

DOCUMENT RESUME

ED 454 603

EA 031 100

AUTHOR Wraga, William G.
TITLE Who Wrote the Cardinal Principles Report? The Commission on the Reorganization of Secondary Education Revisited.
SPONS AGENCY Georgia Univ., Athens. Coll. of Education.
PUB DATE 1999-10-15
NOTE 50p.; Paper presented at the Annual Meeting of the History of Education Society (Decatur, GA, October 15, 1999). Also supported in part by a Faculty Research Grant from the University of Georgia Research Foundation.
PUB TYPE Opinion Papers (120) -- Speeches/Meeting Papers (150)
EDRS PRICE MF01/PC02 Plus Postage.
DESCRIPTORS *Educational History; Educational Objectives; *Foundations of Education; *Secondary Education
IDENTIFIERS Kingsley (Clarence Darwin); Snedden (David Samuel)

ABSTRACT

This study refutes Edward A. Krug's view of the primary authorship of the document created by the Commission on the Reorganization of Secondary Education in 1918. In general, the commission endorsed cardinal principles that emphasized the practical over the intellectual as well as the importance of social control and social efficiency. The document was well received and highly influential until it began to be criticized by education scholars in the 1950s. In addition to concerns about the content of the document, Krug offered evidence that the document was primarily influenced by one member, rather than representing the ideas of the whole commission. He pointed out that one member, Clarence Kingsley, was a follower of David Snedden, whose ideas resemble those propounded by the commission. Krug's evidence is examined point by point and disputed. Similar ideas are found in sources other than Snedden, and documentation is offered to show that other members made substantive contributions to the final report. (Contains 96 references.) (RKJ)

WHO WROTE THE CARDINAL PRINCIPLES REPORT?:
THE COMMISSION ON THE REORGANIZATION OF
SECONDARY EDUCATION REVISITED

William G. Wraga
University of Georgia
Department of Educational Leadership
Rivers Crossing, 850 College Station Road
Athens, GA 30602
Tel. 706-542-4166
email: wwraga@sage.coe.uga.edu
<http://www.coe.uga.edu/leadership/faculty/wraga>

Prepared for presentation at the Annual Meeting
of the History of Education Society,
Decatur, GA, 15 October 1999

U.S. DEPARTMENT OF EDUCATION
Office of Educational Research and Improvement
EDUCATIONAL RESOURCES INFORMATION
CENTER (ERIC)

This document has been reproduced as
received from the person or organization
originating it.

Minor changes have been made to
improve reproduction quality.

• Points of view or opinions stated in this
document do not necessarily represent
official OERI position or policy.

26 SEPTEMBER 1999

PLEASE DO NOT QUOTE WITHOUT PERMISSION

BEST COPY AVAILABLE

PERMISSION TO REPRODUCE AND
DISSEMINATE THIS MATERIAL HAS
BEEN GRANTED BY

W. Wraga

TO THE EDUCATIONAL RESOURCES
INFORMATION CENTER (ERIC)

WHO WROTE THE CARDINAL PRINCIPLES REPORT?: THE COMMISSION
ON THE REORGANIZATION OF SECONDARY EDUCATION REVISITED¹.

In 1955, Lawrence Cremin wrote of the Cardinal Principles report, "Indeed, it does not seem amiss to argue that most of the important and influential movements in the field since 1918 have simply been footnotes to the classic itself."² During the years between the publication of the Cardinal Principles report and Cremin's remark, most of the major proposals for secondary education in the United States endorsed and elaborated the principles and practices outlined by the Commission on the Reorganization of Secondary Education (CRSE); many of these reports explicitly cited the 1918 document.³ And over the decade following Cremin's remark, additional reports would do the same.⁴

¹ The research reported in this paper was supported in part by a Faculty Research Grant from the University of Georgia Research Foundation and by a Summer Faculty Research Grant from the University of Georgia College of Education.

² Lawrence A. Cremin, "The Revolution in American Secondary Education, 1893-1918." Teachers College Record 56, no. 6 (March 1955), p. 307. Commission on the Reorganization of Secondary Education, Cardinal Principles of Secondary Education. Bulletin 1918, no. 35. Department of the Interior, Bureau of Education. (Washington, DC: U. S. Government Printing Office).

³ See, for example, W. S. Monroe and M. E. Herriott, Reconstruction of the Secondary School Curriculum: Its Meaning and Trends. Bulletin No. 41, Bureau of Educational Research, College of Education, University of Illinois (Urbana, IL: University of Illinois, 1928); Committee on the Orientation of Secondary Education, Functions of Secondary Education. Published in Bulletin of the Department of Secondary-School Principals of the National Education Association, 64-70 (1937): 1-263; Educational Policies Commission, Education for ALL American Youth. (Washington, DC: National Education Association, 1944, 1952); H. L. Caswell, ed., The American High School: Its Responsibility and Opportunity. 8th Yearbook of the John Dewey Society (NY: Harper & Row, 1946).

⁴ Notably, American Association of School Administrators, The High School in a Changing World. 36th Yearbook of the AASA (Washington, DC: National Education Association, 1958); ASCD Commission on the Education of

Beginning in the 1950s, however, the weight of opinion about the Cardinal Principles report began to shift seismically.

Within a decade of Cremin's remark, the Cardinal Principles report was subject to sharp criticism and, effectively, sheer rejection first from popular school critics and then from education scholars.⁵ Of the latter, Edward A. Krug was the earliest and most prominent critic of the Cardinal Principles report.⁶ In short, Krug argued that Clarence Kingsley was the principal, if not sole author of the Cardinal Principles report and that, likely influenced by David Snedden, Kingsley was largely responsible for the social efficiency bent in the report. Krug implied that the rest of the CRSE members effectively "rubber-stamped" Kingsley's ideas.

Krug's interpretation of the report, advanced in the first volume of his history of secondary schools in the United States, has become an article of faith among educational and curriculum historians.⁷ Krug's interpretation was certainly consistent with

Adolescents, The High School We Need. (Washington, DC: ASCD, 1959); James Bryant Conant, The American High School Today. (NY: McGraw-Hill, 1959); James Bryant Conant, The Comprehensive High School. (NY: McGraw-Hill, 1967).

⁵ Popular critics who implicated the Cardinal Principles report in the undoing of American secondary education included, Arthur Bestor, Educational Wastelands: The Retreat from Learning in our Public Schools (Urbana, IL: University of Illinois Press, 1953); J. F. Latimer, What's happened to Our High Schools? (Washington, DC: Public Affairs Press, 1958); H. G. Rickover, Education and Freedom. (NY: Dutton, 1959); Richard Hofstadter, Anti-Intellectualism in American Life. (NY: Alfred A. Knopf, 1963).

⁶ Edward A. Krug, The Shaping of the American High School, 1880-1920. (Madison, WI: University of Wisconsin Press, 1964).

⁷ This literature is by now so familiar to educational and curriculum historians that references hardly seem necessary. Representative works, nevertheless, include: David B. Tyack, ed. Turning Points in American Educational History (Waltham, MA: Blaisdell, 1967); Herbert M. Kliebard, "The Curriculum Field in Retrospect," in Technology and the Curriculum, ed.

the subsequent commitment of the so-called revisionist historians to challenge and ultimately undermine the celebratory or "house" history that prevailed in educational scholarship during the first half of the twentieth century. Now, perhaps, with more than three decades of hindsight, we can appropriate Cremin's 1955 wording and, referring to Krug's work, suggest that 'it does not seem amiss to argue that most of the important and influential works in the fields of educational and curriculum history since 1964 have simply been footnotes to the classic itself.'

This paper reports on an "in-progress" reexamination of Krug's famous interpretation. Krug based his interpretation on two grounds: 1) similarities between some of Kingsley's earlier writings and the contents of the 1918 report; and 2) surviving records of the CRSE's work. After summarizing Krug's argument, it is analyzed in two ways. First, employing the logic of Krug's argument favoring Kingsley as the author of the Cardinal Principles report, writings of other members of the CRSE that were published prior to the preparation of the report are examined to reveal that they, also, contain ideas later expressed in the 1918 report. Second, an examination of the documents from the CRSE records held at the NARA that Krug cited--and several he did not

P. Witt (NY: Teachers College Press, 1968): 71; T. James and D. Tyack, "Learning from Past Efforts to Reform the High School." Phi Delta Kappan 64 (1983): 400-406; Herbert M. Kliebard, The Struggle for the American Curriculum, 1893-1958. (Boston: Routledge and Keegan Paul, 1986); J. Spring, The American School, 1642-1990. (NY: Longman, 1990); Herbert M. Kliebard, "The Cardinal Principles Report as Archeological Deposit." Curriculum Studies 3, no. 2 (1995): 197-208; David Tyack and Larry Cuban, Tinkering Toward Utopia: A Century of Public School Reform (Cambridge, MA: Harvard University Press, 1995); Herbert M. Kliebard, Schooled to Work:

cite--reveals that the content of the documents is inconsistent with Krug's conclusions. Krug's analysis of the content of the report is discussed, as well. In short, Krug's conclusion that Kingsley was the sole or even principal author of the report seems to have been premature. Implications of this position for both curriculum history and curriculum reform are discussed.

Krug's Thesis

In a chapter entitled, "Mr. Kingsley's Report," Krug began his discussion by speculating, "One of the fascinating questions of this period is how much Snedden may have influenced Kingsley."⁸ Krug noted that, during his chairmanship of the CRSE, Kingsley, in his capacity as high school inspector for the Massachusetts State Department of Education, reported to Snedden. Krug documented in four of Kingsley's publications during 1913 and 1914 how Kingsley's interests enlarged from a concern with flexibility in college entrance requirements to a concern with the place of vocational training in secondary education. According to Krug, Kingsley resolved this problem by "call[ing] for the cosmopolitan or composite high school, with flexible handling of courses of study to permit changes and shifts" in student interests and aptitudes.⁹ Krug also documented Kingsley's evolving conception of subject matter, which he thought should be more applicable than commonly held, though Kingsley was not prepared completely to

Vocationalism and the American Curriculum, 1876-1946. (NY: Teachers College Press, 1999).

