

THE GREAT DEBATE OVER TRADITIONAL
GRADUATE EDUCATION, 1960-1975

William H. Lyon
Northern Arizona University

Somewhere around 1960 when rapid growth in our colleges and universities began, the nation entered into a great debate over the nature and quality of its graduate degrees. The traditional program came under much criticism. Reformers urged revisions in their content and structure, and some even advocated scrapping the old in favor of new degrees. The debate ranged over all facets of graduate training, as educators, academicians, and even the general public questioned the quality, the significance, the format, and the relevance of graduate degrees. There were political overtones to the discussion: was there enough democracy in graduate education for a democratic society?

For the history profession the discussion was particularly appropriate. Little change or reform had occurred in the Ph.D. since J. Franklin Jameson received the first degree in 1882. Debate was not new, of course. Criticisms had been made since that time. But in the 1960s critics went so far as to propose new degrees, particularly the Doctor of Arts (D.A.), and to associate the inequities and evils of our society with the Ph.D. syndrome. The curious thing about all this was that the professional organizations, including the American Historical Association, largely ignored the controversy.

In 1959, Earl J. McGrath led the first major attack on the Ph.D., which was so specialized, he declared, that its holders, the college or university teachers, had themselves undermined liberal arts education. The next year, Bernard Berelson, speaking for the Carnegie Corporation of New York, summarized many of the criticisms. He complained of the poor student selection process, a lack of breadth in the program, inadequate teacher training, a farcical language requirement, ponderous dissertations, meaningless final examinations, and insufficient faculty supervision. This seemed a severe indictment, and yet, he rejected two criticisms which others had made: drag out, wherein students did not complete the degree until middle-aged; and the high rate of attrition. In 1961, Oliver Carmichael urged a thoroughgoing reform of the Ph.D., which he labeled a "fetish," and he went so far as to suggest an alternate degree, the Doctor of Philosophy (D.Phil.) for college teachers.¹

The critique by Christopher Jencks and David Riesman was more widely circulated. They characterized graduate education as both too rigid and too narrow, and hence it could not be reformed. But, unlike other commentators, they saw no dichotomy between research and teaching. They recommended a teaching internship after the completion of the traditional doctorate to prepare students for the positions they would actually hold.² Thus, they rejected the demand for a new teaching degree, which they considered a soft option.

Even the history profession became concerned. In 1962, Dexter Perkins and John Snell in The Education of Historians in the United States conducted a survey on the merits of the Ph.D. The respondents to their questionnaires believed that degree holders needed more breadth in subject matter and more actual experience in teaching. These did contend, unlike Berelson or Jencks and Riesman, that it took too long to complete the degree--71% of the degree holders of 1958 had taken seven years or more to complete the degree, and 35% of them were at least 36 years of age. Furthermore, faculty advisors skimmed on the amount of time and advice which they gave to students. A considerable number of those surveyed thought the language requirements were excessive and that dissertations were too long. Even at this early date in

the controversy, Snell described remedies, perhaps half-hearted, taken by selected major universities to train better college teachers and to reduce the stretch-out in Ph.D. programs.³

They were not, however, very far reaching remedies, and did not begin to touch the magnitude of the problem. For by 1968 the situation had grown critical. Sixty new community colleges opened in 1968-69, and that rate was expected to continue through 1975. Community college proponents claimed that 50,000 new faculty members would be needed in each of those years.⁴ (They were over-zealous in their predictions.) Aside from where this many people would come from, there was also the question of the type of training these new faculty should receive for community college teaching.

