GEOGRAPHY IN THE GENERAL EDUCATION CURRICULUM: AN ANALYSIS OF THE CURRENT ROLE FROM A HISTORICAL PERSPECTIVE

By

MICHAEL JOE GARRETT

Bachelor of Science
Oklahoma State University
Stillwater, Oklahoma
1968

Master of Science
Oklahoma State University
Stillwater, Oklahoma
1973

Submitted to the Faculty of the Graduate College
of the Oklahoma State University
in partial fulfillment of the requirements
for the Degree of
DOCTOR OF EDUCATION
May, 1982

GEOGRAPHY IN THE GENERAL EDUCATION CURRICULUM:

AN ANALYSIS OF THE CURRENT ROLE FROM A

HISTORICAL PERSPECTIVE

Thesis Approved:

Richard D. Heard
Thesis Adviser

William Adams

John F. Rooney

Stephen W. Tweedie

Norman N. Durham
Dean of the Graduate College

PREFACE

For the few who might hazard to read this dissertation in its entirety, I would hasten to caution that it is not presented as a model to follow for similar research endeavors nor does it portend to offer any finite answers to what geography is or should be in the college setting. It also should be noted that this is not a "geographical" study (hence the absence of maps or other spatial models) but rather a study about geography. It is concerned with the role of geography in its most visible and perhaps most crucial involvement in the academic setting--the general education curriculum.

I selected a historical approach to a rather broad topic because, quite simply, I wanted to understand more clearly the background and evolution of the discipline within the context of the goals and purposes of general education. If my students gain only slightly from the insight and understanding I have gained through writing the results of my research then that alone will have made the effort worthwhile.

In a sense, completion of the doctorate represents only a beginning. It officially recognizes a demonstrated ability and therefore responsibility to contribute to the growth and improvement of a civilized society. To reach such a position requires good fortune, much sacrifice, and years of hard work. It also requires the friendship, encouragement and understanding of many people encountered along the way.

I wish first to express my sincere thanks to my close friend and

committee chairman, Dr. Richard Hecock. This fine man has had a more profound influence on my professional career than any person I have known. It is to him that I dedicate this dissertation. Other members of my committee I wish to thank include Dr. John Rooney and Dr. Stephen Tweedie, both of whom have provided me with friendship and professional guidance, and Dr. William Adrian who was kind enough to join the committee late as an active member.

Special love with appreciation is extended to my best friend and wife, Andi, whose dedication, assistance, and loving care have been invaluable; to my wonderful daughter, Michelle, who has had to make the greatest sacrifices; and to my daughter, Marnnie, whose memory I shall always cherish. I also wish to acknowledge love to my parents, Joe and Alice Garrett, and to my brother, David. Special thanks is due to my friend, the late Roy Sanders, and to Lula Sanders, Lisa, and Dion Casto.

To all other faculty members in the "Stillwater School of Geography," I wish to express sincere gratitude for their long friendship and shared learning. Among this group I especially wish to recognize my close friend and intrepid jogging crony, Dr. Keith Harries; Professor James Stine and Dr. Robert Norris, who together introduced me to the universal "secrets" of spatial science; and to my friend, Dr. George Carney, who puts "flavor" in his geography. Among fellow graduate students, I am thankful for the friendship bestowed upon me by Pat Treadway, Dr. Jerry Williams, Chris Horacek, and George Globemaster.

I also wish to thank my colleagues at Bemidji State University, Dr. Peter Smith, Dr. Charles Parson, Dr. Fred Bodendorf, and Dr. Jack Downing, for their tolerance, patience, and friendship during the latter stages of writing this dissertation.

Because this dissertation represents much more to me than a final document, I wish to acknowledge others who have been instrumental and helpful in my career. They include Mr. Richard Donnell, who first inspired me to become a teacher and who became a close friend, Mr. Harold Lewis, Mrs. Alma Lea Oats, Dr. Noel Leathers, and my former colleague, Jimmie Smith. In my college studies, Dr. Jerry Nye, Dr. Daniel Selakovich, Dr. John Naff, and Dr. Thomas Karman offered special encouragement. I wish to thank Mr. Tannel Farha, who provided me employment while attending undergraduate school; the late master sergeant, John Richardson, who encouraged me to continue my academic studies; and long time friends and fellow students, Dr. Charles Parks and Glenn Avery.

Finally, I extend my affection to the literally hundreds of students who over the years have graced my classrooms at Billings, Ponca City, Stillwater, and Bemidji, because in the end they are what much of this experience has been, and is, all about.

TABLE OF CONTENTS

LIST OF TABLES

CHAPTER I

INTRODUCTION

The subject and role of general education in American higher education has been and continues to be a matter of concern and controversy. In recent years there have been serious questions raised by educators, students, and the public regarding the purposes and benefits of a college education. Many of these questions have focused on those aspects of the curriculum known as general education. In part, these questions concern issues that have traditionally plagued the role of general education, but, as in the past, they also reflect the concerns and needs of a contemporary society.

The discipline of Geography has historically been involved in the role of general education in American colleges and universities. This role has fluctuated due to variations in recognition of geography as a college level subject and changes in areas of emphasis associated with the discipline's evolution. This dissertation is concerned with the contemporary role of geography courses in the general education curricula of undergraduate colleges in the United States. Moreover, it examines the changing parameters of this role as they have varied over time among different types of institutions.

Liberal Education and General Education

The majority of terms used in this study are either self-explanatory

or defined when first used extensively. Two terms used throughout which cause great difficulty in definition are "liberal education" and "general education." The definitional problem is exacerbated by a lack of consensus in the literature and the varied interpretations that have been given in the curricula of various undergraduate programs. Nevertheless, it is important for this analysis that the terms be used consistently and in accordance with what they have come to mean in the majority of cases.

In the broadest context, it has been argued that all learning that occurs in a formal college education is liberal education if its chief aim is to liberate the individual in spirit and mind.[1] More specifically, some learning experiences are more concerned with this objective than are others. That part of the curriculum designed for this purpose is sometimes referred to as "liberal studies" while the remainder is designated for other purposes, namely, preparing the student in some special area. In this perspective the liberal studies component of the curriculum is usually described as "liberal education," "general education," or by some similar term such as "general studies" or "distribution requirements." Further, this portion of the curriculum is usually distinguishable from "free" electives since it usually relates to specific requirements.

Historically, the use of the term liberal education predates general education. Although general education was used as a term in American higher education as early as 1828, the concept as used today came into common use only in the past three or four decades.[2] Both liberal education and general education are frequently equated with the subject matter offered by contemporary liberal arts colleges and their

counterparts, the liberal arts or sciences colleges or divisions of other colleges and universities. Any similarities in the curricula of the modern liberal arts colleges and that of earlier colleges is to be found more in their purpose than the specific content of subject matter. However, liberal education and, to a lesser extent, general education have been identified with an area of studies which once constituted the entire curriculum of a college degree program.[3]

The conventional wisdom of the formulators of earlier college curricula held the view that the soundest preparation for life was development of the "whole person." This single purpose of a college education was best achieved by exposing the student to a rigorous study of the "liberal arts."[4] Fulfillment of a truly liberal education necessitated that a narrowly prescribed and uniform curriculum be administered. Vocationally-oriented studies were generally not included because they were perceived as serving their own ends and not that of the individual.[5] Such an exclusive college curriculum was successful so long as the enrollments were small and colleges accepted only a small and elite segment of the population.

Beginning about the middle of the nineteenth century, the role of colleges began to expand. In response to the changing needs of American society and increasing enrollments from a broader base of the population, courses were added and new programs emerged.[6] The number and types of colleges grew rapidly and their geographical distribution became more widespread, thereby increasing their social and physical accessibility. Because of the vast expansion of knowledge during this period, educators grew to believe that it was no longer possible for an individual to learn all that was know. The entry of the professions

and graduate programs resulted in further diversification of purposes for the undergraduate curriculum. Consequently, the traditional liberal arts courses were relegated to a lesser role. The introduction of various elective systems in the latter part of the century contributed to even greater proliferation of courses and an even more diminished role for liberal education. With the advent of departmentalization and the concept of the major, the continuity of the liberal arts was further weakened as faculty became increasingly specialized. The liberal arts subjects were also becoming less rigorous and more fragmented as students were permitted to have more options within those courses. By the early twentieth century, with the exception of a few liberal arts colleges, the once almost totally uniform curriculum of most colleges had become greatly diversified.[7]

General education emerged as a means to retain at least some of the elements of the liberal arts tradition. In effect it was introduced in a variety of forms as a method for organizing and directing a part of each student's formal college education in a manner which was specifically designed to affect the non-vocational life of the individual.[8] While some colleges continued to devote their entire curriculum to studies such as those that were formerly prescribed, the majority of undergraduate programs could do no more than allocate a portion to a common learning experience of liberal studies. Whether called general studies, liberal studies, etc., general education in practice became largely that part of the undergraduate curriculum which attempted to expose students to some knowledge of the ideas and culture that were once the main themes of the total liberal arts college.[9]

Burke notes that the connection between liberal and general education is not always as close or clear as many seem to believe. In an effort to move discussion of these two terms back toward a philosophical foundation, he offers the following distinctions:

> To start with, a liberal education is not necessarily general, and general education is not necessarily liberal. Liberal education refers to the goal of the process: roughly, a person able to make independent decisions as an adult, and participate effectively in public decisions that affect him. . . . the opposite of liberal in this context is vocational: training for one role considered useful by one society, under masters whose authority in the role, cannot be questioned. . . . general education refers to the breadth of material studied, either in each course or in all the courses collectively. . . . the opposite of general is specialized, the concentration of one's studies in one particular subject matter or discipline.[10]

Burke's distinctions are explicit and serve as definitional guidelines for curriculum development and degree requirements. For individual disciplines which contribute courses to programs meeting different purposes, however, distinctions are not always so clear between liberal and general education. Making a distinction between the two will always be difficult but perhaps not so important if together they are distinguished from specialization. The primary concern of this study is with the contemporary role of geography courses in the general education curriculum. General education is defined here as that part of a college program providing learning that:

1. Builds skills for advanced studies and lifelong learning,
2. Distributes time available (coursework) for learning in such a way as to expose students to the mainstreams of thought and interpretation--humanities, science, social science, and the arts, and,
3. Integrates learning in ways that cultivate the student's broad understanding and ability to think about a large and complex subject.[11]

Any distinctions between general education and other terms used to

describe its purposes are considered here as insignificant and, except where specifically noted, should be interpreted as essentially synonymous.

Recent Interest

Rationale for Reform

A recent upsurge in interest in general education follows a period in which its role had become subverted to one of low priority. The situation is well summarized by Rudolph:

> By 1976 concentration was in charge of the curriculum. A survey of curricular developments and course selections for the period from 1967 to 1974 confirmed persistent trends--increased specialization, choice of electives in the field of concentration, the increase of electives at the expense of general education but not at the expense of majors.[12]

After ten years of justifying the free elective principle to parents, educators are responding to claims and their own observations that students are graduating from college without competence in basic intellectual skills and broader areas of knowledge. Disenchantment with the prevailing open curricula has initiated concern for a need to reestablish basic requirements in place of old foundation and survey type courses. There is also a growing concern for over-specialization and lack of awareness of a common culture in college programs.[13]

In reexamining what a college education should be, most institutions are looking at that part of the curriculum referred to as general education as the target for changes. But before discarding electives and returning to some form of prescribed curriculum, they are taking a hard look at the purposes of general education and how they should be met.[14] While some sort of a core curriculum is still viewed by most as

the best approach to insure a properly balanced college education, any foreseeable changes will more likely result from stricter qualification requirements for general education courses.[15] The effect of these requirements will of course be dependent upon how rigidly they are enforced. While each institution will obviously determine the needs and goals of its own general education program, each must answer this question: If the concept and purposes of general education require redefinition, then what structural changes will be required in the organization and content of those courses which function to meet those purposes?

Impact of Reforms Upon Individual Disciplines

Within the discipline of geography, the implication of this renewed interest in general education has not gone unnoticed. Writing in the August 1978 issue of The Professional Geographer, Frazier stated:

> Despite the present upsurge of professional programs, there are indications that a new trend toward general education is emerging. . . . wise policy would seem to be to maintain a general as well as an applied tracking in geography programs.[16]

The implications of curricular changes in general education are of particular interest to geography departments because of the heavy emphasis they have given to that function in the last few decades. Changes in general education approaches and requirements may result in a reduced role for some departments and an increased role for others. More importantly they may indicate new opportunities or challenges for the discipline in providing that function. The nature of the response by geography departments is likely to be dependent upon the institutional

setting in which the department exists and general education is offered, the present or previous general education role played by the department, the nature of the changes in general education programs, the character of the geography department, and the attitudes of the geographers toward general education.

Any changes occurring in curricular requirements in higher education have a potential impact on the various roles of academic disciplines at individual institutions and for any discipline as a whole. The extent and degree of geography's role in the function of general education, as with most other disciplines, is largely dependent upon its specific implementation and administration at each institution and the strength and priorities of geography departments in relation to other departments and programs. If the renewed emphasis in general education at numerous institutions results in major curricular reform and new requirements, it is of importance to higher education in general and individual institutions in particular to understand the nature of impact these changes may have on the roles of individual disciplines. It is quite possible that some disciplines also may have an interest.

This study has examined the historical evolution of geography as an academic discipline in its role of delivering general education and has attempted to construct a descriptive profile of this role and its parameters in contemporary higher education. Answers to the following questions were sought:

1. What is general education and how has it been implemented?
2. In what ways has general education been a part of geography's evolution and growth as an academic discipline and how has the discipline served this role?
3. What is the contemporary role of geography in general education?

4. What has been the effect of recent curricular revisions on the parameters of geography as general education?

Chapter II describes the major factors which have influenced the perceived purposes of general education and the various responses to these perceptions. A review of the literature in general education provides part of the necessary background for understanding and describing the contemporary role of geography. Chapters II and III together provide the historical background and set the scene for Chapter IV's discussion of geography's role in serving the goals and purposes of general education. Chapter V presents a contemporary view of geography as general education based on a nationwide survey of geography departments. A summary and conclusions resulting from the entire study are provided in the final chapter.

FOOTNOTES

[1]Levine notes that the Carnegie Council defines "liberal education very specifically as rooted in the concerns of civilization and our common heritage," but that others use the term more generally to refer to any education that liberates the learner in spirit and mind. Arthur Levine, Handbook on Undergraduate Curriculum, prepared for the Carnegie Council on Policy Studies in Higher Education (San Francisco, 1978), p. 528.

Narrow interpretations of liberal education in this century have been largely influenced by the writings of Newman in the nineteenth century with his emphasis on "the pursuit of intellectual excellence" and Hutchins in this century who emphasized a need for knowledge based on "first principles" which are to be found in the classical writings of western civilization. John Henry Cardinal Newman, The Idea of a University, ed. Charles Frederick Harrold (n.p., 1852; revised, 1873; new ed., New York, 1947), pp. 88-158; and Robert Maynard Hutchins, The Higher Learning in America (1936) (Clinton, Mass., 1974).

The argument against a narrow and traditional interpretation of liberal education and a view which became more acceptable in practice, if not always in theory, was best expressed in the pragmatism of John Dewey, "The Problem of the Liberal Arts College," Philosophy of Education (Patterson, N. J., 1958), p. 83.

[2]Thomas states that A. S. Packard of Bowdoin College used the term in an 1829 article published in the North American Review in which he defended the common elements of the curriculum, only one year after the Yale Report's historical defense of the classic curriculum. Russell Thomas, The Search for a Common Learning: General Education, 1800-1960 (New York, 1962), p. 11.

[3]Saul Sack, "Liberal Education: What Was It? What Is It?" History of Education Quarterly 2 (December 1962), pp. 210-224.

[4]The term "liberal arts" has its historical roots in the so-called seven liberal arts which, beginning as early as the third century, B.C., in Greece and formulated by the Romans as the core of the curriculum by the fourth century, A.D., came to be defined as the trivium (grammar, rhetoric, and logic) and the quadrivium (arithmetic, geometry, music, and astronomy). However, the connections among "liberal education," "liberal culture," and the subject matter of the liberal arts have varied historically in interpretation, emphasis, and practice. Furthermore, the actual subjects constituting the core of the curriculum, their perceived purposes, and the approaches taken for learning them also have varied widely over the course of two millenia in higher education. But for American higher education, the rate of change and

amount of variation began to accelerate most noticeably by the middle and later part of the nineteenth century. Earl J. McGrath, Liberal Education in the Professions (New York, 1959), pp. 6-25; Frederick Rudolph, Curriculum: A History of the American Undergraduate Course of Study Since 1636, prepared for the Carnegie Council on Policy Studies in Higher Education, the Carnegie Council Series (San Francisco, 1977), pp. 29-32; Sack, "Liberal Education," pp. 210-224; and Laurence Veysey, The Emergence of the American University (Chicago, 1970), pp. 180-251.

[5]John S. Brubacher and Willis Rudy, Higher Education in Transition, 3rd ed. (New York, 1976), pp. 13-14.

[6]Ibid., pp. 59-83.

[7]Ibid., pp. 100-119.

[8]Ibid., pp. 271-272.

[9]G. Lester Anderson, "Half a Century of General Education," Intellect (October 1973), p. 41; Knott reminds us that in 1945, the Harvard Report on General Education sought to state, define, and defend the scope of liberal education. The authors chose "general education" as the lable to be utilized and the fates of both liberal and general education have been inseparably linked since that publication. Bob Knott, "What is a Competence-Based Curriculum in the Liberal Arts?" Journal of Higher Education 46 (January/February 1975), p. 27.

[10]Richard J. Burke, "Two Concepts of Liberal Education," Academe 66 (October 1980), pp. 354-355.

[11]The Carnegie Foundation for the Advancement of Teaching, Missions of the College Curriculum: A Contemporary Review with Suggestions, the Carnegie Council Series (San Francisco, 1977), p. 165.

[12]Rudolph, Curriculum, p. 248.

[13]T. D. Lockwood, "The Rush Back to General Education," The Chronicle of Higher Education 14 (1977), p. 32.

[14]Noreen McGrath, "Major Effort to Revitalize Liberal Education is Launched by Association of Colleges," The Chronicle of Higher Education 17 (February 1979), pp. 1, 15.

[15]Leon Botstein, "Liberal Arts and the Core Curriculum: A Debate in the Dark," The Chronicle of Higher Education 18 (9 July 1979), p. 17; and Richard Chait, "Mission Madness Strikes Our Colleges," The Chronicle of Higher Education 18 (16 July 1979), p. 36.

[16]John W. Frazier, "On the Emergence of an Applied Geography," The Professional Geographer 30 (August 1978), p. 236.

CHAPTER II

THE CONCEPT AND PRACTICE OF GENERAL EDUCATION

By the early twentieth century, an increase in the number of college courses combined with a tendency to permit students to concentrate on narrow areas of specialization had resulted in expansion and fragmentation of the traditional liberal arts curriculum. These changes coincided with a growing student body and a move toward mass education. At Harvard University, President Charles Eliot had introduced a system of electives during the latter part of the nineteenth century which became widely adopted. Under this system a large number of courses were introduced under separate departmental divisions of knowledge. Each course dealt with a specialized area in one larger field of study and served the dual purpose of providing specialized training as well as general education. In their area of specialization, students were programed to take specific courses either by explicit degree requirements or by course sequencing. The selection of all other courses, often amounting to two-thirds of the total coursework, was left to the free "elective" choice of the student.[1]

Not all institutions abandoned traditional forms of higher education. Among those which did, the (specialization-election) elective system was adopted in an array of specific formats. Nevertheless, higher education was affected dramatically by these changes. The "college education" became less identifiable with a universal body of

subject matter, and the college educated shared less of a common body of knowledge, and fewer common experiences. Moreover, the widespread adoption of the elective system contributed to at least four other fundamental changes in higher education: 1) proliferation of courses; 2) acceptance of a philosophy of the importance of all subjects; 3) increasing prominence of scientific and utilitarian courses; and 4) specialization by subject matter--growth of disciplines.[2]

Concern over problems resulting from elective systems instilled a desire in many educators to restore a system of order and sense of purpose to a college education. A complaint from a member of the class of 1899 at the University of California, some four years after graduation, illustrated the effect of some of these changes on students: "All these studies were simply separate tasks that bore no definite intrinsic relation to each other. . . . The right studies were there; what was lacking was the conscious organization of them for the student."[3] Ideas began to surface which gradually accumulated into what later writers referred to as "the general education movement." This began as a reaction to the sense of bewilderment with which many students faced the freedom of the elective course of study.[4]

There is some lack of agreement as to the precise period of the general education movement but most writers have established its origin during the first two decades of this century and note that it ceased being a movement by the late 1950's. By then, general education had become fairly well institutionalized.[5] Although not necessarily accepted nor supported with equal enthusiasm, most institutions experimented with one or more concepts of general education, some of which were unique and revolutionary. The various specific formats taken by

general education reflected a broad range of opinions concerning educational philosophy and purpose. These opinions indicated both a concern for content and instructional methodology and the organization and structure of the curriculum.

Early Attempts in Curricular Reform

If the various developments which characterized these efforts are to be understood, a distinction must be made between two meanings of the term "general education."

> In one sense, it (general education) is the name . . . given to a purpose which has always been central in educational thought and practice. In another sense it designates not an end but a means, a set of devices for achieving that purpose. In the first sense general education is as old as the schools, as old as teaching or even society itself. It is only in the organization and methodology of instruction that something new . . . emerged.[6]

The early attempts in curricular reform sought to address these meanings and pave the way toward a clearer identification and definition of general education's goals and purposes in the total college experience.

The Concentration-Distribution Approach

One early approach toward restoring greater structure to the higher education curriculum was to require students to distribute at least part of their elective course selections among broadly-defined areas. The idea was to insure some breadth to counterbalance specialization. Several major institutions began using variations of "distribution" requirements early in the century, for example, Yale University in 1901 and Cornell University in 1905, but the adoption of a plan by Harvard University in 1914 was influential in generating widespread acceptance.[7] Eliot's successor, Lawrence A. Lowell, was a staunch

critic of the elective system and the reforms he initiated at Harvard attracted much attention. A major-minor plan was implemented and eventually a system described as "concentration and distribution" was developed.[8]

The Comprehensive Course Approach

Although "concentration-distribution" was adopted in a variety of forms, the basic feature of specialization and electives were retained in nearly every instance. But for those who maintained that the primary purpose of a college education should be general education, both systems had serious shortcomings. The idea of a survey course received considerable discussion as a means for addressing these shortcomings.

