

INFORMATION TO USERS

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

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

1. The sign or "target" for pages apparently lacking from the document photographed is "Missing Page(s)". If it was possible to obtain the missing page(s) or section, they are spliced into the film along with adjacent pages. This may have necessitated cutting through an image and duplicating adjacent pages to assure you of complete continuity.
2. When an image on the film is obliterated with a round black mark it is an indication that the film inspector noticed either blurred copy because of movement during exposure, or duplicate copy. Unless we meant to delete copyrighted materials that should not have been filmed, you will find a good image of the page in the adjacent frame.
3. When a map, drawing or chart, etc., is part of the material being photographed the photographer has followed a definite method in "sectioning" the material. It is customary to begin filming at the upper left hand corner of a large sheet and to continue from left to right in equal sections with small overlaps. If necessary, sectioning is continued again—beginning below the first row and continuing on until complete.
4. For any illustrations that cannot be reproduced satisfactorily by xerography, photographic prints can be purchased at additional cost and tipped into your xerographic copy. Requests can be made to our Dissertations Customer Services Department.
5. Some pages in any document may have indistinct print. In all cases we have filmed the best available copy.

University
Microfilms
International

300 N. ZEEB ROAD, ANN ARBOR, MI 48106
18 BEDFORD ROW, LONDON WC1R 4EJ, ENGLAND

7922417

OAKLEY, JESSE RONALD
THE ORIGINS AND DEVELOPMENT OF THE PUBLIC
JUNIOR COLLEGE MOVEMENT, 1850-1921.

THE UNIVERSITY OF NORTH CAROLINA AT
GREENSBORO, ED.D., 1979

COPR. 1979 OAKLEY, JESSE RONALD
University
Microfilms
International 300 N. ZEEB ROAD, ANN ARBOR, MI 48106

© 1979

JESSE RONALD OAKLEY

ALL RIGHTS RESERVED

THE ORIGINS AND DEVELOPMENT OF THE PUBLIC
JUNIOR COLLEGE MOVEMENT, 1850-1921

by

Jesse Ronald Oakley

A Dissertation Submitted to
the Faculty of the Graduate School at
The University of North Carolina at Greensboro
in Partial Fulfillment
of the Requirements for the Degree
Doctor of Education

Greensboro
1979

Approved by



Dissertation Adviser

APPROVAL PAGE

This dissertation has been approved by the following committee of the Faculty of the Graduate School at the University of North Carolina at Greensboro.

Dissertation Adviser

C. A. Sharma

Committee Members

Richard H. Wells
R. L. Mays
Donald W. Russell
Converse D. Clouse

November 7, 1978
Date of Acceptance by Committee

November 7, 1978
Date of Final Oral Examination

Oakley, Jesse Ronald. *The Origins and Development of the Public Junior College Movement, 1850-1921.* (1979)
Directed by: Dr. Chiranji Lal Sharma. Pp. 229

The purpose of this study was to investigate the origins and development of the public junior college movement from about 1850 until 1921. This study examined the socio-economic background of the movement, the major trends in education between 1850 and 1921, the ideas and activities of the outstanding leaders of the movement, and the salient characteristics of the public junior colleges operating at the time of the founding of the American Association of Junior Colleges in 1920-1921. Particular emphasis was given to Henry P. Tappan, William Watts Folwell, William Rainey Harper, David Starr Jordan, and Alexis F. Lange, the major junior college pioneers during this period, and to the development of the junior college movement in the Midwest and California, where the movement was centered.

This study used the historical method of investigation. It was based on primary and secondary sources, using the former whenever possible. Employing external and internal criticisms to determine the authenticity and value of the sources, this study attempted to present the research data in a narrative, interpretative, and documented form.

This study found that the junior college movement originated in the second half of the nineteenth century in the minds and activities of Tappan, Folwell, Harper, and other university leaders who wanted to transplant the German educational system to America. These reformers wanted to relegate to the high school the task of teaching college freshmen and sophomores so that the university could concentrate on

advanced undergraduate work, graduate studies, and research. Tappan and Folwell did not establish any junior colleges, but they helped to spread the junior college idea. Harper, the first president of the University of Chicago and the initiator of the junior college movement, contributed to the movement by establishing a junior college division of the University of Chicago, introducing the associate's degree to junior college education, helping to establish several junior colleges, and spreading the junior college philosophy nationwide. After his death the junior college movement shifted to California, where Jordan, Lange, sympathetic state legislators, and other professional and lay leaders helped to establish the junior college as an integral part of the California public school system and made California the leading junior college state in 1921. By that date the junior college movement had also spread to most other states in the union.

An examination of the junior college movement in 1921 revealed that in that year there were 70 public junior colleges, concentrated primarily in the Midwest and California, and 137 private ones, scattered all over the nation but centered in the Midwest and the South. These 207 public and private institutions had a total enrollment of 16,121, with slightly over half of the students attending the public institutions. The typical public junior college in 1921 had been established as part of a six-year high school, was governed by the local school board, and shared the parent institution's administration, faculty, classrooms, and office space. Most junior colleges emphasized a liberal arts curriculum which could be transferred to senior institutions and applied toward a baccalaureate degree, though some schools were

beginning to offer a few courses of a terminal technical and vocational nature. Public junior colleges suffered from many problems, particularly poorly-trained faculty and inadequate physical facilities, but they also offered to students in the community an inexpensive two-year college education which prepared them to transfer to senior institutions to complete their college degrees. The public junior college was a young educational innovation in 1921, with its greatest growth and accomplishments still lying in the future, but it had already established itself as a valuable, unique, and permanent part of the American system of higher education.

TABLE OF CONTENTS

	Page
APPROVAL PAGE.	ii
LIST OF TABLES	vi
CHAPTER	
I. INTRODUCTION	1
Statement of the Problem.	3
Methods and Procedures of Research.	5
Sources Used in This Study.	6
Significance of This Study.	10
Limitations of This Study	11
Definitions of Terms.	12
II. THE SOCIAL, ECONOMIC, AND EDUCATIONAL BACKGROUND, 1850-1890.	14
The Social and Economic Revolution.	15
Public School Developments.	18
Developments and Reforms Within Higher Education. . .	21
Henry P. Tappan	37
William Watts Folwell	46
Richard Jesse and Edmund James.	53
The Influence of Tappan, Folwell, Jesse, and James. .	55
Conclusion.	56
III. WILLIAM RAINEY HARPER AND THE BEGINNING OF THE JUNIOR COLLEGE IN THE MIDWEST, 1891-1906	58
Harper's Life, Educational Philosophy, and Early Career.	58
Harper's Chicago Presidency, 1891-1906.	63

	Page
The University of Chicago Junior College.	67
Harper and the Six-Year High School Movement.	74
Conversion of Small Senior Colleges to Junior Colleges.	99
The Lewis Institute and the Bradley Polytechnical Institute	105
Conclusion.	106
IV. JORDAN, LANGE, AND THE PUBLIC JUNIOR COLLEGE MOVEMENT IN CALIFORNIA, 1907-1921	108
The Geographical, Economic, Political, and Educational Conditions.	109
David Starr Jordan: Friend of the Junior College . .	112
Alexis F. Lange: Spokesman for the Junior College. .	126
The Development of California Junior Colleges, 1907-1917	137
The Junior College Laws of 1917 and 1921.	146
Conclusion.	150
V. OTHER JUNIOR COLLEGE DEVELOPMENTS.	152
The Development of Public Junior Colleges	152
The Development of Private Junior Colleges.	160
The Founding of the American Association of Junior Colleges.	172
Conclusion.	174
VI. THE PUBLIC JUNIOR COLLEGE IN 1921: A SUMMARY OF ITS PROGRESS AND SALIENT CHARACTERISTICS	176
A Summary of Junior College Development, 1850-1921. .	176
Reasons for Establishing Public Junior Colleges . . .	179
Growth and Distribution of Junior Colleges.	182

	Page
Types and Sizes of Junior Colleges	184
Purposes of the Junior Colleges	186
Advantages of Junior Colleges	188
Administration and Faculty.	190
Junior College Students	194
The Junior College Curriculum	197
Junior College Degrees.	200
Accreditation	201
Relationships Between Junior Colleges and Senior Institutions.	204
Problems, Weaknesses, and Criticisms of the Junior College	207
Summary and Conclusion.	212
BIBLIOGRAPHY	214

LIST OF TABLES

	Page
1. Years of Establishment of Junior Colleges in Operation During 1921-22 or 1922-23.	183
2. Distribution of Junior Colleges by Numbers of Students Enrolled During 1921-22 and Averages, Medians, and Quartiles of the Enrollments	185

CHAPTER I

INTRODUCTION

The junior college system has been one of the most rapidly growing and innovative segments of American higher education in the twentieth century. Although the first junior colleges were not established until the late nineteenth century, their number had grown to 207 in 1921, 575 in 1939, 667 in 1958, and over 1200 in the mid-1970s. By the fall of 1976, enrollment in junior colleges had risen to 4,086,000, which was 36 percent of the total postsecondary enrollment of 11,337,000.¹

In spite of its phenomenal growth and influence, the junior college movement has not attracted the attention it deserves from educational historians. Perhaps this is partly due to the junior college's vague position in the American educational hierarchy, where it is regarded by many observers and state legislators to be situated somewhere between the high schools and the state college and university system. It is possible that this uncertain categorization of the junior college system has led to its neglect by the historians who concentrate on the public school system and by those whose interests have been focused on the traditional areas of higher education, the senior colleges and universities. Another possible cause of the

¹Sandra Drake, "Emphasis," Community and Junior College Journal 47 (February 1977): 4.

neglect of junior college history is the increasing tendency of twentieth-century educational scholars to concentrate on empirical research, in which the scientific method can be applied with greater precision and practicality than it can be in historical research. Whatever the reasons, the history of junior college education has been neglected far too long.

Most students of the junior college movement agree that its history can be divided into three distinct periods. The first period, from 1850 to 1921, saw the beginning of the junior college idea and the establishment of 207 institutions offering two years of traditional college work which could be transferred to senior colleges and universities. This period ended with the founding of the American Association of Junior Colleges in 1920-1921. The second period, from 1921 until 1945, was characterized by the expansion of the junior college philosophy and program to include terminal occupational programs designed to prepare students to enter the job market rather than to transfer to other institutions to complete the baccalaureate degree. The third and present period of the junior college movement began after World War II and has witnessed the transformation of junior colleges into comprehensive community colleges offering college transfer work, occupational education, a variety of adult education programs, and a wide range of community services. The third period has understandably attracted the most attention of educational scholars, while the earlier two periods, and especially the first one, have been neglected. This historical study of the first period will attempt to help remedy this imbalance.

A careful examination of the literature of the early history of the junior college movement has revealed the need for a systematic study and the existence of the research materials necessary for conducting it. No full-length history of the junior college movement has yet appeared and most of the recent studies of the movement concentrate on the era since 1945, providing little information on the two earlier periods. The major secondary sources of information on the first period of the junior college movement are the brief historical surveys provided in the introductory chapters of textbooks and other general works on the community college. Most of these surveys provide only sketchy interpretations, not extensive detailed information, and are usually based almost entirely on secondary sources. The best study, Walter C. Eells' The Junior College,² was written almost fifty years ago and is now outdated. Most of the journal articles on the early history of the junior college movement appeared between 1910 and 1950 and also suffer from the passage of time. These shortcomings in the literature of the early history of the junior college movement persist in spite of the rich veins of primary and secondary sources available to serious students of this area of educational history.

Statement of the Problem

The purpose of this study is to investigate the origins and development of the public junior college movement between 1850 and 1921. This study will involve an examination of the following historical factors and developments:

²Boston: Houghton-Mifflin, 1931.

1. The socio-economic trends in the United States between 1850 and 1921. The junior college movement in the United States appeared during a time of great political, social, and economic change. A brief analysis of these changes is essential to the understanding of educational developments during this period.
2. The major trends in education between 1850 and 1921. The junior college movement was the product of dramatic changes in American secondary and higher education and must be studied in this broad educational context, not as an isolated educational development.
3. The educational ideas, ideals, and practices of major university leaders and thinkers connected with the junior college movement in the period from 1850 to 1890. Henry P. Tappan, W. W. Folwell, and several other university leaders were major pioneers in the development of the junior college philosophy which was later first put into practice by William Rainey Harper of the University of Chicago.
4. The ideas and practices of William Rainey Harper. The first president of the University of Chicago and a major educational reformer, Harper is generally considered to be the father of the junior college movement. He is so important that an entire chapter will be devoted to his influence on the junior college movement in the Midwest and other parts of the nation.
5. The origins and growth of the junior college movement in California. After Harper's death in 1906, the junior college movement was centered in California, where it was dominated by high school administrators and by two university leaders, David Starr Jordan and Alexis F. Lange.
6. The development of junior colleges in other states. A large number of public and private junior colleges developed outside of Illinois and California.
7. The salient characteristics of the public junior colleges operating at the time of the founding of the American Association of Junior Colleges in 1921. Although there were many differences in the origins and nature of the seventy public junior colleges in existence in 1921, it is possible to identify some common characteristics in the areas of curriculum, finance, administration, educational objectives, student profiles, faculty profiles, and relationships with senior colleges and universities. It is these common characteristics which gave the junior college a unique place in American education in 1921. An examination of these characteristics helps to explain why junior colleges came into existence and why they spread so rapidly.

Methods and Procedures of Research

The historical method is the type of educational research employed in this study of the origins and development of the public junior college movement. Like other social scientists, historians use the scientific method, but the subject matter, nature of the data used, and imprecise tools of the educational historian combine to make historical research different in many respects from the research conducted by most kinds of educational scholars. As Philip Perdew,³ Carter V. Good,⁴ and other scholars have shown, educational history has a distinct scientific methodology which must be rigorously followed if good research is to be produced. In this study the researcher has attempted to follow the generally accepted criteria for good historical research.

This investigation of the early history of the public junior college movement utilized the following methods and procedures:

1. An extensive bibliographical search of the available and relevant primary and secondary sources.
2. Collection of data from the primary and secondary sources, using primary sources whenever possible.
3. Use of external criticism to determine the authenticity of the primary and secondary sources.
4. Use of internal criticism to evaluate the accuracy and value of the authors' statements.
5. Formulation of generalizations to explain the relationships among facts and the possible conclusions to be drawn from the factual evidence.

³"Criteria of Research in Educational History," Journal of Education Research 44 (November 1950): 217-233.

⁴Essentials of Educational Research: Methodology and Design, 2d ed. (New York: Appleton-Century-Crofts, 1972), pp. 148-198.

6. Presentation of the research data in a narrative, interpretative, and documented form in order to describe and explain the origins and development of the junior college movement between 1850 and 1921.
7. Presentation of summary and conclusions.
8. Presentation of an exhaustive bibliography for use by other scholars working in the same area who might wish to verify or replicate all, or parts of, this study.

Sources Used In This Study

In preparing this study of the junior college movement the researcher attempted to locate and examine as many as possible of the relevant primary and secondary sources. A thorough bibliographic search was carried out by using the many computerized and non-computerized services of the Educational Resources Information Center (ERIC), the computerized dissertation search services of Xerox University Microfilms, Emory W. Rarig's The Community-Junior College: An Annotated Bibliography,⁵ Walter C. Eells' Bibliography on Junior Colleges,⁶ Education Index,⁷ and other bibliographical aids. The numerous secondary sources consulted early in the research process also contained helpful bibliographies and fruitful leads to other primary and secondary materials. In obtaining access to these many and varied sources, the author made frequent use of the nationwide interlibrary loan system and the huge and relatively inexpensive collection of published and

⁵New York: Columbia University Teachers College Press, 1966.

⁶U. S., Bureau of Education, Bulletin, 1930, No. 2 (Washington: U. S. Government Printing Office, 1930).

⁷New York: H. W. Wilson, 1929 to date.

unpublished materials available on microfilm and microfiche from the Educational Resources Information Center.

Useful perspectives on the place of the junior college movement in the whole scheme of higher education in the United States was obtained from several secondary works on higher education. Especially helpful was John S. Burbacher and Willis Rudy's Higher Education in Transition: A History of American Colleges and Universities, 1636-1968.⁸ In this scholarly and well-written work, the junior college movement is portrayed as part of a larger reform movement within higher education in the late nineteenth and early twentieth centuries. Among the many other helpful studies on higher education were Laurence R. Veysey's The Emergence of the American University,⁹ Frederick Rudolph's The American College and University: A History,¹⁰ and several histories of individual colleges and universities.

The most useful general survey of junior college history was contained in The Junior College, a monumental work completed in 1931 by Walter C. Eells, long-time professor of education at Stanford University and the first editor of the Junior College Journal. In this comprehensive survey of virtually all aspects of the junior college system, Eells devotes three brief chapters to a broad history of the movement. Eells' well-documented and imaginative study is a pioneer work which should be consulted by all students of the junior college movement, but its age

⁸Revised edition. New York: Harper and Row, 1968.

⁹Chicago: University of Chicago Press, 1965.

¹⁰New York: Random House, 1962.

and heavy reliance on secondary materials reduces its usefulness. Of the many recent and general works containing historical information on the junior college movement, those by Tyrus Hillway,¹¹ Ralph R. Fields,¹² Michael Brick,¹³ James W. Thornton,¹⁴ and L. Steven Zwerlig¹⁵ proved to be the most helpful in conducting this study.

This study relied heavily on the writings of the major leaders of the junior college movement, particularly those of Henry P. Tappan, William Watts Folwell, William Rainey Harper, David Starr Jordan, and Alexis F. Lange. All of these men were prolific writers and speech-makers who often expressed their educational philosophy in books and in articles and speeches published in professional and popular journals of the time. In attempting to gain insight into the motives and actions of these men, the author also consulted many biographical and analytical studies. The most useful study of Tappan was Charles M. Perry's Henry Philip Tappan: Philosopher and University President.¹⁶ One of the earliest interpretations of Harper's life and career was provided by

¹¹The American Two-Year College (New York: Harper & Brothers, 1958).

¹²The Community College Movement (New York: McGraw-Hill, 1962).

¹³Forum and Focus for the Junior College Movement (New York: Columbia University Teachers College, 1964).

¹⁴The Community Junior College 2d ed. (New York: John Wiley & Sons, 1966).

¹⁵Second Best: The Crisis of the Community College (New York: McGraw-Hill, 1976).

¹⁶New York: Arno Press and the New York Times, 1971. Reprint of 1933 edition.

Thomas Wakefield Goodspeed, a prominent theologian, colleague, and friend of Harper at the University of Chicago. Goodspeed's two histories¹⁷ of the University and biography¹⁸ of Harper furnished valuable information in spite of their uncritical approach to the subject. Goodspeed's works were well-supplemented and corrected by Richard J. Storr's more recent and more scholarly history of the University of Chicago, Harper's University: The Beginnings.¹⁹ Edward Mcnall Burns' David Starr Jordan: Prophet of Freedom,²⁰ and Luther William Spoehr's "Progress' Pilgrim: David Starr Jordan and the Circle of Reform, 1891-1931,"²¹ provided valuable interpretations of Jordan's career. Unfortunately, no full-length studies of the careers of Folwell and Lange have yet appeared.

A rich source of information for this study was comprised of the hundreds of articles on junior colleges which appeared in educational journals in the late nineteenth and early twentieth centuries. These contemporary accounts provided invaluable information on the history of individual junior colleges and on the views and activities of the leading junior college spokesmen of the time. One of the most important journals was The School Review, founded by the University of Chicago in

¹⁷A History of the University of Chicago: The First Quarter-Century (Chicago: University of Chicago Press, 1916); The Story of the University of Chicago, 1890-1925 (Chicago: University of Chicago Press, 1925).

¹⁸William Rainey Harper: First President of the University of Chicago (Chicago: University of Chicago Press, 1928).

¹⁹Chicago: University of Chicago Press, 1966.

²⁰Stanford: Stanford University Press, 1953.

²¹Ph.D. dissertation, Stanford University, 1975.

1893. William Rainey Harper, the President of the University, regularly used this journal as a forum for the propagation of his views on junior colleges and for the airing of his critics' arguments.

Two other types of primary sources were heavily drawn upon in this study. One type was the numerous Bulletins published by the United States Bureau of Education throughout the period examined in this investigation of the junior college movement. Published several times each year, these Bulletins contained articles and speeches written by educators at all levels, verbatim minutes of educational meetings, detailed studies on all facets of American education, educational statistics compiled at regular intervals by the bureau, and many other types of published and unpublished materials which were often difficult or impossible to find in any other contemporary source. The other major type of primary source was the proceedings, reports, and other records of the National Education Association and several regional accreditation associations. In spite of their poor indices, these publications provided a continuing account of some of the major educational issues of the day.

In all, several hundred different sources were consulted in conducting this study of the junior college movement. A complete list of these works is contained in the bibliography at the end of this dissertation.

Significance of This Study

The completion of a full history of the junior college movement would require years of research and writing. The study undertaken here

is a much less ambitious effort aimed at laying the foundation for such a massive study by providing a history of the junior college movement during its earliest, and least researched, period. It is hoped that in addition to filling a gap in educational history, this study will achieve the aim of all good educational histories: to provide the historical perspective necessary for understanding the ideas, practices, and problems of the present and to anticipate and plan for the needs and problems of the future.

Limitations of This Study

This study suffers from the limitations inherent in all historical research, which is perhaps the most subjective and difficult of all forms of educational research. One obvious limitation is that in spite of a reasonable effort to locate and examine all primary and secondary sources relevant to this inquiry, the researcher has not attempted to achieve the impossible task of examining every single source on the history of the junior college movement from its beginning until 1921. Another limitation is the obvious impossibility of eliminating the personal biases that inevitably creep into all studies of human behavior. No researcher can completely transcend his natural subjectivity when he studies other human beings, and this researcher cannot claim that he has succeeded in this impossible task. Recognizing these limitations, the researcher has made a scrupulous effort in this study to restrain his conscious biases and to adhere to the rigorous techniques and objective spirit of the scientific method.

Definition of Terms

The literature of educational history does not possess a large technical vocabulary. However, since the nomenclature of two-year institutions of higher education has been subjected to considerable change and confusion over the years, it is necessary to define the terms "junior college," "community college," and "college transfer program," as used in the context of this study.

"Junior college" was the term applied to most private and public two-year educational institutions from the late nineteenth century until the 1940s. In this period of the history of the junior and community college movement most junior colleges were liberal arts institutions offering the traditional freshman and sophomore curriculums and courses aimed at preparing students to transfer to senior institutions to complete a baccalaureate degree. In the 1940s, junior colleges began to expand their programs and services and to assume the name "community college" to denote their new comprehensive status.

"Community college" is a term that has been used primarily since World War II to refer to most comprehensive public two-year institutions offering postsecondary programs in college transfer, technical, vocational, and adult education, and providing a full range of educational services to the local community. The rather general and widespread use of the term tends to disguise the diversity existing among the more than 1200 institutions bearing this name in the United States today.

A "college transfer program" (sometimes called "college parallel program") is that part of a junior or community college curriculum which

offers rather traditional freshman and sophomore courses and programs aimed at giving the student the knowledge and credit necessary for transferring to a senior institution to complete the last two years of a baccalaureate program. In the period from 1890 until 1921, this type of program dominated the curriculum of most public and private junior colleges.

CHAPTER II

THE SOCIAL, ECONOMIC, AND EDUCATIONAL BACKGROUND, 1850-1890

The junior college emerged in the second half of the nineteenth century as a by-product of the revolutionary social, economic, and educational developments occurring in that turbulent period of American history. In its early stages the junior college movement had little unity of leadership or purpose, for although the leaders were often in communication with one another they rarely held meetings or conferences and were primarily concerned with reforming the universities and secondary schools rather than founding two-year intermediate institutions. The first junior colleges were in many ways historical accidents, unplanned products of the ideas and efforts of educators who initially had little or no interest in founding two-year colleges. Consequently, the first junior colleges grew up in haphazard fashion as extensions of the high schools, unwanted appendages of the universities, upgraded academies or normal schools, or downgraded four-year colleges. The junior college movement did not acquire a clear philosophy or leader until the 1890s, when William Rainey Harper became president of the University of Chicago and assumed leadership of the movement, and it did not become a national movement with a national organization until the founding of the American Association of Junior Colleges in 1921.

The purpose of this chapter is to analyze the complex origins and development of the junior college movement during its seminal period, from around the middle of the nineteenth century until the emergence of

William Rainey Harper's leadership in the 1890s. This analysis will necessarily begin with an examination of the economic revolution which transformed almost all aspects of American life, including education. This investigation of changing social and economic conditions will be followed by a brief description of the growth of the public school system, concentrating on the expansion of the secondary education and its influence on the development of the first junior colleges. The largest portion of this chapter will be devoted to the revolutionary changes occurring in higher education: the dramatic increases in the number of students and institutions, the growth of state universities, the founding of new private institutions, the introduction of the elective system, the attempts to shorten the baccalaureate from four years to three, and the introduction of major features of the German educational system. Particular attention will be paid to Henry P. Tappan and William Watts Folwell, two influential educators who contributed to the birth of the junior college movement through their attempts to reform the American university along German lines by relegating its freshman and sophomore years to the small colleges or the high schools.

The Social and Economic Revolution

The junior college movement began in the second half of the nineteenth century, one of the most dynamic periods of change in American history. In this half-century Americans fought a destructive and revolutionary civil war which preserved the union, killed over 600,000 people, freed almost four million Negro slaves, destroyed the political and economic power of the South until well into the twentieth century,

and stimulated the growth of industry in the Northeast and West. In this turbulent period white Americans completed the conquest of the West, pushing aside the Indian inhabitants and sending miners, farmers, cattlemen, lumbermen, railroad magnates, and other entrepreneurs to exploit the rich natural resources of the area. Millions of settlers poured into the West during this time, and the centers of population, political power, urban growth, and reform continued to shift from the Northeast to the rapidly growing West.

Perhaps the single most important historical development in this period was the economic revolution which transformed so many aspects of American life. At the middle of the century the United States was still basically a rural and agrarian nation which ranked far below the major European states in industrial and technological progress. However, from the outbreak of the Civil War until the close of the century the United States underwent a far-reaching economic revolution which changed the young country from an agrarian nation to a modern industrial one threatening to challenge Europe's industrial dominance. Between 1860 and 1900 industrial production increased by 1900 percent, the proportion of workers in non-agrarian pursuits rose from 41 percent to over 63 percent, the value of manufactured products grew from \$860 million to over \$6 billion, and exports of industrial products increased from \$316 million to over \$1.3 billion. Three important measures of industrial growth also saw fantastic increases: annual crude petroleum production rose from 500,000 barrels to over 63.5 million barrels, iron ore production jumped from 2.9 million tons to 27.3 million tons, and bituminous coal production advanced from nine million tons to over 213

million tons.¹ By the turn of the century the United States had become a great industrial power, ranking at or near the top in most criteria of industrial growth.

The rapid industrial growth caused dramatic changes in the population profile. In 1860 only 20 percent of Americans lived in towns and cities of 2,500 or more inhabitants, but over the next 40 years the movement of natives and immigrants to the industrial jobs of the cities had raised the urban proportion to slightly over 40 percent of the total population.² The population itself had grown rapidly, from 32 million in 1860 to over 76 million in 1900.³ Much of this increase came from the huge influx of immigrants who poured into the United States from the end of the Civil War until the outbreak of World War I. Between 1860 and 1900 the lure of a new start in a rich nation drew 14 million immigrants, and another 11 million arrived in the peak period from 1900 to 1914.⁴ Most of these new Americans settled in the cities of the Northeast and Midwest, providing cheap labor for the industrial owners and making the United States a richer, more cosmopolitan nation.

¹Donald B. Cole, Handbook of American History (New York: Harcourt, Brace, and World, 1968), p. 152. For a good brief survey of America's economic revolution, see John A. Garraty, The New Commonwealth, 1877-1890, New American Nation Series (New York: Harper & Row, 1968), pp. 78-127.

²Cole, Handbook of American History, p. 152.

³U. S., Bureau of the Census, Historical Statistics of the United States, Colonial Times to 1970, 2 vols. (Washington: U. S. Government Printing Office, 1975), 1:8.

⁴Richard B. Morris, ed., Encyclopedia of American History: Bicentennial Edition (New York: Harper & Row, 1976), p. 654.

These dramatic economic changes had a great impact on American educational philosophy and institutions in the latter half of the nineteenth century. The economic revolution gave new force to the American dream of equal opportunity and upward mobility, and more and more Americans would look to the schools to help them realize these goals. The great wealth produced by the industrial growth provided a continuously increasing public and private source of financial support for all levels of education. Elementary and secondary education now had a larger and more reliable tax base from which to draw funds, and in higher education the new wealth helped to establish and maintain new public colleges and universities as well as private ones founded by such rich industrialists and businessmen as John D. Rockefeller, Johns Hopkins, Leland Stanford, Ezra Cornell and Jonas Clark. The new industrial-technological order also brought increasing demand for literate and skilled workers and informed citizens, while the tremendous influx of immigrants brought new pressures on the schools to help in the process of Americanizing and assimilating the new citizens. The rapid growth of population and cities in the West increased that region's importance and influence in the nation, and in the late nineteenth and early twentieth centuries it became the source of many reforms and innovations in American education, including the development of the junior college movement.

Public School Developments

One of the major developments in American education in the second half of the nineteenth century was the dramatic growth of the free public school system. Free public education in the United States has a

long history stretching back into the early colonial period. The beginnings came in 1647 when the Massachusetts Bay Colony passed legislation requiring every township of fifty or more families to set up a reading school and every township of one hundred or more families to establish a grammar school to prepare young boys to enter Harvard College. From that early period on to the outbreak of the Civil War, all Northern states gradually moved to establish tax-supported elementary schools. In the South there was little progress in the development of public education at any level until after the Civil War.⁵

In the nineteenth century New England also led the way in the establishment of free public high schools, with Boston founding the first one in 1821. It was not until after the Civil War, however, that the free public high school concept became a serious movement in the United States and public high schools began to supplant the old Latin grammar schools and academies.⁶ The development of the high school was given a major stimulus by the United States Supreme Court in 1874, when in the famous Kalamazoo case the court upheld the right of communities to support high schools by public taxation. In addition to paving the way for the growth of the high school, this case indirectly contributed to the growth of the junior colleges which began as extensions of public schools.⁷

⁵H. G. Good, A History of American Education, 2d. ed. (New York: Macmillan Co., 1962), p. 41.

⁶Ibid., pp. 239-243.

⁷Charles R. Monroe, Profile of the Community College (San Francisco: Jossey-Bass, 1972), p. 5.

The number of high schools and high school students grew dramatically in the latter half of the nineteenth century. In 1870, before the Kalamazoo case, there were 1,026 public high schools enrolling 72,158 pupils, but by 1900 the number of public high schools had grown to 6,005 and the number of students to 519,251.⁸ Universal secondary education was still far off, however, for in 1890 only 7 percent of people of high school age were attending high schools.⁹ Nevertheless, the democratization of education at the secondary level was progressing rapidly. Each year more and more students graduated from high school to take their place in society or to continue their education at a higher level. The resulting increased demand for higher education led to overcrowded conditions at many colleges and universities, prompting many university and secondary education leaders to look to the establishment of junior colleges as a way of reducing enrollment pressures at the universities while expanding the opportunity of at least two years of higher education. In some of the high schools themselves, administrators in the late nineteenth and early twentieth centuries began to add one or two years of college-level courses. Many junior colleges began as the thirteenth and fourteenth grades of the public school system.

The growth of the public school system at all levels naturally contributed to the secularization of American education. The

⁸U. S., Bureau of the Census, Historical Statistics of the United States, 1:369; John S. Brubacher and Willis Rudy, Higher Education in Transition: A History of American Colleges and Universities, 1636-1968, rev. ed. (New York: Harper & Row, 1968), p. 161.

⁹B. Lamor Johnson, "Junior College Trends," School Review 52 (December 1944): 606.

secularization process at the elementary level had started before the Civil War, but it accelerated at all levels in the last half of the nineteenth century and early years of the twentieth. From 1890 to 1915 the enrollment in public elementary schools increased from 12.5 million to 19 million and the enrollment in public secondary schools increased from 211,000 to 1.2 million. In this same period the enrollment of private elementary schools decreased from 1,662,000 to less than 1,500,000, while enrollment in private secondary schools increased only from 98,000 to 150,000. Whereas in 1890 one-third of all secondary school students were in private schools, that proportion had declined by 1915 to one-ninth.¹⁰

Developments and Reforms Within Higher Education

The economic and technological changes occurring in American society in the last half of the nineteenth century had a tremendous impact on higher education. Beginning with the establishment in 1636 of Harvard, the first college in the English colonies, American colleges had been modeled after Oxford and Cambridge. Of the nine colleges established in the colonial period, eight were sectarian institutions with narrow classical curriculums: Latin and Greek languages, rhetoric, mathematics, philosophy, theology, ancient history, political economy, literature, and a sprinkling of science. Many of these subjects--such

¹⁰U. S., Bureau of the Census, Historical Statistics of the United States, 1:368-369; I.I. Cammack, "The Legitimate Range of Activity of the Junior College in the Public School System," Addresses and Proceedings of the National Education Association 55 (1917): 724-725.

as arithmetic and grammar--really belonged to the elementary and secondary schools. The primary purpose of these colleges was to train young men for the ministry and for other positions of leadership in society. As late as the middle of the nineteenth century, American higher education was still dominated by this elitist and classical concept of education imported by the English colonists in the seventeenth century. In 1860, there were 246 institutions of higher learning, and all but 17 were private institutions. Most had fewer than 200 students and a dozen faculty members. Williams College, for example, had 208 students and 9 faculty members, including President Mark Hopkins, in 1851.¹¹ In 1857, the fall semester opened with 449 students at Yale, 236 at Princeton, 274 at Indiana University, 207 at Brown, 221 at Amherst, 249 at Dartmouth, 150 at Emory, and 106 at Rutgers.¹² Except for Harvard, Yale, Pennsylvania, Columbia, and Virginia, most of the colleges existing in 1860 were second-rate institutions belonging more to the category of secondary education than to the realm of higher education.¹³

After the middle of the century, however, American higher education underwent rapid, dramatic changes which transformed a relatively homogeneous system of education into one of the most diverse ones in the

¹¹Leonard V. Koos, "Rise of the People's College," School Review 55 (March, 1947): 139-140.

¹²Edgar B. Wesley, The NEA: The First Hundred Years (New York: Harper & Brothers, 1957), pp. 13-14.

¹³Allan Crawford, "A Short History of the Public Community Junior College Movement in the United States," Paedagogica Historica 10 (1970): 31-32.

world. By the end of the century, American higher education included four-year liberal arts colleges, public and private universities, graduate institutions, women's colleges, teacher's colleges, two-year normal schools, Black colleges, professional and technical schools, and private and public two-year colleges. At all levels within higher education reformers were promoting and achieving widespread reforms, even in the old four-year liberal arts colleges. Since the junior college was a product of this era of educational reform, these developments in higher education must be examined in some detail before the roots of the junior college can be adequately explained.

One of the most significant developments in higher education was the dramatic increase in the number of colleges, student enrollment and faculty members caused by the rapid population growth, growing wealth, and expanding educational opportunities. The number of institutions of higher education increased from 563 in 1870 to 977 in 1900 and 1,041 in 1920.¹⁴ In 1870 there were 52,286 college students, comprising about 1.7 percent of the 18-21 age group. By 1900, however, enrollment had increased to 237,592, almost 4 percent of the 18-21 age group, and by 1920 enrollment had gone up to 597,880, almost 8 percent of this same age group. The number of fulltime faculty members

¹⁴U. S., Bureau of the Census, Historical Statistics of the United States, 1:383. These figures include all kinds of postsecondary institutions, many of which were of questionable status as institutions of higher education.

increased from 5,553 in 1870 to 23,868 in 1900 and 48,615 in 1920.¹⁵

Clearly, the American democratization process was rapidly expanding to embrace the once elite area of higher education.

The character of American higher education was greatly changed after the Civil War by the rapid growth of state universities. The first state universities had appeared shortly after the end of the Revolutionary War. Although the legislatures in several states had chartered public-supported universities in the 1780s, the first university to open its doors to students was the University of North Carolina, chartered in 1789 and put into operation in 1795. In these early years of the American republic the federal government attempted to encourage the establishment of public universities by requiring territories applying for statehood to set aside two or more tracts of land to be used for public universities before the territory could be admitted to the union. In spite of this regulation and later federal and state attempts to promote public education, only seventeen state universities were included among the 246 institutions of higher learning existing at the outbreak of the Civil War.¹⁶

After 1860, several socio-economic factors combined to cause a dramatic growth in the number of state-supported colleges and universities and the number of students attending them. One basic factor was

¹⁵L. Steven Zwerlig, Second Best: The Crisis of the Community College (New York: McGraw-Hill, 1976), pp. 42-43; Henry C. Badger, "Higher Education Statistics: 1870 to 1953," Higher Education II (September 1954): 12.