⁸ Edward A. Krug, The Shaping of the American High School, 1880-1920 (Madison: University of Wisconsin Press, 1969) Originally published in 1964, p. 379.

⁹ Krug, The Shaping of the American High School, 18880-1920, 380.

reject traditional subjects.¹⁰ Krug also detected wording in Kingsley's writings that was "reminiscent of Snedden's terminology."¹¹ Krug suggested, then, that while Kingsley seemed to have been "a man groping his way" among a thicket of established and emerging ideas about secondary education, the influence of Snedden's thinking about social efficiency was apparent enough.

The pre-1918 ideas of Kingsley's that Krug highlighted did, in fact, appear in the final version of the Cardinal Principles report. The report indeed endorsed the comprehensive high school, called for flexible programs to accommodate changing student interests, embraced traditional subjects but reconceptualized subject matter to be more practical than the prevailing memoritor instruction allowed, and even employed some social efficiency-type language. Yet Krug's connection of Kingsley to Snedden, while appearing reasonable in light of their professional association, is nevertheless circumstantial. Krug provided no documentation of such a direct influence. In fact, at the time, all three of these ideas were commonplace in the educational literature and certainly at the NEA meetings that Kingsley attended. Most significant, perhaps, is the fact that Snedden rejected the unitary system of secondary education that Kingsley endorsed. Other evidence, evidence that Krug overlooked, sheds further doubt on Krug's conclusions. This evidence is found in the writings of other CRSE

¹⁰ On this idea, also see: Clarence D. Kingsley, "The Study of Nations: Its Possibilities A Social Study in High Schools," School and Society 3, no. 54 (January 8, 1916): 37-41. Cf. Commission on the Reorganization of Secondary Education, Cardinal Principles of Secondary Education, 14.

members published, like Kingsley's, prior to the completion of the report, and in documented activities of the CRSE.

Pre-1918 Precedents

At least eight members of the Reviewing Committee of the CRSE (five from among the ten members-at-large) other than Kingsley expressed ideas that appeared in the Cardinal Principles report in writings published prior to 1918. These ideas ranged from specific provisions to several of the 19 cardinal principles themselves.

One of the distinguishing features of the Cardinal Principles report was its emphasis on the "importance of applying knowledge." The CRSE wrote: "Subject values and methods must be tested in terms of the laws of learning and the application of knowledge to the activities of life, rather than primarily in terms of the demands of any subject as a logically organized science."¹² As noted, Krug documented Kingsley's identical position, observing that while Kingsley advocated increased application of subject matter, he did not reject subject matter altogether.¹³ The stress that the CRSE placed upon the application of knowledge indicates not necessarily a rejection of that subject matter, but rather

¹¹ Krug, Shaping of the American High School, 381.

¹² Commission on the Reorganization of Secondary Education, Cardinal Principles of Secondary Education Bulletin 1918, No. 35, Department of the Interior, Bureau of Education (Washington, DC: U. S. Government Printing Office, 1918), p. 8.

¹³ Sometimes critics misconstrue the failure of the CRSE to list mastery of disciplinary knowledge as evidence of a complete rejection of the subjects. The limitation of this interpretation is revealed when the constant reference to subject matter throughout the report is recognized together with the realization that the CRSE intended the Cardinal Principles report as an umbrella statement for the ten subject area committee reports and the four

more importantly a rejection of the conventional treatment of subject matter and of the exaltation of that knowledge as more worthy than all other realms of human endeavor.¹⁴ Other CRSE members wrote about the application of subject matter, as well.

Charles Hughes Johnston, professor of secondary education at the University of Illinois, served as chair of the CRSE Committee on Organization and Administration of Secondary Education and as a member of the three-person Special Reviewing Committee. In an overview of what he called the "Formal Discipline Controversy" that he prepared for his 1912 anthology entitled, High School Education, Johnston noted that the traditional treatment of the academic disciplines "has dreary historic associations, implies a superimposition of unnatural tasks upon spontaneous curiosity, and reminds us of the painful and laborious literalness of memoritor performances once called 'learning the lesson,' or 'coming to books' of the old pedagogue days."¹⁵ Johnston maintained that, during the 20th century, the course of study had assumed two purposes: "to embody content best adapted to immediate social and

non-subject matter reports. In fact, the CRSE characterized the "departmental organization" of secondary education as "desirable."

¹⁴ Progressive educators reacted against what Tyack characterized as the "abstract and verbal" curriculum proposed by the Committee of Ten. On the typical treatment of that curriculum Tyack quoted Henry S. Canby, a professor at Yale: "We went to school for facts and got them. Facts about Latin, facts about history, facts about algebra, which gave us valuable experience in taking intellectual punishment without a quaver. But of education there was very little because, with one exception, none of our teachers were educated. They had knowledge but, not knowing what to do with it, passed it on to us in raw form. . . . They believed in their subjects with the absolute conviction of the baker that his bread is the staff of life, but there was no passion in their belief, and, to tell the truth, not much reason." Quoted in David B. Tyack, ed. Turning Points in American Educational History (Waltham, MA: Blaisdell Publishing Co., 1967), 357-358.

economic requirements; and to select subject matter also with reference to our ability to use it best educationally, that is to make it over into life disciplines, into effectual habits and desirable mental traits."¹⁶ In effect, the emphasis placed upon applicability would likely eliminate some subject matter, but this was material that was, in any event, painfully memorized and painlessly forgotten by students.

Similarly, H. L. Terry, state high school supervisor in Wisconsin and member-at-large of the CRSE, in 1910 expressed concern with the remoteness of subject matter from lived experience that resulted from an overly academic treatment of the teaching of physics that he observed in Wisconsin high schools. Terry hoped that "physics instruction may be so modified that its usefulness will appeal to our students so strongly" that they would enroll in the subject in increasing numbers.¹⁷ In a discussion of his observations of the teaching of reading, Terry put the issue this way:

It is being recognized more and more that any subject must be taught for its value in daily life, that is, from its utilitarian standpoint, if the teaching is to be effective, and if the subject is to remain in the school course.¹⁸

Terry embraced the so-called "utility criterion" not only for subject matter, but also for the design of assessments. "The examination," Terry recommended, "should be a test of the

¹⁵ Charles Hughes Johnston, ed., High School Education (NY: Charles Scribners, 1912), 32-33.

¹⁶ Johnston, High School Education, 31. Emphasis in original.

¹⁷ H. L. Terry, "Four Instruments of Confusion in Teaching Physics," School Review 18 (January/December 1910): 245.

¹⁸ H. L. Terry, "Two Lines of High-School Reading," School Review 20 (1912): 476.

student's ability to use what he has been studying" that should be "much nearer to actual experience and conditions outside of school."¹⁹ Terry concluded that such assessments would "have a good vitalizing influence upon the nature of subject matter . . . and will be one of the forces tending to substitute thinking for mere formality."²⁰

Members of the CRSE writing at this time often tied the issue of mental discipline to their critique of the traditional academic treatment of subject matter. In the 1918 report, the CRSE stated, "While the final verdict of modern psychology has not yet been rendered, it is clear that former conceptions of 'general values' must be thoroughly revisited."²¹ In 1912, Charles Hughes Johnston noted, "Already we mark the inevitable passing of a strictly faculty psychology--the pseudo-scientific support of the ancient doctrine."²² Similarly, Cheesman Herrick, president of Girard College in Philadelphia and chair of the CRSE's Business Education committee, observed that the "traditional and inherited idea of the school as a mental gymnasium in which pupils were to do exercises . . . has been called to serious question."²³ Rejecting mental discipline, Herrick implored, "Those high-school studies are of most worth which are worth most to the individual pupil,

¹⁹ H. L. Terry, "Tests and Examinations," School and Society 4, no. 96 (October 28, 1916): 673, 675.

²⁰ Terry, "Tests and Examinations," 676.

²¹ Commission on the Reorganization of Secondary Education, Cardinal Principles of Secondary Education, 8.

²² Johnston, High School Education, 41.

²³ Cheesman A. Herrick, "What High-School Studies are of Most Worth?" School and Society 4 (August 26, 1916): 308.

which will best fit him for meeting the many-sided demands of the life which he is to live."²⁴

The by now well-known implication of the rejection of the disciplinary value of subject areas as the main criterion for inclusion in the school curriculum and of the emphasis on the utility criterion not only problematized the traditional treatment and even existence of "academic" subjects to the extent that they were narrow and remote from life, but also legitimated the inclusion of emerging subjects and widening educational purposes in the secondary curriculum. Among the aims of education identified by the CRSE that transcended academic education was that of developing "ethical character." The CRSE identified four means for achieving this aim:

the wise selection of content and methods in all subjects of study, the social contacts of pupils with one another and with their teachers, the opportunities afforded by the organization and administration of the school for the development on the part of pupils of the sense of personal responsibility and initiative, and, above all, the spirit of service and the principles of true democracy which should permeate the entire school--principal, teachers, and pupils.²⁵

While the transmission of morals and values through education had important and prominent precedents to the Cardinal Principles report, CRSE members considered the prominence they lent it a departure from business-as-usual in secondary schools.

In 1908, subsequent CRSE member-at-large Edward O. Sisson maintained that "the high school, of all grades of school education, should take the most active and effective part in the

²⁴ Ibid., 309.