> As early as 1902, John Dewey was pointing out that congestion in the curriculum stemmed not from faulty pedagogical organization but from rapidly expanding knowledge of the arts and sciences. What was needed, he said, was 'a survey, at least of the universe in its manifold phases from which a student can get an "orientation" to the larger world.'[9]

A view which seemed to incorporate Dewey's view was expressed by Preserved Smith at Amherst who saw the elective system as one where the student approached education choices rather blindly, almost as in a lottery. This could be changed by providing the concept of unity first.[10]

> Let us lead him (the student) into the universe and turn on all the lights at once, rather than bringing him into it in the dark and then throwing a flashlight now into this corner, now into that.[11]

Most early attempts to define and enforce a common curriculum which would provide some coherence to college study were essentially college "orientation" courses, for example, Reed College in 1911.[12] Some were introductions to methodology of learning or to aspects of

contemporary civilization, such as that introduced by Alexander Meiklejohn to Amherst freshmen in 1914.[13] However, comprehensive survey courses did not gain much acceptance until after World War I. Columbia University's required "Contemporary Civilization" course in 1919, Reed's Humanities course in 1921, and the University of Chicago's course, "The Nature of the World and Man" in 1924, were significant efforts "to sustain and nurture values and content of Western learning in an age of fragmented and specialized knowledge."[14] Other institutions made at least symbolic efforts in the 1920's which contributed to the emerging concept of general education. A summary of those efforts is provided by Rudolph:

> By 1926 over 100 courses of a general orientation nature were identifiable--42 of the college adjustment and guidance nature, 16 providing an introduction to the methodology of learning, and 34 serving as introductions to aspects of contemporary civilization.[15]

Structural Approaches in the Administration of General Education

Probably the most radical and ambitious adventure in general education in the 1920's was the Experimental College at the University of Wisconsin from 1927 to 1932. Organized and directed by Meiklejohn, the two-year program was described as a "community of learning." There were no separate courses in particular subjects, no lectures, and no classrooms. Faculty offices were located in the same building where students lived and students met with their instructors in conference or discussion sessions. During the first year, students were exposed to a comprehensive study of Greek Civilizations and during the second year to the problems and values of contemporary life in the United States.

The experiment was aborted after five years because Meiklejohn was unable to convince the faculty that he had developed acceptable new curricular forms.[16]

Two other programs were more successfully implemented, one at Reed in 1921 and another at Chicago in 1930-31. Both efforts involved the reorganization of administrative structure in order to secure a more effective operation of curricular changes. Under the leadership of President Richard F. Scholz, Reed replaced the departmental organization of its faculty with a divisional organization. Requirements were imposed in each of the four divisions for a student's first two years. From this experience the student was permitted to select a major area for intensive study in the third and fourth years. An important structural innovation in requirements was the senior "Colloquium in Philosophy" which was one of the earliest successful experiments with a senior integrative course in this century. A similar, junior level course in American history, however, was short-lived.[17]

At the University of Chicago, President Robert Maynard Hutchins, encouraged the faculty to complete plans for reorganization which had been initiated before his arrival. The plan they adopted in 1930-31 created five administrative divisions. The lower division, known as the College, was given complete responsibility for general education instruction. Perhaps the most noteworthy aspect of the plan was that it was the first administrative separation of general education from specialized fields. The College was an autonomous body which had complete control over the administration and instruction of general education, which took place during the first two years of the undergraduate's college experience. Consistent with this approach was the

mid-nineteenth century idea that "general education should, by virtue of its unique function, be offered prior to and as a preparation for specialized education."[18] Since general education belonged in the first two years, it followed that the last two years were for advanced studies. Although others took issue with this practice in later years, it became the norm for most institutions where general education programs were initiated. The delegation of general education to an autonomous body, however, was not adopted by many institutions.

Maturity in the General Education Movement

A report by a Harvard University committee in 1945 identified five major contemporary approaches to the problems of organizing and implementing general education: "1) distribution requirements, 2) comprehensive survey courses, 3) functional courses, 4) the great books curriculum, and 5) individual guidance."[19] A general description of these approaches and references to institutions which adopted these plans provides some perspectives on the range and diversity of general education as it evolved. The descriptions are not intended to be exhausting accounts of all aspects of the programs at any of the institutions discussed, but rather an effort to emphasize some of the more salient features. Although each of these institutions has modified its own program over the years, all but one continue to be operational. Finally, the five major approaches should by no means be considered as reflecting all of the variety in contemporary general education approaches nor can they necessarily be regarded as models which have been or are to be imitated by other institutions.

Distribution Requirements

The system of concentration-distribution, in some form, had been adopted by a majority of American colleges by 1935.[20] One of two basic patterns was usually followed. The most frequently used, and also the most varied, required students to select courses from groups or divisions. Often, the variety from which selections could be made was broad and it was typical that their administration and supervision was decentralized among various departmental areas.[21] The second pattern prescribed a core of specified courses from several areas. The College at the University of Chicago has been the most publicized model of this core approach. Over the years its program was extensively modified but it essentially consisted of a select group of studies comprising the first two years. Although attendance was not mandatory, each student had to pass several comprehensive exams in the required areas before being permitted entrance into advanced studies.[22] A similar but more flexible plan was implemented at the University College of Michigan State University. (This program was recently dismantled.) Students enrolled in four core courses which occupied about one-half their time during the first two years with the balance spent on prerequisites for a major. All students took the same core courses which required numerous sections in order to accommodate the large enrollment. As with the College at Chicago, M.S.U.'s College was under the control of an autonomous administrative body.[23] (It is of historical significance that from 1927 to 1930, Amherst College implemented two courses of study in general education, both of which had a common core of studies which dominated the entire college experience. Ironically, the objective was to permit students more flexibility for occupational pursuits.)[24]

Even with its wide use, the distribution requirements approach has been the object of continuing controversy as to its effectiveness. Moreover, it has always been difficult for an institution to decide on how subjects should be divided into groups or how to define groups.

Comprehensive Survey Courses

The first use of the comprehensive survey as a prescribed means to integrate subject matter across disciplinary lines was at Columbia in 1919.[24] In the early 1950's Columbia's program became a model for many institutions and apparently had much influence on the general education curricula of Harvard and Chicago. The most novel part of Columbia's program was the Contemporary Civilization and Humanities sequence of courses. Both courses were required over a two year period. Based upon classical writings of the Western world, the sequence was an attempt to combine the old with the new. The survey courses sought to retain integrity and meaning of humanistic studies in their application to contemporary problems. These two courses were intended to be taught in small discussion groups and instructors from an interdepartmental faculty were responsible for the various subdivisions of each course. A similar course in science was attempted from 1934 to 1941 but was dropped for lack of support by the science departments. Studies in science and math were subsequently provided through a distribution or group plan where students were allowed to select from a number of first courses in those fields. Students also received a year of writing practice and courses in health and physical education. In total, general education requirements constituted about one-half of each student's degree program. Unlike Chicago, Columbia's courses were

never under a separate administrative structure.[26]

Functional Courses

In addition to the more common arrangement of distributional requirements for students in their four-year degree programs, the University of Minnesota established a separate General College in 1932 with the aim of providing a two-year general education for those students with limited academic abilities. A direct outcome of a pragmatic philosophy, "functional" courses were organized around categories of human behavior and performance. The term "functional" was not in reference to vocational or professional preparation, but rather as an instrumental outlook for learning and knowledge which was applicable to an individual's needs for living in a contemporary society. Based on an effective system of advising and counseling, students selected courses from seven areas in such topics as current reading, how to study, foods and nutrition, home furnishings, and earth and man. A special faculty was assigned to teach the courses and the college was administered by its own dean.[27]

Courses were as complete as possible in themselves and most were of one quarter in duration. However, the particular group of courses a student selected was tailored to interrelate with his or her own needs and interests. Purposes were stated in terms of major objectives based on current phases of living rather than subject matter content to be mastered. Each student was given three comprehensive exams, the first two primarily for diagnostic purposes, and the third to qualify for the two-year associate of arts degree. Students who performed well could transfer to one of the other colleges, providing they met any

special prerequisites. But many studied vocational courses while enrolled in the General College and for most of these students the two years culminated in a terminal degree.[28]

The two versions of general education enabled the University of Minnesota to meet its broader purposes in higher education, primarily serving the diverse needs of the people of Minnesota. The College of Science, Literature, and Arts provided a flexible but more demanding form of general education for the more qualified student. By limiting enrollment in the regular degree programs to students of greater abilities, the high quality of learning standards could be maintained. For students of lesser abilities, the General College provided an answer. Both colleges utilized a form of distribution requirements and both permitted a wide flexibility in the structure of course programs. They differed (radically) in the principles which dominated the organization of subject matter.[29]

The Great Books Curriculum

St. Johns College in Annapolis, Maryland, developed a curriculum which resolved the problem of electives or a major by centering their entire four-year program on a prescribed study of 100-120 so-called "great books." An old and dying liberal arts college in 1937, St. Johns decided to look to the traditional heritage of the West which was to be found in a serious study of carefully selected classical writings. Their approach was based on a philosophy of rationalism. A Neo-Thomistic philosophy, rationalism advances the belief that the basic nature of the universe and the relation of man to nature and God are revealed in the basic principles and absolute values which can be found

within the classical writings.[30]

The course of study was divided into yearly intervals with the first two years focusing upon the Greeks to Descartes and the last two emphasizing the dramatic changes which led up to the scientific revolution of this century. The curriculum was implemented through the use of a seminar, tutorials, laboratories, and a formal lecture. (In 1962 preceptors with whom a student spent a nine-week period for in-depth studies were added.) Preparation for the seminar, scheduled for twice a week, consisted of approximately one hundred pages of reading. The tutorials were in language, mathematics, and music and supported the seminar by encouraging the cultivation of rigorous and methodical study. The laboratory studies included physics, chemistry, and biology. The lecture (or occasionally a concert) was presented formally on Friday nights followed by discussion. The actual list of great books has remained relatively stable.[31]

A second campus was established in 1964 at Santa Fe, New Mexico, and although some Catholic colleges followed a similar approach by concentrating on classical works, St. Johns remained an anomaly among institutions of higher learning.

Individualized (or Student-Centered)

A radical departure from the more prevalent practice of concentration-distribution were the individualized or student-centered curricula developed at some experimental colleges for women. Sarah Lawrence in New York, 1928, and Bennington in Vermont, 1932, are two examples where an early contribution was made to the recognition that women may have different educational needs than men.[32] In contrast to

the prescribed curriculum at St. Johns, these schools encouraged and assisted the student in planning a curriculum around her own interests and talents. Revolutionary in their approach to the learning process, they embraced the pragmatic philosophy of John Dewey and rejected many traditional practices which had become institutionalized at other schools. In their progressive orientation they refused to harbor any distinction between a formal curriculum and an extra curriculum. Both the performing and fine arts were given full academic status as integral parts of the curriculum while entrance requirements, degree criteria, grades and examinations were de-emphasized. Faculty members were selected more often on the basis of significant experiences and contributions outside the normal academic pursuits in such areas as music, art, and even bureaucracy.[33]

The basic approach was quite similar for both schools. With the arrival of each new student, an inventory was made of her interests, capacities, and previous experiences, and, with the aid of a competent advisor, she was encouraged to plan her own program. An exploratory seminar was usually required but to achieve the goals of an individualized general education most courses of study were designed around her own interests and talents. To ensure breadth, students were required to take each of three courses per term in different departments during their first two years. Bennington recognized four major areas of study: science, social studies, humanities, and art. However, both schools advocated that integration was not to be sought in the curriculum but rather by the student. This required the use of good judgement on the part of the student when planning her curriculum. The importance of careful planning was extended to student government and

other campus activities. Students were also encouraged to take an active part in curricular revisions for the school.[34]

Following two years of exploratory studies, mostly in small discussion groups, each student selected a topic or problem area oriented toward contemporary society. With assistance from an advisor, a special reading and tutorial program was planned for the last two years. Rather than study a mosaic of conventional fields in pursuit of her special topic, each student was encouraged to integrate intellectual resources, suggested by the advisor, across disciplinary lines. Progress was generally measured by faculty reports and written evaluations.[35]

By emphasizing the needs and interests of the individual, these two schools had much in common with the "functional" courses of the General College at the University of Minnesota; but there, the pragmatic ideals of instrumentalism had been permitted to become generalized. Important distinctions are obvious in the nature of the student bodies. The General College was designed to serve the needs of marginal students who would terminate their studies after two years. In contrast, the individualized programs at Bennington and Sarah Lawrence catered to the well-motivated and able student and could not really be considered as colleges designed for the mainstream of American society.

Efforts to Formulate Common Goals and Purposes

In the 1940's and 1950's, considerable effort was given to the formulation of goals and purposes for general education. A large number of reports and articles addressed the subject. Three reports often cited and which had much influence on clarifying and defining the

aims of general education were: General Education in a Free Society, Higher Education for American Democracy, and The First Interim Report to the President.

In 1945, Harvard University's General Education in a Free Society had a profound impact on the general education movement. Often referred to as the "Red Book," the report was written to formulate a complete educational philosophy for American society.[36] A deep concern was expressed for the "gulf" which existed between the majority of Americans who had gone no further than high school and the small number who had the opportunity to attend college programs.[37]

The various conceptualizations of general education programs at different institutions were reviewed and found to be insufficient or inappropriate. (Each of the major categories identified by the report was discussed in the preceding section.) According to the report the guide for common, general education programs should be the "heritage" of Western civilization. It further suggested that the emphasis on history should be central in the sciences as well.[38] In many respects the Harvard proposals for general education were quite similar to the Humanities and Civilization courses offered at Columbia. Interestingly, while the report was widely read and served as a guide to many, its proposals were never fully implemented at Harvard.[39]

Nevertheless, at least three important ideas emanated from the "Red Book" which contributed to a common base of objectives for general education. Each may have had its origin elsewhere but they were all greatly clarified by the report. First, was the idea that general education was to assist the individual to find his or her own career or major field of interest.

> Taken as a whole, education seeks to do two things: help young persons fulfill the unique, particular functions in life which it is in them to fulfill, and fit them so far as it can for those common spheres which, as citizens and heirs of a joint culture, they will share with others.[40]

The second idea complements the first by emphasizing the importance of a responsible citizenry with shared experiences in a joint culture. The recent war experience (World War II) had rekindled the concern for responsible citizenship in a democratic society.

> . . . specializing in a vocation makes for inflexibility in a world of fluid possibilities. . . . Our conclusion, then, is that the aim of education should be to prepare an individual to become an expert both in some particular vocation or art and in the general art of the free man and the citizen.[41]

The third idea warned against the inherent danger that specialization poses for the success of general education programs. The authors of the report graphically addressed the roles of special and general education and how they relate to each other:

> General and special education are not, and must not be placed in competition with each other. General education should provide not only an adequate groundwork for the choice of a specialty, but a milieu in which the specialty can develop its fullest potentialities. . . . general education is an organism, whole and integrate; special education is an organ, a member designed to fulfill a particular function within the whole.[42]

In 1947, a President's Commission on Higher Education produced a report, Higher Education for American Democracy.[43] The report focused on the need for curricular improvements to meet the needs of an increasingly diverse student body and the changing world conditions. It asserted that programs were not contributing to the total quality of students' adult lives primarily because there was no longer unity in liberal education. It attributed much of the blame to over-specialization.[44] The role of higher education in the American social system was to transmit a common citizenship. A compatible relationship

was necessary between specialized training and the importance of a common citizenship. The importance of higher education's role in this endeavor was expressed in the following:

> The crucial task of higher education today, therefore, is to provide a unified general education for American youth. Colleges must find the right relationship between specialized training on the one hand, aiming at a thousand different careers, and the transmission of a common citizenship on the other.[45]

Although the Commission did not recommend a curriculum for all institutions to implement, it strongly urged that education leaders work toward agreement on common objectives. Such objectives could serve as a stimulus and guide for individual programs. The principle of strength and diversity for American higher education should continue as a guiding force. Whatever methods each institution developed as a means to implement its own program, it was crucial that general education be broad in scope and aimed at the needs of non-specialists.[46] The implications for the nature of subject matter and instructional methodology in individual courses was obvious:

> . . . emphasize generalizations and the applications of principles rather than the learning of factual minutiae. They will show relationships between subject matters not ordinarily brought together, and they will cultivate in the student the habit of looking for and discovering broad meanings.[47]

Here strong encouragement is given to horizontal curricular relationships oriented toward cross-disciplinary lines as opposed to vertical and sequential relationships. Rather than suggesting anything radically new, the Presidential Commission seemed to reemphasize objectives which had long become central goals of general education programs. Overall, the objectives centered upon a balanced education and effective and responsible citizenship:

> Whatever the methods developed, the purpose is clear: A well-rounded education that will fit men and women to understand the broad cultural foundations, the significant accomplishments, and the unfinished business of their society; to participate intelligently in community life and public affairs; to build a set of values that will constitute a design for living; and to take a socially responsible and productive part in the world of work.[48]

Fulfilling this purpose necessitated that studies extend beyond the confines of American society. The Presidential Commission seemed particularly concerned with the concept of a "shrinking world" and the need for students to develop an understanding of a contemporary foreign culture. They commended the number of institutions which had set up geographic area study programs but pointed out that some non-Western areas were not adequately presented. In particular, they mentioned Eastern and Middle Eastern civilizations. The Commission stated that recent dramatic events (World War II) emphasized the need for global vision and "international mindedness."[49] The implications for course content, objectives, and how they might be attained are evident in the following excerpts from the report:

> For effective international understanding and cooperation, we need to acquire knowledge of, and respect for, other peoples and their cultures--their traditions, their customs and attitudes, their social institutions, their needs and aspirations, for the future.[50]

> American institutions of higher education have an enlarged responsibility for the diffusion of ideas in the world that is emerging. They will have to help our own citizens as well as other peoples to move from the provincial and insular mind to the international mind.[51]

> There should be a definite attempt to present in a sound and comprehensive synthesis the geographic, historical, cultural, social, political, and economic elements of a contemporary foreign culture.[52]

The ideals and goals of general education, which had been expressed by the President's Commission in 1947 and by others received even higher

priorities in 1956 by the First Interim Report to the President.[53] Concerned with the ever increasing problems created by specialization, the report reiterated the thoughts of the 1947 report. In addition to a need to learn about foreign cultures, the report also emphasized the importance for understanding both the social and natural environment:

> Shortsighted economic pressures will increasingly stress specialized vocational training. Hence the Committee feels obligated to emphasize that education in its broadest sense should be the common objective of all those institutional programs. An understanding of our own and other cultures and of the physical and social world in which we live is essential for members of a self-governing society.[54]

By the late 1940's and early 1950's, the concept of general education, and more significantly, its importance, had gained considerable attention and most institutions had at least attempted to implement some type of requirements to fulfill its purpose. The wide publicity given to various programs and reports on the subject resulted in more clarification as to what the goals and objectives should include. During this time a number of lists were compiled, a typical example being the one developed by Johnson:

> The General Education Program aims to help each student increase his (or her) competence in:
>
> 1. Exercising the privileges and responsibilities of democratic citizenship.
> 2. Developing a set of sound spiritual and moral values by which he guides his life.
> 3. Expressing his thoughts clearly in speaking and writing and in reading and listening with understanding.
> 4. Using the basic mathematical and mechanical skills necessary in everyday life.
> 5. Using methods of critical thinking for the solution of problems and for the discrimination among values.
> 6. Understanding his cultural heritage so that he may gain a perspective of his time and place in the world.

7. Understanding his interaction with his biological and physical environment so that he may better adjust to and improve that environment.

8. Maintaining good mental and physical health for himself, his family, and his community.

9. Developing a balanced personal and social adjustment.

10. Sharing in the development of a satisfactory home and family life.

11. Achieving a satisfactory vocational adjustment.

12. Taking part in some form of satisfying creative activity and in appreciating the creative activities of others.[55]

Johnson's list is perhaps representative of the more responsible attempts to identify goals and objectives. Some attempts by others were less comprehensive and even less explicit. An important factor Johnson did include at the outset was the matter of competence. This became a critical issue for the renewed emphasis in general education requirements of the latter 1970's. But the breadth of the example provided here demonstrates how ambitious the proponents of general education had become and at the same time suggests strengths and weaknesses in the general education movement. At least two major problems seem apparent in this example. First, aside from numerical order in which they are offered, there appears to be a lack of attention to the relative importance of the goals. Secondly, there is no indication as to how the goals could become operationalized.

The Climax of the General Education Movement

As a movement, general education probably reached a climax in the late 1950's. The influence of the numerous reports and articles combined with efforts by individual institutions to reform their curriculum produced widespread acceptance of the ideas and various forms of general

education. Not all institutions gave the concept of general education more than token attention and most programs generally amounted to attempts at improving the system of distribution requirements. Alternative models and experimental programs such as those at Sarah Lawrence, Chicago, and St. Johns, may have indirectly influenced other programs but they had few outright imitators.[56] The climax of the movement was more apparent in terms of the proportions of the total degree programs allocated to general education requirements and the large number of self-studies which were carried out at many institutions. The climax was also signified by a noticeable decrease in expended energy given to the subject in articles, books, and reports by the latter part of the decade. In a broader sense, the idea had become institutionalized, though the form was not standardized.

In a comprehensive study of general education programs, which included a survey of twenty institutions, Thomas found a number of characteristics which had become identifiable with general education by the middle and late 1950's. General education course requirements averaged about one-half of a degree program and ranged between one-fourth and two-thirds.[57] The placement of general education within the first two years had become fairly well established although some schools had distributed general education over four years. The requirement of senior capstone or integrative courses was also gaining increased popularity at a number of institutions. Overall, there appeared to be little correlation between differences in programs and the size or type of institution. In some cases exemption examinations permitted students to either begin specialization studies early or extend their general education through a gain in free elective time. In at least one case

(Antioch College) the results of an achievement examination could be used to either excuse the student from a general requirement or require an advanced course in the general program.[58]

By the 1950's and early 1960's, some success had been made in gaining the cooperation of disciplines to provide more courses which integrated two or more subject areas, especially in the sciences where resistance had always been strong.

> General or integrated courses in biological sciences have now become so commonplace that many teachers have forgotten or do not know that twenty-five years ago they were a rarity and that the usual distributional pattern provided options in botany, zoology, and sometimes physiology.[59]

Plus, during this period the momentum of the general education movement appears to have checked, at least temporarily, the growing dominance of the departmental major and areas of specialization. As Thomas states:

> It is no exaggeration of the truth to say that the experience gained in the planning of general courses for general education programs has materially influenced curricular revision in the areas of concentration. The departmental major no longer holds the absolute dominion it once had. Witness the number of area-study courses, interdepartmental and divisional majors, and degree programs in 'general studies.' Some of the more recent 'departments' are actually the result of merging of subject matters previously separated into two or more departments, as for example, the departments or committees of American Studies.[60]

In spite of a number of studies calling attention to a decline in support for general education by the late 1950's, any major reductions in the amount were not to become evident until the later 1960's. A study by Nelson-Jones generalized that between 1955 and 1965 there had actually been an increase in the amount of requirements.[61] A similar study by Dressel and Delisle found little change in degree requirements between 1957 and 1968.[62] There were, however, some major changes for

American society beginning during this period which generated and contributed to some important developments in higher education. These changes served to exacerbate underlying weaknesses in general education programs and resulted in the eventual dimunition of their role in undergraduate education.

