

Philosophy of Education and the Eight-Year Study, 1930-1940

Joseph Watras
University of Dayton

From 1932 to 1940, the Progressive Education Association (PEA) conducted its Eight-Year Study. According to Lawrence Cremin, this study was the association's abiding contribution to American education.¹ This paper will consider the role that philosophy of education played in the development of the study.

Despite the prominence the Eight-Year Study enjoyed, commentators disagreed about what it tried to accomplish and whether the study encouraged reasonable reforms. The development of the Eight-Year Study was complicated because the PEA created several different commissions and committees to undertake different tasks. At first, the PEA charged the Commission on the Relation of School and College to determine if the study was necessary, to recruit schools and colleges to participate, and to organize the effort. Since the study began as an effort to chart the extent that high school students would profit from the freedom from college admittance requirements, this commission created the College Follow-Up Staff. To aid participating schools reconstruct their curriculums, the Commission on the Relation of School and College created the Commission on Secondary School Curriculum. This commission formed the Study of Adolescents to find out how the students developed, and it created several committees to select and order appropriate educational experiences for young people. To enable the participating schools to demonstrate their success, the Commission on the Relation of School and College added the Evaluation Staff. Further, several members of the Commission on Secondary School Curriculum served on the Commission on Human Relations to determine how schools could help adolescent students understand the ways that human relations governed the ways they felt about themselves.

The Eight-Year Study did not begin with this wide range of different commissions performing different tasks. These aspects grew as the study attracted more attention and greater donations. For the first year, the contributions totaled \$800. From 1932 to 1936, the Carnegie foundation supported most of the commission's work with donations that totaled \$70,000. In 1936, after the first group of students had graduated from high school, the General Education Board offered contributions that totaled more than \$1.5 million by the time the study ended. With the money from the General Education Board, the directing committee expanded the evaluation staff, increased the number of curriculum consultants, and conducted workshops with faculty in the participating schools.²

Since the PEA formed many commissions, some commentators chose to emphasize certain

aspects of the Eight-Year Study. For example, in 1942, shortly after the Eight-Year Study concluded, Alvin C. Eurich, C. Robert Pace, and Edwin Ziegfeld classified the Eight-Year Study as an evaluative study. Their article appeared in an issue of the *Review of Educational Research* devoted to the theme, research approaches to the solution of problems, with articles describing the categories of bibliographical techniques, analytic and diagnostic studies, surveys, experimental studies, and evaluative studies. Eurich and his colleagues placed the PEA's efforts in the category, evaluative studies, because they found that the researchers compared the success in college of two groups of students. Eurich and his colleagues were at least partially correct in contending that the Eight-Year Study was an evaluative study because it began as an effort to measure whether students from schools that did not follow traditional college preparatory programs would succeed in college.³

The Absence of an Organizing Philosophy of Education

Although Eurich and his colleagues suggest that the Eight-Year Study sought to compare the effects of two sets of schools with distinct educational philosophies, this was not the case. According to the director of the project, Wilford M. Aikin, the members of the PEA decided to begin the Eight-Year Study during discussions they held about possible ways the organization could bring about changes in high school programs. In 1930, two hundred members of the PEA met in Washington, D.C. Aikin claimed that the members of this small, experimentally orientated group felt they had succeeded in opening elementary schools to opportunities for more student freedom and activity, yet they believed the secondary schools remained more traditional and subject matter oriented. Since the PEA members believed that high schools were hampered by their desire to prepare students for college entrance, the PEA established the Commission on the Relation of School and College to explore ways to allow high schools the freedom to undergo fundamental reconstruction.⁴

For two years, the PEA's Commission on the Relation of School and College held meetings to decide what to do. Among the twenty-six members were high schools principals, college deans, educational philosophers, and evaluation specialists who had been active in educational reform. When the conferences ended, the members of the commission drafted a report to the PEA listing seventeen reasons why secondary schools should change. For example, the first point was that high schools lacked a clear central purpose. The second was that the high schools failed to give students an appreciation of their heritage

as American citizens. The third was that secondary schools did not provide students with opportunities to prepare for community life. At the same time, the commission members complained that high schools did not challenge the students' intellectual abilities, and failed to create conditions for effective learning. Criticizing college preparatory programs, the commission members asserted that the curriculum was removed from the concerns of youth, and that traditional subjects had lost their vitality. While the commission did not try to show that these observations were objectively true, this preliminary report emphasized that the members of his commission agreed they were correct and that they wanted to cooperate to find ways to rectify them.⁵