²⁵ Commission on the Reorganization of Secondary Education, Cardinal Principles of Secondary Education, 15.

formation of character."²⁶ Sisson decried the lack of contemporary interest in character education and recommended that this aim could be achieved through carefully selected subject matter, teacher example, and social relations among students. In an article that appeared in 1910 in the Atlantic Monthly, Sisson similarly documented the lack of attention to moral education, mentioning specifically this lack in the reports of the Committee of Ten and Committee of Fifteen. Sisson claimed that moral considerations had been "crowded out" of the school curriculum by emphasis on "intellectual work" and by "direct attacks."²⁷ Sisson viewed new industrial conditions as part of the rationale behind the new imperative for moral education:

Long and devious are the channels through which the product of industry circulates in its way from the painful and often degrading labor of production, to the comfortable consumer, who at first perhaps does not know whence come his ease and luxury, and later, when wedded to his comforts, does not care; or at least cares too little to face squarely his relation to his far-off unknown neighbor.²⁸

For Sisson, the moral implications of industrialization warranted a prominent place in the secondary curriculum.

Member-at-large Henry Neumann identified the "true mission of the school" as "stressing the moral implications in the ideals of American democracy."²⁹ Neumann linked his proposed emphasis on

²⁶ Edward O. Sisson, "The High School's Cure of Souls," Educational Review (April 1908): 360.

²⁷ Edward O. Sisson, "An Educational Emergency," Atlantic Monthly 10, no. 6 (1910): 60, 61.

²⁸ Sisson, "An Educational Emergency," 55.

²⁹ Henry Neumann, "The True Mission of the School," The Standard 1, no. 1 (May 1914): 14. Neumann had earlier proposed a course in moral education for secondary schools, a version of which he taught at the Ethical Culture School in Manhattan for 40 years. See Frank Chapman Sharp and Henry Neumann, "A

moral education to a transcendence of the traditional academic curriculum. Indeed, in Neumann's writing several ideas central to the Cardinal Principles report are apparent. Neumann, for example, expressly rejected aristocratic forms of secondary education characteristic of European systems. As he trenchantly phrased the matter, "Our culture cannot accept the aims of an aristocratic class set apart from youth for the future government of the common herd." He insisted, "The function of the high school is no longer to prepare for college. It must prepare the majority of its boys and girls to earn their own living in all the various vocations."³⁰ He explained how the inclusion of vocational education in the secondary school represented a manifestation of the democratic ideal:

. . . the essential point is to recognize frankly the dignity of the vocational interests, and make our education center around that recognition. Every one in America is to work hard for his living, and to make his life through the making of that living; and unless the ethical import of this fact is stressed, American education in the years ahead is going to be vocationalized in the narrow utilitarian sense.³¹

The distance of Neumann's position from Snedden's narrow conception of vocational training is made clear in an earlier remark of Neumann's: "The ideal of 'social efficiency' which so allures the popular radical thinking is inadequate."³² Neumann effectively rejected Snedden's position when he implored, "Let us save America from the narrowing effects of that conception of

Course in Moral Education for the High School," School Review 20 (1912): 218-45.

³⁰ Henry Neumann, "The Aims of American Education in the Light of Proposed Innovations," The Standard 3, no. 8 (May 1917): 183.

³¹ Neumann, "The Aims of American Education," 186.

³² Neumann, "The True Mission of the School," 13-14.

efficiency." As he had argued previously, for Neumann, "The way to do so is to stress the ethical aim: the making of a living is to contribute to the making of a certain kind of life; and the vocational preparation is to keep this larger consideration in the forefront always."³³

Neumann's and Sisson's similar conceptions of the relation between vocational education, democratic ideals, and the development of ethical character appeared in the Cardinal Principles report, though in a much milder form. The CRSE wrote:

Vocational education should aim to develop an appreciation of the significance of the vocation to the community, and a clear conception of right relations between the members of the chosen vocation, between different vocational groups, between employer and employee, and between producer and consumer. These aspects of vocational education, heretofore neglected, demand emphatic attention.³⁴

Read in the context of the ideas advanced earlier by Sisson and Neumann, this passage assumes meanings that depart significantly from Snedden's narrow notions of trade training.

The ideas that schooling should relate to the life of the learner and to the life of the society were clearly manifest in the consensus among the CRSE members cited thus far--as well as in the Cardinal Principles report--that the high school program should diversify to accommodate the aptitudes and aspirations of an increasingly heterogeneous student population. Neumann implored simply, "The ideal of the school should be, preparation

³³ Neumann, "The Aims of American Education," 186-87. In this article, Neumann also attacked proposals for compulsory military service and harshly criticized sexist and racist views that emerged during the conscription debate. See 188-89.

³⁴ Commission on the Reorganization of Secondary Education, Cardinal Principles of Secondary Education, 13.

for life in the broadest sense of the term." As noted, Herrick similarly concluded: "Those high school studies are of most worth which are worth most to the individual pupil, which will best fit him for meeting the many-sided demands of the life which he is to live." Charles Hughes Johnston perhaps put it succinctly when describing the purpose of his 1912 anthology: "the life and purposes of high school students constitute the ultimate objects of reference--not college admission standards, if these seem seriously to conflict with the broader aim."³⁵ In his 1914 anthology, Johnston identified the following purposes for secondary education: health; problem-solving; aesthetics; economic; civic; and values.³⁶ These purposes clearly parallel the CRSE's infamous seven objectives of education. Finally, William H. Kilpatrick, chair of the Mathematics committee, recorded in his diary that he had suggested the inclusion of "worthy use of leisure" among the seven main objectives.³⁷

Other specific provisions that appeared in the Cardinal Principles report are evident in these writings, as well. Johnston advocated, for example, that "prospective high school teachers realize the necessity that they understand those high school courses of study which differ radically in function from their own."³⁸ Similarly, James F. Hosis, chair of the English

³⁵ Sharp and Neumann, "A Course in Moral Education," 235; Herrick, "What High-School Studies are of Most Worth?" 309; Johnston, High School Education, ix-x, emphasis in original.

³⁶ Johnston, The Modern High School, 11.

³⁷ See John A. Beineke, And There Were Giants in the Land: The Life of William Heard Kilpatrick (NY: Peter Lang, 1998), 125.

³⁸ Johnston, High School Education, xi-xii.

committee, called for the "coordination" of the teaching of writing 'across the curriculum,' as we have said late in the century. Hosis warned that a failure of teachers to see beyond their specialized subject matter would "tend to disintegrate the life of the pupil instead of unifying and harmonizing it." In order to overcome this problem, Hosis recommended that whenever possible, teachers "give instruction in at least two departments in order to secure necessary breadth and catholicity of interest."³⁹ The CRSE subsequently recognized the isolation and specialization that could result from the departmental organization of faculty and curriculum.⁴⁰ Johnston also advocated the 6-6 organization of elementary and secondary education, as did the CRSE.

The wide aims and corresponding diversified curriculum offerings were designed to serve the specializing function of the comprehensive high school. The CRSE emphasized that this specializing function was "supplementary" to the unifying function of the comprehensive high school. If Snedden had any influence on the report through Kingsley, it certainly was not on this point. As Krug indicated, Kingsley, unlike Snedden, had endorsed the comprehensive high school. Other members of the CRSE had advocated for the unifying function prior to the publication of the 1918 report.

³⁹ James Fleming Hosis, "Effective Ways of Securing Co-Operation of all Departments in the Teaching of English Composition," NEA Journal of Proceedings and Addresses (Ann Arbor, Michigan: NEA, 1913), 479, 480.

⁴⁰ Commission on the Reorganization of Secondary Education, Cardinal Principles of Secondary Education, 27-28.

In 1909, in the first of a two-part article entitled, "The Genius of the American High School," Sisson praised the openness of the American system of education compared to closed European systems and celebrated the unifying function of the American secondary school:

But the educational open road of the high school is also a social common highway, thronged by children from all classes of society, working side by side upon common tasks and sharing a large common life. This quality . . . belongs to the genius of the American high school as contrasted with European secondary schools, and it brings to the high school the peculiar advantages and problems of such social mingling. Democracy in the school is essential to education for democracy in life; it is a constant safeguard against the extremer evils of caste, making it impossible for social classes to grow up ignorant of each other and mutually unsympathetic with one another, engendering rather an all-pervading mutual understanding and a great stock of common conceptions, standards, and ideals.⁴¹

Sisson also addressed arguments made against such a provision for social mingling. Neumann, after dismissing the European aristocratic tradition in education, asserted that American "public schools are intended to emphasize the unifying and not the dividing ideals of the nation."⁴² Moreover, at least two members-at-large other than Kingsley expressly advocated the cosmopolitan or comprehensive high school prior to 1918. In 1913, Milo H. Stuart, Principal of the Manual Training School in Indianapolis and President of NEA's Department of Secondary Education, presented a paper in which he assumed that the cosmopolitan high school was the only acceptable alternative for secondary school organization:

⁴¹ Edward O. Sisson, "The Genius of the American High School," Educational Review 37 (January 1909): 33.

⁴² Neumann, "The True Mission of the School," 14.

It is the first duty of the high school to give each pupil an insight into the form of service in which he is most interested. This is to enable him to do two things: first, to choose with intelligence which phase he wishes to adapt as his own; second, to acquire a sympathetic insight into the lives of his neighbors. A cosmopolitan high school is a high school which does not shirk this duty, but which teaches side by side English, mathematics, history, cooking, sewing, art, agriculture, Latin, mechanical drawing, music, and regards them all as on a level.⁴³

As the CRSE would in 1918, Stuart celebrated the relative openness of the American system of education: "It has been the peculiar glory of our system that the road is open from the kindergarten to the university. This is the most tangible evidence that we are democratic."⁴⁴

In a final instance of a reviewing committee member endorsing ideas that appeared in the Cardinal Principles report prior to its publication in 1918 we turn to member-at-large Alexander Inglis of Harvard University. Inglis advocated such ideas in at least two places. In an article published in the May 1915 issue of Teachers College Record, Inglis articulated the core principles of his theory of secondary education that he would later elaborate in his 1918 book. He identified four "fundamental aims of secondary education" that he regarded as "the controlling aims of the American high school": the socio-civic aim; the economic-vocational aim; the individualistic-vocational aim; and the

⁴³ Milo H. Stuart, "The Cosmopolitan High School in its Relation to College Entrance," NEA Proceedings and Addresses (Ann Arbor, MI: NEA, 1913): 471. Stuart continued, "That person or institution which calls part of these essential, and the rest 'fads and frills,' has not yet caught a glimpse of the meaning of universal education."