Problems and Changes Affecting the Status of General Education

The success of the general education movement had always been marked with problems, many of which appeared to be developing as major issues as early as the late 1950's. Eventually, the growing aggravation of these problems contributed to a drastic reduction in specific general education requirements. According to Thomas, two basic types of difficulties can be identified. On the one hand, there was continual concern about the theoretical basis for general education. Problems often resulted where there was a tendency to mistake the means for the end. For example, some colleges seemed to believe they had introduced general education into the curriculum simply by offering a single course or two. Also, he said, the practice of setting "general courses" apart from other basic requirements by designating them as "courses in general education" sometimes had the effect of distorting the intended meaning of general education.[63] For example, these courses were not always regarded as an integral part of the total college experience but rather as requirements to be "gotten out of the way." On the other hand were parochial problems--those which were created by the necessity of adjusting a program of general studies to the complex academic program of a particular institution.[64]

Inherent Problems of Implementation

Some of the inherent problems which confronted the implementation of general education may be summarized. Requirements imposed by legislative acts and accrediting agencies contributed to the institutionalization of general education but also left many institutions with a set of rigid requirements not always supported by the faculty or students. The difficulty was compounded when implementation was not under the control of a central administrative authority.[65]

Distribution courses became increasingly criticized by general education proponents for not fulfilling the principal goals of general education. For example, where distribution courses were under the control of individual disciplines or departments, they were frequently offered to meet dual purposes, serving as an introductory course for the major and as general education for the non-major. There was the temptation, the critics alleged, to focus on the narrower interests of the major field. Moreover, professors and graduate students often emphasized their own narrow research interests in teaching the courses. Such practices were a disappointment to those who viewed the real purpose of distribution as a means to provide breadth and integration of knowledge. Monroe described the nature of criticism many general education advocates had for distribution courses:

> Many proponents of general education do not agree that this (distribution) is in any way general education since the courses are neither organized nor taught to develop within the student an integrated body of knowledge organized around a few basic concepts and principles which can be used in the solutions of ethical, social, and personal problems.[66]

Another problem resulted from the attempt to accommodate individual differences by permitting students to substitute specialized courses

for required general education courses. According to Mayhew, this practice had the effect of weakening both the integrity and the quality of the required general education courses.

> . . . effective living, personal and marital adjustments and the like seemed to exemplify the worst in progressive education. . . the negative halo effect this created carried over to all required (general education) courses to such an extent that 'man and' courses or 'comp' courses were equated with Mickey Mouse or Rinky Dink--to use the idioms of the students.[67]

The survey type courses, whether taught within one department or through some form of interdepartmental arrangement, seem to have always been plagued with complaints of superficiality, difficulty in staffing, and inability to gain support from various disciplines--especially in the sciences. Kellams concluded from a study of student opinions that they particularly disliked the "broad brush" approach used in many general education survey type courses because it seemed to be designed for common consumption and not the individual students.[68] He also noted that the common practice of listing general education courses with "staff" in place of an instructor's name has been cited by students and others as a symptom of the merely residual interest which departments and faculty have in such courses.

Effects from the Universalization of Higher Education

By making entry into college more accessible, primarily through financial assistance from the federal government to institutions and students, an extension of educational opportunity was given to previously disenfranchised groups. Subsequently, programs in ethnic studies, women's studies, and family or sex-role studies were introduced

at a number of institutions, but for most students the content of the curriculum remained virtually unchanged.[69] The influence of counter-movements and activist-radical students or faculties apparently had little direct influence on specific curricular reforms. Grant and Riesman reported that the influence from these elements did contribute to a growing shift of authority which amounted to increased student autonomy. The increased student autonomy did bring changes in the traditional structure of course requirements.[70]

A 1972 survey of academic deans revealed that a large number of institutions were granting students more control over their studies in such areas as planning their own program of study, receiving credit for work or study away from campus, initiating new courses, conducting their own courses for credit, and receiving pass/fail grades for a growing number of courses. This trend was expected by the deans to continue.[71]

The combined effect of these changes and trends on a vulnerable general education curriculum was the reduction or elimination of its role in degree requirements at many institutions. In 1971, at Amherst, complaints from students played a crucial role in the faculty's decision to wipe out all general education requirements.[72] At Columbia, in 1973, in the wake of a high turnover rate in the teaching staff, the interdisciplinary courses in the core requirements were reduced from two years to one. Similar cutbacks were reported on other campuses.[73]

In a major survey of changing practices in undergraduate education, Blackburn et al. found from examining college catalogs that between 1967 and 1974, the general education component of 210 carefully selected four-year institutions had decreased considerably.[74] The changes in degree programs included changes in the amount, structure, and content

of general education requirements. Concomitantly, there were no substantial changes in the proportion of time allocated to the major, but more choice of electives was allowed.[75] The changes in the proportion of undergraduate degree components are summarized in Table I.

TABLE I

CHANGES IN THE PROPORTIONAL ALLOCATION
OF UNDERGRADUATE EDUCATION
(in percentages)

Four-Year Institutions	1967	1974
General Education Requirements (mean)	43.1	33.5
Major Requirements (range)	26.7 - 40.1	25.2 - 41.0
Available Electives (range)	16.8 - 30.2	25.5 - 41.3

Source: Robert Blackburn et al., Changing Practices in Undergraduate Education, the Carnegie Council Series (San Francisco, 1976), p. 11.

Overall, structural changes resulted in less prescription and more freedom of choice for students. Institutions which had a high degree of prescribed courses generally changed to more distribution requirements. Institutions in which distribution was the norm tended to replace many of those requirements with more free choice courses within general education. The range of structural change among institutions was considerable but the trend was away from any fixed pattern.[76]

No models were found that typified the delivery of general

education and there were no obvious patterns that reflected any commonly discussed philosophies of curricular organization, such as placing all survey and distribution courses at the first two years, parallel structuring, or senior integrating courses.[77]

In the content of general education, there was a decline in the number of classes required in the disciplinary areas of natural science, social science and the humanities. The greatest decreases in required course work were in the humanities; although that area continued to have the highest percentage of requirements overall. In 1974, fewer institutions required "basic" courses in English, foreign language, and mathematics than in 1967. There were also fewer institutions requiring physical education.[78]

In order to compare student behavior with findings from the catalog survey of that period, transcripts were analyzed at ten of the institutions. It was found that in general, students used their enlarged number of electives more often to increase depth in the major field of concentration and less often for breadth in areas outside the major division of their field. However, these courses were usually in other departments within the major division of concentration rather than with the major department. From this the authors concluded that "the trend was for breadth within depth rather than depth within depth."[79] In general, when electives were used for breadth outside the major division of concentration, they were least often in the natural sciences.[80]

The authors found that among institution types there was much variation in the extent of change between 1967 and 1974. The most frequent and more pronounced changes were found to be private institutions where degree requirements had been reduced the most.[81] Overall,

the findings of their study confirmed the perception that the undergraduate curriculum of the mid-1970's had become one of increasing diversity with a diminished role for general education.

The Influence of Faculty and Students in the Diminished Role of General Education

There has been much debate over the effect of student pressures on curricular reform during the 1960's and early 1970's. The subject of whether changes in general education requirements were the result of student complaints about relevance, or moves by faculty members to placate students while at the same time protecting their own interests, has received much attention. Chase, in discussing compromise as the price paid for the decision-making process in curricular reform, cites the Carnegie Commission's argument that

> . . . instead of being shaped by a coherent educational philosophy, the content of general education had been determined by a number of internal and external forces--faculty interests, student concerns with the job market, 'relevance,' social facts and the like.[82]

On the other hand much of the responsibility for an alleged decline in quality of general education has been placed on the faculty. In discussing the challenge by radical students of the 1960's who questioned the legitimacy of academic functions, O'Connell commented:

> Faculties across the nation made only one coherent response to these challenges. They abolished most of the degree requirements outside the major. It seems a curious response, since few radicals criticized the curriculum. But the abolition appeared because it seemed to express sympathy though not agreement, with students and most importantly, because it freed faculty from tasks many did not want--teaching of courses outside their specialization and the regulation of students' extracurricular lives.[83]

The findings of Blackburn et al. led them to support a similar

view. Their observation was that faculty responded to student disenchantment with degree programs primarily by reducing general education requirements without replacing them with new or meaningful alternatives.

> We saw but scattered instances where new courses were created to deal with the precipitating events. Ecology-type offerings emerged in the sciences, cross-discipline study remnants from World War II were sometimes revitalized, and urban sociology received a minority-group emphasis. But the curricular freedom that faculty created was only infrequently enriched by offerings that dealt with the issues that had led to those options being available to students in the first place.[84]

Their report also suggested that the increased freedom provided the student in academic pursuits should not be misinterpreted as increased student control over curriculum. The faculty was still very much in control of the major and the fact that most students used increased electives to strengthen their major indicates that specialization had actually increased.[85] The authors further implied that the faculty had lost interest in the support of general education:

> . . . by loosening the requirements in general education, the faculty were not only seeming to say that general education is not as important as it once was, but also that they were no longer sure what an 'educated person' was.[86]

Related to the problem of faculty indifference and their preoccupation with specialization are alleged weaknesses in their own training. In the early 1970's, Levine and Weingart included an evaluation of a variety of curricular arrangements designed to ensure breadth. With one possible exception (St. Johns), they concluded that all attempts to provide any basis for common humanity among people had failed.[87]

> The type of general education desired is that which builds bridges. . . . Even a program administered by a single

> department can have an inbuilt dimension showing commonality--showing where the field stands with regard to the rest of the world. . . . this is where general education courses fail. There are few general educationists left.[88]

O'Connell says the answer to producing teachers who are both committed to general education and trained to engage in it may be found in the reform of graduate education. The faculty itself may require a more general education and until reform occurs in graduate training, "we will have a few teachers or scholars prepared to teach outside their departments or sufficiently trained to perceive the ways in which disciplines now increasingly intersect."[89]

An underlying factor directly related to the amount of faculty support for general education programs has been the administrative structure used to implement it. Historically, a vast majority of institutions have decentralized the administrative responsibility and according to Thomas, this

> . . . has often resulted in an uneven development of the various parts of the program and has not infrequently led to a withering of general faculty interest because of a lack of communication among various departments concerning their common interests.[90]

To summarize this section, it does appear that those general education programs which have escaped emasculation have generally been those with more central autonomy in their administration, financing, budgeting, and evaluation. While centralized control may in effect be no more than a structural barrier to eventual change by an unsupportive faculty, it has often been a crucial element of success for experimental programs. Overall, experimental programs in general education have been most successfully implemented with a minimum of resistance, and sustained with only moderate change, where they were initiated under a separate administrative structure (for example, The General College

of the University of Minnesota) or where comprehensive programs were developed for new institutions (for example, Sarah Lawrence and Bennington) or where older institutions decided to rebuild from scratch (such as St. Johns).

A New Look at General Education

The latter half of the 1970's brought a renewed concern for general education. This concern was carefully articulated by the Carnegie Foundation which outlined the components necessary for general education, and made specific suggestions for improvements in advanced learning skills, distribution/breadth requirements, integrative learning experiences, and the scheduling of general education in the undergraduate curriculum.[91]

Throughout academia institutions responded to the Carnegie Foundation recommendations, and their own soul-searching, with plans which proposed significant changes in the character and delivery of their general education programs. These proposals called for major changes in structure and content of breadth requirements as well as increases in competency requirements. The more publicized proposals emanated from prestigious institutions which had departed most from traditional general education emphases and structures.

Harvard University, long recognized as a leader in general education innovations, once again proposed a new core curriculum. Review of their programs had revealed "wide agreement that proliferation of courses had eroded the purpose of the existing general education program."[92] A new Harvard curriculum was characterized as "an amalgam of diverse intellectual approaches, major substantive areas of knowledge

and important basic skills."[93] The new core identified five clusters of courses: literature and the arts, historical study, social analysis and moral reasoning, science, and foreign culture.[94] Although the amount of general education course work in these clusters was unchanged, the definitions of the clustering were said to reflect shifts in fields of knowledge.

Students were also to meet other non-concentration requirements in writing, foreign language, and mathematics. These requirements could be met through exam options or by taking courses. Courses which qualified for the core program would be added gradually over four years and should total between eighty and one hundred available options for any given year. The core established ten course requirements but through exemptions and some overlap of courses in concentration requirements, it was expected to amount to eight one-half courses, or approximately one year of the total degree program for most students.[95]

At other institutions the character and extent of changes to general education programs are varied. There are indications that the amount of new requirements are in proportion to the amount which had been eliminated over the past decade or so. Leading institutions such as Columbia and Chicago appear to have made only minor changes in their comparatively strong programs, while others, Amherst and Yale as examples, have attempted to restore major reductions which had occurred in their programs; but some of those schools in the latter category have been confronted with difficulties in gaining faculty approval.[96]

Reported changes in structure reveal tighter and more clearly defined distribution requirements. For example, to avoid simply the accumulation of scattered introductory courses, students at Union

College in Schenectady, New York, are encouraged to form clusters in two or more related areas from a core of six major categories.[97] New courses which students select from six discipline areas at Northwestern University must have a "fundamental basicness" and cover the essential techniques and methods of that field.[98] Interdisciplinary courses are not common, but an exception is the proposal at Amherst where freshmen, over the course of a year, would take two semester length courses with interdisciplinary topics taught by faculty from several disciplines.[99] Most new proposals or programs are avoiding courses which require team-teaching and one of the reasons may be that which was included in the "Philosophy Statement of General Education" at Oklahoma State University:

> Whereas lower division general education courses may be 'team developed,' they usually should be taught by a single individual even though the course is interdisciplinary in nature. Lower division students should not be expected to adapt to a parade of disciplinary specialists nor to an excessive array of pedagogical formats.[100]

As to the content of distribution or breadth requirements, the traditional areas of humanities, social science, and natural science continue to be represented in about the same proportions as before, with a decline in emphasis on less traditional subjects; but many require students to gain familiarity in a culture other than their own. At the California State University at Fullerton, this requirement may be fulfilled by taking courses that focus on minority cultures in the United States--Afro-American Culture, the American Indian, and the Mexican American in the Southwest.[101]

Greater attention in international awareness is also signified by increasing emphasis on foreign language study. Language study has been encouraged to meet requirements to study a foreign culture (usually

only advanced courses qualify) and as partial fulfillment of competency requirements in communication; but few institutions have reinstated mandatory language requirements. An exception is Ohio State University where they are now prescribed for all students.[102] Competency requirements in a foreign language at Berkeley can be satisfied through the completion of college courses, passing college course exams, or evidence of three or more years equivalent of successful high school study.[103]

Most of the recent efforts in curricular reform at public institutions have failed to alter the statutory requirements in American Government and History, but a number of states now permit these requirements to be satisfied by competency exams.[104]

There are some indications that more "hands on" experiences may be included in general education courses which have typically become predominently content oriented. For example, programs are again requiring that breadth requirements in science include a laboratory experience.[105] In the fine arts the criticism is that even when courses in this area are included in requirements there is not enough emphasis on active student involvement in the experience.[106]

A major emphasis is on competency in the areas of communication and quantitative reasoning, or what the Carnegie Foundation referred to as advanced learning skills. Berkeley requires that students take a freshman year sequence in English reading and expository writing. Competence in quantitative reasoning must be shown either by passing a college exam equivalent to three and one-half years of high school mathematics or completion of an approved college course.[107] A special institute for the teaching of introductory English was set up at the University of Iowa and the University of Wisconsin reported significant increases in

the use of their writing laboratory.[108]

Interest in competency has been extended to more than writing and mathematics by some smaller colleges. An idea which has been receiving growing attention since the 1960's is the development of curricula in which desired outcomes are stated in terms of competencies or abilities to perform in comparison to objective standards. Mars Hill College in North Carolina, Sterling College in Kansas, and Alverno College in Milwaukee are noteworthy examples. Here students are permitted to select traditional courses as vehicles for acquiring and demonstrating competence in a number of areas, but they also may achieve these competencies in areas normally outside formal studies which are sometimes tailored to individual aptitudes. A further distinction of the competency approach is its emphasis on mastery with an almost unlimited time requirement. It has been argued that for small colleges this may be a means of finding a middle ground between career and liberal arts emphasis.[109]

Contributions from Outside the Institutional Setting

In addition to the renewed attention on general education by institutions, the subject has received attention from other areas. The Project on General Education Models (GEM) and others have encouraged the development of alternative models of general education which would be effective with a variety of institutions and students.[110] Another project is the College Outcome Testing Program (COMP) which has been administered to a variety of institutions in secondary as well as higher education. It is intended to go beyond the testing of academic

achievement and to assess how general knowledge skills and attitudes are applied in the non-academic world.[111] Its usefulness was described by Forests, the project's director:

> The new tests are intended to measure and evaluate the knowledge and skills that undergraduate students are expected to acquire as a result of general or liberal education programs. and that are important to effective functioning in adult society. . . . the battery of tests assess a person's abilities in communicating, solving problems, and clarifying values in three general areas: social institutions, the arts, and science and technology. . . . high priority is now being given to investigations of its use in evaluating and planning liberal education programs.[112]

If these and other projects are successful, they will add to the probability that structural changes in the general education curriculum will continue to occur. But the effective use of tests or other changes may not come immediately. Any immediate success will more likely result from stricter qualification requirements for general education courses, and how the changes are administered.

For analytical purposes one approach to assessing new programs in general education has been to consider three distinct, but interrelated elements: 1) the educational principles which have been invoked in determining skills and content aims of the programs; 2) the administrative structures designed to make the operation of the programs effective; and, 3) the pedagogical methods adopted for the better implementation of the programs.[113] As more institutions attempt curricular reform in the 1980's they will undoubtedly give careful study to each of these elements within their own setting as well as to how others have dealt with them. How problems in each of these areas are resolved by different institutions is of major importance to higher education in general and in the administration and budgeting of individual institutions in particular.

Among institutions as a whole, the amount and type of changes proposed and their successful adoption are expected to be variable. Regarding the probability of success, Levine has suggested that success (or failure) in curriculum change is dependent on three factors:

The environment targeted for change--

> Successful curriculum change is most likely in either an unstable or particularly supportive environment.

The characteristics of the change--

> Successful curriculum change is most likely when an innovation is consistent with the norms, values, and traditions of the environment in which it is introduced. . . . Two attributes of change . . . favor success. One is compatability--the degree to which an innovation is like the environment into which it has been introduced. . . . . . . The second attribute . . . is profitability--the degree to which a change satisfies environmental or personal needs. The greater the profitability, the greater the likelihood of successful change.

The process by which change is introduced--

> The way in which a change is introduced influences people's attitudes, acceptance, and participation in the change. Five areas of the process are especially critical. They include: 1) communication and publicity, 2) leadership from administration, 3) wide-based support, 4) rewards and resources, and 5) appropriate forms of innovation and organization.[114]

A principal element which must be considered in each of the three factors identified by Levine is the role of the individual department. Within a single institution the effect of curricular reforms in general education upon individual departments may be extreme. It is important to understand how changes in higher education as well as within a single discipline affect that discipline's role in the institutional setting. The next chapter examines the nature of effects that both types of changes have had on the historical development of geography as an academic discipline and its role in the general education curriculum.

FOOTNOTES

[1]Richard Hofstadter and Wilson Smith, eds., American Higher Education: A Documentary History, Vol. I (Chicago, 1961), pp. 697-747; and Frederick Rudolph, The American College and University: A History (New York, 1962), pp. 287-306.

[2]John S. Brubacher and Willis Rudy, Higher Education in Transition, 3rd ed. (New York, 1976), p. 116.

[3]Laurence R. Veysey, The Emergence of the American University (Chicago, 1970), p. 114.

[4]Frederick Rudolph, Curriculum: A History of the American Undergraduate Course of Study Since 1636, prepared for the Carnegie Council on Policy Studies in Higher Education, the Carnegie Council Series (San Francisco, 1977), pp. 236-237; and Earl J. McGrath, "The General Education Movement," Journal of General Education 1 (October 1946), pp. 3-8.

[5]Lester G. Anderson, "Half a Century of General Education," Intellect (October 1973), pp. 41-42.

[6]Hoyt Trowbridge, "Forty Years of General Education," Journal of General Education 11 (July 1958), p. 161.

[7]Rudolph, Curriculum, pp. 228-229.

[8]Ibid.

[9]Brubacher and Rudy, Transition, p. 272.

[10]Preserved Smith, "The Unity of Knowledge and the Curriculum," Education Review 45 (April 1913), p. 341.

[11]Ibid., p. 340.

[12]Rudolph, Curriculum, p. 237.

[13]Ibid.

[14]Ibid.

[15]Ibid., p. 238.

[16]Ibid., pp. 176-177.

[17]Russell Thomas, The Search for a Common Learning: 1800-1960 (New York, 1962), pp. 80-82.

[18]Ibid., pp. 82-86.

[19]Report of the Harvard Committee, General Education in a Free Society (Cambridge, Mass., 1945), p. 181.

[20]Thomas, Common Learning, p. 96.

[21]Rudolph, Curriculum, p. 254.

[22]Aston R. Williams, General Education in Higher Education (Columbia University, 1968), pp. 53-67.

[23]Ibid., 55-67, 122-123; and Trowbridge, "Forty Years," p. 175.

[24]Thomas, Common Learning, pp. 14-15.

[25]Daniel Bell, The Reforming of General Education (New York, 1966), p. 27.

[26]Ibid., pp. 12-26.

[27]Rudolph, American College and University, pp. 478-479.

[28]Williams, General Education, pp. 117-121.

[29]Ibid., pp. 118-123.

[30]Harold Taylor, "The Philosophical Foundation of General Education," General Education, Fifty-first Yearbook: Part I (Chicago, 1952), pp. 27-28.

[31]Arthur Levine and John Weingart, Reform of Undergraduate Education (San Francisco, 1973), pp. 44-50.

[32]Rudolph, American College and University, p. 477.

[33]Ibid., pp. 475-478; and Williams, General Education, pp. 141-143.

[34]Brubacher and Rudy, Transition, p. 277.

[35]Williams, General Education, pp. 141-143.

[36]Bell, Reforming, pp. 38-39.

[37]Ibid.

[38]Harvard Committee, Free Society, pp. 192, 221-222.

[39]Bell, Reforming, p. 47.

[40]Harvard Committee, Free Society, p. 4.

[41]Ibid., pp. 53-54.

[42]Ibid., p. 195.

[43]Report of the President's Commission on Higher Education, Higher Education for American Democracy, Vol. I (New York, 1947).

[44]Ibid., p. 6.

[45]Ibid., p. 49.

[46]Ibid., p. 46-47.

[47]Ibid., p. 59.

[48]Ibid., p. 75.

[49]Ibid., p. 8.

[50]Ibid., p. 17.

[51]Ibid., p. 15.

[52]Ibid., p. 73.

[53]The President's Committee on Education Beyond the High School, First Interim Report to the President (Washington, D.C., November 1956).

[54]Ibid., p. 8.

[55]Lamar Johnson, General Education in Action (Washington, D.C., 1952), pp. 60-63.

[56]Rudolph, Curriculum, pp. 261, 274.

[57]Thomas, Common Learning, pp. 102-103.

[58]Ibid., pp. 104-105, 289.

[59]Ibid., p. 226; and W. Hugh Stickler, "Senior Courses in General Education," Journal of Higher Education 25 (March 1954), p. 146.

[60]Thomas, Common Learning, p. 99.

[61]Richard Nelson-Jones, "General Education in American Higher Education: 1955-56 to 1964-65," (unpub. doctoral dissertation, Stanford, 1967), pp. 138-145.

[62]P. L. Dressel and F. H. Delisle, Undergraduate Curriculum Trends (Washington, D.C., 1969.

[63]Thomas, Common Learning, pp. 95, 99.

[64]Ibid., p. 95.

[65]Lewis B. Mayhew, Colleges Today and Tomorrow (London, 1969), p. 211.

[66]Charles R. Monroe, Profile of the Community College (San Francisco, 1975), p. 73.

[67]Mayhew, Today and Tomorrow, pp. 208-209.

[68]Samuel E. Kellams, "Students and the Decline of General Education," Journal of General Education 24 (January 1973), pp. 217-230.

[69]Gerald Grant and David Riesman, "An Ecology of Academic Reform," American Higher Education: Toward an Uncertain Future, Daedalus, Vol. 2 (Boston, 1975), pp. 166-191.

[70]Ibid., p. 176.

[71]Ibid., p. 177.

[72]Rudolph, Curriculum, p. 272.

[73]Ibid., p. 260.