¹⁶Crawford, "A Short History of the Public Community Junior College Movement," pp. 31-32.

the industrialization and specialization of the American economy, creating increased demand for high-level technical and vocational training which the tradition-bound private colleges and universities could not or would not provide. Equally important was the continuing growth of democratic ideas and institutions, especially in the West, as educators, politicians, and private citizens increasingly sought to democratize higher education and to destroy the old idea that higher education should be reserved for the economic and intellectual elite.¹⁷ Another important factor was the growing number of high school graduates whose varied educational needs and growing numbers could not be adequately handled by the private colleges and universities. The secularization of society was also contributing to growing dissatisfaction with the type of education and environment provided by the private denominational colleges and universities. Finally, and very importantly, the growth of public colleges and universities was promoted by Congress in the Morrill Act of 1862, which granted the states public lands which were to be sold to raise funds for the establishment of colleges aimed at providing training in agriculture and the mechanical arts to young men and women. This important federal aid to state universities, renewed and expanded by the second Morrill Act of 1890, created the land grant colleges and universities, which were destined to play such an influential role in

¹⁷Merle Curti and Vernon Cartensen, The University of Wisconsin: A History, 1848-1925, 2 vols. (Madison: University of Wisconsin Press, 1949), 1:22; Brubacher and Rudy, Higher Education in the United States, pp. 159-161.

American higher education.¹⁸ Eventually, some sixty-nine land grant universities were established in the United States.

In the latter third of the nineteenth century the state universities grew the fastest in the Midwest, especially in Michigan, Minnesota, and Wisconsin, but they helped to revolutionize higher education in all regions of the nation. The establishment of public colleges and universities contributed to the democratization of American higher education by making it more readily accessible--geographically, financially, and intellectually--to more students. After over two centuries of catering to the elite, American higher education now began to respond to the needs of the masses. By introducing practical and vocational subjects at the collegiate level, these new colleges and universities also broke the educational monopoly of the old liberal arts philosophy and institutions and spread the idea that colleges and universities should teach the practical arts and sciences as well as the liberal arts. Very importantly, the state colleges and universities were both propagators and beneficiaries of the growing idea that governments are obligated to provide high level educational training to meet the needs of individuals and of society itself. Finally, the establishment and success of state colleges and universities contributed to the secularization of education

¹⁸Richard Hofstadter and C. Dewitt Hardy, The Development and Scope of Higher Education in the United States (New York: Columbia University Press, 1952), pp. 39-40; Earl V. Pullias, "The Land Grant Concept and the Community College Philosophy," Community College Review (June 1975): 46-47.

and of society and pressured the competing private schools to examine their structures and purposes and to make reforms of their own.¹⁹

Another major development in higher education in the late nineteenth century was the establishment of new private universities by some of the incredibly wealthy industrialists and businessmen created by the economic revolution. Few of these educational philanthropists had college educations themselves, but their beliefs in the value of hard work, self-help, and education led them to establish universities where young men would be given a chance to help themselves. Some of these benefactors were undoubtedly motivated by the desire to add to their fame or to perpetuate the family name. Johns Hopkins and Paul Tulane never married, Jonas Clark and his wife had no children, and the only child of the Leland Stanfords died in a tragic accident at the age of sixteen. For these individuals, the establishment of a university, a hospital, or some other charitable institution was one way of insuring the survival of the family name.²⁰ Whatever the reason, philanthropists poured money into the establishment of new wealthy institutions which continue to bear their names today: Tulane, Johns Hopkins, Clark, Cornell, Vanderbilt, Stanford, and others. The amount of their grants was truly outstanding by nineteenth century standards. Ezra Cornell gave \$500,000, Hopkins \$3.5 million, Cornelius Vanderbilt \$1 million, and

¹⁹ Curti and Cartensen, University of Wisconsin, 1:3-4; Campbell Stewart, "The Place of Higher Education in a Changing Society," in Nevitt Sanford, ed., The American College: A Psychological and Social Interpretation (New York: John Wiley & Sons, 1962), pp. 927-928.

²⁰ Merle Curti and Roderick Nash, Philanthropy in the Shaping of American Education (New York: Rutgers University Press, 1965), pp. 112-114.

Stanford over \$24 million. Rockefeller gave over \$30 million to the University of Chicago without even requiring that the new institution bear his name. Prior to the Civil War, the single largest gift to any institution was Abbot Lawrence's \$50,000 grant to Harvard.²¹

These new universities quickly assumed positions of leadership in American higher education. As newly-established institutions, they were less bound by tradition than the older private institutions, so from the very beginning they were able to establish undergraduate, graduate, and professional schools more in touch with the ideas and needs of their time. Since their founders and trustees often came from the industrial and business world, these universities often adopted the administrative model of the business world, emphasizing specialization of labor, efficiency, public relations, and fund-raising. Some of the new presidents, such as William Rainey Harper of Chicago and David Starr Jordan of Stanford, often operated like educational entrepreneurs determined to increase the size and influence of their educational corporations. Very importantly, their desire for educational efficiency led several presidents of these new universities to look to the establishment of junior colleges as a means of relieving the university of elementary instruction so that it could concentrate on more advanced and specialized work. As will be shown later, Harper and Jordan were pioneers in the establishment of the junior college system, and one of their main arguments was that junior colleges promoted efficiency in higher education.

²¹Richard Hofstadter and Walter P. Metzger, The Development of Academic Freedom in the United States (New York: Columbia University Press, 1955), p. 413; Hofstadter and Hardy, The Development and Scope of Higher Education in the United States, pp. 32-33.

The introduction of the elective system was one of the major reforms introduced by colleges and universities in the second half of the nineteenth century. From the founding of Harvard in 1636 until the outbreak of the Civil War, the educational curriculum at the great majority of American colleges and universities was rigidly prescribed by college trustees and administrators, allowing the student few if any elective courses. In the second half of the nineteenth century, however, this outmoded approach to education gave way. The leader of this major reform movement was Charles Eliot, president of Harvard for forty years (1869-1909) and a major molders of American educational thought in this period. Maintaining that the individual student was the best judge of the courses he needed to take in order to fulfill his personal and career goals, Eliot abolished all required courses except English composition and allowed Harvard students to choose their courses from a wide variety of subjects. To the traditional liberal arts curriculum Eliot added many courses in modern subjects: natural science, history, psychology, sociology, economics, and modern languages and literature. He also established new graduate and professional departments and upgraded existing ones. These and other reforms initiated by Eliot helped to transform Harvard from a college to a major university and undoubtedly contributed to the dramatic increases in enrollments, which went from 383 students in 1869 to almost 3500 in 1909. Eliot's influence and Harvard's example also helped to lead most other institutions of higher education to adopt similar reforms, resulting in the liberalization,

professionalization, and modernization of higher education in the United States.²²

Eliot was also one of the major leaders in the movement to shorten the time required for the baccalaureate degree from four years to three so that students could begin graduate or professional studies one year earlier than usual. This plan was also supported by Presidents Andrew Dickson White and Charles Kendall Adams at Cornell, President Nicholas Murray Butler of Columbia, and by the presidents of several other major universities. Harvard, Cornell, Clark, and several other institutions experimented with the plan with varying degrees of success, but it did not become a permanent feature of American higher education.²³

The movement to shorten the baccalaureate did, however, indirectly influence the junior college philosophy by propagating the idea that the high school and weak four-year colleges should instruct the student in the basic sophomore and college courses so that he could begin advanced work as soon as he entered the university. President Andrew White, for example, often called upon the weak four-year colleges to abandon the pretense of offering four years of legitimate collegiate work and to concentrate on offering two years of strong high school work and two years of upgraded college work corresponding to the freshman and

²²Hofstadter and Hardy, The Development and Scope of Higher Education in the United States, pp. 32-33; Henry J. Perkinson, Two Hundred Years of American Educational Thought (New York: Donald McKay Co., 1976), pp. 141-145.

²³W. H. Cowley, "A Ninety-Year Old Conflict Erupts Again," Educational Record (April 1942): 195-204.

sophomore curriculums then being offered at most colleges and universities. He felt that the private four-year colleges should be converted into intermediate institutions similar to the German gymnasia, acting as feeders to the major universities.²⁴ White's successor at Cornell, Charles Kendall Adams, advocated that students who completed two years of college at a four-year school be awarded the baccalaureate so that when they entered the university in their junior year they could immediately begin professional or graduate studies.²⁵ At Columbia, President Nicholas Murray Butler attempted in the early twentieth century to establish programs leading to the awarding of the baccalaureate degree in two years and the master's in four, but his plan was defeated by the opposition of the faculty and board of trustees.²⁶ As will be shown later, these unsuccessful ideas and programs of university leaders were adopted in modified form by leaders of the junior college movement.

An important but little-noticed development in higher education in the second half of the nineteenth century was the growth of the idea that the university should be more of a service institution attempting to meet the special needs of the population through its regular curriculum or through special short-term courses offered during the school year or during the summer. This movement into the service area was led by several institutions, most notably the University of Chicago and the University of Wisconsin. In addition to short-term courses and summer

²⁴Brubacher and Rudy, Higher Education in Transition, p. 160.

²⁵Cowley, "Ninety-Year Old Conflict Erupts Again," p. 202.

²⁶Ibid., pp. 202-204.

courses, these universities pioneered in offering extension courses designed to teach special vocational skills and to popularize culture. Between 1891 and 1906, twelve universities began to offer extension programs, and between 1906 and 1913 twenty-eight others joined the field. The most successful of these extension programs was at the University of Wisconsin, which by 1910 was offering extension courses to over 5,000 people.²⁷ The idea and practice of extension work was quickly picked up by the junior colleges which grew up in this period, and since 1945 extension work has been a major component of junior and community college offerings.

Perhaps the most significant of all higher educational developments in the late nineteenth century was the adoption of many features of the German educational system. German influence, and particularly that of the largest German state, Prussia, had gradually crept into American educational practice ever since the colonial period. Benjamin Franklin had communicated with scholars at Halle and Göttingen in the eighteenth century, and an American physician, William Barton, obtained a doctorate in medicine at Göttingen in 1789.²⁸ After the end of the Napoleonic Wars in 1815, American students began to go to Germany to study, and their number increased as the nineteenth century progressed. Between 1815 and 1850, about 200 American students studied at German universities, but the peak period came between 1850 and 1914, when well over 9,000 American students journeyed to Germany in search of

²⁷Brubacher and Rudy, Higher Education in Transition, p. 167.

²⁸Curti and Cartensen, University of Wisconsin, 1:31.

graduate educations.²⁹ The top year was 1895-1896, when 517 American citizens were pursuing advanced work at various German universities. From that point onward, the number of Americans studying in Germany declined, partly because of the growth of American graduate schools and the deteriorating relations between the American and German governments.³⁰

Americans who studied in Germany returned with glowing praises of the German educational system. This was especially true after Germany became a unified state in 1871 and began to rival the older Western European states in the growth of industry, military power, world trade, and the pure and applied sciences. By this time, the German educational system was widely acknowledged in Europe and America as the best in the world. In the United States, American magazines and professional journals were full of articles explaining and extolling the German educational system, while American observers or graduates of that system returned to America determined to reform American education along German lines. Although the United States borrowed many ideas and practices from the German system in the nineteenth century, the kindergarten, gymnasium, normal school, graduate school and technical institute stand out as the most important adoptions.³¹ Since the junior college movement

²⁹Hofstadter and Metzger, Development of Academic Freedom, pp. 367-368.

³⁰Laurence R. Veysey, The Emergence of the American University (Chicago: University of Chicago Press, 1965), pp. 129-131.

³¹Tyrus Hillway, The American Two-Year College (New York: Harper & Brothers, 1958), pp. 33-34.

was most influenced by the normal schools, secondary schools, and universities, this study will concentrate on these three important German institutions.³²

The normal school was one of the first educational ideas imported from Germany, and in the late nineteenth century there was a rapid increase in the number of these institutions established in the United States. Originating in the early part of the century as one or two-year schools established to train teachers, the number of normal schools increased to 75 by 1870, 227 by 1886, and 331 by 1898.³³ These institutions played a major role in the development of both junior and senior colleges, for in the latter part of the nineteenth and early part of the twentieth centuries many normal schools attempted to upgrade their status by converting to junior colleges or to four-year institutions.

In nineteenth-century Germany the upper level of secondary education was dominated by the gymnasium. Like the French lycée and the secondary schools of the other European nations, the gymnasium was essentially the thirteenth and fourteenth grades of the public school system, offering courses roughly corresponding to the freshman and sophomore classes of American colleges and universities. The purpose of the gymnasium was to prepare the student to enter the university at a truly advanced level so that he could immediately launch into specialized work in his chosen field of study. This system of secondary

³²For a good summary of the major features of the German educational system and its influence on American education, see Hofstadter and Metzger, Development of Academic Freedom, pp. 367-412.

³³Wesley, NEA, pp. 82-83.

education naturally fostered educational elitism, for weak students were identified early in the grades, encouraged to pursue vocational careers, and led to terminate their education at the end of the high school.³⁴

The German university in the nineteenth century was the capstone of the German educational system and the source of admiration and imitation all over the Western world. With elementary and introductory courses being taught down in the gymnasium, the university was able to concentrate on advanced professional studies, graduate study, and research. Unlike their colleagues in America, who were often educational generalists teaching in several fields, German professors were specialists who concentrated on research and on teaching their specialities to other advanced students in seminars and laboratories. The function of transmitting knowledge became secondary to discovering and advancing it. At the end of a long and rigorous period of advanced study, the student emerged with a new badge of scholarship, the Doctor of Philosophy degree.³⁵

The German educational model had a tremendous impact on higher education in the United States. The first graduate work in the United States was offered by Yale in 1847, which also awarded the first Ph.D. in 1861. However, in 1872 Harvard became the first American institution to establish a department of graduate studies.³⁶ In 1876

³⁴Hillway, American Two-Year College, p. 34.

³⁵Good, History of American Education, pp. 486-488.

³⁶Paul Dressel, The Undergraduate Curriculum in Higher Education (Washington: Center for Applied Research in Education, 1963), p. 8.

Johns Hopkins University opened in Baltimore as a purely graduate university emphasizing research, graduate work, and professional studies, and Clark followed suit in 1889. Soon Chicago, Stanford, and other new and old universities began to offer advanced graduate and professional programs. Whereas no Ph.D. degree had been awarded by an American institution before the outbreak of the Civil War, 164 were awarded in 1890 and over 300 in 1900, while the number of graduate students jumped from 198 in 1871 to 2,872 in 1890.³⁷ More and more the doctorate became the minimum standard for college and university teaching positions, and in these institutions the teaching function became increasingly specialized and professionalized. New and higher standards were set in legal, medical and other professional fields, and scholars in all the major disciplines began to organize national professional organizations and to publish specialized journals. By the end of the nineteenth century, then, the American university had become a hybrid institution, a uniquely American blend of the English undergraduate liberal arts college, the German graduate school, and native American ideas and practices.

German educational ideas and practices did far more than influence the development of the American university. Many of the leaders of the junior college movement were motivated by German educational philosophy and practices in their attempts to establish junior colleges. Henry P. Tappan, William Watts Folwell, and Edmund James, three important spokesmen for educational reforms which led to the establishment

³⁷Hofstadter and Metzger, Development of Academic Freedom, pp. 377-378.

of junior colleges, were graduates of German universities. Two other junior college leaders, William Rainey Harper and David Starr Jordan, were not products of German universities but were very obviously affected by German educational ideas. Several high school administrators who attempted to establish junior colleges by adding thirteenth and fourteenth grades to the high school curriculum were also graduates of German universities or were influenced by their educational philosophy. At this point it is necessary to examine the ideas and practices of Tappan and Folwell, who were proponents of German educational ideas and pioneers in the junior college movement before the emergence of William Rainey Harper.

Henry P. Tappan

Henry P. Tappan (1805-1881) was the first American university president to attempt to reform American universities along German lines and to attempt to relegate the first two years of college to intermediate institutions or to the high schools. Born in New York, Tappan received his bachelor's degree from Union College in 1825. After studying theology for three years, he served briefly as a congregational minister in Pittsfield before chronic throat infections and intellectual boredom led him to leave the ministry for the teaching profession. From 1832 until 1838 he taught philosophy at the University of the City of New York. He then resigned this position in order to become head of a female seminary and to devote more time to writing. In the late 1840s he moved to Europe to study and write, and in 1852, while he was living in Prussia, he was elected president of the University of Michigan. At

that time he was probably better known in Europe than he was in the United States.³⁸

Tappan's views on education seemed to crystallize in the 1840s, when he was able to devote more time to writing and to European travel. In the 1840s he published several books on philosophy, and during his stay in Europe he wrote many letters to friends back in America expressing his great admiration for the Prussian system which he was observing at first hand. In 1851 he wrote that "in the education system of Prussia we have something more than a theory. Here is a glorious achievement of an enlightened and energetic despotism." Although he saw the real and potential evils of Prussia's authoritarian governmental system and the authoritarian traits in the Prussian people, he viewed the educational system as "a sublime work which they have accomplished for the public good."³⁹

The most important of Tappan's educational works is his University Education,⁴⁰ published almost a year before his election to the presidency of the University of Michigan. This little book is a tightly-argued exposition of Tappan's views on the purposes of higher education, the shortcomings of American colleges and universities, the strengths of

³⁸ B. A. Hinsdale, A History of the University of Michigan (Ann Arbor: The University of Michigan Press, 1906), pp. 41-42; Kent Sagendorph, Michigan: The Story of the University (New York: E. P. Dutton, 1948), p. 79.

³⁹ Cited in Charles M. Perry, Henry Philip Tappan: Philosopher and University President (New York: Arno Press and the New York Times, 1971), p. 152. Reprint of the 1933 edition.

⁴⁰ New York: Arno Press and the New York Times, 1969. Reprint of G. P. Putnam edition of 1851.

German universities, and the need for American universities to reform themselves along German lines. In reviewing the educational literature of the mid-nineteenth century, it would be difficult to find a more scathing indictment of American higher education and a greater panegyric of the Prussian system.

In University Education Tappan advocates an elitist system of higher education. To him, the purpose of the university is to develop the character and intellectual capacity of the individual through rigorous training in the methods of discovering truth and through study of the advanced areas of human knowledge. Students must be disciplined "to exercise all the faculties wherewith they are endowed; they are to gain character and worth, to be fitted for duty, as human souls."⁴¹ To Tappan, rigorous training of the mind is the only true liberal education, because it inculcates methods and principles of universal application which allow the individual to function as a scholar and as a practical man of affairs. This type of intellectual training is the "most thorough, liberal, and extensive," and is "designed to make sound, disciplined, and amply-furnished men for the state and the church and for all the arts, duties, and offices of life."⁴² Tappan is highly critical of vocational education, regarding it as a narrow, inferior type of education which leaves the human mind and character in an underdeveloped state.⁴³ He admits that his concept of a liberal

⁴¹Tappan, University Education, p. 62.

⁴²Ibid., p. 13.

⁴³Ibid., pp. 62-67.

education is attainable only by those who "enjoy prolonged leisure for study, and a supply of means and appliances to carry out this conception fully." Therefore, "the conditions of human life may forever limit a thorough education to the few."⁴⁴

Tappan felt that American colleges and universities at mid-century were incapable of providing the true liberal education which he saw as the highest aim of the university. Although the number of colleges had increased in the nineteenth century, their quality had decreased because of lowered admission standards and inadequate personnel and facilities. In Tappan's view, America had no true universities:

In our country we have no universities. Whatever may be the names by which we choose to call our institutions of learning, still they are not universities. They have neither the libraries and materials of learning, generally, nor the number of professors and courses of lectures, nor the large and free organizations which go to make up universities.

The result, he felt, was that "we undertake to do more, with a worse preparation for doing it," so the students in American institutions were acquiring only a superficial knowledge.⁴⁵

Tappan believed that America should imitate the universities of Germany, where, he felt, "in no part of the world had university education been so enlarged, and made so liberal and thorough."⁴⁶ German universities were true universities, "model institutions," with

⁴⁴Ibid., p. 14.

⁴⁵Ibid., pp. 50-52.

⁴⁶Ibid., p. 39.

specialized faculties, specialized and advanced undergraduate courses, graduate and professional schools, good libraries and laboratories, great student freedom in course selection, and rigorous oral and written examinations. He also held that Americans should institute the equivalent of the German gymnasium, which prepared students for the university. The gymnasias freed the university to concentrate on advanced intellectual activity, and without them the university could not function at such a high level. The gymnasias, he felt, "guard the entrance of the universities," training good students to enter them for advanced work and turning away the less capable and less-disciplined.⁴⁷

Tappan felt that it would not be enough for the United States to copy the German university and gymnasium. Instead, it should imitate the entire German educational system, from the elementary grades to the university. As the capstone of the educational hierarchy, the university would set the goals, standards and example for the rest of the educational system. The entire system must be coordinated from the top, insuring that all grades and levels concentrated on the rigorous intellectual training and discipline required to prepare students to become moral and productive citizens or, if capable enough, to enter the university for further training that would allow them to assume positions of leadership in society.⁴⁸

During his eleven-year tenure at the University of Michigan, Tappan worked to propagate his views on university education and to reform the university along German lines. His efforts began with his

⁴⁷Ibid., pp. 43-44.

⁴⁸Ibid., pp. 69-70.

inaugural address delivered at the Presbyterian Church in Ann Arbor on December 21, 1852. In this speech he extolled the merits of the German educational system and advocated its adoption in the United States. Reiterating his belief that most American colleges and universities offered education at the level of the German gymnasia, he proposed that the whole system of American education be reformed and upgraded. The university, he said, should stop teaching elementary subjects and should relegate the burdens of teaching these courses to the four-year college or the high school. The high school should be reformed along the lines of the German gymnasia, adding thirteenth and fourteenth grades which would offer two years of college work. Completion of these two years would be required for admission to the university. Finally, Tappan called upon the state legislature to appropriate large sums of money to upgrade existing facilities and programs at the university and to provide a new library, art gallery, and graduate school. According to many contemporary accounts of Tappan's address, his audience was stunned by his criticisms and his calls for sweeping reforms and large legislative appropriations.⁴⁹

In spite of local and state-wide opposition, Tappan attempted to initiate his reform ideas at Michigan. During his short reign he increased opportunities and facilities for graduate studies, introduced the elective system, reorganized the administrative system along more rational lines, and constantly pressured the legislature for more money. He also appointed several prominent scholars, including

⁴⁹Sagendorph, Michigan, pp. 80-81.

Charles Kendall Adams, Andrew White, and several German professors.⁵⁰ At every opportunity, in speech and in print, he emphasized that the University of Michigan must imitate the German university if she were to become a true university, and that the state of Michigan must adopt the German educational system if it were to have a good educational system. For example, in the Michigan catalogs of the 1850s, he stated that the University of Michigan was modeled after the Prussian universities,⁵¹ and in his writings he often advocated that the State Superintendent of Public Instruction be given broad duties and powers on the scale of those held by the Prussian Minister of Education.⁵²

As might be expected, Tappan was disliked by many people in Ann Arbor and from all across the state. Many people objected to his praise of the Prussian educational system and condemnation of the American system, while others felt that his ambitions for the University of Michigan were too unrealistic and costly. Many labeled him as a dangerous free thinker because of his defense of academic freedom, criticism of sectarian influence in higher education, and even his practice of serving wine at the dinner table at home.⁵³ Newspapers from several cities in the state branded him as an intellectual and social snob, a lover of Prussian autocracy, and an overeducated and unpatriotic

⁵⁰Hofstadter and Hardy, Development and Scope of Higher Education, p. 62.

⁵¹Brubacher and Rudy, Higher Education in Transition, pp. 158-159.

⁵²Hinsdale, History of University of Michigan, p. 43.

⁵³Perry, Henry Philip Tappan, pp. 198-203.

American.⁵⁴ He was also accused of being too Prussian, a charge that was partly reinforced by his daughter's marriage to a German professor at the University and his hiring of German professors. Finally, he was accused of nepotism for hiring his son as the librarian at the University.⁵⁵

These criticisms did not cause Tappan to change his lifestyle or his educational opinions, but in the late 1850s and early 1860s his reform ideas precipitated a running conflict with the Board of Regents. The conflict was exacerbated by Tappan's aloof, condescending manner and by personality conflicts of long standing with some of the board members. In June of 1863, the board dismissed Tappan. Although the firing was protested by Tappan's supporters through letters, speeches, newspaper articles, and student and faculty petitions, the board refused to back down.⁵⁶ Tappan did not fight the decision; instead, he and his family left Michigan and America and went to Switzerland to live. He died there in 1881.

In spite of his relatively short reign and the circumstances of his dismissal, Tappan left a lasting imprint upon American higher education. He helped the University of Michigan to begin the long journey toward becoming a great university. This was recognized in 1875, twelve years after Tappan's firing, when a different Board of Regents

⁵⁴Hinsdale, History of University of Michigan, p. 86; Perry, Henry Philip Tappan, p. 188.

⁵⁵Sagendorph, Michigan, p. 94.

⁵⁶Hinsdale, History of University of Michigan, pp. 50-55; Sagendorph, Michigan, pp. 92-95.

passed a resolution condemning the action of his predecessors and praising Tappan for his distinguished presidential career.⁵⁷ Tappan was also one of the earliest and most influential forces in the spread of the German educational system in America. Although his presidential career was cut short, his University Education and other educational writings were widely read and quoted, and Charles Kendall Adams and Andrew S. White, two of his appointments to the University of Michigan, were highly influenced by him and helped carry his ideas to other institutions. Tappan's influence was later attested to by White:

To Tappan, more than to any other, is due the fact that, about the year 1850, out of the old system of sectarian instruction, mainly in petty colleges obedient to deteriorated traditions of English methods, there began to be developed universities, drawing their ideals and methods largely from Germany.⁵⁸

Tappan had an indirect but substantial influence on the junior college movement. He did not advocate the establishment of two-year institutions and his concerns were with the higher levels of education, not the freshman and sophomore years. However, he was the first university leader in America to propose that the first two years of college be relegated to the high school and that weak four-year colleges convert themselves into gymnasias to prepare students for the university. As will be seen later, many of the first junior colleges actually began as extended high schools offering two years of college work and as four-year colleges converted to two-year institutions. In addition, many of the university leaders who took the lead in establishing junior colleges

⁵⁷Hinsdale, History of University of Michigan, p. 51.

⁵⁸Hofstadter and Hardy, Development and Scope of Higher Education, p. 62.

were highly influenced by Tappan's views on the purpose and structure of the university.

William Watts Folwell

A more direct influence on the development of the junior college movement was exerted by William Watts Folwell (1833-1929), president of the University of Minnesota from 1869 to 1884. Born in New York, he was graduated from Hobart College in 1857, and from then until 1860 he taught languages at Ovid Academy and at Hobart. In 1860 and 1861 he studied and travelled in Europe, where he acquired a great admiration for German universities and secondary schools. He served as an engineering officer during the Civil War, and after the war he managed his father-in-law's flour mill in Ohio before re-entering the field of education in 1868 as a professor of mathematics and civil engineering at Kenyon College in Ohio. He then embarked upon a long career at the University of Minnesota, first as president (1869-1884) and then as a professor of political economy until his retirement in 1907. From 1907 until 1929 he worked as a researcher and writer. His death in 1929 at the age of ninety-six ended an incredibly long and busy life.⁵⁹

According to Folwell, he left his professorship at Kenyon to accept the presidency of the University of Minnesota so that he would have the opportunity to carry out "certain long-cherished ideas about higher education in junior colleges which neither Kenyon nor any small

⁵⁹ Daniel R. Gerber, "William Watts Folwell and the Idea of the Junior College," Junior College Journal 41 (March 1971): 50-51.

denominational college of the time could possibly entertain or be entertained."⁶⁰ On July 14, 1869, almost a month before he was chosen president of the University of Minnesota, Folwell indicated what some of these ideas were in an address delivered before the Hobart College alumni. In this address he stated that small colleges in the United States should abolish the curriculum of the junior and senior years and concentrate on providing just the first two years of college work. The junior and senior years, along with graduate and professional studies, should be the province of the university. The alumni disapproved of these ideas, of course, because they posed a direct threat to their alma mater and other similar small four-year institutions.⁶¹ These ideas were ahead of their time in 1869, but in later years many other educators, including William Rainey Harper, would echo the proposals and translate them into reality, establishing some of the first junior colleges.

In his inaugural address on December 22, 1869, Folwell told his audience that he was developing a master plan for the restructuring of the entire educational system of the state of Minnesota. He revealed only a few details of his plan, however, for as he later wrote, he did not want "to excite alarm."⁶² He apparently realized that as a new

⁶⁰William Watts Folwell, William Watts Folwell: The Autobiography and Letters of a Pioneer of Culture, ed. by Solon J. Buck (Minneapolis: University of Minnesota Press, 1933), p. 168.

⁶¹Gerber, "William Watts Folwell," p. 51.

⁶²William Watts Folwell, A History of the University of Minnesota, 4 Vols. (St. Paul, Minnesota Historical Society, 1930), 4:66.

president and as a new resident of the state he should not move too fast by advocating radical change in his inaugural address. He did indicate that he hoped to upgrade and restructure the University and give to the small colleges and secondary schools the primary responsibility of providing the first two years of traditional college work. One of the many advantages of his plan, he said, was that an immature young boy could live at home and attend a nearby high school, academy, or converted four-year college for two years, studying elementary college subjects until he matured. Then, having "grown up to be a man," he could "emigrate to the university, there to enter upon the work of a man, to be master of his time and studies, to enjoy perfect 'academic freedom.'"⁶³

Folwell's address caused little comment or open opposition at the time of its presentation. Folwell attributed this calm reaction to his plan "to the fact that it was not understood, or if understood, was not taken seriously."⁶⁴ After the address he worked out further details of his proposals in order to present them to the Board of Regents. Before he presented the plan to the board, Folwell sent advanced copies to his faculty, which voiced no significant opposition. When the Board of Regents considered the plan in June of 1870, it adopted it unanimously.⁶⁵

⁶³William Watts Folwell, University Addresses (Minneapolis, Minn.: H. W. Wilson Co., 1909), pp. 37-38.

⁶⁴Ibid., p. 38.

⁶⁵Folwell, Autobiography and Letters, p. 52.

Essentially the plan proposed that the freshman and sophomore years of the University be merged with a preparatory school which the University had been operating since 1866. This four-year division of the University labeled the "collegiate department," would operate as a secondary school similar to the German gymnasium. At the end of the four years of preparatory study, the student would be awarded a certificate attesting to his ability to begin university work at the junior level. Folwell hoped that eventually the secondary schools of the state would be upgraded to the point where they could take over the work of the collegiate department and the University could terminate it and concentrate on true university work. In the meantime the university would adopt as many as possible of the basic features of the German university system.⁶⁶

Although the faculty had not initially opposed the Minnesota Plan, as Folwell's reorganization proposals came to be called in the early 1870s, stiff opposition arose after it was approved by the Board of Regents. Apparently the faculty had been reluctant to initiate bad relations with a new president over a plan that might never be implemented, but once the regents approved it many faculty members openly opposed it. One source of their resistance apparently arose from a natural and understandable fear of any plan calling for such a radical restructuring of the University. It also seems that many of the faculty members felt that the plan would destroy the American four-year college,

⁶⁶Folwell, History of Minnesota, 4:67; Gerber, "William Watts Folwell," p. 52.

and even those faculty members who approved of part of the plan felt that it could not work because the secondary schools were not equipped to offer two years of college work or might not want to assume this responsibility.⁶⁷

From the fall of 1870 onward Folwell battled with his faculty over the implementation of his plan. In July of 1872 the issue was finally taken to the Board of Regents, which, after hearing both sides of the dispute, again endorsed Folwell's plan and ordered its full implementation. Faculty opposition continued, however, and the Minnesota Plan was never fully put into effect.⁶⁸ According to Folwell, "the Minnesota Plan had a book existence of fifteen years, from 1871-1885," but even that nominal existence came to an end in 1885, one year after Folwell's resignation from the presidency, when the Board of Regents rescinded the plan.⁶⁹

Although he was stymied in his attempts to implement the Minnesota Plan on his own campus, Folwell continued to develop and propagate his plan in speeches, articles, and educational meetings. In an important address before the National Education Association in Minnesota in 1875, attended by the nation's top educators, he outlined his plan in considerable detail, again emphasizing his belief that "the work of the first

⁶⁷Gerber, "William Watts Folwell," p. 52.

⁶⁸Folwell, History of Minnesota, 4:69-71; Gerber, "William Watts Folwell," pp. 52-53.

⁶⁹Folwell, History of Minnesota, 4:72.

two years of college is the work of the secondary school, and there it can be done most efficiently and economically."⁷⁰ Folwell referred to these expanded secondary schools as "people's colleges,"⁷¹ a term that was later frequently applied to junior colleges. According to Leonard Koos, a noted authority on the junior college movement, Folwell was the first educator to use this term.⁷² In this address Folwell also repeated his familiar charge that many small private four-year colleges were inadequately equipped for four years of true collegiate work and that they should eliminate their junior and senior years and become secondary institutions offering the last two years of college preparatory work and the first two years of collegiate work.⁷³ As might be expected, this attack on the private college was not well received by the convention.⁷⁴

In the years after he left the presidency of Minnesota, Folwell often admitted that the Minnesota Plan was ahead of its time and had little chance of being implemented. In the 1920's, for example, he wrote that "it is now easy to see that the project was a premature romance." It was "destined to be agitated in reviews, magazines, and newspapers" and "dallied with in educational conventions." It would be "timidly proposed to college faculties, referred to committees,

⁷⁰Folwell, University Addresses, p. 109.

⁷¹Ibid., p. 112.

⁷²Koos, "Rise of the People's Colleges," p. 138.

⁷³Folwell, University Addresses, pp. 85-90.

⁷⁴Gerber, "William Watts Folwell," p. 52.

reported on and recommitted, and, after some decades, adopted, with misgivings, 'in principle.'" ⁷⁵

Although Folwell failed to implement his Minnesota Plan, he had a great influence on the development of higher education in the late nineteenth century. His ideas gained wide circulation, and many of them were appropriated and put into practice by some of the later leaders of the junior college movement. William Rainey Harper was a great admirer of Folwell's educational philosophy, and some of the reforms he initiated at the University of Chicago in the 1890s were a testament to his indebtedness to this earlier university reformer.⁷⁶ In a letter to Folwell in 1906, Henry Pratt Judson, Harper's successor at Chicago, wrote that Harper was familiar with Folwell's speech before the National Education Association in 1875 and that "he expressed high approval and appreciation of the principles involved."⁷⁷ Folwell's attack on private colleges and suggestion that they convert to preparatory institutions offering only two years of college work was later echoed by Harper in his own speech before the National Educational Association in 1900, and Harper's reasons for suggesting changes were essentially the same as the ones offered by Folwell twenty-five years earlier. Although Harper is often considered to be the father of the junior college movement, it is obvious that Folwell was a pioneer in the

⁷⁵Folwell, History of Minnesota, 4:67-68.

⁷⁶Gerber, "William Watts Folwell," p. 50.

⁷⁷Judson to Folwell, August 2, 1909, in Folwell, University Addresses, p. 140.

movement and helped lay the intellectual groundwork so necessary for the success of Harper and other future junior college leaders.

Richard Jesse and Edmund James

Although they were not as influential as Tappan and Folwell, Richard Jesse and Edmund James were two other prominent university educators who hoped to reform university and secondary education by relegating the first two collegiate years to the high school or small college. As president of the University of Missouri in the latter part of the nineteenth century, Jesse frequently wrote and spoke on the need to reorganize higher education. His most quoted and influential speech was the one he made before the North Central Association of Colleges and Schools in 1896, in which he reiterated his view that "the first two years in college are really secondary in character." In his mind, he said, he had always considered "the high school and academy as covering the lower secondary period, and the freshman and sophomore years at colleges as covering the upper secondary period." In both periods, he felt, "the studies are almost identical" and "the character of the teaching is the same." The universities, then, should leave the teaching of secondary subjects to the secondary schools.⁷⁸

Jesse's views were echoed by Edmund James, a prominent professor and administrator at several universities in the late nineteenth and

⁷⁸Proceedings of the North Central Association of Colleges and Secondary Schools, 1896, pp. 15-16, quoted in F. M. McDowell, The Junior College, U. S., Bureau of Education, Bulletin, 1919, No. 35 (Washington: Government Printing Office, 1919), p. 15.

early twentieth centuries. While teaching at the University of Pennsylvania in the 1880s, he unsuccessfully tried to encourage the administration to divide the University into a lower division offering introductory work and an upper division offering true university studies. He later taught at the University of Chicago, where he was influenced by William Rainey Harper, before becoming president of Northwestern University and the University of Illinois.⁷⁹

The fullest expression of James' ideas came in 1905 in his first presidential address at the University of Illinois. In this speech he emphasized his view that the university should be a university in the broadest and truest sense. It should be a center of liberal undergraduate education, specialized graduate and professional education, and high-level research. It should turn out scholars and professional men ready to meet the needs of modern industrial society. He strongly advocated that the university divest itself of the burden and responsibility of teaching the kind of elementary subjects colleges and universities had offered in the past. The university should expand by "a continued growth at the top and a lopping off at the bottom," and in the process elementary work should be relegated to other institutions:

My own idea is that the university ought not to be engaged in secondary work at all; and by secondary work I mean work which is necessary as a preliminary preparation for the proper pursuit of special, professional, that is scientific, study. Consequently, our secondary schools, our high schools and our colleges

⁷⁹Alban Elwell Reid, "A History of the California Public Junior College Movement," (Ed.D. dissertation, University of Southern California, 1966), p. 89.

will be expected to take more and more of the work which is done in the lower classes of the various departments of the university as at present constituted, until we shall have reached a point where every student coming into the university will have a suitable preliminary training to enable him to take up, with profit and advantage, university studies, in a university spirit and by university methods.⁸⁰

The Influence of Tappan, Folwell, Jesse, and James

The efforts of educational reformers to eliminate the first two years of university work and relegate it to the small colleges and high schools did not take root in the United States. Besides the Universities of Michigan and Minnesota, the University of Georgia and a few other institutions considered and even attempted the elimination of the freshman and sophomore years, but all such experiments were short-lived. True, Johns Hopkins University and Clark University were originally opened as purely graduate institutions. But for most Americans, these German educational ideas were too aristocratic for a nation which was attempting to broaden higher educational opportunities, not restrict them to the intellectual and economic elite.⁸¹ The idea also threatened the existence of over two hundred small private colleges which had many influential friends and alumni all across the nation. Many heads of private universities opposed the plan because they needed the tuition fees of their freshman and sophomore students, while the

⁸⁰Edmund J. James, "The Function of the State University." Science 22 (November 17, 1905): 612-616.