But there was more to this discussion than just how to train new professionals. The whole of graduate education itself came under attack. With a new sense of urgency, critics charged that college instructors bored their students, and that they overspecialized in their subject matter field. Not only was Ph.D. training too traditional and too antiquated, it was out of step with the social and political trends of the 1960s. Many of the debators challenged the autocratic nature of the degree--graduate education did not prepare teachers to instruct the masses, and indeed did not accept the masses to instruct. Such words as "anachronistic" and "problem degree" were used to describe Ph.D. education.⁵

The democratic theme was especially strong. The American Association of Community and Junior Colleges held a conference in 1972 which, in its Report, emphasized the necessity to search for community needs and to provide equal educational opportunity for all. The staff of community colleges must be competent to face changing community needs, whatever direction they take.⁶

Similarly, the Panel on Alternate Approaches to Graduate Education, set up by the Council of Graduate Schools and the Graduate Record Examinations Board, suggested that there were not enough options in graduate education and condemned minuscule Ph.D. dissertation topics. The panel urged greater democratization in education, more internship experiences, and greater diversity in a doctoral students program. Non-traditional programs, with interdisciplinary options, should be devised.⁷

The Second Newman Panel, named after its chairman, Frank Newman of Stanford University, reported to the Secretary of Health, Education, and Welfare in 1973, that graduate education lacked imagination in responding to the needs of all citizens, no matter what the social class, education level, or age group. This panel recommended an end to the traditional system, especially the procedures for admitting students to the program, since current evaluation methods were largely based on a myth anyway. This group favored an egalitarian, post-secondary system. The "post-secondary" concept implied a much broader and more accessible educational program than was currently available.⁸

The Carnegie Commission on Higher Education, in two reports in 1973, laid great stress on the "education for democracy" theme. Postsecondary educators (without the hyphen now) had not done justice to high school graduates. Furthermore, higher education had failed to prepare society for self-renewal. The Commission favored universal access to higher education, although not universal attendance; more non-degree programs; more options for the students; and a greater mix of education, work, and service in student programs. In short, it favored the open university and lifelong learning, and proposed that a community college be within commuting distance of 95% of all Americans.⁹

If, then, education was to change so drastically, how should the new faculty be trained for this new egalitarian regime? Such a theme was explored at a conference sponsored in 1968 by the American Association of Junior Colleges. Eight models of teacher preparation were presented to the conferees, which included such designs as a one-year masters, a two-year masters, a three-year masters, a post-masters internship, an in-service training program sponsored by community colleges themselves, and the doctor of arts program. No one at this conference praised the senior colleges for doing an adequate job, and it is interesting to note that the Ph.D. was not discussed as one of the eight models. Two of the participants did present the Doctor of Arts alternative.¹⁰

One of those advocates of the Doctor of Arts was E. Alden Dunham. Shortly after the conference, he published a book (in 1969) entitled Colleges of the Forgotten Americans, actually an analysis of state colleges and universities. In his last chapter he made a "radical recommendation"--the Doctor of Arts. He plainly identified the alleged culprit which had weakened undergraduate liberal education--the Ph.D. Rather than modify the degree which was so deeply mired in research and specialization, he suggested that a new doctoral teaching degree take its place alongside the Ph.D.¹¹

This was the cue for a general approbation of the D.A. by the reigning professional organizations. In 1970, the American Association of State Colleges and Universities produced guidelines for the degree, followed by the Council of Graduate Schools, which also issued an extended supplementary statement in 1972.¹² The North Central Association, the major accrediting association in the nation, also included guidelines for the D.A. in its instructions to universities, presuming that there would be some degrees for NCA evaluation teams to examine.¹³ And true to its commitment to D.A. programs, the Carnegie Corporation of New York (Dunham was its executive associate) granted nearly a million dollars in 1970 and 1971 to twelve universities to plan and institute the D.A. degree.¹⁴

Dunham nearly sounded a death knell for the Ph.D. "Every ill besetting our colleges and universities is related in one way or another to the Ph.D. degree," he declared. And he ticked these ills off: student alienation, irrelevant curricula, uninspired teaching, ironclad adherence to outmoded traditions, absentee professors, extravagantly high costs of research and graduate education. Because of these problems, graduate education itself had become decrepit, and the D.A. could help revive the patient.¹⁵