[74]Robert Blackburn et al., Changing Practices in Undergraduate Education, technical report prepared for the Carnegie Council on Policy Studies in Higher Education, the Carnegie Council Series (San Francisco, 1976), p. 33.

[75]Ibid., p. 11.

[76]Ibid., p. 37.

[77]Ibid., p. 38.

[78]Ibid., pp. 15-16, 34.

[79]Ibid., pp. 29-30.

[80]Ibid., p. 32.

[81]Ibid., p. 36.

[82]Alston Chase, "Skipping Through College: Reflections on the Decline of Liberal Arts Education," in Working Papers - The Rockefeller Foundation, Toward the Restoration of the Liberal Arts Curriculum (June 1979), p. 79.

[83]Barry O'Connell, "Where does Harvard Lead Us?" in Working Papers - The Rockefeller Foundation, Toward the Restoration of the Liberal Arts Curriculum (June 1979).

[84]Blackburn et al., Changing Practices, p. 40.

[85]Ibid., p. 38.

[86]Ibid.

[87]Levine and Weingart, Reform of Undergraduate Education, p. 50.

[88]Ibid., p. 51.

[89]O'Connell, "Harvard," p. 66.

[90]Thomas, Common Learning, p. 105.

[91]The Carnegie Foundation for the Advancement of Teaching, Missions of the College Curriculum: A Contemporary Review with Suggestions, the Carnegie Council Series (San Francisco, 1977), pp. 164-185.

[92]Ellen K. Coughlin, "Harvard's Report on the Core Curriculum," The Chronicle of Higher Education 16 (6 March 1978), pp. 2, 15.

[93]Ibid.

[94]Faculty of Arts and Sciences, Harvard University, "Report on the Core Curriculum," in Working Papers - The Rockefeller Foundation, Toward the Restoration of the Liberal Arts Curriculum (June 1979), p. 79.

[95]Ibid.

[96]Richard J. Cattani, "Campuses Reflect Middle Ground Goals on Curricula," The Christian Science Monitor (5 April 1978), p. 4.

[97]Ibid.

[98]Ibid.

[99]Ibid.

[100]Oklahoma State University, "Philosophy Statement of General Education at O.S.U." Oklahoma State News (26 March 1979), p. 2.

[101]California State University, Fullerton, Fullerton General Education, Special Issue (March 1979), p. 1.

[102]Ohio State University College of the Arts and Sciences, Bachelor of Arts and Bachelor of Science Curriculum (September 1978), pp. 1-2.

[103]Beverly T. Watkins, "Berkeley Faculty Votes to Raise Standards, Restore Requirements," The Chronicle of Higher Education 16 (3 April 1978), pp. 11-12.

[104]"Revamping of General Education Sought in California State System," The Chronicle of Higher Education 16 (8 May 1978), p. 12.

[105]California State University, Fullerton General Education, p. 2.

[106]Carnegie Foundation, Missions, p. 172.

[107]Watkins, "Berkeley Faculty," p. 11.

[108]Cattani, "Campuses Reflect Goals," p. 4.

[109]Carnegie Foundation, Missions, pp. 124-125; and Bob Knott, "What is a Competence-Based Curriculum in the Liberal Arts?" Journal of Higher Education 46 (January/February 1975), pp. 25-38.

[110]"Project on General Education Models (GEM)," The Chronicle of Higher Education 16 (31 July 1978), p. 13.

[111]Jack Magarrell, "How Useful is a Liberal Education? A New Test Tries to Find Out," The Chronicle of Higher Education 17 (23 October 1978), pp. 6-7.

[112]Ibid., p. 6.

[113]Thomas, Common Learning, p. 100.

[114]Arthur Levine, Handbook on Undergraduate Curriculum, prepared for the Carnegie Council on Policy Studies in Higher Education (San Francisco, 1978), pp. 431-433.

CHAPTER III

THE HISTORICAL DEVELOPMENT OF ACADEMIC GEOGRAPHY AS IT RELATES TO THE DISCIPLINE'S ROLE IN GENERAL EDUCATION

Geography has had an intermittent and usually restricted role in the curricula of American higher education. While it was included as a course of study in all nine bona fide colleges established prior to independence, it was virtually eliminated from most curricular programs by the 1820's. Of the nearly two hundred institutions established between 1830 and 1860, none included geography. From the mid-1850's to 1900, it was reinstated at several eastern universities and slowly introduced into a number of new colleges and universities. Of the approximately seven hundred colleges in operation at the turn of the century, only a dozen offered geography. Between 1900 and World War I, geography expanded into a large number of state institutions; but in the privately endowed schools, growth was much slower and it was eliminated from the curricula of many following the war. In most types of public supported institutions, however, the growth continued between the two world wars and at a more constant rate.[1] By 1956, there were 1,106 colleges or universities offering geography and by 1980, 1,388 institutions reported various amounts of course work.[2]

Most writers on the development of the discipline have chosen to focus upon its achievements in producing majors and graduate programs.

This is understandable but leaves an incomplete picture of geography's role and place in American higher education. The impressiveness of the discipline's record of national adoption is somewhat misleading in that probably fewer than five percent of all students enrolled in institutions offering geography ever take as much as a single course in the subject.[3] Nevertheless, geography's major role in this century, in terms of college enrollments, has been primarily the provision of service courses for the other fields of study and its participation in general education curricula.

Geography's role in general education has fluctuated throughout the history of American higher education. In part, this has been due to the evolution of thought and practice within the discipline; but of equal importance has been the changing structure and purposes of higher education in general. Moreover, the effects of these endogenous and exogenous changes have resulted in a pattern of waxing and waning of geography's role and place in the college curriculum.

The purpose of this chapter is to examine the historical development of geography as general education within the context of higher education. It completes the necessary background for Chapters IV and V which focus upon the contemporary views and practices of geography's contribution to the goals and purposes of general education.

Geography in the Colonial Colleges

Geography was included among the principal subjects of study in the colonial colleges of America.[4] Since nearly all students pursued the same basic group of studies, geography may be considered as having an early and central role in general education. Just how different

geography of that era may have been from modern interpretations is perhaps less important than the nature of circumstances which determined its role and place in the curriculum. Yet, there is a close relationship between the success of geography in the early colleges and the events which contributed to the subsequent development of modern geography in American higher education.

General and Special Geography

It appears that the geography of the early colleges (between the late seventeenth and early nineteenth centuries) was basically what is now regarded as "physical geography." Throughout the eighteenth century the predominant text was the Geographia Generalis of Bernhard Varenius (Varen), first published in 1650.[5] This work had a profound influence on the role of geography in the colonial curriculum and provided much of the conceptual framework upon which modern geographic thought would evolve.

Varen viewed the study of geography as taking two basic but interrelated forms, "general" and "special." In his Geographia Generalis he described geographical study and differentiated between the two approaches:

> Geography was that part of mixed mathematics, which explains the State of the Earth, and of its Parts, depending on Quantity, viz. it Figure, Place, Magnitude, and Motion, with the Celestial Appearances, etc. . . . we divide Geography into General and Special, or Universal and Particular. . . . we call that Universal Geography which considers the whole Earth in general, and explains its properties without regard to particular countries; but Special or Particular Geography describes the Constitution and Situation of each single Country by itself which is two fold, viz. Chorographical, which describes Countries of a considerable Extent; or Topographical, which gives a View of some place or small Tract of Earth.[6]

As a response to wide public interest he further included the "human" element as a third aspect in special geography. It was from this conceptual framework that later students would eventually formulate controversial distinctions between what became known as "physical" and "human" (or regional) geography.[7]

Varen based much of his thought on the works of others, dating back to Strabo's writings in the first century, A.D., as well as his own contemporaries; they appear to have held the belief that both general and special geography deserved a place of equal importance and should be studied together. Varen's preeminence in the colonial colleges was due primarily to the efforts of Isaac Newton. Impressed by the work's scientific qualities, Newton updated it and used it at Cambridge University, an action which assured its use in the colonial colleges.[8]

Course Content in the Colonial Colleges

According to Warntz, "formal course work in the use of globes in general systematic geography and astronomy was, it seems, accompanied by 'outside readings' in the descriptive materials of special geography."[9] Of the two, general geography enjoyed a higher status because of its association with astronomy and its link through mathematics to the use of globes. The aim of general geography was to provide a complete system explaining the nature and properties of the earth including the earth's motions in relation to other orbital bodies and the understanding of the seasons, tides, and the atmospheres. Students also learned the principles of navigation and how to make and read maps. The emphasis given to precise measurements and recognition of general laws made it acceptable among the academic circles as a science worthy

of study in college.[10]

Special geography, with its emphasis on description of places and their situation, came to be regarded as important yet still too subjective and changeable to be worthy of serious college study. It was, however, included as a requirement for admission to college and although considered too difficult for public schools, it was taught in private schools and college preparatory institutions.[11]

Changes in Course Content Following Independence

As other college texts replaced Varen's, "special" geography was given more attention. The first American text, and the one most frequently used in the new republic, was written by Jedidiah Morse in 1784.[12] In successive revisions, its major emphasis became increasingly oriented toward satisfying a growing public interest in the elements of special geography. Academic circles, however, continued to criticize special geography for its lack in "scientific qualities" and it was finally rejected from college studies. In fact, both forms of geography were eliminated from the college curriculum after the first quarter of the nineteenth century. General geography came to be replaced by a study of the several substantive fields leaving only those areas of study regarded as special geography which were relegated to the lower schools. With increasing public interest in the new republic, "home geographies" were published and a flurry of state oriented regional geography courses were offered in the public schools.[13]

Geography's role and place in the curricula of the early colleges had long been insured by its ability to meet the criteria deemed worthy

of academic study. As general geography it was accepted as a scientific subject which included those areas of knowledge most well developed for the period. Its success in those areas is evidenced by the number of separate subjects and later disciplines which grew out of its fragmentation. Ironically, the need for integration and synthesis of many of these subjects would later contribute to the emergence of geography in the general education movement of the twentieth century.

European Influences on Modern Geographic Thought and Practice in American Higher Education

Following independence in this country, American academic geography became isolated from developments in Europe where a controversy emerged and continued over the distinction between general and special geography. It is useful to consider the characteristics of the controversy because of its eventual influence on geography's role in American higher education.

The contrast between general and special geography formed the basis of what has been described as the two fundamental approaches and traditions in all geographic inquiry:

> The theoretical (deductive) or nomothetic approach seeks to establish theories relevant to the location and interrelations of places and to establish laws and make deductions on the basis of laws. The empirical (descriptive) or idiographic approach places primary emphasis on the description of particular groups of nations (or other areas) and people in terms of lands, seas, countries, and places. It does not seek to develop laws but to find out how phenomena account for the genus loci, the character of place and its relations with other places.[14]

In practice the varied interpretations and shifts in emphasis between these two approaches have taken on several different forms of an artificial dualism, namely general versus specific, physical versus human,

and topical versus regional. Much of the controversy during the nineteenth century was over a concern that geography should become identified as a scientific discipline. This produced many questions as to what content geographic study included and for what purposes and how it was to be pursued. Richard Hartshorne has suggested that much of the confusion centered on misinterpretations of Varen's views of general and special geography. He observed that several students, including B. L. L. Baker and Paul Vidal de la Blache, in examining the later editions of Varen's works had found that his view of geography was not dualistic.[15] Hartshorne quoted Vidal de la Blache's conclusion that "the rapport between the general laws and the particular descriptions, which are their application, constitute the intimate unity of geography."[16] Hartshorne further offered an explanation for the confusion over Varen's views which contributed to much of the long-lived debate over what constituted the differences between physical and human geography:

> . . . the contrast emphasized by Varen, both in his terms and in his explanation of them, is less the distinction between the approach by study of elements and that by study of areas, but more the contrast between generic and specific studies. Further confusion resulted when later students, notably Kant and Humboldt, substituted the work 'physical' (from physics) for 'general' and classified all generic studies, including those of man, as 'physical geography.'[17]

Dickinson notes that Ferdinand von Richthofen made an attempt late in the century to resolve the controversies surrounding the alleged dualism between general and special geography:

> Geography may be pursued through the most detailed investigation of the smallest areas, as well as through the comparative study of larger areas. Thus there are two approaches according to whether the areas or the things and the phenomena are the primary object of study. The first is Special Geography and is primarily descriptive /or chorographic/. The

> second is General Geography. One is synthetic, the other is analytical. The combination of both methods yields a third approach that considers selected groups of things and phenomena in a particular area and seeks to understand their interrelations and causes. This is the chorological /or regional/ approach.[18]

Richthofen, Alfred Hettner, Vidal de la Blache, and others went on to develop the chorological approach further at the end of the century and in the early part of the twentieth; but these efforts had little influence on American Geography until after the first world war.

It was the influence of Alexander von Humboldt and Carl Ritter that dominated the views of the geographic methodology in Europe for most of the nineteenth century. Both were concerned with geography's ranking with the sciences and to protect it from going astray, a firm methodological principle was needed. Friedrich Ratzel and others would build upon and develop more fully the ideas of Humboldt and Ritter. Together they offered three ideas which gained acceptance in American higher education:

1. Careful assembly of factual material made coherent and intelligible by being subsumed under laws which express relationships of cause and effect. Geography must go from description to the higher task of knowing the cause of things.

2. In the final analysis there was no difference methodologically between what would now be called the social and natural sciences.

3. A primary objective of geographic study was to investigate the ways in which the physical environment affects the functioning and development of societies.[19]

The first sought to unify the methodological approaches between general and special geography, but students of special geography did not always see this as necessary.[20] The second idea was later disputed as geography became more closely identified with the social sciences. The third was in harmony with the ancient teleological ideas of

Judeo-Christian belief in a "divine plan" for explaning the nature of the universe, one which most prominent scientists of the middle nineteenth century continued to support.[21] Revolutions in scientific thought followed the voyages and writings of Charles Darwin rejecting the teleological view but continuing to look at the causal effects of the physical environment on society. This was in spite of the relatively well-known works of Comte de Buffon in the previous century and Mary Somerville in the middle of the nineteenth century calling attention to the effect of human culture on the natural environment.[22] By the end of the century the causal role of the environment did come under increasing attack in Europe but the idea was supported much longer in American geography. Eventually, all three of these ideas were debated and reassessed in the course of the discipline's evolution and practice.

While the specific studies of special geography formed much of the foundation for a more sophisticated human and regional geography in Europe by the early twentieth century, it was the general, systematic geography (essentially as physical geography with the human element included) which found earlier acceptance in American academic circles during the latter nineteenth and early twentieth centuries.[23]

The Reestablishment of Geography in American Higher Education

The growth and development of American academic geography since its reestablishment in the later nineteenth century resulted from a complex set of factors. Broadly defined, these include: 1) changes in the purposes of higher education, its structure and organization; 2) historical

developments within the country and involvement in two world wars; 3) changes in the public's interest and perception of geography; and 4) changes in the predominant stream of intellectual thought and practices within the discipline. The significance of these factors has been more often discussed in the context of examining the discipline's success at producing majors and establishing strong graduate programs. While important aspects of geography, the principal emphasis here will be the effect such factors have had on the discipline's role and place in general education.

Institutions Offering Geography in the Later Nineteenth Century

Geography was slowly reestablished in the American college curriculum during the second half of the nineteenth century. The appointment of Arnold Guyot at Princeton in 1854 is generally accepted as the first of several key events during this period.[24] Other institutions which introduced or reinstated studies in geography before 1900 included Yale, 1863; California, 1870; Harvard and Northwestern, 1890; Cornell, Chicago, and Pennsylvania, 1892; Washington, 1895; Columbia, 1896; Montana, 1897; and South Carolina, 1989.[25] As was the case in the colonial colleges, geography's acceptance seems to have hinged on its ability to conform to normative views of what constituted scientific study. Charles Dryer pointed out that in nearly every instance the entering wedge for geography had been through the offices of geology.[26] This symbiotic relationship with geology and other natural sciences proved essential to geography's further expansion and influenced its focus of study until after the first world war.

The Focus of Geographic Thought and Practice: 1890-1920

Until the early twentieth century, geography was usually taught by geologists who had little or no training in geography. They treated the physical and biotic elements with skill but described the economic, social, and political processes as responses to the so-called geographical "factors," the physical environment. This approach was influenced by evolutionary concepts which had surfaced from the works of Darwin and Wallace but most especially from the writings of Herbert Spencer and his views on "Social Darwinism." The idea that human societies survived by adjusting to the demands of the physical environment formed the basis of thought for various interpretations of "environmental determinism."[27]

The need to establish geography as a scientific field was seen as preeminent by American geographers and they deemed this as most likely to succeed by adhering to the precepts of general geography, primarily physical geography. The predominance of general over special geography also brought more support from academic circles who eschewed the particularism of special geography.[28]

The most outstanding contribution to geography's growth in the later nineteenth and early twentieth centuries came from the efforts of William Morris Davis at Harvard. His views on geographic thought and practice were to have a profound effect on the discipline's role in both higher and secondary education. His work in meteorology and later in geology reinforced his conviction that primary emphasis in academic geography should be given to the physical elements and their related processes. Although Davis did recognize a need to provide balanced

treatment to both natural and cultural elements, his approach was to continue to regard the latter as response. Davis took a broad approach toward identifying general processes which had universal effects while his contemporary, Ellen Churthill Semple, tended to be more specific by directing her studies to particular kinds of habitats and their deterministic effects on human adaptation. The views of both were promulgated through their numerous publications. These views were also held by most of their colleagues at the time.[29]

The deterministic views which were so prevalent during this period were actually one form of what has been referred to as the "man-land" approach in geographic studies. A contrasting view, which also pursued environmental or "man-land" studies, emphasized the deleterious effects of human culture on the natural environment. This view was expressed by Somerville and other European geographers earlier in the nineteenth century but had gained publicity in this country from the writings of George Perkins Marsh.[30] His work and that of other conservationists received little attention from geographers, however, until after the first world war.

The general tendency to attribute human responses to deterministic effects would later be challenged and dismissed by geographers and non-geographers alike as unsound operationally and too narrow in approach. But for the period preceding the first world war, such views were apparently regarded as a rational extension of understanding physical processes. Few saw the irony in embracing deterministic views at the same time that massive exploitation and degradation of the nation's physical environment in the name of manifest destiny was taking place. Nevertheless, environmental determinism is closely associated with the

reinstatement of geography in the American college.

Contributing Support for Physical Geography and Demands for Diversification

Geography's close association with the physical and biological sciences, particularly geology, provided an ideal position for participating in the investigation and analysis of new discoveries resulting from scientific expeditions. Davis's emphasis on the importance of field studies and the explorations by John Wesley Powell and others in the western United States brought added attention to physical geography's potential as an academic field.[31] In an article describing the college unit in physical geography in 1909, Marbut explained some of the reasons for the rather late but growing interest in geography and its new opportunity to carry out scientific studies:

> Interest in a broader knowledge of the earth on which we live had been aroused by the published reports of the many scientific expeditions of the early and middle parts of the nineteenth century, particularly those of von Humboldt, Darwin, the Challenger and the Wilkes expeditions as well as the writing and teaching of the elder Agassiz and others of his associates. The interest and enthusiasm aroused was abundantly sufficient to have produced the most effective teaching of the subject had there been available a sufficient amount of material on which to base a course or series of courses in laboratory studies. This, however, was entirely lacking. The studies of the earth up to that time had resulted in description merely. . . . There was more or less an attempt to describe the unusual, the striking, occasional and marvelous rather than the usual, everyday, common conditions that occur everywhere.[32]

The concern for identifying general principles is explicit in Marbut's comments but public interest in the exploration and development of the western lands was also stimulating a utilitarian value in geography. As the country was beginning to realize success in the area of foreign trade and exploitation of its natural resources, an interest

in commercial and economic geography was creating demand for college training in business and commerce as well as for teaching in the public schools. Courses in commercial and economic geography were implemented before the turn of the centruy; but courses for the training of teachers in geography had a slower start. Regardless of the predominant and narrow views of the discipline, diversification had begun and would continue through the adaptability of the elective system in response to public demand.

Articulation with Secondary Schools

In spite of its elimination from the college curriculum in the early nineteenth century, special geography had been continuously taught in the secondary schools. But with the absence of geography in the colleges, teachers received little, if any, training. Consequently, geography was taught in the secondary schools by requiring rote memorization of an unrelated assortment of statistical facts. With the reintroduction of geography in higher education, there were some extensive efforts on the part of Guyot and others to improve the situation, but these efforts did not meet with lasting success.[33]

In 1893 a conference report on geography was issued which would have lasting effect on geography's role in both the secondary schools and colleges. The National Education Association (NEA) had appointed the Committee of Ten to study the content of pre-college programs and of college entrance requirements. Of nine different conferences organized by the Committee to consider specific fields of study, the conference on geography produced the most radical proposals. The nine member conference team was composed primarily of geologists and physical

geographers, one of whom was William Morris Davis.[34]

After the report, a major effort was launched to change geography in the secondary schools from emphasis on memory work to understanding of physical processes and their effects. Text books and teacher's manuals were produced. While the effort did reinforce physical geography at the college level, it had little effect in the secondary schools, primarily because the inadequately trained teachers were not able to understand the materials. Within ten years the entire effort was considered a failure and most geography in the secondary schools remained unchanged. Instruction in physical geography reverted to the memorization of text book definitions and by the early 1900's it was commonly described as a "dry, uninteresting subject" studied by a diminishing number of students.[35]

Aware of the problem, the discipline responded in 1909 with a committee report on secondary geography. Led by James Chamberlain, the committee included such prominent geographers as Mark Jefferson and P. B. Whitbeck. Read before the NEA convention of that year, the report dismissed as inappropriate the preeminence given to physical geography by the 1893 report and emphasized that more attention be given the human element in geography.[36] While the report demonstrated a major change of emphasis emerging within the discipline, it arrived too late to counter new developments which would adversely affect the role geography was to have in the secondary schools.

Many of the elements of physical geography subsequently were subsumed in a course of study which became known as general science and later as earth science. Since consideration of the distribution of physical and biotic characteristics was not included in this course,

geography continued to appear as a separate subject in some secondary schools. As the decade closed, however, geography came to be more and more closely identified with another new field, "social studies."