⁴⁴ Stuart, "The Cosmopolitan High School . . .," 472.

physical aim.⁴⁵ He stressed that "they are by no means mutually exclusive aims: rather they are necessarily interrelated and interdependent."⁴⁶ For Inglis, collectively these four aims constituted the larger "social aim of secondary education." He emphasized, however, that the "socialization of the high school," that is, the reorganization of secondary education for the purpose of achieving the four aims, "is a perpetual problem arising out of the dynamic character of society."⁴⁷ Thus, secondary education must undergo continual evaluation and revision in order always to work toward social ideal and realities.

Inglis identified three factors that necessitated the continual reevaluation of secondary education. The first two factors were closely related: the "dynamic character of society" and the varying rate of change in society. Significantly, both of these factors pointed to, among other things, "the necessity of providing training [to students] for the development of a capacity to readjust as well as for adjustment to the conditions which exist at any time."⁴⁸ Inglis asserted, "there is constant danger that we may tend to overemphasize adjustment to the neglect of the element of readjustment."⁴⁹

The third factor that Inglis considered important was "the heterogeneity of the group which is to be socialized in part through the high school." Inglis held that a "certain degree of

⁴⁵ Alexander Inglis, "The Socialization of the High School," Teachers College Record vol. 16, no. 3 (May 1915), pp. 205-206.

⁴⁶ Inglis, "The Socialization of the High School," 206.

⁴⁷ Inglis, "The Socialization of the High School," 207.

⁴⁸ Inglis, "The Socialization of the High School," 209.

⁴⁹ Inglis, "The Socialization of the High School," 211.

unity in feeling, in habit, in ideas, in conduct, in thought is a necessity of any form of society." This necessity "is greater in a democracy than in any other form of society."⁵⁰ Inglis suggested that the increasing diversity of American society and the corresponding need for unity held greatest implications for the social-civic and individualistic-avocational aims of secondary education. He proposed that two phases, or functions, of secondary education must be provided through the educational program of the school in order that both of these aims are met: "integration" and "differentiation." He emphasized that to oppose integration and differentiation against each other was "fallacious" and that they were in fact "supplementary." Inglis claimed that "integration and differentiation must be conceived not as conflicting with each other but as supplementary phases of the same unitary process."⁵¹ The differentiation and integration functions would serve as the cornerstone of Inglis' theory of secondary education--and, in the Cardinal Principles report, as the "supplementary" specializing and unifying functions of the comprehensive high school.

The second instance of Inglis advocating ideas expressed in the Cardinal Principles report is found in his 1918 magnum opus, Principles of Secondary Education. Inglis joined the CRSE just in time to participate in the February 1916 meeting held in Detroit. In the first historical study of the CRSE, Simmons documented major similarities between the Cardinal Principles report and

⁵⁰ Inglis, "The Socialization of the High School," 212, 213.

⁵¹ Inglis, "The Socialization of the High School," 216.

Inglis's Principles of Secondary Education. Simmons concluded, however, "Whether Inglis borrowed these ideas from the Commission, gave them to the Commission, or formulated them simultaneously but independently of the Commission is inconsequential."⁵² For the present study, however, the issue of Inglis's influence and the genesis of his thinking are highly consequential.

Some indications of the chronology of the development of Inglis's thinking are available. First, all of the ideas that he wrote about in the 1915 Teachers College Record piece clearly predated his membership on the CRSE and thus were brought by him to those deliberations. Many of these ideas, in various forms, were manifest in the Cardinal Principles report. Second, archival materials from Inglis's publisher, Houghton Mifflin, reveal the chronology of the preparation of his 1918 book. By fall 1915, Inglis had begun writing the book. Since in the book he reported that he had used it in draft form in his classes at Harvard, he could have begun writing as much as a year before that time. In the fall of 1916 Inglis estimated that the manuscript would be complete by the following January. In December of 1916 he was making final revisions to the manuscript, which he ultimately submitted around June 1917.⁵³ In short, Inglis wrote portions of

⁵² Noah Gayle Simmons, The Emerging Design for the Comprehensive High School, 1913-1922 (Unpublished doctoral dissertation, Washington University, 1960), 339. Raymond Callahan served as the chair of Simmons' dissertation committee. Perhaps significantly, Callahan omitted the CRSE and the Cardinal Principles report from his definitive study, Education and the Cult of Efficiency (Chicago: University of Chicago Press, 1962).

⁵³ See Inglis to Franklin S. Hoyt, March 16, 1915 (Folder 1), Hoyt to Inglis, November 17, 1917 (Folder 5) Hoyt to Inglis, September 19, 1916 (Folder 6), Inglis to Foster, August 16, 1916 (Folder 2), Inglis to Hoyt, December 4, 1916 (Folder 2), Houghton Mifflin Co. to Inglis, July 31, 1917 (Folder 6) in

the book before and during his work on the CRSE reviewing committee. Other than the principles expressed in the 1915 article, the exact points at which Inglis wrote about these principles is unclear.

What is clear is the great extent to which Inglis' Principles of Secondary Education and the CRSE's Cardinal Principles report overlap, as Simmons observed. Among the points of congruence are the following: rejection of mental discipline; advocacy of the criterion of utility in selecting subject matter; embracement of wide range of aims; organization of the curriculum into constants and variables; endorsement of the 3-3 organization of secondary education; and resounding endorsement of the comprehensive high school. As Inglis unequivocally concluded:

On the whole it appears: (a) that special-type junior high schools are unjustifiable; (b) that special-type four grade high schools or senior high schools are practicable in a very few large cities only; (c) that the comprehensive or composite or consolidated high school should be the standard type even in the largest cities.⁵⁴

Inglis also repudiated the recommendations of the Committee of Ten, suggesting that, "In light of present knowledge, theory, and practice it is obvious that the recommendations of the Committee of Ten are open to serious criticism."⁵⁵ He listed seven "serious objections," implying that detailed analysis would reveal additional problems.

Correspondence between Alexander James Inglis and Houghton Mifflin, Houghton Library, Harvard University.

⁵⁴ Alexander James Inglis, Principles of Secondary Education (Boston: Houghton Mifflin, 1918), 703.

⁵⁵ Inglis, Principles of Secondary Education, 665.

In summary then, at least eight members of the CRSE's reviewing committee had, like Kingsley, advocated ideas that subsequently appeared in the 1918 report prior to its publication, often prior to their membership on the commission. To associate these ideas exclusively with Kingsley, as Krug did, misrepresents the historic record. This line of reasoning, of course, risks violation of the rule of argument which holds that precedence does not necessarily mean causation. Thus, an examination of the surviving records of the CRSE is warranted in order to shed further light on the question of who wrote the Cardinal Principles report.

Before proceeding to the CRSE records, however, a peculiar paradox in Krug's narrative which casts his interpretation into some doubt deserves attention. Krug's highlighting the fact that Kingsley "had only recently left the classroom for his new position" under Snedden perhaps lends credibility to the possible influence of Snedden on the eager apprentice. The vulnerability or malleability implied in this association, however, is inconsistent with the dominance that Krug would have Kingsley exert over the members of the CRSE. Among the members at large, Kingsley's views would have had to have prevailed over the perspectives and the personalities of the United States Commissioner of Education, two professors from Teachers College, Columbia University and one professor from Harvard University, a leading figure in the Ethical Culture Society of New York, the senior educational secretary of the international YMCA, the state high school supervisor in Wisconsin, and the president of the

University of Montana--and these are just the positions of the members-at-large. Committee chairs included a college president, and several college professors as well as nationally-recognized school administrators. As documented above, many CRSE members had spent years systematically thinking and writing about issues of secondary education.⁵⁶ That these accomplished professional educators allowed the views of any individual to dominate their deliberations seems unlikely. This suggestion, of course, is mere speculation. What does the surviving documentation about the activities of the CRSE disclose about the authorship of the report?

CRSE Activities

Krug based his contention that Kingsley served as the principal if not sole author of the Cardinal Principles report on several developments documented in the surviving records of the CRSE. These developments include the following: 1) Kingsley's preparation in 1915 of "an outline for a general report, complete with the assignment of personnel responsible for writing the various sections," the first three of which Kingsley "proposed to write . . . himself."⁵⁷ 2) That "Kingsley supplemented this outline with a broad sketch not only of his sections but also of

⁵⁶ See also Johnston's pithy and entertaining articulation, through an imaginary dialogue among major participants in contemporary educational policy debates, of the numerous issues swirling around the high school question: Charles Hughes Johnston, "The High School Issue," Educational Administration and Supervision 1,1 (January 1915): 29-49. That an individual possessing such command of the various viewpoints on secondary education would have simply deferred to Kingsley is improbable.