Others intoned a similar litany. The National Advisory Council on Education Professions Development told President Richard Nixon in 1972, in a report entitled People for the People's Colleges (note the democratic theme), that the training of junior college teachers was inadequate. They were trained for something else, but not for the community college. The Council recommended a one-year retraining institute, and branded the course "The Junior College," which was merely added to the traditional programs of study, as ludicrous.¹⁶ In the Chronicle of Higher Education, Larry Van Dyne reported that the community colleges themselves doubted the Ph.D.'s teaching skills. Said one community college president: "We don't have an unmitigated prejudice against Ph.D.s, but by and large, in my personal opinion, they really aren't trained to do the kinds of things we want our teachers to do." Another community college president grudgingly admitted, "They are educable," which was about the most charitable thing Van Dyne could report about the holders of the Ph.D.¹⁷

It may be that a great many universities turned to the D.A. or some other form of teaching degree to rescue enrollments. Interest in new degree

programs corresponded with the enrollment declines of the early 1970s. Being growth-minded, administrators could well have looked upon the new degree as a means of maintaining the growth curve. Perhaps they were responding also to Alden Dunham's appeal to provide a new service. He had warned that once upon a time the academic departments had ignored a need, and thus had lost the teacher education program to the colleges of education. Now, would they lose the training of the community college instructor?

For whatever reason, changes in doctoral programs did occur. This is reflected in a series of six surveys undertaken between 1970 and 1976 by Dean Robert Koenker of Ball State University. Koenker surveyed the member institutions of the Council of Graduate Schools to determine how many of them offered, or planned to offer, or considered the possibility of offering, the D.A. degree, or other doctoral programs similar to the D.A. In his first survey he found three universities which offered the D.A., 27 who planned to offer it, and 46 who were considering it. By the time of his 1976 survey, there was an impressive increase: 25 institutions offered the D.A. (in all areas) and the number who planned to offer it had correspondingly declined, as they shifted over into the "do offer" column.

At the same time that the popularity of the D.A. increased, the number of institutions which said they offered doctoral programs similar to the D.A. also increased, from twelve in 1970 to forty-seven in 1974. And, in addition, fifty other institutions declared there was enough flexibility in existing doctoral degrees to offer a program similar to the D.A. Thus, nearly 100 institutions offered Ph.D.'s and Ed.D.'s outside the traditional mold, and this was a significant finding of the Koenker studies, as well that the new degree, the D.A., had gained acceptance.

Of some interest to historians is the fact that of the ninety-two institutions which Koenker studied in 1971, history ranked second in the number of planned majors. English was first at twenty-nine, history at seventeen, biology was third at thirteen, and mathematics was fourth at eleven.¹⁸

It would appear from the Koenker surveys that, while the accrediting and professional organizations were recognizing the new D.A. degree, traditional programs were nevertheless responding to the need for a teaching Ph.D. One organization, the Association of American Colleges, even went on record against the D.A. and in favor of the revised Ph.D. Colleges and universities were likely to rate the D.A. as inferior to the Ph.D., noted the Association, and its students would be at a disadvantage in the labor market. If there is an oversupply of Ph.D.'s on the market, how can D.A.'s find jobs, it asked. The best place to sharpen teaching skills was in the Ph.D. program.¹⁹

David Strate of the history and political science department, Northern Arizona University, also conducted two surveys.