⁸¹Hillway, American Two-Year College, p. 36.

presidents of state universities needed the extra tax money legislators appropriated for the large freshman and sophomore classes.⁸²

In assessing the foregoing educators' influence on the junior college movement, it should be remembered that these men were primarily concerned with university education and with its reform along German lines. None of them was much interested in the curriculum of the freshman and sophomore years--in fact, they wanted to banish it from the university and relegate its burden to the small colleges and high schools. They were not interested in establishing two-year junior colleges but in combining the last two years of secondary education and the first two years of college work into an intermediate institution similar to the German gymnasium. To them, America should establish this type of German secondary institution so that America could establish the German university. It is ironic that by spreading the belief that America needed a new intermediate institution between the high schools and the universities, these reformers indirectly contributed to the movement to establish two-year junior colleges.

Conclusion

By the last decade of the nineteenth century the historical stage was set for the emergence of the two-year junior college. Population growth, the increase in the number of high school graduates, and the need for more trained workers were all combining to put enrollment pressures on existing institutions of higher education. The rapid

⁸²Zwerlig, Second Best, pp. 45-46.

growth of political and economic democracy was resulting in increased demands for the democratization of higher education. High schools were extending their curriculums upward to include college-level courses, and within higher education itself several successful reform movements had transformed the philosophy and structure of higher education and broken the hold of centuries-old tradition. Tappan, Folwell, and other university reformers had spread the idea that secondary and higher education needed to be restructured for the benefit of students at both levels. As of 1890 no junior colleges yet existed in the United States, but the intellectual foundation had been laid. In Chicago, the newly-appointed president of Rockefeller's new university, William Rainey Harper, was drawing up detailed blueprints for a new university, which opened in 1891 with plans for a junior college on the university campus and in outlying communities. Under Harper, educational ideas derived from many diverse sources would be transformed into a coherent philosophy and dynamic educational movement. In 1891, the era of junior college development was about to begin.

CHAPTER III

WILLIAM RAINEY HARPER AND THE BEGINNING OF THE
JUNIOR COLLEGE IN THE MIDWEST, 1891-1906

William Rainey Harper was one of the leading American educators in the last quarter of the nineteenth century. An extremely versatile scholar, teacher, and administrator, he took all of education as his province, from the elementary level through the graduate and professional schools of the university. Consequently, he has the rare distinction of being remembered in educational history as a major reformer in secondary education, a highly innovative and influential university president, and as the father of the junior college movement. Obviously, a detailed study of his life and career is essential to an understanding of the junior college movement.

Harper's Life, Educational Philosophy, and Early Career

Harper was born on July 24, 1856, in New Concord, Ohio. After graduating with honors from Muskingum College at the age of fourteen, he worked in his father's drygoods store for three years before entering Yale, where in 1875, shortly before his nineteenth birthday, he received a Ph.D. in philology. From 1875 until 1891 he taught religion and languages in several academies and colleges, including Yale, and from 1885 until 1891 he served as a teacher and administrator at the Chautauqua Institute during the summer months. In this early period of his career he achieved national recognition as a teacher, lecturer, author, and

editor of two religious journals. Several colleges and universities tried to recruit him to fill presidential vacancies, but he rejected all such offers until 1891, when he accepted appointment as the first president of the new University of Chicago, a post he held until his death in 1906.¹

Throughout his career Harper exhibited a drive and an obsession with details which filled his colleagues with envy, amazement, frustration, and dismay. He generally worked sixteen-hour days, and it was not unusual for him to work long past midnight or even to four in the morning. He sometimes sent for his secretary to come to his office to take dictation between five and seven in the morning, and even his close friends complained of being called to meetings held at six in the morning or ten in the evening.² On one occasion he began a meeting with the declaration, "I have forty things to discuss this morning."³ His obsession with order and efficiency led him to attend to the smallest details of university life, including such matters as jammed windows and plumbing problems.⁴ His life was a whirlwind of activities, consisting

¹For excellent biographies of Harper, see Milton Mayer, Young Man in a Hurry: The Story of William Rainey Harper, First President of the University of Chicago (Chicago: University of Chicago Press, 1956); Thomas W. Goodspeed, William Rainey Harper: First President of the University of Chicago (Chicago: University of Chicago Press, 1928); John L. Clifton, Two Famous Educators (Columbus, Ohio: R. G. Adams and Co., 1933), pp. 257-272; and Dictionary of American Biography, 1932 ed., s.v. "Harper, William Rainey," pp. 287-292.

²Mayer, Young Man in a Hurry, pp. 28-30; 67.

³Goodspeed, William Rainey Harper, p. 145.

⁴Elizabeth Wallace, The Unending Journey (Minneapolis: University of Minnesota Press, 1952), p. 95.

of teaching Sunday school, serving on the Chicago Board of Education, traveling to other colleges and universities to attend meetings or make speeches, and writing learned articles and books on education, religion, and philology. Even while president of the University of Chicago he continued to teach courses in his field and to maintain his reputation and publications in philology and Biblical scholarship.⁵ In the last decade of his life overwork began to take its toll in the form of anxiety, insomnia, chronic fatigue, and other warnings. In January of 1905 he learned that he had cancer, but he continued to teach his classes through the end of the summer and to appear at public functions as late as September. As he lay dying in the winter of 1905-1906, he continued to read reports, approve new programs, and write letters, and in the last hours of his life he dictated every detail of his funeral, including the specific streets through which his funeral procession was to pass.⁶ He died on January 10, 1906, at the age of forty-nine.

Harper was not a profound educational philosopher. He was more of a doer than a thinker, a pragmatic experimenter who absorbed ideas from many sources and tried to put them into operation. It is obvious from his educational writings and from his educational innovations at Chicago that he was strongly influenced by the German educational ideas which were so popular in America in the last part of the nineteenth century. It is equally obvious that he borrowed many ideas from his summer work

⁵For a complete list of Harper's publications, see Goodspeed, William Rainey Harper, pp. 225-235.

⁶Ibid., p. 214.

with Chautauqua. Started originally in the 1870s for the purpose of training Sunday school teachers, Chautauqua rapidly expanded its services to include lecture tours, reading circles, correspondence courses, university extension courses, summer schools, and concerts and other artistic activities. Chautauqua remained a major force in American higher education until after World War I, and Harper was only one of many university educators who were influenced by Chautauqua's educational innovations.⁷ Harper was also influenced by new ideas in administration which were circulating in the business world at that time, and many of his critics accused him of trying to run the University of Chicago like a corporation. Finally, it seems that Harper's Scotch-Irish upbringing had instilled in him a strong devotion to the Protestant work ethic and the belief that higher education should offer hard-working young people a route to success.

Although Harper was concerned with all levels of the educational hierarchy, his primary interest was in university education. Unlike Henry P. Tappan and James Watts Folwell, Harper was not a graduate of the German university system, but he shared his predecessors' enthusiasm for German educational ideas and ideals. A university, he felt, should concentrate on advanced undergraduate study, graduate and professional education, and research. According to him, "the work of the freshman and sophomore years in the colleges of this country...is but a

⁷Joseph E. Gould, The Chatauqua Movement (New York: State University of New York Press, 1961), pp. 13-38.

continuation of the academy or high-school work."⁸ Since the first two years of studies in American colleges and universities is essentially preparatory work aimed at young, immature, and unsophisticated students, the work of these two years should either be relegated to the high schools or carried on by separate, segregated units on or near university campuses. Both the university and the student would benefit from this arrangement, for the student would receive the necessary elementary study, discipline, and supervision, and the university would be freed from the responsibility of teaching what were essentially high school subjects and of supervising the behavior of young scholars. Harper hoped that eventually the university could eliminate entirely the first two years of its instructional program.⁹

Harper's interest in university education led him to view the elementary and secondary schools as instruments for preparing students to enter the university. In fact, a careful study of his educational writings reveals that his many attempts to reform elementary and secondary education were not motivated by a special concern for these areas of education but by a desire to make them better suppliers of university students. Harper felt that the elementary and secondary schools suffered from confusion of purpose, duplication and overlapping of function and jurisdiction, and a shameful waste of time, money, effort, and minds on the part of both teachers and students. He believed that

⁸William Rainey Harper, The Trend in Higher Education (Chicago: University of Chicago Press, 1905), p. 83.

⁹Ibid.; Richard J. Storr, Harper's University: The Beginnings (Chicago: University of Chicago Press, 1966), p. 127.

a more efficient reorganization of the entire school system could allow students to finish elementary instruction in six years and secondary in four. Students could then complete the first two years of college at age seventeen or eighteen, at which time they could enter the university for serious advanced work. This educational scheme would render tremendous financial savings for society and for individuals while shortening by two years the amount of time required to progress from the first grade to the baccalaureate degree.¹⁰ As will be seen later in this study, Harper returned to these ideas time and time again, revealing the overriding importance he attached to university education and to educational efficiency.

Harper's Chicago Presidency, 1891-1906

Harper obtained the opportunity to carry out his educational ideas when he accepted appointment as president of the new University of Chicago in 1891. Before he accepted the position, he had several meetings with the University's chief benefactor, John D. Rockefeller, who gave over \$2 million to found the University and later poured many more millions into its support. It was primarily through Harper's efforts that Rockefeller agreed to found a university which would be free from external control and would guarantee freedom of thought and expression to its faculty and students. It was Harper, too, who coaxed Rockefeller

¹⁰Harper, Trend in Higher Education, pp. 85-86; Gregory L. Goodwin, A Social Panacea: A History of the Community-Junior College Ideology (Arlington, Va.: ERIC Document Reproduction Service, ED 093 427, 1974), p. 39.

into providing much more financial support than the oil magnate had originally intended. Harper had a great educational vision, and he succeeded in persuading Rockefeller to share it.¹¹ In a letter to Rockefeller in 1890, Harper wrote that "it seems a great pity to wait for growth when we might be born full-fledged."¹² Rockefeller agreed, and in 1892 the university opened its doors with several new buildings, 120 professors trained to teach and conduct research in 27 academic areas, and 594 students, over half of whom were enrolled in the graduate school.¹³ With such an auspicious beginning, it is easy to understand why the new university would quickly take its place among the greatest universities in the nation.¹⁴

It was typical of Harper that he insisted on planning every detail of the University of Chicago on paper before any construction began. He personally planned and supervised the construction of buildings, the organization of the curriculum, and the recruitment of students. He also selected the faculty after personally interviewing over 1,000 applicants from the staffs of some of the nation's top colleges and

¹¹ Harper's prolonged negotiations with Rockefeller are examined in Mayer, Young Man in a Hurry, pp. 26-50, and Storr, Harper's University, pp. 20-52.

¹² Quoted in Dictionary of American Biography, p. 289.

¹³ John S. Brubacher and Willis Rudy, Higher Education in Transition: A History of American Colleges and Universities, 1636-1968, rev. ed. (New York: Harper & Row, 1968), pp. 187-188.

¹⁴ For detailed studies of Harper's presidency, see Storr, Harper's University; Goodspeed, William Rainey Harper, and A History of the University of Chicago: The First Quarter-Century (Chicago: University of Chicago Press, 1916); and Laurence R. Veysey, The Emergence of the American University (Chicago: University of Chicago Press, 1965), pp. 367-380.

universities. When the University opened its doors in 1892, Harper's raids on other faculties had provided the University with many of the nation's top scholars, eight former college or university presidents, the first Dean of Women in any American college, and the nation's first professional football coach, the legendary Amos Alonzo Stagg.¹⁵ Few colleges or universities ever began their first year with a faculty of such high caliber.

Harper's blueprints for the organization of the University were revealed in 1891 and 1892 in several bulletins and reports written by him and approved by the Board of Trustees.¹⁶ In addition to detailing the organization of the University, these publications provide invaluable insight into Harper's educational philosophy. They reveal a highly innovative mind, for they include many new or rarely tested educational ideas--a full-fledged summer session, the quarter system, a university press, a strong extension program, faculty control of intercollegiate athletic programs, the recruitment of female faculty and students, residential colleges, and a strong program of graduate study and research. These publications also proposed a novel administrative and functional division of the University. The institution was made up of an undergraduate division and several graduate and professional schools. The undergraduate division was composed of four colleges: Liberal Arts,

¹⁵Mayer, Young Man in a Hurry, pp. 57-65.

¹⁶See especially The University Proper. The University of Chicago, Official Bulletin No. 1 (Chicago: University of Chicago Press, 1891), and the Colleges of the University. The University of Chicago, Official Bulletin No. 2 (Chicago: University of Chicago Press, 1891). For a good summary of those bulletins, see Goodspeed, History of the University of Chicago, pp. 130-157.

Literature, Science, and Practical Arts. Each of these four colleges was further divided into a University College and an Academic College. The University College, composed of the junior and senior curriculums, was closely allied with the graduate and professional schools and provided advanced work designed to prepare students for postgraduate work. The Academic College, a separate and distinct educational unit, contained the curriculum of the freshman and sophomore years and was designed to provide the elementary collegiate instruction necessary for preparing students for the advanced college work of the University College. Since the terms Academic College and University College did not adequately convey the purpose and nature of the two divisions, Harper in 1896 changed their names to "Junior College" and "Senior College."¹⁷ According to most scholars, this was the first use of the term, "junior college."¹⁸ The names and programs were retained by the University until its reorganization in 1931.

Most of Harper's educational plans were put into operation in 1892, and from then until his death in 1906 his time at Chicago was largely spent in refining his early plans and providing leadership for the University during the difficult early years of its existence. Although junior college education was only one of his many educational interests during these years, he accomplished so much for junior college

¹⁷William Rainey Harper, "President's Annual Report," Decennial Publications of the University of Chicago, 1900-1902 (Chicago: University of Chicago Press, 1903), p. xciv. Hereinafter cited as Decennial Report.

¹⁸Walter C. Eells, The Junior College (Boston: Houghton-Mifflin Co., 1931), p. 47.

education that he became the acknowledged father and leader of the junior college movement. His reputation in the junior college movement rests on the following accomplishments, each of which will be discussed in detail in this chapter:

1. He developed and propagated the junior college philosophy during the early and critical period of the movement.
2. He established a separate junior college on the campus of the University of Chicago.
3. He invented and popularized the term, "junior college".
4. He initiated in America the practice of awarding the Associate in Arts degree to graduates of junior college programs.
5. He successfully campaigned to convince high schools to add one or two years of collegiate instruction to their curriculum and to form cooperating or affiliation agreements with the University of Chicago.
6. He contributed to the establishment of Joliet Junior College, the first public junior college in the United States.
7. He attempted to convince weak four-year colleges to reorganize themselves into strong junior colleges.
8. He played a major role in the establishment of two private junior colleges, the Lewis Institute and the Bradley Polytechnical Institute.

The University of Chicago Junior College

The establishment of a junior college as a distinct and separate division of the University of Chicago was a natural result of Harper's educational philosophy. As has been briefly discussed earlier in this study, Harper felt that the first two years of instruction being given in most colleges and universities of that time were basically secondary in nature. He stressed this idea in his "First Annual Report of the

President of the University of Chicago,"¹⁹ issued in 1892. In this report he stated that in the freshman and sophomore years "the character of the instruction is still the same as that of the instruction given in the academy." Since students at this age are immature and intellectually unsophisticated, they should be allowed few elective courses and their behavior should be strictly regulated and supervised. Only at the end of these two years of elementary instruction would the student be ready to enter the upper division of the undergraduate program, where he would have more personal liberty, the opportunity to take more electives, and the freedom to pursue his specialized interests. Finally, after completing the University College, "the student is prepared to undertake real university work in the Graduate School," where "the emphasis is laid upon investigation" and the student's "effort to discover new truth, to make new contributions, is encouraged."²⁰ Obviously, Harper felt that the University should concentrate on advanced undergraduate work and graduate and professional education, and he did not consider freshman and sophomore instruction to lie in the realm of the real work of the University.

From the very beginning there was a great deal of debate on the junior college curriculum at Chicago. The details of the debate are not important for the purpose of this study, since most of the debate centered around specific requirements in Latin, science, and mathematics.

¹⁹Unpublished report, summarized and quoted in L. W. Smith, "Founding of Early Junior Colleges - President Harper's Influence," Junior College Journal 11 (May 1941): 512-513.

²⁰Ibid.

Between 1892 and 1906 the curriculum did undergo several alterations which reflected the changes sweeping through higher education at that time. Basically, the modifications involved the introduction of more electives, the abolition or reduction of requirements in classical languages and literature, and the addition of more requirements in modern languages and science. Throughout Harper's presidency, the curriculum of the Junior College at Chicago was similar to that at other American colleges during this time--languages, literature, mathematics, science, philosophy, and political science.²¹

Although the University had an overall administrative unity, the Junior College was a segregated unit with its own academic courses, administration, faculty, chapel and assembly exercises, student council, student club house, and graduation exercises. The academic work and social behavior of students were closely supervised by the administration and faculty, who also attempted to encourage a special sense of unity and purpose among the students.²² However, Harper himself contributed to the undermining of this sense of unity when he decreed in 1902 that the junior college men and women would be taught separate classes except where small enrollments in a course made this impractical. According to Harper, segregation of the sexes was needed because young men and women matured at different rates and ages, thereby requiring

²¹Storr, Harper's University, pp. 311-316.

²²Smith, "Founding of Early Junior Colleges," p. 516.

different types of instruction, and because co-education had a harmful effect on the manners and morals of young students of both sexes.²³

In 1899 Harper began to award the Associate in Arts degree to students completing the junior college program. The introduction of this degree was one of Harper's major contributions to junior college development. Harper did not originate the degree, for it had first been awarded by the University of Durham and other British universities in the 1870s. However, in 1899 the University of Chicago became the first American college or university to award the degree.²⁴ In several of his speeches and writings, but most notably in his Decennial Report, Harper went to great lengths to explain the reasons for the establishment of this new degree. The most important of these reasons may be summarized as follows:

1. The completion of the freshman and sophomore years constitute a landmark in the student's education, signaling the end of preparatory work and the beginning of real university study.
2. Students who for various reasons did not want to continue their higher education could terminate their studies with a respectable degree without suffering the disgrace usually attached to withdrawing from a four-year course. This practice would free the upper division of the University from the burden of trying to educate students who had neither the ability nor the desire to do advanced work but did not want to be stigmatized as a "dropout."
3. Students who did not have the financial resources or the ability to pursue a four-year course of study might be encouraged to pursue a two-year course terminating in a respectable degree.

²³Decennial Report, pp. xcvi-xcvi.

²⁴Walter C. Eells, Associate's Degrees and Graduation Practices in Junior Colleges (Washington, D.C.: American Association of Junior Colleges, 1942), pp. 6-7.

4. Students intending to enter the professional schools of law, medicine, and divinity would be encouraged to take two years of college work before entering these schools, thereby allowing these institutions to raise their admission standards and levels of instruction.
5. Weak four-year colleges would be encouraged to convert themselves into strong two-year institutions offering a respectable degree.
6. High schools and academies would be encouraged to offer advanced work leading to the associate's degree, thus allowing the universities to curtail their freshman and sophomore enrollments and concentrate on real university education.²⁵

The establishment of the associate's degree at the University of Chicago attracted nationwide attention and imitation. In 1900, in the April edition of the prestigious Educational Review, the editor asserted that with the establishment of the associate's degree "Chicago University has taken a step of national importance." He went on to express the opinion that all small colleges, large high schools, and professional schools "must and will study with care this plan and its results."²⁶ In 1901, the Lewis Institute of Chicago, a private junior college established with Harper's aid and encouragement in 1896, became one of the first institutions to adopt the degree. Several other senior and junior institutions adopted the degree between 1901 and 1920. The University of Chicago conferred a total of 4,462 associate's degrees between 1892 and 1920. After 1920 most senior institutions stopped awarding the degree, but as the junior college movement progressed the

²⁵Decennial Report, pp. xciv-xcv.

²⁶"A Two-Year College Course," Educational Review 19 (1900): 411-412.

associate's degree was adopted by most of the junior colleges of the nation.²⁷

Harper continued to study new ways to improve the Chicago Junior College right up until he fell ill in 1905. In 1905 he reorganized the junior college division into eight residential colleges, one for men and one for women in each of the four departments (Arts, Literature, Philosophy, and Science) of the Junior College. Each college had its own dean and faculty, with the deans of each college making up a governing board headed by the Dean of the Junior College. Enrollment at each college was to be limited to 175 students, and students were required to take at least one-third of their work from the professors attached to their residential college. The purpose of this reorganization along the lines of England's famous Oxford University was to produce a more intimate and scholarly atmosphere and a closer faculty-student relationship. According to many observers, this reorganization did not work as well as Harper had intended. The fragmentation of the junior college division into eight residential colleges produced difficulties in scheduling courses, needless duplication of small sections of the same course when it could have been more economically taught in one or two larger sections, and no noticeable improvement in faculty-student relationships. Harper died soon after this reorganization was

²⁷Walter C. Eells, Degrees in Higher Education (Washington, D.C.: Center for Applied Research in Education, 1963), pp. 95-97; Eells, Associate's Degrees and Graduation Practices in Junior Colleges, pp. 12-13.

implemented, but it is questionable whether he could have remedied these defects if he had lived.²⁸

The enrollment in the junior college division of the University of Chicago increased steadily from year to year. Beginning with 274 students in 1893-1894, enrollment in this division grew to 545 in 1898-1899 and 772 in 1901-1902, when junior college students made up over one-third of the slightly less than 2,000-member student body at the University. Obviously, the junior college division of the University was one of Harper's most successful educational innovations.²⁹

In spite of the success of the junior college division at Chicago, Harper had never intended for it to become a permanent fixture. It should be remembered that he felt that junior college work belonged to secondary rather than higher education, and that he hoped that eventually the University could be entirely relieved of the burden of providing freshman and sophomore instruction, allowing it to concentrate on serious intellectual pursuits. Throughout his presidency Harper expressed the hope that junior college work could be done off campus by colleges or high schools affiliated with the University of Chicago. One of his favorite plans was the one to transfer these two years of instruction to Morgan Park Academy, a secondary school outside Chicago owned and operated by the University for the purpose of preparing students to enter the University.³⁰ However, these plans to eliminate

²⁸Storr, Harper's University, pp. 326-327; Goodwin, A Social Panacea, p. 59.

²⁹Decennial Report, p. xciv; Storr, Harper's University, p. 324.

³⁰Decennial Report, pp. cxxvii-cxxviii.

freshman and sophomore studies from the Chicago campus were never accomplished, partly because of the opposition from the Chicago faculty and partly because of the involvement of Harper and his faculty in the many complex problems of establishing and operating a new university.³¹ As will be seen later in this study, Harper did succeed in persuading several high schools to offer junior college work under affiliation agreements with the University, but he was never able to make any significant progress in reducing the junior college "burden" on the Chicago campus.

Harper and the Six-Year High School Movement

Harper's efforts in junior college education extended far beyond the campus of the University of Chicago. Soon after he assumed the Chicago presidency Harper became deeply involved in a nationwide effort to reorganize the American high school, and this involvement led him to become the national leader of a movement to relegate to the high schools the responsibility of providing the first two years of college instruction. This movement was called by various names: the six-year high school movement, the upward extension movement, and the expanded high school movement. Before examining Harper's efforts in this area, it is necessary to describe briefly the reorganization efforts occurring in American secondary schools in the late nineteenth century.

In the latter part of the nineteenth century the free public high school movement was spreading rapidly in the United States. As might

³¹Storr, Harper's University, p. 127.

be expected in a rapidly growing movement, there was little national or even state uniformity in the nature or length of the high school course of study. In some states the secondary division of the public school system was two years in length, while in others it was three or four. Attempting to promote national uniformity in American education, the National Education Association in 1888 passed a resolution urging all the states to adopt a four-year high school curriculum, but progress in this direction was slow. From 1888 until well into the twentieth century public school and college educators met in numerous state and national conferences in attempts to reorganize the public school system along lines which would better reflect the changes occurring in American society and in all levels of education. Some educators favored a plan calling for eight years of elementary education and four of secondary, some favored six years of each, and some even favored six years of elementary education, three or four of junior high, and four of secondary, with the latter division including one or two years of collegiate instruction. Although many different combinations were suggested, most educators came to favor eight years of elementary education and four of secondary.³²

While prominent educators were arguing over plans to revamp the high school, many public school superintendents, high school principals, and teachers were quietly working to add college courses to the curriculum of local high schools. Most of these educators were motivated

³²F. F. Bunker, Reorganization of the Public School System, U.S., Bureau of Education, Bulletin, 1916, No. 8 (Washington: Government Printing Office, 1916), pp. 40-53.

by the desire to increase the prestige of the high school and to expand educational opportunities to local students who for various reasons could not leave home to attend a college or university in another town or another state.³³ By the 1880s college courses were being offered in several large public high schools in the Midwest and in many private academies in the Northeast and South. Although the sketchy and contradictory nature of the historical evidence has led to considerable disagreement as to which high school first added college work, most investigators grant this honor to East Side High School of Saginaw, Michigan. The principal at East Side felt that his high school and others should offer a year of college work because it would save students money, force high school teachers to upgrade their knowledge and skills, and allow young students to live at home, protecting "them one year longer from the alluring temptations of life in a college town."³⁴ East Side began offering college courses in the 1880s, and by 1895 was offering a full year of college work in history, English, Latin, algebra, and trigonometry. The University of Michigan gave full college credit for these courses, and students who completed them were allowed to enter the University as sophomores and to graduate in three years. By 1897, eight students who had taken college work at East Side had graduated from the University after three years of study there. However, like most of the high schools offering college work, East Side soon discontinued the

³³Ralph R. Fields, The Community College Movement (New York: McGraw-Hill, 1962), p. 25.

³⁴E. C. Warriner, "The Michigan Schoolmaster's Club - Proceedings of the Twenty-Seventh Annual Meeting," The School Review (February 1897): 127.

experiment after a few years, generally because of the small number of students attracted to the courses.³⁵

In the 1890s Harper became a major proponent of the plan to add college courses and even two full years of college instruction to the high school curriculum. Viewing freshman and sophomore work as essentially secondary in character, he became more and more convinced that the high schools of the nation should extend their offerings upward to embrace the work of the first two years of college. He felt that the high schools could easily assume the responsibility because their quality had improved so much that they were covering academic material that colleges had taught fifty years before.³⁶ From 1891 onward he and his staff at Chicago spent a great deal of time and effort in attempts to persuade Midwestern school boards, public school superintendents, and high school principals to add college courses to their curriculum and to affiliate with the University of Chicago. Gradually, these efforts began to bring results, as high schools and a few colleges began to associate themselves with the University. From the late 1890s onward, Harper used the term "affiliated" to refer to private academies and colleges associated with the University, and the term "cooperating" to refer to similar relationships with public high schools.³⁷ As the years passed Harper began to envision a network of affiliated and cooperating six-year high schools offering two full years of college work which

³⁵ Tyrus Hillway, The American Two-Year College (New York: Harper & Brothers, 1958), p. 36; Eells, The Junior College, p. 53.

³⁶ Harper, Trend in Higher Education, p. 341.

³⁷ Decennial Report, p. lxvi.

would be fully transferable to the University of Chicago, which would admit graduates of these high schools as juniors ready to embark upon serious university study. A network of these schools, he felt, would relieve the University of the need to offer elementary instruction, democratize access to higher education, and help the University to recruit students.³⁸ Harper's enthusiasm for this plan increased as the years passed without any progress being made in his original plan to abolish the freshman and sophomore years from the Chicago campus.

Harper promoted his plans through dozens of speeches, articles, personal visits to area high schools, personal contacts with influential educators throughout the Midwest and the nation, and educational conferences held on the Chicago campus. From 1891 until his death in 1906, he held one or two educational conferences each year at the University of Chicago, inviting representatives of Midwestern high schools, colleges, and other post-secondary institutions. The major purpose of these conferences was to discuss common educational problems, but Harper also used them as a forum for propagating his educational ideas, particularly his desire to add two years of college work to the high school curriculum.

One of the most important of these conferences was the conference of academies and high schools affiliated and cooperating with the University of Chicago, held in the fall of 1902. At this conference, attended by prominent college educators as well as secondary school leaders, Harper outlined a bold plan for "the high school of the

³⁸William S. Griffith, "Harper's Legacy to the Public Junior College," Community College Frontiers 4 (Spring 1976): 16.

future." This plan called for a radical reorganization of the public school system, shortening the elementary period from eight to six years and lengthening the secondary curriculum to six years, the last two of which would be devoted to offering the first two years of college work. He then offered twelve reasons as to why this reorganization was necessary and beneficial. According to Harper, this plan would be consistent with the following ideas and practices:

1. The necessity, so widely recognized, of lifting the standard for admission to the professional schools.
2. The general feeling that in some way or other time must be saved in the preliminary stages of educational work in order that men and women may enter upon their life-work at an earlier age.
3. The practice, recognized in other countries, of drawing a sharp line between the work of the gymnasium or lycée and that of the university.
4. The practice, now in common vogue, of making the first two years of college work only an extension of the work in the secondary school.
5. The contention, which seems to be well founded, that much of the secondary work of today was college work thirty years ago.
6. The tendency, already manifesting itself in some quarters, in accordance with which high schools are offering postgraduate work, and universities are accepting this work in lieu of the work of the first two years.
7. The principle that the line of separation at the close of the second college year is much more clearly marked, pedagogically, than the line at the close of the present high school period.
8. The tendency, everywhere apparent, to extend the scope of the educational work offered by the state or municipality.
9. The tendency, already beginning to be noticed, among smaller colleges to limit the work offered to that of the preparatory school and the first two years of college.

10. The opinion, not infrequently expressed, that the work of the eighth grade is in some measure superfluous for certain classes of pupils, and in some measure injurious to certain other classes.
11. The belief, more and more generally accepted, that the work of the school must be adapted to the needs and possibilities of the individual pupil, rather than that pupils should be treated in mass.
12. The principle that a pupil giving evidence of ability to do the highest grade of work may profitably be excused from doing the same amount of work required of the pupil of lower grade.³⁹

Always a very thorough logician and debater, Harper went on to discuss ten sources of opposition to the plan:

1. The inclination to regard any system actually in use as better than a system or policy still to be tested.
2. The feeling that the reduction of time can be gained only by a loss of thoroughness.
3. The general lack of interest in any proposition to substitute a well-ordered educational system for the present lack of system.
4. The difficulties involved in adjusting the lower work to the higher, on the ground that the great mass of pupils receive only the lower, and that the public school system is intended primarily for them.
5. The belief that the state has already gone too far in providing public education of a high character.
6. The opinion that the present college policy, although it is the result of a gradual development, has now reached a position which it must always occupy.
7. The fear that the college idea would be injured by the rivalry of the new high school colleges.
8. The desire to see specialism begin at a very early age.

³⁹William Rainey Harper, "The High School of the Future," School Review 11 (January 1903): 1-2.

9. The hesitation with which many would regard the transfer of the eighth grade from the realm of elementary to that of secondary work.
10. The failure, even in these times, to accept the doctrine of individualism in the field of pedagogical work.⁴⁰

Having discussed the merits and drawbacks of his reorganization plan, Harper proposed that the conference appoint a joint committee of twenty-one made up of three sub-committees representing the elementary schools, secondary schools, and colleges, to study the plan and make recommendations at a special meeting to be held in 1903. His proposals were approved, and for almost a year these committees wrestled with Harper's proposal and prepared their reports.⁴¹

The committees reported their findings to a general conference of affiliated and cooperating schools and colleges held at Chicago in November of 1903. The committee on elementary education recommended reducing elementary education from eight to seven years, not to six as Harper had proposed. The committee on secondary education, headed by J. Stanley Brown, superintendent of the Joliet (Illinois) school system and a close friend of Harper, reported in favor of a six-year high school which included two years of college. Brown's committee outlined a detailed curriculum for the six-year school and asserted that "the work set forth enables the student completing the six years' work to enter any professional school" and "also to enter upon pure university

⁴⁰Ibid., p. 2.

⁴¹Ibid.

work at once, and without delay."⁴² Brown's support of Harper's plan is not surprising since, as will be discussed later, the two men had earlier joined forces to establish the nation's first public junior college in the six-year high school at Joliet.

The committee on colleges was chaired by Nathaniel Butler, a professor at the University of Chicago. Although his committee endorsed Harper's proposals, much of its report concentrated upon a discussion of objections to the proposals which had been voiced by several college presidents who had been surveyed by the committee during its year-long study. The major objections centered around the assertion that most high schools could not offer high-quality college instruction because of inadequate equipment, incompetent instructors, overcrowded conditions, and the lack of the college atmosphere so necessary for advanced academic work. Many college presidents also felt that the plan would harm or even destroy many good colleges by depriving them of their freshman and sophomore students.⁴³ These arguments are important, for they provide a good summary of the objections of most opponents of the six-year high school during the early period of the junior college movement.

Butler's committee, however, felt that most of these objections were either invalid or were offset by the obvious advantages of offering college work in the high school. Emphasizing that "the work of the first two years of the college course is essentially secondary work,"

⁴²"The General Conference," School Review 12 (January 1904): 19-21.

⁴³*Ibid.*, pp. 22-23.

the committee concluded that it could be offered by the high school, making it possible for many more students to have access to higher education. The committee emphasized that the six-year high school would only be established in large urban areas which could feasibly support such institutions, so it would not be in direct competition with colleges and universities. Furthermore, parents who could afford to send their children to four-year colleges would still prefer to do so, so these established and valuable institutions would not be harmed. The committee ended its report by recommending that six-year high schools be established in areas where high schools were large and strong enough to extend their offerings to include college courses.⁴⁴

Much to Harper's disappointment, the conference of 1903 took no serious steps toward implementing his proposals. Instead, it reappointed the Committee of Twenty-one, made Harper the chairman, and asked the committee to study the proposals in more depth and to report back with more detailed recommendations.⁴⁵

At the annual conference of affiliated schools held in November of 1904, the Committee of Twenty-one presented a brief report, consisting primarily of a list of additional questions which needed to be considered before final recommendations could be made. The committee also recommended that a new committee of fifteen be appointed to study these questions and to continue the investigation of Harper's original

⁴⁴Ibid., pp. 24-25.

⁴⁵Bunker, Reorganization of the Public School System, pp. 58-59.

proposals.⁴⁶ Much of the time of this conference was consumed by discussions of progress that had been made in the establishment of extended high schools. J. Stanley Brown reported that one of the major problems involved in establishing six-year high schools was in deciding what level of academic studies belonged to the high school, what belonged to the college, and what belonged to the university. Brown also stated that he felt that while many students would continue to go to four-year colleges, the six-year high school with its two years of college offered great educational opportunities for students who were too young and immature to leave home when they first graduated from high school, or who could not afford to attend college away from home, or who wanted to attend only two years of college before entering the job market. He also reported that the six-year high school was making gradual progress, having been established in "Philadelphia, Muskegon, Saginaw, St. Joseph, Mo., Goshen, Joliet, and eighteen semi-public institutions in different sections of the country."⁴⁷

After the 1904 meeting of cooperating and affiliated schools, Harper's reorganization plans suffered a slow death in the Committee of Fifteen. However, before his illness in 1905 he had succeeded in persuading many high schools to add college courses and to associate with the University of Chicago. At the time of Harper's death, 139 schools were affiliated or cooperating with the University. Most were

⁴⁶"Report of the Commission of Twenty-one," School Review 13 (January 1905): 23-25.