⁵⁷ Krug, The Shaping of the American High School, 1880-1920, 382.

others."⁵⁸ 3) That "At the November [1915] meeting in Chicago, the reviewing committee approved in broad outline Kingsley's proposals for the general report."⁵⁹ 4) That, regarding the February 1916 meeting in Detroit, "By this time Kingsley had prepared manuscript for the general report, covering not only the sections for which he had already taken responsibility, but also several additional ones."⁶⁰ 5) That, in June 1916, "After consulting with Inglis, Kingsley went ahead to do the revising himself, sending the new draft to the special committee and the reviewing committee so that it could be considered at the July meeting in New York." Krug quoted from Kingsley's correspondence to the reviewing committee: "'I have entirely rewritten the material that I presented at Detroit,' he declared, 'and believe it is now much more satisfactory.'" Krug concluded, "By this time the report had become almost Kingsley's own production, although space was left for the two sections expected from Johnson and Leavitt."⁶¹ 6) That, except for the omission of the "command of fundamental processes" aim, the June 1916 draft that Kingsley distributed to members of the reviewing committee was simply "a briefer version of what later appeared."⁶² By focusing on these six points, Krug construed the activities of the CRSE as driven largely by the administrative and intellectual leadership of Chairman Kingsley.

⁵⁸ Krug, The Shaping of the American High School, 1880-1920, 382.

⁵⁹ Krug, The Shaping of the American High School, 1880-1920, 383.

⁶⁰ Krug, The Shaping of the American High School, 1880-1920, 384.

⁶¹ Krug, The Shaping of the American High School, 1880-1920, 384.

⁶² Krug, The Shaping of the American High School, 1880-1920, 385.

A close examination of the surviving records of the CRSE's activities, however, reveals that while Krug's depiction of Kingsley's efficient administrative leadership is accurate, Krug's contention that Kingsley served as the intellectual author of the report is problematic. Archival records indicate that, in fact, reviewing committee members enjoyed regular input to drafts of the Cardinal Principles report, as they did to all other reports prepared under the auspices of the CRSE, that revisions to Kingsley's section drafts were recommended by reviewing committee members, that the reviewing committee actually voted on revisions, and that Kingsley incorporated such changes into subsequent drafts.

CRSE Archives Revisited

Evidence of regular input to both administrative and intellectual matters on the part of reviewing committee members abounds in the surviving records of the CRSE. From its first meetings in 1915 through its last meetings in the early 1920s, the CRSE, working at meetings and between meetings through the mail, regularly reacted to drafts, advised authors of recommended revisions, and ratified both suggested changes and final documents. Minutes of the February 15, 1915 meeting of the reviewing committee, for example, reveal the adoption of the 6-6 organization of elementary and secondary education as among the matters considered and voted upon. As Kingsley later reported, "the Reviewing Committee voted unanimously to interpret the term 'secondary education' as including the work of seventh and eighth

grades."⁶³ In this section, each of the developments that Krug cited as evidence of Kingsley's disproportionate influence on the Cardinal Principles report is evaluated against surviving archival materials.

With respect to Kingsley's "Preliminary Plan for Meeting of the Reviewing Committee" in Chicago during November 1915, Krug failed to note several important facts. The charges that Kingsley identified for the reviewing committee in the "Preliminary Plan," for example, paralleled those charges previously ratified by the Committee on Articulation of High Schools and Colleges when in 1913 it recommended the formation of the larger CRSE. In the 1915 "Preliminary Plan," Kingsley also indicated that all conclusions would be ratified by the CRSE reviewing committee. While Krug noted that Kingsley had assigned three sections to himself and two others to other CRSE members, Krug failed to report that Kingsley additionally assigned seven other sections to nine other members of the CRSE. That is, only two members-at-large were not assigned a section and Kingsley was responsible for only three of 13. Aside from identifying section topics in the "Preliminary Plan," Kingsley also proposed operating procedures for the CRSE that were designed to allow for review, discussion, and revision of the CRSE's work.⁶⁴ Additionally, most of the section topics that Kingsley proposed did not appear in the final report.

⁶³ "Meetings of the Commission on the Reorganization of Secondary Education," Educational Administration and Supervision 1, no. 5 (May 1915): 332.

⁶⁴ "Preliminary Plan for Meeting of the Reviewing Committee," September 30, 1915, record group no. 12, Reorganization of Secondary Education, National Archives and Records Administration. "Third Report of the Committee on the

Next, Krug bolstered Kingsley's authorship of the report with reference to the "Topics Suggested for Treatment in the Report of the Reviewing Committee" that Kingsley distributed to reviewing committee members in 1915. Krug failed to indicate that Kingsley wrote the following in his July 10, 1915 correspondence to members:

Enclosed I am sending you (a) a preliminary outline of the topics suggested for treatment in our report; (b) a memorandum on a committee on mathematics, and (c) a statement from Commissioner Sisson regarding prescribed units.

In order that we may be able to prepare a good report at the time of the meeting it will be necessary for us to have the problem well in hand in advance of the meeting. To this end I am asking each member of the Reviewing Committee to indicate to me topics in this outline upon which he will agree to gather material or formulate statements, and also to suggest other topics which he thinks should be included in the report of the Reviewing Committee.

May I ask you also to send me criticisms and suggestions regarding the other two enclosures; the memorandum on a committee on mathematics and the statement regarding prescribed units, and to refer to my statement on the problems confronting the Commission contained on pages 483 to 488 of the N.E.A. proceedings for 1914?

P.S. Of course members of the Reviewing Committee will regard all statements as tentative and confidential and as not committing anyone.⁶⁵

Indeed, in the "Topics Suggested" paper, Kingsley emphasized that material was "subject for criticisms by the Reviewing Committee." Krug also failed to note that Kingsley frequently worded the material in this paper in the form of questions for the reviewing committee to consider. These documents suggest that Kingsley's

Articulation of High Schools and Colleges," NEA Journal of Proceedings and Addresses (Ann Arbor, MI: NEA, 1913), 490-491.

aim was not to impose his views on other CRSE members so much as to facilitate discussion by providing a tentative statement for committee reaction--a common practice of committee work to this day.

Kingsley enclosed with this correspondence Edward O. Sisson's "The Nine Prescribed Units" report. Before the reviewing committee met in Chicago, Kingsley received feedback on the materials he had distributed from at least five members which, evidently, he in turn distributed to the rest of the committee. Sisson had rejected the value of Latin and Greek as antiquated and instead identified the natural sciences and the social sciences as the subjects of most value to students. He recommended that, over six years of secondary schooling, students complete four units of English, three of mathematics, four of natural science, three of history, and one of social science for a total of 15 prescribed and 8 elective units of study. William B. Snow, chair of the modern languages committee, wrote to Kingsley and suggested that, with respect to Sisson's recommendations, "the anti-linguistic pendulum has swung a bit too far in his case." Thomas Briggs responded to both Sisson's and Kingsley's materials, insisting among other things that "we must consider our curricula only after the content has been generally understood." Charles Hughes Johnston, like Briggs, also expressed dissatisfaction with identifying units without identifying the nature of subject matter. In the longest response, H. L. Terry desired more

⁶⁵ Clarence Kingsley to P. P. Claxton, July 10, 1915, Record Group no. 12, Reorganization of Secondary Education, National Archives and Records Administration.

attention to mathematics and also suggested that the CRSE examine issues of testing.⁶⁶

Krug claimed that at the November 1915 meeting in Chicago "the reviewing committee approved in broad outline Kingsley's proposals for the general report," citing November 26, 1915 correspondence from Kingsley to Claxton.⁶⁷ Yet neither the letter Krug cited nor the minutes for the November 1915 meeting support such a claim. Of the five elements that Kingsley reported to Claxton as approved by the committee, only two (a statement of a definition and function of the secondary school and a statement distinguishing the aims of the junior and senior high schools) are evident in Kingsley's "Topics Suggested" paper. Moreover, the minutes from the November 1915 meeting, really a list of approved motions, contain reference neither to Kingsley's paper nor to any decisions about it. Rather, the "Minutes of Motions" parallel the proposed procedures in Kingsley's "Preliminary Plan" most closely, although not identically. These motions concerned administrative procedures of the CRSE, not the content of the Cardinal Principles report. Krug seems to have confused the "Topics Suggested" and "Preliminary Plan" documents. Additionally, the guidelines that the committee generated for subject committee reports at the November 1915 Chicago meeting reflected Briggs's and Johnston's concerns about subject matter as well as Terry's concerns about

⁶⁶ Edward O. Sisson, "The Nine Prescribed Units" and attachments to Clarence Kingsley to P. P. Claxton, October 18, 1915, Record Group no. 12, Reorganization of Secondary Education, National Archives and Records Administration.

⁶⁷ Krug, The Shaping of the American High School, 1880-1920, 383.

testing.⁶⁸ The Cardinal Principles report, of course, did not identify prescribed units of study for secondary students--perhaps as a consequence of the input of Briggs and Johnston.

Although Claxton was unable to attend the CRSE's November 1915 meeting in Chicago, in December he sent to Kingsley a three-page letter containing "changes and additions" to Kingsley's "Topics Suggested" paper. Kingsley recorded virtually all of Claxton's changes and additions verbatim onto his copy of the "Topics Suggested" paper in longhand.⁶⁹ Surviving records offer no direct clues to discussions or decisions about Kingsley's "Topics Suggested" paper.

Krug's assertion that by the time of the February 1916 meeting in Detroit, "Kingsley had prepared manuscript for the general report, covering not only the sections for which he had already taken responsibility, but also several additional ones" is problematic, as well. Krug failed to note the following motions from the minutes of the February 1916 meeting in Detroit:

Motion 12. On motion of a sub-committee appointed to consider the statement of Chairman Kingsley, (a) the portion regarding "Fundamental Considerations Affecting the Nature of Secondary Education" as revised by that committee, was approved; (b) the portions regarding "The Main Objectives of Public Education" and "The Role of the High School in Realizing the Main Objectives of Education" were referred back to Chairman Kingsley and (c) a committee of three was

⁶⁸ "Minutes of Motions, Chicago, Ills., November 23rd and 24th, 1915," and "Purpose and Outline of Reports and Summary on High School Subjects Recommended by Reviewing Committee," Record Group no. 12, Reorganization of Secondary Education, National Archives and Records Administration.