Teaching Skills in Graduate History and
Political Science Programs

all figures are percentages

To what extent are teaching skills emphasized?	heavily	moderate	limited	none
History	7	48	43	1
Political Science	8	41	46	4

TEACHING HISTORY

What in the Ph.D. programs strengthens teachers?	teaching experience	course in teaching strategies	Internship	teaching assistant
History	94	33	30	21
Political Science	96	28	24	37

--From a survey by Dr. David Strate

Strate reached two conclusions from his survey: (1) the distinction between Ph.D. and D.A. had become blurred; (2) Ph.D. granting institutions had sought to meet the criticism that they had poorly prepared teachers by including some teacher training in their programs.²⁰

In all this ferment of discussion over the Ph.D., where was the American Historical Association? It did not support the D.A. degree, although Barry Beyer and Edwin Fenton did publicize their D.A. program at Carnegie-Mellon in the AHA Newsletter,²¹ and Russell Major did describe Emory University's teaching Ph.D. to the Association's readers.²² Admittedly, the Association was concerned with the status of the doctoral degrees, and even with teaching effectiveness. One article in the Newsletter series on "Teaching History Today," edited by Henry Bausum and Myron Marty, discussed the training of the college history teacher, including the D.A. in history at Illinois State University at Normal.²³ Otherwise, it was written in a traditional Ph.D. context. Another article discussed history in the two-year colleges, and a correspondent called attention to the feasibility of the Ph.D. for community colleges.²⁴

One should wonder, however, how successful the AHA was in reaching community college personnel. In April 1976, the Association appealed to community college and junior college teachers to join; but a few months later, in October 1976, a profile of community college teachers showed that 41% wanted to work for an Ed.D. degree, 11% for a D.A., and 33% merely wanted to enroll in university courses.²⁵ None of these expressed desires of the post-secondary faculty seemed to fit in with the AHA syndrome. If any of them were interested in a Ph.D., that fact was not mentioned.

Still the Association was devoted to good teaching. Ideas and practices were publicized in the Newsletter, and when the Association reorganized in 1974, a new Teaching Division, one of three such divisions, and headed by a vice president, was organized, it has since sponsored a number of regional teaching conferences and a program at each of the AHA annual meetings.²⁶

But one gets the impression that the Association is concerned mostly with the traditional, research-oriented Ph.D. Earlier, in 1966, the Committee on Ph.D. programs had been organized.²⁷ Its first (and perhaps its only) accomplishment was the issuance of the document, "Standards for Ph.D. Programs in History," which described the Ph.D. as primarily a research degree, and laid down such desirable standards as a nationally recognized faculty, at least twenty full-time students in the program, a six to nine hour teaching load for faculty, and annual expenditures of \$25,000 (in 1967 dollars) for library acquisitions.²⁸

That raised the question whether or not the AHA should examine Ph.D. programs by these criteria. Many disciplines, such as business, engineering, forestry, education, nursing, and the natural sciences, are accredited by their own professional organizations, and their requirements are often quite rigid. Such an accrediting effort in history was made. The chairman of the Ph.D. committee in 1969, E. David Cronon, proposed to the Council that 65

programs be approved and 48 be disapproved.²⁹ Such a practice would undoubtedly have favored the larger universities. The younger history departments, struggling to get a foothold by responding to new professional and population pressures, would not have made Cronon's approved list. Somehow or other, his proposal was sidetracked.

Later, in 1973, when the Association re-examined its structure and objectives, by setting up a Review Board, it specifically rejected the idea of becoming an accrediting agency. The AHA should be concerned with quality of graduate programs, but not formal accreditation, it was decided. The Committee on Ph.D. Programs accepted this position in 1974, and cited its statement of 1967 as a reminder of its policy. Throughout this era, before the Committee's functions were absorbed by other divisions in the reorganization of 1975, it frequently recommended a cutback of current Ph.D. programs, and opposed any new programs at other universities. The poor job market seemed to inspire nearly all its statements. Although at one time it admitted that some flexibility might be desirable in Ph.D. programs, such as the development of outside cognate fields and of internships,³⁰ it is probably fair to say that it ignored both the major criticisms of the Ph.D. and the democratic theme which prevailed in some segments of the educational profession.