After submitting its report, the commission gave responsibility for conducting the study to a directing committee of sixteen members chaired by Aikin. He served part-time in this capacity until 1935 when funds from the General Education Board made it possible for him to devote complete attention to the study.⁶

Under Aikin's leadership, the directing committee moved quickly in 1932 to secure agreements from more than 300 colleges to accept the graduates from high schools participating in the study who had the recommendation of the high school principal and who presented some record of abilities such as scores on aptitude tests. With these promises from colleges, the directing committee set about recruiting schools to participate in the study. The schools came from every section of the country except the southeast where a similar program of cooperation among several colleges and secondary schools sponsored by the Southern Association of Colleges and Secondary Schools was underway. The range of educational policies in the schools extended from conservative to radical. Fourteen were public schools or entire public school systems, and sixteen were private. Although the researchers sought to present a balance of public and private school experiences, they did not match these students equally. Since the public schools were usually large and could include an entire district, the majority of the students in the study attended public schools.⁷

When Paul B. Diederich, a member of the study's evaluation staff, recalled the origins of the Eight-Year Study, he noted that the PEA members wondered whether freeing the secondary schools from external restraints would encourage them to develop new programs that would be better for young people, for colleges, and for the society. According to Diederich, some educators claimed that high school teachers would not take advantage of opportunities to reform their curriculums but would retain their traditional curriculums out of inertia. Other educators claimed that the release of external restrictions would lead to chaos. They feared that, in some high schools, teachers would engage the students in a variety of

worthless activities. A third group of educators remained optimistic and thought that freedom from central control would bring a range of beneficial curriculums to high school campuses. It was to see which of these views was correct, Diederich asserted, that the PEA selected a cross section of the secondary schools in the United States that prepared students for college entrance and arranged for colleges to accept the graduates of those schools without meeting the traditional entrance requirements. Diederich pointed out that despite the fears that the participating schools would not wisely use their freedoms, the members of the study's directing committee, the curriculum consultants, and the members of the evaluation staff took care not to impose any direction on the schools. Instead, they tried to act as facilitators who helped the school people develop their own programs.⁸

Since the directing committee of the Eight-Year Study wanted the participating schools to be as free as possible in selecting their curriculums, the committee asked the educators in the participating schools to accept only two principles to gain admittance to the study. The first principle was that life in the school and the teaching methods would conform to what was known about the ways human beings learn and grow. As the members of the directing committee and representatives of the schools discussed this requirement, they decided that this meant the students should have opportunities to engage in activities that had three characteristics: they had meaning for the students, they involved all aspects of the students' beings, and they led to other different activities. The second principle was that the schools should rediscover their reasons for existence.⁹

In drafting the first principle for participation in the Eight-Year Study, the members of the directing committee restated the founding declaration of the PEA. In 1918, Stanwood Cobb had presented to about one hundred people gathered at the Washington D.C. Public Library a document declaring that the aim of Progressive Education was to seek the freest and fullest development of the individual, based upon the scientific study of his or her mental, physical, spiritual, and social characteristics and needs. Cobb had formed the statement in cooperation with people such as Marietta Johnson, founder of the Organic School in Fairhope, Alabama; Eugene Randolph Smith, headmaster of Park School; and Laura C. Williams, sponsor of the Washington Forum. According to Lawrence Cremin, these founding members were filled with fervor to reform all of education. Nonetheless, until 1930, the organization remained small, and most of the members were involved in private elementary schools. Cremin added that with the Eight-Year Study, the organization applied their principles to other levels and types of education.¹⁰

Although the PEA expanded its influence to secondary school programs with the Eight-Year