⁶⁹ P.P. Claxton to Clarence Kingsley, December 1, 1915, Record Group no. 12, Reorganization of Secondary Education, National Archives and Records Administration. A comparison of the handwriting on "Topics Suggested" paper to other hand-written and signed correspondence of Kingsley's reveals the match.

authorized to co-operate with him after the Detroit meeting in revising these portions.

Motion 16. On motion of a special sub-committee, the portions of the statement of Chairman Kingsley dealing with The Division of Education into Elementary, Secondary and Higher, and The Articulation of Elementary and Secondary Education were accepted as revised, subject to final revision.

Motion 22. . . . Chairman Kingsley announced as the committee to co-operate with him in revising the statement of the Commission, as provided by Motion 12, the following committee: W. H. Kilpatrick, Chairman, and Messrs. Inglis and Herrick.⁷⁰

These motions reveal that Kingsley was preparing draft materials and, importantly, that Kingsley's materials were reviewed and revised both by the whole reviewing committee and by a specially-appointed sub-committee. Indeed, these motions could reveal a lack of confidence in Kingsley's ability to prepare acceptable drafts on the part of reviewing committee members.

Kilpatrick's diaries corroborate the minutes of the Detroit meeting. After naming the committee members present, Kilpatrick recorded:

We work morning, afternoon, and evening on various reports. I say little till in sub committee I work on Kingsley's proposed report. As this is philosophic, I find my forte. It is not long before I am the leading critic and--I judge--so recognized. We have up especially on a definition of culture.⁷¹

On the following day, Kilpatrick wrote:

The day spent much as yesterday. . . . Again, forenoon, afternoon, and evening re Commission work. Meet Herrick,

⁷⁰ "Minutes of meeting of Reviewing Committee, Detroit, February 20, 21, 22, 1916," Record Group no. 12, Reorganization of Secondary Education, National Archives and Records Administration.

⁷¹ Diaries of William Heard Kilpatrick, entry for February 20, 1916. (Accession no. 670 403) Special Collections, Milbank Memorial Library, Teachers College, Columbia University.

President of Girard College, whom I like much. We work together on subcommittee. . . . Retire late and tired.⁷²

While Kingsley was certainly serving as author of certain sections of the report, as were other members for their respective assignments, his and others' drafts were subject to review by and recommendations of the reviewing committee. Krug overlooked documentation of this reality.

Krug's fifth reason for attributing authorship of the Cardinal Principles report almost exclusively to Kingsley is worth quoting at length:

After consulting with Inglis, Kingsley went ahead to do the revising himself, sending the new draft to the special committee and to the reviewing committee so that it could be considered at the July meeting in New York. 'I have entirely rewritten the material that I presented at Detroit,' he declared, 'and believe it is now much more satisfactory.' By this time the report had become almost entirely Kingsley's own production, although space was left for the two sections expected from Johnston and Leavitt.⁷³

Here is the full text of the letter, save for two sentences pertaining to lodging for members and the meeting site:

Enclosed I am sending you a draft of the first part of the report of our Committee.

I have consulted with Prof. Inglis, a member of the special committee appointed at Detroit to confer with me regarding the revision of the report, and we both thought it desirable that I should send it at this time to all members of the Reviewing Committee at the same time that I send it to the other members of the special committee, inasmuch as the time is very short before the New York meeting.

I have entirely rewritten the material that I presented at Detroit and believe it is now much more satisfactory.

⁷² Diaries of William Heard Kilpatrick, entry for February 21, 1916. (Accession no. 670 403) Special Collections, Milbank Memorial Library, Teachers College, Columbia University.

⁷³ Krug, The Shaping of the American High School, 1880-1920, 384.

I hope you will be able to read this statement with some care as I should like to have your criticisms by June 19th if possible so that I may prepare a second draft.

In case you should not be able to attend at New York City, it is especially important that you should send me your criticisms in writing.

Hoping to hear from you in regard to this report and also that you can be with us in New York city, ..⁷⁴

Krug left the impression that Kingsley proceeded independently of the rest of the reviewing committee with Inglis's blessings.

Notice, however, that while Krug claimed that Kingsley "went ahead to do the revising himself" after consulting with Inglis, which implies that Inglis surrendered his responsibility to provide input to the draft, in fact the letter indicates that Kingsley consulted Inglis not about the content of the draft but about its timely distribution. Moreover, Kingsley's revisions were in response to suggestions he received from the reviewing committee and from a special sub-committee at the February 1916 meeting. Kingsley's rewriting was not simply a matter of adding his thoughts to the draft, but of incorporating the input of other CRSE members, as well. Krug also omitted Kingsley's calls for critical feedback from his account.

In late July 1916, Kingsley sent a copy of a report on "Moral Values in Secondary Education" that Henry Neumann had drafted at the CRSE's request, and called for feedback on it. After several revisions, in October 1917 a final version was sent for ratification to the members of the reviewing committee. The description of ways to develop ethical character that appeared in the Cardinal Principles report effectively abstracted Neumann's principal recommendations.⁷⁵

⁷⁴ Clarence Kingsley to Members of the Reviewing Committee, June 3, 1916, Record Group no. 12, Reorganization of Secondary Education, National Archives and Records Administration.

⁷⁵ Clarence Kingsley to Reviewing Committee, July 24, 1916, "Moral values in Secondary Education," by Henry Neumann, Clarence Kingsley to Reviewing

Finally, Krug depicted Kingsley's June 1916 draft as a nearly completed version of the final report. Again, Krug claimed that, except for the omission of the "command of fundamental processes" aim, the June 1916 draft that Kingsley distributed to members of the reviewing committee was simply "a briefer version of what later appeared."⁷⁵ In fact, the June 1916 version of the Cardinal Principles report represented only about 40 percent of the page length and just less than 60 per cent of the sections that appeared in the 1918 document. Contrary to Krug's implication that Kingsley had presented the reviewing committee with a nearly complete draft of the final report, in June 1916 much work on the Cardinal Principles report still lay ahead of the CRSE.

A comparison of Kingsley's 1915 "Topics Suggested" and the 1916 "Draft of Report of Reviewing Committee of the Commission on Secondary Education Appointed by the National Education Association" with the published Cardinal Principles report (1918) is revealing in this regard. In his 1915 document, Kingsley offered a definition of secondary education, outlined reasons for a necessary reorganization of secondary education, justified reorganization on a national scale, and proposed tentative definitions of the following terms: curriculum differentiations, vocational guidance, articulation of general and vocational education, variations of the 6-6 plan, prescribed units in secondary education, concentration (i.e., majors), standards of attainment, the problem of small high schools, and miscellaneous

Committee, October 11, 1917, Record Group no. 12, Reorganization of Secondary Education, National Archives and Records Administration.

matters such as home study and the length of the school day. His treatment of the first three topics was contrasted with the definitions of terms in that the former were offered as statements requiring reaction while the latter were often framed literally as questions. Although specific elements of the 1915 document, such as endorsement of the 6-6 plan and discussion of "constants" for the high school curriculum, appeared in the 1918 report, most of the wording and much of the substance was substantially different. In the 1915 document, for example, the notion of "common ideas" in the curriculum applied only to the junior high school. In the 1915 document Kingsley stressed that the three Rs should be largely the responsibility of the elementary school, freeing the secondary school curriculum for advanced studies. Significantly, Kingsley also cautioned the members of the reviewing committee, "In view of the widespread discussion regarding the relations of general and vocational education it will be important that the Commission avoid sweeping generalities." In the 1915 document, Kingsley aimed to avoid the debate over the dual versus unified system and made no mention of the comprehensive high school.⁷⁷

The 1916 draft was about twice the length of the 1915 document but less than half the length of the 1918 report. Of the seven sections of the 1916 draft, five appeared in the 1918 report in revised and expanded form, one appeared nearly verbatim, and one was dropped. In the 1916 draft Kingsley indicated that two

⁷⁶ Krug, *The Shaping of the American High School, 1880-1920*, 385.

⁷⁷ "Topics Suggested for Treatment in the Report of the Reviewing Committee" (1915), pp. 6, 7, 8. "Reorganization of Secondary Education," RG 12, National Archives.

sections, vocational guidance and organization of differentiated curriculums, were still under preparation by other reviewing committee members. Kingsley also queried, "What other topics should be added?"⁷⁸ The absence of "command of fundamental processes" as one of the seven "main objectives of education" could be explained in reference to Kingsley's 1915 proposal to emphasize the three Rs on the elementary level. With the exception of Kingsley's indication that two sections of the report were being prepared by two other reviewing committee members, Krug overlooked all of these points.

The 1916 draft was substantially briefer than the 1918 report: of the nineteen sections in the 1918 report, eight did not appear in the 1916 draft. These eight sections amounted to fourteen and a half pages of the total twenty-five pages of text in the report. All of the material on the secondary curriculum and on the comprehensive high school appeared in these last eight sections. Krug overlooked these significant differences. In these eight sections of the Cardinal Principles report the CRSE articulated the specializing and unifying functions of secondary education, characterizing them as "supplementary." Here the Commission organized the curriculum into "constants," "variables," and "free electives." Here the Commission regarded vocational guidance as critical to achieving the specializing function and school activities as crucial in achieving the unifying function.

⁷⁸ "Draft of Report of Reviewing Committee of the Commission on Secondary Education Appointed by the National Education Association" (1916), p. 19 and Kingsley to Members of the Reviewing Committee, June 3, 1916. "Reorganization of Secondary Education," RG 12, National Archives.