Let us look at some of the non-traditional graduate degree programs in history. The first category is the non-doctoral programs. A Master of Philosophy degree was devised at Toronto, Yale, Kansas, and Southern Mississippi. The Kansas program was two years in length, required a language, a research paper but not a thesis, and a teaching internship. There was as much history in this degree as in its traditional M.A.; but the candidate could take two secondary fields outside the department, making it possible for this to be an interdisciplinary degree, and therefore adaptable to community college faculty needs. The original idea of this degree at Yale, which revived it in 1966, was to grant this to all-but-dissertation candidates, who thus would possess a more specialized training, not particularly attractive to community college faculty.³¹ Another M.A., in Community College Teaching, is offered at Eastern Washington State College and Northern Arizona University. This year-and-a-half or two-year program includes a subject matter area--probably interdisciplinary, a professional core on teaching strategies and the significance of community colleges in the American democracy, and a teaching internship or practicum.

The Educational Specialist degree (Ed.S.), a sixth year program, located primarily in colleges of education, would also follow a very similar pattern to these M.A.'s. Ed.S. programs of study last longer than the traditional M.A. They are designed mostly for education majors, although some academic majors have been developed for training two-year college instructors.³²

Dean Koenker found that certain other non-Ph.D. degrees, such as the Master of Fine Arts, the Certificate of Advanced Study, and the Candidate in Philosophy (C. Phil) were considered, potentially, as community college degrees. The Candidate in Philosophy was really the A.B.D. (all but dissertation) which originated in the Big Ten schools in the middle 1960s, and was then adopted by the California universities. The object of the title, C. Phil., was to overcome the stigma of the A.B.D. title.³³ These post-masters degrees, however, seem a poor consolation to the student who has suffered the pain of arduous graduate study, only to find that he is no more marketable than before.

We turn now to a second category, the doctoral degrees. In 1945, Syracuse developed a Doctor of Social Science Program (D.S.S.C.). The student developed an area of concentration, but did take courses in various

disciplines, which in that sense at least was integrative and interdisciplinary, and he took also three core seminars in background, methodology, and teaching of social science. The Syracuse degree, however, was not designed for community colleges, and most of its graduates went into the traditional college or university departments. Syracuse retained two features of the traditional Ph.D.: depth and a narrow research specialty; and in 1969, it dropped the Doctor of Social Science title and adopted in its place Ph.D. in Social Science.³⁴

Many will undoubtedly defend the traditional Ph.D. as adequate for the needs of community colleges. So insisted a chairman at a major university, who declared that the rigorous teaching experiences he demanded of his students trained them for the community college, which at that time (1974) provided 50% of his graduates' job interviews.³⁵ But some thought the Ph.D. should be modified rather than preserved. Emory University in 1968, established a teaching oriented Ph.D. a little different than the university track, which emphasized depth. The teaching track, a four-year program, traded a shorter but very narrowly conceived dissertation for an additional history field. Only one foreign language was required, and both teaching and university students engaged in practice teaching.³⁶

Northern Arizona University developed a Ph.D. degree for college teachers and public servants. After considerable deliberation, it was entitled "Ph.D. in History and Political Science." It retained the traditional features of the Ph.D., with research tools and dissertation. It did emphasize breadth, however, by requiring a student to major in history and minor in political science, or vice versa. A social science cognate was also required, plus a core of courses in methodology and teaching strategies. A teaching or public service internship was also provided. Two foreign languages or one foreign language and a statistics or computer tool must be passed. The dissertation was broad in scope. NAU designed this multidisciplinary degree especially for community college instructors. Currently, it must be considered an in-service degree, since only candidates who have jobs, with leaves of absence or sabbaticals, may complete the program.