⁴⁷J. Stanley Brown, "Present Development of Secondary Schools According to the Proposed Plan," School Review 13 (January 1905): 15-18.

in the Midwest, but there were also three in Colorado, two in Pennsylvania, two in California, and one in New York. Some of these institutions were closely supervised by the University of Chicago, but most of them, and especially those outside of Illinois, had only weak agreements with the University. Although the details of the agreements varied from one institution to another, most schools pledged that in their college curriculum they would follow the University of Chicago's guidelines on course content, teaching methods, and testing, while in return the University pledged to accept without special examination the college credits of the graduates of these schools.⁴⁸

One of the best examples of the schools associated with the University of Chicago is the one established at Goshen, Indiana. The early history of this six-year high school illustrates how most of these schools were founded, the nature of their curriculums, and the type of agreements entered into with the University of Chicago. Like most of the cooperating schools, the Goshen program was initiated by local school officials and encouraged in its developmental stage by President Harper. The college program at Goshen was started by Victor W. B. Hedgepeth, the Goshen Superintendent of Schools, who claimed that the introduction of college work at Goshen was "the result of a real demand, rather than an experiment based on any academic discussion as to the advisability of such an extension." According to Hedgepeth, the six-year high school was established to meet the needs of local high school

⁴⁸Cowley, The Emergence of the Junior College in the Evolution of American Education (Arlington, Va.: Eric Document Reproduction Service, ED 116 741, 1976), pp. 42-43.

graduates who could not afford to go away to college or were forbidden to go away by parents who felt that their children were too young to leave home.⁴⁹

Hedgepeth apparently began planning the establishment of college instruction at Goshen in the spring of 1904. On June 14, he wrote a letter to Harper, explaining that the administration and staff at Goshen were interested in "establishing a postgraduate year that will be accepted by the colleges as equivalent to freshman work."⁵⁰ For the next few months, Hedgepeth exchanged several letters with Harper and his staff as the two parties tried to work out the details of the association. While the negotiations dragged on Hedgepeth used the local newspaper and letters to influential citizens to solicit local support for his plan. On August 10, 1904, the ambitious superintendent put a notice in the Goshen Daily News-Times announcing the beginning of post-graduate work at the Goshen High School. The notice indicated that the high school would offer programs "equivalent to and accredited as one year's work in the best colleges and universities." Furthermore, according to this notice, "the work is done under the direct authority and supervision of the University of Chicago, which insures the character and standard of the work to be maintained." The notice indicated that all high school graduates could enter the collegiate program,

⁴⁹V.W.B. Hedgepeth, "The Six-Year High School at Goshen," School Review 13 (January 1905): 19.

⁵⁰Quoted in Waldo L. Adams, "The Junior College at Goshen, Indiana," Junior College Journal 4 (November, 1933): 71.

and that if the enrollment was high enough a second year of work would be added. Tuition for nine months of postgraduate study was set at thirty dollars. This notice ran fourteen times in the local paper, and was followed on August 31 by a second notice listing the postgraduate faculty, which was made up of three teachers with master's degrees and four with bachelor's. Seven students enrolled in the program in the fall of 1904, and in November, with the program still unratified by the University of Chicago, the school board voted to extend the program to two full years.⁵¹

At the University of Chicago, Harper and his staff moved slowly in approving the Goshen program. Harper was anxious to see the establishment of a new cooperating institution, but he was also determined that the new program would meet the high standards of the University. As the negotiations proceeded, Harper took an active role in the correspondence with Hedgepeth and in the tedious task of persuading the various departments of the University to approve the college programs proposed by Goshen. Finally, on March 22, 1905, after almost ten months of negotiations by letter and several visits by Chicago staff members, the University approved the Goshen plan and signed a cooperating agreement with the institution.⁵²

The agreement between Goshen and the University of Chicago was typical of the arrangements worked out by the University with most of

⁵¹Ibid., pp. 73-74.

⁵²Ibid.

the other affiliated schools. The agreement stipulated that all students in the collegiate division of the Goshen High School would have to meet the requirements for admission to the University of Chicago. The agreement stated in detail the courses to be offered and the quarter in which they would be taught, further specifying that "the courses offered must be equivalent in amount and character to the corresponding courses in the university." Each teacher "must be approved by the department of the University in which his work is to be credited" and his teaching load in the high school division was to decrease so that "he may give ample attention to his collegiate work." In the area of testing, the agreement required that all final examinations be approved in advance by the appropriate department at the University and that "examination papers...shall be sent to the University to be read and graded at the expense of Goshen High School." Finally, the agreement indicated that the high school would be subjected to frequent visitations by university faculty and department heads and that the expenses incurred on these visits would be paid by Goshen.⁵³

The junior college division of Goshen High School was never the success its founders and supporters had hoped and expected. Like many of the cooperating schools, the enrollment in most years was small, perhaps too small to justify the expense of conducting a college program. The town of Goshen was probably too small to support a junior college program in the local high school, and the problem was compounded in 1905 when the Mennonites established a small college in the

⁵³Hedgepeth, "Six-Year High School at Goshen," pp. 22-23.

area and began competing with Goshen for students. In 1911, after years of struggle and disappointment, the postgraduate experiment at Goshen was ended, and Goshen High School became once again a typical four-year high school.⁵⁴

A more successful example of the six-year high school was the one established with Harper's aid at Joliet, Illinois. An examination of the early history of this institution is important because Joliet was a pioneer institution, a prototype of most of the kinds of junior colleges started in the period before 1921. In addition, Joliet is generally considered to be the first successful public junior college in the United States.

Joliet's reputation as the first junior college has not gone unchallenged, for in the past seventy-five years local pride and scanty historical evidence have led to considerable confusion and dispute in this matter. Some authorities grant the honor to the extended high schools at Greeley, Colorado, or at Saginaw, Michigan, both founded in the 1880s, while others assign that credit to the extended high school founded at Goshen in 1904. However, these three institutions never had a viable two-year curriculum, and all three ended the junior college experiment within a few years. Most authorities feel that the honor properly belongs to Joliet Junior College, which was founded as a part of Joliet Township High School in 1901 and survives today as the oldest existing public junior college in the United States.⁵⁵

⁵⁴Adams, "Junior College at Goshen," pp. 75-76.

⁵⁵For more about this controversy, see Eells, The Junior College, p. 54; and Charles R. Monroe, Profile of the Community College (San Francisco: Jossey-Bass, Inc., 1972), p. 49.

The forces behind the establishment of a postgraduate course at Joliet are fairly typical of those behind the founding of many of the junior colleges established before 1921. The geographical setting of the city of Joliet and the rapidly growing high school population played a role in the institution's founding, but for the most part the postgraduate program resulted from the combined efforts of local school officials, prominent civic leaders, and officials from the University of Chicago and other institutions of higher education. Although many people contributed to the establishment of the junior college program, J. Stanley Brown and William Rainey Harper were by far the most influential figures.

Founded in 1831 and named after the French-Canadian explorer, Louis Joliet, the city of Joliet in 1900 was a prosperous commercial town of about 30,000 people located thirty-seven miles southwest of its nearest big neighbor, Chicago. Although the city had developed a reasonably progressive public school system from 1850 onwards, its citizens had limited access to institutions of higher learning. Joliet had one small four-year college, the College of St. Francis, but it had limited appeal because of its parochial control and narrow curriculum. The nearest institutions were Northwestern University and the University of Chicago, both located in Chicago. Northern Illinois Normal School was almost forty-five miles to the North, while the University of Illinois at Champaign-Urbana and Illinois State Normal University were almost a hundred miles away to the south. All of these institutions were too far away for daily commuting from Joliet. These geographical realities, combined with the inability of most students to finance

four years of college away from home, prevented most of Joliet's young people from considering college. Joliet was obviously a prime area for the establishment of a local junior college.⁵⁶

In the 1890s the rapid growth of the high school population and the completion of a new high school building made it feasible to establish a postgraduate division of the local high school. From 1890 until 1901, the high school population grew from less than 200 to over 600. In 1899, the high school district was reorganized and renamed the Joliet Township High School District, and the citizens passed a \$100,000 bond issue to support the construction of a new high school building. Showing an unusual farsightedness, the school board tried to anticipate future enrollment increases by authorizing the erection of a building large enough to serve 1400 students. J. Stanley Brown, who had been principal of the high school since 1893, was chosen to be the new superintendent of the district.⁵⁷

Brown was a prominent Midwestern educator in the latter part of the nineteenth century and early part of the twentieth. A teacher, principal, and superintendent in the early part of his career, he later left Joliet to become president of Illinois State Normal School at De Kalb. For many years he was a prominent figure at Midwestern educational meetings and a frequent contributor to regional and national educational journals. He and Harper became close friends through their

⁵⁶Elbert K. Fretwell, Jr., Founding Public Junior Colleges: Local Initiative in Six Communities (New York: Columbia University Teachers College Bureau of Publications, 1954), p. 11

⁵⁷Ibid., p. 10.

frequent contacts at educational meetings and at various conventions of the Baptist Church. Throughout the 1890s and early years of the new century, Brown was a major supporter of Harper's educational ideas and practices, particularly those connected with the six-year high school and junior college. Like Harper, Brown felt that the extended high school would allow more students to attend college by enabling them to complete up to two years of college while living at home.⁵⁸

As principal of Joliet High School Brown had introduced advanced courses as early as 1896 and had succeeded in getting officials at several universities to grant college credit for this work. The University of Michigan, for example, began to grant credit for advanced Latin courses in 1896, and by 1899 the University of Chicago had accepted Joliet as a cooperating institution.⁵⁹ Between 1899 and 1901, the school board at Brown's urging authorized the high school to offer college credit courses in advanced physics, trigonometry, and college algebra.⁶⁰ By the time of the dedication of the new high school building in April of 1901, six students were taking college courses at Joliet, and Brown and a very cooperative school board were ready to initiate a more ambitious program.⁶¹

⁵⁸Goodwin, Gregory L. "The Nature and Nurture of the Community College Movement," Community College Frontiers 4 (Spring 1976): 6.

⁵⁹Thomas L. Hardin, "Joliet: Birth of A College," Community College Frontiers 4 (Spring 1976): 23.

⁶⁰Thomas M. Deam, "Evolution of the Joliet Junior College," Junior College Journal 2 (April, 1931): 429.

⁶¹Hardin, "Joliet: Birth of A College," p. 23.

In 1901 Brown and the local school board gradually moved toward the establishment of a full two-year college curriculum at Joliet. A few individual courses were offered in 1901, but finally in 1902 the board approved a full two-year curriculum. In its first report, issued in 1903, the school board outlined the progress of the previous years and gave the reasons for establishing a college curriculum. According to this report, the extended high school would allow more local students to attend college by giving them the opportunity to complete up to two full years of college work while living at home. In addition, the high school could furnish college-level occupational training and provide more individual attention and better overall instruction than the student would receive at most colleges and universities, especially the larger ones. Finally, the local junior college could provide two years of terminal education for students who did not wish to go further.⁶²

These arguments in support of an extended high school have been the most prominent ones given over the years by the founders and supporters of junior colleges.

It is difficult to assess Harper's influence on the establishment of the postgraduate program at Joliet. Many secondary accounts credit Harper with playing the major role in the founding of Joliet, but little proof has been offered to support this contention. Harper apparently made no personal visits to Joliet during the time of its founding, nor

⁶²First Report of Joliet Township High School (Joliet, Illinois: Joliet Township High School Board of Education, 1903), pp. 73-78, cited in W. W. Haggard, "An Early Upward Extension of Secondary Education," School Review 38 (June 1930): 432-434.

did he attempt to persuade the Joliet Board of Education to establish a postgraduate program.⁶³ It is true that Brown and Harper were close friends and shared many ideas, and it is possible that Harper was the personal and intellectual inspiration for the establishment of Joliet. Brown, a very charitable man, often stated that Harper inspired the idea. For example, in 1922, twenty years after Joliet's birth, Brown wrote that "Joliet takes no particular credit" for the establishment of the junior college program, "but concedes it to the man of vision, Dr. William Rainey Harper."⁶⁴ It is also true that Harper and the members of the Chicago faculty closely watched and encouraged the development of college courses at Joliet High School. They frequently corresponded with the Joliet staff and made visits to the campus. According to the present evidence, the safest conclusion to draw here is that Brown and Harper shared and exchanged many educational ideas, that Brown was the major force behind the establishment of the postgraduate program, and that Harper, while possibly providing some inspiration for Brown's actions, confined his actual work at Joliet to offering aid, encouragement, and official University recognition of the college programs.

Probably the most accurate appraisal of Harper's role was given in 1941 by C. E. Spicer, who was present at the founding of Joliet and

⁶³Goodwin, "Nature and Nurture of the Community College Movement," p. 6.

⁶⁴J. Stanley Brown, The Growth and Development of the Junior Colleges in the United States, U. S., Bureau of Education, Bulletin, 1922, No. 19, Part I (Washington, D.C.: U. S. Government Printing Office, 1922), p. 27.

served as a teacher there for almost forty years. In a letter to L. W. Smith, a former superintendent of Joliet, Spicer gave the following account of Harper's contribution to Joliet's founding:

He and several members of his faculty were watching with interest the development of these 'advanced courses' in our institution, and in several other institutions...that were also 'expanding' their curriculums at that time. He had, during the few years that had just passed, carried on an intensive campaign to bind more closely the secondary schools of the state and of surrounding states to the University of Chicago, and was keenly alive to what was going on in those schools at this time....Dr. Harper's contribution to the establishment of our junior college came after, and not before, the fundamental courses therein had been functioning. What we then needed was recognition from established colleges, without which we could not have survived. He and members of his faculty heartily endorsed our efforts, made themselves acquainted with our teachers of these 'advanced courses' and 'accepted' their pupils for 'advanced credits' when certified to by these teachers, gladly gave pupils who under these conditions had done the college work we offered full college credit for such work. Moreover, they endorsed our efforts and gave us their hearty approval. Pupils granted these advanced credits were certified to by Superintendent Brown, and by their 'accepted' teachers, at least, at first.

Many other colleges also granted us such credits, but none, perhaps, so willingly as did the University of Chicago. Some seemed to feel that we were trespassing on their territory. Dr. Harper believed, no doubt, that these two years of work belong really in the home schools. Probably our effort would have failed of success had we not received his 'recognition.'⁶⁵

When put into full operation, the postgraduate curriculum at Joliet provided the basic courses offered at most colleges and universities of the day. From 1902 until 1912, the college courses were called postgraduate courses and treated as the fifth and sixth years of the high school and the thirteenth and fourteenth years of the school system. In the early years the fifth-year courses were Latin, German, French, Spanish, literature, chemistry, trigonometry, advanced botany,

⁶⁵Smith, "Founding Early Junior Colleges," pp. 518-519.

zoology, and physiology, while the sixth year offered Latin, literature, analytical geometry, advanced physics, astronomy, geology, political economy, government, French, Spanish, and German. Tuition for non-resident high school students was sixty cents per week. By 1903, students who had taken college courses at Joliet were being given advanced credit by the Universities of Chicago, Illinois, Michigan, Wisconsin, Minnesota, and Pennsylvania, and in the next few years several other colleges and universities began accepting college credits from Joliet.⁶⁶

For much of its early history the college division of Joliet was viewed and administered as a postgraduate department of the high school, with the high school and collegiate divisions sharing offices, classrooms, teachers, and administrators. However, postgraduate students did have their own basketball teams, banquets, and other extra-curricular activities. In 1912, the term "junior college" began to be used to refer to the postgraduate division, and in 1916 it was renamed "Joliet Junior College." In 1917, the junior college moved into its own separate facilities in a new extension to the high school building.⁶⁷ From that point onward, Joliet continued to expand, and today this oldest public junior college still ranks as one of the nation's top junior colleges.

Why did the junior college program at Joliet succeed, while those at other high schools, such as Goshen, fail? The answer to this question is fairly obvious. Joliet's distance from established colleges

⁶⁶Haggard, "An Early Upward Extension of Secondary Education," pp. 430-432.

⁶⁷Deam, "Evolution of the Joliet Junior College," p. 430.

created a need for collegiate instruction in the local community, and leaders, with the help of the University of Chicago, fulfilled that need. The encouragement, aid, and recognition of Harper and his colleagues at Chicago played a major role in Joliet's founding and early development. But perhaps more importantly, Joliet was fortunate in having a new high school building, a large student body from which to draw students for the college courses, the strong leadership of Dr. Brown, and the support of the local school board and other concerned citizens. Other six-year high schools secured aid and cooperating agreements from the University of Chicago, but, like Goshen, failed because of small student enrollments and inadequate local support.

The success of the postsecondary program at Joliet was an example of the extended high school at its best. Although Joliet and some of the other cooperating high schools offered high quality college instruction, many of them suffered from inadequate facilities, poorly trained teachers, small student enrollments, and inadequate supervision from the University of Chicago. Harper's affiliation and cooperating plans were supported by many educators, but they were also roundly attacked by others, particularly by high school educators who felt that Harper was trying to control or undermine the high school and by small college educators who felt that he was attempting to destroy the small colleges. Educators at all levels accused Harper of trying to build a Midwestern educational empire of high schools and colleges ruled from

the campus of the University of Chicago.⁶⁸ A particularly bitter attack was launched against Harper's plans in 1905 by Julius Sachs, a professor at Columbia Teachers College, who asserted that extended high schools would harm the high school and the small college and lead to university dominance of secondary education.⁶⁹

Harper's affiliation and cooperating plans met so much opposition that he found it increasingly necessary to defend them in articles and in speeches at various educational conferences. He always denied that he was attempting to fashion an educational empire or that he was trying to destroy the independence of the affiliated and cooperating schools and colleges. Time and time again he emphasized that his major objective was to upgrade the affiliated and cooperating schools so that they could better prepare students to enter the University to do university work.⁷⁰ In spite of these disclaimers, Harper and his plans remained under continuous attack.

After Harper's death many of the affiliated and cooperating schools suffered from declining enrollments in the postgraduate courses and growing disinterest among local educators in continuing the college courses and the association with the University of Chicago. Consequently, many of the extended high schools terminated their college courses after a few years of experimentation and shrank back to

⁶⁸Cowley, Emergence of the Junior College, p. 44.

⁶⁹"The Elimination of the First Two College Years: A Protest," Educational Review 30 (May 1905): 488-499.

⁷⁰Decennial Report, pp. lxvii-ixvii; Cowley, Emergence of the Junior College, p. 44.

traditional four-year high schools concentrating on secondary education. The end of Harper's leadership also led to a de-emphasis of the affiliated and cooperating programs at the University of Chicago, and in 1913 the Board of Trustees officially ended the affiliation and cooperating plan.⁷¹

The failure of the extended high school and affiliation plans should not be allowed to obscure the importance of the experiment for the junior college movement. Although six-year high schools did not take permanent root in the American educational hierarchy, these hybrid institutions housed and administrated the first public junior colleges in the country. In fact, most of the public junior colleges in existence in 1921 had first begun as the fifth and sixth years of expanded high schools. It was not until after 1921 that public junior colleges began to spring up as independent and separate two-year institutions with their own buildings, faculty, and administration.

Conversion of Small Colleges to Junior Colleges

By the turn of the century Harper had begun to see the private four-year colleges as another source for the birth of junior colleges. Harper felt that the conversion of small private four-year colleges to two-year institutions would solve many of America's educational problems, particularly those faced by the universities which were burdened with the problem of providing two years of elementary instruction while trying to carry on true university education. Harper's

⁷¹ Cowley, Emergence of the Junior College, p. 44.

attitudes toward the small private colleges stemmed from his educational philosophy, especially his desire to reorganize the nation's entire educational system so as to promote efficiency and to subordinate the lower levels of the educational hierarchy to the needs of the university. It may also be true, as some of his critics have claimed, that Harper, in his desire to attract to Chicago the best students in the nation, was hoping to eliminate some of the competition for these students by converting four-year colleges to two-year ones which would serve as feeder institutions to the University of Chicago.⁷²

Harper's views on four-year colleges and the need to convert them to two-year institutions were best expressed in a controversial speech he delivered in 1900 at a convention of the National Education Association in Charleston, South Carolina. Always the diplomat, Harper devoted the first part of his address to the merits of the small colleges and to the services they had rendered the nation over the years. He also professed that he was a friend of the small college and had no desire to see it disappear. Having made these remarks, he then went on to the major point of his speech: the small colleges were full of shortcomings and were endangered from many quarters. Many of these institutions, he asserted, were little more than high schools or academies and suffered from inadequate enrollments, poor financial backing, poorly trained teachers, inadequate facilities, and a narrow sectarian spirit which was inimical to the academic freedom so necessary for students and teachers pursuing the higher learning. The growth of

⁷²Griffith, "Harper's Legacy," p. 16.

the high school, and especially the expansion of the extended high school, had produced a new type of institution to compete with the small college, while the growth of new universities with their huge resources was also threatening the existence of the small college from another direction. In short, Harper portrayed the small college as an endangered educational species, weak, poorly adaptable to changing conditions, and threatened on all sides by superior institutions.⁷³

Having identified the dangers faced by the small colleges, Harper went on to prescribe a cure for the illnesses from which they were suffering. Some of these institutions, he maintained, could survive if they strengthened their four-year programs, but most of the others would have to undergo radical changes. Many were so weak that they should close their doors completely, while others should stop masquerading as colleges and identify themselves for what they really were--academies offering high school work. The remaining institutions, about two hundred in number, should eliminate the junior and senior years of their college program and convert to six-year institutions offering four years of college preparatory work and two years of college work. In short, they should become private six-year high schools, similar in purpose and nature to the public institutions Harper was also promoting. In Harper's eyes, the conversion of weak four-year colleges to strong six-year institutions "would, at one stroke, touch the greatest evils of our present situation," creating the following advantages:

⁷³Harper, The Trend in Higher Education, pp. 350-375.

1. The money now wasted in doing the higher work superficially could be used to do the lower work more thoroughly.
2. The pretense of giving a college education would be given up, and the college could become an honest institution.
3. The student who was not really fitted by nature to take the higher work could stop naturally and honorably at the end of the sophomore year.
4. Many students who might not have the courage to enter upon a course of four years' study would be willing to do the two years of work before entering business or the professional school.
5. Students capable of doing the higher work would be forced to go away from the small college to the university. This change would in every case be most advantageous.
6. Students living near the college whose ambition it was to go away to college could remain at home until greater maturity had been reached--a point of the highest moment in these days of strong temptation.⁷⁴

In the remainder of his speech before the National Education Association Harper praised the growth of the six-year public high school and called for greater future cooperation among all sectors of the educational hierarchy. In addition to forming their own individual educational association, the high schools and small colleges should form associations between themselves and even join with the universities in regional and national associations promoting cooperation among the various levels of the educational hierarchy. Harper made it clear that he envisioned a national system of education in which the university, with its superior resources, vision, and position at the apex of the educational hierarchy, would be the dominant guiding force.⁷⁵

⁷⁴Ibid., pp. 375-381.

⁷⁵Ibid., pp. 386-389.

Harper's call for radical changes in the small colleges was also made in a national meeting of university leaders held at the University of Chicago in 1900. At this meeting, Harper introduced a proposal calling upon small colleges to shorten their curriculum to two years of general education and to award associate's degrees to students completing the program. These small colleges would be "associated" with the universities and their graduates would transfer to the universities to complete the last two years of their baccalaureate program. Not surprisingly, the university leaders approved of this proposal.⁷⁶

In his Decennial Report in 1902 Harper reiterated his proposals for saving the small colleges by converting them to junior institutions. In his report he again affirmed his support for the small college, stating that "the greatest calamity which could possibly befall the cause of higher education in the United States would be the extinction, or even a considerable deterioration, of the small college." It was to prevent this calamity that the University of Chicago had attempted to convince these colleges to carry out basic reforms and affiliate with the University. He denied that the affiliation plan was motivated by the selfish desire to lure students away from the private schools in surrounding states, for "the University of Chicago has more college work to do in the future for the city of Chicago than it can possibly succeed in doing, without attempting to enter the territory of its sister colleges." Students from other states were "always welcome," he said, but "the University puts forth no distinct effort to secure such

⁷⁶ Goodwin, "Nature and Nurture of the Community College Movement," p. 6.

students, and therefore does not enter into rivalry with the colleges of these states." The report concluded that the movement toward affiliation had not progressed as rapidly as he had hoped, primarily because of opposition from the small colleges themselves, which were afraid that affiliation would bring a loss of independence, and from within his own university, from people who did not understand the plan or who did not want to assume the extra responsibilities involved.⁷⁷

Harper's pleas to the small four-year colleges fell largely on deaf ears in the early years of the twentieth century. By the time of his death in 1906, less than a dozen colleges, most of which were small denominational colleges located in Texas and Missouri, had signed formal affiliation agreements with the University of Chicago, and few of these had agreed to terminate the junior and senior years of instruction.⁷⁸

The presidents, faculty, alumni, and other backers of these colleges felt that conversion to junior institutions would constitute a severe drop in status and that affiliation with the University of Chicago or other universities would bring a loss of identity and independence. Many were also undoubtedly offended by his criticisms and suggestions.⁷⁹

Although few small colleges followed Harper's advice, his recommendations and prophecies showed considerable foresight. In 1929,

⁷⁷Decennial Report, pp. lxvii-lxviii.

⁷⁸Robert A. Altman, The Upper Division College (San Francisco: Jossey-Bass, Inc., 1970; Eells, Junior College, pp. 59-60.

⁷⁹Eells, Junior College, p. 62.

Walter C. Eells and some of his graduate students attempted to study the fate of the 200 small colleges which Harper had cited in 1900 as candidates for extinction unless they converted to six-year institutions offering four years of secondary work and two years of college instruction. Although name changes, mergers, scanty historical evidence, and other problems hampered their investigation, Eells and his colleagues concluded that of the colleges referred to by Harper, "approximately 37 per cent had perished, 49 per cent survived in 1924-26 as four year institutions, and 14 per cent, or 28, had become junior colleges."⁸⁰ While conversion to junior colleges might not have saved all the colleges which failed, it probably could have saved some of them.

The Lewis Institute and the Bradley Polytechnical Institute

A study of Harper's role in the junior college movement would not be complete without a brief reference to his influence on the founding of two private junior colleges in Illinois, the Lewis Institute, founded in Chicago in 1896, and the Bradley Polytechnical Institute, established in Peoria in 1897. Through his writings and his friendships with influential educators and benefactors, Harper helped provide the personal and intellectual inspiration for the establishment of these two early examples of private junior colleges. He also served on the Board of Trustees at Lewis and as President of the Faculty at Bradley.⁸¹

⁸⁰Ibid., pp. 62-63.

⁸¹Cowley, Emergence of the Junior College, p. 43; Griffith, "Harper's Legacy to the Public Junior College," pp. 15-16.

In Harper's lifetime both of these institutions functioned as successful private junior colleges, but in later years growing enrollments and aspirations led the boards of trustees and administrators of these schools to convert them to senior institutions. The Lewis Institute began to add upper level courses in 1902, and in 1918 it became a four-year college. In 1940 it merged with the Armour Institute of Technology to produce the Illinois Institute of Technology. Bradley became a four-year undergraduate college in 1920, and in 1946 became Bradley University.⁸² It is not clear whether Harper, who was trying to reduce the number of small four-year colleges, ever envisioned the conversion of these two schools from junior to senior status.⁸³

Conclusion

At the time of his death in 1906 Harper had helped to establish the junior college as a new and growing institution within secondary and higher education. Primarily concerned with freeing the university from the burden of providing the first two years of college instruction so that it could concentrate on true university work, Harper had established a junior college on the campus of the University of Chicago, coined the term junior college, initiated the associate's degree as a new degree within higher education, promoted the development of a network of six-year high schools offering junior college work in

⁸²Cowley, Emergence of the Junior College, p. 43.

⁸³Griffith, "Harper's Legacy," p. 16.

association with the University of Chicago, supported the founding of the first public junior college (Joliet) still in existence today, influenced the founding and early development of two private Illinois junior colleges (Lewis and Bradley), and contributed to the national propagation of the idea of the junior college. The junior college was still an educational step-child, a division of high schools and colleges rather than a separate and independent institution. But its roots had been firmly planted, and for his efforts in launching this novel, successful, and highly influential movement in American education, William Rainey Harper certainly deserves his reputation as "the father of the junior college."

After Harper's death no other Midwestern educator emerged to assume his position as leader of the junior college movement in the Midwest. Consequently, junior college education in the Midwest entered a period of slow growth, and the center of the junior college movement shifted to the state of California, which would now dominate the movement until the end of the first era of junior college history in 1921.

CHAPTER IV

JORDAN, LANGE, AND THE PUBLIC JUNIOR COLLEGE MOVEMENT
IN CALIFORNIA, 1907-1921

Although the junior college movement began in the Midwest, it was in California that it experienced its most rapid growth and reached the potential which Harper and other pioneers had dreamed of but had never been able to achieve. Beginning with only a handful of students in 1907, the California public junior college system grew in less than fifteen years to embrace eighteen institutions and over fourteen hundred students.¹ No other state experienced this kind of junior college expansion in the first era (1850-1921) of the junior college movement. California's success in this formative period catapulted her to the top of the junior college movement, a position she has held throughout most of the twentieth century.

Any attempt to explain the birth and rapid growth of the California public junior college movement must take into account several complex, and often inter-related, factors. In part, the success of the California junior college movement was the result of favorable geographical, economic, and political conditions. The success can also be partially explained by the educational progress and problems existing in the state's high schools and colleges. But perhaps most importantly, the California public junior college movement had such unparalleled

¹William John Cooper, "The Junior College Movement in California", School Review 36 (June 1926): 420.

success because of the foresight and efforts of prominent university and high school leaders, such as David Starr Jordan, Alexis F. Lange, and C. L. McLane, who saw the need for a state-wide system of junior colleges and provided the leadership necessary for meeting that need.

The Geographical, Economic, Political, and Educational Conditions

Geography played a major role in the growth of the California junior college movement. Almost one thousand miles long, California in the early twentieth century was the second largest state in the union, so the population served by its educational system was spread over a large area. The state's two universities, the University of California and Stanford University, were both located in the San Francisco area, hundreds of miles from much of the population. The influence of these geographical factors became obvious fairly early in the California junior college movement, for most of the junior colleges that grew up in California before 1921 were established in the southern part of the state, as much as five hundred miles from San Francisco. Obviously, these junior colleges were founded to meet the need of students who were too far away to be served by the two large universities in the North, which drew most of their students from a small radius.²

The economic conditions of California were favorable to the growth of a system of junior colleges. In the first quarter of the twentieth century California was one of the wealthiest states in the union with

²A. A. Gray, "The Junior College in California," School Review 22 (September 1915): 467-468.

a large tax base that was more than adequate for the support of education at all levels. The state also drew large revenues from royalties collected from the sale or lease of its rich mineral resources. From the early twentieth century onward the state was able to provide an ever-increasing amount of financial support for all levels of its educational system. By the mid-1920s, California ranked third in the nation in the proportion of its annual income devoted to education.³

Political conditions contributed to the growth of the junior college movement in the sunny state. California had a long history of liberal political support for increased educational spending to meet the changing needs of a growing population. As will be seen later in this study, far-sighted legislators passed several laws--notably those of 1907, 1917, and 1921--establishing the junior college system on a stable legal and financial basis. Whereas legislators in other states either ignored the junior colleges or left their support up to the local communities, California legislators began to treat the junior college as an integral part of the public school system, and hence deserving of state financial aid. No other state in this time period approached California in the amount of political support given to the establishment and maintenance of junior college education.⁴

Educational conditions in California also fostered the development of a junior college system. California had one of the best--if not the

³Walter C. Eells, The Junior College (Boston: Houghton Mifflin Co., 1921), p. 121.

⁴Ibid.

best--public elementary and secondary school systems in the nation and a large percentage of high school age students attending high school. California's high school teachers were highly trained professionals who had to meet strict state certification requirements, including a pre-requisite of one year of graduate work.⁵ California had, then, three important educational ingredients for the establishment of a junior college system: a good public school system to prepare students for college work, a large number of high school graduates from whom to recruit students for junior college programs, and a supply of well-trained high school teachers who could assume the responsibility of teaching college courses in expanded high schools.

The condition of California's higher education system contributed to the growth of the junior college system. As has been discussed previously, California had only two large universities, both located in the same general area and serving only a small portion of the state. At the turn of the century these two institutions were suffering from overcrowded conditions and had raised their admission standards in order to select students on a rational and qualitative basis. These highly selective standards annually led to the rejection of over half of the high school graduates. Unlike states in the Midwest and Northeast, California did not have a large number of small denominational colleges to serve the needs of students who for various reasons could not attend

⁵Alexis F. Lange, "The Junior College, With Special Reference to California," Educational Administration and Supervision 2 (January 1916): 4; Eells, Junior College, p. 121.

the state's universities.⁶ In California, then, there were not enough public or private higher institutions of learning to serve the needs of a large population.

California had both the resources and the need for the establishment of a junior college system. The need was recognized by many politicians, public school administrators and teachers, and laymen who wanted to provide more education at the local level for students who could not attend the universities. However, in California, as in the Midwest, the need for collegiate instruction was apparently first noted by university educators, who saw local junior colleges as the solution to problems affecting both the universities and the large numbers of students who wanted greater educational opportunities at the local level. Therefore, the story of the origins and development of the California junior college movement begins with the ideas and activities of two university educators, David Starr Jordan of Stanford University and Alexis F. Lange of the Berkeley campus of the University of California. More than any other individuals, these two leaders developed and spread the junior college philosophy and worked to establish the junior college as an integral part of California's public educational system.

David Starr Jordan: Friend of the Junior College

One of the most influential scientists and educators of the past century, David Starr Jordan was born in Gainesville, New York, on

⁶C. L. McLane, "The Junior College, or Upward Extension of the High School," School Review 21 (March 1913): 161; Eells, Junior College, p. 117.

January 19, 1851. He entered Cornell University in 1869, where he completed all the requirements for the bachelor's and master's degrees in three years and so distinguished himself that he was appointed an instructor in the botany department during his junior year. While studying at Cornell he was highly influenced by Louis Agassiz, the nationally-known scientist, and by President Andrew White, a noted scientist and educator who was a well-known advocate of the elective system, a three year baccalaureate degree, and separation of church and state. Following his graduation from Cornell he taught natural science at Lombard University (Galesburg, Illinois) for one year, served a one-year term as a principal and teacher at Appleton Collegiate Institute in Appleton, Wisconsin, and taught science at Indianapolis High School while studying at Indiana Medical School, from which he received a medical degree in 1875. He then spent four years as a professor of natural science and Dean of the Sciences at Butler University in Irvington, Indiana, where he earned the Ph.D. degree in 1878. In 1879 he went to Indiana University, where he served as head of the department of natural science until 1885 and as president until 1891, when largely through the influence of his old mentor, Andrew D. White, he was appointed first president of the newly established Leland Stanford University. He served as president of Stanford until 1913, as chancellor from 1913 until 1916, and as chancellor emeritus until his death in 1931. For over a quarter of a century, then, Jordan devoted

his life to Stanford University, working to establish it as one of the most prominent institutions of higher education in the nation.⁷

Having served as a teacher and administrator at two high schools, several colleges, and a state university before he became president of Stanford, Jordan obviously had obtained wide experience in education and had built a wide reputation as a teacher and administrator. He had also distinguished himself as a scientist and writer, having published several books, speeches, reports, and articles on many different subjects. At the time of his death he had published over one thousand articles and his collected published works ran to fifty-two volumes.⁸ Jordan was also widely known as an educational reformer, for at Indiana he had initiated the elective system, introduced several new courses, broadened the role of the president, taken steps to secularize the presidency and the University, and successfully lobbied at the state legislature for more and more money for the growing University.⁹ Jordan was an extremely capable and versatile man, and after he assumed the tremendous responsibility of the Stanford presidency the number and range of his interests and activities increased rather than diminished.

⁷For biographical information about Jordan, see his autobiography, Days of A Man: Being Memories of A Naturalist, Teacher, and Minor Prophet of Democracy, 2 vols. (New York: World Book Co., 1922); Dictionary of American Biography, 1933 ed., s.v. "David Starr Jordan," pp. 211-214; and Edward M. Burns, David Starr Jordan: Prophet of Freedom (Stanford: Stanford University Press, 1953).

⁸For a bibliography of his most important works, see Burns, David Starr Jordan, pp. 228-232.

⁹Luther William Spoehr, "Progress Pilgrim: David Starr Jordan and the Circle of Reform, 1891-1931" (Ph.D. dissertation, Stanford University, 1975), pp. 45-46.

Stanford University was established by Leland Stanford, a California railroad baron, former California governor, and a United States Senator at the time he lured Jordan to California. He and his wife established the University as a memorial to their young son, Leland Stanford, Jr., who had died while on a European tour in 1884. When the elder Stanford died in 1893, his widow, Jane Lanthrop Stanford, became the sole trustee of the University until her own death in 1905.¹⁰ A conservative and strong-willed woman, Mrs. Stanford was often a source of frustration to Jordan in his attempts to reform higher education and to establish Stanford as one of the nation's premier universities. These frustrations, along with inadequate financial support for the University, led him to seek other outlets for his intellectual curiosity and restless energy. One outlet was provided by his teaching and another by his educational and scientific writings, activities he was able to continue even with the heavy burdens of his office. As time passed, he began to pour more and more of his energies into the anti-imperialist and international pacifist movements.¹¹

Jordan felt that the president of a university should run the institution with little interference from the trustees, faculty, or students. As president of Stanford, he often operated in a very autocratic manner, rarely holding faculty meetings because he felt that the faculty should not be involved in administrative decisions, including

¹⁰Laurence R. Veysey, The Emergence of the American University (Chicago: University of Chicago Press, 1965), pp. 397-398.

¹¹Gregory L. Goodwin, A Social Panacea: A History of the Community College Ideology (Arlington, Va.: ERIC Document Reproductive Service, ED 093 427, 1974), p. 22.

those involving the recruitment and appointment of new faculty. He also was a bitter opponent of permanent faculty tenure.¹² Although he professed belief in academic freedom, he sometimes attempted to qualify its meaning, and on two different occasions he yielded to pressure from Mrs. Stanford and forced the resignation of two liberal, outspoken professors.¹³

Jordan was an independent thinker. He was not a member of any church or political party, and like many scientists of his day he was a skeptic who subscribed to no particular religious creeds or dogmas. As an adult he rarely attended church, though at Stanford he did occasionally visit Unitarian churches. He frequently wrote that organized religion was a major enemy of science and progress, and while at Stanford he attempted to make the institution as secular as possible.¹⁴ Unlike many college presidents of his day, Jordan was not afraid to speak out on sensitive public issues, including the highly volatile ones of imperialism and international peace.

Jordan's anti-imperialist and pacifist views and actions were logical outgrowths of a basic philosophy which was strongly Darwinian in nature and which strongly influenced his educational ideas. Like many intellectuals of his day, he shared the racist principles of Social

¹²Veysey, Emergence of the American University, p. 398.

¹³Richard Hofstadter and Walter P. Metzger, The Development of Academic Freedom in the United States (New York: Columbia University Press, 1955), pp. 436-442; Merle Curti and Roderick Nash, Philanthropy in the Shaping of American Higher Education (New Brunswick: Rutgers University Press, 1965), pp. 131-133.

¹⁴Burns, David Starr Jordan, pp. 35, 182-186.

Darwinism, a distortion of Darwin's views propagated by John Fiske, William Graham Sumner, John W. Burgess, and many other nineteenth century social scientists. Both within and between races, Jordan believed, there was a struggle for existence in which the fittest survived and the weak perished. Jordan felt that the races of mankind greatly differed from each other in their mental and physical abilities and also in their capacities for moral, political, social, and economic development. Frequently stereotyping people by traits and racial characteristics, Jordan freely (and erroneously) used such terms as "the French race," "the Jewish race," and the "Negro race," and typed some groups as lazy, others as heroic and ingenious, and still others as dissolute, ignorant, and immoral. He fully believed that the growth of civilization had been primarily the work of superior races, especially the Anglo-Saxon and Germanic ones.¹⁵ "The blood of nations," he once wrote, "determines its history. The history of a nation determines its blood."¹⁶ He also believed that superior races could degenerate through emigration of inferior stock, inter-marriage, and, especially, war, which killed off the strongest part of the population and destroyed great races and great civilizations.¹⁷

Beginning in 1898 with his outspoken opposition to the Spanish-American War, Jordan became a highly vocal and influential opponent of

¹⁵Ibid., pp. 60-68.

¹⁶David Starr Jordan, The Blood of the Nation: A Study of the Decay of the Races Through the Survival of the Unfit (Boston: American Unitarian Association, 1910), p. 7.

¹⁷Burns, David Starr Jordan, pp. 68-69.

war and of the imperialism which he felt led to war. In speeches, articles, and books, he established himself as the nation's foremost pacifist, condemning war as a moral and biological catastrophe which destroyed the strong and allowed the weak to survive. He modified his views only slightly in 1917 when the United States entered the First World War. In that year he wrote that "I would not change one word I have spoken against war" but "we must now stand together in the hope that our entrance into war may in some way advance the cause of Democracy and hasten the coming of lasting peace."¹⁸ His pacifist efforts brought him national and international fame and consumed much of his energies during the last thirty years of his life. In the 1920s his writings contributed to the growth of isolationist sentiment in the United States, and in 1925 he received the Ralph Herman Prize of \$25,000 for his work in promoting international peace.¹⁹

Jordan's belief in Social Darwinism was reflected in his educational philosophy. A strong believer in the effect of inherited traits on the intelligence and behavior of individuals and groups, Jordan felt that in every society a few superior individuals were destined to rise above the great masses of men, to hold the major positions of leadership, and to be responsible for most of society's progress in all areas. The purpose of the university, he believed, was to develop the superior

¹⁸Jordan, Days of A Man, 2: 735.

¹⁹For additional information on Jordan's pacifist activities, see Richard Hofstadter, Social Darwinism in American Thought (New York: George Braziller, 1959), pp. 195-196; Burns, David Starr Jordan, pp. 22-33, 78-106, 119-127.

talents of this minority which could benefit from a true university education. The university should not attempt to educate the masses because it was inefficient for society to try to give them more educational training than they could properly absorb and use. A college education was highly beneficial, he once wrote, "if you are made of the right stuff; for you cannot fasten a two-thousand-dollar education to a fifty-cent boy." Any attempt to educate the masses at the university would lead to the lowering of educational standards which would cheapen the educational process and prevent the elite from receiving a proper education.²⁰

Jordan's concern for the elite did not, however, lead him to ignore the masses, for he felt that equality of opportunity was the cornerstone of democracy. Jordan believed in an aristocracy of talent, not birth, and he felt that members of this aristocracy came from all socio-economic levels. The purpose of education at all levels was to identify and develop this talent, to increase access to educational facilities, and to elevate the masses by educating them to their fullest capacity. Only in this manner could a democratic nation develop the large number of intelligent and enlightened citizens and workers necessary for the functioning and survival of a free and prosperous society.²¹ Unlike many educators of his day, he felt that the equality of educational opportunity doctrine also extended to women, and he was a strong supporter not only of female education but of co-education. He

²⁰Goodwin, A Social Panacea, p. 66.

²¹Ibid., pp. 65-70; Burns, David Starr Jordan, pp. 170-172.

believed that education was "the birthright of every daughter of the republic as well as every man," and that it was unnatural and inefficient to segregate the sexes in educational institutions.²² Jordan was married twice, and both wives were college graduates and highly intelligent individuals.

Like President Harper and many of the other pioneers of the junior college movement, Jordan was an admirer of the German educational system and hoped to transplant it to America. The university should be concerned, he felt, with advanced studies, not with elementary collegiate instruction. The true purpose of the university was to provide an environment and stimulus for research and for the training of students in the methods of discovering truth. The university's purpose was not to teach truth, but to show people how to discover it themselves. He said and wrote on many occasions that the university's purposes could best be achieved if the freshman and sophomore years were relegated to the high schools. This would be good for the university and also for the student:

It is better for the university to be as far as possible free from the necessity of junior college instruction. It is better for the student at this period to enter an institution with large faculty and large resources. Furthermore, if the junior college has the teachers and conditions it ought to have, it is in very many cases better that the student should take his early training there, rather than as a member of the enormous mass of freshmen and sophomores our great universities are now carrying.²³

²²David Starr Jordan, "The Higher Education of Women," Popular Science Monthly (December 1902): 98.

²³David Starr Jordan, "The College and the University," Science 27 (April 3, 1908): 531.

During his presidency Jordan attempted to mold Stanford into a truly great university. When he came to Stanford from Indiana he recruited twelve professors out of the total Indiana faculty of twenty-nine. He also persuaded thirty-five Indiana students to leave that institution and follow him to Stanford.²⁴ Jordan also recruited top faculty members from across the nation, particularly from the Midwest. At Stanford he quickly made, as he once wrote, "some sweeping changes" in university education.²⁵ He established a curriculum emphasizing pure and applied sciences and the humanities, added many modern courses to the curriculum, allowed students to take more electives and fewer required courses, organized the faculty around professorships rather than departments, introduced the "major professorship" system which he had used at Indiana, and attempted to abolish the lower division (the freshman and sophomore curriculum) from the University.²⁶ In these and other projects he was often frustrated by inadequate resources and the narrow vision and opposition of Mrs. Stanford.²⁷ After the heavy damage caused by the California earthquake of 1906, Jordan realized that he had to concentrate less on innovations and more on rebuilding and consolidating his earlier achievements.²⁸

²⁴ Spoehr, "Progress' Pilgrim," p. 50.

²⁵ Jordan, Days of A Man, 1:293.

²⁶ Dictionary of American Biography, 10:212.

²⁷ Gregory L. Goodwin, "The Nature and Nurture of the Community College Movement," Community College Frontiers 4 (Spring 1976):7.

²⁸ Jordan, Days of A Man, 2:174-177.

In 1907, however, Jordan attempted to accomplish one of his long-standing major projects: the elimination of the freshman and sophomore years from Stanford's curriculum. This plan, which clearly shows the influence of Harper's work at Chicago, was put before the Board of Trustees in Jordan's "President's Report" of 1907. In this report he reiterated his view that the work of the first two years properly belonged to the high school and should be eliminated from the university curriculum. American higher education, he felt, was already moving in this direction:

In America, there is a tendency to separate the college into two parts: the junior college of two years, in which the work is still collegiate, and the university college, in which the work of the university begins. This separation, first accomplished in the University of Chicago, is still little more than a name. About the University of Chicago many collegiate institutions have become junior colleges, that is, institutions which recommend some or all of their students to the university at the end of the sophomore year. This arrangement is in many ways desirable....

It is safe to prophesy that before many years the American university will abandon the junior college work, relegating it to the college on the one hand and to the graduate courses of the secondary schools on the other. Under these conditions its discipline and its method of instruction will approximate those of the universities of Germany and other countries of Europe.²⁹

In this report Jordan also asserted that Stanford University had not lived up to the ideals of its founder, who had hoped that it would be a university in the truest sense, an institution offering specialized and advanced work like its German counterpart. In order for Stanford to become a true university, several important steps would have to be taken. The first essential step was "the elimination, as soon as possible--let us say in the course of five years--of the junior college,

²⁹Jordan, "College and the University," p. 531.

by the addition of two years to the entrance requirements." In essence, this meant that an associate's degree or its equivalent would be the basic requirement for admission to Stanford, so all undergraduates would enter Stanford as juniors and complete the baccalaureate in two years. Jordan also asked the trustees to add medicine, engineering, and other advanced and specialized work to the curriculum, to enlarge the library, laboratories, and other research facilities, and to provide for more scholarships and fellowships which would attract scholars from across the nation.³⁰

The Board of Trustees referred Jordan's recommendations to a faculty committee. The committee rejected the proposals on the grounds that California's high schools and small colleges were ill-equipped to provide high quality freshman and sophomore instruction. Maintaining that "the successful establishment of six year high schools is a problem of the future," the committee held that "upperclassmen coming from six year high schools and small colleges...would not be as well trained or as far advanced as those who began their college work here."³¹

The state legislature's passage in 1907 of the influential Caminetti law authorizing junior college work in the high schools led Jordan to make further attempts to persuade the trustees to adopt his proposals. However, the trustees and faculty study committees remained

³⁰Ibid., pp. 531-533.

³¹Cited in H. A. Spindt, "Establishment of the Junior College in California, 1907-1921," California Journal of Secondary Education 32 (November 1957): 395.

unconvinced, partly because of the fear of such radical change but primarily because of the failure of the California junior college system to develop fast enough to relieve Stanford of the burden of providing the first two years of collegiate instruction.³²

Jordan's junior college views, particularly those concerning the elimination of the freshman and sophomore years from the university, came under heavy attack from the California press. They were also criticized by regional and national educational journals. A typical reaction was that of the editor of the Educational Review, who agreed with some of Jordan's basic ideas, including the establishment of college work in the high schools, but felt that some of his other proposals were too radical:

The principle underlying President Jordan's recommendation is undoubtedly sound in that it recognizes the important differences which exist between the first two years of collegiate work, as now recognized in America, and that of the years that follow. We do not understand, however, the reason for recommending the discontinuance of the Junior College work at the University itself. To carry out this suggestion would be to break sharply with American educational traditions and practice, and to introduce into our already much troubled educational system new problems and difficulties.³³

However, Jordan never abandoned his plans. In numerous speeches and articles he continued to publicize the junior college philosophy and to attempt to convince high schools to take advantage of state legislation authorizing the establishment of junior college programs as extensions of the high school. For example, in a journal article in

³²Robert A. Altman, The Upper Division College (San Francisco: Jossey-Bass, Inc., 1970), p. 28.

³³"The Junior College," Educational Review 37 (May 1909): 537-538.

1908, he summarized his junior college views and concluded with the assertion that the trend toward relegating freshman and sophomore collegiate work to the high school was "the most important movement by far" in the field of higher education.³⁴ Dozens of similar articles appeared in subsequent years. According to Alexis F. Lange, a friend of Jordan and a junior college pioneer in his own right, Jordan did more than any other single individual to propagate the junior college philosophy and to popularize the term "junior college" as a substitute for the old "six year high school" term.³⁵ Jordan also aided the junior college movement by offering university recognition of high school junior college programs and by admitting graduates of these programs into the junior class at Stanford. Jordan's efforts in this area will be discussed in more detail later in this chapter.

After his retirement from the University in 1916 Jordan continued to propagate the junior college philosophy, and he always considered his work in junior college education to be among his major educational achievements. Looking back on the junior college movement in 1926, he wrote that the junior college movement had made great progress in California since his early days at Stanford. He noted that from 15 high schools, less than 1000 students, and no junior colleges in 1890, California's educational system had grown by 1926 to embrace almost 500 high schools, 50 junior colleges, and almost 25,000 college students.³⁶

³⁴"The Junior College," World's Work 16 (July 1908): 10453.

³⁵Lange, "The Junior College, with Special Reference to California," p. 3.

³⁶David Starr Jordan, "The Junior College," Forum 75 (March 1926): 449-450.

Of his contribution to this dynamic development of junior college education in California, Jordan was justifiably proud.

Alexis F. Lange: Spokesman for the Junior College

The most influential figure in the California public junior college movement was Alexis F. Lange. Like so many of the early pioneers of junior college education, Lange was a product of the Midwest. He was born in Lexington, Missouri, in 1862, but soon after his birth his family moved to Wisconsin. Lange received his high school education in the Detroit public schools and his baccalaureate, master's and doctoral degrees from the University of Michigan. After he obtained his master's degree in 1885, Lange taught English, Latin, and German at a Wisconsin high school for two years before going abroad for a year's study of linguistics at two German universities. From 1880 to 1890 he taught English and German at his alma mater while pursuing his doctoral studies, and in 1890, two years before he received his doctorate, he moved to California to begin a long and distinguished career at the Berkeley campus of the University of California. At Berkeley he served in many capacities over the years: professor of English, professor of education, Dean of the College of Letters and Science, Dean of the Graduate School, Dean of the Faculties, and from 1913 until 1923, as Dean of the newly organized School of Education. He died in 1924.³⁷

³⁷Jesse Parker Bogue, The Community College (New York: McGraw-Hill, 1950), pp. 332-335; Dictionary of American Biography, 1933 ed., s.v. "Alexis F. Lange," 10:591.

Unlike Jordan, Harper, and many of the other pioneers of the junior college movement, Lange did not operate from the powerful position of college president, but during his thirty-three years at the University of California he exercised a great influence on the development of education at that institution, throughout the state of California, and across the nation. At the University he helped to reorganize the graduate and undergraduate programs and to develop the education department from a small step-child of the university to a large and nationally recognized professional school. In public school education he was a leading authority and influence in the development of secondary education, particularly in the junior high school, of which he is the acknowledged father, and in the growth of an integrated public school system from the primary through the university level. He was also the major force behind the reorganization of the state board of education as a lay board in 1913. Finally, he was a major leader in the junior college movement, helping to provide much of the philosophy and inspiration behind the establishment of a state-wide system of public junior colleges.³⁸ In the history of American junior college education his influence was second only to that of William Rainey Harper.

Lange's junior college philosophy grew out of years of study, writing, and experience as a student, teacher, and administrator. He was not a formal student of education. His graduate degrees and his studies in Germany were concentrated in literature and linguistics, and

³⁸Bogue, Community College, p. 334; Dictionary of American Biography, 10:591.

until 1906 he taught in the department of English rather than education. His years as an undergraduate and graduate student at Michigan left a major impression on his thinking, for he was at the university during the presidency of James B. Angell, who, like one of his predecessors, Henry P. Tappan, was trying to eliminate the freshman and sophomore years from the curriculum and to make other reforms along German lines.³⁹ Lange himself later wrote that he acquired his interest in junior college education at Michigan and carried the basic ideas with him to California.⁴⁰ Lange also had a personal knowledge of the German system through his year of study at German universities, and he was acquainted, through educational literature, with the ideas and activities of William Rainey Harper.

Like Harper, Lange felt that American education should adopt many German ideas and practices, particularly in secondary and higher education. In many speeches and articles he compared the first two years of American collegiate instruction to the last two years of European secondary schools, such as the French lycée and the German gymnasium.⁴¹ According to Lange, these two years were but "the continuation and culmination of secondary education," and on many occasions he predicted that in the future American universities would become more like their German counterparts, concentrating on advanced undergraduate studies and graduate and professional education while the small colleges and

³⁹Goodwin, A Social Panacea, p. 76.

⁴⁰Eells, Junior College, p. 91.

⁴¹Alexis F. Lange, "The Junior College - What Manner of Child Shall This Be?" School and Society 7 (February 1918): 212.

expanded high schools carried the burden of freshman and sophomore instruction. He also felt, however, that for practical reasons the university would have to provide freshman and sophomore instruction for many years to come, until the junior colleges in the high schools had developed to the point where they could take over the responsibility.⁴² However, he often became impatient with progress in this area, and time and time again he urged that this burden "be relegated as soon and as far as practicable to the secondary schools."⁴³

Lange's interest in reorganizing the university along German lines appeared very early in his career in California. In 1892, two years after he came to Berkeley, he became a prominent member of a university committee established to study the possible reorganization of the University. The head of the committee was Charles M. Gayley, who had taught with Lange at Michigan and had been very instrumental in luring Lange to California. Largely through the work of these two men, the committee recommended, and the University implemented, a plan to divide the undergraduate program into an upper and lower division, with the latter consisting of the freshman and sophomore years of instruction.⁴⁴ Students completing the first two years of instruction were granted a junior certificate "to mark the distinction between university and

⁴²Alexis F. Lange, "The Junior College As An Integral Part of the Public School System," School Review 25 (September 1917): 471-472.

⁴³Lange, "Junior College With Special Reference to California," p. 2.

⁴⁴W. H. Cowley, The Emergence of the Junior College in the Evolution of American Education: A Memorandum for the Fund for the Republic. (Arlington, Va.: ERIC Document Reproduction Service, ED 116 741, 1976), pp. 47-48.

secondary education." Acquisition of this certificate was required for students to begin their junior year of study or to enter the University's professional schools. The purpose of these changes, Lange often maintained, was to promote recognition of the secondary nature of freshman and sophomore instruction, to upgrade the University, and to encourage the high schools to begin offering college instruction.⁴⁵ The similarities between Lange's ideas and actions and those of Harper at Chicago are quite apparent, though Lange and the University of California did not officially refer to the lower division as the junior college.

Although Lange's contributions to the bifurcation of the undergraduate program at the University of California showed his intellectual kinship to Harper, Jordan, and other junior college pioneers, his educational views were much broader than those of any of his predecessors or contemporaries in the junior college movement. Unlike them, Lange did not look upon the public schools, and particularly the high schools, as just college and university preparatory schools, nor did he view the junior college as simply a high school imitation of the traditional first two years of college. Lange felt that the entire public educational system, from the primary grades through the university, should be viewed and organized as an integrated system serving the many different needs of its diverse student population. He emphasized that although the university was the natural capstone of the system, only a

⁴⁵Lange, "Junior College As An Integral Part of the Public School System," pp. 470-471.

small minority would ever attend it, so the elementary and secondary schools should attempt to do far more than prepare students for university work. Thus, in contrast to other junior college pioneers, who were primarily interested in university education and promoted it at the expense of the lower levels, Lange took a much broader view and emphasized the special roles of all educational levels and the needs of students of all ages, talents, and aspirations.⁴⁶

Although Lange felt that the junior college should function, like the gymnasium, as a feeder to the universities, he also strongly believed that it should be much more than that. For a quarter of a century he preached the doctrine that the California junior colleges were logical extensions of the public school system and had originated and spread to meet the many diverse needs of the state's growing population. To him, the junior college was "a normal development within a state school system in the making, and this, in turn, is itself being shaped largely by factors and forces that are national and even world-wide." As a natural extension of public education in a time of rapid socio-economic changes, the junior college should perform many functions.⁴⁷

Lange felt that junior college departments in the high schools should provide a high quality education for students who wanted traditional college programs that would allow them to transfer to a university as juniors. He believed that this was necessary because of the

⁴⁶These themes run throughout Lange's speeches and articles, especially "The Junior College As An Integral Part of the Public School System" and "The Junior College With Special Reference to California."

⁴⁷Lange, "Junior College With Special Reference to California," pp. 1-2.

overcrowded conditions in California's universities, the relative absence of a large number of small four-year colleges in the state, the long distances separating public universities and colleges from large portions of the population, and the inability of many poor or immature students to move away from home to attend college. These factors played a major role in his efforts to bifurcate the undergraduate programs at the University and to promote the development of junior college departments in the high schools. From the 1890s onward he was a major force behind the University's practice of granting full university credit for up to two full years of college courses completed in six-year high schools. In determining credits for graduation from the University, these junior college transfer students were treated like transfers from four-year colleges and like the institution's own lower division students.⁴⁸

Unlike the other early junior college pioneers, Lange felt that the junior college should offer vocational training for students who did not have the desire or ability to acquire a university education. He saw the introduction of vocational education in the junior college as part of a nationwide "movement to equalize educational opportunities by the creation of lower and middle systems of vocational training." In addition to promoting educational opportunities, junior college departments of vocational training would "render a great service to the universities and to thousands of young people by diverting them from the university and thus preventing their becoming 'misfits' for

⁴⁸Ibid., pp. 4, 7-8.

life."⁴⁹ For these reasons, he frequently urged high school and junior college faculty and administrators not to persuade students to pursue traditional college studies when what they really needed or wanted was vocational training. Lange's interest in junior college vocational education placed him far ahead of his time, for the era of the development of junior college vocational education, which is now a major component of junior college curriculums across the nation, did not arrive until the period between the two world wars.

Lange often emphasized that the junior college should teach citizenship in its broadest sense. In an important address delivered before the National Education Association in San Francisco in 1915, Lange recommended that every junior college in California establish a department of civic education. This department would have several functions. One of its major functions would be to train students to have a better grasp of the real meaning of democracy, so that they would understand that "democracy is neither a perfect gift of the fathers nor a perfect fact, but a goal more or less remote, an ideal to be realized." Another purpose of this department would be to teach students how to live in society by inculcating in them a sense of oneness with their fellow citizens and a sense of responsibility for the good of all. Finally, the department would provide practical vocational training in the art of civic government, training young civil servants to fill essential jobs in Federal, state, county, and municipal

⁴⁹Alexis F. Lange, "The Junior College," Addresses and Proceedings of the National Education Association 53 (1915): 119-121.

governments. Lange felt that the department of civic education was so important that it should constitute the center of any curriculum offered at the junior college, and that every student should be required to take at least a few of its courses. To him, citizenship was an essential skill, an applied science which could be and should be taught at the junior college.⁵⁰

Lange's interest in vocational and civic training indicates his great concern that the junior colleges of California not be simply imitations of the first two years of the university. He felt that "the junior college, in order to promote the general welfare, which is the sole reason for its existence, cannot make preparation for the university its excuse for being." On the contrary, "the junior college will function adequately only if its first concern is with those who will go no further." The junior college could justify its existence only "if it enables thousands and tens of thousands to round out their general education" and "turns an increasing number into vocations for which training has not hitherto been afforded by our school system."⁵¹

Lange felt that junior colleges throughout the state should not offer duplicate programs but should individualize their offerings to meet local needs. Every junior college should have two years of collegiate instruction to prepare students to enter the university, a department of civic education to teach citizenship, and a department of

⁵⁰ Alexis F. Lange, "A Junior College Department of Civic Education," School And Society 2 (September 1915): 443-445.

⁵¹ Lange, "Junior College As An Integral Part of the Public School System," p. 472.

vocational training to train students in the specific skills needed in each geographical area. For example, vocational departments in junior colleges in rural areas would emphasize the agricultural sciences and technologies, while those in cities would promote the industrial and commercial skills needed in urban economies.⁵² He often complained that California junior colleges were not moving fast enough to provide vocational training tailored to local needs and that they were placing too much emphasis on imitating the lower divisions of four-year colleges and universities. Lange correctly indicated that the reason for this imbalance lay in the large expenses involved in providing vocational training and in the traditional educational backgrounds and preferences of most junior college administrators and faculty.⁵³

Lange's vision of junior college education was a broad one which placed him far ahead of his time and made him sound very much like modern junior college admirers and prophets. He wanted to establish comprehensive junior colleges, very much like today's community colleges, offering many different curriculums geared to the needs of individual students and local communities. He looked forward to the time when "each city and each county of the state will have at least one junior college."⁵⁴ These institutions would be "within the reach of rich and poor alike, throughout the length and breadth of the State"

⁵²Lange, "The Junior College - What Manner of Child Shall This Be?", pp. 211-212.

⁵³Lange, "Junior College As An Integral Part of the Public School System," pp. 472-474.

⁵⁴Lange, "A Junior College Department of Civic Education," p. 442.

and would come close to realizing the impossible dream of bringing "the University within walking distance of every doorstep."⁵⁵ A fully developed system of junior colleges as an integral part of the state system of public education would bring future Californians many advantages:

They will enable the Universities to concentrate their efforts more and more on university work proper. They will relieve the State University of a large part of University extension service. They will offer thousands of young people from sixteen to twenty years of age the advantages of being taught and trained in small groups, not far from home. They will make it possible for thousands who are unable to attend a university or college to round out their general education. They will reduce very materially the cost of college and university education. They will provide 'finishing' vocational courses in agriculture, in the industries, in commerce, in applied civics, in domestic science, etc. They will constitute educational centres of a high order, whose influence for good will extend in many directions over large areas of the state.⁵⁶

Lange played a major role in helping California to establish the kind of junior college system he had in mind. For over thirty years he developed and spread the junior college philosophy in articles and speeches, visited and corresponded with high schools establishing or considering establishing junior college programs, and promised the University of California's recognition and acceptance of college work offered in the expanded high schools. Many authorities also credit Lange with playing a major role in the drafting and passage in 1907 of the state's first junior college bill. According to this view, Lange used his personal influence to persuade George E. Crothers, a prominent

⁵⁵Cited by Spindt, "Establishment of the Junior College in California," p. 393.

⁵⁶Lange, "Junior College With Special Reference to California," p. 8.

lawyer and member of Stanford's Board of Trustees, to draft the law, and then persuaded Senator Anthony Caminetti to introduce the bill and muster enough support to secure its passage.⁵⁷ Lange was not the first junior college pioneer, but he was one of the most influential and modern-looking of all the junior college leaders in the era between 1850 and 1921. More than any other man, he helped develop the junior college into a unique institution rather than a poor imitation and student dumping ground of the lower divisions of universities which were seeking to divest themselves of the burden of freshman and sophomore instruction.

The Development of California Junior Colleges, 1907-1917

David Starr Jordan and Alexis F. Lange provided much of the philosophy and leadership during the early history of the junior college movement, but beginning in 1907 the impetus for the institutional growth of the junior college system began to shift to the state capital and the halls of the state legislature. Between 1907 and 1921 the state legislature moved gradually to establish the junior college system on a firm legal and financial basis. Several junior college bills were enacted in this time period, with the most important ones being those of 1907, 1917, and 1921. These three laws are important landmarks in the history of the California junior college movement.

Although the first state junior college legislation dates from 1907, the philosophical and institutional history of California's junior

⁵⁷Cowley, Emergence of the Junior College, p. 49.

colleges began long before then. Ever since the 1890s Jordan and Lange had been promoting the junior college idea and their respective universities had been accepting college credits from high schools offering postgraduate work. The University of California in 1892 had established a lower division, the equivalent of a junior college, on its own campus and begun awarding the junior certificate to graduates of this division. Although neither the state legislature nor the state board of education had authorized the establishment of postgraduate courses, some California high schools were offering college work several years before 1907.⁵⁸

In 1907 the state legislature passed a bill legalizing the long-standing practice of offering college courses in the high school. The bill was introduced by Senator Anthony Caminetti, a liberal politician who had sponsored a great deal of educational reforms in his long political career. As has been discussed earlier, Lange may have influenced Caminetti's decision to introduce the bill and to guide it through the maze of committees and floor debates. The full text of this bill is as follows:

The board of trustees of any city, district, union, joint union or county high school may prescribe post-graduate courses of study for the graduates of such high schools, or other high schools, which courses of study shall approximate the studies prescribed in the first two years of university courses. The board of trustees of any city, district, union, joint union, or county high school wherein the post-graduate courses of study are taught may charge

⁵⁸Altman, Upper Division College, p. 28; Allan Crawford, "A Short History of the Public Community Junior College Movement in the United States," Paedagogica Historica 10 (1970): 35.

tuition for pupils living within the boundaries of the district wherein such courses are taught.⁵⁹

This short bill is as notable for its omissions as for its inclusions. Basically, it legalized the offering of freshman and sophomore college work in the high schools, something the larger high schools had already been doing for years. However, it provided no guidelines or standards for courses or faculty and, most importantly, no financial backing, leaving it up to the local high schools to support postgraduate courses through tuition charges. In 1909 the legislature attempted to remedy the financial weaknesses of this law by passing legislation providing for state support of postgraduate courses offered in the high school, but the governor vetoed the bill on the grounds that it would cost the state too much money. Another legal impediment to junior college growth came in 1915, when the state attorney general ruled that junior college students in the high schools could not be counted in determining state allocations of money and faculty to the high schools.⁶⁰

In spite of its weaknesses, the junior college law of 1907 provided the basis for California's junior college growth for the next ten years. No high school took advantage of the law until 1910, but between that year and the passage of a new, stronger law in 1917, eighteen high schools established junior college programs. Although many of these

⁵⁹Eells, Junior College, p. 89; Cooper, "Junior College Movement in California," p. 412; and McLane, "The Junior College," p. 162.

⁶⁰Eells, Junior College, pp. 96-97.

junior colleges had short life spans, they provided the foundation for the rapid growth of the California junior college movement after 1921.

The first secondary school to take advantage of the 1907 law was Fresno high school. The leadership for the establishment of a junior college program at Fresno came primarily from C. L. McLane, the Fresno Superintendent of Schools, and A. C. Olney, the principal of the high school. Although the two men worked closely together in 1909 and 1910 in planning the junior college department, the primary role in the whole enterprise seems to have been played by McLane. In 1910 he sent out a circular letter to the community, explaining in detail his plan for a junior college program at Fresno. He quickly received over two hundred favorable replies. With this kind of support, he had no trouble convincing the Fresno board of education to authorize the establishment of a two year junior college course as an extension of the high school.⁶¹

The primary motives behind the establishment of a junior college program at Fresno were similar to those operating in the establishment of other junior colleges in the Midwest and in California during this period. The board of education, in its resolution authorizing the establishment of a junior college program, indicated that the major reasons for its actions were geographical and financial. The nearest college or university was over two hundred miles away, and many parents could not afford the expense of sending their young boys or girls away to a residential college. In addition, some parents were reluctant to

⁶¹McLane, "The Junior College," pp. 163-164; Gray, "Junior College in California," p. 466.

send their immature children so far away from home. McLane shared these concerns, though in his thinking the primary reason for the establishment of a junior college program was the lack of educational opportunities throughout the state. California's two major universities were both located near San Francisco, he emphasized, and the state lacked the large number of small colleges that could be found in the Midwest and the Northeast. The high school, he felt, would have to fill this major educational void.⁶²

The junior college division at Fresno high school opened in September of 1910 with fifteen students, three faculty members, free tuition for local residents, and a charge of four dollars per month for non-residents. The principal of the high school was Frederick Liddeke, who replaced A. C. Olney when the latter took the principalship at Santa Barbara High School. An 1891 graduate of Harvard, Liddeke had also completed a year of graduate work at the University of Berlin and had been strongly influenced by the German educational system. He felt that the American high school should become more like the French lycée and the German gymnasium and assume the responsibility of providing the first two years of university instruction.⁶³ Consequently, the junior college curriculum at Fresno was a traditional college curriculum aimed at students who wanted to transfer to the university to complete the

⁶²McLane, "The Junior College," pp. 161-164.

⁶³Alban Elwell Reid, Jr., "A History of the California Public Junior College Movement," (Ed.D. dissertation, University of Southern California, 1966), p. 72.

baccalaureate degree. The curriculum offered few opportunities in vocational or terminal education, except for agricultural technology, even though the board of education had authorized junior colleges "to provide practical courses in agriculture, manual training, domestic science, and other technical work in addition to the regular academic courses."⁶⁴

The junior college at Fresno was aided from the very beginning by Stanford University and the University of California. Authorities at both institutions had conferred with McLane and his staff before the opening of the junior college division, helping to draft the curriculum and select the faculty and dean.⁶⁵ From the 1890s onward these two institutions had accepted college credit from California high schools with postgraduate programs, and after the passage of the junior college law of 1907 the University of California began to publish and circulate guidelines and standards for junior college courses, faculty training, and equipment. For the most part, the University of California treated the junior college courses offered in Fresno and other high schools as interchangeable with those taught in the lower division of the University.⁶⁶

Jordan and Lange naturally showed a great interest in the development of the junior college program at Fresno. In 1912, Jordan wrote a congratulatory letter to McLane, offering his support and reiterating his views on the values of the junior college.

⁶⁴McLane, "The Junior College," p. 164.

⁶⁵Ibid.

⁶⁶Cooper, "Junior College Movement in California," pp. 414-416.

I am looking forward, as you know, to the time when the large high schools of the state, in conjunction with the small colleges, will relieve the two great universities from the expense and from the necessity of giving instruction of the first two university years. The instruction of these two years is of necessity elementary and of the same general nature as the work of the high school itself. It is not desirable for a university to have more than about two thousand students gathered together in one place, and when the number comes to exceed that figure then some division is desirable. The only reasonable division is that which will take away students who do not need libraries or laboratories for their work. The value of the University is highly dependent on its possession of great and expensive libraries. I am interested in the experiment which is going on at Fresno, and in the high school in Los Angeles.⁶⁷

Lange also sent McLane a letter of congratulations and support in 1912. The letter is worthy of full reproduction here because of the insight it offers into Lange's views on the junior college movement:

Farsighted and progressive educators are agreed that the establishment of 'junior colleges' denotes a necessary development in the right direction. Such extensions of the four-year high school would (1) enable the universities to concentrate their efforts on university work proper, (2) provide for young people from eighteen to twenty years of age the immense educational advantage of being taught and trained in small groups, not far from home, (3) make it possible for thousands who are unable to attend a university to round out their general education, (4) reduce very materially the cost of college and university education, (5) provide - a most important factor - finishing vocational courses in agriculture, the industries, commerce, applied civics, domestic science, etc., which cannot be adequately provided either by the four-year high school or by the universities, (6) tend to create a number of educational centers of a high order whose influence for good would extend in many directions over large areas of the state.

The state university has stood for the junior college plan for more than fifteen years, and its policy is to further the establishment of junior colleges in every possible way. This implies of course that the university stands ready to recognize the courses of junior colleges as the equivalent of corresponding courses at Berkeley and to give full credit for successfully completed work.

⁶⁷Cited in McLane, "The Junior College," pp. 166-167; and E. A. Fitzpatrick, "The Case for Junior Colleges," Educational Review 65 (March 1923): 151.

The city of Fresno is to be greatly congratulated on being the first city in the state to establish a junior college. May this prosper and become year by year more useful, especially to those who would otherwise have to forego the chance of higher vocational training. Those recommended for university work at Berkeley will, I feel confident, have no reason to regret that their Freshman and Sophomore work was done in Fresno.⁶⁸

Lange's encouragement of the Fresno junior college program was not limited to letters, for in 1912 he also visited the campus and addressed a convocation of its high school seniors and junior college students. In this address he reiterated his view that educational trends in California were leading to the elimination of the freshman and sophomore years at the university level and the relegation of this burden to the junior college departments in the high schools. He indicated that this was necessary if the University of California was to relieve its overcrowded conditions and become a true university like those of Germany. He also emphasized that in his view the junior college students at Fresno could get a better education in the small classes at the high school than they could in the overcrowded and impersonal classes at the University. He again promised, as he had many times before, that the University would recognize and accept all college work done at Fresno without any further examinations.⁶⁹

In spite of support from the local community and from the state's major universities, the junior college program at Fresno grew slowly between 1910 and 1917. Beginning with 15 students in 1910, the junior college division at the high school grew to 35 in 1912-1913, 77 in

⁶⁸Cited in McLane, "The Junior College," p. 167.

⁶⁹Ibid., pp. 167-168.

1914-1915, and 117 in 1915-1916, but in 1916-1917 it fell back to 79. The enrollment decline in 1917 was probably a result of the unsettled conditions in the nation as the United States prepared to enter World War I.⁷⁰ The faculty also grew during this period, from 3 in 1910 to a respectable 8 in 1913, including 2 with doctoral degrees and 2 with master's.⁷¹ The junior college division at Fresno, like those in other cities, was a small and struggling department in its early period, but it was from these modest beginnings that California's junior college system grew to become the nation's largest.

After the establishment of a junior college division at Fresno, seventeen other California high schools took advantage of the 1907 law and established junior college programs. In 1911 junior college departments were founded at Santa Barbara and Hollywood, with the former being established by A. C. Olney, who had helped McLane initiate the junior college division at Fresno. Junior college programs were started at a Los Angeles high school in 1912 and in Kern County, Fullerton, and Long Beach high schools in 1913. By 1913 the total enrollment in all California junior colleges was only 247, but that figure jumped dramatically with the rapid growth of junior colleges in the next three years. Three junior college departments were established in high schools in 1914 (San Diego, Sacramento, Placer), two in 1915 (Citrus and Santa Ana), and five in 1916 (Chaffey, Pomona, Anaheim, San Luis Obispo, and Los Angeles Polytechnic). Six other high schools

⁷⁰Cooper, "Junior College Movement in California," p. 412.

⁷¹Gray, "Junior College in California," p. 471.

introduced a handful of college courses in this early period but did not establish junior college departments. By 1915-1916, on the eve of the passage of a new California junior college law, the enrollment in all California junior college departments had reached a total of 1104, with over half of the students enrolled in the two Los Angeles high schools.⁷² Very significantly, as the junior college movement grew, the term "junior College" began to replace "postgraduate department" in educational literature and in the communications of the state board of education.⁷³

The Junior College Laws of 1917 and 1921

The early California junior colleges established under the 1907 law were severely handicapped by the lack of state financial support. From 1907 onward, prominent educators at both the college and secondary level worked to establish the junior college departments on a sounder financial basis. The most important of these friends of the junior college was William C. Wood, the California Commissioner of Secondary Education. In 1916, he presented to the state board of education a detailed report arguing the case for state financial support of junior colleges on the same basis as high school programs. "The time has arrived," he wrote, "when the graduate or junior college department

⁷²For more detailed accounts of the founding of these early junior colleges, see Walter C. Eells, "The Early History of California Public Junior Colleges," California Quarterly of Secondary Education 4 (April 1929): 214-222; and Reid, "History of the California Public Junior College Movement," pp. 181-197.

⁷³Eells, "Early History of California Public Junior College," p. 215.

should be placed on a more satisfactory financial basis." Junior college students in high schools should be counted in determining the appropriations the high school would receive from the state. He emphasized that in his view, "the junior college is part of our public school system and tuition therein should be free."⁷⁴

The state board of education, prominent educators, and leading politicians supported Wood's ideas, and in 1917 his proposals were included in a new state junior college law named the Ballard Act after the senator who sponsored it. The first part of the Ballard Act reads as follows:

The high school board of any high school district having an assessed valuation of \$3,000,000 or more may prescribe junior college courses of study, including not more than two years of work, and admit thereto the graduates of such high schools, the graduates of other high schools, and such other candidates for admission who are at least 21 years of age and are recommended for admission by the principal of the high school maintaining such junior college courses. Junior college courses of study may include such studies as are required for the junior certificate at the University of California, and such other courses of training in the mechanical and industrial arts, household economy, agriculture, civic education, and commerce as the high school board may deem it advisable to establish.

The law also provided that students enrolled in junior college courses would be counted in determining the average daily attendance of the high schools of the district. The law further provided that all junior college courses would have to be approved by the state board of education, and very importantly, it gave high school districts the authority to set up separate junior colleges not connected with the high

⁷⁴William C. Wood, Second Biennial Report of the State Board of Education of California, (Sacramento, 1916): 163-164, cited by Reid, "History of the California Public Junior College Movement," p. 201.

schools.⁷⁵ This portion of the law facilitated the growth in California of independent, separate two-year institutions like those dominating the nationwide junior college system today.

America's entrance into World War I hampered the full implementation of the Ballard Act. Many young people were reluctant to begin educational careers in such unsettled times, and of course many young men who might have entered California's junior colleges were mobilized instead by the American military machine. Although eleven new high schools began to offer junior college programs between 1917 and 1921, several new and old junior college departments were dropped in these four years because of severe decreases in enrollments. Enrollments dropped from 1561 in 1917-1918 to 1225 in 1918-1919 and 1096 in 1919-1920. In 1920-1921, before the passage of the new junior college law, there were still only 18 junior colleges with an enrollment of 1442, down 119 from the pre-war high.⁷⁶ This figure does not include the 1080 students enrolled at the Southern Branch of the University of California, which was founded in Los Angeles in 1919 by the merger of the junior college departments of three high schools in the area. For several years this branch of the University offered only junior college work.⁷⁷

⁷⁵F. M. McDowell, The Junior College, U. S., Bureau of Education, Bulletin, 1919, No. 35 (Washington: Government Printing Office, 1919), pp. 72-73.

⁷⁶Cooper, "Junior College Movement in California," p. 422.

⁷⁷Leonard V. Koos, The Junior College, 2 Vols (Minneapolis: University of Minnesota Press, 1924), 2:654; Eells, Junior College, p. 99.

The California junior college district law of 1921 was the result of the efforts of professional educators and influential laymen in the state legislature. In 1919, a joint committee of high school principals and University of California professors, meeting at the request of the state Commissioner of Secondary Education, called for greater state effort to promote the junior college system. The actions of this committee led to the formation in 1920 of a special education committee in the state legislature. This committee recommended that junior colleges be established at several locations in the state for the purpose of providing the first two years of undergraduate work which could be transferred to the university.⁷⁸ In 1921 the state legislature acted on this legislation by passing a new junior college district law (the Deering Act) which authorized the high school and county school districts to establish distinct junior college districts separate from those of the high school. The law also increased the amount of state aid to junior colleges and provided for close affiliation of junior colleges with the University of California. This new law, with its increased financial support and provisions for the establishment of separate two-year institutions, was largely responsible for the rapid growth experienced by the California junior college system after 1921.⁷⁹

⁷⁸Hugh Ross, "University Influence in the Genesis and Growth of Junior Colleges in California," History of Education Quarterly 3 (September 1963): 147.

⁷⁹Spindt, "Establishment of the Junior College in California," p. 396.

Conclusion

By 1921 the state of California had a thriving junior college system with more institutions and students than any other state in the union. Geography had played a major role in stimulating the growth of this unique type of educational institution, for the huge size of the state left many citizens hundreds of miles from the nearest institution of higher learning. This educational gap was filled through the efforts of university leaders like Alexis F. Lange and David Starr Jordan, who propagated the junior college philosophy and encouraged the establishment of junior colleges in high schools, and through the work of secondary school leaders like C. L. McLane and A. L. Olney, who provided leadership at the local level. The movement was also promoted at the state level by educational administrators like William C. Wood and by sympathetic legislators who passed the important junior college laws of 1907, 1917, and 1921. In no other state in this time period did so many favorable circumstances combine to create such a dynamic educational movement.

In 1921 California had 18 public junior colleges with an enrollment of 1442. The Southern Branch of the University of California had about 1500 students⁸⁰ and the four private junior colleges had an enrollment of about 40.⁸¹ Most of the public institutions were physical and administrative divisions of the local high school and shared with it

⁸⁰William M. Proctor, "The Junior College in California," School Review 30 (May 1923): 363.

⁸¹Walter C. Eells, "Private Junior Colleges in California" California Quarterly of Secondary Education 5 (October 1929): 85.

the available faculty, offices, and classrooms. Although most of these institutions emphasized traditional college courses, more and more of them were beginning to offer technical and vocational programs. Over the years the graduates of these junior colleges had compiled excellent records after their transfer to the University of California, which had enrolled 50 junior college transfers in 1915, 65 in 1920, and would, within 10 years, be enrolling over 1000 junior college transfer students.⁸² With the junior college district law of 1921, junior college leaders began to organize separate two-year institutions, independent of the high school. The first of these new institutions was founded at Modesto in 1921, the year of the law's passage, and it apparently holds the honor of being the nation's first separate junior college. Within the next 5 years, the number of junior colleges in California increased to 36 and the number of students to 8,178, and by 1930 the state could boast of 49 junior colleges and 21,213 students.⁸³ It is easy to understand why the rest of the nation began in the 1920s to imitate the California legal and administrative junior college model.

⁸²Ross, "University Influence in the Genesis and Growth of Junior Colleges in California," p. 147.

⁸³Eells, Junior College, pp. 102, 108.

CHAPTER V

OTHER JUNIOR COLLEGE DEVELOPMENTS

Thus far this study has concentrated upon the origins and development of the public junior college movement in Illinois and California, the two leading states in the early period of the junior college movement. This chapter will be concerned with the movement in other states and with the birth and development of private junior colleges across the nation, particularly in the leading areas of the South and Midwest. The private junior college is included in this study of public institutions because the private junior college movement began before the public one, paralleled it from 1900 until 1921, helped to spread the junior college idea, and exerted a great influence on the development of public junior colleges everywhere. These factors make a study of the private junior college essential to understanding the public junior college movement.

The Development of Public Junior Colleges

The public junior college movement began in the Midwest, matured in California, and then spread slowly to other regions of the nation. No public junior college existed anywhere in the nation in 1900, but 19 were established between that year and 1915 and 51 others between 1915 and 1921. Of the 70 public junior colleges existing in the nation in 1921, 36 were located in the Midwest, 28 in the West (primarily in

California), 4 in the South, and only 2 in New England and the Middle Atlantic States.¹ These figures indicate the movement's overwhelming dominance by the Midwest and West and the relative insignificance of the public junior college movement in other parts of the nation.

The Midwest was the leader in the junior college movement between 1850 and 1921. This early dominance stemmed primarily from the region's willingness to innovate in all areas of education and from the progressive outlook and leadership of the area's major universities, particularly Michigan, Minnesota, and Chicago. A dynamic and progressive area unfettered by many of the educational traditions of the Northeast and South, the Midwest seemed to contribute more than its proper share of educational reformers, especially those who were strong advocates of German educational ideas and ideals. In addition to Henry P. Tappan, William Watts Folwell, and William Rainey Harper, the three earliest pioneers in the junior college movement, the Midwest also produced David Starr Jordan and Alexis F. Lange, the two pioneers of the California junior college movement. In many ways, then, the Midwest was the birthplace of the junior college movement.

The state of Illinois, which had taken the early lead in the junior college movement because of the efforts of William Rainey Harper at the University of Chicago, did not maintain her junior college primacy after the death of that influential educator. As has been described earlier, the University of Chicago ended its affiliation and cooperating agreements with high schools and colleges a few years after

¹Leonard V. Koos, The Junior College, 2 Vols. (Minneapolis: University of Minnesota Press, 1924); 1:10.

Harper's death, and from then on junior college development was hampered by the failure of the state to follow California's lead in passing junior college legislation. By 1921, Illinois could claim only three junior colleges: Joliet Junior College, located in Joliet, and Crane Junior College and the Medill School of Commerce, both located in Chicago. Crane Junior College is of particular interest because, unlike most of the junior colleges of this period, it was a technical junior college organized as part of a technical high school. Crane started in 1911 when the Chicago Board of Education authorized Crane High School to offer two years of college work. From the beginning it was closely associated with, and supervised by, the University of Illinois, where most of its students transferred to complete engineering degrees. Crane also provided two years of pre-medical education for students planning to attend medical school and several terminal technical programs for students planning to enter the job market immediately after graduation.²

Between Harper's death in 1906 and the founding of the American Association of junior colleges in 1920-1921, junior colleges were established in several Midwestern states besides Illinois. One was founded in Idaho and Oklahoma, two each in Iowa, North Dakota, South Dakota, and Missouri, three in Kansas, four in Michigan, and six each in Minnesota and Wisconsin.³ Most of these institutions were established by school

²Charles S. Stewart, Junior Colleges As Completion Schools, U.S., Bureau of Education, Bulletin, 1922, No. 19, Part I (Washington: U.S. Government Printing Office, 1922), pp. 42-45.

³Koos, Junior College, 2:651-654; Frederick L. Whitney, The Junior College in America (Greeley: Colorado State Teachers College Education Series, No. 5, 1928), pp. 220-233.

boards and high school principals as agencies of local school districts, but some were state-operated institutions offering two years of technical education or teacher training. All six of Wisconsin's junior colleges, for example, were state normal schools. Kansas and Michigan were the only two states outside of California to have state laws providing for the establishment of public two-year institutions in high school districts. Thus, most of these junior colleges grew up without state legal sanction or financial aid.⁴ In most of these states, and particularly in Minnesota and Michigan, the state university worked closely with local educators in establishing and maintaining junior college programs in the high schools. The University of Minnesota advised the six institutions in that state during the founding process, helped in setting standards for courses and faculty, and published pamphlets outlining requirements to be met by graduates of these institutions who planned to transfer to the University as juniors.⁵

The junior colleges established in Grand Rapids and Detroit, Michigan, in Hibbing, Minnesota, and in Kansas City, Missouri are typical of those started in the Midwest during this time period. The Grand Rapids Junior College was founded in 1914 by the city board of education under authority granted by state legislation. From the very beginning this institution emphasized that its major purposes were to provide two years of university instruction, one or two years

⁴Clyde E. Blocker, Robert H. Plummer, and Richard Richardson, The Two-Year College: A Social Synthesis (Englewood Cliffs, N. J.: Prentice Hall, 1965), pp. 28-30.

⁵C. C. Alexander and G. W. Willett, "Some Aspects of A Junior College," School Review 28 (January 1920): 16.

of terminal vocational instruction, and general cultural courses for interested members of the community. The college courses and requirements closely paralleled those of the first two years at the state university. The president of the junior college was also the principal of the high school in which the junior college division was housed. At the completion of two years of college work, students were granted an associate's degree in one of six areas: arts, science, commerce, music, fine arts, and household arts. Grand Rapids Junior College obviously met a real need: its enrollment increased from 82 students the first year to 406 by 1920.⁶

Like the Grand Rapids Junior College, Detroit Junior College was organized by the city board of education. It opened in 1913 with a one-year college curriculum, then expanded in 1917 to offer a full two-year course of study. As in so many other junior colleges, the chief administrative officer, the Dean of the Junior College, was also the principal of the high school in which the junior college was located. Detroit Junior College concentrated primarily on offering standard college work for students who could not or would not go away from home to attend a residential senior college or university. That Detroit Junior College met a real community need is evident from its rapid enrollment growth, from 118 students in 1913 to 697 in 1920.⁷

⁶A. Monroe Stowe, Report of a Survey of the Junior Colleges of Detroit and Grant Rapids, Michigan, and of Joliet, Illinois, U. S. Bureau of Education, Bulletin, 1922, No. 19, Part II (Washington: U.S. Government Printing Office, 1922), pp. 65-70.

⁷Ibid.

Hibbing Junior College was established as part of a six-year high school through the efforts of the city's school superintendent and board of education. The principal of the high school was also the head of the junior college department, which had fourteen faculty members, all of whom had at least a master's degree and most of whom taught in the high school as well as in the junior college. The entrance requirements, courses, and course requirements followed closely those of the University of Minnesota. Junior college students had a social life of their own, apart from the high school students, through the organization of their own clubs, athletic teams, and other extra-curricular activities. Before the establishment of Hibbing Junior College no graduate of the high school had ever obtained a university or college degree, but as of 1920 over 70 of the high school graduates from the classes of 1916 through 1919 were attending the junior college or other senior colleges or universities and had indicated that they planned to obtain at least a bachelor's degree. The First World War retarded the growth of the junior college division, but it still expanded from 25 students in 1916 to 40 in 1917 and over 70 in 1919.⁸

In Kansas City the high schools had been offering postgraduate courses for several years prior to the opening of the Kansas City Junior College in 1915. According to the Kansas City superintendent of schools, I. I. Cammack, these postgraduate courses had been offered at the requests of parents who wanted their children to have education beyond the high school level but did not want to send these young and

⁸Alexander and Willett, "Some Aspects of A Junior College," pp. 20-23.

immature students away to a traditional residential college. Many of these postgraduate courses were taught at the high school level rather than at a true university level, which caused problems when students attempted to transfer these courses to the University of Missouri. In 1915 a representative from the University met with a group of local citizens to discuss this problem and advised them to solve the transfer problem by adding to the high school a full-fledged junior college program which would offer work only of freshman and sophomore collegiate grades. The citizens' group and the local newspaper endorsed this plan, and in that same year the board of education unanimously approved the establishment of a junior college department in the local high school. Kansas City Junior College opened in September of 1915 with over 200 students, more than twice the expected number, and by 1917 had grown to over 400 students. The college emphasized the first two years of traditional collegiate instruction and was closely affiliated with the University of Missouri.⁹

The public junior college movement in the West was dominated by California. The only other Western states with public junior colleges in 1921 were Arizona, New Mexico, Utah, and Washington, each of which had only one such institution. Phoenix Junior College, established in 1920, and Everett Junior College (Everett, Washington), established in 1916, were begun and operated by city school districts, while the Branch Agricultural College of Utah (1897) and New Mexico Military

⁹
I. I. Cammack, "The Legitimate Range of Activity of the Junior College in the Public School System," Addresses and Proceedings of the National Education Association 55 (1917): 724-727.

Institute (Roswell, 1917) were state owned and operated institutions.¹⁰ Apparently, the underdeveloped economies and resources, along with a small and scattered population, hindered the growth of junior colleges in this region.

Were it not for Texas, the South would be able to claim no public junior colleges in 1921. Texas had one local district junior college, El Paso Junior College of the City of El Paso, established in 1920, and three state operated junior institutions: Sul Ross State Normal School (1920) at Alpine, Grubbs Vocational College (1917) at Arlington, and John Tarleton Agricultural College (1917) at Stephenville.¹¹ The paucity of public junior colleges in the South was due to the area's scattered population, small number of large cities, poverty, and large number of private academies, military schools, four-year colleges, and junior colleges. By meeting most of the region's need for higher education, these private institutions seriously hindered the growth of public two-year institutions.¹²

The New England and Middle Atlantic states had only two public junior colleges in 1921, one in Massachusetts (Springfield Junior College, established in 1917) and one in New Jersey (Newark Junior College, established in 1918).¹³ Before 1921, New York and several

¹⁰Koos, Junior College, 2:651-654.

¹¹Ibid.

¹²T. W. Raymond, The Junior College in the South and the National Association, U. S., Bureau of Education, Bulletin, 1922, No. 19, Part II (Washington: U. S. Government Printing Office, 1922), p. 60.

¹³Koos, Junior College, 2:651-654.

other states had established public technical and agricultural institutes, but these institutions did not become junior colleges until the period between the two world wars.¹⁴ Public junior college growth in this region was apparently hampered by the educational conservatism of the area and by the relatively large number of traditional senior colleges, universities, and private academies which seemed to meet most people's needs for post-secondary education.

Most of the seventy public junior colleges in existence in 1921 were extensions of public high schools, though a few were downgraded four-year colleges, upgraded normal schools, or special divisions or extensions of the state system of higher education. The great majority of these institutions offered traditional college work which could be transferred to senior colleges or universities. The public junior college movement had made great strides, but its years of greatest development still lay in the future, when it would surpass private junior colleges in the number of students and institutions and would challenge the nation's senior institutions for primacy in lower division work.

The Development of Private Junior Colleges

Private junior colleges grew up long before public ones and dominated the junior college movement until the end of World War I. Enrollments in private institutions outnumbered those in public ones until

¹⁴Charles R. Monroe, Profile of the Community College (San Francisco: Jossey-Bass, Inc., 1972), p. 12.

1921, and in the number of institutions private two-year schools maintained their early lead until they were finally surpassed by public ones in 1948.¹⁵ Although a detailed study of private junior colleges is beyond the purpose and scope of this investigation, a brief examination of these schools is essential to an understanding of the public junior college movement and to the junior college movement in general.

Private junior colleges were founded for several reasons. The major motive seems to have been the desire of churches and other religious organizations to provide institutions where young men and women could acquire the first two years of college education in a controlled, religious atmosphere, free, or relatively free, from the worldly temptations present on many secular campuses. A related motive was the desire to segregate the sexes, as is evidenced by the large number of all-male and all-female private junior colleges. In some cases the overriding purpose was to provide narrow religious indoctrination at the postsecondary level, with serious educational purposes being of secondary importance. Some of the founders of private junior colleges were also attempting to use the junior college as a foundation for the later establishment of a four-year liberal arts school. Finally, some were founded as a means of upgrading private academies and normal schools or of saving many weak senior institutions from bankruptcy by converting them to strong junior institutions. Whatever the founding motive, private junior colleges grew rapidly, surpassing the public ones because their private control and funding gave them

¹⁵Ibid., p. 13.

greater freedom and financial security than public institutions, which often suffered from the lack of state legal recognition and financial support. With their dormitories, small classes, and close faculty-student relationships, private junior colleges were often more appealing to many students than were the public ones, which seldom had any of these advantages.¹⁶

Private junior colleges came into being in several ways. Many of them, and especially those in the Northeast and the South, had once been male or female academies serving as college preparatory schools for boys or as finishing schools for girls. As the demand for higher education grew in the nineteenth and early twentieth centuries, many of these institutions began to add a few college courses or even one or two years of college instruction. As the public secondary schools grew and began to compete with the academies for high school students, enrollments in the high school grades of these private institutions began to decline. This led the administrators and trustees of these institutions to strengthen their collegiate offerings so as to compensate for the enrollment losses in the high school grades by increasing enrollments in the collegiate ones. The greatest enrollment increases came in the female academies with junior college programs, undoubtedly because of the lack of educational opportunities for women at four-year colleges and universities. Stephens College in Missouri and Greenbrier College

¹⁶Win Kelley and Leslie Wilbur, "Junior College Development in the United States," School and Society 97 (December 1969): 486-487; F. M. McDowell, The Junior College, U. S., Bureau of Education, Bulletin, 1919, No. 35 (Washington: U. S. Government Printing Office, 1919), pp. 35-37.

in West Virginia are good examples of private junior colleges which began as secondary schools but converted to junior colleges offering two years of high school and two years of college work in order to meet changing educational conditions.¹⁷

One and two-year normal schools were another important source for the development of private junior colleges. Both public and private normal schools had been established in the nineteenth century to train teachers for the nation's schools, and in that century the number of students and institutions grew rapidly. By 1874, there were 134 normal schools, 80 public and 54 private, with total enrollments of over 24,000, and by 1898 the number of institutions had grown to 331, with enrollments in the 166 public institutions and 165 private ones totaling almost 45,000.¹⁸ In the late nineteenth and early twentieth centuries many normal schools in both the public and private sector attempted to meet higher state requirements for teacher training by upgrading their curriculum and seeking collegiate recognition from the state and other accrediting agencies. Some expanded to become four-year institutions offering baccalaureate degrees, but many others became respectable two-year institutions offering college work which could be transferred to senior institutions.¹⁹

¹⁷ Tyrus Hillway, The American Two-Year College (New York: Harper & Brothers, 1958), p. 40.

¹⁸ Edgar B. Wesley, NEA: The First Hundred Years (New York: Harper & Brothers, 1957), pp. 82-83.

¹⁹ McDowell, The Junior College, pp. 20-32; Ralph R. Fields, The Community College Movement (New York: McGraw-Hill, 1962), pp. 21-22.

A third source for the beginning of private junior colleges was the weak four-year college which converted to a strong two-year institution in order to survive. This process, called decapitation, occurred all across the nation, and it was one of the major educational reforms called for by William Rainey Harper and other leading educators of the early part of the twentieth century. Many of these four-year schools suffered from inadequate finances, weak curriculums, declining enrollments, inadequate library and laboratory facilities, accreditation problems, and increased competition from the growing number of public colleges and universities. Some of these institutions closed their doors, but others survived by becoming strong two-year institutions, often affiliating with four-year schools or universities and serving as feeder institutions to these schools.²⁰

It is difficult to determine which institution was the first private junior college because there are so many claimants to this title. Many academies in the colonial period and in the nineteenth century gradually added college courses to their curriculums, but it is difficult to ascertain when these academies converted to legitimate junior colleges. According to Walter C. Eells²¹ and Florence Kirchgessner,²² a one-year Catholic college which opened in Newton, Maryland, in 1677 may deserve credit as the first junior

²⁰McDowell, Junior College, pp. 35-37; A. A. Gray, "The Status and Service of the Small College," School and Society 3 (April 1916): 592.

²¹The Junior College (Boston: Houghton Mifflin Co., 1931), p. 57.

²²"The Junior College," Catholic Educational Review 22 (March 1924): 157.

college. However, it offered only one year of college work, sending its young graduates to St. Omer's in Belgium to complete their college studies. Its status as a one-year institution does not seem to qualify it as a junior college, a term generally reserved for two-year institutions. Besides, many other academies in the late colonial period and the nineteenth century offered up to one year of college work but are not considered to be junior colleges.

A better candidate for the honor of being the nation's first private junior college is Lasell Junior College. This institution was founded in 1851 as Lasell Female Seminary at Auburndale, Massachusetts, by Edward Lasell, a professor of chemistry at Williams College who also served as a teacher at Mary Lyon's Mount Holyoke Female Seminary. By 1852, Lasell Female Seminary was offering the last two years of high school and the first two years of college work. Initially, Lasell emphasized two years of terminal cultural education rather than college transfer work, for its founder realized that most of his young female students would not transfer to senior institutions to complete baccalaureate degrees. He wanted the seminary to turn out young women with broad cultural backgrounds who would acquire, in the words of the 1874-1875 catalog, "a liking for good intellectual food...which shall bear fruit in long years of growth after school days are over."²³ The seminary survived major changes in education in the nineteenth and twentieth centuries, and in 1932 its name was changed to Lasell Junior College. The high school grades were always given less emphasis

²³Cited by Theodore H. Wilson, "The First Four-Year Junior College," Junior College Journal 9 (April 1939): 361-365.

than the collegiate ones, and in the 1940's the high school program was completely abolished and the institution became strictly a junior college.²⁴

Another claimant to the honor of being the nation's first private junior college was the Missionary Institute of the Evangelical Lutheran Church, which opened in Selingsgrove, Pennsylvania, in June of 1858 as a two-year institute for the training of ministers. Offering two years of instruction similar to the classical curriculums taught at many private liberal arts colleges of the day, this institution prepared students to transfer to senior colleges as well as to enter the ministry immediately after graduation. The Missionary Institute did not grant degrees, but it did award certificates affirming that its graduates had completed two years of college work. In 1894, this institution ended its junior status by converting to a four-year Lutheran college called the Susquehanna University of the Evangelical Lutheran Church. It may have been the first junior college, but it remained one for less than forty years.²⁵

Several other junior colleges have claimed to be the nation's first private junior college. Among the many are Monticello College, opened in 1835 in Godfrey, Illinois, Decatur Baptist College, opened in 1897 in Decatur, Texas, and Brooklyn Female Academy, which opened as a female academy in 1803 and added junior college work in the late

²⁴James M. Stanley, "The Oldest Junior College," Junior College Journal 36 (November 1965): 38.

²⁵Saul Sack, "The First Junior College," Junior College Journal 30 (September 1959): 13-15.

nineteenth century. It is probably impossible to ever settle this issue to everyone's satisfaction because of the difficulty of determining when academies began to offer two years of college work and whether those institutions claiming to offer genuine college work were really doing so. Many scholars believe that Lasell Junior College was the first legitimate junior college, but Walter C. Eells, who is perhaps the greatest authority on nineteenth century private junior colleges, grants that honor to Decatur Baptist College in Texas.²⁶

Unlike public junior colleges, which were heavily concentrated in two regions, the Midwest and California, private junior colleges were generally distributed throughout the nation. However, there was considerable concentration of these institutions in the Midwest, particularly in Missouri, and in the South, which had a large number of two-year female institutions. Of the 137 private junior colleges existing in 1921, 9 were in the New England and Middle Atlantic states, 15 in the West, 44 in the Midwest, and 69 in the South. The leading state was Missouri, with 16 private two-year institutions, followed by Texas (15), Virginia (11), Kentucky (9), North Carolina (8), Tennessee (8), and Georgia (6). California, which led the nation in the number of public junior colleges, had only 3 private ones. With the exception of the Midwest, which was a leader in both the public (36 institutions) and private (44 institutions) junior college movements, the private junior college movement was strongest in the areas where the public one was the weakest, particularly in the South.²⁷

²⁶Junior College, p. 64.

²⁷Koos, Junior College, 2:655-659.

The development of junior colleges in Missouri offers a good example of the way in which many private junior colleges were established across the nation. Most of the private junior colleges in this state had once been senior institutions which converted to junior college status by the process of decapitation--the abolition of the last two years of study. In the early years of the twentieth century many private senior colleges in this state suffered from falling enrollments, low academic standards, inadequate facilities, poorly trained faculty, and other serious problems. Many of these institutions were little more than academies, seminaries, and finishing schools for girls, and they were being threatened not only by internal problems but by the growth and expansion of public high schools and universities. In 1910 and 1911, many of these institutions, struggling to survive, asked the University of Missouri to help them to reorganize and to strengthen their college programs.²⁸

University of Missouri officials responded generously, giving a great deal of time and advice in an effort to help these institutions to survive by converting from weak four-year schools to strong two-year ones, revamping their curriculums, upgrading their faculty, and improving their library and laboratory facilities. Most of this advisory work was done through a University of Missouri faculty committee, the University Committee on Accrediting Junior Colleges, which served as an agency for standardizing and accrediting these institutions. This committee prepared a booklet outlining standards

²⁸David B. Carson, "The Claims of the New Type Junior College," Education 40 (February, 1920): 328.

for faculty training, equipment, admissions, length of the school term, courses to be taught, and other essential matters. Each institution was visited each year by a university committee which was to act as an unofficial overseer of the junior colleges' operations. Graduates of these institutions were awarded associate's degrees and admitted as juniors to the University, which gave full credit for all collegiate work done in these institutions.²⁹

The University of Missouri's experience with reorganizing, standardizing, and accrediting weak senior colleges was a great success. By 1915, seven small private colleges had converted to junior colleges under the Missouri plan and by 1921 several other four-year schools had converted to junior college status and associated themselves with the University. In changing to junior colleges, most of these institutions had upgraded their faculty, course offerings, and physical facilities and had experienced significant increases in enrollments, endowments, and prestige. These institutions were organized into an association called the Missouri Junior College Union which met annually to discuss common problems and to facilitate relations with each other and with the University. In Missouri, then, the decapitation process was a major
³⁰success.

²⁹Gray, "Status and Service of the Small College," pp. 590-591; J. H. Coursault, "Standardizing the Junior College: An Experiment by the University of Missouri," Educational Review 49 (January 1915): 56-62; John C. Jones, "The Junior College Movement in Missouri," School Life 8 (December 1922): 89; J. D. Elliff, "The Junior College: The Missouri Plan," Proceedings of the Association of Colleges and Secondary Schools of the Southern States 13 (1915): 52-54.

³⁰Gray, "Status and Service of the Small College," pp. 590-591.

Missouri was not the only state to experiment with the decapitation of senior colleges carried out under the supervision of universities. Illinois had taken some steps in this direction during Harper's reign at Chicago, and in the South the Baptist Church in Texas began to reorganize its institutions over a decade before the process began in Missouri. In the 1890's the Baptist Church in Texas was operating several weak and often competing institutions. Attempting to remedy this undesirable situation, the Baptist State Convention in 1897 established an educational commission to study the reorganization of the church's colleges in the state. Largely because of this commission's work, Texas' Baptist colleges were reorganized in 1897 and 1898 into a streamlined and affiliated system. Baylor University at Waco was the center of the newly established system, which included, in addition to the University, one senior college (Baylor College) and three junior colleges: Decatur Baptist College, Howard Payne College, and Rusk Baptist College. In return for agreeing to end all upper division instruction, the latter three institutions were promised that their graduates would be given full credit for their work when they transferred to Baylor College or Baylor University. In 1908 Burleson College joined this system, followed in 1913 by Wayland Baptist College and in 1917 by the new College of Marshall. The prestige of these and other private junior colleges throughout the state was greatly increased in 1917 when the state legislature provided that work done in private junior colleges could be fully applied toward the credits needed for the acquisition of a state teacher's certificate.³¹

³¹Eells, Junior College, pp. 63-64, 151-152.

There were only eight private junior colleges in existence in 1900. Thus, the great majority of the 137 private institutions existing in 1921 had come into being in the short period of twenty years. About one hundred of these schools were under the control of church and religious organizations, with the remainder being strictly private enterprise ventures.³² Financial support of most private junior colleges came primarily from student tuition, the endowment, regular church budgets, and private philanthropy.³³ Most of the private junior colleges operated two years of high school in conjunction with the junior college program, and some offered four full years of high school work in addition to junior college work. Even more than the public two-year institutions, private junior colleges tended to emphasize traditional college courses that could be transferred to senior colleges and universities and applied toward a baccalaureate degree: English, history, mathematics, Latin, German, chemistry, physics, botany, and Bible. However, a few did offer a smattering of vocational courses in the areas of home economics, agriculture, journalism, and education. Like most public junior colleges, the private ones viewed themselves as junior versions of senior institutions and attempted to imitate the courses and teaching methods of their more prestigious educational relatives.³⁴

³²Koos, Junior College, 1:7.

³³McDowell, Junior College, p. 49.

³⁴Ibid., pp. 50-52.

The Founding of The American Association of Junior Colleges

Throughout most of its early history the junior college movement, whether public or private, had little leadership or co-ordination at the national level. Leadership was generally of a state or regional nature, such as that provided by Tappan, Folwell, and Harper in the Midwest and Jordan and Lange in California. Meetings of junior college administrators, faculty, and other personnel were rarely held outside state or regional boundaries. This lack of co-ordination and leadership bothered many junior college educators, who were concerned at the absence of any national organization to set standards, define purposes, provide for national accreditation, facilitate the transfer of junior college students to senior institutions, or provide a forum for the discussion of junior college issues. A new and unique institution, the junior college belonged to neither secondary nor higher education but somewhere between the two, and junior college representatives were generally not invited to the state, regional, or national meetings of high schools or of colleges and universities. The junior college lacked a clear sense of identity and had not yet assumed a definite place within the American educational hierarchy.

The first step toward remedying this unhappy situation came in 1920, when Dr. George F. Zook, a specialist in higher education for the United States Bureau of Education, and James Madison Wood, president of Stephens College in Missouri, persuaded the United States Commissioner of Education, P. P. Claxton, to arrange for a national meeting of junior college representatives. Held in St. Louis, Missouri, on June 30

and July 1, 1920, the meeting was chaired by James Madison Wood, and attended by thirty-four junior college delegates representing twenty-two public and private junior colleges from thirteen states.³⁵ The delegates discussed several issues, including the relationship of the junior college to the high school and the university, curricular reforms, the nature and purposes of the junior college, the administration and control of the junior college, and the advantages of the junior college. The delegates also agreed to form a national organization, the American Association of Junior Colleges, rather than to petition for membership in any existing organization of secondary schools or colleges and universities. This action indicated the delegates' belief that the junior college was a unique and distinct institution which deserved its own organization and sense of identity. Finally, the delegates provided that the first meeting of the Association would be held in Chicago in February of 1921.³⁶

Over seventy public and private junior colleges were represented at the first meeting of the American Association of Junior Colleges held in Chicago on February 16-17, 1921. At this important meeting the delegates elected officers, adopted a constitution, established permanent committees, set up requirements for membership in the

³⁵ Michael Brick, Forum and Focus for the Junior College Movement: The American Association of Junior Colleges (New York: Columbia University Teachers College Bureau of Publications, 1964), pp. 30-34.

³⁶ George F. Zook, ed. The National Conference of Junior Colleges, 1920, and First Annual Meeting of the American Association of Junior Colleges, 1921, U. S., Bureau of Education, Bulletin, 1922, No. 19 (Washington: U. S. Government Printing Office, 1922), pp. 1-47.

organization, and agreed upon long-range objectives. These objectives, as defined by the constitution, were as follows:

To define the junior college by creating standards and curricula, thus determining its position structurally in relation to other parts of the school system; and to study the junior college in all of its types (endowed, municipal, and state) in order to make a genuine contribution to the work of education.³⁷

The American Association of Junior Colleges, renamed the American Association of Junior and Community Colleges in the 1960s, has now served as the national forum and focus of the junior college movement for over fifty-seven highly successful years.

Conclusion

The public junior college movement began in the Midwest and then spread to California and other parts of the nation. By 1921, there were 70 public junior colleges, with all but 6 of them located in the Midwest and West. Private junior colleges grew more rapidly than public ones in this early period of junior college development, from 8 institutions in 1900 to 137 in 1921, located in all areas of the nation but concentrated in the Midwest and the South. Private junior colleges influenced the development of public ones in several ways, principally by competing with them for students and faculty and by spreading the idea of the junior college. Most public junior colleges developed as extensions of public high schools, while the private ones grew primarily from private academies, normal schools, or decapitated senior colleges. Regardless of their origins, locations, dates of birth, and types of support,

³⁷Ibid., pp. 48-73. The full text of the Constitution and Bylaws is on pages 71-73.

junior colleges established in this time period emphasized traditional college instruction and gave little attention to vocational, technical, and terminal education. By 1921 the junior college, whether public or private, was a thriving educational innovation, presenting a strong challenge to the educational dominance of traditional senior colleges and universities.

The formation of the American Association of Junior Colleges in 1920-1921 brought to an end the first period of the junior college movement. After decades of haphazard growth, the junior college movement now had a national organization to provide a forum for the discussion of mutual problems and to help in the coordination, standardization, accreditation, and spread of junior colleges. With a dynamic national organization, the junior college movement was now ready to enter a period of rapid change and expansion.

CHAPTER VI

THE PUBLIC JUNIOR COLLEGE IN 1921: A SUMMARY OF ITS
PROGRESS AND SALIENT CHARACTERISTICS

This concluding chapter presents a brief summary of the progress of the public junior college from about 1850 until 1921 and a summary analysis of the salient characteristics of most public junior colleges in existence at the end of this period. It should be obvious from the preceding chapters that the junior college evolved as a part of the history of both secondary and higher education and that it therefore shared some characteristics of each. At the same time, however, it had developed many unique features which placed it in a special category in the American system of education.

A Summary of Junior College Development, 1850-1921

The public junior college movement originally began as part of a major reform effort within American higher education in the second half of the nineteenth century. In that period of America's history, the young nation was experiencing a dynamic industrial revolution which was transforming almost all areas of life, including education. The growth in the number of public high schools and high school graduates, along with the expansion of the American ideals of democracy and equality, was putting pressure on the public universities to serve more students. The universities themselves were being shaken by reformers calling not only for greater educational opportunities but also for major curricular reforms, such as the adoption of modern subjects, the introduction of

the elective system, the initiation of a three-year baccalaureate program, and the adoption of the German university model with its de-emphasis of undergraduate instruction and concentration upon graduate study and research. Higher education was also being changed by the growth of public universities and by the founding of new private institutions, such as Johns Hopkins, Chicago, and Stanford, which quickly took their place among the giants of American higher education.

The initial proponents of the junior college idea were Henry P. Tappan and William Watts Folwell, late nineteenth century university presidents who wanted to adopt in America the major features of the German university system. These two reformers wanted to relegate the freshman and sophomore years of university instruction to secondary schools reorganized along the lines of the German gymnasium or French lycée so that the university could emphasize advanced study and research. Tappan and Folwell had little interest in the secondary schools except as feeders to the university, for their basic concern was with university education. Neither of these men was successful in ending lower division studies at their institution, nor did they establish any junior colleges. However, they were instrumental in propagating educational ideas which led to the initiation of the junior college movement.

The man most responsible for the beginning of the junior college movement was William Rainey Harper, president of the University of Chicago from 1891 until 1906. Like Tappan and Folwell, Harper was primarily interested in higher education and in ways to relieve the university of the burden of freshman and sophomore instruction so that

it could concentrate on advanced studies and research. His pursuit of these objectives led him to establish a junior college division of the University of Chicago, to introduce the associate's degree to American education, to aid in the founding of the first public junior college (Joliet) and two private ones (Lewis and Bradley), to foster the development of six-year high schools affiliated with the University of Chicago, and to promote the junior college idea through articles, speeches, and books which reached a national audience. These accomplishments in the area of junior college education earned him the title of "the father of the junior college movement."

After Harper's death in 1906 the center of the junior college movement shifted to California, a state with great financial and educational resources but serious weaknesses in its system of higher education which prevented it from serving large segments of the population. The junior college movement in California was led by David Starr Jordan, president of Stanford University, Alexis F. Lange, a prominent professor and dean at the University of California at Berkeley, and several secondary school leaders. With the help of sympathetic state legislators, these men established the junior college as a legal and integral part of California's public school system. By 1921 junior college programs had been established in 18 public high schools with a total enrollment of 1442 students. An almost equal number of students could be found at the Southern Branch of the University of California, which was originally founded as a two-year school. With about 3000 students enrolled, California was the leading state in junior college education in 1921.

At the time that the junior college movement was developing in Illinois and California it was also making considerable progress in other states. Public junior colleges grew the fastest in the Midwest and West, while private ones grew fastest in the South and Midwest. New England and the Middle Atlantic states had few examples of either. By 1921-1922, the junior college movement had grown to embrace 70 public and 137 private institutions with a total enrollment exceeding 16,000.

Reasons for Establishing Public Junior Colleges

As has been discussed earlier in this study, the public junior college evolved out of the vast educational changes occurring in the United States in the second half of the nineteenth century. Many of its advocates saw the establishment of junior colleges as a way of relieving the university of its large freshman and sophomore classes, while others viewed the junior college as a logical outgrowth of the expansion of the public school system to embrace not only the high school but the first two years of college as well. This dual origin of junior colleges was reflected in the founding of most of these institutions started before 1921, for the great majority of them were established as six-year high schools by local public school administrators and school boards with the invaluable aid of university educators who helped in the process of setting standards for courses and faculty and promised to accept transfer credit from these junior institutions.

The educational literature of the time contains a great deal of information as to why educators, legislators, students, and parents of high school and college students were interested in founding public

junior colleges in local communities. Almost all contemporary observers emphasized low cost, the desire to keep students at home for two years beyond high school, and the provision of two years of college training in the local high school as the three major reasons for the establishment of a junior college program as part of the high school. The first major study of the reasons for organizing junior colleges was done in 1917 by F. M. McDowell, whose survey of junior college principals or presidents as to why their junior college was founded revealed the following responses, in order of frequency of mention:

1. Desire of parents to keep children at home
2. To provide a completion school for those who can go no further
3. Desire of students to secure college work near home
4. To meet specific local needs
5. Geographical remoteness from a standard college or university
6. To meet the entrance requirements of professional schools
7. To provide vocational training more advanced than high school work
8. Financial difficulty in maintaining a four-year course
9. To provide additional opportunities for teacher training
10. To secure the segregation of the sexes
11. To provide opportunities for higher education under church control.¹

The last two reasons were obviously given by the heads of private institutions included in McDowell's study.

¹The Junior College, U. S., Bureau of Education, Bulletin, 1919, No. 35 (Washington: U. S. Government Printing Office, 1919), p. 28.

Other factors also played a role in the establishment of public junior colleges. Many of its founders and supporters saw the establishment of junior colleges as a way of democratizing education by removing traditional financial, geographical, age, sexual, and academic barriers to higher education. Others wanted to use junior colleges for the purpose of promoting equality of opportunity by making higher education available to all Americans, regardless of socio-economic background.² Many founders of junior colleges were motivated by the desire to establish institutions which would promote the upward mobility of all classes of people, particularly those near the bottom of the socio-economic ladder, by giving them the opportunity to acquire knowledge or skills which would enable them to rise in social and economic status. Finally, many advocates of junior colleges were driven by the hope of providing a community education center which would serve as an agent for the continuing education of all the adult population.³ This latter motive was one of the least important ones in the period before 1921, but in later years, and especially after World War II, the adult and continuing education concept emerged as a major reason for founding junior colleges in many communities and led to the growth of the comprehensive community college as an idea and an institution.

²Claude B. Boren, "Why A Junior College Movement?" Junior College Journal 24 (February 1954): 349.

³Jesse Parker Bogue, The Community College (New York: McGraw-Hill, 1950), p. 94.

Growth and Distribution of Junior Colleges

Although private junior colleges were founded before the middle of the nineteenth century, the first public one did not appear until Joliet Junior College opened its doors in 1902. At that time there were nine private junior colleges, and from 1902 until 1921-1922, as shown in Table 1, private junior colleges grew faster than the public ones. Of the 207 junior colleges in existence in 1921-1922, only 70 were public ones, with the remaining two-thirds being private, predominantly denominational, institutions. However, in 1921-1922 the enrollment in public junior colleges slightly outstripped that in private ones, 8,439 to 7,682, with the total enrollment for all junior colleges being 16,121.⁴ After 1921-1922, enrollment in public junior colleges grew much faster than that in private ones. By 1929-1930, for example, the enrollment in the 171 public institutions was 39,095, while that in the 279 private ones was 30,402.⁵ However, private junior colleges maintained their lead in the number of institutions until 1947-1948, when public institutions outnumbered private ones for the first time, 328 to 323.⁶

Geographically, junior colleges existed in almost every state in the union. As of 1921, 19 states had public junior colleges, while 33 states, plus the District of Columbia, had private ones. Of the 70

⁴Leonard V. Koos, The Junior College, 2 vols. (Minneapolis: University of Minnesota Press, 1924), 1:11.

⁵Walter C. Eells, The Junior College (Boston: Houghton Mifflin Co., 1931), p. 24.

⁶Ralph R. Fields, The Community College Movement (New York: McGraw-Hill, 1962), p. 42.

TABLE 1
 Years of Establishment of Junior Colleges In
 Operation During 1921-22 or 1922-23

Year of Establishment	Number Established			
	Public Junior Colleges	State Institutions	Private Institutions	All
1839	1	1
1869	1	1
1890	1	1
1898	3	3
1900	2	2
1901	1	1
1902	1	1
1903	1	1
1904	1	1
1905	2	2
1906	1	1
1908	2	2
1909	4	4
1910	1	5	6
1911	1	5	3	9
1912	6	6
1913	2	1	10	13
1914	1	8	9
1915	7	2	8	17
1916	6	2	14	22
1917	3	2	11	16
1918	4	7	11
1919	4	2	10	16
1920	4	2	4	10
1921	3	7	8	18
1922	9	5	14
Year not reported..	1	5	19
TOTAL	46	24	137	207

Source: Leonard V. Koos, The Junior College, 2 vols.
 (Minneapolis: University of Minnesota Press, 1924), 1:2, Table 1.

public institutions, 2 were in the New England and Middle Atlantic region, 4 in the South, 36 in the Midwest, and 28 in the West. Nine of the private institutions were located in the New England and Middle Atlantic area, 69 in the South, 44 in the Midwest, and 15 in the West. The Midwest, with 80 public and private institutions, had more junior colleges than any other region, followed by the South (73), the West (43), and the New England and Middle Atlantic region (11).⁷

Types and Sizes of Junior Colleges

The 207 public and private junior colleges existing in 1921-1922 had originated from several sources. The public institutions had been established as departments of six-year high schools or as junior divisions of the state system of higher education, while most private junior colleges had been founded by the upgrading of private academies and normal schools or the decapitation of small private four-year schools. By 1921 these various sources had produced 46 public junior colleges, most of which had begun as departments of six-year high schools and were administered by the city or county school board. They had also resulted in the establishment of 24 state-operated junior colleges administered as branches of the state system of higher education, and 137 private institutions which often encompassed a two- to four-year preparatory school. In addition to these junior colleges, there were six additional two-year schools operated as part of the lower division of the state universities in the West and Midwest. Since the latter were organized as part of the undergraduate division of the

⁷Koos, Junior College, 1:10.

TABLE 2

Distribution of Junior Colleges by Numbers of Students
Enrolled During 1921-22 and Averages, Medians,
And Quartiles of the Enrollments

Enrollment	Numbers of Junior Colleges			
	Public	State	Private	All
Less than 24.....	4	2	27	33
25- 49.....	8	6	51	65
50- 74.....	11	2	19	32
75- 99.....	..	3	10	13
100-124.....	2	2	11	15
125-149.....	2	..	1	3
150-174.....	3	..	1	4
175-199.....	1	1	..	2
200-299.....	2	2	2	6
300-399.....	..	1	1	2
400-499.....	..	1	1	2
500-1,200.....	3	1	1	5
Total Schools.....	36	21	125	182 ^a
Total Enrollments.	5,163	3,276	7,682	16,121
Average ^b	143	156	61	89
First Quartile ^b ...	39	28	28	28
Median ^b	60	78	44	47
Third Quartile ^b ...	151	195	72	85
Range.....	7 to 1,227 ^c	15 to 1,080	6 to 550	6 to 1,227

^aNo report for 13 institutions.

^bComputed from original distributions.

^cNot including summer session.

Source: Leonard V. Koos, The Junior College, 2 Vols.
(Minneapolis: University of Minnesota Press, 1924), 1:11, table 3.

university, many authorities do not consider them as part of the junior college system existing in 1921-1922.⁸

Regardless of their geographical location, age, and type of control, most junior colleges were small. As Table 2 shows, 33 junior

⁸Ibid., pp. 4-8.

colleges had less than 25 students, 143 had less than 100 students, 24 had from 100 to 199, and only 15 had 200 or more students. The public institutions were generally larger than the private ones. The average enrollment was 143 at public junior colleges associated with high schools and 156 at junior colleges operated as part of the state system of higher education, while at private junior colleges it was only 61. The average enrollment at all schools was 89.

Purposes of the Junior College

The public junior colleges existing in 1921 had a wide variety of purposes and functions. Most of them concentrated on providing two years of traditional college work aimed at the student who planned to transfer to the university to complete a baccalaureate program. Some also offered terminal vocational and technical programs for students who did not plan to complete more than two years of postsecondary work before entering the labor market, while a few others tried to provide general education, adult education, and continuing education for non-traditional college students in the community. However, most junior colleges had many more purposes than these, as Leonard V. Koos found in 1921 in his comprehensive and illuminating study of the junior college. In his attempt to ascertain the purposes of the junior college, Koos studied the college catalogs and bulletins of fifty-six private and public junior colleges for the school year 1920-1921 and the professional literature on the junior college movement for the previous ten years. His study revealed over fifty purposes of the junior college, which he consolidated and reduced to the following twenty-one:

1. Offering two years of work acceptable to colleges and universities
2. Completing education of students not going on
3. Providing occupational training of junior college grade
4. Popularizing higher education
5. Continuing home influence during immaturity
6. Affording attention to the individual student
7. Offering better opportunities for training in leadership
8. Offering better instruction in these school years
9. Allowing for exploration
10. Placing in the secondary school work appropriate to it
11. Making the secondary school period coincide with adolescence
12. Fostering the evolution of the system of education
13. Economizing time and expense by avoiding duplication
14. Assigning a function to the small college
15. Relieving the university
16. Making possible real university functioning
17. Assuring better preparation for university work
18. Improving high school instruction
19. Caring better for brighter high school students
20. Offering work meeting local needs
21. Affecting the cultural tone of the community.⁹

Not all junior colleges pursued all of these purposes, and undoubtedly some of the purposes found in educational articles and college catalogs and bulletins were fabrications or exaggerated rhetoric

⁹Ibid., pp. 14-15.

intended to promote the junior college movement or persuade students to enroll in the institution. Nonetheless, many junior colleges attempted to implement a multitude of purposes that went far beyond the traditional one of providing the first two years of undergraduate collegiate work. Even as early as 1921, many junior colleges, attempting to be more than imitations of senior institutions, were trying to become comprehensive schools offering a wide range of educational services to the community.

Advantages of Junior Colleges

The founders and other proponents of public junior colleges, including laymen as well as professional educators, often praised the junior college by emphasizing the many advantages it offered to students, parents, the senior colleges and universities, and society as a whole. Of the many articles in the professional literature of the time, the one by William T. MacGruder offers perhaps the best description of the advantages of public junior colleges to students. His views on the kinds of students who would benefit the most from junior colleges can be summarized as follows:

1. Young men and women who could not afford to go away to college
2. Students who were too immature to go off to college immediately after high school
3. Students who had personal responsibilities at home which prevented them from going off to college
4. Students who needed "further moral and religious training before they are thrown into the vortex of city temptations and college life"
5. Students who planned to go to a professional school like law, medicine, or journalism

6. Students who wanted to become teachers
7. Students who wanted to go into businesses like banking, insurance, and merchandising
8. Students who wanted to learn a vocational trade of some kind
9. Students who did not want to pursue a baccalaureate degree but wanted two years of general education or finishing school.¹⁰

These views on the advantages of the junior college were seconded and supplemented by many other scholars of the time. In his study of why parents sent their children to junior colleges, Leonard V. Koos found many of these same advantages operating in parents' minds, but he also found that many parents and professional educators felt that junior colleges gave more attention to individual students than did the universities and provided an education which was as good or better than that offered in the first two years at universities.¹¹ H. R. Brush, in his survey of administrators at seventeen junior colleges as to the advantages of their institutions, found similar results, though his respondents also emphasized that their institutions also relieved the university of overcrowding and allowed them to concentrate on advanced work.¹² W. H. Hughes¹³ and many other scholars of the junior college also stressed these advantages to the university, while I. I. Cammack added that the junior college helped to "meet the present demand for

¹⁰"The Junior College As A Relief," Educational Review 61 (April 1921): 293.

¹¹Junior College, 1:124.

¹²"The Junior College and the University," School and Society 4 (September 1916): 360.

¹³"Junior College Development," Educational Administration and Supervision 5 (April 1919): 193.

preparation along agricultural, industrial, and commercial lines through the channels of public education without requiring the student to leave his home."¹⁴ William Proctor agreed with most of the advantages cited above, while emphasizing that junior colleges offered smaller classes, better instruction, and more personal attention than students could get at most universities.¹⁵

Administration and Faculty

In the first period (1850-1921) of the junior college movement most junior college administrators, faculty, and other staff members were drawn from the high schools and senior colleges, primarily from the former. The head of the junior college division in the high school, commonly called the President or Dean of the Junior College, was almost always the principal of the high school as well. His immediate superiors were the city or county school superintendent and school board, and he had the unenviable task of pleasing both while trying to run a high school and college under the same educational umbrella. His high school outlook, along with his susceptibility to community pressures, often made it difficult for him to foster in the junior college the climate of academic freedom so necessary for effective college teaching and learning. Like their faculty, junior college

¹⁴"The Legitimate Range of Activity of the Junior College in the Public School System," Addresses and Proceedings of the National Education Association 55 (1917): 720.

¹⁵"The Junior College in California," School Review 31 (May 1923): 372.

administrators were often subjected to too much local control and pressure.¹⁶

One of the most frequent, and unfortunately most accurate, criticisms of the junior college faculty made in the period before 1921 is that they were poorly trained for their tasks. Most junior college instructors were high school teachers who taught both high school and college classes in the six-year high school in which the junior college was located. In his study in 1917 of the highest degrees held by 523 instructors at 66 private and public junior colleges, McDowell found that 6 percent held doctoral degrees, 31 percent held master's, 48 percent had bachelor's, and the remainder had less than a bachelor's degree. Of the 180 public junior college instructors included in this study, fewer than 3 percent had doctorates, 40 percent had master's, 45 percent had bachelor's and the remainder had no degree. For comparative purposes, McDowell studied the training of 223 instructors at universities and 58 at four-year colleges. Here he found that 60 percent of the university instructors and 26 percent of the senior college instructors had doctoral degrees, 25 percent of the university instructors and 41 percent of the senior college ones had master's, and almost 13 percent of the university instructors and 26 percent of the senior college ones had bachelor's degrees.¹⁷ Obviously, junior

¹⁶"The Junior College Menace As Seen From Within," Atlantic Monthly 139 (June 1927): 811.

¹⁷Junior College, p. 56.

college instructors were not as well trained as their colleagues in senior colleges and universities.

However, the comparison might not have appeared so unfavorable to junior college instructors if they had been compared to the senior college and university instructors who taught exclusively in the lower division of their institutions, for these schools often assigned lower ranking instructors or graduate students to the freshman and sophomore classes. This type of study was done on a limited scale in 1921 by Leonard V. Koos, who examined the credentials of 403 junior college, college, and university instructors. Koos found that of the 163 public junior college instructors studied, 3.1 percent had doctoral degrees, 46.6 percent had master's 46.6 percent had bachelor's, and 3.7 percent had no degrees. His study of the highest degrees held by 119 four-year college instructors revealed that 27.7 percent had doctor's degrees, 48.7 percent had master's, and 23.5 percent had bachelor's, while of the 121 university instructors included in his study the respective figures were 28.1, 42.2, and 29.7. Koos then took this same group of university and college instructors and examined the credentials of those whose teaching duties were confined exclusively to freshman and sophomore courses. Of the 22 college instructors who fell into this category, 18.2 percent held the doctorate, 40.9 percent the master's, and 40.9 percent the bachelor's, while of the 65 university instructors falling into this group, 10.8 percent held doctoral degrees, 55.4 percent held master's, and 33.8 percent held bachelor's.¹⁸ When examined from this

¹⁸Junior College, 1:191-193.

perspective, junior college instructors compared more favorably to their colleagues teaching in the lower division of senior colleges and universities, though the latter still had superior training for their tasks. Most experts of the time felt that the minimum requirement for junior college teachers should have been the master's degree, but except for California, where 75 percent of the junior college teachers held this degree, this standard was not met by most instructors in the nation's junior colleges.¹⁹

Junior college faculty also suffered from other weaknesses and problems. All too often they were appointed to their position by the junior college president or school board, not by their academic department, as would normally be the case in a senior college or university. Coming primarily from the high school ranks, they often brought into the college classroom high school teaching methods and attitudes. Most were teachers rather than scholars, and even the scholars among them were often isolated from contact with other scholars in their field.²⁰ They had burdensome teaching loads of 15-20 hours per week, compared to the 11-12 hour average of instructors at universities and the 12-15 hour standard for those at senior colleges.²¹ In salaries, public junior college instructors did not compare quite so unfavorably with senior college and university instructors, for they were generally paid more than instructors in private junior colleges, the same or slightly more

¹⁹ Proctor, "Junior College in California," p. 364.

²⁰ "Junior College Menace As Seen From Within," pp. 810-811.

²¹ McDowell, Junior College, p. 61.

than high school teachers, and slightly less than instructors at senior colleges and universities.²²

The problems and weaknesses of junior college faculty were not easy to overcome in the public school setting in which most public junior colleges were located in 1921. McDowell²³ and other contemporary scholars of the movement correctly identified the low quality of junior college faculty as one of the most pressing problems facing the public junior colleges. In 1921 correction of this problem was decades away, for it was not until the 1960s that junior colleges, with their increased prestige and expanding salaries, began to attract the highly qualified personnel needed to administer and staff these unique institutions.

Junior College Students

Unfortunately, few studies have been conducted on the characteristics of junior college students in the period prior to 1921. Little is known about their socio-economic background, academic aptitudes, academic performances, success upon transferring to senior institutions, or other essential characteristics. Most studies that have been undertaken are of a local or limited nature, so much of what is known has been derived from these narrow studies or from inferences from other known information.

²² Koos, Junior College, 1:208-213.

²³ McDowell, Junior College, p. 102-103.

Most public junior colleges required only a high school diploma for admission to the junior college program. Therefore, the student body at most public junior colleges would have been more heterogeneous than that at senior colleges and universities where stricter admission requirements prevailed. Certainly the typical junior college classroom would exhibit a wider range of abilities than would be found in a senior college or university and would encompass more students who were incapable of doing successful college work. One of the few studies in this area was conducted between 1919 and 1921 by Leonard V. Koos. Koos attempted to compare the intelligence levels of junior college, senior college, and university students by administering the Army Alpha Test and the Thurstone Test for College Freshman to several hundred students from these three types of institutions. Both tests had severe limitations in content and conditions of administration, as Koos realized, but he still concluded from their results that junior college, senior college, and university students were apparently about equal in intelligence and that students at all three types of institutions were drawn from approximately the same upper mental strata of the population.²⁴ It is difficult to assess Koos' findings, but given the state of intelligence testing in 1921 his studies are probably as accurate or inaccurate as those of any of his contemporaries. Like the results of all intelligence tests, they should be viewed with considerable skepticism and used with great caution. In this case it is quite doubtful that junior and senior college students were as similar in

²⁴ Junior College, 1:87-122.

mental ability as Koos concluded they were, since admission standards at senior institutions were considerably higher than those at junior ones.

Some of the studies conducted on junior college students prior to 1921 indicate that junior college students were academically successful when they transferred to senior colleges or universities. McDowell's study of private and public junior college students revealed that from 1914 to 1917, 73 percent of the graduates of public junior colleges and 41 percent of the graduates of private ones were continuing their education at senior colleges and universities.²⁵ Some studies of junior college students indicate that junior college transfers to senior colleges and universities made higher grades at these institutions than the students who had completed their freshman and sophomore work at them.²⁶ Apparently the junior college, with all of its obvious weaknesses and problems, did perform reasonably well the task of preparing students to continue their higher education at senior colleges and universities.

Since most public junior colleges had no dormitories or other student living quarters and appealed primarily to the local community for students, it can safely be assumed that most of their students were drawn from a small radius of the institution. Most public junior college students lived at home and commuted daily to the junior college for classes. This tended to prolong the home influence, to retard

²⁵Junior College, p. 53.

²⁶A. A. Gray, "The Junior College in California," School Review 23 (September 1915): 471.

students' maturation, and to contribute to the lack of a collegiate atmosphere and attitude at the local junior college. Although several studies have shown that most colleges and universities of this time drew their students from a fifty-mile radius or from within the state,²⁷ most students at these institutions did have the benefit of living on campus rather than at home. Most public junior college students did not have this beneficial educational experience, however, and to many of them attendance at the local junior college probably seemed little different from their previous years at the local high school of which it was a part.

The Junior College Curriculum

In the initial period of the junior college movement the curriculum at both public and private junior colleges emphasized traditional liberal arts programs which could be transferred to senior colleges or universities for credit toward a baccalaureate degree. This emphasis on college transfer work and de-emphasis of occupational, vocational, and adult education courses was caused by several factors. Most high schools were already geared to provide college preparatory courses, and it seemed both logical and convenient for expanding high schools to add traditional college courses as extensions of the college preparatory ones. In addition, the curriculum of the first two years of college was already fairly standardized across the nation at the time

²⁷E. A. Fitzpatrick, "The Case for Junior Colleges," Educational Review 65 (March 1923): 154.

junior colleges emerged, so they found it easier to imitate these existing programs than to experiment with new ones.²⁸ Officials of junior colleges also wanted their institutions and courses to be accepted by the public and the senior colleges and universities. Therefore, they were afraid to be too innovative. In some states accreditation agencies and state legislatures required the junior colleges to imitate the first two years of traditional college work. In addition, most senior colleges and universities contributed to the junior colleges' conformist policies by refusing to grant transfer credit for technical and vocational courses and for other courses outside the conventional liberal arts area. Like the University of Chicago under the leadership of William Rainey Harper, most colleges and universities required that all work transferred to the senior institution be equivalent to corresponding courses in the senior institution.²⁹

In 1921, almost seventy-five percent of all courses taught in the nation's junior colleges were liberal arts courses,³⁰ and in the private junior colleges, which were generally more conservative and traditional than the public ones, the percentage of liberal arts courses was undoubtedly much higher. Most public junior colleges

²⁸Smith, L. W. "Founding of Early Junior Colleges - President Harper's Influence," Junior College Journal 11 (May 1941): 511.

²⁹Hughes, "Junior College Development," p. 191.

³⁰James W. Thorton, The Community Junior College, 2nd ed. (New York: John Wiley & Sons, 1966), p. 52.

offered courses in English, mathematics, science, public speaking, literature, ancient and modern languages, history, religion, psychology, physical education, music, art, and education. They also taught some courses of a terminal technical and vocational nature, such as agriculture, commerce (shorthand, typing, bookkeeping, accounting, commercial law, money and banking), engineering (shop work, mechanical drawing, surveying, architectural drawing, machine shop), library science, and home economics (food preparation, dietetics, food chemistry, textiles, dressmaking, home management, and sewing). Public junior colleges also often offered pre-professional courses in law, pharmacy, medicine, nursing, education, and journalism. With this wide range of courses available for selection, students at most public junior colleges could get all the courses needed for admission to senior institutions as college juniors, but they still had only about half the number of courses to choose from as students who had completed their freshman and sophomore work at the senior college or university.³¹

Although public junior colleges emphasized traditional college courses at the expense of terminal technical and vocational ones, the attention given to non-traditional courses gradually increased as the years passed. In the first decade of the twentieth century few courses in junior colleges were of a terminal technical and vocational nature, but the number falling into this category increased to 17.5 percent in 1917, 28 percent in 1921, and 33 percent in 1930.³² The increase in the

³¹ Koos, Junior College, 1:27-29, 1:40-41, 1:60, 1:65-78.

³² Thornton, Community Junior College, p. 52.

number of these courses was due to the increasing efforts of junior colleges to meet the educational needs of non-traditional students and the vocational needs of the local community served by the college. Many prominent educators began to call for greater emphasis on vocational education in the junior college, and their demands were echoed by many parents and students.³³ This trend toward courses of this nature was also accelerated by state legislation, such as the California law of 1917, which authorized the junior colleges to offer technical and vocational courses. California became the national leader in junior college vocational education, and by 1921 the University of California and Stanford University were accepting these kinds of courses for college credit.³⁴ However, in California and in other parts of the nation, terminal vocational and technical courses did not become major components of junior college curriculums until after 1921. In 1921, the liberal arts remained supreme in the nation's junior colleges, both public and private.

Junior College Degrees

William Rainey Harper began to award the associate's degree in the junior college division of the University of Chicago in 1899, and after his introduction of this British degree to America several junior

³³ Frederick E. Bolton, "What Should Constitute the Curriculum of the Junior College or Extended High School?" School and Society 8 (December 1918): 726-728.

³⁴ Merton E. Hill, Vocationalizing the Junior College, U. S. Bureau of Education, Bulletin, 1922, No. 19, Part 1 (Washington: Government Printing Office, 1922), pp. 18-19.

colleges awarded only certificates or diplomas and did not grant degrees of any kind. McDowell³⁵ reported in 1917 that only sixteen private and public junior colleges awarded the associate's degree, while Koos³⁶ could find only eleven institutions, all private ones, granting the degree in 1921. It is difficult to determine why so few institutions awarded the associate's degree in this period of the junior college movement. The newness of both the junior college and the associate's degree may have retarded the expansion and acceptance of the latter, or perhaps, as Koos suggests, officials in public junior college departments in six-year high schools felt that the junior college was part of the secondary school system and that it would be presumptuous of it to award a collegiate degree.³⁷ Whatever the reasons, the widespread practice of granting associate's degrees did not begin until well after the end of the first era of the junior college movement in 1921.

Accreditation

Very little progress was made in regional or national accreditation of junior colleges until after 1921. The issue of junior college accreditation was discussed in meetings of regional associations of colleges and schools from 1903 onwards, but as of 1921 the only two

³⁵ Junior College, p. 70.

³⁶ Junior College, 2:638.

³⁷ Ibid., 2:639.

regional associations to establish standards for junior college accreditation were the Association of Colleges and Secondary Schools of the Southern States and the North Central Association of Colleges and Schools. As of 1917, the Association of Colleges and Secondary Schools of the Southern States maintained the following accreditation standards for junior colleges:

To be accepted as a member of this association a junior college must meet the following conditions: The college work must be the essential part of the curriculum, and names of college students must be published separately;...requirements for graduation must be based on the satisfactory completion of 30 year hours of work corresponding in kind and grade to that given in the freshman and sophomore years of colleges belonging to the association; the junior college shall not confer a degree, but may award diplomas; the number of teachers, their training, the amount of work assigned them, the number of college students, the resources and equipment of the college are all vital factors in fixing the standard of an institution and must be considered in accepting a junior college for membership. On these points the executive committee shall make regulations, and compliance therewith shall be a condition essential to their recommendation.³⁸

The North Central Association of Colleges and Secondary Schools established standards for accreditation of junior colleges at its annual meeting in 1918. Unlike the standards of the Southern Association, which were written in rather general terms, those of the North Central Association were prescribed in considerable detail:

A 'standard junior college' is an institution with a curriculum covering two years of collegiate work (at least 60 semester hours, or the equivalent in year, or term, or quarter credits), which is based upon and continues or supplements the work of secondary instruction as given in an accredited four-year high school. A semester hour is defined as one period of classroom work in lecture or recitation extending through not less than 50 minutes net or their equivalent per week for a period of 18 weeks, two periods of

³⁸Samuel P. Capen, Accredited Higher Institutions: The Junior College, U. S. Bureau of Education, Bulletin, 1917, No. 17 (Washington: Government Printing Office, 1917), p. 79.

laboratory work being counted as the equivalent of one hour of lecture or recitation.

1. The minimum scholastic requirements of all teachers of classes in the junior college shall be graduation from a college belonging to this association, or an equivalent, and in addition, graduate work in a university of recognized standing amounting to one year.
2. The junior college shall require for registration as a junior-college student the completion by the student of at least 14 units of high-school work as defined by this association.
3. The work of the junior college must be organized on a collegiate as distinguished from a high-school basis.
4. The teaching schedule of instructors teaching junior-college classes shall be limited to 22 hours per week; for instructors devoting their whole time to junior-college classes 18 hours shall be a maximum; 15 hours is recommended as the maximum.
5. The limit of the number of students in a recitation or laboratory class in a junior college shall be 30.
6. Students registered in a junior college who are permitted to enroll in regular high-school classes shall not be given full junior-college credit for such work, and in no case shall the credit thus given exceed two-thirds of the usual high school credit. No junior college will be accredited unless it has a registration of 25 students if it offers but a single year, and 50 students if it offers more than a single year.
7. The junior college shall have library and laboratory facilities sufficient to carry on its work the same as it would be carried on in the first two years of an accredited standard college.³⁹

Except for the above two exceptions, the accreditation of most junior colleges before 1921 was carried out by state boards of education, state educational associations, and universities which accepted transfer credits from junior colleges. Generally, state boards of

³⁹Samuel . Capen and John C. Walton, Higher Education: The Junior College, U. S. Bureau of Education, Bulletin, 1919, No. 22 (Washington: Government Printing Office, 1919), pp. 15-16.

education and state educational associations defined junior colleges as postsecondary institutions offering two years of college work and established accreditation regulations similar to those of the North Central Association quoted above. Some states, such as Virginia, granted certificates to graduates of junior colleges.⁴⁰ In most states the first agency to establish accreditation standards was the university, since newly-established junior colleges generally petitioned universities for aid in starting the junior college programs, setting standards, and organizing courses that would be accepted for transfer credit. The standards of most universities were similar to those of the North Central Association, though usually they were written in greater detail. They usually required that the courses at junior colleges correspond closely to those at the university and insisted that the teaching load of junior college instructors be confined primarily to the junior college department of the six-year high school, with little time allotted to the teaching of high school courses.⁴¹

Relationships Between Junior Colleges and Senior Institutions

From the very beginning of the junior college movement a close relationship existed between the university and the junior college. As has been demonstrated earlier in this study, the pioneers of the junior

⁴⁰ Samuel P. Capen, Higher Education: Recognition of the Junior College, U. S., Bureau of Education, Report of the Commissioner of Education, 1914 (Washington: U. S. Government Printing Office, 1915), 1:167.

⁴¹ For greater details on accreditation policies of state boards of education, state education associations, and universities, see McDowell, Junior College, p. 71-97, and Capen, Accredited Higher Institutions, pp. 71-79.

college movement--Tappan, Folwell, Harper, Jordan, and Lange--were university educators. The university in many states encouraged the initiation and development of junior colleges, helping them with the tasks of setting standards for faculty, courses, and equipment and agreeing to accept transfer credits from them. Consequently, the junior college movement spread most rapidly in those states where it was encouraged and aided by the university--Illinois, California, Missouri, Minnesota, and Texas.⁴²

There were many reasons behind the university's promotion of the junior college movement. Many university officials hoped to relegate the freshman and sophomore years of instruction to the junior college so that they could concentrate on graduate study and research. Many universities were overcrowded and could not admit all qualified applicants, so they looked to the junior college to help relieve some of these enrollment pressures. Some university officials also felt that the junior college would help democratize higher education by opening its doors to many more students than had ever been admitted before. Other university officials felt that the junior college would provide a good environment for students to gain the intellectual and emotional maturity they needed before they plunged into university life. Finally, many university officials viewed the junior college as an institution which could help weed out from higher education those students who were incapable of doing college work or who needed only a year or two of terminal occupational education. For these and other reasons,

⁴² McDowell, Junior College, p. 16.

university officials generally supported the junior college movement, though occasionally they expressed skepticism and concern at the quality of education provided at some junior colleges.⁴³

One important measure of the attitude of universities toward junior colleges was their policy about accepting transfer credit from these institutions. In his study of the transfer policies of 168 four-year colleges and universities, Koos found that almost two-thirds of them (108) had received requests from students wanting to transfer junior college work to their institutions and that 104 generally recognized the junior college credits of transfer students. These credits were usually accepted on an hour-for-hour basis without requiring the incoming transfer student to take special examinations in the courses submitted for credit. In spite of the newness of the junior college movement, most junior college students had no trouble in transferring to universities to complete their baccalaureate degrees.⁴⁴

Private four-year colleges were usually not as open-minded as the public or private universities in their attitudes toward public junior colleges and junior college transfer students. Most private schools, particularly the many small ones which dotted the landscape of the country, were competing with the junior colleges for the same kind of college student. Many of these small colleges were facing enrollment

⁴³Brush, "Junior College and the Universities," pp. 359, 362-365; Frederick E. Bolton, "Some Probable Effects Upon Higher Education Due to the Development of Junior Colleges," Educational Administration and Supervision 5 (February 1919): 85-86.

⁴⁴Junior College, pp. 80-82.

declines and possible extinction, and they did not want to encourage their junior college competitors by helping them to get established or by accepting their transfer students.⁴⁵

Problems, Weaknesses, and Criticisms of the Junior College

Although the public junior college was praised and promoted by many educators and laymen during the early period of the movement, many others condemned it or pointed out its many weaknesses and problems. Many high school educators felt that the junior college was an unwarranted, unnatural, and even harmful addition to the public high school, while many college and university educators feared that the junior colleges were offering inferior academic programs which threatened to cheapen the whole structure of higher education. Many small private college officials saw the public junior college as a competitor and as a threat to their very existence. Hence, their criticisms of the junior college should be viewed in this perspective. Although the founders, promoters, and friends of the junior college often tried to defend it from its critics, they had to admit that this unique and fast-growing educational innovation suffered from many kinds of weaknesses and problems.

Adverse criticism of the junior college appeared very early in the history of the movement. William Rainey Harper was frequently accused of trying to use his system of affiliated and cooperating junior colleges as the foundation for a Midwestern educational empire, and

⁴⁵James R. Angell, "The Junior College Movement in High Schools," School Review 23 (May 1915): 291-292.

both before and during his years as a junior college pioneer the junior college was regarded by many critics as a poor and unworthy imitation of the senior college or university. This kind of criticism mounted as the junior college movement grew. In July of 1911, for example, a major attack upon the junior college was mounted by C. A. Duniway, president of the University of Montana, in a paper presented before the forty-ninth annual meeting of the National Education Association in San Francisco. He attacked the junior college for promoting high claims and low standards, and asserted that the practice of adding two years to the high school "to keep its students busy for six years does not really make of that high school a junior college." Duniway concluded that the junior college did not have much of a future in American higher education.⁴⁶

In 1915 some basic weaknesses of the junior college were pointed out by one of its friends, James R. Angell of the University of Chicago. He applauded the establishment of junior college programs in the high schools, but warned against trying to push the movement too far too soon, reminding junior college promoters that many high schools lacked the financial support, libraries, laboratories, faculty, and other resources necessary for the establishment and maintenance of a good junior college program.⁴⁷ Three years later, in 1918, Julius Sachs, a long-time critic of the junior college, echoed Angell's views while

⁴⁶C. C. Duniway, "The Separation and Development of the Junior College as Distinct from the University," Addresses and Proceedings of the National Education Association 49 (1911): 660-664.

⁴⁷"Junior College Movement In High Schools," pp. 296-297.

adding that "higher education is costly, but cheap substitutes will not give you higher education." Sachs felt that it was virtually impossible to operate a high school and junior college program under the same administrative umbrella and that a proper college atmosphere could never exist in a six-year high school.⁴⁸

The problems facing many junior colleges were summarized in 1920 by David Mackenzie, Dean of the Detroit Junior College, at the national conference of junior colleges which resulted in the founding of the American Association of Junior Colleges. Mackenzie stated that in his studies of junior college problems he had found that many institutions suffered from poorly prepared and poorly paid faculty, low admission standards, and frequent student absences, the latter resulting from the fact that most students lived at home and often held full-time jobs or had to help their parents with home responsibilities. He also stated that many students were not attracted to the junior colleges because they lacked the active social life (sports, clubs, and other extra-curricular activities) found at senior colleges and because the institutions suffered from the stigma of being attached to the local high school.⁴⁹

Perhaps the most devastating attack upon the junior college appeared in an article written by Carl Holliday for the February, 1920, edition of School and Society. Holliday, who was Dean and Professor

⁴⁸"Junior Colleges in California," Educational Review 55 (February 1918), 117-125.

⁴⁹David MacKenzie, Problems of the Public Junior College, U. S., Bureau of Education, Bulletin, 1922, No. 19, Part 1 (Washington: Government Printing Office, 1922), pp. 32-34.

of English in the College of Arts and Sciences at the University of Toledo in Ohio, was especially critical of junior colleges organized as the fifth and sixth years of the public high school, a practice he said would "make the word 'college' a subject for a farce and higher education for a tragedy." According to Holliday, the city school board, school superintendent, and high school principal were not qualified to establish and operate a college program. Under this type of operation, the junior college would "readily degenerate into simply two more grades of high school, run in the typical high school groove, and with the conventional high school spirit." He was especially critical of the practice of recruiting junior college teachers from the local high school staff:

And lo and behold! Under the system now proposed for some states, any high school teacher may suddenly find himself a college professor--a 'specialist,' ready to discuss with students problems that have made Agassiz, James, and Dewey wrinkle their brows! The average high school teacher is not trained--nor should he be--for the advanced instruction required even in junior college; and yet such misfitting is exactly what is occurring in some of the so-called junior colleges now attached to the high schools. It is a peculiar state of affairs when a man finds himself one hour a high school instructor, and the next hour a full-fledged college professor.⁵⁰

Holliday also maintained that it was a mistake for students to attend college at the same place they had once been high school students. College students needed to leave their high school and break with their educational past, moving to a new environment featuring a separate campus with different buildings, instructors,

⁵⁰"Junior College - If," School and Society 11 (January 1920): 211-212.

teaching methods, and friends. "It is a poor understanding of a boy's nature," he asserted, "to believe that he will be contented in his 'college days' to tramp the same soil and walk the same halls with high school 'children.'" For these and other reasons, the high school could never provide the true college atmosphere and facilities so necessary for a genuine college education.⁵¹

Holliday called for an end to the practice of adding junior college programs to high schools, asserting that "if the high school desires to add a fifth or sixth year to its work, well and good; but in the name of common honesty, let it not try to fool students by calling this addition a college." He concluded by urging cities which wanted junior colleges to establish them as distinct institutions, separate from the high school, with their own governing boards, facilities, and staff.⁵²

It is undoubtedly true that many public junior colleges, along with some private ones, suffered from the weaknesses and problems pointed out by their many friendly and unfriendly critics. As new institutions forced to compete with the parent high school for money, faculty, and physical facilities, many public junior colleges had to operate a two-year college program in a high school atmosphere with inadequate faculty, classrooms, libraries, and laboratories. The lack of a separate board of trustees, administration, faculty, and campus also certainly made it difficult to operate the junior college

⁵¹Ibid.

⁵²Ibid., pp. 213-214.

division as a legitimate college and to promote the college atmosphere so necessary for a genuine college experience. Most of these problems could not be solved until after 1921, when many states began to pass legislation providing for the establishment of distinct, independent junior colleges, separate from the high school, with their own governing boards, campuses, and staff.

Summary and Conclusion

The public junior college movement developed as a part of both secondary and higher education in the second half of the nineteenth century. Initially conceived by Henry P. Tappan, William Watts Folwell, William Rainey Harper, and other University educators as a way of relieving the university of lower division work so that it could concentrate on research and graduate study, the public junior college evolved slowly as the fifth and sixth years of expanded high schools or as branches of the state university system. Although it was started in the Midwest, the public junior college movement came into its own in California, where through the efforts of Alexis F. Lange and other leaders the state legislature provided for the establishment of the junior college as an integral part of the state public school system. By 1921 there were 70 public junior colleges, concentrated primarily in the Midwest and West, and many of these institutions had joined with some of the 137 private ones in forming a national organization, the American Association of Junior Colleges, to serve as the national leader and coordinator of the movement. By that time the junior college had established itself as a unique institution in American

education, with characteristics which set it apart from both the secondary schools, from which it grew, and from the colleges and universities, which it tried in many ways to imitate and to which it sent its transfer students.

The typical public junior college in 1921 was part of an expanded high school, sharing with it administrators, faculty, classrooms, and office space. Its curriculum emphasized liberal arts courses which could be easily transferred to senior colleges and universities, though a few institutions were beginning to offer work of a terminal technical and vocational nature. Some junior colleges suffered from poorly prepared teachers, inadequate physical facilities, the absence of a collegiate atmosphere, and other problems, but most junior colleges accomplished fairly well their task of providing the first two years of college instruction and preparing their students to enter senior institutions as reasonably mature scholars capable of completing a baccalaureate program. In 1921 the public junior college was still in its infancy, it had internal problems which needed to be resolved, and its years of greatest growth still lay in the future, but it had already established itself as a novel and permanent part of the American system of education.

BIBLIOGRAPHY

I. Bibliographical and Research Aids: Books

- Good, Carter V. Essentials of Educational Research: Methodology and Design. 2nd ed. New York: Appleton-Century-Crofts, 1972.
- Rarig, Emory W., ed. The Community Junior College: An Annotated Bibliography. New York: Columbia University Teachers College Press, 1966.
- Skager, Rodney W., and Weinberg, Carl. Fundamentals of Educational Research: An Introductory Approach. Glenview, Illinois: Scott, Foresman and Co., 1971.
- Smith, Henry Lester, and Smith, Johnnie Rutland. An Introduction to Research in Education. Bloomington, Indiana: Educational Publications, 1959.

II. Bibliographical and Research Aids: Articles

- Eells, Walter C. Bibliography of Junior Colleges. U. S. Bureau of Education. Bulletin, 1930, No. 2. Washington: Government Printing Office, 1930.
- Perdew, Philip W. "Criteria of Research in Educational History." Journal of Educational Research 44 (November 1950): 217-233.
- Woody, Thomas. "Of History and Its Method." Journal of Experimental Education 15 (March 1947): 175-201.

III. Unpublished Sources

- Cowley, W. H. The Emergence of the Junior College in the Evolution of American Education: A Memorandum for the Fund for the Republic. Arlington, Va.: ERIC Document Reproduction Service, ED 116 741, 1976.
- Diener, Thomas J. Federal Influences on the Junior College Search for Identity. Arlington, Va.: ERIC Document Reproduction Service, ED 068 095, 1973.

Getty, Ronald. European Influences that Affected the Early Development of the Junior College. Arlington, Va.: ERIC Document Reproduction Service, ED 037 200, 1970.

Goodwin, Gregory L. A Social Panacea: A History of the Community Junior College Ideology. Arlington, Va.: ERIC Document Reproduction Service, ED 093 427, 1974.

Horn, Jefferson Lee. "William Rainey Harper and Alexis F. Lange: Productive Pioneers in the Junior College Movement." Ph.D. dissertation, University of Texas, 1952.

Meisterheim, Matthew. "A History of the Public Junior College in Illinois, 1900-1965." Ph.D. dissertation, Northern Illinois University, 1973.

Palinchak, Robert S. Folwell, Tappan, and Harper--Early Proponents of the Two-Year College. Arlington, Va.: ERIC Documentation Reproduction Service, ED 045 066, 19 1.

Reid, Alban Elwell, Jr. "A History of the California Public Junior College Movement." Ed.D. dissertation, University of Southern California, 1966.

Smith, William S. "A Rhetorical Criticism of David Starr Jordan's Addresses on Education." Ph.D. dissertation, Stanford University, 1952.

Spoehr, Luther William. "Progress' Pilgrim: David Starr Jordan and the Circle of Reform, 1891-1931." Ph.D. dissertation, Stanford University, 1975.

IV. Primary Sources: Books

Folwell, William Watts. A History of Minnesota. 4 vols. St. Paul: Minnesota Historical Society, 1930.

_____. University Addresses. Minneapolis: H. W. Wilson Co., 1909.

_____. William Watts Folwell: The Autobiography and Letters of a Pioneer of Culture. Edited by Solon J. Buck. Minneapolis: University of Minnesota Press, 1933.

Goodspeed, Thomas Wakefield. A History of the University of Chicago: The First Quarter-Century. Chicago: University of Chicago Press, 1916.

_____. The Story of the University of Chicago, 1890-1925. Chicago: University of Chicago Press, 1925.

- _____. William Rainey Harper: First President of the University of Chicago. Chicago: University of Chicago Press, 1928.
- Harper, William Rainey. The Trend in Higher Education. Chicago: University of Chicago Press, 1905.
- Harper, William Rainey et al. Present College Questions: Six Papers Read Before the NEA at the Sessions Held in Boston, July 6 and 7, 1903. New York: D. Appleton & Co., 1903.
- Jordan, David Starr. The Blood of the Nation: A Study of the Decay of the Races Through the Survival of the Unfit. Boston: American Unitarian Association, 1910.
- _____. The Care and Culture of Men. San Francisco: Whitaker & Ray-Wiggin Co., 1910.
- _____. Days of a Man. Being Memories of a Naturalist, Teacher, and Minor Prophet of Democracy. 2 vols. New York: World Book Co., 1922.
- _____. The Trend of the American University. Stanford: Stanford University Press, 1929.
- Tappan, Henry P. University Education. New York: Arno Press and the New York Times, 1969. First published by G. P. Putnam in 1851.

V. Primary Sources: Articles and Reports

- Alexander, C. C. and Willett, G. W. "Some Aspects of a Junior College." School Review 28 (January 1920): 15-25.
- Angell, James R. "The Junior College Movement in High Schools." School Review 23 (May 1915): 289-302.
- _____. "Problems Peculiar to the Junior College." School Review 25 (May 1915): 385-397.
- Babcock, Kendric C. Higher Education: Standard Colleges and Junior Colleges. U. S. Bureau of Education. Report of the Commissioner, 1912. Washington: Government Printing Office, 1913, pp. 97-102.
- Bainter, Edward M. The Administration and Control of Public Junior Colleges. U. S. Bureau of Education. Bulletin, 1922, No. 19, Part 1. Washington: Government Printing Office, 1922, pp. 15-18.
- Blauch, L. E. "Reorganization on European Lines Appears Imminent." School Life 9 (December 1923): 77-79.

- Bolton, Frederick E. "Some Probable Effects Upon Higher Education Due to the Development of Junior Colleges." Educational Administration and Supervision 5 (February 1919): 85-93.
- _____. "What Should Constitute the Curriculum of the Junior College or Extended High School?" School and Society 8 (December 1918): 726-730.
- Brown, J. Stanley. "Future Outlook and Possibilities: Secondary Education." Addresses and Proceedings of the National Education Association 53 (1915): 616-621.
- _____. The Growth and Development of the Junior College in the United States. U. S. Bureau of Education. Bulletin, 1922, No. 19, Part 1. Washington: Government Printing Office, 1922, pp. 27-28.
- _____. Normal Schools and Junior Colleges. U. S. Bureau of Education. Bulletin, 1922, No. 19, Part 2. Washington: Government Printing Office, 1922, pp. 56-60.
- _____. "Present Development of Secondary Schools According to the Proposed Plan." School Review 13 (January 1905): 15-18.
- Brush, H. R. "The Junior College and the Universities." School and Society 4 (September 1916): 357-365.
- Buenger, Theodore. A Change of Gymnasias to Junior Colleges. U. S. Bureau of Education. Bulletin, 1922, No. 19, Part 2. Washington: Government Printing Office, 1922, pp. 51-52.
- Bunker, F. F. Reorganization of the Public School System. U. S. Bureau of Education. Bulletin, 1916, No. 8. Washington: Government Printing Office, 1916.
- Burgess, Theodore. Technical and Vocational Education in Junior Colleges, U. S. Bureau of Education. Bulletin, 1922, No. 19, Part 2. Washington: Government Printing Office, 1922, pp. 52-56.
- Butler, Nathaniel. "The Six-Year High School." School Review 12 (January 1904): 22-25.
- Cammack, I. I. "The Legitimate Range of Activity of the Junior College in the Public School System." Addresses and Proceedings of the National Education Association 55 (1917): 724-729.
- Capen, Samuel P. Accredited Higher Institutions: The Junior College. U. S. Bureau of Education. Bulletin, 1917, No. 17. Washington: Government Printing Office, 1917, pp. 71-79.

- Higher Education: Recognition of the Junior College. U. S. Bureau of Education. Report of the Commissioner of Education, 1914, Part 1. Washington: Government Printing Office, 1915, pp. 166-168.
- Capen, Samuel P. and Walton, John C. Higher Education: the Junior College. U. S. Bureau of Education. Bulletin, 1919, No. 22. Washington: Government Printing Office, 1919, pp. 14-16.
- Claxton, P. P. The Better Organization of Higher Education in the United States. U. S. Bureau of Education. Bulletin, 1922, No. 19, Part 1. Washington: Government Printing Office, 1922, pp. 21-27.
- Corson, David B. "The Claims of the New Type Junior College." Education 40 (February 1920): 327-339.
- Coursault, J. H. "Standardizing the Junior College: An Experiment by the University of Missouri." Educational Leave 49 (January 1915): 56-62.
- Davis, Arthur Kyle. The Importance of Standardization and Coordination of Junior Colleges. U. S. Bureau of Education. Bulletin, 1922, No. 19, Part 2. Washington: Government Printing Office, 1922, pp. 49-51.
- Duniway, C. A. "The Separation and Development of the Junior College as Distinct from the University." Addresses and Proceedings of the National Education Association 49 (1911): 660-664.
- Elliff, J. D. "The Junior College: The Missouri Plan." Association of Colleges and Secondary Schools of the Southern States. Proceedings 13 (1915): 52-54.
- Extracts from Proceedings of the First Annual Meeting of the American Association of Junior Colleges, Chicago, Illinois, February 16, 17, 1921. U. S. Bureau of Education. Bulletin, 1922, No. 19, Part 2. Washington: Government Printing Office, 1922.
- Fleagle, Fred K. Military Schools As Junior Colleges. U. S. Bureau of Education. Bulletin, 1922, No. 19, Part 1. Washington: Government Printing Office, 1922, pp. 12-15.
- "The Founder of a Great University." The Independent 60 (January 18, 1906): 172-173.
- Frazier, C. R. "The Junior College." Addresses and Proceedings of the National Education Association 55 (1917): 271-274.
- "The General Conference." School Review 12 (January 1904): 15-28.

- Gray, A. A. "The Junior College in California." School Review 23 (September 1915): 465-473.
- _____. "The Status and Service of the Small College." School and Society 3 (April 1916): 586-594.
- Harper, William Rainey. "The High School of the Future." School Review 11 (January 1903): 1-3.
- _____. "President's Annual Report." Decennial Publications of the University of Chicago, 1900-1902. Chicago: University of Chicago Press, 1903.
- _____. "The Small College--Its Prospects." Addresses and Proceedings of the National Education Association 38 (1900): 67-87.
- _____. "The Trend of University and College Education in the United States." North American Review 174 (April 1902): 457-465.
- Hedgepeth, V.W.B. "The Six-Year High School at Goshen." School Review 13 (January 1905): 19-23.
- Hill, Merton E. Vocationalizing the Junior College. U. S. Bureau of Education. Bulletin, 1922, No. 19, Part 1. Washington: Government Printing Office, 1922, pp. 18-21.
- Holliday, Carl. "Junior College--If." School and Society 11 (January 1920): 211-214.
- Hughes, W. H. "Junior College Development." Educational Administration and Supervision 5 (April 1919): 189-196.
- James, Edmund J. "The Function of the State University." Science 22 (November 17, 1905): 609-628.
- Jones, John C. "Junior College Movement in Missouri." School Life 8 (December 1922): 73, 89-90.
- Jordan, David Starr. "An Apology for the American University." Proceedings and Addresses of the National Education Association 37 (1899): 213-225.
- _____. "The College and the University." Science 27 (April 3, 1908): 530-533.
- _____. "The Higher Education of Women." Popular Science Monthly 62 (December 1902): 97-107.
- _____. "The Junior College." Forum 75 (March 1926): 448-450.
- _____. "The Junior College." World's Work 16 (July 1908): 10453.

- Judson, Henry Pratt. "William Rainey Harper." Proceedings and Addresses of the National Education Association 44 (1906): 293-296.
- "The Junior College." Educational Review 37 (May 1909): 537-538.
- "The Junior College." Educational Review 49 (February 1915): 215-216.
- Koos, Leonard V. "Current Conceptions of the Special Purposes of the Junior College." School Review 29 (September 1921): 520-529.
- _____. "Junior-College Courses in 1920-1921." School Review 29 (October-November 1921): 586-592.
- _____. "Where to Establish Junior Colleges." School Review 29 (June 1921): 413-433.
- Koos, Leonard V., and Crawford, C. C. "College Aims, Past and Present." School and Society 14 (December 1921): 499-509.
- Linn, James Weber. "President Harper of the University of Chicago." The World's Work 11 (December 1905): 7009-7013.
- Lange, Alexis F. "The Junior College." Addresses and Proceedings of the National Education Association 53 (1915): 119-124.
- _____. "The Junior College As An Integral Part of the Public School System." School Review 25 (September 1916): 465-479.
- _____. "A Junior College Department of Civic Education." School and Society 2 (September 25, 1915): 442-448.
- _____. "The Junior College--What Manner of Child Shall This Be?" School And Society 7 (February 1918): 211-216.
- _____. "The Junior College With Special Reference to California." Educational Administration and Supervision 2 (January 1916): 1-8.
- _____. "The New High School and the New High School Teacher." School and Society 4 (August 1916): 267-272.
- Liddeke, Frederick. "The Extension of the High School Course." School Review 12 (October 1904): 635-647.
- McDowell, F. M. The Curriculum of the Junior College. U. S. Bureau of Education. Bulletin, 1922, No. 19, Part 1. Washington: Government Printing Office, 1922, pp. 37-42.
- Macgruder, William T. "The Junior College As A Relief." Educational Review 61 (April 1921): 286-297.

- Mackenzie, David. Problems of the Public Junior College. U. S. Bureau of Education. Bulletin, 1922, No. 19, Part 1. Washington: Government Printing Office, 1922, pp. 29-37.
- McLane, C. L. "The Junior College, or Upward Extension of the High School." School Review 21 (March 1913): 161-170.
- Million, John W. Advantages of the Junior College. U. S. Bureau of Education. Bulletin, 1922, No. 19, Part 1. Washington: Government Printing Office, 1922, pp. 2-6.
- Nelson, S. Gifford. "The University of Chicago and Its President." Harper's Weekly 35 (May 1891): 410.
- Pierce, E. C. "How Far Should the High School Do College Work?" School Review 5 (May 1897): 117-121.
- Raymond, T. W. The Junior Colleges in the South and the National Association. U. S. Bureau of Education. Bulletin, 1922, No. 19, Part 2. Washington: Government Printing Office, 1922, pp. 60-61.
- "Report of the Commission of Twenty-One." School Review 13 (January 1904): 23-25.
- Sachs, Julius. "The Elimination of the First Two College Years: A Protest." Educational Review 30 (May 1905): 488-499.
- _____. "Junior Colleges in California." Educational Review 55 (February 1918): 117-125.
- Steward, Charles S. Junior Colleges As Completion Schools. U. S. Bureau of Education. Bulletin, 1922, No. 19, Part 1. Washington: Government Printing Office, 1922, pp. 42-45.
- Stowe, A. Monroe. Report of a Survey of the Junior Colleges of Detroit and Grand Rapids, Michigan and of Joliet, Illinois. U. S. Bureau of Education. Bulletin, 1922, No. 19, Part 1. Washington: Government Printing Office, 1922, pp. 65-71.
- "A Two-Years' College Course." Educational Review 19 (1900): 411-415.
- Warriner, E. C. "The Michigan Schoolmaster's Club-Proceedings of the Twenty-Seventh Semi-Annual Meeting." School Review (February 1897): 127-128.
- Winfield, G. F. Denominational Education and the Junior College Movement. U. S. Bureau of Education. Bulletin, 1922, Part 1. Washington: Government Printing Office, 1922, pp. 9-12.

Wood, James M. The Function of the Junior College. No. 19, Part 1. U. S. Bureau of Education. Bulletin, 1922, Part 1. Washington: Government Printing Office, 1922, pp. 2-6.

. "The Junior College." Addresses and Proceedings of the National Education Association 54 (1916): 151-157.

Zook, George F., ed. The National Conference of Junior Colleges, 1920, and the First Annual Meeting of the American Association of Junior Colleges, 1921. U. S. Bureau of Education. Bulletin, 1922, No. 19. Washington: Government Printing Office, 1922.

VI. Secondary Materials: Books

Altman, Robert A. The Upper Division College. San Francisco: Jossey-Bass Inc., 1970.

Beckman, William W., and Lehrer, Stanley, eds. A Century of Higher Education: Classical Citadel to Collegiate Colossus. New York: Society for the Advancement of Education, 1962.

Blocker, Clyde E., Plummer, Robert H., and Richardson, Richard C. The Two-Year College: A Social Synthesis. Englewood Cliffs, N.J.: Prentice-Hall, 1965.

Bogue, Jesse Parker. The Community College. New York: McGraw-Hill, 1950.

Brick, Michael. Forum and Focus for the Junior College Movement: The American Association of Junior Colleges. New York: Columbia University Teachers College Bureau of Publications, 1964.

Brubacher, John S., and Rudy, Willis. Higher Education in Transition: A History of American Colleges and Universities, 1636-1968. rev. ed. New York: Harper & Row, 1968.

Burns, Edward M. David Starr Jordan: Prophet of Freedom. Stanford: Stanford University Press, 1953.

Clifton, John L. Ten Famous American Educators. Columbus, Ohio: R.G. Adams & Co., 1933.

Cole, Donald B. Handbook of American History. New York: Harcourt, Brace, and World, Inc., 1968.

Coulter, E. Merton. College Life in the Old South. Athens: University of Georgia Press, 1951. First published in 1928 by Macmillan.

- Curti, Merle, and Cartensen, Vernon. The University of Wisconsin: A History, 1848-1925. 2 vols. Madison: University of Wisconsin Press, 1949.
- Curti, Merle, and Nash, Roderick. Philanthropy in the Shaping of American Higher Education. New Brunswick: Rutgers University Press, 1965.
- Dictionary of American Biography. New York: Charles Scribner's Sons, 1933.
- Dressel, Paul. The Undergraduate Curriculum in Higher Education. Washington: Center for Applied Research in Education, 1963.
- Eells, Walter Crosby. Associate's Degree and Graduation Practices in Junior Colleges. Washington: American Association of Junior Colleges, 1942.
- _____. Degrees in Higher Education. Washington: Center for Applied Research in Education, 1963.
- _____. The Junior College. Boston: Houghton-Mifflin Co., 1931.
- _____. Present Status of Junior College Terminal Education. Washington: American Association of Junior Colleges, 1941.
- Elliott, Leslie Orrin. Stanford University: The First Twenty-Five Years. Stanford: Stanford University Press, 1937.
- Faulkner, Harold U. Politics, Reform, and Expansion, 1890-1900. New American Nation Series. New York: Harper & Row, 1959.
- Fields, Ralph R. The Community College Movement. New York: McGraw-Hill, 1962.
- Fretwell, Elbert K., Jr. Founding Public Junior Colleges; Local Initiative in Six Communities. New York: Columbia University Teachers College Bureau of Publications, 1954.
- Garraty, John A. The New Commonwealth, 1877-1890. New American Nation Series. New York: Harper & Row, 1968.
- Good, H. G. A History of American Education. 2nd ed. New York: Macmillan Co., 1962.
- Gould, Joseph E. The Chautauqua Movement. New York: State University of New York Press, 1961.
- Henninger, G. Ross. The Technical Institute in America. New York: McGraw-Hill, 1959.

- Herbst, Jurgen. The German Historical School in American Scholarship: A Study in the Transfer of Culture. Ithaca: Cornell University Press, 1965.
- Hillway, Tyrus. The American Two-Year College. New York: Harper & Brothers, 1958.
- Hinsdale, B. A. History of the University of Michigan. Ann Arbor: University of Michigan Press, 1906.
- Hofstadter, Richard. Social Darwinism in American Thought. New York: George Braziller, 1959.
- Hofstadter, Richard and Hardy, C. Dewitt. The Development and Scope of Higher Education in the United States. New York: Columbia University Press, 1952.
- Hofstadter, Richard, and Metzger, Walter P. The Development of Academic Freedom in the United States. New York: Columbia University Press, 1955.
- Johnston, C. H. The Modern High School. New York: Charles Scribner's Sons, 1914.
- Koos, Leonard V. The Junior College. 2 vols. Minneapolis: University of Minnesota Press, 1924.
- _____. The Junior College Movement. Boston: Ginn & Co., 1925.
- Link, Arthur S. Woodrow Wilson and the Progressive Era, 1910-1917. New American Nations Series. New York: Harper & Row, 1954.
- Mayer, Milton. Young Man in a Hurry: The Story of William Rainey Harper, First President of the University of Chicago. Chicago: University of Chicago Alumni Association, 1956.
- Medsker, Leland L. The Junior College: Progress and Prospect. New York: McGraw-Hill, 1960.
- Monroe, Charles R. Profile of the Community College. San Francisco: Jossey-Bass, Inc., 1972.
- Morris, Richard, ed. Encyclopedia of American History. Bicentennial Edition. New York: Harper & Row, 1976.
- Mowry, George E. The Era of Theodore Roosevelt and the Birth of Modern America, 1900-1912. New American Nation Series. New York: Harper & Row, 1958.

- Ogilvie, William K., and Raines, Max R., eds. Perspectives on the Community-Junior College: Selected Readings. New York: Appleton-Century-Crofts, 1971
- Palinchak, Robert. The Evolution of the Community College. Metuchen, N.J.: Scarecrow Press, 1973.
- Perkinson, Henry J. Two Hundred Years of American Educational Thought. New York: David McKay Co., 1976.
- Perry, Charles M. Henry Philip Tappan: Philosopher and University President. New York: Arno Press and the New York Times, 1971. Reprint of 1933 edition.
- Power, Edward J. Main Currents in the History of Education. New York: McGraw-Hill, 1962.
- Proctor, William Martin., ed. The Junior College: Its Organization and Administration. Stanford: Stanford University Press, 1927.
- Rudolph, Frederick. The American College and University: A History. New York: Random House, 1962.
- Rudy, Willis. The Evolving Liberal Arts Curriculum: A Historical Review of Basic Themes. New York: Columbia University Teachers College, 1960.
- Sagendorph, Kent. Michigan: The Story of the University. New York: E. P. Dutton, 1948.
- Sanford, Nevitt, ed. The American College: A Psychological and Social Interpretation of the Higher Learning. New York: John Wiley & Sons, 1962.
- Seashore, Carl E. The Junior College Movement. New York: Holt, Rinehart & Winston, 1940.
- Storr, Richard J. Harper's University: The Beginnings. Chicago: University of Chicago Press, 1966.
- Thomas, Russell. The Search for a Common Learning: General Education, 1800-1960. New York: McGraw-Hill, 1962.
- Thornton, James W. The Community Junior College. 2nd ed. New York: John Wiley & Sons, 1966.
- United States Bureau of the Census. Historical Statistics of the United States, Colonial Times to 1970. Washington: Government Printing Office, 1975.

- Veysey, Laurence R. The Emergence of the American University. Chicago: University of Chicago Press, 1965.
- Wallace, Elizabeth. The Unending Journey. Minneapolis: University of Minnesota Press, 1952.
- Ward, F. Champion, ed. The Idea and Practice of General Education: An Account of the College of the University of Chicago by Present and Former Members of the Faculty. Chicago: University of Chicago Press, 1950.
- Wesley, Edgar B. NEA: The First Hundred Years. New York: Harper & Brothers, 1957.
- Whitney, Frederick Lamson. The Junior College in America. Greeley: Colorado State Teachers College, 1928.
- Zwerlig, L. Steven. Second Best: The Crisis of the Community College. New York: McGraw-Hill, 1976.

VII. Secondary Materials: Articles and Reports

- Adams, Waldo L. "The Junior College at Goshen, Indiana." Junior College Journal 4 (November, 1933): 71-77.
- Badger, Henry C. "Higher Education Statistics: 1870 to 1952." Higher Education 11 (September 1954): 10-15.
- Bogue, Jesse P., and Sanders, Shirley. "Analysis of Junior College Growth." Junior College Journal 19 (February 1949): 311-319.
- Boren, Claude B. "Why a Junior College Movement?" Junior College Journal 24 (February 1954): 345-357.
- Brunner, Ken August. "Historical Development of the Junior College Philosophy." Junior College Journal 40 (April 1970): 30-34.
- Colvert, C. C. "Half-Century of Junior Colleges." Junior College Journal 17 (February 1947): 244-247.
- Cooper, William John. "The Junior College Movement in California." School Review 36 (June 1928): 409-422.
- Cowley, W. H. "A Ninety-Year Old Conflict Erupts Again." Educational Record 23 (April 1942): 192-218.

- Crawford, Allan. "A Short History of the Public Community College Movement in the United States." Paedagogica Historica 10 (1970): 28-48.
- Deam, Thomas M. "Evolution of the Joliet Junior College." Junior College Journal 2 (April 1931): 429-432.
- Eells, Walter C. "Abolition of the Lower Division: Early History." Junior College Journal (January 1936): 193-195.
- _____. "The Early History of California Public Junior Colleges." California Quarterly of Secondary Education 4 (April 1929): 214-222.
- _____. "Junior College Patriarchs." Junior College Journal 10 (February 1940): 307-309.
- _____. "Private Junior Colleges in California." California Quarterly of Secondary Education 5 (October 1929): 82-86.
- Fitzpatrick, E. A. "The Case for Junior Colleges." Educational Review 65 (March 1923): 150-156.
- Frankie, Richard J., and Dubois, Eugene E. "The Community-Junior College in Historical and Cultural Perspective." School and Society 99 (January 1971): 45-47.
- Gerber, Daniel R. "William Watts Folwell and the Idea of the Junior College." Junior College Journal 41 (March 1971): 50-53.
- Gleazer, Edmund J., Jr. "Analysis of Junior College Growth." Junior College Directory. Washington: American Association of Junior Colleges, 1959, pp. 49-52.
- _____. "The Junior College." College and University Business 37 (October 1964): 64-67.
- Goodwin, Gregory L. "The Nature and Nurture of the Community College Movement." Community College Frontiers 4 (Spring 1976): 5-13.
- Griffith, William S. "Harper's Legacy to the Public Junior College." Community College Frontiers 4 (Spring 1976): 15-20.
- Haggard, W. W. "An Early Upward Extension of Secondary Education." School Review 38 (June 1930): 430-434.
- Harbeson, John W. "The Place of the Junior College in Public Education." Educational Review 67 (April 1924): 187-191.
- Hardin, Thomas L. "Joliet: Birth of a College." Community College Frontiers 4 (Spring 1976): 21-23.

- Harrison, J. Derek. "General Education in the Community College: A Recent View." Journal of General Education 25 (July 1973): 83-93.
- Hutchins, Robert M. "The Junior College." Educational Record (January 1938): 5-11.
- Johnson, B. Lamar. "Junior College Trends." School Review 52 (December 1944): 606-610.
- "The Junior College Menace As Seen From Within." Atlantic Monthly 139 (June 1927): 809-812.
- Kelley, Win, and Wilbur, Leslie. "Junior College Development in the United States." School and Society 97 (December 1969): 485-498.
- Kemp, W. W. "The Junior College in California." California Quarterly of Secondary Education 5 (January 1930): 188-194.
- Kirchgessner, Florence. "The Junior College." Catholic Educational Review 22 (March 1924): 153-162.
- Koos, Leonard V. "A Quarter-Century With The Junior College." Journal of Higher Education 9 (January 1938): 1-6.
- _____. "Rise of the People's College." School Review 55 (March 1947): 138-149.
- Lindsay, Frank B. "California Junior Colleges, Past and Present." California Journal of Secondary Education 22 (March 1947): 137-142.
- McAninch, Harold D. "Joliet: 75 Years the Community College." Junior College Journal 46 (October 1975): 14-15.
- McDowell, F. M. The Junior College. U. S. Bureau of Education. Bulletin, 1919, No. 35. Washington: Government Printing Office, 1919.
- Morgan, W. E. "Junior College Developments in California." Junior College Journal 1 (November 1930): 64-65.
- Noffsinger, H. G. "One Third of a Century of Progress." Junior College Journal 5 (May 1935): 395-404.
- Proctor, William M. "The Junior College in California." School Review 31 (May 1923): 363-375.
- Pullias, Earl V. "The Land Grant Concept and the Community College Philosophy." Community College Review 3 (June 1975): 45-49.

- Roland, Leo J. "The American Junior College." Social Education 22 (November 1958): 357-360.
- Ross, Hugh. "University Influence in the Genesis and Growth of Junior Colleges in California." History of Education Quarterly 3 (September 1963): 143-152.
- Sack, Saul. "The First Junior College." Junior College Journal 30 (September 1959): 13-15.
- Shideler, J. W. "The Junior College Movement in Kansas." School Review 31 (June 1923): 460-463.
- Smith, L. W. "Founding of Early Junior Colleges--President Harper's Influence." Junior College Journal 11 (May 1941): 511-521.
- Spindt, H. A. "Beginnings of the Junior College in California, 1907-1921." College and University (Fall 1957): 22-28.
- _____. "Establishment of the Junior College in California, 1907-1921." California Journal of Secondary Education 32 (November 1957): 391-396.
- Stanley, James W. "The Oldest Junior College." Junior College Journal 36 (November 1965): 37-38.
- Wilson, Theodore H. "The First Four-Year Junior College." Junior College Journal 9 (April 1939): 361-365.
- Wood, James Madison. "Twenty Years Progress." Junior College Journal 10 (May 1940): 511-518.
- Zook, George F. "The Junior College." School Review 30 (October 1922): 574-583.
- Zwerlig, L. Steven. "Second Class Education at the Community College." New Directions for Community Colleges 2 (Autumn 1974): 23-38.