Here the Commission proposed that academic and vocational education be housed under the same roof. Here the Commission resoundingly endorsed the comprehensive high school as "the standard type of secondary school in the United States."⁷⁹

This comparison reveals that many of the principles Alexander Inglis advanced in his 1918 book and in his earlier writings appear in the Cardinal Principles report, but not in the two earlier documents. Inglis had no input to the 1915 document and only last minute access to the 1916 document as a new member of the reviewing committee. Although the evidence is little more than circumstantial, the fact that the ideas that most resembled Inglis' were introduced to the Cardinal Principles report after he joined the reviewing committee could illuminate the question of the authorship of the report. Of course, other members of the reviewing committee, such as Johnston of Illinois and Leavitt of Pittsburgh who were assigned later sections of the report, likely influenced the final document, as well.

Records of the CRSE between June 1916 and the publication of the Cardinal Principles report in 1918 unfortunately contain documents relating only to a schedule of its publication and plans to disseminate the report nationally. In January 1917 Kingsley began making arrangements for dissemination of the published report, looking for the widest dispersion possible within existing financial constraints. On July 2, 1917, Kingsley wrote to members

⁷⁹ Commission on the Reorganization of Secondary Education, Cardinal Principles of Secondary Education, Bulletin, 1918, No. 35, Department of the Interior, Bureau of Education (Washington, DC: U.S. Government Printing Office, 1918), 21, 23, 24.

of the reviewing committee asking for comments on five reports nearly ready for publication, among them the "Cardinal Principles" report. In an attached table of dates for submission to the reviewing committee and to the government printer for all of the extant reports, Kingsley indicated the general report was scheduled for its final submission to the reviewing committee on June 1, 1917 and to the printer after September 1, 1917. Surviving records provide no clue as to the deliberations about the substance and wording of the report during the eighteen months immediately preceding its publication.⁸⁰

1918 and After

In his description of both the contents of and the reactions to the Cardinal Principles report, Krug continued to argue for Kingsley's influence. In this section of his narrative, however, Krug appears to equivocate on the extent of Kingsley's influence. Seeds of this equivocation were evident in Krug's occasional acknowledgment in his description of the CRSE's activities that in fact members had input to draft manuscripts, such as in his brief description of Sisson's prescribed units paper. Krug's equivocation becomes more apparent as he examines the content of the report.

In describing the content of the report, for example, Krug maintained that the sections "dealing with the goal of education in a democracy, the main objectives of education, and the role of secondary education in achieving these objective, appeared in the

⁸⁰ Kingsley to Claxton, January 8, 1917, Kingsley to Members of the Reviewing Committee, June 2, 1917 and attachment, "Reorganization of Secondary

final report substantially as Kingsley had written them in his preliminary draft, except for the addition of the seventh objective."⁸¹ This statement, however, exaggerates Kingsley's input in two ways. First, Krug again overstated the similarities and understates the differences between the 1916 draft and the 1918 report. Language was often significantly revised, resulting in deletion and addition of phrases, sentences, and whole paragraphs. Indeed, in the 1916 draft, Kingsley quoted material verbatim from an article that he wrote which appeared in the January 8, 1912 issue of School and Society. While the essential idea remained in the 1916 report, the wording was thoroughly revised. Moreover, new material was added that Krug ignored--such as the entire section on developing ethical character. Second, and perhaps more important, Krug again ignored the fact that Kingsley prepared the June 1916 draft in response to suggestions provided by the reviewing committee at the February 1916 meeting in Detroit. Krug also attributed the recommendation for curriculum "constants," the classification of the seven main objectives of education, and the section on universal secondary schooling all to Kingsley--despite the fact that other reviewing committee members had previously advocated these ideas, as well.

Despite Krug's conclusion about Kingsley's role in writing the report, Krug concomitantly left open the prospect that certain sections of the report were written by "possibly someone other than Kingsley," especially considering "a more cosmic ring" to the

Education," RG 12, National Archives.

⁸¹ Krug, The Shaping of the American High School, 1880-1920, 387.

wording than was typical of Kingsley's writing style. At one point Krug even conceded that, "As often happens in committee productions, Kingsley may have felt compelled to include these points simply because someone had brought them up and made a strong case for including them."⁸² In light of the operating procedures revealed in the surviving records of the CRSE, which Krug overlooked in his account, Kingsley had little choice but to make changes ratified by the reviewing committee.

Krug equivocated on his association of the Cardinal Principles report with social efficiency and social control, as well. At one point he claimed that the report's conception of democracy "leaned toward the group side" of the individual versus group dilemma and concluded, "This, then, was democracy as the age of social efficiency saw it." One page later he suggested that another provision of the report "leaned in the direction of the service side rather than the control side of the social movement." A page after that, Krug viewed the CRSE's final stance on differentiation as "a less extreme version" than versions typical for the time.⁸³ Despite these equivocations, however, Krug maintained that the CRSE's final product was "Mr. Kingsley's Report."

In a final attempt to attribute the substance of the report to Kingsley and associate it with Snedden, Krug understated the harshness of Snedden's rejection of the recommendations of the CRSE. Regarding the 19 principles, Snedden remarked, "these

⁸² Krug, The Shaping of the American High School, 1880-1920, 386.

⁸³ Krug, The Shaping of the American High School, 1880-1920, 387, 388, 389.

general terms are often equivocal and sometimes illusory." With respect to the seven main objectives of education, Snedden admonished that "it would seem that failure to utilize what are even now available as sociological guideposts had led the committee into unnecessary confusion." He rejected the objectives as patently impractical. Snedden characterized the CRSE's view of the secondary school as a unifying element in a diverse society as "sociologically preposterous and would excite incredulity if defended before a well-informed public."⁸⁴ Snedden categorically dismissed the conception of vocational education advanced by the CRSE. Kingsley's response deserves note not only for its reasonableness in the face of Snedden's intemperance, but also for inclusion of a description of the process of developing the report that is corroborated by surviving documentation.⁸⁵ That Kingsley was willing publicly to dispute each of Snedden's criticisms perhaps suggests that the latter's influence over his subordinate at the Massachusetts State Department of Education was much less than Krug surmised.

In his final analysis, Krug characterized the Cardinal Principles report as "an archaeological deposit of many ideas and influences in the American tradition of education some of them as old as the expressions of the founding fathers, other as close to its own times as the doctrine of social efficiency." Despite this characterization, despite his apparent equivocation about

⁸⁴ David Snedden, "Cardinal Principles of Secondary Education," School and Society 9 (May 3, 1919): 519, 520, 527.

⁸⁵ Clarence D. Kingsley, "Cardinal Principles of Secondary Education," School and Society 10 (July 5, 1919): 18-20.

authorship of the report, despite his conclusion that the Cardinal Principles report represented a "mild" form of social efficiency, Krug nevertheless chose to play up the possibility of Snedden's influence and to play down the possibility of other influences, particularly Dewey's. On the latter, Krug claimed, "It is difficult, however, to see Dewey as a direct influence," despite Krug's acknowledgment that, "Undoubtedly Kingsley and his colleagues on the reviewing committee did know Dewey's writings, or some of them." Krug dismissed the possibility of the influence of Dewey's 1916 Democracy and Education by contending that "Kingsley may have been influenced by it, but there is no need to assume this in order to account for the nature of the report."⁸⁶

Yet the number of principles in the report that resemble Dewey's ideas about secondary education is remarkable. From the emphasis on the application of subject matter, to the moral implications of democracy, to the role of the secondary school in unifying a diverse population, to advocacy of the comprehensive high school over a dual system of secondary education, the Cardinal Principles report manifests many ideas that Dewey had championed. In fact, arguably this resemblance is much greater than the resemblance with Snedden's ideas. Krug seems even to have equivocated on the issue of Dewey's influence, which he all but admitted when he enjoined, "The influence of Spencer, Eliot, Dewey, and the social workers entered in varying degrees into the ways the CRSE sought to resolve" contemporary educational issues.⁸⁷

⁸⁶ Krug, The Shaping of the American High School, 1880-1920, 400, 402.

⁸⁷ Krug, The Shaping of the American High School, 1880-1920, 405.

Finally, Inglis' colleagues at Harvard were confident about his contributions to the report. At a memorial service conducted by the Harvard Graduate School of Education after Inglis' sudden death at the age of 45 in 1924, Dean Henry Wyman Holmes noted that Inglis "played a commanding part in the work of the Commission."⁸⁸ Colleague Frederick Edson Clerk claimed, "The work of the Commission was most thorough and comprehensive, and yet when it came to the Reviewing Committee, the searching scrutiny and unprejudiced analysis by Dr. Inglis and his associates frequently changed the original judgments and always improved them."⁸⁹ In another memorial, Holmes noted that "Professor Inglis did especially important work, contributing much to the chief publication of the Commission."⁹⁰ While these tributary claims hardly count as solid evidence of Inglis' impact on the report, they are not inconsistent with the portrait of committee participation that emerges from archival materials.

Conclusion

Clearly, committee chair Kingsley assumed responsibility for preparing drafts of sections of the Cardinal Principles report. Surviving records also indicate that, in fact, Kingsley continuously sought and received input from members of the reviewing committee about the evolving drafts of the report-- indeed, the operating procedures that the CRSE established required ratification of all text. Insufficient evidence exists,

⁸⁸ In Memoriam: Alexander Inglis, 1879-1924. (Cambridge, MA: Harvard University Graduate School of Education, 1925), p. 8.

⁸⁹ In Memoriam: Alexander Inglis, 1879-1924, 33.

however, to support Krug's contention that the final document was largely the brainchild of Kingsley. As indicated above, surviving records from 1915 and 1916 point to ample input to the document from reviewing committee members. Krug played down and even overlooked these efforts. Krug was able to depict Kingsley as the sole intellectual author of the Cardinal Principles report by virtue of selective quoting from surviving records of the CRSE. The full text of these documents, however, casts Krug's interpretation into doubt.