But some critics simply deemed the Ph.D. unsuitable for teaching scholars. The best known of the non-traditional degrees, the Doctor of Arts, was begun by Carnegie-Mellon. Even as Alden Dunham spoke, this university inaugurated its program in 1967. Students enrolled in thematic or comparative courses, broader in scope than normal. Students must also enroll in a core course on teaching, and must intern in research, in curriculum, and in teaching. No language was required, and the dissertation could be traditional, or it could be very broad in scope, or even be practical, such as a teaching unit or a series of essays on teaching and education philosophy. Variations on this model do occur. Lehigh's program in government has a core course in Interpersonal Awareness, requires an outside field, but like Carnegie-Mellon has internships, a research project (i.e., a mini-dissertation), and a core of teaching and research methodology. North Dakota's History D.A. (which in 1970 was the second D.A. history degree in the country after Carnegie-Mellon), and Claremont's various programs have no dissertation requirement at all and no language requirement. Idaho State's D.A. in Government requires two outside fields in Economics and Sociology and an interdisciplinary field, providing much broader coverage than most, and requires no dissertation. The University of Washington's D.A. in German, on the other hand, has a much narrower focus in a more esoteric field. And in a proposal that has yet to be implemented, Stephen F. Austin planned a "total coverage" in history.

Some aspects of these programs are similar; all have an internship and a core of teaching strategies and research methodologies. But they vary as to whether they are intradisciplinary or multidisciplinary, whether they require a language and computer-statistical tool or not, or whether they demand a mini-dissertation or not. As one reflects on this, we see considerable diversity in these programs, and probably the standards are not as rigorous as the Ph.D., although every one of the departments offering the degree would claim that they are.

But whatever its status, the D.A. degree has held its own, despite the enrollment crunch and unfavorable state governing board attitudes, which favor retrenchment rather than expansion. While it is true that the number of institutions offering the D.A. rose only from 23 to 25 between 1974 and 1976, the total number of degrees granted has risen modestly from 416 in 1975 to 482 in 1977, and the number of students enrolled rose from 556 in 1975 to 740 in 1977. Of the various D.A. programs, 12 are in English, 9 in Chemistry, 7 in History, 6 in Mathematics, 5 in Music, 5 in Economics and 21 distributed among other majors. The D.A. in history is offered at Carnegie-Mellon (1967), University of North Dakota (1970), Middle Tennessee University (1970), University of Miami (1972), Illinois State University (1974), Catholic University of America (1974), and University of Northern Colorado (1976).³⁷

The defenders of the D.A. must confront those who deplore the proliferation of degrees. The Ph.D., say its proponents, stands for a quality of mind and a spirit of inquiry, and should be flexible enough to meet modern demands. Spurr believes that even now the number of degree titles is excessive.³⁸ The D.A. proponents, on the other hand, may point out that reform of the Ph.D. is hopeless so long as the present Brahmins control it.³⁹ But that remains an open question: will the present managers of the Ph.D. program consent to change it?

One other doctoral program is the Ed.D., hardly a non-traditional degree any longer. As an example, the Ball State Ed.D. in Social Science (it is no longer called Social Science Education) prepares the students for college teaching. This degree requires a major in American history, an outside cognate, a curriculum and instruction cognate, and a practical problem approach in the dissertation. No language is required, and in its place there is an additional field of study. The Ph.D. in Social Science, a variation of the Ed.D., substitutes another social science cognate for the curriculum and instruction cognate of the Ed.D., but even at that there is a 19 quarter hour requirement in professional education. This degree is in some respects much like the D.A.

At the Community College Conference on 1968, it became evident that community college teachers wanted to be treated as full-fledged professional faculty. If that is true, perhaps the sub-doctoral degrees, the M.A.'s, Ed.S.'s, and the Certificate degrees, should not be taken seriously. Rather, we should expect community college faculty to secure a doctor's degree in order to earn the full respect of our college and university colleagues. But should it be the Ph.D., D.A., or Ed.D.? The Ed.D. is not recognized as the equal of the Ph.D., and perhaps the D.A. is not either. Some of the D.A. programs do indeed need to be upgraded, with the establishment of a bona-fide dissertation and research tools to become the equal of the Ph.D. But perhaps, also, the Ph.D. is flexible enough to adapt to the college teaching market.