Study, the members retained their concern for the individual liberation of the students and ignored other more comprehensive explanations of education such as the need for social reform. For example, Aikin noted that neither the members of the directing committee nor the representatives of the participating schools were willing to devote time during the meetings to questions of the guiding principles of education. Aikin added that in submitting statements to the directing committee on their plans during participation in the study, the educators from the high schools did not present any common aim as they sought to fulfill the second requirement, to form a reason for their existence. Instead of coherent wider aims, the secondary educators offered themes similar to the original and individualistic aims of the PEA such as adapting the work to the individual student needs, providing greater mastery of skills, and offering opportunities for the release of creative energy.¹¹

In 1937, the educators in most of the participating schools decided they had to express some wider social aim for education. According to Aikin, the members of the participating schools decided that they had to help students understand and appreciate the ideal of democracy that was basic to the country's heritage. Once the representatives of the study accepted the democratic ideal as their overarching purpose or philosophy of education, Aikin added, most of the school people developed this principle into their work, and it permeated the reports of their schools as they described what they had done. To illustrate this change, Aikin quoted from the report of the Denver Public School wherein the authors acknowledged that the faculty and administration in Denver made no connection between the curriculum and the wider aims of the study until the study had been underway for four years. Having made such a connection, the officials in Denver sought to adjust all aspects of school life to the concept of democracy. In this way, the schools could become instruments of personal liberation and of social reform.¹²

Aiken did not explain why the representatives of the participating schools waited so long to connect their efforts to the need to reinforce democracy. The change may have been a reaction to the specter of increasing Nazi power; Hitler's renunciation of the disarmament clauses in the Versailles Treaty; the march of the German army into the Rhineland; the alliance of Germany, Italy, and Japan; and the aid that German and Italian air forces gave to Franco's rebels in Spain.¹³ The members of the Commission on Secondary School Curriculum expressed this view.

In the report of the Commission on Secondary School Curriculum, *Reorganizing Secondary Education*, the authors, V. T. Thayer, Caroline B. Zachary, and Ruth Kotinsky, listed four reasons why educators needed to reconsider their

curriculums. First, there had been fundamental readjustments in American life. These included the way that industrialization and urbanization took away opportunities for children to participate in essential activities in the home, the increased enrollments brought on by the lack of employment opportunities during the depression, and a new concern for democracy caused by popular fears that the advance of the depression would stimulate the rise of anti-democratic groups as it had in Europe. Second, educators faced opportunities and threats from the social changes. These included the changes caused by the rise of science that reduced the need for labor and increased wealth but that caused insecurities as life styles changed. Third, researchers had created new theories of learning recognizing that students should develop their skills of thinking in ways that enabled them to understand and to direct their experiences. In these actions, learning became a method in which students reshaped themselves and their surroundings not just a way to accumulate information. Fourth, educators in different levels held to contradictory teaching practices. For example, elementary school teachers sought to tailor the lessons to the students' patterns of development. At the same time, the secondary schools and colleges tried to have students acquire as much of the academic disciplines as possible. For Thayer, Zachary, and Kotinsky, the way to reorganize secondary education in ways that would serve all students and the society was for high schools to focus on meeting students needs.¹⁴

The 1939 report of the PEA's Commission on Secondary School Curriculum followed in three important ways the pattern that the National Education Association's Commission on the Reorganization had set with its cardinal principles report released by the CRSE in 1918. The first way was that the PEA's commission did not describe plans the secondary schools should follow. Instead, imitating the CRSE, the commission described a set of ideas. The second way was that the PEA commission charged various sub-committees to show how these basic ideas could be translated into practice. In 1932, the Executive Board of the PEA had created the Commission on Secondary School Curriculum to focus attention on the needs of youth and to further experimentation in curriculum revision. Consequently, the commission started the Study of Adolescents to determine what the students needed in order to grow and it created several sub-committees devoted to the study of curriculum approaches in such areas as art, language, science, mathematics, and social studies. Although Thayer, Zachary, and Kotinsky claimed the curriculums should offer means to satisfy the students' needs as defined by the Study of Adolescents, they warned that this research could not define the standards toward which the students' growth should be directed. Instead, they noted that the research could offer insight into the essential values of the adolescent and

it could illuminate trends that enhanced or retarded the students' abilities to realize their desires. It was the job of the sub-committees to show schools how they could provide standards that enabled the youth to grow in desirable directions. This led to the third way the PEA commission's report was similar to the cardinal principles report. Both documents contended that the way to determine the standards for appropriate education could come from an examination of the ideal of democracy.¹⁵