The absence of records of the deliberations of the CRSE after June 1916 prevents a full accounting of who, exactly, contributed which ideas to the report. Available evidence suggests, however, that Kingsley was not the sole author of the report and that other members of the reviewing committee made substantive contributions to the document. Kingsley's influence on the final report cannot be overestimated and the influence of other CRSE members should not be underestimated. In short, to answer the question at hand, available documentation discloses that, contrary to Krug's contention, the Cardinal Principles report was written by the reviewing committee of the CRSE.

In his efforts simultaneously to associate the Cardinal Principles report with Snedden's brand of social efficiency through Kingsley's purported authorship and to qualify this association with the caveat characterizing the report as a "mild" version of social efficiency ideology, Krug left subsequent

⁹⁰ Untitled document in general biographical folder, p. 609. Harvard University Archives, HUG 300.

generations of historians and educators with an equivocal assessment of the report. While Krug had characterized much of the social efficiency ideology that served as the thesis of his book as reflecting "an anti-academic bias, some of it expressed to an almost unbelievable degree,"⁹¹ he did not view the Cardinal Principles report in such a harsh light. He noted that years later the report had "been disparaged as an anticipation of 'life adjustment' education and as a symbol of what might be called an anti-academic bias." He reiterated, however, that "Snedden had found it too academic for his tastes." Krug concluded, "In the long run, the effect of the report may have been to support those who wished to preserve as much as possible of the academic tradition."⁹² A few years earlier, Krug had suggested presciently, "It would be unfair to suggest that the Commission was anti-intellectual; but it is also probable that the Cardinal Principles would not satisfy those who feel that intellectual training must be identified explicitly as the sole or the most important objective of secondary education."⁹³ Despite Krug's caution, this has, in fact, become the prevailing interpretation of the report among educational and curriculum historians.

In the long run, Krug's equivocation and conclusion that the Cardinal Principles report represented a "mild" form of social efficiency-social control ideology, while occasionally

⁹¹ Krug, The Shaping of the American High School, 1880-1920, xi.

⁹² Krug, The Shaping of the American High School, 1880-1920, 400. George Counts, who endorsed the comprehensive high school, found this to be the case in the short run. See George S. Counts, The Senior High School Curriculum Supplementary Education Monographs No. 29 (Chicago: University of Chicago Press, 1926).

acknowledged, has largely been lost. Subsequent historical scholarship has cast the Cardinal Principles report in particular and the comprehensive high school model in general as archetypal manifestations of social efficiency-social control ideology. But, if the historic record reveals that Krug's qualified conclusion was overdrawn, then subsequent interpretations were surely so. Historians working from a revisionist perspective have relentlessly applied the social efficiency-social control thesis to early twentieth-century education. Yet, Kliebard cautioned that "the presentism embedded in what is actually a commonly cited history results in an obfuscating, rather than an illuminating effect on curriculum issues."⁹⁴ Kliebard was, of course, referring to the celebratory approach to educational history; today his admonition may well apply to revisionist educational history and especially to the ubiquitous social efficiency-social control thesis. One result of this tendency is that among education scholars in the United States, the comprehensive high school model has come to be held largely in contempt, depicted as an anti-intellectual and anti-democratic relic of an earlier, less sophisticated, and misguided educational policy. In addition to the evidence discussed above, two great paradoxes suggest that this interpretation warrants reconsideration.

The first paradox resides in the reality that during the very period of time in which the comprehensive high school model fell

⁹³ Edward A. Krug, The Secondary School Curriculum (NY: Harper, 1960), 36.

⁹⁴ Herbert M. Kliebard, "Constructing a History of the American Curriculum," in Philip W. Jackson, ed. Handbook of Research on Curriculum (NY: Macmillan, 1992), 161.

into disrepute among academic in the United States, it was embraced as an instrument of enlightened egalitarianism by academics and policymakers on the political left in European nations.⁹⁵ Indeed, IEA data revealed that comprehensive educational systems manifest the lowest social class bias and the highest educational yield. The second paradox resides closer to home and is found in emerging evidence that in virtually the same breath in which American academics dismiss the comprehensive high school, they frequently also propose reform measures to "restructure" the secondary school which were precisely those advocated historically--even in the Cardinal Principles report--as components of the comprehensive high school.⁹⁶ Perhaps there is no better time than the present to begin to construct a balanced perspective on our educational past, one that accounts for both past successes and past failures and that seeks to build upon rather than simply to discard the repository of principles and practices our predecessors left us.

⁹⁵ See, for example, Torsten Husen, The School in Question: A Comparative Study of the School and its Future in Western Society (Oxford, UK: Oxford University Press, 1979) and, more recently, Richard Pring and Geoffrey Walford, eds., Affirming the Comprehensive Ideal (London: Falmer Press, 1997). For IEA data, see Torsten Husen, "Are Standards in U.S. Schools Really Lagging Behind Those in Other Countries?" Phi Delta Kappan 64 (1983): 455-461.

⁹⁶ See William G. Wraga, "Repudiation, Reinvention, and Educational Reform: The Comprehensive High School in Historical Perspective," Educational Administration Quarterly, 35 (April 1999): 292-304, and Mary Anne Raywid, "On the Viability of the Comprehensive High School: A Reply to Professor Wraga," Educational Administration Quarterly, 35 (April 1999): 305-310.



U.S. Department of Education
Office of Educational Research and Improvement (OERI)
National Library of Education (NLE)
Educational Resources Information Center (ERIC)



REPRODUCTION RELEASE

(Specific Document)

I. DOCUMENT IDENTIFICATION:

Title: WHO WROTE THE CARDINAL PRINCIPLES REPORT: THE COMMISSION ON THE REORGANIZATION OF SEC. ED. REVISITED	
Author(s): WILLIAM G. WRAGIA	
Corporate Source: UNIVERSITY OF GEORGIA	Publication Date: 15 OCT 1999

II. REPRODUCTION RELEASE:

In order to disseminate as widely as possible timely and significant materials of interest to the educational community, documents announced in the monthly abstract journal of the ERIC system, *Resources in Education* (RIE), are usually made available to users in microfiche, reproduced paper copy, and electronic media, and sold through the ERIC Document Reproduction Service (EDRS). Credit is given to the source of each document, and, if reproduction release is granted, one of the following notices is affixed to the document.

If permission is granted to reproduce and disseminate the identified document, please CHECK ONE of the following three options and sign at the bottom of the page.

The sample sticker shown below will be affixed to all Level 1 documents

PERMISSION TO REPRODUCE AND DISSEMINATE THIS MATERIAL HAS BEEN GRANTED BY

Sample

TO THE EDUCATIONAL RESOURCES INFORMATION CENTER (ERIC)

1

Level 1

Check here for Level 1 release, permitting reproduction and dissemination in microfiche or other ERIC archival media (e.g., electronic) and paper copy.

The sample sticker shown below will be affixed to all Level 2A documents

PERMISSION TO REPRODUCE AND DISSEMINATE THIS MATERIAL IN MICROFICHE, AND IN ELECTRONIC MEDIA FOR ERIC COLLECTION SUBSCRIBERS ONLY, HAS BEEN GRANTED BY

Sample

TO THE EDUCATIONAL RESOURCES INFORMATION CENTER (ERIC)

2A

Level 2A

Check here for Level 2A release, permitting reproduction and dissemination in microfiche and in electronic media for ERIC archival collection subscribers only

The sample sticker shown below will be affixed to all Level 2B documents

PERMISSION TO REPRODUCE AND DISSEMINATE THIS MATERIAL IN MICROFICHE ONLY HAS BEEN GRANTED BY

Sample

TO THE EDUCATIONAL RESOURCES INFORMATION CENTER (ERIC)

2B

Level 2B

Check here for Level 2B release, permitting reproduction and dissemination in microfiche only

Documents will be processed as indicated provided reproduction quality permits. If permission to reproduce is granted, but no box is checked, documents will be processed at Level 1.

I hereby grant to the Educational Resources Information Center (ERIC) nonexclusive permission to reproduce and disseminate this document as indicated above. Reproduction from the ERIC microfiche or electronic media by persons other than ERIC employees and its system contractors requires permission from the copyright holder. Exception is made for non-profit reproduction by libraries and other service agencies to satisfy information needs of educators in response to discrete inquiries.

Sign here, please →

Signature: <i>William G. Wragia</i>	Printed Name/Position/Title: WILLIAM G. WRAGIA, Assoc. Prof.	
Organization/Address: UNIV OF GEORGIA 850 COLLEGE STA RD ATHENS, GA 30602	Telephone: 706-542-4166	FAX:
	E-Mail Address: <i>wragia@coe.usg.edu</i>	Date: 4 May 2002

(over)

III. DOCUMENT AVAILABILITY INFORMATION (FROM NON-ERIC SOURCE):

If permission to reproduce is not granted to ERIC, or, if you wish ERIC to cite the availability of the document from another source, please provide the following information regarding the availability of the document. (ERIC will not announce a document unless it is publicly available, and a dependable source can be specified. Contributors should also be aware that ERIC selection criteria are significantly more stringent for documents that cannot be made available through EDRS.)

Publisher/Distributor:
Address:
Price:

IV. REFERRAL OF ERIC TO COPYRIGHT/REPRODUCTION RIGHTS HOLDER:

If the right to grant this reproduction release is held by someone other than the addressee, please provide the appropriate name and address:

Name:
Address:

V. WHERE TO SEND THIS FORM:

Send this form to the following ERIC Clearinghouse: University of Maryland ERIC Clearinghouse on Assessment and Evaluation 1129 Shriver Laboratory College Park, MD 20742 Attn: Acquisitions
--

However, if solicited by the ERIC Facility, or if making an unsolicited contribution to ERIC, return this form (and the document being contributed) to: