, organizational, trial and error approach to the improvement of society.[32] Revisionist and New Left historians alike have viewed Progressives as conservatives and Progressivism as a conservative force. Hofstadter portrayed the Progressives as a conservative, professional, and small business class which was opposing the monopoly of big business.[33] Christopher Lasch protested against both the Progressives and New Deal liberals for being allies of the corporate-industrial system. He castigated them for becoming more

[31]Vernon Louis Parrington, Main Currents in American Thought, Vol. III: The Beginnings of Critical Realism in America, 1860-1920 (New York: Harcourt Brace and Company, 1930), pp. 401, 412.

[32]Richard Hofstadter, The Age of Reform (New York: Alfred A. Knopf, 1966), pp. 318-19.

[33]Ibid., chap. iv.

and more conformist themselves with their unions, professional organizations, and acceptance of token reforms.[34] The Progressives also are regarded as mere dissenters who did not visualize how democracy could be made the source of creative social change.[35] The political Progressives who carried on in the thirties also were seen as a conservative force. They were essentially individualists and had no heart for the New Deal. They were as against collectivism and big government as they had been against monopoly. They were against the New Deal policy of catering to groups or classes. They preferred majority rule to pressure group politics.[36]

The New Deal itself was portrayed as a period of change only in its bold trial and error attempts to "do something" through the force of government action. Although many radical reforms were advocated in the thirties by the Marxist and Socialists on the left and by the

---

[34]Christopher Lasch, The Agony of the American Left (New York: Alfred A. Knopf, 1969), pp. 10-17.

[35]John Chamberlain, Farwell to Reform: The Rise, Life and Decay of the Progressive Mind in America (Chicago: Quadrangle Books, 1965), p. 203; Charles Forcy, The Crossroads of Liberalism: Croly, Weyl, Lippman and the Progressive Era (New York: Oxford University Press, 1961), p. 315.

[36]Otis L. Graham, An Encore for Reform: The Old Progressives and the New Deal (New York: Oxford University Press, 1967), p. ii; Russel B. Nye, Midwestern Progressive Politics: A Historical Study of Its Origins and Development, 1870-1958 (East Lansing, Mich.: Michigan State University Press, 1959), p. 373.

"share the wealth" demogogues on the right, the New Deal was considered by many as only another way to preserve the old values of capitalism and individualism.[37] The old liberalism and earlier philosophic Pragmatism seemed naive and out of touch with reality at a time when the demand was for more goals, objectives, and planning than these could offer. The new realism was reflected in literature, art, and religion. Writers, typified by Steinbeck and Farrell and by a changed Sinclair Lewis and John Dos Passos, were more socially conscious. Experimentalists in art gave way to the social consciousness of such regionalist painters as Grand Wood, Charles Burchfield, and John Steuart Curry. Other literature and art were purely escapist, while the press, radio, and motion pictures tended to be conservative and less socially conscious.[38]

Protestant churches in the thirties also were essentially conservative. They turned from the liberalism of the social gospel to the neo-orthodoxy of Reinhold Niebuhr. Although, like Niebuhr, many church conferences and newspapers embraced socialism and denounced capitalism to express their social concern, their theology was based

---

[37]Ralph H. Gabriel, The Course of American Democratic Thought (New York: The Ronald Press Company, 1940),

[38]Harvey Wish, Society and Thought in Modern America: A Social and Intellectual History of the American People from 1965 (New York: Longmans, Green and Co., 1952), p. 523.

on individual man united in his needs and weaknesses. Therefore, the politics of the grass-roots membership remained relatively stable.[39] The same Methodist Conference which in 1932 adopted a socialistic report went 86 per cent for Hoover. The kind of socialist resolutions pushed through at a conference were not likely to be preached from the pulpit. The conservative Baptists were voting for the New Deal, and the more liberal, middle-class Presbyterians and Methodists were supporting the Republicans.[40]

Several contemporary educational historians have examined education in the Depression years and have reinterpreted it with the advantage of being thirty years removed. Many of the same patterns are observed in education as in other aspects of society. On the one hand, education and its leaders were a force to preserve and perpetuate the political and economic heritage. On the other hand, educators felt the same social consciousness being expressed by socially sensitive members of society during this time of crisis. Educational organizations and educational leaders expressed their hopes that

---

[39]Donald B. Meyer, The Protestant Search for Political Realism, 1919-1941 (Berkley, Calif.: University of California Press, 1960), chap. xvii.

[40]Robert Moats Miller, American Protestantism and Social Issues, 1919-1939 (Chapel Hill, N.C.: University of North Carolina Press, 1958), pp. 114-15.

education could bring about a better society. Their vision of a better society, however, was conditioned by the American tradition of individual competition within a framework of equalitarianism. In a time of rapid political and economic change, Americans looked to the schools as a conservator of traditional values.

Most contemporary historians do see progressive education, which began in the pre-World War I era, as a force which made education vital to the perpetuation of American values, and they equate it with the Progressive movement in politics. In the most often quoted of recent educational histories, Lawrence Cremin called progressive education "American Progressivism writ large."[41] Thus, Cremin equated progressive education with a moral crusade in the same sense that political reform, the women's rights movement, and the social gospel. Cremin is supported by other historians who cite the pre-World War I period as a period in which educators dared to experiment and institute radical changes in the schools with no fear that such revolutionary innovations would unleash social forces they later would not be able to control.[42] An example of the close parallel between political Progressivism and

---

[41]Cremin, The Transformation of the School, p. viii.

[42]Welter, Popular Education, pp. 262-63.

progressive education was the advocacy of participant democracy in the political realm and a greater amount of pupil participation and activity in the educational sphere.[43]

Cremin ignored the decline and change of the political Progressives in the thirties and had progressive education rolling merrily along until the fifties. Others saw progressive education changing or dying in the twenties and thirties just as Progressivism was doing politically. One educational historian, Henry J. Perkinson, pointed out that the Progressive Education Association in the twenties ignored the union which had been formed with the political Progressives and that, therefore, the schools in the twenties and thirties had less of a political function and were concerned less with social reform. Progressive education became merely a pedagogic attitude.[44] This observation was supported by other historians of the progressive education movement.[45] Perkinson also saw the New Deal as breaking with the reformist tradition by

---

[43]Henry J. Perkinson, The Imperfect Panacea: American Faith in Education, 1865-1965 (New York: Random House, 1968), p. 194.

[44]Ibid., p. 199.

[45]Patricia Graham, Progressive Education: From Arcady to Academe: A History of the Progressive Education Association, 1919-1955 (New York: Teachers College Press, Teachers College, Columbia University, 1967), p. 75.

changing the role of government. The old idea of a liberal government was to prevent tyranny. With the onset of the New Deal, the government became protector; hence, people, rather than being political participants, were merely passive objects of governmental paternalism. Education followed suit and became an agency of the state to be used in rewarding middle-class conformers and ostrasizing radicals.[46] Progressive education became, like religion, more moderate and introspective. Cremin saw even the radicals' efforts as an attempt to preserve the American way of life.[47]

Another educational historian C. A. Bowers also disagreed with Cremin and did not see how progressivism could have lasted fifteen years longer in the schools than in politics. The Progressives, he said, became conservative, remaining "wedded to an eternal world order in which progress was equated with moral perfection."[48] And in the meantime, as he saw it, the progressive educators became radical by advocating that the schools be used to indoctrinate for something which sounded like Marxism.

---

[46]Perkinson, The Imperfect Panacea, p. 220.

[47]Cremin, The Transformation of the School, pp. 233-34.

[48]C. A. Bowers, "Ideologies of Progressive Education," History of Education Quarterly, VII (Winter, 1967), 452, 455. See also his book, The Progressive Educator and the Depression: The Radical Years (New York: Random House, 1969).

The political Progressives were men who had been propelled by moral causes--individual liberty, justice, and freedom from control by a plutocracy. They were protestors during a reasonably stable period who thought in terms of ideals rather than practices. The New Deal was all practice. It was too busy trying to find out what worked to worry about principles.

Education leaders during the thirties likewise were more concerned with keeping the schools running than coping with pupils of a socio-economic class which had never stayed in school before. They continued to be concerned with administrative structure and methods and not with reforming education or altering it as a social force. The educational bureaucracies which continued to expand at all levels, tended to further isolate education from society just as the huge governmental complex developing during the New Deal left people further removed from the political forces affecting them.

The Depression and the New Deal were not solely responsible for this development. There was much tradition and precedent in American education for it. Even though nineteenth-century education was regarded as partially utilitarian, the twentieth century brought an even further shift in education from a moral philosophy based on reason to a materialistic way of life. Emphases shifted to methodology and vocational education. It has been

pointed out that the influence of Thorndike and his pronouncements on individualism and individual differences--on how children learn rather than on what they learn--has been greater than that of Dewey.[49] The nineteen thirties saw an even greater emphasis on the learner himself than on what he should learn. Even the P.E.A. members saw curriculum reform as more important than social reform.[50] Others arguedthat Dewey's ideas were beginning to filter through to educators by the thirties and the important thing was that he perceived progressive education as an intellectual reform--the reconstruction of experience--and not as a social reform.[51]

Rush Welter concluded that American child-centered education does not relate directly to making a political democracy more effective. He pointed out that the political Progressives were trying to preserve economic individualism and competition, but that economic competition cannot be effective in modern society with its oligarchic combinations of capital and labor. He recognized, however, that "although the American people commonly accept the economic

---

[49]William E. Drake, "Philosophy of Education and the American Culture," Educational Theory, XVIII (Fall, 1968), 365-75.

[50]Graham, Progressive Education, p. 75.

[51]Robert M. Weiss, "Review of The Transformation of the School: Progressivism in American Education by Lawrence Cremin" in History of Education Quarterly, II (June, 1962), 131.

revolution of the twentieth century, they continue to press for formal education as if it would serve their traditional liberal values. . . . They have grown skeptical of purely economic competition for success only to substitute educational competition for the rewards that economic competition used to promise."[52] The idea of egalitarian education is used to disguise a hierarchically divided and stratified social order.[53]

Summary

In summary, formal education in the thirties branched off from the mainstream of society and from social and intellectual thought. Although there was a fleeting involvement with education by some historians in this decade, the chasm between educators and other intellectuals was never so great. Even the more recent educational historians have a difficult time relating education to other social forces. Most social and political historians write superficially about education or ignore it when writing about this period.

Much of twentieth century education had its roots in the Progressive era, but, as with the political movement, by the thirties its relevance to society was more

---

[52]Welter, Popular Education, p. 328.

[53]Ibid., p. 329.

difficult to see. As with the older liberalism of the Progressive Era, it became more difficult to discern its goals. Like religion and the arts it outwardly professed a social concern, but apart from its few extremists, was inwardly cautious, reluctant to look for new structures and new ideas.

Another factor in the growing separateness of education was the growth of the educational hierarchy. The bigness and top-heaviness seemed insurmountable to intellectuals outside of the profession. As in other areas, this corporateness made it difficult to find the essences of the ideas and trends in education. As with government and business, educators were anxious through trial and error to find what worked, and they tended to move from one new method and cliche to another. The emphasis was on justifications rather than goals.

The general tendency in education to emphasize the practical and the utilitarian was underscored in the thirties. Schooling moved even further away from content toward education for citizenship. Equalitarianism was tempered by the idea of meeting individual needs. Although many pieties concerning the relationship of education to democracy were professed, there was a continued emphasis on methodology.

The most consistent observation of the historians probing into education was that the schools continued to

mirror society, reacting to what was expected of them by community leaders. Like the theology professors, the educators at the universities could preach about new social orders from their ivory towers, but the decisions of the school administrators were more complex and closer to reality, and influenced by the liberalism which had formed them and the nation.

Later chapters will deal more specifically with the ideas of these education professors and the ideas and actions of school administrators. The educational histories have not covered school administrators per se to any great extent. One of them which did, concluded that administrators had to show themselves to be conventional and practical minded. Because the ordinary American wanted to "focus attention on the machinery and forms rather than on the spirit and intrinsic substance of education, the majority of their school administrators seemed to share that outlook."[54]

---

[54]Willis Rudy, Schools in an Age of Mass Culture: An Exploration of Selected Themes in the History of Twentieth-Century American Education (Englewood Cliffs, N. J.: Prentice-Hall Inc., 1965), p. 80.

CHAPTER III

TURMOIL ON THE CAMPUS

Growth and Professionalization

The 1920's and 1930's saw a great increase in the shift of educational leadership from public school administrators to university professors of education. Where charismatic educators of the past, such as William T. Harris, spent most of their lives as school administrators, by the thirties men such as Jesse Newlon, who began their careers as administrators, spent most of their productive lives at universities. As time went on, having been a successful public school educator was no longer a requisite to a career as a professor of education at a university.

The growth of the "educational establishment" and the great mass of educational literature which appeared during the period did not make education a more important force. Much of the energy of educators went into making education more of a profession. The certification of teachers was delegated in large part to colleges and universities. A technical language was developed and a

great number of trade secrets were exhanged in a growing number of educational journals.

The diffusion of the power and authority, and the growing specialization resulted in a great many experts who had difficulty in agreeing on goals either for society or for education. Many retreated into method and curriculum as means became the only ends which the profession could agree upon. Much of the rhetoric of those who espoused the use of education for social change was long on principles and short on practical suggestions. Like many of the older political Progressives, many of the progressive educators could not understand or cope with the New Deal trial and error type of social planning.

The professionalization of public school education also intensified the cleavage between the educationists and academicians. As far as non-educationist intellectuals were concerned the pattern for American education had been set, and the great prophets of American education belonged to a formative period of the past. They did not want to sift through the writings of the educational experts at the universities, state and national bureaus, and local school districts.

At the same time, the public continued to view the schools as the agencies which would reinforce the middle-class American ideologies and folkways which they held and

wanted to pass on to their children. The teaching profession accepted this and probably believed the same thing.[1]

Although giving them a platform on which to speak, the removal of some of the educational leaders to the universities took them away from not only the responsibilities but from the source of power which was still residing at the local level.

The proliferation of teachers and researchers in education occurred because more and more teachers, administrators, and potential administrators were seeking their wares. The progressive period before World War I had focused attention on the schools and the importance of the education of youth as well as children. More comprehensive compulsory attendance laws and teacher and administrative certification requirements were considered "progressive" measures. Most state normal schools had, by the 1930's, become four year colleges. Some of them offered advanced degrees. Education departments at universities grew by leaps and bounds. Local districts differentiated salaries partially on the educational level of the teachers.

Preparation for public school teaching became not only a specialized discipline in the first three decades of the twentieth century, but became the fastest growing

---

[1]John L. Child, "Whither Progressive Education?," Progressive Education, XIII (December, 1936), 585-86.

of the so-called professions. More significant than the steady growth of enrollments in teacher preparation was the number of advanced degrees in education in general and in administration and supervision in particular. While most statistical reports indicated that the number of men and women entering teacher preparation declined slightly in the depths of the Depression, in the period 1932-34 the number of advanced degrees in education increased considerably. The number of masters' degrees increased from 5,310 with 1,350 institutions reporting in 1931-32 to 5,370 with only 562 institutions reporting in 1933-34. In 1931-32, 1,380 institutions granted 172 Ph.D. degrees. In 1933-34, 167 doctorates were earned in just 567 institutions. Based on the number of institutions reporting, this would amount to a substantial increase. These figures jumped to 7,225 and 271 respectively with 585 institutions reporting in 1937-38. The number of graduates in administration increased from 1,033 (1,460 reporting) in 1930-32 to 1,128 (only 376 reporting) in 1932-34. This number jumped to 1,577 for the period 1936-38 (431 reporting).[2] Statistics from individual schools bear this out. At the University

---

[2]U.S. Office of Education, Biennial Survey of Education 1930-32, Bulletin, 1933, No. 2 (Washington, D.C.: Government Printing Office, 1935), 80-100; Biennial Survey of Education 1932-34, Bulletin, 1935, No. 2 (Washington, D.C.: Government Printing Office, 1937), 76-88; Biennial Survey of Education 1936-38, Bulletin, 1940, No. 2 (Washington, D.C.: Government Printing Office, 1942), 92-106.

of Michigan, while the number of bachelors' degrees declined, the number of masters' degrees increased.[3] The number of courses in administration for graduate students in twelve institutions climbed from 74 in 1926-27 to 177 in 1930-31. Classes in supervision also increased significantly in the same period.[4] At the University of Michigan the number of graduate courses in administration increased from 26 in 1928-29 to 38 in 1937-38.[5]

The total number of students enrolled in colleges of education in universities and in four-year teachers colleges also increased significantly during the decade of the 1930's. For example, at Teachers College, Columbia University, the enrollment increased from 4,625 in 1929 to 7,983 in 1939.[6] The staffs of these institutions not only

---

[3]Cameron W. Meredith, "An Account of Changes in the School of Education at the University of Michigan During the Period 1921-49," (Unpublished Ph.D. dissertation, University of Michigan, 1950), p. 47. (Microfilm)

[4]Earle Rugg, et al., Teacher Education Curricula in Seven Parts, Vol. III of National Survey of the Education of Teachers, Bulletin, 1933, No. 10 (6 Vols.: Washington, D.C.: Government Printing Office, 1935), 447.

[5]University of Michigan, School of Education General Announcement 1937-38 and 1938-39, Part X of the General Register, (Ann Arbor: University of Michigan, 1937), pp. 98-104; School of Education General Announcement 1928-29, Part X of the General Register (Ann Arbor: University of Michigan, 1928), p. 65.

[6]John Henry MacCracken, ed., American Universities and Colleges (2nd ed.; Baltimore: The Williams and Wilkins Company, 1930), p. 401; Clarence Stephen Marsh, ed., American Universities and Colleges, (4th ed.; Washington, D.C.: American Council on Education, 1940), p. 320.

grew in number, but their educational level was also higher. They were less likely to be trainers in a laboratory school and more likely to teach and write about theories of instruction and of education.

Administrative Training

Two major themes in educational writing concerned what should constitute the best education and training for educational leadership. One was that education should be considered a profession just as medicine was and that professional status could be achieved only through specialized training in a separate college of a university. The other often-stated idea, which seems somewhat dichotemous, was that future educational leaders should have a broader education with an emphasis on the social sciences.

The Department of Superintendence Yearbook of 1933, Educational Leadership, contains the following statement which indicated the emphasis which the profession had placed on its growing specialization:

> From its humble beginnings of thirty and forty years ago, the subject-matter for the training of educational school administration has grown to such proportions as to require the equivalent of three full academic years of graduate study on the part of a student who desires to prepare adequately for the entire field. Educational leadership has now become definitely dependent on specific training.[7]

---

[7]Department of Superintendence of the National Education Association, Educational Leadership: Progress and Possibilities, Eleventh Yearbook (Washington, D.C.: The Department of Superintendence, 1933), p. 271.

Some authors in the same volume praised the trend toward the concentration of educational leadership in institutions and its attendant specialization of function which marked the coming of the expert.[8] Other authors thought that, like other professions, the emphasis should be placed on laboratory or field work.[9] State certification for administrators was pushed by training institutions. Because of the emphasis on professional training, those who majored in subject-matter rather than education, even as undergraduates, felt the need to apologize.[10] By the mid-thirties a vast majority of superintendents had advanced degrees and over 80 per cent of these had majored in education.[11] By 1937 no potential educational leader was majoring in anything else.[12]

Even those who were beginning to advocate a broader education for educational leaders stressed that educational administration must be a profession unto itself and not dependent on other disciplines. Educators

---

[8] Ibid., p. 37.

[9] Ibid., pp. 296-97.

[10] Clarence Carl Moore, "The Educational Administrator and His Opportunities," Educational Administration and Supervision, XXIII (November, 1937), 623.

[11] Ibid., p. 624.

[12] Frederick Elmer Bolton, Thomas Raymond Cole, and John Hunnicut Jessup, The Beginning Superintendent (New York: The MacMillan Company, 1937), p. 23.

who criticized school administrators for their emphasis on business efficiency insisted that the principles of educational administration were quite different from the authority-based, managerial traditions of industry and the military. Science alone should be used to determine educational aims and methods.[13] And while future administrators were encouraged to take more social sciences, there was much argument for the "professionalization of subject matter" for the administrator as well as for the teacher. Therefore, in some schools cognate courses were taken within the professional school. Such courses as educational sociology, educational psychology, educational philosophy, educational history were offered to supplement the more practical courses.

While this great crusade was going on to make education an applied science and its study a professional course apart from the liberal arts, there also was a great deal of self-criticism about the narrowness of education received by educational leaders with its over-emphasis on methods and techniques. The criticism within the

---

[13]Ernest O. Melby, "Building a Philosophy of Leadership," School Executive, LVI (September, 1936), 17-18; Arthur B. Moehlman, School Administration: Its Development, Principles and Future in the United States (Boston: Houghton Mifflin Company, 1940; Cambridge, Mass.: The Riverside Press, 1940), p. 249; Obed Jolmar Williamson, Provisions for General Courses in the Professional Education of Teachers (New York: Bureau of Publications, Teachers College, Columbia University, 1936), p. 86.

profession was so extensive that if one did not examine courses of study he would be brought to think that there was an exclusion of all but technical courses. One author writing about a survey of the professional education of secondary school principals found that most of the courses taken and recommended were technical in nature and all within education. The principals themselves rated courses such as administration and supervision high and philosophy and history low in usefulness.[14] In reality, most programs included some electives in the liberal arts areas, mostly recommended in the social sciences. The professional courses remained largely technical with the social concern of the period beginning to be reflected in some of the new courses. In examining the University of Michigan offerings for the years 1937-38, one finds that most of the 38 courses listed for the seven sequences in administration were of the technical variety, and included much duplication. These included such courses as Child Accounting, Public School Finance, Principles of Educational Administration. There was a Seminar in Secondary School Supervision, Seminar in the Secondary School Curriculum, and Seminar in Secondary School Administration, as well as other courses in these three areas. However, while in 1928-29 the only

---

[14]Arvid J. Burke, "Professional Courses for Secondary School Principals," Educational Administration and Supervision, XX (October, 1934), 508-511.

non-technical course was one in curriculum, in 1937-38 there appeared such courses as Reading in Current Problems and Social Interpretation.[15] In addition, a student took only sixteen of the twenty-four credits in the School of Education with an additional six in lieu of a thesis.[16] Likewise, at Columbia Teachers College, most of the courses were "Principles of . . ." or "Essentials of . . . ," but there were a few courses such as "Social Aspects of School Administration."[17]

There was also criticism about the selection of graduate students in education and the lack of selectivity. It seemed that in most schools students were accepted on the basis of a baccelaureate degree only. Candidates for doctoral programs were screened more thoroughly, being admitted on about the same basis as graduates in other fields of study. In many schools the graduate program at the doctoral level was not yet under the control of the schools of education.

The recommended courses of study at the doctoral level included courses outside of the field of

---

[15]University of Michigan, School of Education Announcement, 1928-29, pp. 69-75.

[16]University of Michigan, School of Education Announcement, 1937-38 and 1938-39, p. 85.

[17]Teachers College Bulletin, Announcement of Teachers College 1935-36 (New York: Teachers College, Columbia University, 1935), pp. 115-130.

specialization ranging from a whole year of liberal graduate study at Harvard to six courses outside of the field of specialization, but within the school of education at Columbia.[18] Graduate students at the doctoral level at Michigan were required to take sixty semester hours, two-thirds of them in education and twenty of them in a field of specialization.[19]

There was some soul-searching about the proliferation of degrees and the quality of graduate education. University professors did not view graduate programs in teachers colleges as being truly graduate level programs. They too often contained what were really undergraduate courses or courses which were simply "rule-of-thumb" advice.[20] Others worried that too often the graduate degree was attained merely because of state requirements and salary differentiation and not to become more professional. This was reflected in the sometimes inferior

---

[18]Timothy O'Leary, An Inquiry Into the General Purpose, Functions and Organizations of Selected University Schools of Education With Special Reference to Certain Aspects of Their Growth and Development (Washington, D.C.: Catholic University of America Press, 1941), pp. 89, 164.

[19]University of Michigan, School of Education Announcement, 1937-38 and 1938-39, p. 91.

[20]National Society for the Study of Education, Graduate Study in Education, Fiftieth Yearbook, Part I (Chicago: University of Chicago Press, 1951), 10-21; W. A. Stumpf, "Graduate Work in State Teachers Colleges," School and Society, XLVI (December 25, 1937), 834-838.

graduate programs themselves. The colleges and universities were accused of offering graduate programs only to compete for numbers of students.[21]

A large part of the energies of the educational establishment at colleges and universities was thus being put toward developing a profession. One objective was to elevate teaching from something anyone could do to a vocation that only a specially trained person could perform. The training of these teachers also was to become a specialized function which could not be left to traditional college professors.

Another objective was to establish educational administration as a profession within a profession. This profession was to wrest control of the schools from laymen and then share the power with the teachers. This could be done by "educating" the lay boards of education. There were also suggestions in the 1930's that lay boards could be done away with entirely or their composition changed to include members of the profession.[22] This is

---

[21]Stumpf, "Graduate Work," p. 834; Edgar W. Knight, "Getting Ahead by Degrees," School and Society, LIII (April 26, 1941), 527; James E. Wert, "The Function of Graduate Education in a Teachers College," Educational Research Bulletin, XVII (February 10, 1938), 29-35.

[22]Jesse Newlon, "The Importance of a Point of View in Educational Administration," National Education Association, Proceedings, LXXV (Washington, D.C.: National Education Association, 1937), 498-501; William Heard Kilpatrick, ed., The Educational Frontier (New York: Century, 1933), p. 255.

in line with the idea of social planning prevelant in the 1930's; and who but the professionals should do the planning?

Educators as Social Engineers

It was in the 1930's that members of the profession began to call themselves and think of themselves as social engineers. According to some writers, educators had been caught up in the "cult of efficiency" prevelant in industry and government in the post-World War I era.[23] The profession, especially those members in the universities, worked hard at changing its image and disassociating itself from business and business administrative practices. That this objective absorbed much of their time and attention is evidenced by the tremendous amount of self-criticism and the search for an identity as seen in the writings of these professors. In the summary of a survey on the education of school administrators, one author felt compelled to state that in no other professional program was there as much confusion.[24] The call was for common aims and a common philosophy. It also was for a

---

[23]See Raymond Callahan, The Cult of Efficiency; A Study of the Social Forces That Have Shaped the Administration of the Public Schools (Chicago: University of Chicago Press, 1962).

[24]John Lund, Education of School Administrators, U.S. Office of Education, Bulletin, 1941, No. 6 (Washington, D.C.: Government Printing Office, 1942), p. 77.

unique body of knowledge and a technical vocabulary. In the training of school administrators, a need was expressed for clarification, sequence, and differentiation in the professional courses.

In this time of cirsis, educators as social engineers were to use education administration to change or to have some kind of impact on society. There was not agreement on what kind of society should result, how education could bring about change, or even whether educators should play this role.

Education and its administration, therefore, came to be regarded as an applied social science rather than one of the humanities or an institutional hierarchy of individuals. Many writers pointed out that educational administrators needed to be more knowledgeable in the social sciences, particularly in sociology.[25]

On the other hand, there was not an equating of social science with education. No one suggested that social scientists would do well as educators. The great emphasis was still on educational administration as a profession

---

[25]Everett H. Fixley, "Governing Factors in the Construction of a Training Program for Superintendents of Schools," Educational Administration and Supervision, XXIV (November, 1938), 634; James Collins Miller, "Educational Administration Must Be More Highly Trained," Nations Schools, XII (November, 1933), 40; Jesse Newlon, Educational Administration as Social Policy, Report of the Commission on the Social Studies, Part VIII (New York: Charles Scribner's Sons, 1934), 267-268.

with a special body of knowledge. Although many schools were developing a liberal education for graduate students in education,[26] many in the profession thought that the advanced degree should be for the select few who would be researchers in the same manner as the scientists. In reality, the average administrator was a practitioner who needed some certification to substantiate his position. The number of writers who saw the educational administrator as the teacher-scholar or saw education as one of the humanities was very small.[27]

In trying to improve and enhance their profession, professors of education were as much concerned with whether or not administrators and professors were social, political, and economic "liberals" as they were with their scholarship and training. In citing Frederick Bair's study of the social backgrounds of school administrators,[28] Newlon expressed concern that they accepted the political and economic system without question.[29] A study written by R. Bruce Raup showed education professors to be more

---

[26]Clyde Hill, "Progressive Procedures in Graduate Study," Progressive Education, XII (May, 1935), 352-57.

[27]Carroll Champlin, "The Scholarship of Graduate Students of Education," School and Society, LI (February 10, 1940), 186-188.

[28]See Frederick Bair, The Social Understandings of the Superintendent of Schools.

[29]Newlon, Educational Administration, p. 167.

liberal than subject-matter teachers in colleges. This study was based on a questionnaire measuring such issues as static-dynamic, academic-direct life, science-philosophy, individualism-socialization, heredity-environment.[30] One could argue about using these terms to determine liberalism, but the results do illustrate that there were some common ideas, theories, and at least a common vocabulary among professors of education.

William Bagley crticized the study and by using one of Raup's own criteria for illustrating clear and consistent thinking was able to reverse the order of the liberal rating and place the education professors lowest.[31] Raup himself stated that although the professors must have been influenced by the doctrine of socialization, when confronted with particulars: "there is evidence, that, although they would be willing to socialize conduct in general, they would not change things so much in particular to do it."[32] One of the chief uses Raup makes of his study is to advocate an increase in the shrinking number of courses in education which students were taking.[33]

---

[30]Rugg, et al., Teacher Education, pp. 459-507.

[31]R. Bruce Raup, "What Teacher-training Faculties Believe," Educational Administration and Supervision, XX (May, 1934), 353.

[32]Rugg, et al., Teacher Education, p. 460.

[33]Raup, "What Teacher-training Faculties Believe," p. 347.

If education professors were liberal, should not their courses also be more liberating and enlightening?

The removing of much of the educational leadership to the universities gave it a safe vantage point from which to criticize educational administrators in the field. The professors claimed that at a time when administrators should have been leaders in developing a better society, they were still influenced too greatly by the politics and pressures of their own constituencies. At a time when they should have been more broadly educated in terms of curriculum, instruction, and the relation of schools to society, they were still concerned mainly with the skills needed to efficiently manage a large institution.

The articles written by professors of education about practicing school administrators were very critical and indicated that, for the most part, the administrators were not held in high esteem by them. Administrators were seen as authoritarians, technically educated with narrow vision. Frederick Bair stated that "nothing in the education of the present administrator has prepared him for strategic social action."[34] George D. Strayer emphasized that administrators no longer could simply deal with

---

[34]Frederick Bair, "School Administration and Freedom," Educational Freedom and Democracy, 2nd Yearbook of the John Dewey Society, edited by Boyde H. Bode and Harold R. Alberty (New York: D. Appleton-Century Company, 1938), p. 186.

externals, but had to be familiar with curriculum. They should be technically competent and social engineers.[35]

While educators gave lip service to lay participation, they wanted no part of lay control. Many articles dealt with the distinction between the policy-making role of the Boards of Education and the planning and decision-making roles of the educational expert. Administrators were taken to task for allowing boards of education to decide content, method, and philosophy.

A Profession without Goals

But the criticism by education professors did not give the administrators well-defined goals, purposes for education in general, or theories of educational leadership in particular. The educational leaders were to be narrowly trained specialists who would be truly professional just as the doctors and lawyers, and yet there was no agreement on a body of specialized knowledge for these leaders. Their leadership was to be based on this undefined expertise and not on their position. Their colleagues were their equals and should share equally in policy and decision making. But the differences between educational administration and business administration were not

---

[35]George D. Strayer, "Changing Concepts of Educational Administration," Teachers College Record, XL (March, 1939), 473.

clearly stated. Education was to be instrumental in changing or improving society, but how educational technology was to accomplish this, to say nothing of what kind of a society it should be, were questions on which there was very little unanimity.

While government in the 1930's was forced by the crisis into action without theory, much of the energy in education went into the stating of principles without arriving at goals or purposes. Laissez faire and individualism remained more strongly entrenched in education than in other social and economic institutions. Moreover, education professors were not called to Washington to develop programs. Unlike welfare and many other social and economic developments, the firing lines in education remained at the local level, which were often far removed from educational spokesmen at universities.

The lack of goals and purposes was often associated with "progressive" education. This criticism was made by its advocates as well as by its critics. George Counts, who considered progressive education as one of the only promising movements in education, severely criticized the movement for its lack of a theory of social welfare and for its emphasis on individualism.[36] Theodore Brameld, a

---

[36]George S. Counts, Dare the Schools Build a New Social Order? (New York: The John Day Company, 1932), p. 7.

social reconstructionist defined progressive education as being "strong in teaching us how to think--weak in teaching us the goals toward which to think."[37] The leading essentialists of the period, William Bagley, Isaac L. Kandel, and Henry C. Morrison have all characterized progressive education as being too general, broad, and aimless. Frederick Breed complained that even in their methods, progressives accepted as improvements ideas which had never been tested.[38]

Progressive education was criticized because it was based on the philosophy of pragmatism which, as a method was antithetical to ethical standards. The essentialists believed that man needs the moral security of being able to absorb his ethical nature.[39]

This lack of philosophy and lack of goals may be seen to be an extension of political Progressivism which has been accused of the same shortcomings. The political Progressives crusaded against big business and the power it held. They railed against the machine politicians who

---

[37]Theodore Brameld, Toward a Reconstructed Philosophy of Education (New York: Holt, Rinehart and Winston, 1962), 92.

[38]Frederick S. Breed, "On Changes in Methods of Teaching," School and Society, XLI (April 27, 1935), 559.

[39]M. J. Demiashkevich, "Philosophy and the Philosophy of Education," Educational Administration and Supervision, XVIII (February, 1932), 123; Margaret Noel, "What Kind of Education?," Educational Administration and Supervision, XVIII (March, 1932), 218.

kept the "people" out of power. The progressive education of the 1920's had been exclusively for the upper-middle class and was completely child-centered. Each individual was encouraged to pursue that which interested him at the time. Prescribed curricula with imposed ideas were kept to a minimum.

The Radical Progressives

With the advent of the Depression many of the progressive educators turned to theory and objectives. They advocated collectivism, cooperation, interdependence and social planning. Representing only a part of the leaders of the progressive education movement, the "radical" progressives advanced ideas which seemed extreme. But at least they received some attention in the education journals of the time. These radicals said that there should be a new social order and that education and schools should be responsible for creating it. George Counts, John L. Childs, William H. Kilpatrick, R. Bruce Raup, all from Teacher's College were among the chief proponents and promoters. Their ideas have been interpreted variously as straight Marxism, democratic socialism, or simply a better planned economy in which more people had a share. After all, the radicals argued, we as individuals had already lost the freedom to act independently in most ways. Business, labor and most social

activities were no longer matters of individual enterprise. In order to achieve this new social order, the radicals felt that it was necessary to indoctrinate, that is, for schools to shape attitudes and impose ideas. This, too, they said, was something that had always been done.[40]

Some historians felt that the influence of these radicals in changing education, to say nothing of society, was slight or moderate.[41] Other historians attributed the demise of individualism during the early 1940's and the rise of the life adjustment movement to the influence of the radical progressive educators.[42] However, one can present a strong case for the view that the progressive educators were essentially promoting individualism by fighting the same old Populist-Progressive battle against the plutocrats of industry. They were against an economic structure over which the vast majority of people had no share or no control. They were against any forms of authoritarian control, managed news, or any kind of monopoly. As noted in Chapter II they were protestors and reformers with purposes not always clear. Their goals were idealistic rather than scientific or practical.

---

[40]Counts, Dare the Schools, p. 19; Kilpatrick, ed. Educational Frontier, Chapter i.

[41]Cremin, Transformation of the Schools, p. 233; Curti, Social Ideas, pp. 575-580.

[42]Bowers, "Ideologies of Progressive Education," pp. 459-471.

Even the radicals who said that there was no longer any opportunity for competition in the economic sphere, advocated the development of the individual and independent thinking as the means of fighting the "system." Perhaps the radicals were quixotic, but certainly their emphasis on individuality and expressing one's own individual ideas completely overrode the indoctrinating for socialism. They denounced the conformity that brought about big business and hoped that free thought and the better side of man could bring individuals to think in terms of helping their fellow-man. They held to the old idealistic idea that freeing man would make him more apt to work for a better world.

Even though the radicals advocated something which sounded like socialism, their writings, along with the writings of other progressive educators continued to stress nineteenth-century individualism. The first part of every statement about the new education had to do with the development of the individual and his ability to think for himself with no settled truths thrown at him by adults. Only as an afterthought or second statement was regard for one's fellow-man brought in. For example, Educational Frontiers, one of the more radical books published during the depts of the depression, stated:

> We are concerned, rather, that the process of education from beginning to end operate so that students think their own thoughts and live their own lives, but with an ever growing appreciation

> of the significance of their conduct as bearing upon the lives of others.[43]

The same book stated that although the administrator or instructor might be concerned about specified ways of thinking, acting, and feeling, the striving should be for self-directive behavior. "The learner's ideas must be self-grown, his actions must ring true to the qualities of his own nature."[44] The authors inferred more of a sharing of power than the development of socialistic or collectivist enterprises.[45] A differentiation was made between egoistic individuality and "normal" individuality.[46] There was seen no opposition between individuality and social ends. "The opposition is between the public and shared on one side and the private and isolated on the other."[47] The social reconstruction which many had in mind emphasized that each individual would formulate his own social philosophy. This formulation "may be socially motivated to any degree, yet it remains a personal matter."[48]

---

[43]Kilpatrick, ed., Educational Frontier, pp. 211-212.

[44]Ibid., p. 229.

[45]Ibid., p. 386.

[46]Ibid., pp. 291-92.

[47]Ibid., p. 64.

[48]Ibid., pp. 27-28.

More than one writer has pointed out that progressive education and the social planning, centralization, and consolidation advocated in the 1930's did not go together. The kind of simulation and "socializing" activities did not teach the students how to cope with modern problems, but rather perpetuated rugged individualism.[49] The progressive concepts in education which derived from John Dewey himself were based on Progressivism. One of the main premises of Dewey's ideas on education was that the social development which had taken place in farms and villages in pre-industrial days now had to be preserved in the schools. The nineteenth-century idealism which idealized the individual and especially the child remained present in progressive education and in political Progressivism. The rejection of established principles and the sometimes equating of reform with change were seen in both education and politics.

In the 1930's Dewey, who had become an avowed socialist, found himself forced to condemn much of what was being done in his name and in the name of progressive education. For example, he condemned the rejection of subject matter, the lack of adult direction and guidance, and the diminishing of the study of the past.[50] He also

---

[49]William Withers, "Is Progressive Education on the Wane?," School and Society, XLVI (September 25, 1937), pp. 401-403.

[50]John Dewey, Experience and Education (New York: The MacMillan Company, 1938), pp. 21-22.

criticized the "progressive" practices which gave individualism full rein. He said that there "is no reason why progressive education should identify impulse and desire with purpose . . . ."[51]

Like John Dewey, George S. Counts did not think that in the early stages of the Depression the New Deal had gone far enough in controlling capitalism. In many ways his ideas had the ring of the older Progressivism. The enemy was industry. Individualism as an evil was associated only with economics. Counts shared that optimistic view of man which said that freed from concern about his daily needs he would cooperatively build a better world, fulfilling an American dream. Like the Progressives he was long on criticism and principles and short on designating ways in which to carry out a revolution or suggesting who should control the collective society. Although he advocated that an intensive effort be made by teachers to indoctrinate students as to the benefits of collectivism and social planning, he mentioned no plans for indoctrinating the teachers or administrators. Counts may have been treading new ground in suggesting that educators rise up and take the lead in creating a new society, but he was following a long line of Populists and Progressives in advocating a greater sharing of power within a democratic structure.

---

[51] Ibid., p. 70.

Counts defined democracy as "a sentiment with respect to the moral equality of man."[52] This belief outweighed the indoctrinating for collectivism and placed a priority in education on the development of the individual. He was concerned in the later 1930's that the individual would be swallowed up by totalitarianism.[53] In his later writings, he also placed a higher priority on the development of the individual than on his socialization.[54]

Other radical writers and publications also committed themselves more to the protection of individual rights and the development of individual uniqueness than to the cooperative, collective society. Kilpatrick in at least one article said, in effect, that we should change the economic and social system which was competitive, but we should not change American progressive education which placed the individual first.[55] Likewise the Educational Policies Commission of the N.E.A. which was dominated by university professors, including George Counts, emphasized in a 1938 publication individual rights, the uniqueness of

---

[52]Counts, Dare the Schools, p. 41.

[53]George S. Counts, The Prospects of American Democracy (New York: The John Day Company, 1938), pp. 2-3, 91-92.

[54]George S. Counts, Education and American Civilization (New York: Bureau of Publications, Teachers College, Columbia University, 1952), pp. 312-13.

[55]William H. Kilpatrick, "The Social Philosophy of Progressive Education," Progressive Education, XII (May, 1935), p. 293.

the individual, and individual initiative.[56] By 1937 rather than collective society, writers were using the term associational society. However, the essence of the thinking about the relationship of education to democracy was that while education was to prepare man to live in an associational society, it was also the agency that protected and developed the individual.[57] In 1941, a publication of the same Commission stated that "man's first loyalty is to himself as a human being of dignity and worth."[58] Democracy was identified "as a way of life in which the individual is made the center of things and is encouraged to develop freely according to his own nature."[59]

One can agree with the contemporary educational historian C. A. Bowers, that progressive educators failed to resolve the dilema of modern liberalism--that it is difficult to control social change without controling the

---

[56]Educational Policies Commission, The Purposes of Education in American Democracy (Washington, D.C.: National Education Association and the American Association of School Administrators, 1938), pp. 20, 21, 23.

[57]Educational Policies Commission, The Unique Function of Education in American Democracy (Washington, D.C.: National Education Association and the Department of Superintendence, 1937), p. 92.

[58]Educational Policies Commission, The Education of Free Men In a Democracy (Washington, D.C.: National Education Association and American Association of School Administrators, 1941), p. 55.

[59]Ibid., p. 32.

life and minds of the student.[60] However, one has to disagree with him that progressive education--even that advocated by the radicals--caused the demise of individualism leading to the despised organization man of the 1950's. Progressivism of the pre-World War I era did live on in the schools and the conservatives as well as the radicals of the profession of the 1930's continued to see the schools as institutions where the cultural heritage of the middle class would be passed on. This heritage included the "right" of each individual to develop to his fullest potential. Individuality would be nurtured and the individual differentiated. It was not suggested that material as well as non-material rewards would not serve as a reward or an incentive. The Progressives were still fighting against the unearned affluence of the plutocracy made rich and powerful at the expense of others, not against individual achievement.

Other Philosophies

There were, of course, many progressive social reconstructionists who were aware of the dilemas facing progressive educators. Boyd Bode was particularly concerned about the "one sided absorption in the individual pupil" and was concerned about the lack of a democratic,

---

[60]Bowers, "Ideologies of Progressive Education," p. 171.

social and educational philosophy by progressive educators.[61] He did not believe in indoctrination in the same way the radicals did, but neither did he believe that schools should continue to teach traditional ideas of society or of the teachers. Mutual interests, he said, had to be recognized.[62] There were also progressive educators who continued to believe in and stress the child-centered approach of the 1920's.

The most united and vocal of the conservative educators of the 1930's were known as essentialists. Rather than believing that education should take the lead in changing society, they believed that, especially in a time of crisis, education could maintain a much-needed stability. Most of them felt that cooperation in a democracy can come only from self-directed individuals.

The essentialists continued to view American education, as had earlier American educators, as something which should be the same for everyone. It would help to serve as an equalizer and melting pot for persons of all classes, nationalities, and races. This education would stress time-tested content, guided discipline, and orderly sequence. Unlike the progressives who stressed individualism

---

[61]Boyde H. Bode, Progressive Education at the Crossroads (New York: Newson, 1928), pp. 43-44.

[62]Boyd H. Bode, "The Meaning of Freedom," Educational Freedom and Democracy, pp. 11-13.

during the educative process, the essentialists believed that education should provide an equal start for all. They did stress competition, since this was a traditional American value.

The essentialists were among the first to point out the contradiction of democratic collectivism, particularly if the schools were to indoctrinate. They emphasized that you can not have laissez faire education in the school and social control in the state. The "industrial discipline" brought in by the New Deal was incompatible with progressive education, said the moderate Frederick S. Breed. He pointed out that emphasis on and respect for the individual could be balanced by respect for a common culture based on tradition.[63]

The essentialists believed that the schools should follow the dictates of society and should prepare young people for life, imbued with middle-class cultural values and trained for useful occupations. Vocational education and many other fads of the twenties and thirties, often erroneously associated with progressive education, came about more because of social demands than because of educational leadership.[64] The essentialists also

---

[63]Frederick S. Breed, Education and the New Realism (New York: The MacMillan Company, 1939), p. 189.

[64]Frederick Rudolph, "Review of the Transformation of the Schools: Progressivism in American Education by Lawrence A. Cremin," in The Mississippi Valley Historical Review, XLVIII (December, 1961), 550.

emphasized content over method, believing that there was an irreducible body of knowledge which should be taught through subject-matter disciplines. They did not think that the pupil could discover all of this knowledge by himself, and unlike some of the progressives, believed that the child should be guided, disciplined, and instructed.

The survey of over 100 articles written by professors of education indicated above all their dissatisfaction with and uneasiness about the lack of philosophy and goals. This feeling was expressed by both those within and those outside of the progressive education movement, but it was expressed mostly about progressive education. Boyd Bode, one of the leaders of progressive education became dismayed that while every government could have its own truths, when educational aims were under consideration, growth was considered to be its own end "with the disquieting implication that truth and validity do not really matter."[65] A critic of progressive education, Isaac L. Kandel, believed that it was impossible for the progressives to lead the way in a planned society while their path was still strewn with the disorder resulting from their emphasis on individualism and their

---

[65]Boyd H. Bode, "Education as Growth: Some Confusions," Progressive Education, XXXIV (February, 1937), 154.

refusal to define goals or ends.[66] The essentialists could not accept the idea that a moral value was only the average ethical judgment of the time. As one writer put it, while the fabric of society changes frequently, the fundamentals of society change slowly. Therefore, "the more kaleidoscopic society becomes, the more reason there is why school and university should hold firm to the eternal verities and inculcate them."[67]

Other writers thought that there was too much change for the sake of change and not enough on what was being accomplished. Frederick Breed objected that too often innovation preceded scientific experimentation.[68] The very emphasis of progressive education on experimental methods meant that evaluation had to play a greater role. They were beginning to advocate and plan experiments with evaluation, such as the Eight Year Study. It was emphasized that evaluation had to be based on measurable, behavioral objectives.[69]

---

[66]Isaac L. Kandel, "Education and Social Disorder," Teachers College Record, XXXIV (February, 1933), 359.

[67]Henry C. Morrison, "Sincerity In the Present Situation," Educational Administration and Supervision, XX (April, 1934), 280-81.

[68]Breed, "On Changes," 559.

[69]Ralph W. Tyler, "Evaluation: A Challenge and An Opportunity to Progressive Education," Educational Record, XVI (January, 1935), 121-31.

The essentialists did not quarrel so much with the methods advocated by the progressives as with their lack of direction and purpose. The essentialists claimed that it was the progressives who almost wrecked American society on the rocks of individualism.[70] They also criticized the progressives' emphasis on the means and on the "now" aspect of society. Bagley attacked especially the idea that an experience which was not of immediate value had no place in the schoolroom. He also blasted the idea of using a value such as freedom as a means rather than seeing it as an aim.[71] Another leading essentialist, M. J. Demiashkevich, called progressive education "a contemporary version of the age-old sophistic tendency toward the extreme individualist emancipation from all permanent criteria of values and from all tradition."[72]

Bagley indicated that more than two-thirds of the National Society for the Study of Education membership representing much of the leadership in education adhered to the theories of immediacy.[73] However, an examination

---

[70]William Bagley, "Modern Educational Theories and Practical Considerations," School and Society, XXXVII (April 1, 1932), 414.

[71]Ibid., p. 409.

[72]M. J. Demiashkevich, "'Traditionalists' Before a 'Progressive' Tribunal," Educational Administration and Supervision, XIX (December, 1933), 641.

[73]Bagley, "Modern Theories," p. 410.

of many articles by university and college professors of the 1930's indicated a trend toward a middle ground on this issue. For example, a professor of educational psychology at the University of Chicago thought that the moderates among both the progressives and conservatives were in substantial agreement. He thought that independent discovery was valuable but students also needed to accept ideas on the basis of authority. He also thought that activities resulting from interest had to be differentiated from those resulting from drives. Drill and discipline, he thought, were as valuable as spontaneity.[74] Thinking educators were asking that their colleagues stop and ask what they were trying to accomplish before instituting or doing away with certain educational practices.[75] Other educators attempted to redefine progressive education in the later 1930's showing that it did not mean extreme ideas, that direction and structure were needed and advocated.[76]

Frederick Breed was a moderate who rejected instrumentalism and adopted a philosophical position of

---

[74]Frank N. Freeman, "Proposed Educational Reform--Some of the Major Issues," Nations Schools, XII (July, 1933), 30-33.

[75]William Bruce, "Some Sources of Conflict in Public Education," Educational Administration and Supervision, XXI (April, 1935), 281-88.

[76]Denton L. Geyer, "What is Progressive Education?" Educational Method, XVII (October, 1937), 8-11.

realism related to the ideas of Whitehead and Russell. He believed that the very fact that we have educators illustrates the fact that life is not education. He believed that there was a reality apart from experience. Therefore, one learned apart from experience in subject matter, and content had to be accepted along with activities and projects.[77]

Another group of progressives took a modified stand on both the freedom of the child to develop his own ideas and on indoctrination to change the social order. This group called for independent reconstruction. According to this point of view, democracy was a method of achieving liberty and equality of opportunity and not a doctrine or creed. It was the "obligation of the schools to stimulate the young people to reinterpret their earlier beliefs and attitudes without pre-determining the conclusion."[78]

Of course, most educators of the thirties, as evidenced by their writings, would not have categorized themselves as either essentialists or radicals. Most would have considered themselves "progressives" with many different connotations of the word. Few would have

---

[77]Frederick S. Breed, "The Liberal Group in Education," Educational Administration and Supervision, XXII (May, 1936), 328-29.

[78]Pedro Orata, "Conflicting Viewpoints in Contemporary American Education," Educational Administration and Supervision, XXII (May, 1936), 374.

themselves counted as traditionalists. None wanted to return to the extreme formalism in instruction of an earlier day, and essentialists claimed as much credit for newer methods as did the progressives.

Most of the writings of the professors of education dealt more with methods and curriculum than with social or political ideas. Although there was a smattering of articles about indoctrination, mostly against, most educators retreated into curriculum reform as a more appropriate professional activity. Most educators offered neither support nor alternatives to the ideas of the radicals. This limited amount of social criticism from educators suggests that this is at least in part the reason for the isolation of the profession from other scholars and intellectuals who were being called upon by the government or who were creating a literature of constructive criticism.

A broad survey of the writings of the professors of education in the colleges and universities during the period indicated the trend of ideas which were emanating from this part of the educational hierarchy.

One trend which was more a reflection of society and the times rather than of any particular group was the emphasis on the practical rather than the theoretical. Subjects had to have a close relationship to the student's life. Theoretical mathematics was to be shunned by most.

The only math needed was for everyday and household use. Vocational and technical education were stressed over science. Latin lost ground even though its advocates attempted to show how useful it was for budding doctors or lawyers.

Although a few radicals had endorsed indoctrination for collectivism as the only way in which the schools could change society, the trend was in the opposite direction. The emphasis was on teaching students to think for themselves and the improvement of their problem-solving ability. Controversial subjects were encouraged with the idea that students should arrive at their own conclusions about them.

There was a great deal of anti-subject-matter feeling, the only vocal support coming from the more staunch essentialists. The turning from subject-matter structure to the use of a core or central problem approach was considered "progressive" much as the teaching without textbooks made one feel up-to-date in the 1960's.

Although never well defined, the stress was on the "needs" of children and of youth rather than on lessons to be learned, or on subject matter. Although there was little emphasis on theories of learning, the popularity of Gestalt psychology brought about an emphasis on dealing with the whole child and individual differences continued to be stressed.

Education for Democracy

The later part of the thirties saw social reformers, progressives who wanted curriculum change, moderates who wanted to emphasize American tradition, all able to unite under the rubric "education for democracy." Democracy was the philosophy which could preserve the dignity of the individual, protect his rights, and place him above institutions. It would also be on guard against minority groups who would trample on these rights. At the same time democracy meant an interest in the other fellow and in the general welfare. The rise of fascism in Europe and of proto-fascism at home was responsible for much of this thought. Education, both as a model of life experiences and as a preparation for life, should use and teach democracy.

This idea of practicing democracy was nowhere more emphasized than in educational administration. It would seem from some of the writings and textbooks of the period that almost the sole task of the educational administrator was to involve the total staff in planning and decision-making in the schools. One would assume from the heavy emphasis on democratic administration that most administrators were authoritarian. On the other hand, it could mean that the administrators were so much better trained in education than the teachers (for which there is evidence) that the teachers had little to offer. Perhaps it was a

good way in which to institute in-service training. At any rate, the involvement of teachers in curriculum-making and decision-making was promoted by the idea of education for democracy. Research is needed to determine whether this increased or moderated curriculum change.

Summary

In summary, there was a rapid growth during the 1930's of colleges of education in universities as well as the expansion of two-year normal schools into four-year teacher colleges. The number of advanced degrees granted in education and in educational administration and supervision increased more rapidly than the profession in general. As the number of teachers and administrators who were trained and the amount of training they received increased, the number and influence of college and university professors of education also grew. The spokesmen for education, whether representing teacher and administrator associations or contributing to a variety of education journals, were more often than not college or university professors of education.

According to these university and college faculty members, education had to become truly professional in order to guide or change society. Educational administration was to be a science consisting of a body of specialized knowledge and techniques comparable to medicine or law.

One needed to partake of at least some portion of this professional training in order to practice the trade. Just as important was the building up of a large group of experts who from the vantage point of a university, through the scholarly exchange of ideas, and through research could develop theories and a more extensive professional body of knowledge.

It also was suggested that educational administration become an applied social science and that administrators should become agents instrumental in changing society. The training, therefore, of administrators was no longer to consist of technical courses in administration, but would include heavy doses of the social sciences, particularly sociology. Business efficiency was something to be downplayed in those days of business breakdown and social concern.

A group of radicals of the Progressive Education Association, a small minority of educators, advocated that the schools be major and forceful agents in the changing of a society and economy which seemed in 1932 in desparate straits. Many of their colleagues gave lip service to the idea of a new social order, even if they were not quite as sure that the schools could or should help develop and lead it.

However, most of the educators in higher education continued to be more concerned with methods, curriculum,

and the business and technical aspects of administration than with changing society. Most of the writings of education professors were about curricula and methods which would cater to the needs of students. Units or contracts, activities, and student involvement centering around a core subject were emphasized. The student, rather than subject matter or knowledge, was to be the focal point of education. Moreover, the subject matter studied had to be immediately useful in order to be relevant. Essentialists fought a rearguard action, stressing that there were essentials to be learned and some unchangeable values to be taught.

Most of the internal criticism of professors of education about education and about their profession was the lack of goals. This was inherent in the nature of Progressivism and progressive education. In addition, both the crisis of the Depression and the recovery and reform measures of the New Deal caught educators unprepared. The idea of educators building a new social order was almost absurd for a profession which almost had been oblivious of society in moving from one panacea to another and which catered to the needs of the individual. The goals for the whole society were vague or unstated and, therefore, it was a relief for educators to be able to join together in the late thirties under the threat of Fascism and advocate something called "education for democracy."

A case can be presented that the ideas of most educators, even the radicals of progressive education, were more like the idealists and protestors of the Progressive Era than the reformers of the New Deal. As with the experimentalism which they followed, the progressive educators were without a philosophy and their goals and aims were vague. Although there was some advocacy of a more cooperative, collectivist society, most educators remained primarily concerned with the development of the individual and individual self-realization. The educational progressives had not become completely severed from the ideas of Political Progressivism which spawned them, and education remained a sanctuary for individualism and competition.

CHAPTER IV

THE PAPER TIGER

In times of crisis, a different kind of leadership is sought; autonomy ranks lower in most people's hierarchy of values than order and survival. Like the businessmen who were forced to look toward the national government for leadership and support, schoolmen too sought help from Washington. The administrative structure to provide aid for education to the states and local districts was already there, although in embryonic form. The question, then, remained: How much aid would be both tolerated and forthcoming, and how much leadership and control would come with the federal money?

Background

> Be it enacted by the Senate and the House of Representatives of the United States of America, in Congress assembled, That there shall be established at the City of Washington, a Department of Education, for the purpose of collecting such statistics and facts as shall show the condition and progress of education in the several States and Territories, and of diffusing such information respecting the organization and management of schools and school systems and methods of teaching as shall aid the people of the United States in the establishment and maintenance of efficient school

> systems and otherwise PROMOTE THE CAUSE OF EDUCATION throughout the country.
>
> 39th Congress, 2nd Session
> Approved by President Andrew Johnson, March 2, 1967[1]

Since education is not mentioned in the United States Constitution and the Tenth Amendment provides that powers not enumerated in that document should be reserved to the states, schooling is acknowledged as the province of the various states. De facto power due to historical circumstances and a unique system of financial support has rested with the local districts. This localism provided a fundamental problem from its inception; how could empirically obtained educational results from thousands of local, independent laboratories become organized into a body of knowledge and how could better techniques thus reported be disseminated back again to the practitioners? The Office of Education was the nation's answer to the problem.

In its early years, the Office of Education was a mere bureau of statistics. As time passed it was commissioned with other activities: the administration of Eskimo and Indian schools in Alaska, more sophisticated surveys, comparative education, Howard University, and the distribution of funds to land-grant universities.

When the office was reorganized in 1930 there were five major divisions and five minor ones. The large number

---

[1]Department of Education Act, U.S. Statutes at Large, XIV, 434 (1867).

of employees seemed to imply growth, but the office was still a long way from a bureaucracy. However, the way had been found to broaden the scope of the Office by what came to be called the elastic clause of the Office, "promote the cause of education."

The first effect of the Depression on the Office of Education was to enforce greater efficiency and economy. Its budget was slashed along with every other budget in the country. Cut-backs were made; growth was paralyzed. Commissioner William Cooper in his Annual Report for 1933 felt that conferences of experts to discuss problems and make specific recommendations would be much more economical than adding more specialists to the staff, and yet would enable the Office to maintain its expert service.[2]

The staff also immediately mobilized to provide assistance to the state departments of education and the schools. Three investigations were immediately undertaken. One was to find out the exact situation and what the schools were doing to combat the problem. Another was to ascertain desirable economic practices. The other investigation, looking beyond the present crisis, was to seek out the innovations that would have lasting value,

---

[2]U.S. Department of Interior, Annual Report of the Secretary of the Interior for the Fiscal Year ended June 30, 1933 (Washington, D.C.: Government Printing Office, 1933), p. 262.

especially such practices as related to desirable size and the benefits coming from federal and state financing.[3]

The Office distributed studies which demonstrated the ineffectiveness of small districts, the economy of larger districts and of central financing.[4] They also assisted districts in streamlining their accounting systems. The research division put their efforts into kindergarten programs in a valiant effort to save them.[5] The Commissioner also was cognizant as early as 1932 that unemployed adults would need educational opportunities.[6]

Nineteen thirty-three marked a milestone for the Office because it was the first time that federal funds were given directly to individual schools or paid to teachers in wages. Federal monies were used in school construction in all forty-eight states. Salaries were paid to teachers in rural schools to prevent their closing and also to teachers in nursery work, adult, and vocational education.[7]

---

[3] Ibid., p. 239

[4] Ibid., p. 240.

[5] Ibid., p. 242.

[6] U.S. Department of Interior, Office of Education, Annual Report of the Commissioner of Education to the Secretary of the Interior for the Fiscal Year ended June 30, 1932 (Washington D.C.: Government Printing Office, 1932), p. 27.

[7] Timon Covert, Federal Grants for Education, 1933-1934, U.S. Office of Education, Leaflet, No. 45 (Washington, D.C.: Government Printing Office, 1935), pp. 6-10.

The year 1933-34 was an active one under the able, invigorating leadership of a new Commissioner, George F. Zook. Commissioner Zook was with the Office only one year, but during that time he helped fashion the New Deal educational emergency plan and brought to the Office of Education new heights of educational leadership. It was also during this year that vocational education, previously governed by a different board, came under the supervision of the Office of Education.[8]

Commissioner Zook worked closely with the PWA, NRA, and CCC in helping them to set up their educationa programs.[9] He also loaned personnel to the Federal Emergency Relief Agency.[10] The Office administered and staffed the educational program of the CCC.[11] In January, 1933 the Office of Education in conjunction with the American Council on Education held the Conference on the Crisis in Education which had been called by President Hoover. The Conference established Citizens Councils on Education across the nation. These Councils became the bulwarks of

---

[8]U.S. Department of Interior, Annual Report of Secretary of the Interior for the Fiscal Year ended June 30, 1934 (Washington, D.C.: Government Printing Office, 1934), p. 254.

[9]Ibid., p. 254.

[10]Ibid., p. 261.

[11]Ibid., pp. 263-64.

defense against educational budget cutting and the curtailment of art and music classes.[12]

The Commissioner called another large conference for June to discuss education in relation to guidance, leisure, and employment. The conference developed a statement of basic principles to serve as a guide for the development of youth.[13]

Zook also took the initiative in developing programs of federal legislation. In November, 1933 he called a select group of leaders to Washington to plan a conference to discuss and adopt a legislative plan. As a result, a comprehensive legislative plan was projected and a lobbying committee appointed to push these bills through Congress. The bills failed, but it was not deemed a total loss because it helped to sensitize Congressmen to the educational needs of the nation.[14]

The Commissioner also kept the states alert regarding vocational education. The Federal Board for Vocational Education reported in 1933 that schools must act as agents for industrial recovery through rational planning, training, and retraining for new and expanding fields of

---

[12] Ibid., pp. 257-58.

[13] Ibid., pp. 255-57.

[14] Ibid., p. 258.

employment.[15] The Commissioner prodded the states to make greater efforts toward updating the programs of local districts and kept the state departments abreast of changing conditions, and even provided courses. Dr. Zook resigned on June 30, 1934 to become Director of the American Council on Education.

By 1936 the worst of the crisis was over. Commissioner J. W. Studebaker asserted that it was a year of progress and development. Less federal money was needed and services and salaries were being restored. He also noted that educational objectives were shifting from subject mastery to individual development and social well-being.[16]

Although the federal government had met the crises caused by the Depression, no permanent plan for federal aid had been formulated. The pre-Depression policy of patching up the established schools and filling in where there was the greatest neglect continued. Until the Depression both of these policies had been pursued by persuasion and by grants to the states. The Depression changed this and for the first time the Federal government

---

[15]Interior, Annual Report 1933, p. 289.

[16]U.S. Department of Interior, Annual Report of the Secretary of the Interior for the Fiscal Year ended June 30, 1936 (Washington, D.C.: Government Printing Office, 1936), pp. 229-30.

financed and administered, as emergency measures, educational programs of its own. These programs were never in direct competition with the public schools, but sought to reach the extremely young, the old, the maimed, and the displaced. Through research, study, and conferences the Office of Education also sought to make the traditional middle-class public schools aware of children they were overlooking. Commissioner Cooper stated in his 1932 Report that while 100 per cent of the children in a democracy should be provided educational opportunity, conventional schools were organized for the "normal majority."[17]

If the relief programs were the most dramatic, the traditional policy of research, conferences, and demonstrations was the most consistent and in the long run more productive. Policies on adult education and preschool education were a combination of traditional and temporary emergency programs. In both cases an effort was made to increase public education vertically--upward and downward.

Commissioner John W. Studebaker was personally concerned with adult education. He had been very successful in establishing, with the help of a Carnegie grant, an adult forum in Des Moines, Iowa when he was superintendent there. By 1939 these local forums had spread to

---

[17]Education, Annual Report 1932, p. 14.

thirty-eight states.[18] The adult education programs of the NYA, CCC, and WPA were also highly successful. For the first time adults outside of cities had access to educational programs above and beyond the traditional vocational fare.[19] To combine these two movements Studebaker, with $600,000 allotted from the Federal Emergency Relief Appropriation, set up demonstration centers in twenty-two diverse localities.[20] The stated purpose of these forums was to continue the traditions of local democracy formerly expressed in New England town meetings, lyceums and Chautauquas. They were an attempt to arouse civic interest and provide training in democracy. While federal funds were used, the forums were administered by the local superintendent, and the school district selected the personnel. The movement was not without its critics. Many feared that it was a propaganda devise. Others charged that the forum leaders were too highly paid--

---

[18]John B. Holden, "Adult Education and the Public Schools," Chap. i of Education in the States: Nationwide Development Since 1900, ed. by Edgar Fuller and Jim B. Pearson (Washington, D.C.: National Education Association, 1969), p. 318.

[19]Ibid., p. 317.

[20]Maris M. Proffitt, "Adult Education," Chap. iv, Vol. I of Biennal Survey of Education 1934-1936, U.S. Office of Education, Bulletin, 1937, No. 2 (Washington, D.C.: Government Printing Office, 1940), p. 69.

$450 a month, but no travel allowance.[21] There was a policy change in 1938-39. Local districts no longer ran the program. Instead, the Office of Education, working with state departments of education, designed a plan to reach smaller communities. Regional centers were set up in 15 states with 196 communities being served.[22]

This was not and was never intended to be a permanent program. The demonstration centers were to serve as models of good adult education. It was another way of showing the importance of adult education as an integral part of the public school system.[23]

Reforms in prison education were instituted in the Federal prisons in 1930 by providing trained educational staffs. No other area of adult education presented a more desperate need. The curriculum was broadened to include cultural subjects. The State of New York was the first to follow the government example.[24]

---

[21]U.S. Office of Education, Choosing Our Way, Bulletin, 1937, Misc. No. 1 (Washington, D.C.: Government Printing Office, 1937), p. 47.

[22]U.S. Department of Interior, Annual Report of the Secretary of the Interior for the Fiscal Year ended June 30, 1939 (Washington, D.C.: Government Printing Office, 1939), pp. 78-79.

[23]U.S. Department of Interior, Office of Education, Annual Report of the Commissioner of Education to the Secretary of the Interior for the Fiscal Year ended June 30, 1931 (Washington, D.C.: Government Printing Office, 1931), p. 24.

[24]Proffitt, "Adult Education," p. 67.

Studies had been made in 1930 of pre-school and kindergarten education. One of the New Deal emergency measures was the establishment of federally financed nursery schools in 1933.[25] The demonstration purposes of these nursery schools were deemed of great value. It was predicted that nursery schools would be incorporated into existing local units.[26]

Traditional Programs

One of the most consistent progressive policies was the promotion and development of radio for educational purposes. Unfortunately, by the end of the decade it had reached a dead end. Beginning in 1930, a section of the Office was devoted to the educational implications of radio.[27] In 1932, a senior specialist in education by radio was added to the permanent professional staff.[28] Radio projects were begun in earnest in 1935. "Democracy in Action" went on the air in 1939. This was a half-hour

---

[25]U.S. Department of Interior, Office of Education, Annual Report of the Commissioner of Education to the Secretary of the Interior for the Fiscal Year ended June 30, 1930 (Washington, D.C.: Government Printing Office, 1930), p. 27.

[26]Interior, Annual Report 1936, p. 230.

[27]Education, Annual Report 1930, p. 42.

[28]Education, Annual Report 1932, p. 3.

program which explained the federal exhibits at the World's Fair. Historical, scientific and political science programs were also begun.[29] To stimulate radio broadcasting by school districts and colleges, a radio script exchange was coordinated by the Office. About 72,000 scripts were exchanged. Local educational radio projects grew from 300 in 1936 to 800 in 1939 due to the service and encouragement provided by the Office. The office of education also put on a radio series with the National Congress of Parents and Teachers which was carried by seventy-five N.B.C. stations.[30]

The radio program was greatly curtailed in June, 1940 when the funds of the WPA were cut back by Congress and the Education Office lost its allotment.[31] Thus, a great source of influence, information, and communication for educational direction was largely lost. Commissioner Studebaker summed up the difficulties of launching educational radio programs:

> Congress, in drafting the basic legislation for radio evidently envisioned local stations serving local needs and interests much after the fashion of

---

[29] Interior, Annual Report 1939, p. 82.

[30] Ibid., p. 80.

[31] Federal Security Agency, U.S. Office of Education, Annual Report of the United States Commissioner of Education for the Fiscal Year ended June 30, 1940 (Washington, D.C.: Government Printing Office, 1941), p. 93.

> local newspapers. This would include service to local educational needs. But local educational programming has been retarded due mostly to difficulties of learning new techniques and high cost of radio production.[32]

Without federal funds, advice, and service the educational radio venture had slim chances of getting off the ground.

When the Office of Education was reorganized in 1930, a Division of Special Problems was created. The three main sections in this division were: special education, including physically or mentally handicapped and gifted children; atypical groups such as Indians, Negroes and other minorities; and rural education.[33] Of the nation's children, 49.3 per cent attending school in rural areas as late as 1934.[34] The Office of Education, state departments of education, as well as the National Education Association considered rural education as a separate problem because children in these areas were not considered to have equal educational opportunity. By 1931, a need was seen for a specialist in the socially delinquent, an indication of new displacements as society changed.[35]

The Division of Special Problems was strong on surveys but lacked aggressive leadership. The ghost of

---

[32] Ibid., p. 87.

[33] Education, Annual Report 1930, p. 27.

[34] Katherine M. Cork, "Review of Conditions and Developments in Education in Rural and Other Sparsely Settled Areas," Cahp. v, Vol. I of Biennal Survey of Education 1934-1936, p. 7.

[35] Education, Annual Report 1931, p. 6.

Federal control was closely and emotionally intertwined with the Negro question. Rural areas were strongholds of localism. While surveys were made, and data collected about the education of Mexicans, the Appalachian poor, Negroes, and migratory workers, and deficiencies were found, little action was taken.[36]

The Office hired a specialist in Negro education, Dr. Ambrose Caliver, in 1930. His studies documented the Negro child's plight.[37] He made speeches, wrote articles, and attended hundreds of conferences, but either there were more pressing problems or local middle-class leaders responded with apathy.[38]

As the curricular movement became more and more centered on individual differences and on instruction, the emphasis on the Special Problems Division shifted from atypical groups to individual "exceptional" children. In 1935 a report on curriculum construction for retarded children was issued.[39] In 1939, the two large projects for the year were studies on the education programs of

---

[36]Education, Annual Report 1932, pp. 15-17; Interior, Annual Report 1933, p. 247.

[37]Interior, Annual Report 1933, pp. 248-49.

[38]Harry Kursh, The United States Office of Education: A Century of Service (Philadelphia, Pa.: Chilton Books, A Division of Chilton Company, 1965), p. 134.

[39]U.S. Department of Interior, Annual Report of the Secretary of the Interior for the Fiscal Year ended June 30, 1935 (Washington, D.C.: Government Printing Office, 1935), p. 298.

handicapped children in residential schools and of the provisions made for socially maladjusted children in regular schools.[40] In 1939-40, the staff visited delinquent residential schools to assist them in curriculum reform and in establishing better communication with their own state departments of education.[41]

By far the greatest effort put forth by the Office of Education during the thirties was in the field of vocational education. Vocational education included agriculture, homemaking, trades and industry, and after 1936, distributive education. Federal funds first went to the states for public schools in 1917 under the Smith-Hughes Act for vocational education. In 1934, when Congress passed the George-Ellzy Act, three million dollars were annually pumped into the states for vocational education. Two years later this legislation was modified by the George-Deen Act which raised annual Federal expenditures to over fourteen million dollars and extended coverage to distributive education. This money was distributed to the states on a matching fund principle with no further earmarking of funds.[42] The Secretary of Interior's Report

---

[40]Interior, Annual Report 1939, p. 94.

[41]Education, Annual Report 1940, p. 6.

[42]Gordon I. Swanson, "The World of Work" Chap. vi of Education in the States, p. 297.

for 1935 noted that in the past the United States had relied on European apprentice programs to train skilled artisans who later immigrated into this country. With new immigration laws this source had dried up. An apprentice plan set up under the NRA had been declared unconstitutional. Since Wisconsin was the only state to have assumed responsibility in this area it fell to the Federal government to insure that programs were set up which were in the national interest.[43]

In addition to the distribution of federal funds, the Office of Education did studies, held conferences, and provided curriculum materials. Part of the funds went into the training of vocational teachers. For example, the home economics specialists campaigned for courses in sociology, science, and child development for both boys and girls so that they would be prepared for the effects of change on the home.[44]

Two massive surveys were completed during the decade: a survey of teacher training and a survey of secondary education.[45] The teacher training survey was useful to states for improving curriculum in teacher

[43]Interior, Annual Report 1935, p. 322.

[44]Education, Annual Report 1932, p. 20.

[45]U.S. Office of Education, National Survey of Secondary Education, Bulletin, 17, 1932, Monographs 1-28 (Washington, D.C.: Government Printing Office, 1933-34); Education, National Survey of the Education of Teachers.

training institutions and in reforming teacher certification requirements. The survey on secondary education was necessary because it was here that the pressure of industrialization and the effects of the depression were hitting hardest at the schools, both because of increasing enrollments and curricular demands.

A review of the publications and conferences held reveal further concerns of the Office of Education. Leadership was offered in the following areas: conservation, consumer education, motion picture evaluation, visual aids, guidance, parent education, and a bibliography was prepared on religious education.[46] The staff worked with the National Council of Teachers of English on a three year program to develop a structured English curriculum from first grade through college.[47]

Through library services and thousands of publications, the Office of Education was able to reach out to even the smallest hamlet. Curriculum materials were collected and loaned.[48] Doctoral and master's theses were on inter-library loan.[49] Publications were sent without charge to state departments of education, libraries,

---

[46]Education, Annual Report 1931, p. 27.

[47]Ibid., p. 47.

[48]Interior, Annual Report 1939, p. 101.

[49]Education, Annual Report 1930, p. 30.

colleges, superintendents--over fifty thousand addresses in 1931.[50] School Life, the Office of Education magazine, led in sales all government publications. By 1939, the address list had grown to 186,992 and in that year alone 903,000 copies of the various publications were sold or issued.[51] Encouragement and advice were given to state school librarians in developing and evaluating libraries in every school in their states.[52]

Building Up State Departments

The Office of Education tried to exert its greatest leadership through the state departments of education. Equalization of educational opportunity within the states required strong state departments. The United States Office of Education staff served as consultants on the states.[53] They helped state departments of education draft legislation.[54] The National Survey on Teacher Preparation was done for state use as was a study on school financing.[55] Advice in school plant planning was of great

---

[50]Education, Annual Report 1931, p. 28.

[51]Interior, Annual Report 1939, p. 103.

[52]Ibid., p. 99.

[53]Education, Annual Report 1931, p. 12.

[54]Education, Annual Report 1932, p. 21.

[55]Education, Annual Report 1930, p. 11.

help to the States. Regional offices were established at state request to conduct research and offer consultant services.[56]

The federal office stimulated state departments in various ways. In 1936, a state school specialist was added to the Federal staff.[57] The Federal Office promoted the equalization of state library facility access. Through extension services three million more people were served in 1939 than in 1934.[58] Conferences were held with state supervisors on elementary education. With state cooperation, conferences also were conducted on integrating the secondary curriculum.

The elementary conferences worked up a program for the American Association of School Administrators Conference of February, 1939.[59]

In 1938 the Office of Education staff began a coordinated study of the programs of the state departments of education. It was a major study of about twenty volumes.[60] In the same year, the office made an effort to establish standards for teacher training institutions.[61]

---

[56]Education, Annual Report 1931, p. 31.

[57]Interior, Annual Report 1936, p. 240.

[58]Interior, Annual Report 1939, p. 74.

[59]Ibid., p. 90.

[60]Education, Annual Report 1940, p. 6.

[61]Ibid., p. 15.

But the time was not yet ripe for the major role of providing funds to equalize educational opportunities among the many states.

Relationships With the Profession

The relationship between the United States Office of Education and the National Education Association was always most cordial. In fact, the N.E.A. regards the Office of Education as its own creation.[62] During the thirties the N.E.A. Legislation Committee lobbied for a Federal Department of Education and helped secure federal emergency grants to the states.[63] But by 1938 the N.E.A. and the A.A.S.A. through their Educational Policies Commission were saying that there was danger of encroaching federal control. In the Commission's report, The Structure and Administration of Education in American Democracy,[64] were aspects of the Smith-Hughes law which controlled curriculum planning, personnel selection and the organization of schools. The Commission also objected to the concept of matching funds, arguing that this was a way of

---

[62]Edgar B. Wesley, NEA: The First Hundred Years: The Building of the Teaching Profession (New York: Harper & Brothers Publishers, 1957), p.52.

[63]Ibid., p. 305.

[64]Educational Policies Commission, The Structure and Administration of Education in American Democracy (Washington, D.C.: National Education Association and the American Association of School Administrators, 1936).

pressuring state departments of education to spend their money in Federally determined ways.[65] The Commission, however, did feel that Federal support was more and more necessary due to increased mobility and communications among the population, making for a greater need for equality and uniformity among the states.[66] The Commission recommended appropriations to states with no earmarking.[67]

General Trends

Tremendous growth occurred in the Office of Education from 1930 to 1940. The greatest single factor affecting the number of employees was the absorbtion of vocational education late in 1933. This immediately added eighty personnel. The regular staff grew from slightly over ninety in 1932 to 225 in 1938. This excluded the CCC staff and those engaged in emergency and relief projects. Appropriations also increased. Regular appropriations jumped from 300 million in 1932 to 900 million in 1938. Special expenditures for land-grant colleges, vocational education, and rehabilitation skyrocketed from two and a half million to nearly twenty-eight million

---

[65] Ibid., pp. 111-12.

[66] Ibid., pp. 108-10.

[67] Ibid., p. 116.

during the same period.[68] There was a 50 per cent increase in incoming mail in one year as the decade drew to a close.[69]

The Depression years also brought about policy changes within the Office of Education. From 1930 to 1935, statements about aims and purposes of the Office of education were self-assured and consistent. As stated in the organic act, the purpose of the Office was to collect facts and disseminate the information. As the decade wore on, statistics gathering was implemented by more sophisticated research such as in-depth field studies, historical research, direct experiments under emergency grants. But fact-finding was still the most emphasized activity. The Commissioners not only considered this as their basic function, but saw this as the best way to bolster the American system of local autonomy--a bias which they shared with other educators. Their second objective--to influence the public--was consistent with this. The Office of Education should influence the public and educate them so that they could build better, more efficient schools. Adult education, parent education, and

---

[68]U.S. Office of Education, To Promote the Cause of Education: A Pictorial Presentation, Bulletin, 1938, Misc. No 2. (Washington, D.C.: Government Printing Office, 1938), pp. 20-22.

[69]Interior, Annual Report 1939, p. 104.

radio were all ways of promoting this objective. Not federal money, not federal control, but informational service was the toal.[70] Commissioner Cooper's report for 1931 contains some slight suggestions of doubt that perhaps this was not quite enough. He characterized the year as one of searching "on the part of the Office of Education to find its real place in the scheme of American education."[71] It was the policy of the Office to hire young Ph.D.'s to build up its research bureau. It was also to give these future educational leaders a national outlook,[72] suggesting that national goals were not issuing forth from the heartland.

Nineteen thirty-six was the first year of appearance for a section of the Commissioner's Report entitled "Policy Making in Education." The section stated the importance of working with state departments of education in "initiating and developing progressive educational practices." And further: "Handicapped groups are in serious need of special attention everywhere."[73]

---

[70]Education, Annual Report 1930, p. 1; Education, Annual Report 1931, p. 2; Education, Annual Report 1932, p. 27; Interior, Annual Report 1933, p. 263; Interior, Annual Report 1934, p. 277.

[71]Education, Annual Report 1931, p. 1.

[72]Ibid., p. 10.

[73]Interior, Annual Report 1936, p. 251.

While educators throughout the nation were enthusiastically embracing child-centered, individualized instruction, Commissioner Studebaker from a different perspective was able to say:

> The primary purpose of a free public education in a democracy should be to prepare youth for intelligent and independent exercise of citizenship. The improvement of personal competency and culture is second in importance.[74]

The CCC educational programs were able to state objectives by 1936. There had been no educational goals when the Corps was started. It was strictly a pragmatic approach typical of the early New Deal. The objectives were compensatory. They were consistent with the philosophy which gathered momentum in the Office during the decade--that of stimulating educational endeavor in all areas which were missed or bungled by the local systems. The first three goals of the CCC were these: eliminate illiteracy, provide remedial programs to cover school deficiencies, and job training.[75] A 1938 survey found that 88 different courses were offered in the CCC, but 97 per cent of the young men were enrolled in 9 courses--basically the skills and social studies. There was no prescribed curriculum. In fact, no one was obliged to take part in the educational program at all.

[74]Michigan, Department of Public Instruction, News of the Week, Vol. III, No. 25 (January 25, 1936), p. 1.

[75]Interior, Annual Report 1936, p. 233.

Reflections

It was inevitable that the United States government would have to intervene financially in education. There were too many inequalities. Minority groups in some cases were almost completely overlooked or inadequately served. Antiquated tax systems based on an older economy could not bring in the money to do the job. Technical, remedial, and applied arts courses were much more costly than the straight academics had been. There was a tremendous imbalance of ability among the states to finance education. The highest proportion of youth to adults was in rural areas where there was the least ability to pay. Something had to be done.

The Depression was the impetus to get the equalization of educational opportunity in a technical society started. In 1933, when the crisis was at its worst, local administrators sought and were given federal aid. The relief measures of the early thirties were exactly that--relief and not a planned program. By 1937, it was quite evident that some form of federal aid should continue. In 1933, local administrators said they needed help, and by 1937 national leaders conceded the need. Help was needed in more fundamental ways than just to meet a crisis. Educationally, this crisis brought to national attention the problems of change from an agrarian to an industrial

society. If the social scientists are right in their assessment of change in saying that the greatest impetus for organizational change comes from the outside, then the Depression was a mixed blessing for the schools.[76]

President Roosevelt created an Advisory Committee on Education in 1937. The original purpose of the committee was to study vocational programs, but it was enlarged to consider the whole relationship of the federal government to general education. The Committee recommended that federal aid should be continued. Grants should be made to the states for general aid, improvements of teacher training, school construction, improvement of state departments of education, administration, adult education, and rural libraries. In addition, a grant which would reach three million dollars per annum should be made to the Office of Education for planning and research.[77]

Commissioner Studebaker recommended various ways in which the commission report could be implemented by the Office and legislation that would be needed to carry it out. Throughout his recommendations the two criteria of

---

[76]Daniel E. Griffith, "The Nature and Meaning of Theory," Behavioral Science and Educational Administration, Sixty-Third Yearbook of the National Society for the Study of Education, Part II (Chicago, Ill.: University of Chicago Press, 1964), pp. 117-18.

[77]U.S. Department of Interior, Annual Report of the Secretary of the Interior for the Fiscal Year ended June 30, 1938 (Washington, D.C.: Government Printing Office, 1938), p. 300.

equality and excellence were evident. It may be significant that he found it necessary to say that the government had another leadership role to play because:

> While industry may be expected to subsidize those sciences which are basic to industrial development, government must see to it that development in the social, economic, and civic phase of life keeps pace with the industrial developments of this machine age.[78]

There is little criticism that the federal government and the Office of Education played too dominant a role during the Depression. The criticism is of a different sort. It can be said that the Office was too pragmatic--a finger in the dike approach which shied away from the more basic issues. It was initially without planning or goals. One writer asserts that it diversified and fragmented educational energies. Federal relief agencies such as the CCC, PWA, and NYA remained under federal responsibility and control. Federal programs sought not to duplicate state programs but supplement them. However, because of the way they were administered they never became integrated into the state systems. Nursery schools and adult education are good examples which thirty-five years later still cannot get off the ground without federal stimulus. The same writer argues that by not giving control of these programs to local educators

---

[78] Ibid., pp. 346-65.

(or even to the Office of Education), they never became traditional; they alienated educators, and caused a split in the profession about federal aid.[79]

In rebuttal there may have been something in the system of local control itself which would not warrant this transferral or faith that local school districts could carry out the reforms. There was not always a high level of local leadership. Hundreds of districts were too large or too small to be administratively efficient. The greatest deficiency of localism, however, was its resistance to change. The government meant many of these measures as stimulants for local school districts. It was hoped that local districts would permanently adopt some of the programs which were demonstrated and funded. Even programs such as pre-school education were dropped. Local district leadership followed the dictates of a citizenry which had not been sold on a program, and who were reluctant to alter priorities or to assess additional local taxes. On the other hand, the leadership of the federal government had stopped short of control. The Office of Education had an equal fetish about the sacredness of localism which deterred it from pushing harder.

---

[79]Harry Zeitlin, "An Abstract of Federal Relations in American Education, 1933-1943: A Study of New Deal Efforts and Innovations," Dissertation Abstracts: Abstracts of Dissertations and Monographs in Microform, XIX, Part I, No. 2 (August, 1958), 268-69.

Many economic and social reforms were carried out by the New Deal and yet, educators were reluctant to press for change in education. Educators from top to bottom did not seize the opportunity presented by crisis to carry out reforms which would have been equally as radical.

CHAPTER V

STATE DEPARTMENTS TO THE RESCUE?

Background

The responsibility of the state to provide free public schooling for the children of America has long been established. No state in 1930 had assumed this responsibility in any great measure. The states performed only superficial supervision, and the schools were left to local financing and control. The varieties found among the forty-eight state departments of education are so great that to generalize much further is hazardous, but certain trends can be discerned.

There were several trends operating toward school centralization. Control of teacher certification was definitely in this direction. Theorists, administrators, and teachers were advocating state certification of teachers and the raising of professional standards. Legislation was on the books in most states regulating attendance, minimal qualifications for county superintendents, certain areas of the curriculum, and in some states adoption of textbooks. These laws set the minimums very low and usually were the result of eratic political pressure rather

than of any comprehensive plan. Their impact on the schools consequently, was negligible, and state financial support actually was waning. An education text published in 1931 went so far as to say: "The suggestion that the state pay the major part of school costs would today meet with violent opposition in nearly every state in the Union."[1]

This was not the fault of educational planners. One could make quite a list of men in the profession who had spoken out on the issue of state support of education. The list would begin with Ellwood P. Cubberley in 1905 and continue with G. D. Strayer, R. M. Haig, and F. H. Swift in the twenties. Probably the best known of all was Paul R. Mort who was a prolific writer and speaker and had great influence in the thirties. All of these men advocated greater state action to equalize the disgraceful diversity of educational opportunity within the nation.[2]

Most state departments of education lacked the funds, personnel, and organizational structure to take any leadership role. Perhaps even worse was their subservience to party politics. In a 1930 survey of state departments,

---

[1]Fletcher Harper Swift, Federal and State Policies in Public School Finance in the United States (Boston: Ginn and Company, 1931), p. 96.

[2]R. L. Johns, "State Financing of Elementary and Secondary Education," Chap. iv of Education in the States, pp. 183-88.

two states listed political interference as impediments to their effectiveness. None of them listed lack of funds, lack of authority, or a need for federal aid. Only one mentioned the prevalence of tiny local districts and the taxation system as conditions needing reform. Only nineteen of forty-eight even replied--a further indication of their conservatism.[3]

In the agrarian period of American history, a state department of education was not needed. Each village was educationally self-sufficient. State superintendents were appointed to gather statistics for the legislatures to serve as an indication of needed legislation. At the turn of the century, school inspection and supervision was assumed by these departments. Administration of federal funds for vocational education became another responsibility for some departments, but some states provided for separate boards of vocational education. A 1933 study found that the staffs of education departments spent most of their time in routine unimaginative tasks--preparing curriculum outlines and bulletins, inspection and supervision, and working with

---

[3]Department of Superintendence of the National Education Association, Educational Leadership: Progress and Possibilities, Eleventh Yearbook (Washington, D.C.: The Department of Superintendence, 1933), p. 255.

individual teachers.[4] Even their non-statistical reports were more concerned with facts than with interpretations.[5]

In May, 1930, the N.E.A. Research Division published a handbook of standards for state departments of education.[6] In an evaluation using those criteria, it was found that only half of the state departments could measure up on eleven of the twenty standards. The largest failure was the state boards of education. Most had too many ex officio members. Boards also lacked the authority to appoint the state superintendent. Top men were kept from the leadership post by residence requirements, poor salaries, and minimum professional standards, even when they were not elected. Their staffs were too small and poorly paid. The range of staff size was truly phenomenal. It varied from 8 employees in Arkansas to 594 in the state of New York. The study concluded that as presently

---

[4]M. R. Steffens, "The Relationship of State Departments of Education to the Administration and Supervision of Local Secondary Schools," Department of Secondary-School Principals of the National Education Association, Bulletin, No. 47 (May, 1933), Abstracts of Unpublished Masters' Theses in the Field of Secondary School Administration (Berwyn, Ill.: Department of Secondary-School Principals, 1933), pp. 84-85.

[5]New York, University of the State of New York, Twenty-Eight Annual Report of the Education Department for the School Year ending June 30, 1931, Vol. I (Albany, N. Y.: University of the State of New York, 1932), 42.

[6]Department of Superintendence, Educational Leadership, p. 253.

constituted state departments of education were a hindrance to education.[7]

Educational confusion was rampant in most states. No state had organized all educational functions under one board. One state had as many as 18 educational boards, and the total number of state boards for the nation was 348. In thirty-two states the superintendent was elected on a partisan basis.[8] It was toward these types of organizations that local administrators would have to look for leadership during this period of economic depression and social disorientation.

The Depression

Even before the major effects of the Depression jarred the schools, school administrators knew they had problems. By 1933, they were saying: "The demand now is for leadership. Local school systems need guidance in overcoming their many difficulties."[9] Some of the problems were financial difficulties; lack of efficient administrative size; a need for curricula; research and

---

[7] Ibid., pp. 253-256. Italics mine.

[8] Walter D. Cocking and Charles H. Gilmore, Organization and Administration of Public Education, Staff Study No. 2, Prepared for the Advisory Committee on Education (Washington, D.C.: Government Printing Office, 1938), pp. 98-99.

[9] Department of Superintendence, Educational Leadership, p. 265.

better personnel which involved certification and teacher-training reform. Some of these needs could only be met by the state. At first states were able to do very little. In 1932, with a staff of 703 employees (far from typical), 1,200 calls for advice and inspection of school buildings alone had to go unanswered in New York.[10]

However, as the Depression worsened, states did respond. State legislatures like the federal government passed emergency legislation. They lowered property taxes and teachers' salaries. They assumed more state control over budgeting and extended free textbooks. State financial aid was increased. School consolidation was begun in earnest.[11] While the efficiency of consolidation had been demonstrated and accepted in theory, application worked against strong local sentiments and caused antagonism against the state.[12]

The federal government and new research were also putting additional demands on the educational facilities of the states. The number of standardized tests doubled during the thirties to a total of 2,600. The George-Reed

---

[10]New York, Twenty-Eighth Annual Report of Education, p. 10.

[11]Ward W. Keesecker, "A Review of Educational Legislation 1933 and 1934," cahp. viii of U.S. Office of Education, Biennial Survey of Education 1932-1934, pp. 1-2.

[12]Robert M. Isenberg, "State Organization for Service and Leadership to Local Schools," chap. iii of Education in the States, 138.

Act of 1929 and the George-Deen Act of 1936 provided funds for vocational guidance--another service to be directed by the state.[13] There were also the programs of adult education, vocational rehabilitation, improvements in special education which were being passed on by the federal government.

State legislators were making their demands, too. Twenty-nine state surveys were made during this decade, at the request of the legislatures or the governors. Interestingly, only two surveys in all forty-eight states were initiated by the state departments of education themselves.[14] Legislation involving state funds for textbooks and state selection of texts also involved the departments. Compulsary attendance was achieved by the mid-thirties necessitating more sophisticated child accounting and bringing into the schools the social and psychological problems of those who had to attend. Legislative reform bills gave them new powers and duties: distribution of more state aid, district consolidation, budgetary controls, regulatory functions over certification and teacher training, administration of tenure laws and retirement funds,

---

[13] Walter S. Crewson, "Pupil Personnel Services," chap. viii of Education in the States, pp. 349-52.

[14] Robert F. Will, Louise R. Murphy, and James E. Gibbs, Jr., State School Administration 1900-1955: Reports of Major Surveys and Studies, U.S. Office of Education, Circular, No. 580 (Washington, D.C.: Department of Health, Education and Welfare, 1957), et passim.

and supervision over loyalty oaths. Legislatures also prescribed curricula. This involved supervision and the development of outlines and syllabi.[15] Regulatory and supervisory duties were prescribed by law for the departments. Leadership did not come from within the departments.

Minimum Educational Programs

The financial crisis of the thirties forced educators to look to their state houses for survival. But while they wanted funds, they wanted no strings attached. Local control must prevail. But the state had more than financial responsibilities as the theorists had been pointing out for years. Therefore, the idea of a state sponsored minimum educational program which had been created in the universities became very relevant. Once this concept received adequate support among local administrators and state educational leaders, the division of authority could be worked out politically and professionally.

Professors of administration were not all unanimous in their fear of state control. The early theorists--

---

[15] Keesecker, "A Review of Legislation 1933 and 1934," p. 2; Ward W. Keesecker, "A Review of Educational Legislation 1935 and 1936," chap. viii of Vol. I of U.S. Office of Education, Biennial Survey of Education 1934-36, p. 1; Ward W. Keesecker, A Review of Educational Legislation 1937 and 1938, Office of Education, Bulletin, 1939, No. 16 (Washington, D.C.: Government Printing Office, 1939), pp. 1-2, 17-19, 24-25, 29.

Cubberley, Mort, Strayer, and Haig--equated democracy with home rule and innovation with local control. During the thirties another generation of financial planners came to the fore. Edgar L. Morphet and R. L. Johns wrote and were consultants to state departments at that time. Arguing that if the schools were the legal responsibility of the state, decisions made in state capitols were just as democratic as those made in Chimney Corners. They also questioned whether discrimination and nepotism were democratic. They thought the state should use its power to censor undesirable educational practices as well as to provide incentives to districts to adopt desirable ones.[16] Another theorist, Henry C. Morrison, was even more radical. He would abolish all districts and have the states directly administer the schools, financing them through a state income tax. This idea was not well received.[17] The real influence of Johns and Morphet had impact only later. The theories of Mort were the accepted ones during the thirties.

Another variable in state financing theory was how to compute a minimum foundation program in dollars. Cost could be stated in units such as so much money behind each child, or teacher, or classroom. The state also

---

[16] R. L. Johns, "State Financing of Education," p. 195.

[17] Ibid., p. 192.

could establish minimum requirements for such things as teachers' salaries and qualifications, school facilities, length of school year, and size of the district. Money then would be apportioned to those districts which lacked the local resources to meet the state standards. The two plans were really complimentary, but the second one, while equalizing many more factors also brought more control. With the high feeling about home rule which then prevailed, it was much easier to get the first plan through the legislatures. This was the plan advocated by Mort, and it was adapted to various state needs by himself and his followers.[18]

The states were making some erratic, stumbling attempts to set educational standards. In 1930, not one state specifically demanded school consolidation. Only six states required school closure when enrollment fell below a certain bare minimum.[19] Yet, in 1933 West Virginia achieved consolidation by statute. It abolished 450 districts and created 55 new ones along county boundaries.[20] Under state leadership, 127,531 nationwide school districts

---

[18]A. W. Schmidt, Development of a State Minimum Educational Program (New York: Bureau of Publications, Teachers College, Columbia University, 1932), pp. 2-3.

[19]Ibid., p. 11.

[20]Isenberg, "State Organization for Service," p. 142.

in 1931 were reduced to 117,108 in 1939.[21] The result of such consolidation was more course offerings, more services, and a higher level of professional preparation of the staff.[22]

There were other attempts at raising minimum standards. In 1935 South Carolina and West Virginia extended the school year.[23] Compulsory attendance laws were passed keeping youth in school until they reached sixteen.[24] Certification requirements were raised and special certificates were required in certain fields. Growth by legislation occurred in vocational and adult education. Other legislation extended retirment benefits, established tenure, improved transportation, increased health and safety facilities, provided free textbooks, and standardized teacher salaries.

An Office of Education Bulletin mentioned three general trends for this decade: "(1) Increased state responsibility for the financial support of public education. (2) A Strengthening of state instrumentalities of control

---

[21]Lerue W. Winget, Edgar Fuller, Terrel H. Bell, "State Departments of Education Within State Governments," chap. ii of Education in the States, p. 78.

[22]Isenberg, "State Organization for Service," p. 148.

[23]Interior, Annual Report 1935, p. 276.

[24]Keesecker, "Review of Legislation 1937 and 1938," pp. 24-25.

over education. (3) The establishment of minimum state-aid foundation programs of State-wide application."[25]

Early in the thirties state departments set up committees to work with state educational associations on certification. The public was clamoring to lower standards to further deflate teachers' salaries. Departments needed backing from the entire teaching establishment to lobby effectively to deny these demands. It is to the credit of the state leadership that this attack not only was met and defeated, but strides were made in raising certification requirements. While only two states required baccalaureate degrees in 1930 for elementary certificates, eleven states had this requirement in 1940. Baccalaureate degree requirements for secondary certificates were established in seventeen states by the end of the period.[26]

State legislatures also reacted to pressures from abroad. Communist and fascist threats in Europe produced a rash of loyalty oaths.[27] The study of state and federal constitutions were prescribed by legislation. Instruction in alcohol, narcotics, and natural resources were ordered by law. Control was extended over private schools.[28]

---

[25] Ibid., pp. 1, 2, 29, 51.

[26] T. M. Stinnett, "Teacher Education, Certification, and Accredidation," chap. ix of Education in the States, pp. 393-401.

[27] Keesecker, Review of Educational Legislation 1935 and 1936, p. 23.

[28] Keesecker, Review of Educational Legislation 1937 and 1938, pp. 17-19, 49-51.

The most pressing problem for states to face was adequate and equitable financing of public education. The Depression only worsened the financial crises of the schools which was due to local financing. In 1933, there was a change of state policy, and the states began to assume their responsibilities. Property taxes were insufficient and inequitable so the states had to find new sources of revenue. Seven added an income tax, eight turned to sales taxes, and six taxed liquor and licences. Wyoming, Arizona, Arkansas, Indiana, Kentucky, Michigan, Minnesota, Montana, New Mexico, Ohio, Oklahoma, Pennsylvania, South Dakota, Texas, and Washington all made attempts at equalization.[29] The greatest increase in state aid in the twentieth century through 1966 occurred during the decade of the thirties--11.9 per cent.[30]

Minimum standards for learning fared less well. Standards for courses tended to be expressed in ambiguous or non-measureable terms. State developed courses of study outlines were more concrete and helpful than listing of objectives. Achievement standards measured by testing were emphatically rejected by most educators.[31]

---

[29]Interior, Annual Report 1935, pp. 275-76.

[30]R. L. Johns, "State Financing of Education," pp. 180, 205.

[31]Schmidt, Development of Minimum Educational Program, p. 75.

Accountability for educational results was not part of the reform package. The trend was for the state departments of education to conduct research and set minimum standards "to safeguard the communities against their own ignorance"[32] and to upgrade the profession. However, no change was to occur in actual control.

The chief supporters of more state aid and responsibility have already been named. They were professors of educational administration. But the N.E.A. took strong stands on state support beginning in 1933. The Joint Commission on Emergency in Education of the N.E.A. and the Department of Superintendence sponsored a National Conference on School Finance which emphasized state support based on the Mort plan of equality and efficiency. It also recommended more aid from the federal government. In 1938 the N.E.A. established the Committee on Tax Education and School Finance to promote state and local financing. It included college and state department representatives. Many state superintendent associations also advocated increased state aid. The Michigan Association of School Administrators annually resolved that more state aid was needed.

---

[32] Ibid., p. 73.

[33] Michigan Association of School Administrators, 1933 Minutes of Meetings, Lansing, 1933, p. 177. (Mimeographed.); MASA, 1934 Minutes of Meetings, Lansing, 1934, p. 183 (Mimeographed.); MASA, 1936 Minutes of Meetings, Lansing, 1936, p. 190 (Mimeographed.)

The U.S. Office of Education also promoted state financing beginning in 1930. They published surveys every ten years of amounts of state support and the level obtained of equality of opportunity in education. The Council of Chief State School Officers which was organized in 1928 and many state governors were instrumental in passing needed legislation.[34]

In the state financing debate, the two value principles which frequently came into conflict were equalization and home rule. The home rule position was a conservative one. Horace Mann first advocated the theory that all the wealth should be taxed to provide an education for all the children. Cubberley first advanced the thesis that it was the industrial revolution which caused the inequalities of wealth among the various school districts. This latter argument is used by state departments of education in securing funds.[35]

Mort's conservatism on the home rule factor was very influential in the thirties due to his influence as a theorist for state departments. But he was additionally concerned with the slowness of local communities to adapt to change. He found it took fifty years for established,

---

[34]R. L. Johns, "State Financing of Education," p. 202.

[35]Ibid., pp. 202-204.

sound educational practice to spread. Also he was concerned that so many districts were satisfied with minimum programs with no desire to improve. He added incentives to his theoretical model to counteract this. Yet, he truly believed that central control stifled initiative.[36]

The Educational Policies Commission also took a conservative stand on home rule. This seemed odd considering some of the illustrious names who served on it. The new social order did not seem to include state control of education. If the schools were as bad as research had shown them to be, it would seem that a more radical organization of structure would be in order. Schools were not serving minorities. They were deteriorating in the cities, and the curriculum was not keeping pace with rapid change. Yet the educational leaders were defending the local structure which produced all of this and extolling half-trained teachers from county normal schools as curriculum developers and decision makers. The Commission rightly condemned lay legislators as curriculum builders, but completely ignored the state departments as bodies of experts which could furnish direction, coordination, and incentives.

A study conducted in 1932 to determine the attitudes of professors of educational administration, and of

---

[36] Ibid.

local school superintendents on the question of state versus local control sheds light on the opinions of working educators. Both groups were more willing to delegate educational decision making to a state department of professional educators than to a lay legislature. The professors were more tolerant of state control than were the superintendents. Over 50 per cent of the interviewees thought the maximum portions of the education program should be left to the localities. Minimums were accepted as state responsibilities. State control over parts of the curriculum, minimum qualifications for superintendents, attendence, census, standards for buildings and equipment, the establishment of libraries, equality of opportunity for all children, and the establishment of taxation was accepted as state functions by 90 per cent of those polled. In addition, 90 per cent of the professors felt that minimum teacher certification requirements should be state-prescribed, and 80 per cent of the professors agreed that it was the responsibility of the states to provide lists of textbooks from which local districts could choose. Only 50 per cent of the superintendents would give this perogative to the state. More than 60 per cent of both groups favored state control over time devoted to each subject, standards of achievement, minimum salaries for teachers, tenure, free textbooks, and establishment of special schools.

Of those powers enjoyed by the state, administrators agreed that state departments should be charged with standards which defined the quality of education. Minimum requirements could be set by law. A majority of professors agreed on only four items which should be left to local control. They were the maximum length of the term, which textbooks should be used, which supplies would be furnished free of change, and the internal budget allotments. City superintendents agreed on all of these items, but in addition, wanted to decide whether or not to employ supervisors, the maximum length of the day, the maximum local tax to be collected, and minimum class size. The report would indicate that superintendents would tolerate quite a bit of regulation from the state as long as they retained leadership in curricular and budgeting areas.[37]

The study concluded from the data that states had not exercised the control that educators would have permitted them. But control was only part of the problem. Existing tax laws would not have permitted the financing of even the minimum program. Regulation of teacher training curricula would also be necessary for real educational reform to be effective. Administrative units would have to be changed.

---

[37]Schmidt, Development of Minimum Educational Program, pp. 36-52.

Mort had been campaigning for the substitution of county for district units, but his plan was not accepted by the electorate.[38] In the end consolidation became more palatable and the worsening Depression was the impetus to solve some of these problems and effect some educational change.

State Departments as Leaders

There was some leadership growth by state departments during the thirties. Fred F. Beach and Andrew H. Gibbs in their monograph "The Personnel of State Departments of Education," chose 1930 as the beginning leadership stage of state departments.[39] Up to 1900 state departments existed primarily for statistical purposes. The inspection stage lasted from the turn of the century until 1930. After 1930, real leadership emerged. No educational leader thought a minimum educational program was enough. State departments were leary about leaving it to local initiative to see that quality programs were pursued. Financial aid alone would not equalize educational opportunity. Guidance, the results of research, and motivation were also necessary. This logically fell to the state departments of education.

---

[38] Ibid., pp. 56, 88, 89.

[39] Fred F. Beach and Andrew Gibbs, The Personnel of State Departments of Education, U.S. Office of Education, Misc. No. 16 (Washington, D.C.: Government Printing Office, 1952), p. 3.

Most staffs were too small to provide leadership. In order to raise the educational levels of districts, a highly qualified professional state staff was needed. Staffs also would have to be expanded. In fact, state departments staffs grew over 100 per cent during this decade.[40] These staffs would have to be composed of men with a higher level of training than the former inspectoral staffs. They now began to be called consultants. Their aim was no longer supervisory but to furnish leadership and guidance. The Michigan Department of Public Instruction paper, News of the Week, reflected this policy shift. It reported that school visitations that year would seek to gather information to form an educational policy for present needs. Helpful service not criticism was the policy. Its objectives were: "Professional growth of the teacher, improvement in instruction, united effort, formation of a definite educational policy for the whole school, and a bolstering of faculty morale."[41]

These consultants used new techniques. First, they became available or "on call." They used teachers' meeting, demonstrations, bulletins, handbooks, instead of the old ways of visiting classes and working with

---

[40] Ibid., p. 6.

[41] Michigan Department of Public Instruction, News of the Week, I (September 27, 1933), p. 1.

individual teachers. Two goals were uniform among the various state departments--equitability and coordination within subject matter and between disciplines.[42]

Curriculum research came into its own in the thirties. Curriculum laboratories or divisions were established in leading educational institutions following the example of Teachers College in 1928. Laboratories were established in colleges, city school systems, and state departments of education. In a survey of state departments, eleven of the twenty-three respondents had curriculum laboratories all of which had been established since 1930. The activities of these state curriculum laboratories included course construction, publishing, research, holding conferences, and directing local school systems in curriculum courses. Only one state department evaluated courses and materials. Leadership in curriculum improvement was found to be less common in colleges and universities than in state departments. Curriculum staffs were smaller in city laboratories than in state laboratories and were often headed by an outside consultant. City laboratories developed courses of study rather than

---

[42]Katherine M. Cork, Supervision of Instruction as a Function of State Departments of Education, U.S. Office of Education, Bulletin, 1940, No. 6. Monograph No. 7 (Washington, D.C.: Government Printing Office, 1940), pp. 117-18, 122.

working with staffs in curriculum development. Long term research was avoided.[43]

Michigan, California, New York, New Jersey, Tennessee, and Alabama all made gains in curricular leadership. Michigan had a particularly energetic program. In January, 1934, the state superintendent of Public Instruction established the Michigan Educational Planning Commission. It was a cross section of lay leaders who would chart the future course of education in Michigan. Its tasks were to define the goals of public education, to examine the financing of public education, to study school administration and organization, to determine the extent of free public education, to plan instructional improvement, to study teacher training, and to develop a policy of public relations.[44] The goals were formulated in 1934 and adopted by the State Board of Education. Then the important task remained of implementing these goals and putting them into practice. To do this the Curriculum Steering Committee was formed in 1935. This was a committee of professionals from various Michigan educational

---

[43]Bernice E. Leary, Curriculum Laboratories and Divisions: Their Organization and Functions in State Departments of Education, City School Systems, and Institutions of Higher Education, Office of Education, Bulletin, 1938, No. 7 (Washington, D.C.: Government Printing Office, 1938), pp. 1-21.

[44]Michigan, Ninety-Second Report of the Superintendent of Public Instruction of the State of Michigan for the Biennium 1931-33 (Lansing, Mich.: Franklin De Kleine Co., Printers and Binders, 1934), pp. 22-25.

institutions. They initiated two programs: a crash program to start improving instruction immediately and a long term program for careful review and revision.[45]

By 1937 lay participation was encouraged in curriculum work. By this time the curriculum program was extensive. The emphasis was functional and sought to relate individual needs to the present society. It was based on the assumption that the community--lay and professional--"must become the dynamic element in planning and executing an improved instructional program."[46] Bulletins were published, conferences held, a regional organization was established to improve service to more remote areas of the state. New courses of study were developed, and special aids were provided for special groups.

In an interpretation of the legal basis for curriculum development, the Superintendent reported that the state fulfilled its constitutional duties through planning and appraisal, but that executive authority was best

---

[45]Michigan, Ninety-Third Report of the Superintendent of Public Instruction of the State of Michigan for the Biennium 1933-35 (Lansing, Mich.: Superintendent of Public Instruction, 1936), p. 21.

[46]Michigan, Ninety-Fourth Report of the Superintendent of Public Instruction of the State of Michigan for the Biennium 1935-37 (Lansing, Mich.: Superintendent of Public Instruction, 1938), pp. 17, 22.

delegated to the districts. Any form of coercion was shunned.[47]

By 1940, the emphasis had changed in the Curriculum Program. Citizenship education was becoming dominant. Evaluation was another major thrust in order "to ground the program in realism and to level all pedagogical theories by subjecting them to the acid test of effectiveness."[48] An instructional policy was developed and distributed. Its basic philosophy was the school-community concept with experience as the basis of learning. The state department again expressed that the guide was neither authoritative nor mandatory.[49]

In its Third Report of Progress, the Michigan Curriculum Program listed its administrative policy with a rationale. Items one and three set the tone.

> 1. The relationships of the Department with local schools are based upon the service concept of educational leadership. This concept is inclusive and democratic and should take precedence over such concepts as inspection, supervision, direction, the dissemination of "rulings" or direct evaluation of local programs by outside agencies.

---

[47] Ibid., pp. 33-34.

[48] Michigan, Ninety-Fifth Report of the Superintendent of Public Instruction of the State of Michigan for the Biennium 1937-39 (Lansing, Mich.: Superintendent of Public Instruction, 1940), p. 37.

[49] Ibid., pp. 37, 74, 78.

> 3. The local community is responsible for planning, executing, and appraising its educational organization and curriculum. . .[50]

The Lay Advisory Commission which was a descendent of the Educational Planning Commission and which served in an advisory capacity to the Department of Public Instruction had a set of principles which were quite similar to those of the Curriculum Program. Number two is especially significant.

> 2. Adjustments in school organization should follow the general principles observed by the founders of the state, in which they emphasize the formation of school districts for neighborhood and communities of people of like interests, exercising democratic control over the operation of their schools. . .[51]

According to the educational beliefs of the time, many state superintendents did provide leadership. Leadership like teaching aimed at stimulation of activity. In the 1940 Report the Michigan State Superintendent of Public Instruction claimed that nearly all districts had been stimulated by the department to carry on some form of curriculum study.[52] Current theory was calling for democratic leadership. Under state leadership professors,

---

[50]Michigan, Department of Public Instruction, The Michigan Curriculum Program: Third Report of Progress, Bulletin, No. 311 (Lansing, Mich.: Superintendent of Public Instruction, 1939), p. 4.

[51]Ibid., p. 6. Italics mine.

[52]Michigan, Ninety-Fifth Report, pp. 39-40.

deans, labor and business leaders, teachers, citizens, and administrators were taking part in participatory curriculum building. Whether curriculums improved by this method is issue for debate. The advocates of this philosophy were more concerned about the process. They saw benefits in getting everyone involved and the value of in-service-training. The product was secondary. The involvement of the community seemed to erode the autonomy of the profession. Democracy and professionalism are frequent antagonists.

There was one area in which state superintendents definitely lost ground. Teachers, especially rural ones, looked to state leadership. State teachers associations worked closely with the departments. They campaigned against elected superintendents and for lay state boards. Until 1934, every state superintendent was an ex officio delegate to the N.E.A. convention. But two things happened during the thirties which weakened this bond. Due to tenure and an increase in male high school teachers, classroom teachers assumed more power. This growth occurred over a short time span. There was a 53 per cent rise in high school enrollment between 1929 and 1934. As teacher power in state and national organizations grew, there was a shift of emphasis from improvement of instruction to teacher benefits. State and teacher goals overlapped but were no longer identical. Also during this decade

many state organizations appointed executive secretaries who took over many of the state department's functions in providing teacher services.[53]

Nevertheless, there still were calls for leadership from state departments. The New York Regents' study of public schools led to a call for a whole new educational program. Strong state departments were part of this plan. They recommended that the state department "adopt leadership based on research" as its central objective.[54] They advised a policy of working to strengthen the professional leadership rather than dissipating their energies by working with individual teachers. They were told to decentralize state supervision and encourage local research by using the Regents Examination as a catalyst for evaluation and experimentation in the districts rather than as an instrument of control. A need was pointed out for new materials to keep pace with the new curriculum developments. Teachers often lacked the time to develop their own materials. They were encouraged to sponsor joint councils and conferences to work out problems. For state leadership to be really effective, it was recognized that

---

[53] Ibid., pp. 657, 664-65.

[54] New York, The Regents' Inquiry, Education for American Life: A New Program for the State of New York (New York: McGraw-Hill Book Company, Inc., 1938), p. 64.

schools must be large enough to have supervisors and department heads of their own.[55]

The Regents found that much of the dilemma the schools were facing was a result of lack of planning. Surveys, meetings, and resolutions were not enough. Regulatory power only could establish minimums. Persuasive and stimulating leadership had to come from an administrative staff devoted to excellence and whose authority was based on knowledge. If the Regents' plan were to be carried out, the actual work could only be accomplished by the department. In order to carry out this mission, the department must first be strengthened and modernized. But the Regents' Inquiry was not only an answer--it contained a plea for greater leadership from the state departments because the "public school system of the United States now stands at the crossroads. No state knows what to do for youth today."[56]

But the Regents backed down because they also said:

> There are two major foundations of the school system of the State of New York. One is the strong centralized State Department just described, the other is local educational freedom. The progress of Schools in this State arises from both of these elements. In spite of the great influence of the State Department for educational advance, it is the conclusion of the Inquiry

---

[55] Ibid., pp. 65, 107.

[56] Ibid., pp. 122-23.

> that an even greater source of educational progress has been local freedom and the experimentation which this freedom has encouraged.[57]

This was not only their conclusion but their desire. State departments purposely had been kept weak.

The President's Advisory Commission was equally insistent that the future quality of the public schools depended on strong state leadership. It found that localism had both strengths and weaknesses. Localism was successful in small and middle-size towns, but it broke down in the cities and rural areas. Another inherent danger of local control cited was the difficulty of maintaining a balanced program. There was considerable pressure to get rid of the less practical frills.[58] The arts, sciences, and foreign languages often had no local defenders. The committee recommended national, state, regional, and local planning boards and general federal aid to be administered jointly by state and federal agencies. The Committee asked for federal funds to aid the strengthening of the administrative services of state education departments.[59]

---

[57] Ibid., p. 98.

[58] U.S., The Advisory Committee on Education, Report of the Committee (Washington, D.C.: Government Printing Office, 1938), pp. 7-9.

[59] Ibid., pp. 197, 221, 203-04.

Reflections

There were few educational reforms in the states during the thirties.[60] The actions taken were merely adjustments made to maintain the system. Rural Populists and political Progressives combined to substitute home rule and laissez faire activity for any real educational progress. Education in the name of democracy was used to maintain class interest. The activity movement and democratic planning favored the middle-class children who did not need as much help with basic skills and whose home environment was less autocratic. Lack of goals and measurements hid the glaring deficiencies of the system. Real reform was against the interest of the American Association of School Administrators because reform brings a redistribution of power. Local administrators were seeking more power in the form of state financial aid but with no accountability attached to it. Over half of all state revenue was apportioned according to load without taking into account the districts' ability to pay. Only three states awarded state aid inversely to district wealth.[61] Through state compulsary attendance laws which

---

[60] Winget, "State Departments within State Governments," p. 77.

[61] Timon Covert, State Provisions for Equalizing the Cost of Public Education, Bulletin, 1936, No. 4 (Washington, D.C.: Government Printing Office, 1936), pp. 47-48.

the educational establishment had lobbied for for years, the schoolmen had a complete monopoly over youth. But monopoly did not bring equality. Tracking, not compensatory education, was the answer to social differences. While priding themselves on a democratic "one track"[62] system, within the system the socio-economic classes were treated differently. This was rationalized by a liberal concern for individual differences.

Taking the schools out of politics was consistent with standard Progressive policy. In theory, this would seem to imply more professionalism, but, in fact, it worked out to insure that the schools remained an instrument of the establishment. Minorities were neutralized when educational administration was removed from the arena of public and political debate. At large, non-political school board elections in the districts always had worked to insure that representation would be from the majority constituency. It also insulated educators from the political fact that state school monies were apportioned politically and only through building up support within various political factions could reform legislation and financing be pushed through the legislatures.

---

[62]Educational Policies Commission, The Structure and Administration of Education in American Democracy, p. 1.

Leaving curriculum design to teachers and laymen guaranteed the status quo and encouraged anti-intellectualism. It was hardly a group which would produce theory, empirical data, or tough-minded reforms. Education, long hailed as the guardian of democracy, was sacrificed on its altars.

State gains in control were mainly illusory. There was actually less prescriptive legislation passed than early in the century.[63] Supervision was replaced by "leadership." Achievement testing was going out.[64] There was no real reorganization of structure. Consolidation usually involved only the very smallest districts, and in many states this was only at their request. Decentralization of city systems was neglected. Little administrative machinery was forged to carry quality education to the pupils or the teachers. Many guidelines never reached them. The growth of state education offices was in the lateral, staff direction.

But to the sons and daughters of Progressives, these adjustments were reform. There was lay and local

---

[63]Alex Baskin, "An Abstract of Education and the Great Depression: An Inquiry into the Social Ideas and Activities of Radical American Educators during the Economic Crisis of the 1930's," Dissertation Abstracts: Humanities and Social Sciences: Abstracts of Dissertations Available on Microfilm or as Xerographic Reproduction, XXVII, Part I, No. 2 (August, 1965), p. 474A.

[64]Walter W. Cook, "Tests, Achievement," Encyclopedia of Educational Research, 1st ed., p. 1285.

control, room for individual initiative, activity and a child-centered approach. That this might reduce American culture to the lowest common denominator was not thought through or perhaps sacrificed to immediacy. Schools must be a leavening agent in a leveling society. Stress on individualism hardly prepared students to live in a mass society.

The federal experience demonstrated that change comes with grants. Force is needed to bring change. The disorganized, localized, democratic, committee-run education profession was far too flexible to be any real force at all. State departments lost a real opportunity during the Depression to bring aggressive, determined leadership. State superintendents were too timid to assume vocal positions and herald public support for equalization and rational planning. The law was on their side, but tradition was stronger. Fears of public antagonisms and hostile legislatures prevented superintendents from pursuing strong public relations. Lack of funds was a proverbial handicap.[65] Yet, a professional statesman was called for to lead educators on a middle ground between extrinsic and intrinsic extremism.

---

[65]Richard G. Gray, "Public Relations in State Departments of Education," chap. xvi of Education in the States, p. 743.

One member of the Educational Policies Commission has since reversed his opinion of how quality is imbued into the schools. Speaking before a meeting of state superintendents in 1964, James Bryant Conant, commenting on his views during the thirties, said:

> I came to envision the American scene as one in which the local school board and the local superintendent were the all important agencies for carrying out American public school policy.[66]

The Educational Policies Commission reports were addressed to them, and Conant presumed if they read these reports, they could do the job. He felt then that the less said about state departments, the better. But the demand for educational reform and equalization of educational opportunity never became a mass movement. Without the coercive power of the state real reform would not be forthcoming. Democratic leadership by state departments was not enough.

---

[66]Winget, "State Departments within State Governments," pp. 123-24.

CHAPTER VI

CONSERVING DEMOCRACY

Introduction

To establish the fact that a large group of educational experts had been ensconced at the top of a large and developing educational hierarchy has not been a difficult task. Much of the growth in educational leadership had come since World War I and continued to grow during the thirities. There was also growth in federal and state interest in and control of education. These leaders, whether at education schools of universities or attached to state or federal bureaus, constituted a profession apart from college and university scholars who had influenced education in the past. They were also different from the officials of the turn of the century, sometimes politically chosen, who passed out information and collected statistics from one-room school districts. They wrote voluminously in books and journals about the theories and mechanics of education. The emphasis no longer was on material and numerical growth and with business efficiency as it had been in the twenties, Educational leaders in the thirties wrote curriculum guides and

suggested new structures and new teaching techniques. Although it had been difficult for educators to articulate goals and objectives for American education, the Depression did cause them to ask questions about American society. They continued to be more concerned, however, with the individual and his role in society than about society itself.

To ascertain the extent to which the concerns and ideas of the experts and advisers became the ideas and concerns of the practicing school administrators is more difficult. This chapter will survey, analyze, and summarize the stated ideas of school administrators. The background and training of school administrators, the effect of the political, social, and economic developments of the decade as well as the impact of the educational hierarchy on them will be examined.

The emerging field of school administration covered a wide range of positions in education. It included superintendents of districts educating a few hundred students to those educating hundreds of thousands. It included principals and supervisors who spent much of their time teaching. Superintendents from the larger districts were in close association with the university professors and state departments and moved frequently into these positions themselves. (The movement in the profession was seldom the other way.) For many, professional

training and formal education ended after graduation from the local teacher's college.

Background and Training

A study of the social understandings of the superintendents of schools by Frederick Bair gives the following picture of the background of a typical superintendent of 1933.[1] He was born in 1890, was of Anglo-Saxon stock and was long settled in this country. He came from an agrarian culture, usually raised on a farm where a primary concern was man as an individual against nature. He needed to have initiative and to be resourceful. There were few experts in those days. His parents usually had finished common school only. Books were rare and reading was not a common pastime in the home. He went to a small denominational liberal arts college. He had been in the teaching profession for eighteen years. He was likely to live and work in a rural area, village, or small town. He attended church regularly and conscientiously. He was a leader in his community, belonging to one or more service clubs, and was a frequent speaker at local gatherings.

Bair emphasized that the school administrator's roots were in an agrarian age and that his ideas were

---

[1]Frederick Bair, The Social Understandings of the Superintendent of Schools (New York: Bureau of Publications, Teachers College Columbia University, 1934), pp. 26-33; Carter Saunders, "Self-Portrait," The Nations Schools, XVIII (August, 1936), 25-27.

formed in the pre-World War I era--that he was in essence provincial. Bair rated the superintendents on a scale developed by Manly Harper[2] to show that superintendents were conservative and that they tended to impose traditional and authoritarian prescriptions upon the young.[3] Bair, being one of the more radical educators of the period, wrote concerning the superintendent that something should "move him from the firm base of his sturdy Republican (1898) inheritances."[4] That superintendents in Michigan did tend to be Republican was borne out by a straw vote taken at their 1932 fall meeting which showed them favoring Hoover over Roosevelt forty-six to five.[5]

A survey by the Department of Superintendence confirmed much of Bair's findings, but differentiated between the city and rural superintendents. The rural superintendent was more likely to have been the product of a normal school while 72 per cent of the city superintendents had been educated at liberal arts colleges.[6] It also was

---

[2]See Manly H. Harper, Social Beliefs and Attitudes of American Educators, Columbia University Contributions to Education, No. 294 (New York: Bureau of Publications, Teachers College, Columbia University, 1927).

[3]Bair, Social Understandings, p. 31.

[4]Ibid., pp. 28-29.

[5]"Third Annual Conference of City Superintendents at Traverse City," Michigan Education Association Journal, X (October, 1938), p. 97.

[6]Department of Superintendence, Educational Leadership, p. 105.

found that the city superintendent was better read than the rural superintendent. The Atlantic Monthly was read by 44 per cent of the large city superintendents while only 12 per cent of the rural superintendents reported reading it.[7]

The number of superintendents with higher degrees was increasing steadily. In Michigan, in 1934, the average superintendent in the larger schools had 1.28 years of graduate training. The average for all superintendents was .88 years.[8] By 1933, 57 per cent of the superintendents in the nation held masters' degrees and a significant number (10 per cent) in large cities had doctorates.[9] Most of them had been elevated to their positions from the high school principalship, and a majority of them had majored in and taught math or science. A trend that could be noted is that in their graduate work a larger percentage of rural superintendents majored in education as graduate students than did city superintendents, and a larger percentage majored in education in 1933 than in 1929.[10] The

---

[7] Ibid., p. 126.

[8] E. J. Jennings, "The Status of the Superintendent in the Public Schools of Michigan" (unpublished M.A. thesis, University of Michigan, 1934), p. 13.

[9] Department of Superintendence, Educational Leadership, p. 106.

[10] Ibid., p. 109; W. W. Coxe, The Study of the Secondary School Principal in New York State (Albany, N.Y.: The University of the State of New York Press, 1929), p. 21.

implication was that the younger and less experienced superintendents were more likely to have done their graduate work in education (see Chapter III).

Not as many facts are available about the social backgrounds of principals and other administrative personnel. It may be assumed that if a large percentage of superintendents came from the ranks of high school principals, the background of the principal would be similar to that of the superintendent. However, in some smaller systems principals were often little more than head teachers. By 1930-31, the number of high school principals with masters' degrees was equal in number to those with bachelors' degrees. There was a lag of about three years behind superintendents.[11] Surveys showed that principals had taken more recent professional courses than teachers. They took such courses as Administration and Supervision, High School Administration, Tests and Measurements, and School Finance.[12] They ranked supervision and methods of instruction as their most valuable courses. They read their state educational journal and

---

[11]J. R. Shannon, "Academic Training of Secondary School Principals in the United States," Bulletin of the Department of Secondary School Principals of the National Education Association, No. 5 (December, 1934), p. 11.

[12]G. W. Bannerman, "Principal Facts," Nations Schools, XVI (September, 1935), p. 30.

perhaps one other professional journal.[13] Most professed to read one professional book per year, but many could not list even one non-professional book which they had read.[14]

Although in large systems the principal regarded his position as being more challenging than that of the superintendent,[15] in the smaller systems a principalship was regarded merely as a stepping stone.[16] The small high school principal had a heavy teaching load which gave him little time for leadership or administration.[17] As late as 1938 in Nebraska where 42 per cent of the secondary school principals were women, only 12 per cent of them had masters' degrees. They still spent 93 per cent of their time in teaching and supervising study halls.[18]

The status of the principal had grown during the decade of the thirties. He had been better trained and

---

[13]Orlie Clem and James F. Murray, "The Status of the Pennsylvania High School Principal," Educational Administration and Supervision, XIX (September, 1933), pp. 449-450.

[14]Thomas H. Briggs, "Some Characteristics of Secondary School Principals," School Review, XLII (March, 1934), p. 14.

[15]Otto W. Haisley, "The Principal as Social Interpreter," Clearing House, IX (October, 1939), 100.

[16]Harlan Koch, "The High School Principal Looks at Himself as Educational Leader," School Review, XLV (June, 1937), 453-54.

[17]Clem and Murray, "Status of the Principal," p. 450; Bannerman, "Principal Facts," p. 30.

[18]Cecil Winfield Scott and Harold D. Reid, "The Public High School Principal in Nebraska," School Review, XLVII (February, 1939), 123-24.

was given more of a leadership role in the area of curriculum and instruction and given greater responsibility in initiating new ideas and in administrative authority.

Criticism of Administrators

However, professors who did studies on administrators were far from satisfied with what they saw and learned about superintendents and principals. Bair told what a superintendent should be. He should be the "purposeful ambassador between an imperfect society that is passing and an improved society that is coming. . ." This "must be apprehended with convincing clarity, first of all by the superintendent himself. He has too largely allowed himself to be shaped in a lesser mold."[19] Bair's findings prompted him to be harsh on the superintendent. The superintendent had to fight such things in his background as "bigotry, narrowness, provincialism, plain ignorance, and a tendency to be satisfied to guide his life with an inadequate search for truth." His college education could not have been functional and his graduate work dealt merely with administrative techniques. He needed to re-educate himself from scratch and to liberalize his social views.[20]

---

[19] Bair, Social Understandings, p. 26.

[20] Ibid., p. 20.

Newlon was also concerned that the superintendent was narrow and that he did not have enough contact with liberal or radical groups.[21] He thought that the superintendnent had accepted for too long without question the American political and economic systems.[22] For example, the superintendents were for prohibition until the bitter end and had endorsed women's suffrage only at the last minute.[23]

The Educational Policies Commission felt compelled to state: "not all public school officials represent the best of the profession. Education . . . has its share of novices and mediocrities."[24]

Paul Mort, in a study of schools in 1941, also saw a lack of educational leadership on the part of principals. He found them more concerned with orderliness and regularity than with innovation.[25] He attributed this partially to the fact that most of them had been science and math teachers who did not see the broad educational

---

[21]Newlon, Educational Administration as Social Policy, Report of the Commission in Social Studies, Part VIII (New York: Charles Scribner's Sons, 1934), p. 130.

[22]Ibid., p. 145.

[23]Ibid., pp. 161-62.

[24]The Educational Policies Commission, The Purposes of Education in American Democracy, p. 136.

[25]Paul R. Mort and Francis L. Cornell, American Schools in Transition: How Our Schools Adapt Their Practices to Changing Needs: A Study of Pennsylvania. (New York: Bureau of Publications, Teachers College, Columbia University, 1941), p. 215.

objectives.[26] Another frequent observer of schools during the period who favored leadership from principals rather than from specialists said that evidence was lacking that the principal made a contribution. He was too often judged by a well-organized school.[27] Another educator who conducted a survey on how superintendents felt about principals said that while principals were responsive to forces which made for educational change, the position of principal had not yet emerged professionally. The principal was still manager of the plant and as yet had not become an educational leader.[28]

Once again, it should be kept in mind that a large part of education was rural and scattered. Charles Judd found in New York that most of the district superintendents had received little or no training and that they spent most of their time dealing with reports, school property, and boards, and had little time for supervisory duties.[29]

Although the school administrators themselves insisted on the concept of local control, it was the very

---

[26] Ibid., p. 218.

[27] Harold Spears, The Emerging High School Curriculum and its Direction (New York: American Book Company, 1940), pp. 32-35, 345.

[28] Harlan Koch, "The Superintendent Judges the Principal's Contribution to Secondary Education," School Review, XLIV (October, 1936), 594-96.

[29] Charles H. Judd, Preparation of School Personnel: The Regents Inquiry (New York: McGraw-Hill Book Company, 1938), p. 34.

close association with the local power structure that prevented them from assuming a real leadership role. That studies of school boards showed them to represent the vested interests and to be educationally as well as politically and economically conservative was not surprising.[30] Furthermore, many boards still maintained a direct kind of leadership and administrative control which boards in business had long delegated to executives.

The criticism by fellow educators, historians, and sociologists was that administrators too often followed the path of least resistance and gave in to the established order. Newlon asserted that superintendents acted in the same direction in which pressures were operating.[31] Bair indicated that the superintendent had allowed himself to drift into the position of being the community football.[32] Melby said that one of the problems of educational leadership was that administrators were not assumed to be part of the profession but rather representatives of laymen.[33] An educator from the Office of Education put it another

---

[30]George S. Counts, The Social Composition of Boards of Education: A Study in the Social Control of Public Education, Supplementary Educational Monographs, No. 33 (Chicago: The University of Chicago, 1927), pp. 78-79.

[31]Newlon, Educational Administration, p. 136.

[32]Bair, Social Understandings, p. 30.

[33]Melby, "Building a Philosophy," p. 19.

way. "The smaller the school, the closer it is to the people, the closer to the people, the more difficult it is for an educational leader to be progressive."[34] Lloyd Warner found that superintendents' success was based on avoidance of criticism rather than on how students were educated.[35] Willis Rudy, in his recent history of education, also characterized specialized school administration as reflecting the dominant currents around them. Administrators had to show themselves to be conventional and practical minded.[36]

At the same time, much of what was considered to be innovative came from the very pressures resented by educators. Businessmen and the National Association of Manufacturers supported vocational or other subjects which had a direct bearing on business.[37] The public in general approved of courses which were "practical." Even the expansion of art and music programs came about because

---

[34]W. H. Gaumitz, "Small High Schools in the National Survey of Secondary Education," Clearing House, VIII (April, 1934), 467.

[35]W. Lloyd Warner, Democracy in Jonesville: A Study of Quality and Inequality (New York: Harper and Brothers, 1949), p. 199.

[36]Rudy, Schools in an Age of Mass Culture, p. 80.

[37]Newlon, Educational Administration, p. 209; Roger B. Magnuson, "The Concerns of Organized Business With Michigan Education, 1910-1940" (Unpublished Ph.D. dissertation, University of Michigan, 1963), p. 158.

of public pressure, and they were sustained by public demands.[38] On the other hand, there is evidence that school boards and the public expected the superintendent to be an educational leader and not merely an administrator. The Jackson, Michigan, school board accused its superintendent of failing to correlate courses and methods between elementary, intermediate, and high school; of disorganization of the teaching personnel; and of failing "to reorganize professional educational theories that have laregly been abandoned." The board threatened to hire a director of education responsible only to the board.[39]

Although there has been a tendency in recent history for laymen to be critical of education in times of crisis, most of the criticism in the early thirties came from within the profession. The public and outside agencies ignored education. A search through several newspapers of the period showed that, except for the financial problems, schools were having, the press gave very little space to education in the early thirties. However, the articles which did appear were more likely to be critical than complimentary. The cause of education was not championed until recovery was well under way.[40]

[38]"Classroom and Campus: Superintendents Studied," New York Times, March 12, 1933, Part IX, p. 12.

[39]Jackson (Michigan) Board of Education Proceedings, March 9, 1942.

[40]Educational Policies Commission, Research Memorandum on Education in the Depression (New York: Social Science Research Council Bulletin No. 28, 1937), p. 123.

Business was generally critical of the schools in the early thirties according to a study on the subject. To some businessmen, the education of the period was no more than a cruel method of brainstuffing.[41] Business was also against public spending and in essence was competing with the schools for dollars. However, by the late thirties business undertook a gigantic public relations project to use education to sell the public on free enterprise.[42] Business generally supported programs which produced the kind of worker it wanted--one who would be politically and economically sympathetic to the nation and to free enterprise.[43]

One study of the period between 1910 and 1930 in the Mesabi Iron Range towns, where the school boards were dominated by mine superintendents and business men, showed that educational leaders were not always affected by business pressure. The educational leaders in this study repeatedly demonstrated their invulnerability whenever educational policies were at stake.[44]

---

[41] Magnusson, "The Concerns of Organized Business," p. 10.

[42] Ibid., p. 11.

[43] Ibid., p. 151.

[44] Timothy L. Smith, "Review of Education and the Cult of Efficiency: A Study of the Social Forces That Have Shaped the Administration of the Public Schools by Raymond E. Callahan" in History of Education Quarterly, IV (March, 1964), p. 77.

Farm groups tended to oppose business and wanted to finance education with taxes other than those on property. Labor backed education, but their efforts on its behalf were negligible. The evidence in at least one state, Michigan, is that the state education association did not speak out on political issues which affected education.[45]

Reaction to the Depression

The reaction of administrators to the Depression was delayed until the real economic and financial impact hit them. They did not question the basic American social and economic system as did some of the more radical educators. Therefore, up through 1932 their concerns were mildly stated. They recognized that more teaching about economies was needed and seemed prepared to tighten their belts a bit. The resolutions committee of the N.E.A. in 1932 made statements to this effect. In addition, they advocated history and social studies courses which would help citizens to understand economic crisis.[46]

It was not until the banks failed and school districts were unable to collect taxes that the normally

---

[45]Magnusson, "The Concerns of Organized Business," pp. 161-163.

[46]National Education Association, Proceedings, Vol. LXX (Washington, D.C.: N.E.A., 1932), pp. 671-673.

conservative administrators gave their assent to some of the anti-business, anti-establishment feelings of the progressives. The N.E.A. Proceedings for the year 1933 told quite a different story. In that year schools closed early, teachers went unpaid, and expenditures in many districts dropped 25 per cent. The Report of the Joint Committee on the Emerging Crisis in Education included the following statement:

> The fact which should absorb the attention of these [business] leaders is that their shortsighted and in some instances, selfish and dishonest management is one of the prime causes which has reduced the income of the American people. . . .[47]

The Committee on Resolutions asserted that there was an "organized attempt by certain vested interests to cripple the public school system of America."[48] The same committee also complained about the unequal distribution of income and began to look to state and federal governments for tax reforms to help remedy inequities.[49]

Between 1933 and 1936, school administrators by the hundreds spoke out against the system, especially against business. The superintendent of New York City took an attitude about businessmen typical of the older Progressives, deploring the selfishness, ineptitude, and

---

[47] Ibid., Vol. LXXI (1933), 679.

[48] Ibid., p. 675.

[49] Ibid., p. 677.

complete inability to suggest a way out of the Depression.[50] The superintendent of Oakland, California, who claimed to represent 1,000 members of the Department of Superintendence, declared that all of the basic industries should be taken over and run by the federal government. Education would become a part of this corporate state.[51] The superintendent of Pontiac, Michigan, said: "Local control and local initiative are as obsolete as 'rugged individualism'." He advocated federal and state control.[52] An elementary principal speaking out against the system said that the competitive system, along with the spirit of nationalism, had shown its futility and should be replaced by the idea of service.[53] A high school principal lashed out at the press which was advocating going back to the little red schoolhouse and railed against the "wealthy-selfish" who did not want to support public education.[54]

---

[50]Harold Campbell, "The Contribution of the Public Schools," N.E.A., Proceedings, Vol. LXXII (1934), p. 550.

[51]William Givens, "Education for the New America," N.E.A., Proceedings, Vol. LXXII, pp. 647-649.

[52]James H. Harris, "Can We Have Our Cake and Eat It?" Journal of Education, CXVII (February 18, 1935), 105.

[53]Rose Bland, "Some Aspects of the Program of the Elementary School as it is Planned to Meet the Challenge in this Period of Social Change," National Education Association, Proceedings, Vol. LXXIII, 361.

[54]H. H. Ryan, "The High School Principal Looks to His Faculty," Clearing House, VIII (January, 1934), 353.

The president of the A.F. of T. blamed the Depression on bankers and on the low morals of public servants.[55]

Many administrators including those mentioned above also used the crisis as an opportunity to express their ideas for needed changes in the content and structure of education. Typical was the Medford, Massachusetts superintendent who wanted to "fearlessly clear the curriculum of such subject matter than has no immediate social or economic value. . ."[56] The Oakland superintendent spoke of a new social science based on contemporary issues which would be the central core of the new education.[57] The general tenor of the published articles of practicing administrators was an emphasis on cooperation, service, and a social motive rather than on individualism. They advocated an increased emphasis on social studies programs which stressed contemporary problems. Life and living, they said, should be the subject of the schools. Children should be taught to desire those things which make for constructive and spiritual growth rather than individual gain and material acquisitions.

At the same time, they emphasized more than ever individualization as opposed to mass conformity,

---

[55]"Public Mind Held Socially Degraded," New York Times, June 28, 1933, p. 19.

[56]J. Stevens Kadisch, "A Comprehensive Program of Public Education," N.E.A. Proceedings, Vol. LXII, 626.

[57]Givens, "Education for the New American," p. 648.

differentiation as opposed to equalization, and meeting immediate as opposed to deferred needs. Also creeping into many of the articles and speeches critical of the system were the older virtues of hard work, honesty, and thrift.

The Depression and Youth

One of the results of the depression most difficult for administrators to face was the additional number of youth remaining in high school. Of course, this trend had been growing due to more extensive compulsory attendance laws, but the lack of employment opportunities accentuated it. In spite of the fact that administrators had long spoken out against schools being preparatory for life and for college, they were not prepared for the change. Their middle-class biases seemed to have made them assume that many of these youth could not succeed academically and that some should take nothing except vocational courses. This attitude may have influenced the "catering to the needs" idea for all students. Many statements by administrators gave the impression that they felt that they were saddled with a burden that should not be theirs. The influence of students was considered one of their greatest "problems." This inundation of "inferior" students not only altered the expectations they had for high school students, but had a great deal to do with altering the

curriculum. In some cases they frankly spoke of these students as the cause of declining standards and achievements.

A report of the U.S. Office of Education expressed the problem as most administrators saw it. The report stated that the NRA minimum employment age would become permanently sixteen and that the fourteen to sixteen age group would, therefore, continue on in day school. The report went on to state: "Obligation rests directly upon school authorities to face the problem of providing for this group of future citizens who cannot benefit by further formal academic instruction, some alternative educational discipline from which they may be reasonably expected to derive benefit."[58]

There was a definite feeling that all students cannot and should not go to college. However, the generally held belief that the high schools of the thirties were designed for college preparation is open to question. The conclusion was that over four-fifths of high school students, and especially the "new load" of unemployed youth, needed a different kind of education. Although there was no foot dragging, and there was much emphasis placed on educating all of the youth, there was a feeling of condescension toward those who were referred to as low ability students. Even though much was said condemning a

[58]Interior, Annual Report 1933, p. 281.

caste system, it was accepted that those students who, because of their social and economic status would have been working except for the depression, should have a different kind of education. Terms such as inferior-superior, and top-bottom frequently were used.

These "new-comers" of "low mental ability" would be placed in "differentiated" programs where they would be indoctrinated for "citizenship" and be given special vocational courses along with "minimum" essential tools.[59] Intelligence tests were relied on and used to point out that a lowering of I.Q.'s of high school students over the years meant that there should be a more "varied" program.[60] In a study of vocational ambitions of high school students comparing them with their fathers' occupations, the authors attributed the high ambitions of children of laborers to poor guidance.[61]

---

[59]See for example The Regents Inquiry, Education for American Life: A New Program for the State of New York (New York: McGraw-Hill Book Company, 1938), pp. 6-26 and E. D. Grizzell, "A Survey of Secondary Education in Philadelphia," The Harvard Educational Review, VIII (March, 1938, 172-174.

[60]Havrah Bell and William Proctor, "High School Population Then and Now--A Sixteen Year Span," School Review, XLIV (November, 1936), 693; William A. Wetzel, "Forty Years a Schoolmaster," Bulletin of the Department of Secondary School Principals of the National Education Association, No. 57 (May, 1935), pp. 15-19.

[61]Bell and Proctor,"High School Population," pp. 691, 693.

The director of the NYA in New York City said: "It is dangerous to fill the heads of children with $5 worth of knowledge when they can assimilate only 5¢ worth. The children must be given what they can use." By this he meant vocational usbjects which could get them jobs.[62]

"Catering to the needs" of students resulted in the integration of subject matter, differentiated courses (tracking), fewer requirements, a greater variety of subjects and more electives, an emphasis on vocational education, and less emphasis on "mastering" a skill or body of knowledge.[63]

Certainly, reform was needed where retention or "failure" and the repeating of all of the subjects in a grade was common in both elementary and high school. The superintendent of Newark, writing about his school system when he took it over found that one-fourth of the pupils had failed first grade, and one-half had failed one of the first three grades. His answer was an activity program and an emphasis on individual differences.[64] In

---

[62]"Big Change Urged in School Courses," New York Times, November 25, 1936, p. 21.

[63]Chicago, Board of Education, Annual Report of the Superintendent of Schools for the Year ending June 11, 1936, pp. 103-114.

[64]John Logan, et al., "Representative School Systems--Newark," Journal of Education, CXIX (April 6, 1936), 198.

addition, many of the programs designed for the pupils from lower-class homes seemed to be well-designed and well-executed.[65]

On the other hand, this trend could be viewed as a typical pragmatic American expedient. Equality was sacrificed in the name of progress. The very lack of educational goals for society and the emphasis on meeting individual needs may have helped to bring this about.

Not all educators, including those who published, were sure that a formal education was for everyone. One principal stated what might have been in the minds of other educators:

> The public is even beginning to realize that it is possible to a certain extent to over-educate types and classes who will not only never use the training given them, but will not even appreciate it. . .there has arisen a serious questioning whether a good many pupils did not remain in school to no special advantage either to themselves or to the school.[66]

A New York City assistant superintendent denounced large scale education as it had developed in the United States in the twentieth century. He declared that the efforts to salvage poor-grade students was "largely

---

[65]Chicago, Annual Report 1936, pp. 106-114, 145-151.

[66]James Newell Emery, "Let's Analyze School Costs," Journal of Education, CXVI (June 19, 1933), 318.

fruitless" and advocated "super high schools" for the bright pupils.[67]

That middle-class education perpetuated a caste system cannot be doubted when out of thousands of pages of articles and proceedings from professional education journals of the thirties, not one word was found crying out against segregated education for the Negro in the South. In describing his school system the superintendent in Lexington, Kentucky pointed out as exemplary the training of Negroes as cooks, waitresses, and maids, because this was what 80 per cent of the Negroes did. He said that if the schools did not train them well for such employment, housewives would do their own housework.[68]

There is a question then as to whether the catering to the needs of individuals by the schools was a democratic movement or whether it was a way of training youth for a more static, pluralistic society with the retention of power by the middle class.

There is little doubt, however, that the middle-class idea of education being the gateway to opportunity and a better life still prevailed. When George Counts,

---

[67]"Educator Charges Miseducation: Recommends Super High Schools," Journal of Education, CXIX (January 20, 1935), 54.

[68]Henry A. Hill, "Representative School Systems--Lexington," Journal of Education, CXIX (December 7, 1936), 518.

in a speech in 1933 suggested that education should not be for the purpose of avoiding manual labor, an editorial in the New York Times responded, why not? After all, what is wrong with using education as a way to lift us from brute labor and to provide more leisure?[69]

The same question might have been asked of the move toward the non-partisan election of school boards. Was it democratic or was it a means of preserving the traditional middle-class power structure? The Democrats, who generally represented a broader spectrum of the people complained in Bronxville, New York in 1936 that the move to a non-partisan board had been prompted by the inroads that the Democrats had made in the traditional Republican territory in recent years. The non-partisan system, they said, was merely a ruse to keep the Republicans in power.[70]

Views of Administrators

The impact of the Depression on the public schools has been alluded to several times. The advice and criticism of professors of education have been recorded. The position of federal and state departments of education has been noted. It is also possible through a survey of the

---

[69]"Schools are for Everybody," New York Times, May 15, 1933, p. 12.

[70]"Democrats Oppose School Board Plan," New York Times, January 19, 1936, sec. 2, p. 2.

writings of practicing administrators to discover how they viewed their roles, how they saw education in relation to society, and how they responded to the criticisms and challenges which had been directed at them.

A composite picture of what administrators thought a good administrator should have been in the thirties revealed a man not too different from the kind of person one would expect any executive to be. He should have a pleasing personality, be able to meet and handle people, be inspired and an inspiration to others, and be an efficient businessman. He should also be flexible, although in education circles the word democratic usually was used instead. It was also in vogue to emphasize educational as well as business leadership. Most felt that they were progressive, by which they meant that they were willing to change and experiment, even at the risk of some resistance by school boards. They did not mention additional traits which education professors thought they should possess--intellectual and scholarly interests and creativity. Neither did they mention professional preparation or state educational goals other than that of preparing individuals for life in a democracy.

When it came to the relationship of schools to society, most administrators took a middle or conservative position. They accepted the idea that society and technology were changing and that education should change with

it. Most, however, believed that education should reflect rather than lead society. None, except for a few mentioned above who spoke out during the peak of the crisis, wanted to indoctrinate students for a very different kind of society. The important thing was to give pupils free rein to develop as individuals to their fullest capacities. They had no doubt that the romantic and Progressive idea of individual self-realization would create a better society.

The superintendent of Spokane, Washington, stated that both the classical and up-to-date scientific thinking were needed in order to deal with everyday life. He also stated: "It is not the function of the schools either to hamper or enhance social change."[71] Another typical statement is one made by the superintendent of Minneapolis: "The Minneapolis schools cannot build a new social order, but they can train pupils to think clearly about social problems."[72] The superintendent of Indianapolis made a similar statement:

> Those who would have the American Public schools lead a social revolution and would have them so train our pupils that they in turn would more or less violently remake the world, have overlooked one of the distinquishing characteristics of our schools . . . the

---

[71]Orville C. Pratt, "Viewing Our Work in Perspective," N.E.A. Proceedings, Vol. LXXV (1937), pp. 165-167.

[72]Carroll B. Reed, "Representative School Systems--Minneapolis," Journal of Education, CXVIII (October, 1935), 437.

> freedom of choice of its graduates in the field of politics, economics, and social attitudes.[73]

A panel discussion of the Yearbook Committee was recorded in the N.E.A. Proceedings for 1935. The two professors on the panel, John Childs and Jesse Newlon, were very critical of American society and its economic system. The three superintendents on the panel supported the social order as it was, emphasizing the development of the individual.[74]

Some administrators were much more frank and realistic. A high school principal said, "The high school principal can seldom do much to bring about a radical change of view in the teacher."[75] In writing about the qualifications for a superintendent in a small community, a principal wrote that "He cannot afford to be classified as a revolutionary nor as a reactionary. He must keep his feet on the ground."[76]

The statements of principles of educational leadership were broad and inclusive and were aimed not only at

---

[73]Paul C. Stetson, "Representative School Systems," CXIX (November 2, 1936) 466.

[74]N.E.A. Proceedings, Vol. LXXIII (1935), 534-559.

[75]G. W. Willett, "As the Principal Sees It," The North Central Association Quarterly, V (December, 1930), 404.

[76]Donald L. Simon, "Desirable Qualifications for Educational Leadership in a Small Community," American School Board Journal, LXCV (November, 1937), 22.

conserving the society, but also the profession. For example, a list of principles in the Elementary School Journal included this one: "All supervisory influences should reach the teacher through the principal."[77] Nor did they go out on a limb with this statement on philosophy. The principal "should be directive or creative, intermittent or continuous depending on the situation."[78]

Thus, most administrators saw themselves and thier school systems as forward looking and progressive. By this they meant mostly in terms of adopting the latest innovations which were thought to improve learning and help the pupils deal with a "changing world." Their writings did not indicate that they wanted to change the system. Although many held old anti-Wall Street views, they were, by and large, political and economic conservatives. They did not seriously question the basic American social system. Their educational mission was to see that their schools gave the pupils the ability to understand and cope with problems and with change.

Educational Practices and Techniques

Most of the educational methods and ideas about learning espoused by educators in the thirties already

---

[77]"Basic Principles of Instructional Leadership," Elementary School Journal, XXXVI (March, 1936), 485.

[78]Ibid., p. 458.

have been alluded to. These ideas centered around catering to the needs of children and youth. This had come about in the 1920's in part because of the progressive education movement with its emphasis on the individual. Also the lock-step method was looked down upon because disadvantaged students were holding the better students back. The retention system where a large percentage of pupils were held back for a year was demeaning for the students and costly for the schools.

The idea of meeting individual needs also met with the approval of administrative leaders as the Depression struck. The emphasis was more than ever on the usefulness and practicality of education. Studying ancient history would not help you understand the Depression and reading Shakespeare could not help you get a job.

Administrators who wrote during the period seemed to be in general agreement with their mentors in the universities with respect to the practices and innovations which they supported and attempted to implement. A list would include the following: differentiated classes (ability grouping), non-grading for slow students, education for the atypical (special education), health programs, guidance programs, improved libraries, integrated or core curriculum, activity and participation by the learner, vocational education, music, art, physical education, and adult education. Education for citizenship also was

emphasized. It was advocated that social studies and contemporary problems be the core of the curriculum.

Administrative structure and practices which administrators supported were: total staff involvement in curriculum change, larger administrative areas, the community-centered school, more state and federal aid without jeopardizing local control.

Although the talk was about teaching pupils, not subject matter, the emphasis was still on what was to be studied. The curricular revolution, if there were any, was the shift of emphasis to the practical and useful. This was in a sense a conservative trend. The same administrator who could tell his constituency that the schools were emphasizing the three "R's" was also talking about revolutionizing the schools by teaching only what was practical and useful. Current events dominated the social studies; current novels and short stories replaced other forms of literature in English; students wrote letters instead of compositions; character education was to be achieved by being cooperative in class rather than through literature or by example. Vocational education grew by leaps and bounds, and separate technical high schools were popular.

In terms of actually interpreting what "progressive" education was and to what extent it was advocated by administrators, researching the professional journals indicates

that administrators were more moderate and more consistent in their interpretation of what progressive education was and their advocacy of it than were the university professors.

In the first place, most administrators defined progressive education differently than professors. In answer to a question, "What is a progressive school?," put to a number of educators by a writer from the Journal of Education, the professors' talked about doing away with external formalities, making education self-active, etc. The one superintendent polled said that it was any school making an effort to go ahead or that progress was anything of which a given person approves.[79] Some suggested practices in the name of progressive education called for less recitation in front of the teacher and more self-drill activities which one would assume good teachers had always done.[80] Other moderate superintendents felt compelled to institute different structures such as the Winnetka or Bronxville plans in order to encourage their teachers to change.[81] Other superintendents simply straddled the fence saying that good schools are both conventional and

---

[79]"What Is a Progressive School?," Journal of Education, CXV (October 17, 1932), 572.

[80]Sidney G. Firman, "Taking the First Steps in Progressive Education," Progressive Education, XII (January, 1935), 30-34.

[81]Frank R. Wassung, "It Can Be Done," Education, IV (May, 1935), 538-540.

progressive, not necessarily Progressive with a capital "P."[82] Most believed that progressive education had been beneficial, but that it was a fallacy to conclude that traditional practices were ineffective. Many felt that progressive schools did not have a monopoly on new educational techniques. All believed in structure, training, instruction, and discipline even though they also accepted the idea that teachers should cater to the child's nature.[83] There were also those who frankly argued in favor of the conservative school, saying that it was more like life and that there could actually be more cooperation.[84] If the school is like life it should be a well-ordered day of work, play, and rest.[85] Those administrators tending to emphasize progressive education seemed to put more faith in methods and techniques while the moderates were more likely to recognize the importance of an artistic teacher.

In an attempt to compare ideas which administrators put to their school boards and staffs with those published in professional journals, a number of board proceedings

---

[82]Hill, "Lexington," p. 518; W. C. McGinnis, "Progressive Education--Pros and Cons," School Executive, LV (November, 1935), 117.

[83]Roscoe Pulliam, "How Much Freedom in Education?," Elementary School Journal, XXXV (September, 1934), 23.

[84]William H. Smith, "Cooperation--A Myth or a Reality?," Clearing House, IX (January, 1935), 293.

[85]Raymond S. Michael, "What's It All About?," N.E.A. Proceedings, Vol. LXXIII (1935), 358.

and annual reports of various local school boards were examined. While curricular matters seldom showed up in board proceedings, annual reports tended to display not only course offerings but the ideas behind them. Board proceedings did indicate the increase in vocational education and also suggested that much of the community involvement in schools through adult education, recreation, and other special programs was a result of public demand along with the availability of federal aid.

The annual reports indicated that the superintendents and their staffs said much the same things to the citizens as they said to each other. The superintendent from Grand Rapids said that curriculum work was necessary because "the shifting of emphasis had been from formal and antiquated subject matter to the child-centered school."[86] Superintendents seemed to want to explain to their constituents that schools were not like they used to be--that they were more diversified and that more was expected of them.[87] Life was different than when they were in school, with the schools now having to provide through

---

[86]Grand Rapids, Sixty-Third and Sixty-Fourth Annual Reports of the Board of Education of the City of Grand Rapids Michigan for the School Years Ending June 1935 and June 1936, 14.

[87]Cambridge (Massachusetts), Annual Report of the School Committee and Superintendent of Schools, 1939, p. 22.

actual participation those experiences which children could no longer encounter on their own.[88]

Most superintendents emphasized and explained differentiated programs, activities, student involvement, integrated and correlated courses, and in general all special attention given to the individual. They were especially proud of the programs for the physically and mentally handicapped and of vocational and adult classes.

Unlike the articles in proceedings and journals, however, they showed no hostility toward the system or toward the business world. The superintendent of Hamtramck, Michigan, said that economic and social unrest were not necessarily a sign of unhealthy social organization, but were merely outward manifestations of a democracy making adjustments.[89]

The major criticism of schools by professional educators was that education was not suited to the needs of contemporary youth. It certainly did not, they said, do much for the large numbers of low ability students. School was not enough like life and the activities in which youth liked most to engage were not found in the school. All of

---

[88]Chicago, Annual Report 1937, p. 11.

[89]Hamtramck, Education For Democracy; Annual Report Hamtramck Public Schools, 1936-37 (Hamtramck, Michigan: Board of Education, 1937), p. 2.

this of course resulted in recommendations for vocational and useful subjects as discussed above.[90]

Another criticism was that in the larger systems too much of the authority was retained by the central office with principals being bypassed and schools losing their identities.[91] This could well lead to the questioning of the validity of much of the research upon which this paper is based--published statements of superintendents. Much of what filtered down through a bureaucratic structure to the teachers may have been either ignored, resulting in little change, or misunderstood, resulting in little education.

Education for Democracy

One of the most significant trends in administration in the thirties was the educators' interpretation of democracy. One of the results of this was a gradual move away from the planned and cooperative kind of society pictured by some educators in 1932-33 back toward an emphasis on the individual. In terms of staff-teacher relations, the result was that the teacher was often left to his own devices. This was not because educational leaders were idling their time away. Many excellent

---

[90]"Faulty Aims Laid to High Schools," New York Times, June 5, 1939, p. 19.

[91]Grizzell, "Education in Philadelphia," p. 175.

curriculum guides were prepared by the larger districts and by state departments of education. Courses were complete with pupil activities, teacher and pupil resources, and included very scientific approaches to learning. They were probably indispensible for teachers in one and two room districts. Administrators, however, were extremely reluctant to promote the use of this material and emphasized that these were only suggestions which could properly be ignored by the teacher who wished to teach something different or do it his own way.

Two critical statements by leading American educators point out what they view as misconceptions of American democracy. One was Mortimer Adler who said that educators were afraid of the authority of a prescribed curriculum, "as if democracy did not depend on leaders and followers, rulers with authority and subjects . . ."[92]

Another famous educator, Ellwood P. Cubberley put it another way. He said:

> We have thrown both teachers and pupils largely on their own resources, with the result that either instruction has been very poor or both teachers and pupils have made marked development in initiative and in ability to care for themselves. The most prominent characteristic of many of our schools has been the former.[93]

---

[92]"Educators Debate Morals vs. Science," New York Times, May 7, 1939, p. 27.

[93]Ellwood P. Cubberley, Public Education in the United States: A Study and Interpretation of American Educational History, Revised edition (Boston: Houghton Mifflin Company, 1934), p. 758.

As has been stated before, educational radicals and conservatives alike were able to unite under the banner of democracy. To the conservative, democracy meant rule of the majority, and faith in the ability of common man to decide the issues which shaped his destiny. It meant individual initiative, self control, and responsibility.

To the radical, democracy signified change, growth, and the freedom to develop one's values and criteria for truth. It meant not imposing one's ideas upon another. A great deal of emphasis was placed on teachers being free to teach what they wanted, free of local pressure groups.

All educators tended to use the words democracy and education interchangeably. For example: "Education offers to society the only possibility of rational and orderly change in the interest of humanity."[94] The Fifteenth Yearbook of the Department of Superintendence made democracy synonomous with liberalism. Almost all pressure groups except the American Civil Liberties Union were denounced. The writers were certain that the middle class was likely to fall to Fascism and the only hope for

---

[94] Department of Superintendence of the National Education Association, The Improvement of Education: Its Interpretation for Democracy, Fifteenth Yearbook (Washington, D.C.: The Department of Superintendence, 1937), 116.

democracy was a strong and militant labor movement.[95] The radicals sounded much like they did in 1932-33 except that they were now stressing liberty more than they were equality.

However, the goals of liberals and conservatives in education were scarcely distinguishable. Individualism, local control, a profession with power and influence were the goals of both.

The expressions on education and democracy of the Educational Policies Commission were more conventional. Democracy meant an interest in the general welfare, placing the individual above institutions, a belief in the dignity and worth of each individual. Education in a democracy included self-realization, civic responsibility, human relationships, and economic demands as its objectives.[96]

In terms of administration, there was almost unanimity that educational leaders had to be more democratic. This meant that administrators needed to defer to their teaching staffs for curricular and other decisions. Some went to the extreme of saying that all administration and supervision was autocratic and would be no longer needed when teachers were better trained and prepared.[97]

[95] Ibid., pp. 73-90.

[96] Educational Policies Commission, The Purposes of Education, pp. 7, 33.

[97] Alonzo Meyers, "Will Education Go Democratic?" Clearing House, XI (January, 1937), p. 265.

Educational theorists stressed that the leadership of administrators should not be vested in their authority. The "progressive" administrator pointed with pride to his system of committees which was set up to develop new curricular ideas and courses of study. Of course, the teacher was also told that the same kind of democracy should be taking place in the classroom with students sharing in the planning and decision making.

What educational leadership was saying in the late thirties in many ways bore little resemblence to their utterings at the beginning of the financial crisis in 1932-33. Whereas in the early thirties the leaders were hoping for more cooperation and a better planned, more equalitarian society, in the late thirties they emphasized democracy which meant local autonomy catering to individual desires and freedoms, and a lack of faith in the corporateness of society. Middle-class control of education continued. And even though administrators seemed to control teacher organizations, they were reluctant to exercise real educational leadership with teachers.

As the growing prosperity silenced most who had questioned the establishment, the spector of Fascism made Americans wary of anything centralized and institutionalized. However, even the most progressive middle-class educational leaders could not erase their heritage of

individual initiative, competitiveness, and the idea that individual self-realization was tied to economic and material success.

On the eve of the beginning of World War II the New York Times reported on a Congress on Education For Democracy at Columbia to which had been invited delegates from business, government, religion, and representatives from Europe's remaining democracies. There was the usual emphasis on individual differences, the freedom of teaching, and democratic structures. There was a concern by some about getting in a war to preserve the democracy of someone else. There were reservations about forcing adult problems on the attention of children too soon. The conservation of local responsibility and initiative was urged. Education seemed to be regarded as something to help preserve what they had. The whole flavor of education for creating a more dynamic and changing society was gone.[98]

By the end of the thirties, democracy was becoming something that was taught in units and bolstered by assembly programs emphasizing patriotism. Directives to this effect were sent down from central offices.[99]

---

[98]"Seminars Draft Citizenship Course," New York Times, August 17, 1939, p. 9; "Reports of Directors of Sixteen Seminars On Problems of Democracy," New York Times, August 18, 1939, p. 9.

[99]"Head of City's Schools Aims to Advance 'Basic Training'," New York Times, January 1, 1939, Part II, p. 10.

A year-end summary on education on December 31, 1939 in the New York Times found an upswing of public interest in education, but at the same time noted a declining tendency for educators to speak out on issues. "Fatigue and weariness seem to have overcome bold leaders who courageously spoke out when the Depression was blackest."[100]

Summary

The background of most educational administrators of the thirties was rural and politically, socially, and economically conservative. Most educators in the thirties still worked in rural areas and in small towns. They took cooperativeness for granted and tended to regard education as a means of individual progress.

The local administrators were frequently criticized by university educators because they were unduly influenced by local pressure and because of their tendency to be concerned with business efficiency rather than with education. Many of the local pressures, however, were for the same things progressive educators were hoping for. They included such trends as vocational education, adult education,

---

[100] "Viewpoints on Education," New York Times, December 31, 1939, Part II, p. 5.

the use of schools by the community, and an emphasis on courses which were practical.

Administrators were able to agree with the concept of catering to the needs of students. This enabled them to track the students of "lower mental ability" and retain much of the curriculum for the middle class. The hopes that education could be used for upward mobility, including going to college, were still held by many local administrators as well as by students and parents.

While some practicing administrators tended to lash out at business during the worst of the Depression, most thought that schools should reflect society rather than change it.

Administrators espoused the same innovations as did the professors, but in some ways the emphasis on the practical and useful can be construed to be in the same tradition as the emphasis on the three "R"'s. Local school reports dealt with many of the same ideas and practices as those in professional journals. Board proceedings and statistical reports, however, showed a continued concern with finances.

Administrators defined progressive education more broadly than did professors. Almost any change was progressive to the administrators. They frequently mentioned a greater amount of pupil activity and participation. But in describing progressive education they were more

likely to point to quantitative growth such as special education or adult education.

The stress of democracy, the stigma of authoritarianism, the fear of totalitarianism, and the concern over federal and state control led administrators to allow teachers to be thrown on their own resources which, in a sense, was a return to laissez faire.

In the late thirties, democracy was used by doctrinaire liberals to equate education with liberalism, while conservatives could use it to stress the older ideas of individualism. The end result was the same--individual rights, local control, middle-class dominance, a lack of cohesive planning, and an emphasis on structure rather than purpose.

CHAPTER VII

CURRICULAR CHANGE FOR SOCIAL STABILITY

Introduction

It was apparent that national, state, and university leadership was concerned about society enough to advocate change in method and content of education. Even though society did not regard education as the panecea in the 1930's that it did in 1970, there was just enough advocacy of more central planning and financing to necessitate an increase in the staffs of the federal and state bureaus in order to make curriculum change. Change was advised, if not actually practiced, at the local level. A reviewer of the research of the period said that "the crisis may have generated a willingness to accept some changes."[1]

There is no question that local administrators knew of the curriculum changes recommended through their state departments of education, their university contacts, and their professional associations. School administrators

---

[1]Helen Hefferman, "The School Curriculum in American Education," chapter iii of Education in the States, p. 291.

of largely conservative backgrounds were not adverse to changes which made schools seem more practical and useful, although they did not accept the idea that schools should lead the way in changing society. Administrators continued to stress the preparation of the individual for a competitive society. They tended to look at curricular change less in terms of social goals and more in terms of what would meet the immediate needs of individual students.

It is further evident from surveys and studies that local administrators had a difficult time implementing such changes they did want and believed in. The uncertainties brought on by the crisis made communities leary of change. In order to gain the approval of the community and the confidence of the staffs, experts were often brought in to survey the school system. Teachers were heavily involved in re-writing courses of study.

Although there is some evidence of change taking place, much of the criticism extending into the 1940's sounded like the criticism heard in the 1930's. Teachers were still too "traditional." High schools were still aiming too much toward the college bound. Subject matter rather than students was being emphasized. Too much mass conformity of students was demanded.

Even though Mort may have been correct when he said that it took fifty years for the inception of an idea to its general adoption, there were other reasons for a

reluctance to change. One was the conservatism of many communities. Another was the emphasis on local control whereby state departments were reluctant to impose even general structure. Another factor was the interpreting of democracy to mean that each teacher could deviate to the extent of sabatoging prescribed objectives or methods. The very diversity of American society was another impediment. Educators had difficulty agreeing on goals for a society so individualistic and pluralistic and so culturally, politically, and geographically divergent. Furthermore, in an educational system dominated by the middle class, middle-class students were likely to succeed in almost any school whether progressive or traditional, public or private. It is difficult to argue with success.

The purpose of this chapter will be to determine the extent of changes which were actually made in the curriculum and to assess their importance. To ferret out change as evidenced by the curriculum is difficult. Many members of the profession wrote for each other. Superintendents were concerned with public relations. The authors of most surveys were biased in favor of innovation and change. However, there are trends observable from such data as enrollments in high school courses and the consistency of statements by local administrators.

Local Reports and Surveys

Some indication of curricular trends can be found in the reports of superintendents in which they highlighted what was new, innovative, or expanding. These tended to be vocational programs designed for students with little academic ability or interest. They also emphasized other aspects of the school programs which catered to the needs of students, such as homogeneous grouping and special education. At the high school level, requirements were lessened and a greater choice of courses was available.

Many superintendents emphasized an "activity" program in which students would learn from experience rather than solely from books and drill.[2] There was a trend toward the study of problems in social studies resulting in such courses at the secondary level as Problems in Democracy. Subject matter was soft pedaled. Integrated or correlated courses were attempted. For example, in Hamtramck, Michigan, the study of Poland was used as a central core of study in the junior high school with English, math, social studies, drama, and music courses all supposedly making contributions.[3]

---

[2]Harold Campbell, "The School Year Opens," New York Times, September 13, 1936, p. 14; Chicago, Annual Report 1937, pp. 11-16; Detroit, Superintendent's Annual Report, Detroit Public Schools, 1938-39 (Detroit, Mich.: Board of Education, 1939), pp. 19-21; Lansing, Mich.: Board of Education Minutes, November, 1936, April 14, 1941, p. 10.

[3]Hamtramck, Annual Report 1936-37, p. 24.

A variety of sources of information were recommended. Newspapers as textbooks were mentioned. Multiple adoptions of textbooks were made to meet varying abilities in the same courses.[4] Social studies courses centering around current themes, using a variety of activities and resources replaced courses in geography and history.[5]

A typical statement concerning curriculum, found in the superintendent's report of a smaller school district follows:

> Within the school curriculum provision should be made for the individual differences in abilities and interests of the pupils. . . More attention should be directed toward encouraging the pupil to do his best and to consider more thoroughly his potential abilities. Less attention should be given to watching the performances and successes of others. The American way-of-life is based on the development of each individual to his highest level of happiness and achievement.[6]

There is no evidence, however, to show that any major curricular changes were being made in this district.

Another source of information about curriculum in the thirties is "research" that had as its purpose the

---

[4]Lansing, Michigan, Your Schools (Lansing: Board of Education, 1939); Detroit, Annual Report 1938-39, p. 38.

[5]Ann Arbor, Mich., Helping Children Experience the Realities of the Social Order: Social Studies in the Public Schools of Ann Arbor, Michigan; Junior High Schools (Ann Arbor, Mich.: Board of Education, 1933); Detroit, Annual Report 1938-39, p. 20.

[6]East Lansing, Mich.: Growth: Superintendent's Report 1945-46 (East Lansing, Mich.: East Lansing Public Schools, 1946), p. 14.

demonstrating of the superiority of the activity-centered curriculum over one emphasizing more "traditional" methods. Although there was a great deal of subjectivity in what constituted traditional and what constituted progressive teaching, the results showed that children in the activity-centered classrooms learned at least as much factual material as those in which drill was stressed. Researchers also assumed that gains had been made in the harder-to-measure characteristics such as initiative and creativity.[7]

An insight into the curriculum of the thirties can be gained also through studies or surveys done by school districts themselves or by consultants called in by them. These studies invariably showed that the schools were deficient in most of the curricular changes then advocated in the literature or which were current in the more progressive schools. The St. Louis, Missouri, schools were told in 1941 to institute more activities and pupil participation, use more dynamic methods than that of question and answer, and to integrate subject matter, emphasizing social studies. Differentiated courses, the

---

[7]Edison Ellsworth Oberholtzer, An Integrated Curriculum in Practice, Teachers College Contribution to Education No. 694 (New York: Bureau of Publications, Teachers College, Columbia University, 1937), p. 127; Division of Field Studies, Institute of Educational Research, Teachers College, The Report of a Survey of the Public Schools of Pittsburgh, Pennsylvania (New York: Bureau of Publications, Teachers College, Columbia University, 1940), p. 75.

discouragement of uniformity, and the abolishment of the three to one ratio favoring academic subjects were advocated.[8]

A study of the New Orleans schools in 1940 resulted in similar advice. The schools were thought to place too much emphasis on drill, subject matter, and factual learning. It was suggested that high school courses be differentiated for the poorer students. At the same time, it was found that there were not enough vocational courses in the regular high schools and not enough academic courses in the commercial high schools.[9]

A citizen's study headed by educators in a smaller suburban and college community contained the following criticisms and comments:

> The teachers have been allowed, in fact encouraged, to make their own plans; there is . . . no general co-ordinated plan of instruction; there have been few faculty discussions. . . ; progress reports are largely a history of text book pages covered and the number of specific skills taught; there is little evidence of pupil-teacher or teacher-administration planning; there is no evidence of co-ordinated planning from grade to grade . . .; there is no evidence to show broad provisions made for individual differences in children; there is no evidence of research among

---

[8]St. Louis, Mo., Approved Recommendation of the St. Louis School Survey (St. Louis, Mo.: St. Louis Public Schools, 1941), pp. 15-23, 107-118.

[9]New Orleans, La., Tomorrow's Citizens: A Study and Program for the Improvement of the New Orleans Public Schools (New Orleans, La.: Citizens Planning Committee for Public Education, 1940), pp. 40-59.

> teachers or administrators . . .; guidance appears in theory but there is little evidence of school tangible practice; community resources have not been used . . .[10]

Surveys and histories in smaller communities indicate that the most basic curricular trends did not reach them until the late thirties or early forties. The schools at Minoa, New York, were reminded that the study of human relations, community life, general math, and the arts were more important than scattered subjects.[11] In most rural and remote areas Latin, Math, English, and history continued to be stressed while there was very little home economics, agriculture, or industrial arts.[12]

National and State Surveys and Advice

There were also a great many and varied national, state or regional surveys taken during the period concerning trends in courses and methods.

---

[10]East Lansing, Mich., Report to the Board of Education of the Citizens' Survey of East Lansing Schools (East Lansing, Mich.: 1945), p. 9.

[11]Harry P. Smith, A Limited School Survey of the Minoa, New York Area (Syracuse, New York: Syracuse University, 1941), p. 36.

[12]Philip Edward Keith, The History of Secondary Education in Penobscot County in Maine (Orono, Maine: The University Press, 1948), p. 225; Francis T. Spaulding, High School and Life, The Regents Inquiry (New York: McGraw Hill Book Company, 1938), p. 124; W. H. Faumitz, Education in the Southern Mountains, U.S. Office of Education, Bulletin, 1937, No. 26 (Washington, D.C.: Government Printing Office, 1937), p. 49.

One of the most comprehensive studies was A Survey of Courses of Study and Other Curriculum Materials Published Since 1934 published by the Office of Education in Bulletin 1937, No. 31. These included curriculum materials gathered from states, cities, and counties. States and counties generally had studies broken into broad age group segments from K-12. City districts made many more high school curriculum studies than they did elementary. There were very few K-12 courses of study. More curriculum materials were written for social studies than for any other subject. A few "integrated" courses began to appear such as character education, safety, and temperance.[13]

The following were some of the major trends and ideas of the survey.[14] Teachers played a major role in writing the materials, much being done in committees. Most of the courses were designed as tentative courses or suggested outlines with teachers being invited to add or make changes. Little research was done to determine what courses and content were needed. That research which was being done was being done by state departments of education. Most of the objectives stated were general. About 31 per cent of the curriculum studies stated goals in terms of pupil behavior. Although some courses were

[13]U.S. Office of Education, A Survey of Courses of Study and Other Curriculum Materials Published Since 1934, Bulletin, 1937, No. 31, p. 8.

[14]Ibid., pp. 14-63.

organized around problems or functions, 88 per cent were organized as isolated subjects. Although textbooks led in source material, visual aids and other supplementary materials were widely listed. Activities and methods were listed in such great varieties that they were suggestions only, with the teacher free to choose.

Very few courses stated standards or norms to be achieved. Most expressed "expected outcomes" or "probable attainments." Very few contained sample tests or suggestions for types of tests to be given.

The tendency within courses was toward the useful or functional. For example, in English, such units as telephone conversations, letter writing, and note taking were introduced. Math tended to be based on real life situations. The trend in science was on observation of nature and surrounding life. Social studies tended to emphasize current problems.

A similar survey conducted biennially pointed out certain tendencies in courses of study.[15] There was an increase in integrated courses. The author was very much concerned whether or not the courses were "functional" and whether suggested activities were lifelike. Physical education and the practical arts ranked high on his scale

---

[15]See Henry Harap, "A Survey of Courses of Study Published in the Last Two Years," Journal of Educational Research, XXVIII (May, 1935), 641-656.

while English and social studies were average; and math and foreign languages ranked low. One tendency was a continuing increase of teachers and committees writing courses of study and a decrease in the involvement of the superintendent. For the first time, the involvement of professors of education was significant.

Another trend was the decrease in the inclusion of tests with courses of study. A decreasing amount of experimentation and research were reported, along with the courses of study. The author concluded that he was encouraged by the proliferation of curriculum materials although he had earlier pointed out the lack of uniformity. He also commented favorably on the growing number of state-wide programs of curriculum revision.

A gigantic survey of secondary education was undertaken by the United States Office of Education in 1930-32. The trends in the program of study indicated by this survey were in the directions desired by advocates of curriculum reform. There was a diversification of offerings, making it more possible to recognize individual differences; the offerings were "cast in terms of immediate values instead of the remoter and deferred values of college preparation and the presumedly pervasive mental discipline." The drift was away from specific subjects toward the integrated courses. Foreign language, math and science

declined, while non-academic subjects, including art, music and physical education increased.[16]

Trends in secondary education through 1936 were reviewed in the Biennial Survey of 1937. The emphasis once again was on the changing school population and the fact that six out of seven students would not go to college. The "trends" toward various ways of dealing with the "growing problems" of widely differentiated capacities. Although segregated schools for slow learners or gifted students were advocated and the idea accepted, the leaning was toward the comprehensive high school. Even technical and commercial high schools were apt to become comprehensive. Homogeneous grouping and special classes for "exceptional" children were considered innovative. Also emphasized were fused and core courses, the division of courses into units, extracurricular activities, and vocational guidance. The author's conclusion was more of a hope than a reality:

> The curriculum of the secondary school is evolving in direction of less emphasis upon the formal classroom work or units of credit and more attention to successful adjustment and learning to live. . . The problem is one of developing techniques and procedures for introducing these important adjustments into the educational program of the schools without succumbing to a system of soft pedagogy which makes no demands on anybody anywhere.[17]

[16]Carl A. Jessen, Trends in Secondary Education, U.S. Office of Education, Biennial Survey of Education 1934-36, Vol. I, Bulletin 1937, No. 2 (Washington, D.C.: U.S. Government Printing Office, 1940), pp. 2-6.

[17]Ibid., p. 39.

A survey was conducted by the State Department of Education of Michigan on changing secondary education throughout the nation. The authors felt the significant direction was toward a core or experience curriculum. Most of these turned out to be fused courses such as English and social studies; and others were based on specific concepts or social problems. These included such courses as Community Improvement, Health, Leisure, Sex Education, Peace, and Problems and Values.[18]

A survey conducted by the Department of Education in California was based on a questionnaire which itself editorialized that changes should be occurring. A checklist giving a wide lattitude for indicating that changes in some degree would be or had been made was used. The authors were happy that there were more core courses, less emphasis on grammar and on the classics, and the relating of science to health. This survey leads one to doubt the value of such surveys or at least their interpretation. For example, on the question as to whether laboratory work in science was decreasing--the desired answer, the authors declared that it was decreasing while the tables showed the opposite. The same was true of the question

---

[18]Michigan Department of Public Instruction, Changing Secondary Education in the United States: Report on a Survey of Modifications of Secondary Education, Secondary School Curriculum Study, Bulletin, No. 2 (Lansing, Mich.: 1939), pp. 31-50.

as to whether algebra and geometry had become "socialized."[19]

The same study suggested that teachers were resistant to changes suggested by state departments and universities. It also implied that administrators were often indecisive and that they abdicated leadership by weakly following either the teachers or the so-called experts. The article reflected the attitudes of teachers as being either atrophied, irritated by the inconsistence of administrators, or simply bewildered by what the curriculum debate was all about. A large number evidently felt that "those responsible for the policy of the school are inconsistent and changeable, that give ear to the 'latest,' whatsoever it may be, and that they do not take teachers into their confidence. . ."[20]

An important study of high school education was made by John Latimer in 1955. His statistics confirmed a significant drop between 1910 and 1949 of the cumulative subjects--mathematics, foreign languages, and science. Although English grew in total enrollments, the percentage of students taking English dropped off. Social studies,

---

[19]Aubrey Douglass, "The Next Steps in Improving the Secondary Education Program," California Journal of Secondary Education, XI (May, 1936), pp. 205-214.

[20]Ibid., p. 212.

the practical arts along with art, music and physical education made significant gains.[21]

The basic reasons given by Latimer for the changes were the same as those given by educators in the thirties. The objectives of education had become social as well as intellectual and greater numbers and varieties of students attended high school. However, Latimer made some other interesting observations. He found that the assumptions that high schools at the turn of the century existed primarily to prepare students for college was invalid. In fact, between 1900 and 1920 a student's chance of finishing high school and then entering college increased. This also proved unfounded the assumption that an increase in numbers meant a decrease in ability.[22] Furthermore, between 1922 and 1952 the number of graduates increased more rapidly than the total enrollment. There was also a larger number prepared for college.[23]

Latimer believed that, unfortunately, the new concepts in curriculum in the thirties were based on the belief that an increase in numbers meant a decrease in intelligence and that this was the primary reason for general science in place of chemistry and physics, and

---

[21]John Francis Latimer, What's Happened to Our High Schools? (Washington, D.C.: Public Affairs Press, 1958), pp. 68-73.

[22]Ibid., p. 74.

[23]Ibid., p. 76.

general mathematics in place of algebra. New curricular concepts also held that foreign languages were a waste of time as was grammar and most types of literature.[24] Latimer called this "split level" education. While he conceded that some flexibility in adapting courses to student interest was good, he stated that students had possessed neither the maturity nor could have received sufficient guidance to deal with an almost unlimited number of elections. His chief concern was that split-level education often resulted, not from lack of ability, but from an under-estimation of student's capacity by himself, his parents, or his advisor.[25]

Edgar B. Wesley in his history of the N.E.A. expressed similar sentiments. "Whether the decline in student quality was actual or imaginary, the steadfast belief in it had considerable effect upon the curriculum and educational standards. It led to needless sacrifices in requirements, and to the too ready attitude to blame students rather than the educational process."[26]

Educational experts felt that things were happening, but they were not quite sure what. Bess Goodykoontz of the Office of Education was convinced that schools were

---

[24] Ibid., p. 76.

[25] Ibid., pp. 77-78.

[26] Wesley, N.E.A., The First Hundred Years, p. 77.

no longer devoting themselves largely to acquiring tools of knowledge, but were planning their programs close to the needs of their clientele. She did not know quite how, but assured her readers that "behind the fog things are going on . . ."[27] She also felt it necessary to plead that the various state and local personnel planning similar programs all over the nation should get together.[28]

A review of the research on the period 1920-1940 lists three distinct trends which vied with each other for attention: a continuing emphasis on subject matter, the scientific movement, and the activity curriculum. The survey noted criticisms which called English "formal exercises," mathematics a "stumbling block," foreign language a waste of time, and history as failing to emphasize democratic ideals.

The same survey of research listed one study in elementary education in 1936 which showed that nearly half of the time of the pupils was spent on reading, writing, spelling, language, and arithmetic. Only 16.6 per cent was spent on science and social studies and 34.7 per cent involved music, art, physical education.[29] This may

---

[27]Bess Goodykoontz, Elementary Education 1930-1936, U.S. Office of Education, Biennial Survey 1934-36, Vol. I, pp. 3-4.

[28]Ibid., p. 7.

[29]Hefferman, "The School Curriculum," p. 237.

be indicative, in spite of other indications, that the value of literacy remained high and that the emphasis by educators on citizenship and socializing were laregly ignored.

In spite of the fact that curriculum revisions and courses of study proliferated from ten in 1923 into the thousands in the thirties, the summarizer of research said, "Brave efforts at curriculum improvement to meet the needs of all children and yough suffered in the Depression."[30]

Curriculum studies and pronouncements by states followed the directions indicated in surveys and studies. The department in New York indicated that it was interested in curricular experiments based on individual needs and interests of the students and that subjects were important only for more definite objectives.[31] And yet, most of the syllabi issued by the department for both elementary and secondary schools were based on subject matter.[32] On the other hand, a ten-year evaluation of education in New York state found that a chief gain had been in a shift of emphasis from subject to child.[33] Both the Reports from

---

[30] Ibid., p. 241.

[31] New York, University of the State of New York, Thirty-Second Annual Report of the Education Department for the School Year Ending June 30, 1935, Vol. I (Albany: The University of the State of New York, 1937), p. 35.

[32] Ibid., pp. 21, 36.

[33] Ibid., Thirty-Third Annual Report of the Education Department for the School Year Ending June 30, 1936, Vol. I, 1938, p. 26.

the department of education and the Regents Inquiry had stressed meeting the needs of youth.

The state of Michigan Department of Public Instruction undertook many curriculum projects in the thirties. A list of educational goals was worked out with the help of lay groups. They were very general, but stressed democracy, cooperation, and meeting a changing society.[34] The stated department in Michigan also established an extensive program of curriculum revision. Interestingly, in a progress report in 1937, the statement was made that many schools were anxious to improve their practices but needed assistance in generating a fundamental philosophy.[35] The goals of 1934 were not long remembered.

A reviewer of research on the period said that reports of various national committees such as the Educational Policies Commission did not indicate that public education was becoming anti-intellectual or anti-subject matter.[36] However, the most consistent criticisms were of the influence of the universities and of the stress on subject-matter. A principal of a Chicago high school

---

[34]"Goals of Public Education in Michigan," Michigan Education Association Journal, XII (September, 1934), p. 2.

[35]Michigan Department of Public Instruction, The Michigan Program of Curriculum Revision: Second Report of Progress, Bulletin 305A, (Lansing: Superintendent of Public Instruction, 1937), p. 8.

[36]Hefferman, "The School Curriculum," p. 244.

criticized high schools for emulating universities by having departments, specialized subject fields, credits, standard blocks of time, and even textbooks written by university professors.[37]

Not all of the blame was put on subject matter. Teaching methods were also blamed for lack of interest and the lack of social competence on the part of students. In a summary of a study of schools in New York State one writer blamed some of the educational problems on the "academic mold" into which most of the programs were cast, but also stated that "Unfortunately, the methods of teaching most often used are not those which can be expected to produce scholarship in any real sense."[38]

In the late thirties, the same curricular changes were advocated and the same criticisms made as were made in the earlier part of the decade. The improvement in the economy brought less of a concern for a cooperative society and a continued concern for the individual. An article published by the Michigan Department of Public Instruction asked: "can secondary schools . . . give these youths actual experience in working out techniques of cooperative endeavor that are still satisfying to the

---

[37]Paul R. Pierce, Developing a High School Curriculum (New York: American Book Company, 1942), pp. 12, 13.

[38]Spaulding, High School and Life, pp. 128-29.

individual?" The prescriptions did not indicate that they could.[39]

The effect of the rise of totalitarianism abroad upon education in a democracy was evident. There was an emphasis on putting the individual above institutions. The Education Department in New York state stated in 1939 that education is the servant of society in which we live and that it must develop the individual to serve society.[40] An article in the New York Times called a similar statement by the Chamber of Commerce Fascistic.[41]

Surveys of Students

Although few good surveys of students of the period seem to exist, the few which do, indicate that the high school student of the period was conservative and individualistic. One survey of 10 per cent of all seniors in Nebraska in 1939 found such conservative leanings as:

---

[39]Edgar G. Johnston and Dwight H. Rich, "Planning Educational Programs in Terms of Actual Needs of Young People," Michigan Department of Public Instruction, Should Youth Challenge the Secondary School? (Lansing, Mich.: Superintendent of Public Instruction, 1941), pp. 8-11.

[40]New York, University of the State of New York, Thirty-Fourth Annual Report of the Education Department for the School Year Ending June 30, 1937, Vol. I, Albany: University of the State of New York, 1939), p. 68.

[41]"Report on Schools Scored as 'Fascist': Educational Groups Criticize State Chamber Committees," New York Times, October 3, 1939, p. 23.

> Educational practice should change slowly; school work should be fitted to the class average rather than to the needs and abilities of individual students; . . . the college preparatory course is best and the most difficult subjects are usually most valuable. More attention should be given to formal drill . . .; Learning how to compete successfully is more important than learning how to live cooperatively.

There were also some almost contradictory liberal trends. However, as the author stated, the results of the survey must have reflected the practices and attitudes of the school.[42]

A survey of graduates of Indianapolis high schools taken in 1941 revealed that there was a positive correlation between grades in high school and the amount of money earned as well as with success in college. Male graduates listed English, social science, math, industrial arts, and science in that order as subjects which gave them the most satisfaction in life. They also listed English and math as the courses which most helped them get jobs. Female replies were similar except that commercial subjects ranked high for aiding in employment.[43]

One of the Educational Policies Commission's publications referred to a survey of students conducted in 1939. In a summary of answers to an open-ended question

---

[42]Paul Harnly, "Attitudes of High-School Seniors Toward Education," School Review, XLVII (September, 1939), 507-509.

[43]W. A. Evans, "Indianapolis Surveys Its High School Graduates," American School Board Journal, CII (March, 1941), 56.

regarding democracy, two-thirds were found to have defined democracy solely in terms of rights and liberties without mentioning responsibilities.[44]

A survey conducted by the American Youth Commission in 1938 is reported on in a book, Youth Tell Their Story. The results showed that high schools did not equalize opportunities for those in the lower economic status.[45] The study showed, however, that those students in school felt that their education would be of economic value. Income did correlate positively with length of time spent in school.[46]

The author found it difficult to accept some of the results. How could 70 per cent feel that vocational guidance was adequate, and how could 15 out of 25 aspire for business or the professionals? Although 71 per cent felt that schools had contributed to helping them enjoy life more, the author felt that the results indicated a need for educational programs more related to everyday life.[47]

---

[44]Educational Policies Commission, Learning the Ways of Democracy: A Case Book of Civic Education (Washington, D.C.: National Education Association of the United States and the American Association of School Administrators, 1940), p. 47.

[45]Howard K. Bell, Youth Tell Their Story (Washington, D.C.: American Council on Education, 1938), p. 60.

[46]Ibid., pp. 81-82.

[47]Ibid., pp. 67-88.

Sociological Study

An interesting observation of education in the thirties by non-educators is contained in Middletown in Transition by sociologists Robert and Helen Lynd. Although they viewed education in Muncie, Indiana through liberal eyes, their observations were very candid.

The Lynds saw Middletown in the 1930's as being ready for a "conservatively progressive" change. They gave as a reason, in addition to the Depression, the diffusion to Middletown of more of the professionalized practices of the twenties. The aims for the Middletown schools as stated in 1933 by the planning and research department of the schools were the same as statements being written by educators throughout the country, including "reorganization and rearranging of curriculum offerings in terms of student needs."[48] They saw a "slow diminution" in the traditional emphasis upon factual courses and more emphasis on exploratory work centering around main problems.

However, they also stated: "If adult Middletown sees its own hope for the immediate future lying in hard work and making money, it has been want to see in education

---

[48]Robert S. Lynd and Helen Merrill Lynd, Middletown in Transition: A Study in Cultural Conflicts (New York: Harcourt, Brace, and Company, 1937), p. 221.

the Open Sesame that will unlock the world for its children."[49] The authors felt that parents still wanted something tangible from education such as better jobs.[50]

The Lynds saw the educating for individual differences as not being in tune with the renewed stress on elements making for solidarity and harmony. The Depression "had forced the community reluctantly to widen its recognition of common necessities rather than individual differences. . . . Sooner or later the schools' concept of 'educating for individual differences' will again be redefined."[51]

The authors saw the administrators dutifully carrying out the wishes of the citizens, with the teachers not really being free to teach anything they wanted. What was really required of the schools was to pass on tradition and inculcate the status quo. They wanted their children trained as intelligent citizens, but not to raise questions. The prolonged schooling heightened the strains involved in the status of the adolescent.

The Lynds concluded by saying something about educational leadership:

> . . . educators are themselves caught in the whirlpool of their own conflicting aims. Many of the external efficiencies . . . have been achieved at the expense of other alleged values of education. . . The desire

[49] Ibid., p. 204.

[50] Ibid., p. 222.

[51] Ibid., pp. 225-226.

> to achieve a standardized procedure widely acclaimed as desirable is frequently at sharp variance with the newly aroused sense of what education can mean in terms of individual development in actual present-day society.[52]

Summary

A look at what was actually going on in some of the school districts throughout the country showed that an attempt was being made to put the ideas from universities, state departments, professional journals and educational meetings into practice. The most widely accepted idea was that individual differences should be stressed and that the needs of individuals should be catered to. Although this idea was not in harmony with the sense of cooperation and community brought on by the economic crisis, it was a heritage of the 1920's and it helped solve the problem of what to do with the influx of lower ability students into the high schools.

There is evidence that an activity centered curriculum--meaning that students no longer sat in rigid attention at their desks--was in wide use. Although scattered subject matter in elementary schools was reduced and courses integrated, the essentials were still stressed. In high schools a stress on education for upward mobility

---

[52] Ibid., p. 240.

and for college continued, but subjects which were practical and useful were in vogue.

The practical arts, music, art, physical education and the social studies grew, while math, foreign languages, and science declined. Furthermore, all subjects had to be related to real life.

Special education and guidance were emphasized. The Depression, with the encumbent state and federal assistance brought about more recreation, and adult and vocational education.

Curriculum guides and courses of study became more numerous in the thirties and it is difficult to determine how much of a change they effected. Although many courses changed in name only, the trend, particularly in social studies, was toward fused and integrated courses dealing with current problems.

To ascertain how much real change occurred is difficult. Certainly, changes did not occur all over. Evidence from some school system reports and proceedings show little change. Rural and the more remote areas changed slowly.

School superintendents seemed to be very careful in explaining changes to their public. Writers indicated that society during this time of crisis and change wanted the security of a stable education system. On the other hand, at a time when society was becomming bureaucratized

and the future uncertain, Americans still looked to education as one of the last bastions of competition which would lead to greater opportunities.

Some writers felt that change was thwarted by the conservatism of teachers and administrators, and there was evidence to support this. But in another sense, few other groups had retained as much liberty as teachers. They, in all probability, had more freedom from professional and governmental restrictions than business or any other profession.

CHAPTER VIII

CONCLUSION

Summary

The breech between educators and other intellectuals widened during the thirties. Educational theory branched off from the mainstream of American political and intellectual thought. Historians had difficulty relating education to the other social forces and neglected that branch of social history as the decade wore on. Educators professed social concern but were cautious about remolding the schools. The schools continued to mirror the dominant culture which was middle-class and liberal in the classic sense of the word. Historians pointed out the conflict between a child-centered, individualistic curriculum and the real world which was technical, oligarchic, and complex. Educators, however, were still fighting the turn-of-the-century battle against big business and big industry. Schools remained a refuge for individualism, competition, and upward mobility at a time when more controls and planning were appearing on the horizon.

Numerical growth, diffusion of energies, and conflicting philosophies characterized the state of colleges of education during the thirties. It was a time of turning inward. Education schools shut themselves off from the rest of the university and tried to turn education into a profession. They failed because there were too many questions they never answered and because leadership, accreted to the universities and became separated from political power.

Education was hampered from becoming a true profession by a lack of discipline of its members, lack of an organized body of specialized knowledge, and lack of goals. The rate of growth alone would have made it almost impossible to properly initiate new members. After pulling together in 1932-33 to save the schools, the rest of the decade saw a fragmentation of the profession with classroom teachers, administrators, academicians, and education professors pulling in different directions. There were disagreements about teacher training and the importance of subject matter.

An attempt was made by a few professors to build a new social order, but it was difficult to define and perished on the rocks of American liberalism. Change and growth won out over science and reason. Although there was an effort to make a separate profession out of administration, democratic practices in the schools

counteracted it. Criticism rather than bold new ideas dominated the professional literature. Defensiveness rather than self-confidence was the result.

The Depression underscored the inequality of educational opportunity within the states and nationwide due to economic changes brought about by the industrial revolution. The state and federal governments responded with relief, but without a program for continued equalization. There was no redistribution of power and little reorganization of the educational structure. Local control and middle-class interests were maintained. Demand for educational reform did not become a mass movement.

Practicing school administrators came from a rural, conservative background of the pre-World War I era. While not adverse to new teaching techniques, changes, and innovations, their social and economic outlooks were of a pre-technical, individualistic era. They did not basically question the American social system and certainly did not see education as a means of changing the social order.

Administrators were criticized for allowing their schools to be judged by the avoidance of controversy rather than the quality of education. They were also criticized for following the path of least resistance and giving in to the established order on the one hand and to the teachers on the other. In deference to democracy, laissez faire prevailed. Authoritarianism had no place in the

schoolhouse, and one person's ideas were as good as another's. The old Progressive fear of control by the few became more fixed than ever. With local control, all of its resultant diversity remained an aspect of American education.

Administrators momentarily were unified during the early part of the Depression by their anger at business and by the financial straits in which the schools had been placed. However, schools, with some federal aid and help from state taxes, probably recovered more rapidly than business and turned their attention to meeting the needs of individuals in the context of older traditions and values.

There is a question as to whether the catering to the needs of students perpetuated a segregation of the lower socio-economic groups since educators appeared to have underestimated their intellectual capacities.

In the late thirties, under the banner of democracy, the goals of educational radicals and conservatives became scarcely distinguishable. Both individual liberty and individual opportunity seemed threatened by totalitarianism. The time was not ripe to put any institution or creed, except democracy, above the individual.

In the field of curriculum development, the most widely accepted ideas were that individual differences should be stressed and that the needs of individuals should

be catered to. Although this was not in harmony with the sense of cooperation and community brought on by the economic crisis, it was the heritage of the twenties and was useful in setting up a tracking system for working-class children. Activity-centered, practical courses were stressed. Subject matter was fused, integrated or centered around a core idea. Math, foreign languages, and sciences declined. Guidance, special and adult education were introduced or expanded.

Democratic curriculum-building and lesson planning were in vogue. State departments and universities provided consultants and curriculum guides, but each teacher was allowed and encouraged to do his own course, leading to a lack of consistency. Testing and norms were not emphasized. Education for change meant adjusting to society and practicing democracy, not an attempt to transcend one's own culture or to understand the theory of political and social change.

Conclusions

1. <u>There was a dichotemy between theory and practice</u>. Theory borrowed from business administration was undermined due to an aversion to efficiency in the schools. However, there had not been developed at this time sufficient educational administrative theory or theory of leadership to fill the void. There was little to

countervail the practical or the pragmatic. Therefore, practice was substituted for theory. Democratic decision-making by either vote of the faculty or by political pressure was not rational.

2. Democracy and ideal citizenship were never defined. While democracy as a method was accepted by educators, their libertarian values kept them from accepting or defining democracy as an end. They ignored the market place of ideas to refine and test their thoughts and were consequently ignored by intellectuals outside of the profession. With the rejection of any sort of social design or purpose, educators could not intervene in society to change its direction. It was not clearly stated whether America was a melting pot or a pluralistic society. The individual was made supreme over institutions rather than being integrated into society. The results were often iconoclastic. But this did not deter nationalism. With world history, other cultures, foreign languages, and the classics ousted from the curriculum a truly catholic viewpoint was not developed. The idea was planted that Americans had little to learn outside of their own experiences. The schools were expected to avoid controversy, but taught it by stressing rights and differences, rather than responsibilities and common needs. Without an established Church or a homogeneous population, the schools would have been the logical institution to support or change the social

order. But the liberal tradition of American educators made them more prone to defend the individual against it.

3. The change which took place in the schools was a shift from economic individualism to social and political individualism. To meet the new problems, education merely adapted the old answer. Educators failed to realize that American individualism was ingrained in the American character much deeper than the profit system. Religious and political forces had been as important as economic. America was founded by rebels and dissenters and it was the Dissenting branches of Protestantism which enjoyed the greatest growth in this country. But liberalism was dead and had no relevancy to an interdependent, shrinking world. John Dewey's model for education was based on preserving in the schools the disappearing forms of socialization which he knew in his boyhood. By the 1930's when his ideas had overcome the emphasis on efficiency and on scientific measurement, they were already outdated. Individual activity for the good of the whole already had been replaced by the philosophy of the NRA which emphasized the corporate structure.

The schools not only did not purge society of its old values, they indoctrinated a new generation with them. These values were an impediment to living in a changing, converging environment. They also kept the profession from uniting and becoming a social and political force.

Skepticism, with each man his own judge, bred solipsism and alienation in a day which called for cooperation and trust. The real meaning of individual differences was never faced, and differences remained a sub-conscious threat. Equality and fraternity fell by the wayside.

4. Educators failed to seize on the crisis as an opportunity to use education as a means of promoting intellectual values and the common good. The Depression experience showed that if change were to come it would probably come from the government or some other outside agency. The last change which occurred in the schools occurred at the turn of the century at the time of the political Progressive thrust. This Progressive reform movement entered the schools and became embedded in them. Only another thrust equally as potent could have a similar effect. The federal government was able to effect change through federal grants, but this change was not permanent because its programs remained outside the state school systems. State officials and some university professors of administration were in a position to rise above petty localism and see the real needs of the people and the nation. But the nation was not willing to give up its belief in the superiority of the individual, small business, and local control regardless of the evidence. Educational leadership did not come forth because educational philosophy was in direct contrast to the national interest.

Recommended Research

There is a need to integrate research on education into more social and intellectual histories and also into political and general histories. The role of education in the development of American society is as important as any other factor. It is usually considered only in biographies.

The writing of the history of local school districts should be resumed. The few local histories written in this century deal almost exclusively with buildings and quantitative growth.

A definitive history of the United States Office of Education is needed in order to focus attention on the embryonic efforts at national leadership and standarization.

Most curriculum making is done before scientific evaluation takes place. There is a need for historical research in curriculum making in order to determine the reasons for the changing of method, structure, and content as well as to help evaluate their effectiveness.

BIBLIOGRAPHY

BIBLIOGRAPHY

Articles in Professional Journals and Yearbooks

Alstetter, M. S. "Evaluating the Education of Administrative Heads of Secondary Schools." School Review, XLVI (Febraury, 1938), 108-117.

Bagley, William C. "Modern Educational Theories and Practical Considerations." School and Society, XXXVII (April 1, 1933), 409-414.

Bair, Frederick, "School Administration and Freedom." Educational Freedom and Democracy. Second Yearbook of the John Dewey Society. Edited by Boyde H. Bode and Harold R. Alberty. New York: D. Appleton-Century Company, 1938.

Bannerman, G. W. "Principal Facts." Nations Schools, XVI (September, 1935), 30.

"Basic Principles of Instructional Leadership." The Elementary School Journal, XXXVI (March, 1936), 485-86.

Baskin, Alex. "An Abstract of Education and the Great Depression: An Inquiry into the Social Ideas and Activities of Radical American Educators during the Economic Crisis of the 1930's." Dissertation Abstracts: Abstracts of Dissertations Available on Microfilm or as Xerographic Reproductions, Vol. XXVIII, Part I, No. 2 (August, 1967), 474A.

Bell, Haurah and Proctor, William. "High School Population Then and Now--A Sixteen Year Span." School Review, XLVI (November, 1936), 689-93.

Blair, John R. "The Conflict of Voltaire and Pollyanna in Education." Educational Administration and Supervision, XX (February, 1934), 147-51.

Bland, Rose. "Some Aspects of the Program of the Elementary School as Is Planned to Meet the Challenge in this Period of Social Change." National Education Association, Proceedings, Vol. LXXIII. Washington, D.C.: National Education Association, 1935.

Bode, Boyd. "Education as Growth: Some Confusions." Progressive Education, XIV (February, 1937), 151-157.

Bode, Boyd H. "The Meaning of Freedom." Educational Freedom and Democracy. Second Yearbook of the John Dewey Society. Edited by Boyd H. Bode and Harold R. Alberty, New York: D. Appleton-Century Company, 1938.

Bowers, C. A. "The Idealogie of Progressive Education," History of Education Quarterly, VII (Winter, 1967), 452-73.

Breed, Frederick S. "The Liberal Group in Education." Educational Administration and Supervision, XXII (May, 1936), 321-30.

_____. "On Changes in Methods of Teaching." School and Society, XLI (April 27, 1935), 558-63.

Brickman, William. "Conant, Korner, and History of Education." School and Society, XCII (March 21, 1969), 135-39.

_____. "Revisionism and the Study of the History of Education." History of Education Quarterly, IV (December, 1964), 209-23.

Briggs, Thomas H. "Some Characteristics of Secondary School Principals." School Review, XLII (March, 1934), 205-209.

Bruce, William. "Some Sources of Conflict in Public Education." Educational Administration and Supervision, XXI (April, 1935), 281-288.

Burke, Arvid J. "Professional Courses for Secondary School Principals." Educational Administration and Supervision, XX (October, 1934), 506-12.

Campbell, Harold. "The Contributions of the Public Schools." National Education Association, Proceedings, Vol. LXXII. Washington, D.C.: National Education Association, 1934.

Chambliss, J. J. "The View of Progress in Laurence Cremin's The Transfirmation of the Schools." History of Education Quarterly, III (March, 1963), 43-51.

Champion, Carroll. "The Scholarship of Graduate Students of Education." School and Society, LI (February 10, 1940), 186-88.

Child, John L. "Whither Progressive Education?" Progressive Education, XIII (December, 1936), 583-89.

Clem, Orlie and Murray, James F. "The Status of the Pennsylvania High School Principal." Educational Administration and Supervision, XIX (September, 1933), 442-450.

Cook, Walter W. "Tests, Achievements." Encyclopedia of Educational Research, 1st ed.

Demaashkevick, M. J. "Philosophy and the Philosophy of Education." Educational Administration and Supervision, XVIII (February, 1932), 115-24.

Demaashkevich, M. J. "Traditionalists Before a 'Progressive' Tribunal." Educational Administration and Supervision, XIX (December, 1933), 641-651.

Douglass, Aubrey. "The Next Steps in Improving the Secondary Education Program." California Journal of Secondary Education, XI (May, 1936), 205-214.

Drake, William E. "Philosophy of Education and the American Culture." Educational Theory, XVIII (Fall, 1968), 365-75.

"Education Charged, Miseducation Recommends Supper High School," Journal of Education, LXIX (January 20, 1935), 54.

Emery, James Newell. "Let's Analyse School Costs." Journal of Education, LXVI (June 19, 1933), 317-319.

Evans, W. A. "Indianapolis Surveys Its High School Graduates." American School Board Journal, CII (March, 1941), 564.

Firman, Sidney G. "Taking the First Steps in Progressive Education." Progressive Education, XII (January, 1935), 30-34.

Fixley, Everett H. "Governing Factors in the Construction of a Training Program for Superintendents of Schools." Educational Administration and Supervision, XXIV (November, 1938), 632-635.

Freeman, Frank N. "Proposed Educational Reform--Some of the Major Issues." Nations Schools, XII (July, 1933), 30-33.

Gaumitz, W. H. "Small High Schools in the National Survey of Secondary Education." Clearing House, VIII (April, 1934), 464-468.

Geyer, Denton L. "What is Progressive Education?" Educational Method, XVII (October, 1937), 8-11.

"Goals of Public Education in Michigan." Michigan Education Association Journal, XII (September, 1934), 2.

Gray, Richard G. "Public Relations in State Departments of Education." Chap. xvi of Education in the State: Nationwide Development since 1900. Washington, D.C.: National Education Association, 1969.

Givens, William. "Education for the New America." National Education Association, Proceedings, Vol. LXXII. Washington, D.C.: National Education Association, 1934.

Grace, Alanzo. "Some Expensive Fallacies in American Education." Educational Administration and Supervision, XIX (March, 1933), 191-203.

Griffiths, Daniel E. "The Nature and Meaning of Theory." Behavioral Science and Educational Administration, Sixty-third Yearbook of the National Society for the Study of Education, Part II. Chicago, Ill.: University of Chicago Press, 1964.

Grizzell, E. D. "A Survey of Secondary Education in Philadelphia." The Harvard Educational Review, VIII (March, 1938), 168-178.

Haisley, Otto W. "The Principal as Social Interpreter." Clearing House, IX (October, 1939), 100-103.

Harap, Henry. "A Survey of Courses of Study Published in the First Two Years." Journal of Educational Research, XXVIII (May, 1935), 641-656.

Harnly, Paul. "Attitudes of High School Seniors Toward Education." School Review, XLVII (September, 1939), 501-509.

Harris, James H. "Can We Have Our Cake and Eat It?" Journal of Education, CXVIII (February 18, 1935), 104-105.

Hefferman, Helen. "The School Curriculum in American Education." Chapter v of Education in the States: Nationwide Development Since 1900. Edited by Edgar Fuller and Jim B. Pearson. Washington, D.C.: National Education Association, 1969.

Herbold, Paul. "Small-Town Superintendent." Journal of Education, CXX (April 5, 1937), 178-180.

Hildreth, Gertrude. "Graduates of Lincoln Schools." Teachers College News, XLIV (February, 1943), 361-68.

Hill, Henry A. "Representative School System--Lexington." Journal of Education, LXIX (December 7, 1936), 516-518.

Holden, John B. "Adult Education in the Public Schools." Chap. vii of Education in the States: Nationwide Developments Since 1900. Edited by Edgar Fuller and Jim B. Pearson. Washington, D.C.: National Education Association, 1969.

Isenberg, Robert M. "State Organization for Service and Leadership to Local Schools." Chap. iii of Education in the States: Nationwide Development Since 1900. Edited by Edgar Fuller and Jim B. Pearson. Washington, D.C.: National Education Association, 1969.

Johns, R. L. "State Financing of Elementary and Secondary Education." Chap. iv of Education in the States: Nationwide Developments Since 1900. Edited by Edgar Fuller and Jim B. Pearson. Washington, D.C.: National Education Association, 1969.

Kadisch, J. Stevens. "A Comprehensive Program of Public Education." National Education Association, Proceedings, Vol. LXXII, Washington D.C.: National Education Association, 1934.

Kandel, I. L. "Education and Social Disorder." Teachers College Record, XXXIV (February, 1933), 359-367.

Kilpatrick, William H. "The Social Philosophy of Progressive Education." Progressive Education, XII (May, 1935), 289-93.

Knight, Edgar W. "Getting Ahead by Degrees." School and Society, LIII (April 26, 1941), 521-28.

Koch, Harlan. "The High-School Principal Looks at Himself as Educational Leader." School Review, XLV (June, 1937), 452-58.

_____. "The Superintendent Judges the Principals' Contribution to Secondary Education." School Review XLIV (October, 1936), 590-596.

Koos, Leonard V. "A National Survey of Secondary Education--A Preliminary Study." North Central Association Quarterly, VII (September, 1932), 206-15.

Latham, O. K. "The Teachers College Versus the Liberal Arts College in the Education of Teachers." National Education Association, Proceedings, Vol. LXXIV. Washington, D.C.: National Education Association, 1936.

Lewis, H. Graham. "Bailyn and Cremin on Cubberley and the History of Education," Educational Theory, XVII (June, 1967), 56-59.

Logan, John, et al. "Representative School Systems--Newark." Journal of Education, CXIX (April 6, 1936), 198-202.

McGinnis, W. C. "Progressive Education--Pros and Cons." The School Executive, LV (November, 1935), 90-92+.

Melby, Ernest A. "Building a Philosophy of Leadership." School Executive, LVI (September, 1936), 17-19+.

Meyers, Alonzo, "Will Education Go Democratic?" Clearing House, XI (January, 1937), 263-67.

Michael, Raymond S. "What's It All About?" National Education Association, Proceedings, Vol. LXXIII. Washington, D.C.: National Education Association, 1935.

Miller, James Collins. "Educational Administrators Must Be More Highly Trained." Nations Schools, XII (November, 1933), 37-40.

Moore, Clarence Carl. "The Educational Administrator and His Opportunities." Educational Administration and Supervision, XXIII (November, 1937), 622-32.

Morrison, H. C. "Sincerity in the Present Situation." Educational Administration and Supervision, XX (April, 1934), 272-281.

Newlon, Jesse. "The Importance of a Point of View in Educational Administration." National Education Association, Proceedings, Vol. LXXV. Washington, D.C.: National Education Association, 1937.

Noel, Margaret. "What Kind of Education?" Educational Administration and Supervision, XVIII (March, 1932), 216-22.

Orater, Pedro. "Conflicting Viewpoints in Contemporary American Education." Educational Administration and Supervision, XXII (May, 1936), 361-374.

Prutt, Orville E. "Viewing Our Work In Perspective." National Education Association, Proceedings. Vol. LXXV. Washington, D.C.: National Education Association, 1937.

Pulliam, Roscoe. "How Much Freedom in Education?" Elementary School Journal, XXXV (September, 1934), 16-23.

Raup, R. Bruce. "What Teacher-Training Faculties Believe." Educational Administration and Supervision, XX (May, 1934), 341-59.

Reed, Carroll B. "Representative School System--Minneapolis." Journal of Education, CXVIII (October, 1935), 437-41.

Rudolph, Frederick. "Review of the Transformation of the School: Progressivism in American Education by Laurence A. Cremin." The Mississippi Valley Historical Review, XLVIII (December, 1961), 549-51.

Ryan, H. H. "The High School Principal Looks to His Faculty." Clearing House, VIII (January, 1934), 351-354.

Saunders, Carter (pseud.). "Self-Portrait." The Nations Schools, XVIII (August, 1936), 25-27.

Scott, Cecil Winfield and Reid, Harold D. "The Public High School Principal in Nebraska." School Review, XLVII (February, 1939), 121-127.

Shannon, J. R. "Academic Training of Secondary School Principals in the United States." National Education Association, Department of Secondary School Principals, Bulletin, No. 53 (December, 1939), 7-12.

Simon, Ronald L. "Desirable Qualifications for Educational Leadership In a Small Community." American School Board Journal, LXCV (November, 1937), 22+.

Smith, Timothy L. "Review of Education and the Cult of Efficiency: A Study of the Social Forces that Have Shaped the Administration of the Public Schools by Raymond E. Cullahan." History of Education Quarterly, IV (March, 1964), 76-77.

Smith, William H. "Cooperation--A Myth or a Reality?" Clearing House, IX (January, 1935), 293-295.

Steffens, M. R. "The Relationship of State Departments of Education to the Administration and Supervision of Local Secondary Schools." Department of Secondary-School Principals of the National Education Association. Abstracts of Unpublished Masters' Theses in the Field of Secondary-School Administration. Bulletin, No. 47 (May, 1933), 84-85.

Steson, Paul C. "Representative School Systems--Indianapolis." Journal of Education, CXIX (November 2, 1936), 466-469.

Stinnett, T. M. "Teacher Education, Certification, and Accredidation." Chap. ix of Education in the States: Nationwide Development Since 1900. Edited by Edgar Fuller and Jim B. Pearson. Washington, D.C.: National Education Association, 1969.

Strayer, George D. "Changing Concepts of Educational Administration." Teachers College Record, XL (March, 1939), 469-482.

Stumpf, W. A. "Graduate Work in State Teachers Colleges." School and Society, XLVI (December 25, 1937), 834-38.

Swanson, Gordon I. "The World of Work." Chap. vi of Education in the States: Nationwide Developments Since 1900. Edited by Edgar Fuller and Jim B. Pearson. Washington, D.C.: National Education Association, 1969.

"Third Annual Conference of City Superintendents at Traverce City." Michigan Education Association Journal, X (October, 1938), 96-99.

Tyler, Ralph W. "Evaluation: A Challenge and an Opportunity to Progressive Education." Educational Record, XVI (January, 1935), 127-31.

Wassing, Frank R. "It Can Be Done." Education, IV (May, 1935), 538-41.

Weiss, Robert M. "Review of the Transformation of the Schools: Progressivism in American Education, 1876-1957 by Lawrence Cremin." History of Education Quarterly, II (June, 1962), 130-132.

Wert, James E. "The Function of Graduate Education in a Teachers College." Educational Research Bulletin, XVII (February 10, 1938), 29-35.

Wetzel, William A. "Forty Years a Schoolmaster." National Education Association, Department of Secondary School Principals, Bulletin, No. 57 (May, 1935), 9-42.

"What is a Progressive School?" Journal of Education, LXV (October 17, 1932), 572.

"Where Superintendents and Principals Fail." Elementary School Journal, XXXIV (January, 1934), 331-333.

Winget, Lerue W.; Fuller, Edgar; Bell, Terrel H. "State Departments of Education Within State Governments." Chap. ii of Education in The States: Nationwide Development Since 1900. Edited by Edgar Fuller and Jim B. Pearson. Washington, D.C.: National Education Association, 1969.

Willett, G. W. "As the Principal Sees It." The North Central Association Quarterly, V (December, 1930), 403-405.

Withers, William. "Is Progressive Education on the Wane?" School and Society, XLVI (September 25, 1937), 401-03.

Zeitlin, Harry. "An Abstract of Federal Relations in American Education 1933-1943: A Study of New Deal Efforts and Innovations." Dissertation Abstracts: Abstracts of Dissertations and Monographs in Microform, XIX, Part I, No. 2. (August, 1958), 268-69.

Books and Yearbooks

Adams, James Truslow. The Epic of America. Boston: Little, Brown, and Company, 1931.

American Association of University Professors, Committee Y. Depression Recovery and Higher Education. New York: McGraw-Hill Book Company, Inc., 1937.

American Historical Association Commission on the Social Studies. Conclusions and Recommendations of the Commission. New York: Charles Scribner's Sons, 1934.

Bailyn, Bernard. Education in the Forming of American Society: Needs and Opportunities for Study. New York: Vintage Books, 1960.

Bair, Frederich. The Social Understandings of the Superintendent of Schools. New York: Bureau of Publications, Teachers College, Columbia University, 1934.

Beale, Howard K. Are American Teachers Free?: An Analysis of Restraints Upon the Freedom of Teaching in American Schools. Report of the Commission on Social Studies of the American Historical Association; Part XII. New York: Charles Scribner's Sons, 1936.

_____. A History of Freedom in Teaching in American Schools. Report of the Commission on the Social Studies of the American Historical Association, Part XVI. New York: Charles Scribner's Sons, 1941.

Beard, Charles A. and Beard, Mary R. America in Midpassage. New York: The MacMillan Company, 1939.

_____. The American Spirit: A Study in the Idea of Civilization in the United States. New York: The MacMillan Co., 1942.

Bell, Howard K. Youth Tell Their Story. Washington, D.C.: American Council on Education, 1938.

Bode, Boyd and Alberty, Harold R. Educational Freedom and Democracy. Second Yearbook of the John Dewey Society. New York: D. Appleton-Century Company, 1938.

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

Bolton, Frederick Elmer; Cole, Thomas Raymond; Jessup, John Hunnicut. The Beginning Superintendent. New York: The MacMillan Company, 1937.

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

Breed, Frederick S. Education and the New Realism. New York: The MacMillan Company, 1939.

Brogan, D. W. The American Character. New York: Alfred A. Knopf, 1944.

Brumeld, Theodore. Toward a Reconstructed Philosophy of Education. New York: Holt, Rinehart and Winston, 1962.

Callahan, Raymond. The Cult of Efficiency: A Study of the Social Forces that Have Shaped the Administration of the Public Schools. Chicago: University of Chicago Press.

Chamberlain, John. Farewell to Reform: The Rise, Life and Decay of the Progressive Mind in America. Chicago: Quadrangle Books, 1965.

Cocking, Walter D. and Gilmore, Charles H. Organization and Administration of Public Education. Staff Study No. 2, Prepared for the Advisory Committee on Education. Washington, D.C.: Government Printing Office, 1938.

Commager, Henry Steele. The American Mind: An Interpretation of American Thought and Character since the 1880's. New Haven: Yale University Press, 1950.

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

_____. Education and American Civilization. New York: Bureau of Publications, Teachers College, Columbia University, 1952.

_____. The Prospects of American Democracy. New York: John Day Company, 1938.

_____. The Social Composition of Boards of Education: A Study in the Social Control of Public Education. Supplementary Educational Monographs, No. 33. Chicago: The University of Chicago, 1927.

Coxe, W. W. The Study of the Secondary School Principal In New York State. Albany: The University of the State of New York Press, 1929.

Cremin, Lawrence. The Transformation of the School: Progressivism in American Education, 1876-1957. New York: Alfred A. Knopf, 1961.

Cubberley, Elwood P. Public Education in the United States: A Study and Interpretation of American Educational History. 1st ed., rev. Boston: Houghton, Mifflin Company, 1934.

Curti, Merle. The Social Ideas of American Educators: With New Chapter on the Last Twenty-five Years. Commission on the Social Studies of the American Historical Association. Patterson, N. J.: Pageant Books, Inc., 1959.

Department of Superintendence of the National Education Association. Educational Leadership: Progress and Possibilities. Eleventh Yearbook. Washington, D.C.: The Department of Superintendence, 1933.

Department of Superintendence of the National Education Association. The Improvement of Education: Its Interpretation for Democracy. Fifteenth Yearbook. Washington, D.C.: The Department of Superintendence, 1937.

Department of Superintendence of the National Education Association. Social Change and Education. Thirteenth Yearbook. Washington, D.C. The Department of Superintendence, 1935.

Dewey, John. Experience and Education. New York: The MacMillan Company, 1938.

Division of Field Studies, Institute of Educational Research, Teachers College. The Report of a Survey of the Public Schools of Pittsburgh, Pennsylvania. New York: Bureau of Publication, Teachers College, Columbia University, 1940.

Educational Policies Commission. The Education of Free Men in a Democracy. Washington, D.C.: National Education Association and American Association of School Administrators, 1941.

_____. Learning the Way of Democracy: A Case Book of Civic Education. Washington, D.C.: National Education Association of the United States and the American Association of School Administrators, 1940.

_____. The Purposes of Education in American Democracy. Washington, D.C.: National Education Association and the American Association of School Administrators, 1938.

_____. Research Memorandum on Education in the Depression. New York: Social Science Research Council Bulletin, No. 28, 1937.

_____. The Structure and Administration of Education In American Democracy. Washington, D.C.: National Education Association and American Association of School Administrators, 1938.

_____. The Unique Function of Education in American Democracy. Washington, D.C.: National Education Association and the Department of Superintendence, 1937.

Encyclopedia of Educational Research. 1st ed.

Forcey, Charles. The Crossroads of Liberalism: Croly, Weyl, Lippman and the Progressive Era. New York: Oxford University Press, 1961.

Fuller, Edgar and Pearson, Jim B., eds. Education in the States: Nationwide Development since 1900. Washington, D.C.: National Education Association, 1969.

Gabriel, Ralph H. The Course of American Democratic Thought. New York: The Ronald Press Company, 1940.

Graham, Otis L., Jr. An Encore for Reform: The Old Progressives and the New Deal. New York: Oxford University Press, 1967.

Graham, Patricia Albjerg. Progressive Education: From Arcady to Academe: A History of the Progressive Education Association, 1919-1955. New York: Teachers College Press, Teachers College, Columbia University, 1967.

Handlin, Oscar. The American: A New History of the People of the United States. Boston: Little, Brown and Company, 1963.

Harper, Manly H. Social Belief and Attitude of American Educators. Teachers College, Columbia University Contributions to Education, No. 294. New York: Bureau of Publications Teachers College, Columbia University, 1927.

Hofstdter, Richard. The Age of Reform. New York: Alfred A. Knopf, 1966.

_____. Anti-Intellectualism in American Life. New York: Alfred A. Knopf, 1964.

Judd, Charles H. Preparation of School Personnel: The Regents Inquiry. New York: McGraw-Hill Book Company, Inc., 1938.

Keith, Philip Edward. The History of Secondary Education in Penobscot County in Maine. Oreno, Maine: The University Press, 1948.

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

Kursh, Harry. The United States Office of Education: A Century of Service. Philadelphia, Pa.: Chilton Books, A Division of Chilton Company, 1965.

Lasch, Christopher. The Agency of the American Left. New York: Alfred A. Knopf, 1969.

Latimer, John Francis. What's Happened to Our High Schools? Washington, D.C.: Public Affairs Press, 1958.

Lerner, Max. America as a Civilization: Life and Thought in the United States Today. New York: Simon and Schuster, 1957.

Lynd, Robert S. and Lynd, Helen Merrill. Middletown in Transition: A Study in Cultural Conflicts. New York: Harcourt, Brace, and Company, 1937.

MacCracken, John Henry, ed. American Universities and Colleges. 2nd ed.: Baltimore, Md.: The Williams and Wilkins Company, 1930.

Marsh, Clarence Stephen, ed. American Universities and Colleges. 4th ed. Washington, D.C.: American Council on Education, 1940.

Mayer, Frederick. American Ideas and Education. Columbus, Ohio: Charles E. Merrill Book Co., 1964.

Meyer, Donald, B. The Protestant Search for Political Realism, 1919-1941. Berkley, Calif.: University of California Press, 1960.

Miller, Robert Moats. American Protestantism and Social Issues, 1919-1939. Chapel Hill, N.C.: University of North Carolina Press, 1958.

Moehlman, Arthur B. School Administration: Its Development, Principles, and Future in the United States. Boston: Houghton Mifflin Company, 1940.

Morison, Samuel Eliot. The Intellectual Life of Colonial New England. Ithica, N.Y.: Great Seal Books, A Division of Cornell University Press, 1956.

Mort, Paul R. and Cornell, Francis L. American Schools in Transition: How Our Schools Adapt Their Practices to Changing Needs: A Study of Pennsylvania. New York: Bureau of Publications, Teachers College, Columbia University, 1941.

National Education Association. Proceedings. Vols. LXX-LXXVII. Washington, D.C.: National Education Association, 1932-39.

National Society for the Study of Education. Graduate Study in Education. The Fiftieth Yearbook, Part I. Chicago, Ill.: University of Chicago Press, 1951.

Newlon, Jesse H. Educational Administration as Social Policy. Report of the Commission on Social Studies, Part VIII. New York: Charles Scribner's Sons, 1934.

Nye, Russel B. Midwestern Progressive Politics: A Historical Study of its Origins and Development, 1870-1958. East Lansing, Mich.: Michigan State University Press, 1959.

Oberholtzer, Edison Ellsworth. An Integrated Curriculum in Practice. Teachers College Contributions to Education, No. 694. New York: Bureau of Publications, Teachers College, Columbia University, 1937.

O'Leary, Timothy. An Inquiry into the General Purpose, Functions and Organizations of Selected University Schools of Education with Special Reference to Certain Aspects of Their University Growth and Development. Washington, D.C.: Catholic University of America Press, 1941.

Orton, William Aylott. America in Search of Culture. Boston: Little, Brown and Company, 1933.

Parrington, Vernon Louis. Main Currents in American Thought. Vol. III: The Beginning of Critical Realism in America, 1860-1920. New York: Harcourt, Brace and Company, 1930.

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

Pierce, Paul R. Developing a High School Curriculum. New York: American Book Company, 1942.

Rudy, Willis. Schools in an Age of Mass Culture: An Exploration of Selected Themes in the History of Twentieth-Century American Education. Englewood Cliffs, N.J.: Prentice-Hall Inc., 1965.

Schmidt, A. W. Development of a State Minimum Educational Program. New York: Bureau of Publications, Teachers College, Columbia University, 1932.

Smith, Harry P. A Limited School Survey of the Minoa, N. Y. Area. Syracuse, N.Y.: Syracuse University, 1941.

Spaulding, Francis T. High School and Life: The Regents Inquiry. New York: McGraw-Hill Book Company, 1938.

Spears, Harold. The Emerging High School Curriculum and Its Direction. New York: American Book Company, 1940.

Swift, Fletcher Harper. Federal and State Policies in Public School Finance in the United States. Boston: Ginn and Company, 1931.

Warner, W. Lloyd. Democracy in Jonesville: A Study of Quality and Inequality. New York: Harper and Brothers, 1949.

Welter, Rush. Popular Education and Democratic Thought in America. New York: Columbia University Press, 1967.

Wesley, Edgar B. NEA: The First Hundred Years: The Building of the Teaching Profession. New York: Harper and Brothers, Publishers, 1957.

Williamson, Obed Jolman. Provisions for General Theory Courses in the Professional Education of Teachers. Contributions to Education, No. 684. New York: Bureau of Publications, Teachers College, Columbia University, 1936.

Wish, Harvey. Society and Thought in Modern America: A Social and Intellectual History of the American People From 1865. New York: Longmans, Green and Co., 1952.

Government and University Publications

Ann Arbor, Mich. Helping Children Experience the Realities of the Social Order: Social Studies in the Public Schools of Ann Arbor, Michigan: Junior High Schools. Ann Arbor, Mich.: Board of Education, 1933.

Beach, Fred F. and Gibbs, Andrew H. The Personnel of State Departments of Education. U.S. Office of Education. Misc. No. 16. Washington, D.C.: Government Printing Office, 1952.

Cambridge, Mass. City of Cambridge, Massachusetts Annual Report of the School Committee and Superintendent of Schools, 1939. Cambridge, Mass.: Board of Education, 1939.

Chicago, Ill. Board of Education, City of Chicago. Annual Report of the Superintendent of Schools for the Year ending June 12, 1936. Chicago, Ill.: Board of Education, 1936.

Chicago, Ill. Board of Education, City of Chicago, Annual Report of the Superintendent of Schools for the Year ending June 11, 1937. Chicago, Ill.: Board of Education, 1937.

Cork, Katherine M. "Review of Conditions and Development in Education in Rural and Other Sparsely Settled Areas." U.S. Office of Education. Biennial Survey of Education in the United States 1934-36. Vol. I. Washington, D.C. Government Printing Office, 1940.

_____. Supervision of Instruction as a Function of State Departments of Education. U.S. Office of Education, Bulletin, 1940, No. 6. Monograph No. 7. Washington, D.C.: Government Printing Office, 1940.

Covert, Timon. Federal Grants for Education 1933-1934. U.S. Office of Education. Leaflet, No. 45. Washington, D.C.: Government Printing Office, 1935.

_____. State Provisions for Equalizaing the Cost of Public Education. U.S. Office of Education. Bulletin, 1936, No. 4. Washington, D.C.: Government Printing Office, 1936.

Detroit, Mich. The Superintendents' Annual Report: Detroit Public Schools, 1938-39. Detroit: Board of Education, 1939.

East Lansing, Mich. Growth: Superintendent's Annual Report, 1945-1946. East Lansing, Mich.: East Lansing, Public Schools, 1946.

East Lansing, Mich. Report to the Board of Education of the Citizens' Survey of East Lansing Schools. East Lansing, Michigan: 1945.

Gaummitz, W. H. Education in the Southern Mountain. U.S. Office of Education Bulletin, 1937, No. 26. Washington, D.C.: Government Printing Office, 1937.

Goodykoontz, Bess. "Elementary Education, 1930-1936." U.S. Office of Education. Biennial Survey of Education, 1934-1936. Vol. I. Bulletin, 1937, No. 2. Washington, D.C.: Government Printing Office, 1940.

Grand Rapids. Mich. Sixty-First and Sixty-Second Annual Reports of the Board of Education of the City of Grand Rapids, Michigan for the School Years ending June, 1935 and June, 1936. Grand Rapids. Mich.: Board of Education, 1936.

Grand Rapids, Mich. Sixty-Third and Sixty-Fourth Annual Reports of the Board of Education of the City of Grand Rapids, Michigan for the School Years Ending June 1935 and June, 1936. Grand Rapids: Board of Education, 1936.

Hamtramck, Mich. Education for Democracy: Annual Report, Hamtramck Public Schools, 1936-1937. Hamtramck, Mich.: Board of Education, 1937.

Jessen, Carl A. "Trends in Secondary Education." U.S. Office of Education. Biennial Survey of Education, 1934-1936. Vol. I, Bulletin, 1937, No. 2. Washington, D.C.: Government Printing Office, 1940.

Johnston, Edgar G. and Rich, Dwight H. "Planning Educational Programs in Terms of Actual Needs of Young People." Michigan Department of Public Instruction. Should Youth Challenge the Secondary School? Lansing, Mich.: Superintendent of Public Instruction, 1941.

Keesecker, Ward W. "A Review of Educational Legislation 1933 and 1934." Chap. viii of Biennial Survey of Education in the United States, 1932-1934. U.S. Office of Education. Bulletin, 1935, No. 2. Washington, D.C.: Government Printing Office, 1935.

_____. "A Review of Educational Legislation, 1935 and 1936." Chap. viii of Vol. I of Biennial Survey of Education in the United States, 1934-1936. U.S. Office of Education, Bulletin, 1937, No. 2. 2 Vols. Washington, D.C.: Government Printing Office, 1939.

_____. A Review of Educational Legislation 1937 and 1938. U.S. Office of Education. Bulletin, 1939, No. 16. Washington, D.C.: Government Printing Office, 1939.

Lansing, Mich. Your Schools. Lansing, Mich.: Board of Education, 1939.

Leary, Bernice E. Curriculum Laboratories and Divisions: Their Organization and Functions in State Departments of Education, City School Systems and Institutions of Higher Education. Office of Education. Bulletin, 1938, No. 7. Washington, D.C.: Government Printing Office, 1938.

Lund, John. Education of School Administrators. U.S. Office of Education. Bulletin, 1941, No. 6. Washington, D.C.: Government Printing Office, 1942.

Michigan Department of Public Instruction. Biennual Reports 1931-1941. Lansing: Superintendent of Public Instruction, 1932-1942.

Michigan Department of Public Instruction. Changing Secondary Education in the United States: Report on a Survey of Modifications of Secondary Education. Secondary School Curriculum Study, Bulletin, No. 2. Lansing, Mich. 1939.

Michigan Department of Public Instruction. The Michigan Curriculum Program: Third Report of Progress. Bulletin, No. 311. Lansing, Mich.: Superintendent of Public Instruction, 1939.

_____. The Michigan Program of Curriculum Program: Second Report of Progress. Bulletin 305A. Lansing: Superintendent of Public Instruction, 1937.

_____. News of the Week. Vols. I-VIII.

New Orleans, La. Tomorrow's Citizens: A Study and Program for the Improvement of the New Orleans Public School. New Orleans: Citizen's Planning Committee for Public Education, 1940.

New York. The Regents' Inquiry. Education for American Life: A New Program for the State of New York. New York: McGraw-Hill Book Company, Inc., 1938.

New York University, School of Education. Announcement for the Session 1934-35. New York: Washington Square, 1934.

New York. University of the State of New York. Twenty-Eighth Annual Report of the Education Department for the School Year ending June 30, 1931. Vol. I. Albany, N. Y.: University of the State of New York, 1932.

_____. Thirty-Second Annual Report of the Education Department for the School Year Ending June 30, 1935. Vol. I. Albany, N. Y., The University of the State of New York, 1937.

_____. Thirty-Third Annual Report of the Education Department for the School Year ending June 30, 1936. Vol. I. Albany, N. Y. The University of the State of New York, 1938.

_____. Thirty-Fourth Annual Report of the Education Department for the School Year ending June 30, 1937. Vol. I. Albany, N. Y.: The University of the State of New York, 1939.

Proffitt, Marie M. "Adult Education." U.S. Office of Education, Biennial Survey of Education in the United States 1934-1936. Vol. I. Washington, D.C.: Government Printing Office, 1940.

Rice, Theodore, and Faunce, Roland. The Michigan Secondary Study: A Report of the Michigan Study of the Secondary School Curriculum 1937-1945. Lansing, Michigan: State Board of Education, 1945.

Rugg. Earle U., et al. Teacher Education Curricula in Seven Parts. Vol. III of National Survey of the Education of Teachers. Office of Education. Bulletin, 1933, No. 10. 6 Vols. Washington, D.C.: Government Printing Office, 1935.

St. Louis, Mo. Approved Recommendations of the St. Louis School Survey. St. Louis: St. Louis Public Schools, 1941.

Teachers College Bulletin. Announcement of Teachers College 1935-1936. New York: Teachers College, Columbia University, 1935.

U.S., The Advisory Committee on Education, Report of the Committee. Washington, D.C.: Government Printing Office, 1938.

U.S. Department of Interior. Annual Report of the Secretary of the Interior for the Fiscal Year ended June 30, 1933-39. 7 vols. Washington, D.C.: Government Printing Office, 1933-39.

U.S. Office of Education. Annual Report of the United States Commissioner of Education for the Fiscal Year ended June 30, 1940. Washington, D.C.: Government Printing Office, 1941.

_____. Annual Report of the Commissioner of Education to the Secretary of the Interior for the Fiscal Year ended June 30, 1930-32. 3 vols. Washington, D.C.: Government Printing Office, 1930-32.

_____. Biennial Survey of Education 1930-1932. Bulletin, 1933, No. 2. Washington, D.C.: U.S. Government Printing Office, 1935.

_____. Biennial Survey of Education 1932-1934. Bulletin, 1935, No. 2. Washington, D.C.: Government Printing Office, 1937.

_____. Biennial Survey of Education 1934-1936. Bulletin, 1937, No. 2. 2 vols. Washington, D.C.: Government Printing Office, 1939, Vol. I.

_____. Biennial Survey of Education 1936-1938. Bulletin, 1940, No. 2. 2 vols. Washington, D.C. U.S. Government Printing Office, 1942.

_____. Choosing Our Way. Bulletin, 1937, Misc. No. 1. Washington, D.C.: Government Printing Office, 1937.

_____. National Survey of the Education of Teachers. Bulletin, No. 10, 1933. 6 vols. Washington, D.C.: Government Printing Office, 1932-33.

_____. National Survey of Secondary Education. Bulletin, 17, 1932, Monographs 1-28. Washington, D.C.: Government Printing Office, 1933-34.

_____. A Survey of Courses of Study and Other Curriculum Materials Published Since 1934. Bulletin, 1937, No. 31. Washington, D.C.: Government Printing Office, 1937.

_____. To Promote the Cause of Education: A Pictoral Presentation. Bulletin, 1938, Misc. No. 2. Washington, D.C.: Government Printing Office, 1938.

U.S., Statutes at Large. Vol. XIV (1867).

University of Michigan School of Education. General Announcement 1938-29. (Part X of the General Register). Ann Arbor, Mich.: Published by the University, 1928.

_____. General Announcement 1937-38 and 1938-39. (Part X of the General Register). Ann Arbor, Mich.: Published by the University, 1937.

Will, Robert F.; Murphy, Louise R.; Gibbs, James E., Jr. State School Administration 1900-1955; Reports of Major Surveys and Studies. U.S. Office of Education. Circular, No. 580. Washington, D.C.: Department of Health, Education and Welfare, 1957.

Newspapers

Campbell, Harold G. "The School Year Opens." New York Times, September 13, 1936, p. 14.

New York Times, January 1, 1933 - December 31, 1939.

Unpublished Material

Jackson, Mich. Board of Education Proceedings, January 1, 1932-June 10, 1942. (Mimeographed.)

Jennings, E. J. "The Status of the Superintendent in the Public Schools of Michigan." Unpublished M.A. thesis, University of Michigan, 1934.

Lansing, Mich. Board of Education Minutes. November 23, 1936-April 14, 1941. (Mimeographed.)

Magnuson, Roger P. "The Concerns of Organized Business With Michigan Education, 1910-1940." Unpublished Ph.D. dissertation, University of Michigan, 1963.

Meredith, Cameron W. "An Account of Change at the University of Michigan during the Period 1921-49." Unpublished Ph.D. dissertation, University of Michigan, 1950.

Michigan Association of School Administrators, Proceedings, 1933-1940. Lansing, 1933-1940. (Mimeographed.)

General References

Periodicals

Bagley, William C. "An Essentialists Platform for the Advancement of American Education." Educational Administration and Supervision, XXIV (April, 1938), 241-256.

Blume, Clarence E. "How the Secondary School Principal Can Be Progressive." School Executive, LIII (October, 1933), 42-43.

Brubacker, John S. "Review of Conclusions and Recommendations of the Commission [American Historical Association Commission on the Social Studies]." American Historical Review, XL (January, 1935), 301-305.

Crawford, Will R. "Representative School Systems--San Diego." Journal of Education, CXIX (June 6, 1956), 14-18.

Dewey, John. "Democracy and Educational Administration." Department of Superintendence. Official Report. Washington, D.C.: American Association of School Administrators, 1937.

Forsythe, L. L. "New Wine in New Bottles." Clearing House, XI (December, 1936), 225-227.

Forman, W. D. "The Principal As Interpreter." Journal of Education, LXIX (April 20, 1936), 224-225.

Haggerty, M. E. "The Low Visibility of Educational Issues." School and Society, XLI (March 2, 1935), 273-283.

Hutchins, Robert M. "The American Educational System." School Review, XLIII (February, 1933), 95-100.

McClure, Worth. "The Schools and the Democratic Way of Living." Educational Method, XIV (October, 1934), 10-18.

Osburn, W. J. "What Next In School Administration?" Educational Administration and Supervision, XI (February, 1935), 107-114.

Soderbergh, Peter A. "Charles A. Beard and the Public Schools, 1909-1939." History of Education Quarterly, V (December, 1965), 241-252.

Sutton, William. "Problems of a Superintendent." Department of Superintendence. Official Report. Washington, D.C.: American Association of School Administrators, 1937.

Van Slyck, Willard N. "The Development of the High School Curriculum in Three Large American Cities." Bulletin of the Department of Secondary School Principals of the National Education Association, No. 5 (December, 1934), 13-34.

Waterhouse, Ralph G. "Analyzing the Progressive Movement." Ohio Schools, XIV (October, 1936), 278.

Books

Aiken, Wilfred M. The Story of the Eight Year Study. New York: Harper, 1942.

Arnett, Claude E. Social Belief and Attitude of American School Board Members. Emporia, Kan.: Emporia Gazette Press, 1932.

Cohan, Sol. Progressive and Urban School Reform: The Public School Association of New York City, 1895-1954. New York: Bureau of Publications, Teachers College, Columbia University, 1964.

Detroit Public Schools. Frank Edy: A Realist in Education. New York: The MacMillan Company, 1943.

Karier, Clarence J. Man, Society and Education. Glenview, Ill.: Scott, Foresman, and Company, 1967.

Kilpatrick, William Heard. Education and the Social Crisis: A Proposed Program. New York: Liveright Publishing Corporation, 1932.

Koopman, G. Robert; and Meil, Abie; and Misner, Paul J. Democracy in School Administration. New York: D. Appleton-Century Company, Incorporated, 1943.

Newlon, Jesse H. Education for Democracy in Our Time. New York: McGraw-Hill, 1939.

Persons, Stow. American Minds: A History of Ideas. New York: Henry Hill and Company, 1958.

Pierce, Bessie Louise. Citizens Organizations and the Civic Training of Youth. Report of the Commission on the Social Studies of the American Historical Association, Part III. New York: Charles Scribner's Sons, 1933.

Rugg, Harold. The Great Technology: Social Chaos and the Public Mind. New York: John Day Company, 1933.

Spears, Harold. Experience in Curriculum Building. New York: The MacMillan Company, 1937.

Whittemore, Robert Clifton. Makers of the American Mind. New York: William Morrow & Company, 1964.

Young, Kimball. An Introduction to Sociology. New York: American Book Company, 1934.