In any case, community colleges are not taking much interest in any doctoral degree. Only 10% of new faculty hired in 1977 in the community

colleges held a Ph.D. Even four-year colleges showed little enthusiasm for the degree, since only 40% of the total faculty hired by all colleges held the Ph.D.⁴⁰ Perhaps our doctoral degrees are not adaptable to current employment needs. (The Koenker Survey of 1976 indicates that D.A.'s have a better chance of placement than other doctoral degrees, but his sample would seem to be small.)

If there is a crisis of confidence in our Ph.D. programs of study, our professional organizations in history are unaware of it.

NOTES

¹Earl J. McGrath, The Graduate School and the Decline of Liberal Education (New York, 1959), vi, 7, 14, 21, 23-54; Bernard Berelson, Graduate Education in the United States (New York, 1960), 44-80, 156-248; Oliver Carmichael, Graduate Education: A Critique and a Program (New York, 1961), 119-131, 195.

²Christopher Jencks and David Riesman, The Academic Revolution (Garden City, 1968), 515-537. See also Everett Walters, ed., Graduate Education Today (Washington, 1965), 30-102; Richard J. Storr, The Beginning of the Future (New York, 1973), 57-79; and Lewis B. Mayhew and Patrick J. Ford, Reform in Graduate and Professional Education (San Francisco, 1974), 188-209.

³Dexter Perkins and John L. Snell, The Education of Historians in the United States (New York, 1962), 168-199.

⁴American Association of Junior Colleges, Preparing Two-Year College Teachers for the '70s (Washington, 1969), 7.

⁵Kenneth E. Eble, "The Road to College Teaching Must be Rebuilt or Repaired," Chronicle of Higher Education, November 6, 1972; James Friguglietti, "Zeus, Agamemnon, Zeus," ibid., September 27, 1976; Panel on Alternate Approaches to Graduate Education, Scholarship for Society (Princeton, 1973), passim; Second Newman Report, National Policy and Higher Education (Cambridge, 1973); New York Times, July 19, 1970 (Fred Hechinger).

⁶American Association of Community and Junior Colleges, Educational Opportunity for All: An Agenda for National Action (Washington, 1973), 141-151.

⁷Scholarship for Society, passim.

⁸National Policy and Higher Education, 4-17.

⁹Carnegie Commission on Higher Education, Toward a Learning Society (New York, 1973); ibid., The Purposes and Performance of Higher Education in the United States (New York, 1973). See also Ann M. Heiss, Challenges to Graduate Schools (San Francisco, 1970) for an assessment of graduate education based on surveys of ten elite institutions.

¹⁰Educational Opportunity for All, 12-16, 23-24.

¹¹E. Alden Dunham, Colleges of the Forgotten Americans (New York, 1969), 155-166.

¹²American Association of State Colleges and Universities, The Doctor of Arts Degree, (Washington, pamphlet, 1970); Council of Graduate Schools The Doctor of Arts Degree (Washington, pamphlet, 1970); ibid., (1972).

¹³Commission on Institutions of Higher Education of the North Central Association, Guidelines for Institutions Offering Advanced Degree Programs (Chicago, pamphlet, n.d.).

¹⁴New York Times, June 10, 1970.

¹⁵E. Alden Dunham, "Rx for Higher Education: Doctor of Arts Degree," Journal of Higher Education (October, 1970), 505-515.

¹⁶American Association of Colleges for Teacher Education, Bulletin (July, 1972), 1; Arizona Republic, Phoenix, May 28, 1972, 8-A; Larry A. Van Dyne, "Big Effort Urged to Train Staff for Nation's Community Colleges," Chronicle of Higher Education, October 16, 1972.

¹⁷Larry A. Van Dyne, "Many 2-Year Colleges Resist Hiring Ph.D.'s; Doubt Their Teaching Skill," ibid., January 24, 1972.