Selecting Democracy as an Integrating Ideal

While Thayer, Zachary, and Kotinsky claimed that the social conditions during the Great Depression made it necessary for educators to organize their efforts around the ideal of democracy, they did not explain why they selected the ideal of democracy rather than another equally reasonable notion such as social efficiency. For example, according to such historians as John F. McClymer, many progressives turned to social efficiency as the important ideal for social improvement at the turn of the century.¹⁶

There are three possible sources that suggest why Thayer, Zachary, and Kotinsky chose to emphasize the ideal of democracy rather than a related concept such as social efficiency. These include the 1918 Cardinal Principles report, the influence of Boyd Bode, and the findings of the evaluation staff when they held summer workshops for teachers. Most likely, Thayer, Zachary, and Kotinsky took inspiration from all of these sources.

The first source may have been the 1918 Cardinal Principles Report published by the CRSE and mentioned above. In their report, the CRSE claimed that schools should be guided by the ideal of democracy because it provided for the individual and the society to find fulfillment in each other. According to the CRSE, the purpose of democracy was to organize society so that each member could develop his or her personality through activities designed for the well-being of all members of society. The CRSE held that schools aimed toward the ideal of democracy could provide instruction suitable for the students who wanted to go to work and appropriate for students who wanted to attend college. In addition, the schools could provide assistance to students in fulfilling their family responsibilities, in satisfying their patriotic duties, and in pursuing their leisure enjoyments.¹⁷

Thayer, Zachary, and Kotinsky may have imitated the CRSE report in order to connect the Eight-Year Study to reforms of secondary education that had taken place earlier. The 1918 CRSE report enjoyed the largest sale up to that time of any work published by the U.S. Bureau of Education. By 1929, when it remained popular, the bureau had sold more than 110,000 copies of the CRSE report.¹⁸ According to some historians, the popularity of the CRSE report derived from its suggestions that high schools could

combine vocational and academic education in ways that enhanced the students' appreciation of democracy.¹⁹ Consequently, Thayer, Zachary, and Kotinsky may have taken the CRSE report as a model to show public school people that they could and should adopt the progressive reforms.

The second source may have been the influence of Boyd Bode, a professor at The Ohio State University, who achieved such prominence that *Time Magazine* labeled him as progressive education's number one philosopher.²⁰ Bode served on the directing committee of the Commission on the Relation of School and College and, for the first year, he was a member of the Commission on Secondary School Curriculum. More important, Bode had close relations with the commission members. For example, in 1924, when Bode was the head of the Department of Principles and Practice in Education at The Ohio State University, he hired Thayer, who in 1932 became the chair of the Commission on Secondary School Curriculum. Although Thayer left Bode's department in 1928, they became such friends during those four years that Thayer claimed Bode had shaped his entire pattern of thinking.²¹

In 1938, Bode published his book, *Progressive Education at the Crossroads*, in which he criticized progressive educators for placing too much faith in the individual. According to Bode, progressive educators nurtured the pathetic hope that they could find out how to educate children by cataloguing the children's interests and protecting the children's freedoms. Bode complained that progressive educators made children's freedom into a form of absolutism because they forbade adults to interfere in the children's desires to do things.²²

When Bode noted that progressive educators commissioned studies of adolescence in order to determine children's needs, he worried that progressive educators believed they could find a pattern of instruction in a listing of the children's needs. Bode argued that this hope was similar to an architect expecting the plans for a building to emerge from a study of the materials out of which the building would be constructed. To Bode, the students' needs came from the students' way of life. Thus, educators had to construct the curriculum in reference to the social order. Since the progressives admired democracy, Bode urged them to recognize the complex relationships the democratic ideal created in the modern world. He believed that in this way, progressive educators could find the proper direction for curriculum development.²³ This is the view that Thayer, Zachary, and Kotinsky expressed in their commission's report.

The third source for the selection of the ideal of democracy as the basis of the philosophy of education may have been the workshops the evaluation staff held for teachers. The summer workshops began in 1936 as an experiment in the in-

service training of teachers. Although the Commission on the Relation of School and College had held annual conferences of representatives from the schools, these proved inadequate because they lasted only a few days. Most important, by 1936, the Study of Adolescents had begun to explore the needs of youth as a basis for curriculum theory, the sub-committees for curriculum areas had generated instructional ideas, and the evaluation staff was seeking ways measure the results of curriculum innovations. Since it seemed that the information from these efforts could help teachers, the PEA held the first six week long seminar began at Ohio State University for teachers of science and mathematics in 1936. They repeated a similar workshop took place at Sarah Lawrence College in 1937. Open to teachers across the United States, the Sarah Lawrence conference required teachers to bring some definite instructional problem on which they were working. In 1938, the PEA set up additional workshops in New York, Colorado, and California.²⁴

The workshops did not offer formal classes. Instead, the teachers and the sub-committee members worked cooperatively, exchanged ideas, and sought innovations for the teachers. In each of the workshops, the participants concentrated on ways to meet individual students' needs. Usually, the teachers spent the mornings in small group meetings that focused on some particular subject such as science, social science, or student guidance. In the afternoon, groups might meet to consider topics such as evaluation or test making. Despite the frequency of these meetings, attendance was voluntary and many teachers worked independently.²⁵

When the workshop coordinators considered the results of their efforts and tabulated the participants' responses to questionnaires, they found several things that made workshops productive experiences. For example, the groups of teachers had to be formed to allow all the members to contribute, the staff members and participating teachers had to be on the basis of their abilities to work cooperatively, and the instructional problems the teachers brought to the workshops could not be so narrow they would not lead to other considerations or so broad they defied resolution. One important observation was that the teachers in every group at the summer workshops noted they could not complete their work until they had some understanding of a general philosophy of education. It seemed that the conversations among the members of the various groups focusing on specific subject matters had turned at some point to questions about the function of the subject matter in general education. Despite the prevalence of the concern for a philosophy, the members of the summer workshops agreed that specific instruction in the philosophy of education would not have been helpful. They contended that the understandings of philosophy had to arise from their struggles with specific issues. They

claimed they would not have benefited from attending lectures comparing various philosophic systems.²⁶

In wanting the understandings of philosophy to arise from concrete efforts to solve classroom problems, these summer workshop participants expressed the view about democratic teaching methods that seemed to permeate the Eight-Year Study. This was a bias to work inductively. For example, the curriculum sub-committees urged teachers to use inductive methods of curriculum construction and instruction. In this model, curriculum would begin with the recognition of the students' problems and the belief that the subject matter would provide the means to solve those difficulties.

To some extent, when Thayer, Zachary, and Kotinsky planned the work of their Commission on Secondary Curriculum, they followed an inductive format. That is, they looked to the researchers on the Study of Adolescents to suggest the framework that the curriculum sub-committees would follow. In the final report of the Commission on Secondary School Curriculum, *Reorganizing Secondary Education*, Thayer, Zachary, and Kotinsky claimed that the Study of Adolescents had found most students had similar needs and that the needs fell into the categories of immediate social relationships, wider social relationships, economic relationships, and personal living. Thayer, Zachary, and Kotinsky added that the curriculum sub-committees had found ways that teachers could take these four categories of needs into account and help the students change these needs in desirable ways. In all cases, the direction in which the teacher would direct the changes was toward the democratic tradition. This implied the worth of the individual, the relationship the individual had with his or her group, and the free play of intelligence to solve problems.²⁷

When the sub-committees on curriculum translated these general statements into specific suggestions, their reports recommended an inductive method of instruction. Taking their direction from the three tenets of the democratic tradition that Thayer, Zachary, and Kotinsky expressed, the subcommittees recommended that teachers value the problems that the students faced, concentrate on the relationships the individual had with the group, and enhance the free play of intelligence. Bode made these same recommendations when he wrote *Progressive Education at the Crossroads*.²⁸ A description of the report of the Committee on the Function of Science in General Education may illustrate the ways they infused a bias for induction.

Published in 1938, the report of the Committee on the Function of Science in General Education expressed why and how teachers could tailor the instruction to the needs of students in ways that concentrated on the relationships the individual had with the group and enhanced the students' ability to think. Since the committee was drafting a manual to

teach science as a part of general education, the authors set out what they called a frame of reference. This included a definition of the purpose of general education as meeting the needs of individuals in ways that promoted the realization of personal potential and the most effective participation in a democratic society. Since the definition depended on what the members of the committee on science thought were student needs, the authors repeated the claim of Thayer, Zachary, and Kotinsky that students' needs fell into four categories. For the authors of the science report, their frame of reference listed the student needs as personal living, immediate personal-social relationships, social-civic relationships, and economic relationships. The authors of the report of the committee on science claimed the areas of pure or applied science could aid in meeting the students' needs because the disciplines could illuminate the ways the students' lives were changing and how society developed. Finally, the frame of reference included the recognition that democracy required three interrelated qualities: optimum development of personality, reciprocal individual and group responsibility for promoting common concerns, and the free play of intelligence.²⁹

Building on their frame of reference, the members of the committee on science described a method by which science teachers could construct an appropriate curriculum. The process began with teachers making investigations to discover the problems and interests of the specific students in the classrooms and conducting surveys of the community to determine such factors as occupational conditions, civic atmosphere, and religious climate. Thus, the process began in an inductive fashion. To the information about the specific students and the local community, the teachers could add reports from professional educational organizations, findings from authoritative books on science, information from textbooks, and patterns of organization from courses of study from other schools to determine the scientific material that could be included in the curriculum. On the basis of the accumulated information, the teachers, students, and other curriculum makers should make judgments about what materials to include and how to present it. While the committee on science noted that there were several models teachers could follow in designing the courses, the members refused to recommend any specific one. They claimed that teachers should select the style of the curriculum that best suited the needs of the students and the characteristics of the community.³⁰

Since the Committee on the Function of Science in General Education was the first to publish its report, the other committees, such as the Committee on the Function of the Social Studies in General Education, sought to blend those suggestions with the findings from the Study of Adolescents. While the authors thought the perspective they took

would result in revolutionary changes in secondary schools, they did not recommend any specific form of curriculum organization. They believed the changes would come from the teachers' growth in insight and thoughtful personal experimentation.³¹

One possible explanation why the inductive approach occupied a central part of these committee reports is that prominent academic specialists did not serve on these committees. For example, of the ten members on the science committee, there was one instructor of physics from Sarah Lawrence College and a lecturer on the philosophy of science from the College of the City of New York. In the case of the social studies committee, out of eleven members, the only person from an academic subject was an associate professor of history from American University. The other members of both of the committees were professors of education from prominent universities, teachers in secondary schools, and consultants for the Eight-Year Study. The composition of the committees may be important because academic scholars tend to emphasize the need for students to master some abstract material before applying it to concrete situations. On the other hand, educators tend to believe that students want to learn things that will alleviate some practical problem they face.

Conclusion

Commentators disagree about the influence of the Eight-Year Study on subsequent educational reform. One interesting possibility is that the strengths of the Eight-Year Study contributed to its demise. Since the inductive method of thinking and teaching dominated the reports of the study, critics could complain that the students did not learn significant subject matter. More important, though, the notion of democracy as the liberation of the individual may have left the participants defenseless in the face of mounting conservative reaction. Writing a history of progressive education, Arthur Zilversmit concluded that progressives could not withstand the storm of criticism during the post World War II years because their theories did not teach them the strategies they needed to overcome opposing authoritarian forces. To Zilversmit, the progressive ideas of democracy stressed personal fulfillment, but they did not discuss notions of countervailing forces.³²

Whether Zilversmit was correct is not important for this paper. The important point is that, during the Eight-Year Study, philosophy of education played an important role in the development of curriculum. The role was the reverse of what most people seem to think, though. That is, the discussions about philosophy did not provide the starting point of curriculum revision. They were the result of those efforts. This is an important lesson.

¹ Lawrence A. Cremin, *The Transformation of the School: Progressivism in American Education, 1876-1957* (New York: Alfred A. Knopf, 1964), 251.

² Readers should see Cremin, *The Transformation of the School*, 256-258 for a list of the sums. A similar account and statements of appreciation appear in the frontispieces of the volumes published by the PEA to describe the study.

³ Alvin C. Eurich, C. Robert Pace, and Edwin Ziegfeld. 1942. "Evaluative Studies" *Review of Educational Research*. 12 no. 5 (1942): 521-533.

⁴ Wilford M. Aikin, *The Story of the Eight-Year Study: With Conclusions and Recommendations* (New York: Harper and Brothers, 1942), 1-2.

⁵ Aikin, *The Story of the Eight-Year Study*, 2-12.

⁶ H.H. Giles, S.P. McCutchen, and A.N. Zechiel, *Exploring the Curriculum: The Work of the Thirty Schools from the Viewpoint of the Consultants* (New York: Harper and Brothers, 1942), xxii-xxiii.

⁷ Paul B. Diederich, introduction to *Thirty Schools Tell Their Story* (New York: Harper and Brothers, 1943), xviii.

⁸ Diederich, introduction, xvii-xix.

⁹ Aikin, *The Story of the Eight-Year Study*, 16-19.

¹⁰ Cremin, *The Transformation of the School*, 240-253.

¹¹ Aikin, *The Story of the Eight-Year Study*, 30-31

¹² Aikin, *The Story of the Eight-Year Study*, 30-33.

¹³ David M. Kennedy, *Freedom from Fear: The American People in Depression and War, 1929-1945*. (New York: Oxford University Press, 1999), 384-385.

¹⁴ V. T. Thayer, Caroline B. Zachary, Ruth Kotinsky, *Reorganizing Secondary Education* (New York: D. Appleton-Century Co., 1939, 3-25.

¹⁵ National Education Association of the United States. Commission on the Reorganization of Secondary Education, *Cardinal Principles of Secondary Education: A Report of the Commission on the Reorganization of Secondary Education appointed by the National Education Association* Department of the Interior, Bureau of Education, Bulletin, No. 35 (Washington, D.C.: G.P.O., 1918). Thayer, Zachary, and Kotinsky, *Reorganizing Secondary Education*, v-ix, 54-59.

¹⁶ John F. McClymer, *War and Welfare: Social Engineering in America, 1890-1925* (Westport, CN, 1980).

¹⁷ NEA, *Cardinal Principles of Secondary Education*, 9.

¹⁸ Edward A. Krug, *The Shaping of the American High School, 1920-1941*. (Madison: University of Wisconsin Press, 1972), 24-27.

¹⁹ Tanner and Tanner, *History of the School Curriculum*, 97-98.

²⁰ George Willis, et al. eds. *The American Curriculum: A Documentary History* (Westport, CN: Praeger, 1994), 243.

²¹ Robert V. Bullough, Jr. *Democracy in Education: Boyd H. Bode* (New York: General Hall, Inc., 1981), 64-66.

²² Boyd H. Bode, *Progressive Education at the Crossroads* (New York: Newson and Co., 1938), 39-41.

²³ Bode, *Progressive Education at the Crossroads*, 67-71.

²⁴ W. Carson Ryan and Ralph W. Tyler, *Summer Workshops in Secondary Education: An Experiment in the In-Service Training of Teachers and Other Educational Workers* (New York: Progressive Education Association, 1939), 5-7.

²⁵ Ryan and Tyler, *Summer Workshops*, 15.

²⁶ Ryan and Tyler, *Summer Workshops*, 38-46.

²⁷ Thayer, Zachary, and Kotinsky, *Reorganizing Secondary Education*, 44, 50, 86.

²⁸ Bode, *Progressive Education at the Crossroads*, 120-122.

²⁹ Progressive Education Association (U.S.). Commission on the Secondary School Curriculum, *Science in General Education: Suggestions for Science Teachers in Secondary Schools and in the Lower Division of Colleges* (New York: D. Appleton-Century Co., 1938), 23-57.

³⁰ PEA, *Science in General Education*, 443-454.

³¹ American Education Fellowship. Commission of Secondary School Curriculum, *The Social Studies in General Education: A Report of The Committee on the function of the Social Studies in General Education* (New York: D. Appleton-Century Co., 1940), v-ix.

³² Arthur Zilversmit, *Changing Schools: Progressive Education Theory and Practice, 1930-1960* (Chicago: University of Chicago Press, 1993), 176-177.