¹⁸Robert H. Koenker, "Status of the Doctor of Arts Degrees Programs for Preparing Junior College and College Teachers" (November 22, 1971); "The Doctor of Arts Degree" (Report to North Central Association Meeting, March 20, 1972); "Status of the Doctor of Arts Degree" (January 11, 1974); ibid. (February 28, 1976). All of the above are mimeographed copies by Ball State University. Koenker, as a firm advocate of the D.A., did not like the fact that nearly 100 institutions had teaching doctorates within the traditional framework, and recommended they switch to the D.A. title.

¹⁹Larry A. Van Dyne, "A Revised Ph.D. Found Preferable to New Degree," Chronicle of Higher Education, January 17, 1972. Koenker did not like this statement from the Association of American Colleges, an organization primarily of liberal arts colleges, and issued a rebuttal to his college deans. See his memo dated January 20, 1972, in this author's possession.

²⁰The questionnaires, responses, and tabulations are in this writer's possession.

²¹AHA Newsletter, XIII (October, 1975), 9-11; ibid., XV (November, 1977), 3.

²²ibid., VI (December, 1968), 36-40.

²³Maxine Seller, "The Training of the College History Teacher: a Teaching Division Survey," ibid., XV (January, 1977), 6-8.

²⁴Henry Bausum and Myron Marty, eds., ibid., XIII (April, 1975), 5-6; ibid.; William E. Spencer, letter, ibid., XII (March, 1974), 2.

²⁵ibid., XIV (April 1976), 1; ibid., XIV (October, 1976), 9.

²⁶ibid., XV (May, June, 1977), 2-3.

²⁷ibid., VII (June, 1969), 6-11.

²⁸ibid., V (October, 1967), 4-8.

²⁹ibid., VII (June, 1969), 6-11.

³⁰ibid., XI (November, 1973), 12, 27; ibid., XII (March, 1974), 3-4. See also "The Breadth of Current Graduate Programs," ibid., VIII (September, 1970), 3-9.

³¹ Stephen Spurr, Academic Degree Structures: Innovative Approaches (New York, 1975), 72-73, 90-91.

³² Ibid., 91-93, 112; Robert Koenker, "Status of Sixth-Year Programs Leading to a Degree or Certificate" (Ball State University: March 30, 1978, mimeographed copy).

³³ Ibid.; Spurr, Academic Degree Structures, 84-88, 91-93.

³⁴ Syracuse University, Interdisciplinary Social Science Program (Syracuse, pamphlet, 1969). Spurr in Academic Degree Structures, 144, mentions this as a teaching degree, but I believe this is inaccurate. McGrath, The Graduate School and the Decline of Liberal Education, 54, also calls it a teaching degree.

³⁵ L. Pearce Williams to W. H. Lyon, August 4, 1974, in author's possession.

³⁶ Russell Major, "A Doctoral Program for College Teachers," AHA Newsletter, VI (December, 1968).

³⁷ Koenker, "Status of the Doctor of Arts Degree," February 28, 1976, mimeograph copy. Obviously, Dean Koenker's study has been invaluable to this article. For a positive approach to the D.A., see "The Doctor of Arts is 'Here to Stay,'" Chronicle of Higher Education, May 22, 1978. See also Spurr, Academic Degree Structures, 145-148. Spurr is skeptical about another degree. Very much opposed to the D.A. degree is C. Michael Abbot, "A Graduate Student Looks at the 'New' Doctor of Arts Degree," AAUP Bulletin, LVII (September, 1971), 364-367.

³⁸ Spurr, Academic Degree Structures, 14, 21-22, 26-27; Storr, The Beginning of the Future, 48-56, 84-87.

³⁹ For the debate over reform of the Ph.D. structure and content, see references in footnotes 1, 2, and 11.

⁴⁰ "Ph.D.'s Made up only 40 percent of New Faculty Members Hired Last Year, Survey Indicates," Chronicle of Higher Education, May 30, 1978.