In 1916 yet another review of curricula in secondary schools revealed a change of view regarding the purpose of these schools. Now more concerned with educating students to become citizens in a democracy than with preparing them for college, the final report assigned geography along with history, civics, economics, and a theme called "problems of democracy" to the social studies. The report stressed that social studies courses should not be concerned with the disciplinary boundaries, but rather a sociological orientation unhampered by chronological or geographical limitations was to be followed in the study of problems which cut across subject matter fields.[37] As a single field in curriculum planning and teacher education, social studies was taught in most states by teachers who had received no geography in their preparation. Soon after World War I, subject matter specialists in most fields of the social sciences were asked their cooperation in strengthening the background of social studies teachers. Assistance came from most fields except geography. Of the leading geographers of the day who were asked to participate, all declined on the basis that geography was not a social study.[38]

The National Council of Geography Teachers, which later became the National Council for Geographic Education (NCGE), was organized in 1914 with the intention of focusing attention of professional geographers on teaching and teacher training. The organization quickly had enrolled three thousand members from twenty states by 1924. (Membership in 1980 was approximately 3,500.)[39] Dryer enthusiastically reported that the

influence of the NCGE contributed to an awakening of high school authroities to the idea that geography "may be made one of the most complex and far-reaching sciences, and that specially trained teachers are as much needed for it as for any other subject."[40] In spite of these efforts the discipline failed to articulate effectively with secondary education, and this failure subsequently had an indirect, yet major and detrimental, effect on geography's role in general education.[41]

Diversification and Further Expansion in Higher Education

The elective system (Chapter II) had revolutionized the structure and organization of higher education by the turn of the century. Its coincidence with a move toward mass education to serve the growing and diverse needs of the country had permitted vast proliferation of courses and specialization. Its timing was particularly ideal for the expanding sciences and the departmentalization of subject matter which made possible more emphasis on research and advances in a number of areas. Although geography remained wedded to geology departments for some time, there is evidence that its rate of growth and diversity in courses began to increase significantly during the first two decades of this century. Winstead found from a survey of universities in 1911 that important gains had occurred in both the number and types of geography courses offered (Table II).[42]

Winstead's study demonstrates the predominance of physical geography but some signs of expansion into other areas are also evident, especially economic geography and regional courses for teachers, and a few in conservation. In the second decade, enrollments were increasing

TABLE II

NAMES OF GEOGRAPHY COURSES OFFERED IN AMERICAN UNIVERSITIES 1910-1911

Course Names	Numbers of Universities Offering Course
Anthropology-geography	2
Commercial, Economical, and Industrial	10
Conservation of Natural Resources	3
Climatology	12
Fieldwork and Laboratory Practice	5
Geographic Influences; Man and His Environment	5
Glacial Geography	4
History of Geography	1
Historical Geography of American Cities	1
Introduction or General Geography	5
Map Study, Map Making, Relief Modeling, etc.	4
Meteorology	15
Oceanography	3
Physical Geography; Physiography	28
Political Geography	2
Principles of Geography	1
Regional Climatology	2
Regional Geography	13
Regional and Experimental Physiography	7
Research, Seminar, Problems, Thesis, etc.	9
Teachers Courses	10

Source: Huldah Winstead, "Geography in American Universities," The Journal of Geography 20 (April 1921), p. 315.

in both colleges and universities. A growing number of geography departments had established programs for majors and several universities were offering graduate degrees. In terms of enrollments, however, geography's largest role at most institutions was apparently the provision of electives or service courses for other majors. Whitbeck reported in 1921 that expansion into other subjects was partly delayed by a lack of suitable text books, especially in economic geography where there was only one American text and it was ten years old.[43] A study by Mathews and Little about the same time found that 170 of 571 institutions they surveyed offered courses in geography but very few offered sufficient course work to provide a specialization in geography. Geography was for the most part still a subdivision of some other department --usually geology.[44]

But the diversity of courses in both natural and social sciences broadened immensely by the mid-1920's. Dryer reported that this was particularly noticeable in the state universities. Commercial, economic, and industrial geography were doing well and the more strictly cultural values on the subject were receiving twice as much attention as the commercial. He observed that a majority of state universities which offered geography reported their date of introduction between 1900 and 1914. Moreover, while the first world war served to stimulate geography's growth in general, significant gains had been made at these institutions prior to the war.[45]

The role of geography as service courses also was gaining success in institutions which specialized in the training of teachers by the second decade. Dodge reported in the Teacher's College Record in 1914 that of 144 normal schools, geography was required in varying

amounts in 103.[46] Studies by Cooper in 1920 and Randolph in 1921 portrayed continued growth of geography in normal schools but that in nearly all cases geography courses were offered as electives.[47] Cooper also commented that the practice of normal schools was to have departments for nearly every subject and frequently these were comprised of only one faculty person. He expressed serious doubt whether many of these instructors had received training as geographers.[48]

In contrast to the normal schools and state universities, geography's expansion into privately endowed colleges and universities was much slower and even suffered some retrenchment after the first world war. This was especially the case for most of the Ivy group and approximately two dozen other outstanding liberal arts colleges.[49] However, Hutter did find in a survey as late as 1929 of 517 liberal arts colleges that more than half were offering courses that were strictly geography and about ten percent had separate departments in the dicipline. Both figures were noticeably higher when geology-geography combinations were considered. The leading courses in geography were economic, continental (regional), general, elementary, and physiography. In most instances, however, these courses served as electives or service courses to other majors.[50]

There is little direct mention in the literature of higher education or geography regarding the role or place of geography in the early years of the general education movement. In practice geography was offering courses in both the social and natural sciences which, by the late 1920's, probably satisfied distribution requirements at a number of institutions. Yet, in spite of its increasing diversity, non-geographers appear to have viewed geography's principal place in the

curriculum as among the natural sciences. Indication of this view was provided in a chapter-length discussion by the writer and philosopher, John Dewey. He called attention to the complementary nature of history and geography in their approaches to subject matter:

> The function of historical and geographical subject matter . . . is to enrich and liberate the more direct and personal contacts of life by furnishing their context, their background, and outlook. While geography emphasizes the physical side and history the social, these are only emphases in a common topic, namely, the associated life of men. . . . . . To 'learn geography' is to gain in power to perceive the spatial, the natural, connections of an ordinary act; to 'learn history' is essentially to gain in power to recognize its human connection.[51]

Dewey's comments regarding geography's emphasis on the physical environment were reflective of the period, but as a non-geographer, his perception of geography's role in understanding the associated life of humans through the spatial approach is especially noteworthy. This would be amplified later by others as the central and principal role of geography in general education, but in the meantime some important changes were occurring in the evolution of geographic thought and practice.

Interwar Changes in Geographic Thought and Practice

During the early 1920's, geography continued to expand its course offerings in the subject matter areas of natural science but the greatest rate of growth was occurring in the emerging social sciences. Commenting on this phenomena, Dryer suggested that the proper place of academic geography would probably "crystallize" around a view expressed by Adamson that:

> . . . geography had its own individuality, readily realizable if it be thought of as a great divide, shelving off on one

> side into nature study and science, and on the other into history and civilization.[52]

This division of subject matter became common practice in the organization and administration of curricula, but the changes occurring during this period went beyond institutionalization of geography's duality in the college curriculum. Accompanying this process was a major shift in focus of geographic thought and practice. The nomothetic-deductive approaches to geographic study were (at least temporarily) replaced by empirical studies seeking regional synthesis and description. This was essentially a shift from general to special geography as the predominant focus of the discipline. The changes occurring during this period can be summarized as follows:

1. increased emphasis on regional studies (more frequently as the study of areal units) as the unifying theme of geographic research and instruction;

2. general rejection of "deterministic" concepts which were replaced by chorographic and chorological studies of landscape phenomena;

3. a general move away from the natural sciences to a closer, although not exclusive, identity with the rapidly emerging social sciences;

4. more emphasis on applied geography in addition to academic studies; and

5. a general decline of geography's role in liberal arts institutions contrasted by broad expansion and growth in teachers colleges.

All of these developments were more or less interrelated as they reflected changes of emphasis in geographic thought and more active responses to the needs and interests of the public. Though these developments did not occur simultaneously, they did become characteristics of geography's role and place in higher education by the end of the period.

Efforts to Promote Unity and New Directions

Following the first world war, there was frequent discussion among leading geographers regarding two broad, but critical issues. One area of concern was to identify the central purpose of geographic studies which were becoming more broadly diversified. This concern was accompanied by a recognized need to de-emphasize or replace the attention given to environmental controls on human society. Efforts to resolve these issues brought fundamental changes in geographical research which ultimately transformed the discipline's role and place in the college curriculum.

In a presidential address to the Association of American Geographers in 1918, N. M. Fenneman identified and confronted some of the critical issues surrounding geography's role and place as a discipline in academic studies.[53] In the address, entitled "The Circumference of Geography," he presented a diagram expressing the manner in which geography overlapped with other fields of study. He then suggested, rhetorically, that geography could easily be taught by other sciences in the event of its demise as a discipline; but this would not happen, he said, because there would always be a need for a synthetic areal science. It did not matter that most concrete data were already organized into other sciences. It was the areal relation, after all, that made geography what it was.[54] He emphasized that sciences are not defined by their circumference but by their core. The common bond of geographers was their interest in places, areas, and regions. Fenneman did not wish to discourage geographers who had pursued specialized topics but cautioned that those who directed research or organized education should not lose sight of the core, which was regional geography.[55]

> This quasi-philosophical study of relationships is therefore important to those whose privilege it is to direct research or to organize education. If men in such positions decide with eyes open that physiography and commercial geography and anthropogeography and the rest should not be merely geology, economics, ethnography, etc., they must act accordingly. . . . The effective way is to set in the midst of them a great light, the light which comes alone from the comprehensive, rational, systematic study of regions.[56]

In a somewhat different approach to the problem of unifying geographical studies, Harlan Barrows proposed that emphasis should continue to be placed on the adjustments of humans to natural surroundings but in view of their choices (possibilism) rather than from physical causes. The scope of geographic studies should be focused narrowly on what he called "human ecology." This, he said, would also solve the problem of geography's tendency to overlap into so many other fields of specialization. He was prepared to relinquish such specialities as geomorphology, climatology, and biogeography and place more emphasis on an explanatory treatment in orderly sequence of human relationships to their natural environment.[57] Barrows and his followers were able to provide new meaning to the man-land approach which had dominated American geography, but his concept of human ecology was still too restrictive to make it the guiding theme for the discipline. Among its shortcomings was the serious omission of attention to human interactions and their spatial relationships.[58]

The replacement of the narrowly-defined, man-land approach as the central focus of the discipline was to come from the regional synthesis of chorological studies. During and following the war, courses in regional or area studies had become popular and geographers were devoting increasing attention to regional investigations. Derwent Whittlesey attributed much of this new preoccupation with regions to

the war-time experience of young geographers who also comprised the first considerable group trained in American universities as geographers rather than as geologists. They had also become more informed, he said, of the progress European geographers had made in regional geography since the turn of the century.[59]

Areal Differentiation and Landscape Morphology

Shortly after Barrows's call for human ecology, Carl Sauer's "Morphology of Landscape" was published.[60] Sauer noted the work of contemporary geographers in Europe (Vidal de la Blache in France, Hettner, Siegfried Passarge, and Norbert Krebs in Germany) who were giving increasing attention to the "classical tradition of geography as chorologic relation."[61] He stated that the objective of geography now was "conceived as the establishment of a critical system which embraces the phenomenology of landscape, in order to grasp in all its meaning and color the varied terrestrial scene."[62]

Sauer berated the use of deterministic approaches in geographic studies as unsound operationally since they too often led to preconceived or predetermined outcomes.[63] He further contrasted his approach with that of Barrows's.

> Since we waive the claims for the measurement of environmental influences, we may use, in preference to ecology, the term morphology to apply to cultural study, since it describes perfectly the method. . . .
> . . . In the universal, but not necessarily cosmologic sense, geography then becomes that part of the latest or human chapter in earth history which is concerned with the differentiation of the areal scene by man.[64]

The effect of Sauer's influence on the discipline was a predilection by most geographers to avoid any set of a "a priori principles" and to concentrate on developing systematic survey methods for

empirical-inductive descriptions of regional synthesis. This was an important switch in the approach to geographical studies in that the researcher now attempted to find meaning in the results after the information was assembled.

> All science may be regarded as phenomenology, the term 'science' being used in the sense of organized process of acquiring knowledge rather than in the common restricted meaning of a unified body of physical law.[65]

Beginning with this view of science, the objective in geographic research became chorological in which most proponents began to advocate a need to go beyond the description of regions (chorographical) to a search for explanations. Two major directions were taken in this pursuit. The first, under Sauer's leadership (the Berkeley School), was a genetic approach which studied the processes of change acting through time on an area. Out of this came historical geography and the offshoot of "sequent occupance" studies. The second approach (the Midwestern School), through the efforts of Robert Platt, Preston James, and Hartshorne, sought explanations regarding the functional organization of space.[66]

During the 1930's the discipline became increasingly involved with applied studies, often in relatively small areas, in which both forms of the regional approach were incorporated. This trend continued into the 1940's and was complemented by regional studies of larger areas. Evidence of the growing emphasis on regional studies, along with other changes occurring in geography during this period, was becoming observable in course offerings at different institution types as early as the late 1920's. The paramount effect of some of these changes on geography's role and place in higher education, however, was to become more noticeable by the early 1940's and postwar period.

A Landmark Survey in Geography Course Offerings at Different Institution Types

A college catalog study by Shrode for the 1927-28 academic year revealed that a number of trends were developing in the role and place of geography courses in academic studies.[67] Of the 398 institutions she randomly selected, 322 were senior liberal arts colleges and universities, 62 were normal schools or teachers colleges, and 14 were junior colleges. Only twenty percent of these institutions offered no courses in geography. Where geography was offered, it was listed under sixty different catalog headings or departments, some under more than one department. In many instances the close association of geography with geology and economics made it difficult to clearly identify geography courses. She was able, however, to group courses under twelve headings, representing various phases of geography on the basis of content studies (Table III). Under these twelve headings, she identified 339 different course titles represented by 1,380 courses.[68]

Of the total number of institutions which offered geography (319), the average number of courses was 4.3 but by omitting 267 courses which would normally be considered geology, the average was 3.5 courses in geography. While she did not identify the number of institutions which offered a major in geography, it seems rather clear that geography's role was predominantly one of providing electives or as a service function to other major areas of study. She did note that geography's role in the teacher-training schools was greater than it was in the liberal arts colleges and that there was a tendency in teacher training courses to stress the geography of the home state or region.[69]

TABLE III

GEOGRAPHY COURSES IN COLLEGES AND UNIVERSITIES
FOR THE 1927-28 ACADEMIC YEAR

Course Content Area	Number of Course Titles in Content Area	Number of Courses
Geology and Physiography	38	406
Economic and Commercial Geography	63	272
Regional Geography	68	234
Teaching of Geography	58	128
General Geography	14	97
Human Geography	18	61
Weather and Climate	14	58
Historical and Political Geography	27	53
Research Courses and Seminars	16	27
Cartography and Mathematical Geography	11	22
Field Geography	6	15
Miscellaneous	6	7
TOTAL	339	1,380

Source: Ida May Shrode, "A Catalog Study of Geography in Educational Institutions above High School," The Journal of Geography 28 (May 1929), pp. 189-201.

In summarizing her findings, she called attention to the increased emphasis geography was giving to the social science aspects of its studies:

> Although many courses are organized around physiographic content, there is a pronounced tendency to give the subject its application and social significance as evidenced by the wide variety of courses in economic, in historical and political, and human geography.[70]

She warned that there may be a danger of excessive overlapping of

geography courses with work in other fields but that this was also a positive sign of geography's ability to add meaning to other subjects.

> But this variety is proof also of the wealth of geographic material which makes such dispersion possible, and is suggestive of the role geography plays in contributing to an understanding of their subjects.[71]

Shrode's findings provide evidence of the growing interest in regional studies and the changing emphasis of the discipline toward becoming identified as a social science. The date of her study is significant in that it serves as a baseline from which the effects of later changes in geography's role and place in general education can be assessed.

Shrode's study identified a growing interest in courses for teachers of geography as well as an emphasis on regional studies at the local and state scale. This trend became more evident in the following two decades and reflected both the interests of the public and the research endeavors of the discipline. By the 1930's and 1940's, the number of teachers colleges had grown substantially as many normal schools evolved from the provision of two or three years training into four-year degree programs. Just as state universities had been established to serve the needs of their constituent populations, the normal schools and teachers colleges were located to serve areas within a state. Because of their specialized mission in the training of teachers, the role of geography had become well established in these schools, although most frequently as electives or service courses to majors in education, or other fields.

In a survey of these schools in 1933, Cunningham found that 92 percent offered courses in geography and 61 percent had separate departments.[72] A follow-up study ten years later by Belotti et al.

found that some important changes had occurred in geography's role at these institutions. The average number of geography courses had increased from eight in 1933 to ten in 1943. Courses in fundamentals or methods of geography and in physical geography had decreased in number. Now the courses most strongly represented were those in principles of geography and economic geography, and a substantial increase was observed in the number of continental or regional courses. The changes were attributed to a need to understand the war and to prepare for peace, and in response to demands for more geography from history teachers, experts in the social studies field, and prominent educators.[73]

The pattern in the teachers colleges was in stark contrast to the discipline's fate in many liberal arts institutions. The contrasts accentuated differences in the perceived roles of these two types of institutions. Warntz noted that geography had always been more acceptable to the liberal arts colleges when the emphasis was on general geography, but that efforts to emphasize special or regional studies had been looked upon with disfavor. He further observed that this current shift toward special or regional geography was unlike the first cycle which occurred in the early nineteenth century colleges. Then the shift had led to geography's total removal from higher education. In this cycle a similar shift led not to geography's disappearance but rather to its reorientation to special circumstances, and indeed its growth numerically.[74]

> It is within the organization of regionally focused higher education that a 'practical' geography based on regional ideas came to prosper. With it came the strong correlation between the kind of role a college plays in the nation's education and the position of and facilities available for geographic instruction and research there.[75]

The regionally focused role of higher education (in four-year schools) reached its zenith with the teachers colleges and to a lesser extent with the state universities. The role of geography in teachers colleges was to continue to be important as many of these schools became comprehensive colleges and state universities in the 1960's and 1970's. In the liberal arts institutions, however, geography's role had weakened and would be further reduced during the 1950's.

The General Education Context of Geography

As a movement, we have seen that general education reached a climax sometime between the end of World War II and the late 1950's. During this period geography's role in general education became principally associated with the regional approach. The most typical definitions offered by geographers characterized the regional approach as areal differentiation and/or the descriptive synthesis of regional units. This was perhaps best illustrated by the definition Hartshorne offered to the editors of the American College Dictionary during the mid-1950's. Geography was defined as

> . . . the study of the areal differentiation of the earth surface, as shown in the character, arrangement, and interrelations over the earth of elements such as climate, relief, soil, vegetation, population, land use, industries, or states, and of the unit areas formed by the complex of these individual elements.[76]

The general education role geographers ascribed to geography tended to be broad and comprehensive and exemplified the aspirations of many proponents of regional or areal studies. Leading geographers of the day were inclined toward references to geography's role as a synthesizer among disparate areas of subject matter. Moreover, they saw geography as the ideal vehicle for meeting many of the goals and

purposes which were being identified in numerous studies and reports on general education.

The continuation of geography's role in providing courses in both the natural sciences and social sciences in this light does not appear to have been viewed as a problem, especially as general education. Commenting on this phenomenon, Picó suggested that ". . . perhaps geography's greatest contribution to an era of extreme specialization is its ability to provide a much needed link between the modern physical and social sciences."[77] Wilson viewed the use of area studies during the war as a realistic means for attacking the problem of departmentalization of knowledge:

> The synthesis of landscape lends itself to the current attempts to instill unity in liberal arts education . . . geography is peculiarly adapted to coordinate the social sciences and to serve as a bridge between the social sciences and science.[78]

Fred Schaefer called for the continued use of area studies as general education to instill an understanding for the changing relationships among nations.[79] Similarly, Bengtson noted that because other areas of study were largely systematic in approach, geography's contribution was to assist students in understanding the regional concept and the interrelations among different regions.[80]

> As a field of thoughtful knowledge geography emphasizes the interrelationships of environmental factors and the interdependence of regions and of nations. In any program of general education, whether presented singly or in cooperation with related disciplines it is a fundamental subject and provides the golden thread of integration.[81]

Geography's Role in Curriculum Models of General Education

Throughout the general education movement, various curricular

models had been implemented to serve the goals and purposes of general education. There appears to be some question as to what extent geography was included in any of the alternate models to the more prevalent practice of concentration-distribution. Bengtson reported in 1948, that from the beginning of the general education movement, geography had most often served general education through the concentration-distribution form of curricular organization.[82] He found from an investigation of thirty "highly-rated" colleges, supplemented by a detailed study of forty-six others, that geography courses were accepted in both the social and natural science groups as general education.

> In virtually all the major colleges and universities, particularly in liberal arts, business administration, and teachers colleges of the larger universities, geography is considered to be a vital element in general education whether the plan followed be that of separate courses in the several subjects, the survey courses of related departments, or the closely integrated programs now (1948) apparently winning favor.[83]

Bengtson also noted that those colleges which gave the earliest attention to special programs in general education (for example, Columbia, Chicago, and Southern Methodist Universities) did not include geography, but those more recently revising their general education (in the mid-1940's) appeared to be giving preeminence to geography, as exemplified by Colgate, Northwestern, and Iowa State.[84]

As part of an intensive study of geography's potential role in general education, Terry found little evidence in 1955 that geography was included in those institutions (for example, Chicago, Columbia, Bennington, and Sarah Lawrence) which had implemented alternate models to the more commonly found organization of general education as distribution requirements.

Geography as General Education at Mid-Century

While a number of strong geography departments had become established nationwide in colleges and universities, by 1950 the principal role of geography for most institutions was to offer service courses as electives and general education. Ironically, at some of the more prestigious institutions such as Chicago, where geography was well established as an outstanding graduate department, there appears to have been little effort given to fulfilling geography's general education role. Its role in many liberal arts colleges continued to decline in contrast to its strengthening position in state universities and teachers colleges. Nevertheless, from the standpoint of total college enrollments, the overall effect of geography courses was apparently minimal. Wheeler reported in an address to the fiftieth anniversary of Chicago's Department of Geography (1955) that geography's role in general education had never been more than slight.[86] A New York Times study that same year disclosed that fewer than five percent of all college students enrolled in even one geography course.[87]

Controversies and Changes in Geographic Thought and Practices Following Mid-Century

During the 1950's, the discipline reached another turning point in methodology and practice which, in terms of impact, rivaled similar shifts in focus of earlier periods. Efforts to implement changes were initiated by geographers who were concerned with: 1) the poor status of geography in academic circles; 2) failures of the regional approach to fulfill requisites of scientific inquiry; and, 3) the lack of nomothetic studies which were capable of universal explanations and

prediction. Efforts to make changes were met with strong resistance from traditionalists in the discipline who countered with their own arguments regarding methodology and purpose in geography. It seemed clear that geography's role and status in academic circles was diminishing. In discussing some of the events which precipitated changes during the late 1950's and early 1960's, Peter Gould said:

> . . . these . . . were the days when universities like Harvard Yale, and Stanford threw geography out on its ear, and many older and major universities, with proper intellectual standards, refused to invite it in.[88]

The regional approach came under increasing attack for its alleged inadequacies. Critics argued that the ultimate objective of a synthesis or composite picture of an area never ever seemed to get developed and that the idiographic approach to geographical studies was too unique. They further argued against the predominance of "areal differentiation" which had become the catholic definition of geography after Hettner, Hartshorne, James, and others. Edward Ullman noted that it did have great value as a sub-concept and was justified for the area approach but that he could not accept areal differentiation as a short definition of geography for outsiders because it implied "that we are not seeking principles or generalizations or similarities, the goal of all science."[89] The regional concept was also attacked for its failure to establish relationships with other disciplines. In place of regional studies, the focus of geographic research began to shift to an analysis of spatial organization and the processes responsible for dynamic patterns of phenomena which occurred over space. There was increasing concern for situational relationships and less with the site specific.[90] Taaffe identified three changes during this period:

1. the quantitative change consisting of the use of statistical and mathematical methods in research;

2. the theoretical change consisting of an emphasis on the use of theory for the generation of hypotheses in a positive framework; and,

3. the definitional change consisting of a more explicit emphasis on the spatial components of each geographical study.[91]

A renewed emphasis in the development of theory from which laws could be deduced brought attention to older works which had previously received only slight notice in American geography. They included von Thunen's model of "land rent" and patterns of concentric zones, and Christaller's "central place theory." Quantitative methods using statistical techniques for sampling and testing hypotheses (which many other disciplines had incorporated a decade or more earlier) were applied to geographical studies at some universities by the late 1950's.[92] There was much borrowing from developments in other disciplines, especially economics, in theory formulation and quantitative methods of research. There was also much trial and error in the use of these approaches during the early 1960's, and many of the studies were dismissed by traditionalists as trivial in nature. Nonetheless, major contributions in geography did emerge from these efforts, albeit, with much early difficulty in gaining acceptance or publication. One of the quintessential contributions which typified the difficulties in gaining publication and acceptance was William Bunge's Theoretical Geography.[93] Drawing on the work of Schaefer at Iowa[94] and working under the influence of Ullman, William Garrison and others at the University of Washington, he discussed the question of predictability in scientific study:

> The question of predictability is crucial since it is the basic assumption of all theory. The predictability of geographic phenomena depends in turn on the answer to a question: Are geographic phenomena unique or general? If they are unique, they are not predictable and theory cannot be constructed. If they are general, they are predictable and theory can be constructed. The clarification of the issue may be drawn from science. Science assumes phenomena to be general, not unique. Whether a phenomena is unique or general can be considered to be a matter of point of view or of the inherent property of the phenomena itself.[95]

The pressing concern for geography to once again be identified among the sciences became a central theme among proponents of the spatial approach, as was procedurally demonstrated in their research methodologies. In view of the historical context, the focus of geography moved from a period in which special geography had dominated to a new period of general geography.

Diversification and the Effects of Universalization in Higher Education

The changes occurring within the discipline during the 1960's and 1970's coincided with broader developments in higher education (Chapter II). The effects of universalization of higher education including increased student enrollments, increased financial assistance from the federal government, a trend toward decentralized control in administration, and a relaxation in general education requirements, all contributed to a climate of growth and new opportunities for specialization for many geography departments. During this period the changes associated with the spatial approach became the mainstream of thought and practice in the discipline. Implementation of the spatial approach was perhaps best exemplified by what Peter Haggett referred to as the "location school" with research contributions in urban, economic,

and transportation geography.[96]

Developments related to the spatial approach enabled more interaction with other disciplines as well as renewed emphasis in some of the more traditional areas of geography. For example, growing public concern over environmental problems brought a resurgence of studies in the man-land approach.[97] Although the region was no longer the major focus of study, regional studies of more carefully selected phenomena and their areal associations became more important, and rigorous in approach. Areal differentiation remained an important concept in the study of phenomena and their occurances over space but the principal focus was now on the analysis of dynamic patterns and the spatial processes which caused their variation.[98] Use of the computer enabled storage and manipulation of massive amounts of information and more extensive use of both descriptive and inferential statistics. The effect of these developments transcended research into diverse areas of instruction, including the content of text books and the structure of courses.

The Effect of Changes and Diversity on Geography's Role in General Education

It appears that disenchantment with the regional approach during the 1950's and early 1960's was amplified by the general erosion of support for general education which began about the same time. Although general education requirements were reduced and made more flexible during the later 1960's and early 1970's, many geography departments appear to have regarded this as a mixed blessing. Large sections of introductory courses were usually considered as necessary to generate

majors and support advanced courses and research, but the relatively low level of academic abilities or inadequate background of these students often precluded the assignment of challenging learning activities.[99] At first, some introductory courses attempted to utilize new text books which incorporated some of the ideas and methods resulting from spatial analysis research but these were usually found to be too difficult and were not well received.[100] Introductory courses developed to meet general education criteria were topical in approach, and less abstract and theoretical texts were generally received more enthusiastically by students.[101]

The changes and diversity which characterized the 1960's and 1970's represented the culmination of three centuries of evolution in academic geography. By the 1970's, geography's role in general education was met principally through course offerings at the introductory level which served distribution requirements in both the natural and social sciences. The predominant area was in the social sciences where both topical and regional courses were offered but there was no concensus within the discipline as to which approaches best served this role. Views and practices varied among the philosophies and interests of geography departments, the institutional settings where geography was offered, and even among geographers in the same department. Although enrollments continued to increase there was no real change relative to other disciplines' enrollments since the 1950's and the public survey polls citing geographic illiteracy among college students remained unchanged.[102]

Between the later 1960's and early 1970's, members of the discipline engaged in several efforts to provide guidelines and clarification

regarding geography's role in general education. Their undertakings sought to identify the goals and purposes of general education which geography was best suited to serve. Some of their contributions were through the aegis of the Association of American Geographers in the form of special reports while others resulted from individual publications.[103] Their combined efforts reflected the diverse views and opinions which had emerged in the discipline. The contrasts in these views and the varied approaches found in course offerings are the subject of the next chapter. The subject is examined with a view toward the adaptability of the discipline to the particular situation of different institutional settings and within the context of critical issues which have been identified by general education proponents.

FOOTNOTES

[1]William Warntz, Geography Now and Then (New York, 1964), pp. 100-102.

[2]Figures for both years include both two- and four-year institutions. J. R. Schwendeman, Directory of College Geography of the United States, Vol. VII (New York, 1956), p. 1; and J. R. Schwendeman, Sr. and J. R. Schwendeman, Jr., Directory of College Geography of the United States, Vol. XXI (Richmond, Kentucky, 1980), p. 2.

[3]This figure is only an estimate derived from the expressed opinion of numerous geographers and the relatively large number of institutions reported by Schwendeman's Directory as offering only one to three courses. Wilfred Black, "Do College Students Know Their Geography?" The Social Studies 62 (January 1971), pp. 16-20; and Benjamin Fine, "Geography Almost Ignored in Colleges, Surveys Show," The Journal of Geography 50 (April 1951), p. 165.

[4]Warntz, Now and Then, p. 103.

[5]Ibid., p. 11.

[6]Ibid., p. 109.

[7]J. N. L. Baker, "The Geography of Bernhard Varenius," in J. N. L. Baker, The History of Geography: The Collected Papers of J. N. L. Baker (New York, 1963), p. 109; and Preston James, "On the Origin and Persistence of Error in Geography," Annals of the Association of American Geographers 57 (1967), p. 20.

[8]Warntz, Now and Then, pp. 115-116.

[9]Ibid., p. 10.

[10]Preston James, "Continuity and Change in American Geographic Thought," Problems and Trends in American Geography, ed. Saul B. Cohen (New York, 1967), p. 6.

[11]Warntz, Now and Then, pp. 28-29.

[12]Ibid., p. 56.

[13]Ibid., p. 103.

[14]Robert E. Dickinson, The Makers of Modern Geography (New York, 1969), p. 11.

[15]Richard Hartshorne, Perspective on the Nature of Geography (Chicago, 1959), p. 109.

[16]Ibid.

[17]Ibid.

[18]Dickinson, Modern Geography, p. 83.

[19]E. A. Wrigley, "Changes in the Philosophy of Geography," in Richard J. Chorley and Peter Haggett (eds.), Frontiers in Geographical Teaching (London, 1965), pp. 3-7.

[20]Ibid.

[21]Hartshorne, Perspective, pp. 43, 48, 62.

[22]Clarence J. Glacken, "Count Buffon on Cultural Changes of the Physical Environment," Annals of the Association of American Geographers 50 (March 1960), pp. 2-3; and J. N. L. Baker, "Mary Somerville and Geography in England," in J. N. L. Baker, The History of Geography: The Collected Works of J. N. L. Baker (New York, 1963), pp. 207-222.

[23]John Leighly, "What Has Happened to Physical Geography?" Annals of the Association of American Geographers 45 (December 1955), p. 312.

[24]Warntz, Now and Then, p. 143.

[25]Rafael Picó, "Geography in American Universities," The Journal of Geography 40 (November 1941), p. 293.

[26]Charles Redway Dryer, "A Century of Geographic Education in the United States," Annals of the Association of American Geographers 14 (December 1924), p. 147.

[27]D. R. Stoddart, "Darwin's Impact on Geography," Annals of the Association of American Geographers 56 (December 1966), pp. 683-698; and Jergen Herbst, "Social Darwinism and the History of American Geography," Proceedings of the American Philosophical Society 105, 6 (1961), p. 543.

[28]W. M. Davis, "The Progress of Geography in the United States," Annals of the Association of American Geographers 14 (December 1924), pp. 195, 210.

[29]T. W. Freeman, A Hundred Years of Geography (Chicago, 1962), pp. 74-82.

[30]Preston E. James, All Possible Worlds (New York, 1972), pp. 194-196.

[31]Ibid., pp. 303-310.

[32]C. F. Marbut, "The College Unit in Physical Geography," The Journal of Geography 7 (May 1909), p. 193.

[33]James, Worlds, p. 358.

[34]National Education Association, Report of the Committee of Ten on Secondary School Studies (New York, 1894), pp. 32-33.

[35]N. M. Fenneman, "Problems in the Teaching of Physical Geography in the Secondary Schools," The Journal of Geography 7 (March 1909), pp. 146-148.

[36]James F. Chamberlain, "Report of the Committee on Secondary School Geography," The Journal of Geography 8 (September 1909), pp. 1-9.

[37]Preston E. James, "The Significance of Geography in American Education," The Journal of Geography 68 (November 1969), pp. 476-480.

[38]Ibid., pp. 481-482.

[39]Dryer, "A Century of Geographic Education," p. 141.

[40]Ibid.

[41]Clyde F. Kohn, "Geography in American High Schools," in Richard J. Chorley and Peter Haggett (eds.), Frontiers in Geographical Teaching (London, 1965), p. 298. Despite subsequent efforts by various educational groups and geographers (e.g., the High School Geography Project in the early 1970's), there is little evidence to support any claims for improvement in the situation. Reasons for failure are numerous; but the diminishing role of geography in secondary education has indirectly limited potential enrollments in college geography.

[42]Huldah Winstead, "Geography in American Universities," The Journal of Geography 10 (June 1912), pp. 309-316.

[43]R. H. Whitbeck, "Thirty Years of Geography in the United States," The Journal of Geography 20 (April 1921), pp. 121-128.

[44]Dryer, "A Century of Geographic Education," p. 143.

[45]Ibid., pp. 143-144.

[46]Whitbeck, "Thirty Years," p. 127.

[47]Dryer, "A Century of Geographic Education," pp. 141-142.

[48]Clyde E. Cooper, "Status of Geography in Normal Schools of the Far West," The Journal of Geography 18 (October 1919), pp. 300-305; Idem, "Status of Geography in Normal Schools of the Middle States," The Journal of Geography 19 (September 1920), pp. 211-222; and Idem, "Status of Geography in Normal Schools of the Eastern States," The Journal of Geography 20 (September 1921), pp. 217-224.

[49]Warntz, Now and Then, pp. 152-153.

[50]Harry K. Hutter, "The Status of Geography in the Liberal Arts Colleges of the United States," The Teaching of Geography, 32nd Yearbook of the National Society for the Study of Education (Bloomington, 1933), pp. 556-559.

[51]John Dewey, "The Significance of Geography and History," Democracy and Education (New York, 1915), pp. 246-247.

[52]Dryer, "A Century of Geographic Education," p. 147.

[53]Nevin M. Fenneman, "The Circumference of Geography," Annals of the Association of American Geographers 9 (December 1919), pp. 3-11.

[54]Ibid., p. 6.

[55]Ibid., p. 11.

[56]Ibid.

[57]Harland H. Barrows, "Geography as Human Ecology," Annals of the Association of American Geographers 13 (March 1923), pp. 1-4.

[58]William Warntz, "Geography at Mid-Twentieth Century," World Politics 11 (April 1959), pp. 442-454.

[59]Derwent Whittlesey, "The Regional Concept and the Regional Method," American Geography, Inventory and Prospect, Association of American Geographers (New York, 1954), p. 25.

[60]Carl O. Sauer, "The Morphology of Landscape," Land and Life, A Selection from the Writings of Carl Ortwin Sauer (Berkeley, 1925; reprint, Berkeley, 1965), pp. 19-53.

[61]Ibid., p. 320.

[62]Ibid.

[63]Ibid., pp. 347-349; and Idem, "The Survey Method in Geography and Its Objectives," Annals of the Association of American Geographers 14 (March 1924), pp. 18-22.

[64]Sauer, "Morphology," pp. 333, 342.

[65]Ibid., pp. 315-316.

[66]James, Worlds, pp. 398-409; and Charles C. Colby, "Changing Currents of Geographic Thought in America," Annals of the Association of American Geographers 26 (March 1936), pp. 1-37.

[67]Ida May Shrode, "A Catalog Study of Geography in Educational Institutions Above the High School," The Journal of Geography 28 (May 1929), pp. 189-201.

[68]Ibid., pp. 190-192.

[69]Ibid., pp. 193, 197.

[70]Ibid., p. 201.

[71]Ibid., p. 196.

[72]Floyd F. Cunningham, "The Present Status of Geography in Teacher Training Institutions," The Teaching of Geography, 32nd Yearbook of the National Society for the Study of Education (Bloomington, 1933), pp. 546-551.

[73]Helen Bellotti, Betty C. Wirk, and Elizabeth Menk, "Changes in the Geography Taught in Teacher Education Institutions," The Journal of Geography 44 (September 1945), pp. 246-251.

[74]Warntz, Now and Then, p. 149.

[75]Ibid., p. 150.

[76]Hartshorne, Perspective, p. 14.

[77]Picó, "American Universities," p. 300.

[78]Leornard S. Wilson, "The Position of Regional Geography in Current Liberal Arts Education," in National Council of Geography Teachers, Geography in Undergraduate College Curricula, Professional Paper No. 8 (April 1948), p. 26.

[79]Fred K. Schaefer, "Area Study and General Education," The School Review 53 (February 1945), pp. 90-95.

[80]Nels A. Bengtson, "Geography as an Element in General Education," in National Council of Geography Teachers, Geography in Undergraduate College Curricula, Professional Paper No. 8 (April 1948), p. 13.

[81]Ibid.

[82]Nels A. Bengtson, "Geography as General Education," The Journal of Geography 47 (April 1948), pp. 121-122.

[83]Ibid., p. 125.

[84]Ibid., p. 130.

[85]Joseph E. Terry, "Geography in General Eduvation: Its Contribution in the Undergraduate General Education Programs of Selected American Colleges and Universities," (unpub. doctoral dissertation, University of Denver, 1957), pp. 60, 136, 161.

[86]Albert W. Brown, "The Role of Introductory Geography Courses in College Curricula," The Journal of Geography 60 (October 1961), p. 322.

[87]Benjamin Fine, "U.S. College Students 'Flunk' in Knowledge of Geography," The Journal of Geography 50 (November 1951), pp. 334-341.

[88]Peter Gould, "Geography 1957-1977: The Augean Period," Annals of the Association of American Geographers 69 (March 1979), p. 141.

[89]Edward L. Ullman, "Human Geography and Area Research," Annals of the Association of American Geographers 43 (March 1953), p. 60.

[90]Report of the Ad Hoc Committee on Geography, Earth Sciences Division, The Science of Geography (Washington, D.C., 1965), pp. 1-2, 8-11.

[91]Edward J. Taaffe, "Geography of the Sixties in the Chicago Area," Annals of the Association of American Geographers 69 (March 1979), p. 133.

[92]Ibid., pp. 134-138.

[93]William Bunge, Theoretical Geography, Lund Studies in Geography, Series C (Lund, Sweden, 1962; revised, 1966).

[94]Fred K. Schaefer, "Exceptionalism in Geography," Annals of the Association of American Geographers 43 (September 1953), pp. 226-249.

[95]Bunge, Theoretical Geography, p. 7.

[96]Peter Haggett, Locational Analysis in Human Geography (London, 1965), p. 10.

[97]Ian Burton and Robert W. Kates, "The Perception of Natural Hazards in Resource Management," Natural Resources Journal 3 (January 1964), pp. 412-441.

[98]Jan O. M. Broek et al., The Study and Teaching of Geography (Columbus, Ohio, 1980), pp. 16-17.

[99]Gould, "Geography 1957-1977," pp. 149-151.

[100]Ibid.

[101]Ibid.

[102]Neal R. Peirce, "America: Land of the Ignorant," Tulsa (Okla.) World, (14 January 1979).

[103]Association of American Geographers, Geography in Undergraduate Liberal Education (Washington, D.C., 1965).

CHAPTER IV

THE GOALS AND PURPOSES OF GENERAL EDUCATION: GEOGRAPHY'S ROLE

In 1965 the Association of American Geographers published a report entitled Geography in Undergraduate Liberal Education, prepared by a team comprised of well-known geographers.[1] Major parts of the report dealt with the fundamental unity of knowledge, approaches toward its organization and study, and objectives geography should seek in the areas of values, content information and skills. The individual sections represented the range of views found within the discipline.

The report asserted that a primary objective in general education was an appreciation of the fundamental unity of knowledge. An essential component of this unity is the geographic approach.[2] As a basis for discussing geography's place in the study of knowledge, Hartshorne's interpretation of Emanual Kant's approaches to knowledge and its organization was used.[3] The three basic approaches Kant suggested in his lectures are:

1. The systematic approach (used primarily by the natural and social sciences), defined largely in terms of the types of objects studied and of the processes that affect them;

2. The chronological approach (used primarily by history), concerned with the differentiations of the historical record and the nature of change through time; and,

3. The chorological approach (used primarily by geography), focused upon distributions and association of terrestrial phenomena in the world as a whole and in particular places

> and upon the interrelationship and interaction of these particular places.[4]

The concepts and objectives of systematic sciences are included in the time and space studies of approaches two and three. Within this framework, interconnections of diverse elements and processes are emphasized.[5]

The report stated that the values geography provides to a liberal education include the following:

1. It exhibits the causal interrelations of physical, biotic and human phenomena, and shows how these can serve as clues to the origin and function of socio-economic and political processes.

2. It stimulates the observation of pattern, especially regularity in the occurrence of landscape phenomena.

3. It provides the key to understanding the importance of place in human affairs, in historical as well as in contemporary perspective, so that the student sees the present world in context.

4. It cultivates a sense of value relative to man's stewardship of the earth.

5. It fosters the appreciation of differences and similarities from place to place; the geographer views the world as both richer and more significantly complex because it is diverse.

6. It involves the student directly in the study of the real world (through map and photo interpretation and field work) and encourages him continually to test abstraction against experience.[6]

Geography facilitates liberal education primarily through its emphasis on understanding the interrelationships among phenomena in space. Moreover, if the student is not provided this "spatial awareness," the liberal education cannot be complete.[7] On the other hand, in order for geography to contribute to liberal education, it should be concerned with broad understanding--and providing the student with a conceptual framework within which facts and theories from other

disciplines can be appraised.[8]

Objectives for General Education

In a discussion of the relationship between geography and general education, the report stated that objectives for all general education geography courses should provide:

1. An understanding of spatial distributions and associations, and of area interrelationships.
2. An understanding of the importance of time.
3. A recognition that the world is subject to continual transformation.
4. An awareness of man's relations with his physical environment.[9]

These are encouragingly broad and demonstrate a preference for wide range of learning over the narrower specialty training.

A more specific list of criteria for objectives in general education geography courses was established by a Report of the Geography Advisory Panel to the Statewide Social Sciences Study Committee on Improving the Education of Teachers of Geography. This report for the California State Department of Education was concerned with geography in both high school and college and stated that students should acquire an understanding of such matters as:

1. the content of the world, systematized into meaningful categories and patterns;
2. the concept of environment: its physical, biotic and cultural elements;
3. the diversity and distribution of environments as spatial arrangements, over the earth's surface;
4. ecologic processes that tend to increase productivity or that tend toward deterioration of environment;

5. cultural processes of invention, diffusion, culture diversification or cultural convergence in man's perception and use of space.[10]

Such objectives help delineate the subject matter in general education geography courses. Within this realm there must be decisions as to what the relationship should be between the amount and type of content information and the type and use of intellectual skills. These decisions should take into consideration such factors as the students' stage of learning development, background and abilities, structure and makeup on the enrollment, duration of the course, and other extraneous constraints including resource materials, equipment, class size, and learning environment. The orientation of geography departments, their position within the curriculum of the institution and the professional training of the instructor are other relevant considerations. The issues and problems (both real and perceived) of such matters as they pertain to geography's role in general education will be the concern of this chapter.

Information and Skills

Geographers usually interpret the assertion that college students are geographically illiterate differently than does the public in general. The term "geographic illiteracy" is used by the public to imply ignorance of place name locations, lengths of the longest rivers, capitals of states, and who produces the second largest number of bamboo chairs, while geographers attach little importance to such information. They are quick to agree that a certain minimal factual knowledge is necessary, but that emphasis should be on important ideas, relationships and disciplined reasoning. This would suggest that place names

and other geographic facts should be learned preferably within the context and as a result of the study of more meaningful material.[11]

In the AAG report on liberal education, it was recognized that students do not normally achieve geographic literacy before reaching college. A guide was provided as a framework within which new facts, events, experiences, and problems could be interpreted by the student. That framework should be comprised of

1. a systematic knowledge of the basic distributional character of such worldwide phenomena as climate, cultural systems, population, and resources;

2. a knowledge of the processes responsible for the spatial distribution and variable character of selected landscape features; and,

3. a more detailed knowledge of a selected number of individual areas illustrating typical or atypical conditions.[12]

The report also suggested that the following areas of skill be emphasized:

1. the use of maps, globes, and ground and aerial photographs;

2. the use of elementary statistical methods, so that charts, diagrams and other visual methods of presenting geographic information can be understood, and geographic relationships may be tested; and,

3. the use of field techniques in collecting, organizing and presenting data; and in particular, the importance of direct observation as a fundamental source of geographic instruction.[13]

The extent to which any of the above listed areas of information and skills should be stressed in general education geography courses (and for what purposes) has been debated. One related area of concern is the selection and use of geographical concepts. Some geographical concepts and related terms are apparently more appropriate than are others. McNee suggests that getting the "ideas" across is more

important in a general education class than correct terminology of the discipline.[14] A similar concern is voiced by Harper who believes that it is more important that students have "geographic insights" than that they "think like geographers."[15] A somewhat different view is expressed by A. David Hill:

> . . . it is necessary /in general education/ to distinguish between geographic concepts and types of abstraction used by other disciplines such as order of magnitude, typology, function, or process. These are examples of fundamental concepts and although heavily used by geographers they are not exclusively within his purview.[16]

According to Fenneman and Taaffe, geography enjoys an ideal position, pedagogically, to exploit these broad concepts and terms and to demonstrate their place in geographic inquiry.[17]

The interrelationship of the course's content with that of courses in other areas has been identified as an essential goal for a general education course. Kimber provides a good summary on this problem, "We cannot teach geography as an isolated subject, leaving it to the student to relate it to other subjects as best he or she may."[18] Related to this is the need to provide learning experiences which increase the student's ability to make life-long decisions as individual citizens. In this context John Fraser Hart has identified four facets of general education to which geography courses may contribute:

1. To understand and appreciate the values and beliefs of other people, the principles for which they are ready and willing to make sacrifices.

2. Learn how to assemble and evaluate evidence that is pertinent to a particular situation or decision.

3. Learn how to communicate their ideas clearly and effectively. It is impossible to place too much emphasis on the importance of good writing.

4. Learn how to think--incisively, critically, logically, analytically.[19]

As general education, geography has been faced with the task of identifying those goals and purposes which it can best undertake. In fact geography has pursued general education in a number of different specific contexts.

Course Models in General Education Geography

One of the things that distinguishes geography from other disciplines is that it customarily offers general education courses in both social and natural science areas. The division of geography between natural and social sciences is often considered as somewhat arbitrary and as a matter of convenience by the discipline--at least for general education purposes. For pedagogical purposes a distinction has usually been made on the basis of subject matter. The primary focus of physical geography has been on biotic and physical phenomena while human geography has given its main emphasis to the social environment. On this basis physical geography has most often been included among natural science divisions and human geography with the social sciences.[20] In both instances geography courses for general education have been predominantly survey and introductory at the lower division level; but upper division courses have also functioned as general education. Which courses should be offered and what they should contain has been mostly a function of the purpose, programs, and curricular structure of each institution. In practice, the actual objectives and treatment of subject matter has usually been left to the discretion of the department but perhaps more often to the instructor responsible for the course.

Because geography commonly serves general education in both

natural sciences and social sciences under separately organized administrative divisions, it may be useful to consider these roles individually.

Physical Geography as General Education

Assuming that most students who enroll in a physical geography course have had no other geography courses and will take no additional courses, what should the purpose of that course be? From the standpoint of pedagogical classifications by college administrative divisions, the subject matter has been somewhat prescribed; but from the discipline's position there are objectives consistent with the geographical approach which should be met.

The Commission on College Geography produced the report, Geography In The Two Year Colleges in 1970.[21] The report noted many parallels in general education geography courses at two-year and four-year institutions. From sampling the goals of physical geography courses, the report found that three major themes predominated for the beginning general education student:

1. as a base for cultural studies;
2. as an ecological framework to indicate the integration of the features of physical geography over the earth's surface; or,
3. as a description of distributional patterns over the earth of physical and biotic phenomena.[22]

Gilbert White has offered a statement which is fairly descriptive of the goals and objectives most geographers seek to accomplish:

> A liberally educated person should know sufficiently about the processes which shape the spatial distribution of selected landscape features, so that with a minimum memorization of basic facts and anomalous relationships he can

> state with fair degree of accuracy the complex of landscape features he would expect to find on any given part of the earth's surface, expressly noting the amount of diversity present at any given scale, and the changes he would expect to result from any given shift in conditions affecting the processes.[23]

Geographers have taken different approaches toward meeting these goals and objectives through the vehicle of physical geography. Although they are numerous, there are some more prevalent themes as observed by the commission's report on two-year schools. To provide an alternate way of looking at the various competing views of what the study of geography should be and what geographers should do, William Pattison outlined four traditions which broadly focused upon major interests and ways of study by geographers.[24] The traditions (earth science, man-land, area studies, and spatial) do not necessarily exist in reality, but provide some structure within which the pluralistic endeavors of geography might continue. They offer a layperson a plain spoken explanation of what geographers do and according to Pattison "greatly expedite the task of maintaining an alliance between professional geography and pedagogical geography . . ."[25]

Physical geography has been pursued through the approaches of all four traditions but apparently this has not always been recognized. Ironically, non-geographers (and some geographers) have almost exclusively associated physical geography with the earth science tradition while physical geographers have usually preferred to deemphasize this connotation in favor of the other three traditions.[26] In some ways, Pattison's traditions have perhaps added to the confusion of what physical geography is within the discipline. The term "physical" is in reference to subject matter, except in the case of the earth science tradition where subject matter is rather explicit. The attempt to

categorize geography, especially physical geography, strictly on the basis of subject matter has caused many to neglect the importance of a geographical approach. This has contributed to the partly correct and partly incorrect conception of physical geography as "earth science." Physical geography continues to be offered as an earth science course but in such cases its distinction as geography is seriously suspect. Physical geography as "earth science" is not geography to many geographers and there have been suggestions to consider all geography, regardless of subject matter, within the sphere of the other three traditions.[27] Physical geography continues but the predominant trend is through an approach that incorporates aspects of the remaining three traditions.

With these remaining traditions in mind, the commission's report on two-year schools identified three prevalent themes in general education physical geography which were currently in practice. Each of the thematic trends for physical geography courses include elements of each of the other traditions (i.e., man-land or ecological, area studies or regional, and the spatial).[28] It is important to note that the commission also found a continued dependence upon basic elements of natural science regardless of approach or variations. Those basic elements of course, continue to be the central focus of subject matter for physical geography but the prevalent study themes are as follows:

The Environmental Unity Idea--

> The interrelationships existing between man and his natural environment are here viewed from the standpoint of physical process. . . . nature takes precedence, and man becomes involved at the process stage rather than at the evaluation or end stage. Man is included as an agent . . . comparable to any other physical or biological agent in shaping the variable patterns over the earth.[29]

The Regional Tradition--

> . . . focuses more on the end result of processes at work on the earth's surface. . . . description of the areal variation of the physical landscape becomes of major importance while landscape change and process is usually relegated to a secondary position. . . . one which analyzes a few of the earth's environments rather than one attempting to treat them all. . . . the regional tradition has often been used to set the stage for later human studies but the variety of physical landscapes are becoming important in their own right, without resorting to patterns of occupance.[30]

The Spatial Tradition--

> . . . long used in areas like climatology, is beginning to proliferate rapidly into landform studies, soils geography, and hydrogeography. . . . attempts to study both process and spatial arrangement within the areas of physical geography by utilizing statistical models. . . . it is perhaps another way to blend the old with the new, or to phase in some of the new within the framework of the old.[31]

The three thematic approaches presented above are examples of how three of Pattison's traditions are invoked in the study of the fourth, the earth science tradition. A distinguishing characteristic of all three is the attention given to processes. Each of the approaches concentrates on physical processes or their results, but there is always emphasis on "spatial awareness," for example, surface patterns, areal variation, and spatial arrangements. In this sense, physical geography is not unlike all geography except that there is a primary emphasis on natural science phenomena and a secondary emphasis on man.[32]

The position and strength of other disciplines often precludes or limits the contribution of geography in the general education curriculum. This is particularly noticeable in the natural science divisions. In some cases geography is restricted to a single course in earth science, but in more favorable situations one or more courses in physical geography are permitted. The earth science approach may impose a severe restraint on the use of geographic instructional methods

and objectives. An eclectic course of different sub-topics from the natural sciences may permit only a "hodgepodge" coverage of disparate subject matter with little opportunity to introduce unity and integration concepts. A physical geography course may be no more than a difference in title but often that single factor infers a stronger role for a geographic approach.[33]

This problem of subject matter constraint may be the reason for Marcus's reservation that "physical geography courses should follow an introductory general geography course."[34] This may be ideal but not always possible. The place of physical geography in the curriculum as a general education course distinct from an introductory course to the discipline is supported by Wolman's statement, "The purpose of a physical geography course is not to provide students with a first course in a specialized field."[35]

Human Geography as General Education

Geography has served general education most frequently with courses in the social sciences. Although physical geography courses are occasionally offered as social science, the more common practice is to offer regional or topical courses which focus on the human element. In the guidelines of the AAG report on liberal education, approaches in organizing subject matter for courses were reported to be either "regional" or "systematic." The regional approach divides subject matter on the basis of segments of the earth's surface, for example, continents, cultural areas, etc. The systematic approach makes a topical division of subject matter. However, regional courses often analyze phenomena with a systematic approach and topical courses

commonly treat information on a regional basis.[36]

There is usually a larger selection of geography courses which qualify as general education at the upper division level in social sciences than in the natural sciences. The most prevalent requirement for any upper division course to qualify as general education is the absence of prerequisite course requirements, and social sciences tend to be less restrictive with prerequisites. Nevertheless, most geography courses which serve general education in the social sciences are offered at the lower division level and are often of an introductory nature.[37]

In the guidelines of the AAG report on liberal education, the authors suggested three basic versions of introductory courses that are indicative of the types offered as general education. These versions and their variations provide a basis for identifying the priorities of and issues confronting geography's role in general education. It is important to stress that these versions refer to courses and not necessarily to any true pedagogical division of knowledge.

Version One emphasizes processes.

> It is an orderly examination of the world's spatial complexities. Landscape features--landforms, vegegation, soil, land cultivation and use, urban functions, transport routes . . . examined in association with each other. Emphasis would be on the processes active in shaping the major world arrangements of features and their associations.[38]

Version Two of the guidelines emphasizes regions.

> Viewed as an effective mode of analysis and comparing domestic and foreign areas. . . . it would emphasize a knowledge of disparate peoples, and cultures; and appreciation of the diversity of the world in terms of its physical makeup and resources, cultural evolution, economic development, and political, and cultural ties, as well as the common threats and dangers that affect the nations of the world and that touch off changes in area interrelationships.[39]

Version Three emphasizes methods and theory and is representative of the topical or systematic approach.

> . . . concerned with key concepts, ideas and theories in several major subfields of geography, together with a survey of the history of geographic thought. . . . serves as an introductory or supplementary course for the prospective major.[40]

The three versions of introductory courses are quite similar to the three approaches the report on two-year colleges found for teaching physical geography. They differ basically in subject matter. The emphasis given to processes in the three major themes found in physical geography courses appears to be most similar to that which is described of courses in Version One. Geography courses serving general education in the social sciences are probably most often, although not exclusively, in the form of Version Two or Three.

Topical or Regional Approaches for General Education Courses

It must be acknowledged that most geographers would probably consider all geographic studies as "regional"; but lower division introductory geography courses in the social sciences are normally structured as either "topical" or "regional."[41] To some extent the varying views as to which course approach best serves general education may reflect methodological differences between nomothetic and idiographic approaches to geography as social science.[42] Admittedly, typologies can be dangerous and misleading, but if used cautiously they can help identify sources of conflict in opinion in the establishment of priorities. The use of a topical/regional dichotomy may serve to clarify a skill-information continuum if one exists, and its relationship with the purposes and goals of general education courses; but it is not the

intent of this study to determine a value of, or place for, topical or regional courses within the undergraduate curriculum. They serve only as vehicles with which to identify some of the problems and questions this study seeks to explore.

Both topical and regional courses have been offered to serve general education, sometimes simultaneously at the same institution. The topical course, however, has frequently served a dual purpose. Organized along the lines of Version Three, it has been an introduction to the discipline for majors as well as a general education course. Less often, a course with a regional approach has been given this dual role.

The contributors to the AAG report on liberal education, with some exceptions, seemed to view geography courses for general education and introductions to the discipline as one and the same. This is probably widespread in practice, but there is not a consensus that it is an appropriate view. An example of why some proponents favor regional courses over introductory type courses for general education is provided by Larimore who developed a model course in world regional geography especially for general education students. She said that one of the essential features of her course was the following: "The course is conceived to be a general liberal education course, an 'elective' or 'distribution-satisfying course' rather than the first course in a geography major sequence."[43] She distinguished world regional geography courses from courses which serve as an introduction to the major as having different purposes:

> While the purpose of the 'The Introductory Course to the Major' is to begin explicitly to train the student as a practicing geographer (to which end no doubt, it should include a section on the regional method), the aim of the World Regional Geography course seems rather to be the display of geography's

> cumulative achievements in ordering and analyzing the arrangement of phenomena on the earth's surface. The two courses then accomplish different purposes.[44]

The contributors to the AAG report on two-year colleges also viewed the use of world regional courses as a solution to the problem of serving dual purposes:

> When considering the place of geography in the general or liberal education framework . . . a course in world regional geography must be considered primarily as a liberal education course rather than as the first or introductory course required for a geography major. . . . the world regional course does not have to satisfy sets of conflicting objectives.[45]

McNee made a strong case for the regional approach in general education by listing a number of virtues a regional geography course had for general education. In asking what objectives of general education are especially adapted to the use of the regional concept, he noted that it was useful in encouraging the student

1. to integrate knowledge derived from academic study of traditionally separate subjects;

2. to generalize accurately the variety of the face of the earth; and,

3. to relate effectively his or her immediate community to wider communities.[46]

With regard for the content of information a general education course should emphasize, the regional approach was also favored by Preston James, who took a firm position on the matter:

> The educated public assumes that geography is studied in schools and colleges in order to find out where places are and what is important about them. . . . less concerned about what geographers do and are more concerned at the appalling geographic illiteracy of most Americans. . . . it is geography's duty or assignment to reach about and illuminate the economic, social, and political conditions and problems of major divisions of the earth.[47]

One major argument for the regional course approach is that it is

important to study foreign areas or cultures. Recent resurgence of interest in international education may lead to an increased role for regional geography.[48] The goal in general education to develop a better understanding of other cultures, their values and customs, is seen as particularly valuable by Harris. He says that if the student takes only one geography course, a course featuring exposure to other cultures should be given high priority.

> One of the greatest potential contributions of a liberal education is to provide knowledge and understanding of the magnificent diversity and the high cultural attainments of the peoples of the world and thus to immunize citizens against the viruses of hate, suspicion, and misunderstanding.[49]

Although Harris is explicit about subject matter, he also identifies three pitfalls, excessive regional subdivision, encyclopedic assemblages, and bias, which must be avoided if such a course is to provide a proper study of the international dimension.[50]

Most support for regional approaches over topical arrangements seem to emphasize the information content to be learned rather than development of skills for learning it. This has been a target of criticism by those who give a high priority to the use of skills and concepts which will enable the student to better understand the spatial approach to knowledge. For example, Broek questions whether regional geography students ever come to grips with the terminology, classification, and generalizing concepts of geography. In particular Broek objects to the implication that there is only once correct way of dividing up the earth into segments. Rather, students should learn to use regional methodology as a tool. He concludes that the topical approach is the best way to teach conceptual tools so that the student can build his or her own regional presentation.[51] Nevertheless, the

most vehement criticism of regional courses is that memorization of unrelated facts is often a high priority in their goals and methods.[52]

The regional approach also became a target of "systems" proponents in the early and mid-1960's. At issue was a lack of connectivity in traditional regional courses which a systems approach would include as its major characteristic. It was argued that the advantages of studying the world as an interacting system were not inherent to the regional approach as it was generally practiced. The views of Edward Ackerman as they applied to general education were summarized by Harper:

> The goal is understanding the vast, interacting system--not just regional pieces of the human world that most of us have given central position in geography. . . . many geographers have stressed differences, as exemplified in the term 'area differentiation' but in a system 'connectivity' . . . is its most important characteristic. It is the connectivity of the spread of the human system over the earth today that should be the chief concern of geography in general education. . . . interesting and useful as the study of area differentiation and the development of a 'mental atlas' of world patterns may be, the approach is essentially static.[53]

According to Harper, the connectivity idea can include all geographical concepts of importance such as spatial interaction, functional organization, cultural "mindsets" as well as fundamentals such as location, distance, situation, and resource base that would be needed in a general education course.[54]

The ideas of the "systems" proponents have influenced both physical and human geography but perhaps not to the extent its proponents would desire. Systematic approaches, although not the equivalent of "systems" approaches, have related features. Strahler, Kates, and others have developed systematic approaches in physical geography which emphasize the unity and interaction concepts of a "systems" analysis. The topical courses in human geography are often referred to as systematic,

as are some regional courses, but the use of systems as any kind of organizing construct is not always so noticeable.[55]

An extensive survey by Heiligmann found differences of opinion on the part of geographers as to the purpose of regional courses in the liberal arts curriculum. Most agreed that the most important function of regional courses at their institution was:

> To provide students with general information concerning regions of the world . . . and to provide students with general information which will complement their work in other subject areas.[56]

However, from the same survey, those most strongly anti-regional and also those more neutral in their opinion agreed that regional courses should: ". . . provide the liberal arts student with intellectual skills which will enable him to develop abilities in relating and synthesizing knowledge."[57] This group further agreed that courses in the liberal arts curriculum should: ". . . provide students with intellectual skills which will enable them to perceive regions as mental constructs and be able to apply this to reality," but those who were most strongly pro-regional in their opinion about general education courses ranked this as a low priority.[58]

Another view regarding regional courses questions whether they can be effectively taught at the introductory level. Their role in general education may be more instrumental after the student has reached a more advanced level of study. In discussing the view of the faculty at the University of Iowa toward world regional geography, Clyde Kohn said:

> . . . such courses need to be given after the student has been introduced to a broad range of topically-oriented courses, and not before . . . at the introductory level such courses tend too often to degenerate into little more than inventories of the physical, biotic, and human content of individual countries or groupings of countries, and provide very little that

> is intellectually satisfying. They are apt to concentrate on the current state of affairs, and for the student who has taken them, soon become outdated.[59]

The strengths and weaknesses of regional courses have received most of the attention in this discussion thus far. Topical or systematic courses appear to be used more frequently in a dual role of serving general education requirements and as an introduction to the discipline. This matter is discussed further in the next section.

Contemporary Views in Higher Education Regarding the Role of Introductory Courses in General Education

The view that courses such as regional geography or others which attempt to integrate broad areas of learning should be offered after the student has pursued other studies has been a subject of controversy among proponents of general education. Many of the arguments have to do with the multiple purposes of general education. A central goal has been to provide unity for the total educational experience. This includes goals which may appear to be at cross purposes, such as, identifying a major, providing information and training in intellectual skills applicable to other studies, and confronting issues of contemporary life. At issue is how a discipline can most effectively serve these multiple purposes.

The central problem seems to remain with the predominant influence of specialization over the curriculum. The use of introductory courses has been to provide a dual function; one to introduce the student to the discipline and the other as a vehicle for broader purposes of general education. In Little's view, the latter has suffered severely at

the expense of the former. This problem would have to be resolved if objectives of a course are to reflect those of general education and he does not view this as possible. He describes why there is an inherent conflict in these objectives:

> . . . the structure of knowledge appropriate to the kind of question it (general education) raises is different, and in some ways in conflict with the structure of knowledge which defines the study of specific disciplines. Disciplines are organized around the logic of their subject matter while the consensus of general studies are reflective of human needs, problems, questions and ponderings.[60]

However, this problem is perhaps less applicable to the disciplines of history and geography where the emphasis is placed more on the approach to subject matter rather than its logic of content organization.[61] Furthermore, the combined weight of evidence in geographical publications and textbooks of the past decade would dispute the implied notion of misplaced priorities.

A different and more positive view which advocates the use of introductory courses to the discipline as a basis for general education is held by Bell, Bruner, and Phenix. Each sees the role of disciplines as essential on the basis of theoretical grounds. Bell provides a dynamic role of how general education should interact with the disciplines:

> If general education will concern itself with how disciplines form and reform their basic conceptualizations and how the basic conceptualizations of different disciplines can be linked together it will have been justified both as an invaluable end in itself and as an indispensable preparation for specialization.[62]

Version Three of the AAG guidelines for introductory geography courses reflects the same approach. This view can be further interpreted to mean that the various disciplines must assume the responsibility of how their different conceptualizations are interlocked. In practice,

Version Three type courses have generally met this responsibility as a social science distributional requirement. How much responsibility individual disciplines will assume is questionable but their role is further supported on more theoretical grounds.

Both Bell and Bruner have advocated that learning can be maximized by a careful study of the basic ideas and principles of the established disciplines. In their opinion, survey or interdisciplinary courses should not be offered until the student has at least developed an understanding for the structure of knowledge gained from introductory studies in the disciplines.[63] In a view similar to that of the geographers at the University of Iowa, they claim that many issues and problems can only be given superficial study without proper understanding of the basics behind them. The ability to transfer ideas, concepts and principles is based on learning the structure of knowledge rather than a psychology of learning. Learning the structure of knowledge should also enable the student to retain information longer, reconstruct forgotten details, and update or correct obsolescent information.[64]

Phenix goes a step further in justifying the disciplines' role in general education. Because education should be meaningful to the learner, the controlling idea of general education should be to impart unity to the pattern of studies.[65] This emerges from a philosophy of man and his ways of knowing. The desireable scope, content, and arrangement of studies may be derived from the realms of meaning which are found within the fields of disciplinary inquiry. Because the available knowledge in each realm of meaning is so large, selection of subject matter requires special attention. Learning about particular products of investigation is less important than becoming skillful in

the ways of knowing. Skill in the ways of knowing is also less transient and helps overcome fragmentation and surfeit of materials. Disciplines are unified by their particular methods or ways of knowing.[66] For general education he has suggestions for the content of instruction:

1. It should be drawn entirely from the fields of disciplined inquiry.
2. Those items should be chosen that are particularly representative of the field as a whole.
3. It should exemplify the methods of inquiry and the modes of understanding in the disciplines studied.
4. Materials should be chosen as to arouse imagination.[67]

Phenix's concept of general education provides a useful guide for determining the proportional emphasis to be allocated for content information and the practice of intellectual skills in a course. Hartshorne would say that a continuum, rather than a dichotomy exists between the two in the geographical approach.[68] For geography, the approach in general education courses may vary more than with other disciplines because of its unusual (and somewhat artificial) pedagogical and administrative divisions of subject matter. For example, courses in world geography may or may not require more emphasis on content information than would some topical courses, particularly at the introductory level. Geography courses offered as general education in the social sciences may have more latitude or options than those which serve as natural sciences at some institutions.

Whether the views of Bell, Bruner, and Phenix appropriately deal with some of the broader purposes in general education may be questionable. The criticism regarding fragmentation and a lack of coherence between distributional electives of the disciplines do seem to support Little's objections to their having a predominant role in general

education. General education at most institutions appears to be firmly in the control of the disciplines but theoretical support for this organization is not unanimous. Changes in the structure and organization of general education requirements at different institutions may provide new opportunities or constraints for some geography departments.

Disciplinary Responses to General Education Changes

The Institutional Setting

The broader or multiple purposes of an institution may result in problems which affect an individual discipline's role in general education. To avoid the inherent problems of offering introductory courses which serve both the major and the requirements of general education, some disciplines have been able to pursue a policy of "dual tracking" whereby separate courses or sections are offered. Dual tracking may be easier for some disciplines such as sociology, history, biology, or geology because of their comparatively larger enrollments. With the exception of some large departments such as the one at the University of Minnesota, most geography departments are not able to do this.[69]

The problems for departments may be more extensive than the maintenance of two programs. According to Caswell, getting instructors interested in teaching general education courses and preparing them to do so has been the one major obstacle to developing satisfactory programs of general education. The demands and rewards of other priorities in a department's program frequently place the instructor in a position of divided loyalties.[70] For the discipline as a whole, the

problem is compounded in that geography may be taught as general education by persons not adequately trained in the discipline. This is a particular problem in the larger number of institutions where geography courses are the responsibility of some department other than geography.[71]

When asked by administrators what contributions they can make to general education, geography departments often make choices which reflect varying emphasis on their views. A department's focus on general education may reflect the specialties of their program. For example, if a department is heavily geared toward regional studies, planning, man-environment studies, etc., then general education takes on a different meaning. These program orientations have special meaning for those states, for example, Oregon, which have delegated specialty areas within the discipline for their different institutions.[72] Geographers also have to keep in mind what other departments offer at their institution. In some arrangements of distribution requirements, geography is able to offer alternatives to choices in other disciplines, but at some institutions the competitive strength of other subject areas may preclude or limit geography's involvement. This may be why physical geography is offered as a social science at some schools, for example, Bemidji State in Minnesota, where an earth science program has exclusive control over physical science distribution requirements.[73]

Enrollment patterns in geography courses often reflect particular needs of majors in other disciplines and this may create conflicting demands. An extreme example is the University of Wyoming where a conservation course serves as a major requirement for students in geography and some other disciplines, and as a cognate elective for still others.

The course also qualifies as general education in natural science for some social science majors, as a social science for some science majors, and as a humanities course for engineering students.[74] A more common practice at many institutions that is applicable to nearly all disciplines participating in general education programs is to permit advanced level students, juniors and seniors, to enroll in introductory level courses to satisfy distribution requirements. The presence of these students in a class comprised primarily of lower division students may pose some questions of fairness in the evaluation of students and may lend support to proposals for changes in the timing of general education requirements--changes which include the use of more upper division courses.

Geographers have suggested, and frequently offered, upper division courses for general education credit. More commonly these have included conservation, climatology, and regional studies, but occasionally courses in cartography or planning have been offered in this context.[75] It has also been suggested by some geographers and others interested in general education that integrative learning experiences which emphasize inter-disciplinary or inter-departmental studies are more appropriately offered at the advanced level. In the past, various alternate models to distribution requirements have attempted this but usually at the lower division level. Where these models have been implemented, geography has rarely participated.

A Profile to Assess the Effects of Curricular Changes

Geography has traditionally served general education by offering

courses which meet distribution requirements in both the natural and social sciences. This role has varied immensely with individual institutions and institution types. The Carnegie Commission and other recent studies have placed emphasis on advanced learning skills, more clearly defined distribution requirements, integrative learning experiences, and changes in the timing of these components in general education requirements. The effect upon disciplines of changes in the organization and administration of curricula to implement these proposals has not been assessed. In the next chapter the results of a survey designed to assess some of the effects of these changes on the current role of geography departments in general education are presented.

FOOTNOTES

[1]Association of American Geographers, "Guidelines," Geography in Undergraduate Liberal Education (Washington, D.C., 1965), pp. 1-12.

[2]Ibid., p. 2.

[3]Richard Hartshorne, "The Concept of Geography as a Science of Space, from Kant and Humboldt to Hettner," Annals of the Association of American Geographers 48 (June 1958), pp. 97-108.

[4]Association of American Geographers, "Guidelines," p. 2.

[5]Ibid.

[6]Ibid., p. 3.

[7]Ibid.

[8]Ibid., pp. 3-4.

[9]Ibid., p. 4.

[10]Report of the Geography Advisory Panel to the Statewide Social Sciences Study Committee on Improving the Education of Teachers of Geography (Sacramento, 1967), p. 2.

[11]Robert D. Picker, "Geography and the Learning Process: A Methodological Review," The Journal of Geography 64 (November 1965), p. 341.

[12]Association of American Geographers, "Guidelines," p. 5.

[13]Ibid., pp. 5-6.

[14]Robert B. McNee, "A Proposal for a New Geography Course for Liberal Education: Introduction to Geographic Behavior," in Association of American Geographers, New Approaches in Introductory College Geography Courses (Washington, D.C., 1967), p. 15.

[15]Robert A. Harper, "Geography's Role in General Education," The Journal of Geography 65 (April 1966), pp. 178-179.

[16]A. David Hill, "Learning Geographic Concepts in the Local Area: An Introduction to Geography Through Field Work," Field Training in Geography, Technical Paper No. 1 (Washington, D.C., 1968), p. 14.

[17]Nevin M. Fenneman, "The Circumference of Geography," Annals of the Association of American Geographers 9 (December 1919), pp. 3-11; and Edward J. Taaffe, "The Spatial View in Context," Annals of the Association of American Geographers 64 (March 1974), pp. 3, 12-16.

[18]George C. Kimber, "The Place of Geography in a General Education Program," The Journal of Geography 48 (October 1949), p. 272.

[19]John Fraser Hart, "Geography and Decision Making," The Journal of Geography 77 (December 1978), pp. 252-253.

[20]Richard Hartshorne, Perpective on the Nature of Geography, Association of American Geographers (Chicago, 1959), p. 80.

[21]Panel on Geography in the Two-Year Colleges, Geography in the Two-Year Colleges, publication No. 10, Association of American Geographers (Washington, D.C., 1970).

[22]Ibid., p. 43.

[23]Gilbert White, "Geography in Liberal Education," in Association of American Geographers, Geography in Undergraduate Liberal Education (Washington, D.C., 1965), p. 16.

[24]William D. Pattison, "The Four Traditions of Geography," The Journal of Geography 63 (May 1964), pp. 211-216.

[25]Ibid., p. 211.

[26]Taaffe, "Spatial View," p. 3.

[27]Ibid.

[28]Panel on Geography, Geography in the Two-Year Colleges, pp. 43-44; a detailed discussion on the role of physical geography and its contributions in each of these areas throughout the course of geography's evolution in the United States is provided by Melvin G. Marcus, "Coming Full Circle: Physical Geography in the Twentieth Century," Annals of the Association of American Geographers 69 (December 1979), pp. 521-532.

[29]Panel on Geography, Geography in the Two-Year Colleges, p. 44.

[30]Ibid.

[31]Ibid.

[32]Ibid., pp. 44-45.

[33]Melvin G. Marcus, "Introductory Physical Geography in the College Curriculum," in Association of American Geographers, Introductory Geography: Viewpoints and Themes (Washington, D.C., 1967), pp. 5-6, 13.

[34]Ibid., p. 14.

[35]M. Gordon Wolman, "Physical Geography in the Liberal Arts," in Association of American Geographers, Geography in Undergraduate Liberal Education (Washington, D.C., 1965), p. 49.

[36]Association of American Geographers, "Guidelines," p. 6.

[37]J. R. Schwendeman, Sr., and J. R. Schwendeman, Jr., Directory of College Geography of the United States, Vol. XXX (Richmond, Kentucky, 1979), p. 2.

[38]Association of American Geographers, "Guidelines," p. 7.

[39]Ibid.

[40]Ibid., pp. 7-8.

[41]Ibid., p. 6.

[42]Arthur H. Robinson, "On Perks and Pokes," Economic Geography 37 (April 1962), pp. 181-183; and Norton Ginsburg, "On Regional and Other Geographies," in Association of American Geographers, Introductory Geography: Viewpoints and Themes (Washington, D.C., 1967), pp. 105-111.

[43]Ann E. Larimore, "The World Regional Course: Alternative Approaches," in Association of American Geographers, New Approaches in Introductory College Geography Courses (Washington, D.C., 1967), p. 42.

[44]Ibid., p. 43.

[45]Panel on Geography, Geography in the Two-Year Colleges, pp. 40-41.

[46]Robert B. McNee, "Geographic Objectives in General Education: The Regional Method," The Journal of Geography 55 (November 1956), p. 390.

[47]Preston E. James, "Introductory Geography: Topical or Regional?" The Journal of Geography 66 (February 1967), p. 53.

[48]Malcolm G. Scully, "A New Era of Concern for International Education," The Chronicle of Higher Education 16 (31 July 1978), pp. 1, 6.

[49]Chauncy D. Harris, "The Geographic Study of Foreign Areas and Cultures in Liberal Education," in Association of American Geographers, Geography in Undergraduate Liberal Education (Washington, D.C., 1965), p. 25.

[50]Ibid., pp. 31-32.

[51]Jan E. M. Broek, "Introductory Geography: The Topical Course," The Journal of Geography 66 (October 1967), pp. 348-349.

[52]Vincent Miller, "Observations on the Goals and Methods of Regional Courses," The Journal of Geography 59 (November 1960), p. 372.

[53]Harper, "Geography's Role," p. 179.

[54]Ibid., p. 181.

[55]Robert Kates, "Links Between Physical and Human Geography: A Systems Approach," in Association of American Geographers, Introductory Geography: Viewpoints and Themes (Washington, D.C., 1967), p. 81; and Thomas J. Wilbanks and Richard Symanski, "What is Systems Analysis?" The Professional Geographer 20 (March 1968), p. 81.

[56]Katherine St. Germaine Heiligmann, "The Regional Course: Its Growth and Functions in American Higher Education," (unpub. doctoral dissertation, Oklahoma State University, 1976), p. 55.

[57]Ibid.

[58]Ibid., pp. 55, 57.

[59]Clyde F. Kohn, "The Iowa Approach, or Revisionists at Work," in Association of American Geographers, Introductory Geography: Viewpoints and Themes (Washington, D.C., 1967), p. 60.

[60]D. Richard Little, "Beyond Careerism: The Revival of General Education," Journal of General Education 26 (Summer 1974), p. 95.

[61]Richard Hartshorne, The Nature of Geography, A Critical Survey of Current Thought in the Light of the Past (Lancaster, Pa., 1939) pp. 460-469; and Brian J. L. Berry, "Approaches to Regional Analysis: A Synthesis," Annals of the Association of American Geographers 54 (March 1964), pp. 2-12.

[62]John S. Brubacher and Willis Rudy, Higher Education in Transition, 3rd ed. (New York, 1976), p. 275.

[63]Daniel Bell, The Reforming of General Education (New York, 1966), pp. 155-159; and Jerome S. Bruner, The Process of Education (New York, 1963), pp. 6-20.

[64]Ibid.

[65]Philip H. Phenix, Realms of Meaning (New York, 1964), pp. 5-12.

[66]Ibid.

[67]Ibid., pp. 10-12.

[68]Hartshorne, Perspective, p. 144.

[69]Interview with Dr. John F. Rooney, Jr., Former Chairman, Department of Geography, Oklahoma State University (15 April 1979).

[70]Hollis L. Caswell, "Persistent Curriculum Problems," Educational Forum 43 (November 1978), p. 109.

[71]John R. Bergen, "Geography in Small Liberal Arts Colleges," The Journal of Geography 62 (January 1963), pp. 22-29.

[72]Interview with Dr. Stephen Tweedie, Department of Geography, Oklahoma State University (July 1979).

[73]Interview with Dr. Peter C. Smith, Chairman, Department of Geography, Bemidji State University, Minnesota (July 1979).

[74]Interview with Dr. Phillip M. Fowler, Chairman, Department of Geography, University of Wyoming (July 1979).

[75]Arthur H. Robinson, "The Potential of Cartography in Liberal Education," in Association of American Geographers, Geography in Undergraduate Liberal Education (Washington, D.C., 1965), pp. 34-71 and Katherine L. Kutsche, "Teaching Planning for Public Awareness," paper presented at the Annual Meeting of the National Council for Geographic Education, Mexico City, Mexico (2 November 1979).

CHAPTER V

GEOGRAPHY AS GENERAL EDUCATION: A CONTEMPORARY VIEW

Over the span of about three centuries, geography has had an intermittent role in American Higher education. The changing nature of academic geography has been characterized by shifts in the focus of thought and practice by the discipline. These shifts have interacted variably with changes in the structure and purposes of higher education and have resulted in identifiable cycles in the history of academic geography. Moreover, the nature of geography's role as an academic discipline has varied among institutions of different types.

A major, and often the only, role for academic geography has been the offering of courses for general education. At many institutions this service has been intricately connected to the successful pursuit of other roles by geography departments. Departments have been dependent upon general education courses to generate majors and support advanced courses and research. In terms of enrollments in geography courses, general education has probably been geography's principal support in the institutional setting. Yet, compared to the total number of general education enrollments in courses offered by other disciplines, geography's role has been insignificant.

While each institution has been more or less unique in its own organization and administration of curriculum, there are broad

similarities among institutions of the same type. Similarly, generalizations can be made regarding the respective role of geography departments at institutions of the same type. In the historical development of academic geography, the response by the discipline to the needs and purposes of higher education have had mixed (and sometimes fatal) results for geography in some types of institutions. Changes in contemporary higher education may produce similar responses.

The purpose of this study has been to provide a descriptive profile of the historical development of the general education role of academic geography, its importance to the discipline's success, and the factors which have influenced its nature. Recent major changes in general education may have the effect of modifying this role for geography. It is important to understand how and to what extent such changes affect a single discipline. Overall, the nature of response by geography at different institutions is presumed to be dependent upon:

1. the present and former arrangement at the institution for providing general education and the nature of changes in these programs in the area of administration and control, the types of curricular models used, the existance of stated objectives regarding the content and instruction of courses, and the type and amount of competition other disciplines offer for general education enrollments;

2. the institutional setting in which the department exists, its size and type--whether it is a major university involved in research, a comprehensive state institution, or a liberal arts college and whether it is public or private;

3. the present or previous general education role played by the department including the number of courses offered, at what levels, and in what subject matter areas;

4. the characteristics of the department's other roles--whether it offers a major, has a cognate role, or has a graduate program; and,

5. the attitudes of geographers toward general education regarding the nature and determination of objectives, the qualifications

of geographers to teach general education, and the nature of course content, its structure and organization.

Taken together these factors have the effect of defining and substantially altering the character of academic geography.

To more fully understand the contemporary role of geography in general education at different types of institutional settings and the effect of recent curricular revisions on this role, questions in four related areas were proposed:

1. What general education programs are most prevalent at different institution types where geography is offered; how and by whom are they established and controlled; and what variation exists in the control of individual course content and instruction?

2. What and how many geography courses serve general education, in what subject areas, and at what levels of instruction; what are the major competing disciplines with geography in general education; and, what percentage of the total student body is currently taking some geography for general education?

3. What is the relative importance of general education to geography, in terms of enrollments, and in relation to other departmental pursuits; what effect have curricular changes had on the general education role of geography; and what degree of standardization exists in the instruction of general education courses in geography?

4. What are the opinions of geographers regarding major issues and problems germane to the discipline's role in general education?

In order to answer these questions it was decided that a survey of geography departments at the national scale should be undertaken.[1] Ideas incorporated into the objectives and design of the survey instrument were obtained from three sources: the literature review; the deliberations of an inter-faculty committee on general education at Oklahoma State University; and the development of a profile of geography courses offered by the geography department at Oklahoma State University. The latter effort included extensive interviews with faculty members charged with the supervision and instruction of geography

courses offered for general education and a compilation of enrollment characteristics in geography courses over a three year period.[2]

Design of Study

A four page questionnaire was designed to collect information in each of the four major areas. The questionnaire with a cover letter (Appendix A) was mailed to the head or chairperson of each geography department listed in the 1979 edition of Schwendeman's Directory of College Geography of the United States.[3] Questionnaires were mailed during September of 1979 and respondents were asked to report information based on the Spring, 1979 school term. Due to the expectation of great differences in general education at different types of institutions and because of the descriptive nature of this study, it appeared more desirable to seek a high number of responses as opposed to a smaller, random sample which would tend to be less comprehensive.

According to the literature in higher education, the undergraduate programs vary considerably among different institutions. However, there appeared to be similarities among institutions of the same type, as determined by enrollment size, student characteristics and backgrounds, stated purposes and objectives of the school, and funding sources. It was perceived that such important distinctions may also be linked to the general education role of institutions. Because institutions belonging to identifiable types are distributed throughout most of the country, a nationwide survey was considered most appropriate.

Limitations

This study was limited in that it did not attempt to identify the

specific components and requirements of each institution's general education program, but did attempt to identify the extent and nature of geography's role in the programs of different institution types. It did not attempt to describe the individual needs and characteristics of students in geography courses beyond a description of their reasons for and timing in taking general education courses in geography. This study was further limited by its confinement to geography curricula at four-year institutions which have geography departments. Finally, the respondents to this survey may or may not have represented the prevailing views and opinions of their respective departments.

Data Analysis

Institutions from which completed questionnaires were obtained were classified according to a typology derived from one used by the Carnegie Commission on Higher Education in A Classification of Institutions of Higher Education.[4] The use of this system for comparative purposes appeared justified on the basis of the professional literature in higher education and the discipline of geography. While it was recognized that the role of geography departments in institutions of the same type do vary in nature and extent, it was believed that other characteristics of the institutional setting, on the basis of type, might reveal noticeable differences in geography's role as general education.

Categories of institutions are referred to in this study by type and whether they are private or public. Type I includes institutions with graduate programs and which are engaged in postgraduate research, often at the doctoral level (for example, Syracuse University and

TABLE IV

SURVEY RETURNS BY INSTITUTION TYPE
AND RESPONDENT'S POSITION

Institution	Surveys Sent N	Percent Response	Position or Title of Respondent: Chair/Head (%)	Professor (%)	Other or No Answer Given (%)
Type I	113	44	74	20	6
Private	19	47	56	33	11
Public	94	43	78	17	4
Type II	139	53	71	21	8
Private	14	36	40	40	20
Public	125	55	74	19	7
Type III	37	49	61	22	16
Private	33	45	60	20	20
Public	4	75	67	33	0
Total Private	66	44	55	28	17
Total Public	223	51	75	18	7
TOTAL	289	49	71	21	8

Pennsylvania State University). On the whole these are major universities with relatively large enrollments. Type II refers to institutions which may or may not have graduate programs. These institutions are commonly regarded as comprehensive schools offering a wide range of professional programs. They typically include existing or former city, teacher, and state regional colleges which have expanded their missions and in many cases their names now include the designation of state university (for example, St. Lawrence University and Bemidji State University). Type III institutions are liberal arts colleges and tend to have smaller enrollments than most Type I and II schools (for example, Gustavus Adolphus College and Mary Washington College). Most do not have graduate programs. Private refers to all three types of institutions which are privately endowed and controlled and public refers to all types which are predominantly government supported.

A total of 142 or 49 percent of the questionnaires were completed and returned (Appendix B). The percentage of each institution type responding was tabulated as was the position or academic rank of each respondent (Table IV). The completed returns were fairly well distributed among institution types and in most cases respondents were either chairpersons or heads of geography departments who held the rank of professor in geography.

The results from each section of the survey were tabulated and cross-tabulated according to institution type. They were further cross-tabulated on the basis of private or public. A preliminary analysis of the findings was presented to the annual convention of the National Council for Geographic Education at Mexico City, Mexico, November 1, 1979.[5] Suggestions received during the ensuing discussion were

incorporated in further analysis. The number and percentage of responses from each institution type was considered an adequate basis upon which comparisons and descriptive generalizations might be made.

Discussion of the Survey Results

Discussion of the survey results is organized in accordance with the four major areas of the problem statement and their respective questions. Tables supporting the findings are presented throughout the discussion. The findings are also discussed as they relate to major conclusions reached in the literature review of the first four chapters.

Types and Nature of General Education Programs

Geography in a General Education Environment

Geography exists in a curricular environment in which general education is prevalent. The vast majority (96.5 %) of the responding departments have a designated program in general education required of most undergraduate students (Table V). A few institutions report having more than one form of general education program. For example, a program may exist for students in all fields of study with one or more optional programs offered under special circumstances. There is a wide variety in the names given programs, but general education leads (42.7 %), followed by general studies (8.0 %); other descriptions include "the core," distributive education, and liberal education. Type III institutions (liberal arts colleges) are more likely to have designations other than general education or general studies. Names of programs appear to offer few clues to any differences in how they are

administered, implemented, or what purposes they are intended to serve.

TABLE V

DESIGNATED PROGRAM IN GENERAL EDUCATION

Institution Type	N	Yes, Only One Program (%)	Yes, More Than One Program (%)	Institution Type	N	Yes, Only One Program (%)	Yes, More Than One Program (%)
I	50	90.0	4.0	Private	29	93.1	0.0
II	73	94.5	4.1	Public	112	92.9	4.4
III	18	94.4	0.0				
TOTAL	141	93.0	3.5			92.9	3.5

Agents of Decision and Locus of Control in General Education Curricula

As reported in this survey the specific courses, or types of courses, which constitute the various requirements of the general education component of undergraduate programs are most frequently determined by a committee or council or by some combination of several sources (Table VI). The latter may include deans, vice presidents, and individual departments in addition to a committee or council. Although there is quite often some faculty input, in no instance does an institution report that this is the sole responsibility of department heads or chairpersons or individual instructors.

TABLE VI

RESPONSIBILITY FOR DETERMINING TYPE AND SELECTION OF COURSES FOR GENERAL EDUCATION

	N	Dean/Vice President (%)	Committee/ Council (%)	Depart-ment (%)	Combi-nation (%)	Other (%)
TOTAL	138	3.6	54.4	1.4	31.2	9.4

Geography departments indicate that the responsibility and authority for monitoring general education curricula at their institutions is varied (Table VII). Over 16 % of departments in Type II institutions report that this assignment belongs to no one. Those in Type III institutions and private schools report that their institutions leave these responsibilities to department heads or chairpersons, or some combination of decision-makers; but for the most part, this assignment tends to be shared by administrators and faculty. Among the respondents there are few institutions where decision-making about general education is the full time responsibility of some designated individual such as a coordinator, or an autonomous body with centralized control over administration, implementation, instruction, and budgetary matters. The wide diversity of answers to this question in addition to the ten percent who state that no one has this responsibility at least indicates lack of consistent approach to administering general education and may indicate a lack of direct supervision in general education for colleges and universities as a whole.

TABLE VII

ADMINISTRATION AND MONITORING OF
GENERAL EDUCATION COURSES

Institution Type	N	Dean/Vice President (%)	Committee/ Council (%)	Depart-ment (%)	Department Head/Chair (%)	Coordi-nator/ Director (%)	Combi-nation (%)	Other (%)	No One (%)
I	43	23.3	44.2	6.9	2.3	2.3	16.3	0.0	4.7
II	68	19.1	45.6	2.9	0.0	1.5	10.3	4.4	16.2
III	18	11.1	38.9	0.0	11.1	0.0	33.3	5.6	0.0
Private	29	17.2	37.9	0.0	6.9	3.5	20.7	6.9	6.9
Public	100	20.0	46.0	5.0	1.0	1.0	14.0	2.0	11.0
TOTAL	129	19.4	44.2	3.9	2.3	1.5	15.5	3.1	10.1

Academic Freedom in the Instruction of General Education

Another aspect of locus of control in general education has to do with the methods employed to govern the content and instruction of courses. Only one-third of all reporting departments indicate that their institutions have formal statements describing the broad objectives that general education courses should meet (Table VIII). Almost one-half of all schools report that their objectives are implied by the institution but not stated. Type I institutions are highest here with almost 62 % and Type II lowest with 41 %. Type III institutions more nearly represent the average in responses for all institution types. There is no great difference between private and public institutions on the matter of specification of objectives. The relatively higher incidence of stated objectives for courses at Type II institutions may be a carry-over effect from an earlier period when many of these schools had the specialized mission of being teachers colleges. The absence of institutional requirements with stated objectives for general education courses at two-thirds of all institutions indicates, however, that considerable autonomy still exists at the course level.

TABLE VIII

INSTITUTIONAL REQUIREMENTS WITH STATED OBJECTIVES FOR GENERAL EDUCATION COURSES

Institution Type	N	Yes (%)	No, but Implied (%)	No, and Not Implied (%)
I	47	23.4	61.7	14.9
II	71	42.3	40.8	16.9
III	18	33.3	50.0	16.7
TOTAL	136	34.5	49.3	16.2

The Role of Geography in General Education Programs

Geography in the Organization of General Education Curricula

The second section of the survey dealt with geography's involvement in general education which has historically been to offer an alternative in some form of distribution or breadth requirement. Few institutions currently offering geography appear to include narrowly prescribed courses among distribution requirements nor do many offer numerous options without group requirements. The relatively moderate level of response to this section of the survey makes generalizations difficult but indications are that distribution or breadth requirements at most institutions offering geography are in the form of groups of subjects with either numerous or limited course options.

General education geography courses are most frequently offered for freshman or sophomore level credit (Table IX). This is not surprising since one of the traditional purposes of general education is to provide students opportunities for exposure to many fields from which a major can be selected. Respondents also indicate that the common practice of permitting juniors and seniors to enroll in lower division courses continues at their institutions. Despite the conventional wisdom which ascribes the general education role to first and second year level courses, geography offerings in the upper division appear to be quite common.

Among all types of institutions the social/behavioral science role of geography is predominant in terms of numbers of courses, sections of individual courses, and student enrollments. This is consistent with the general trend of the discipline, beginning in the 1930's, to become more associated with the social sciences (see Table III) and less so with the physical sciences. This should not, however, be interpreted to mean that geography's general education role in the physical sciences is ending. Over one-half of all respondents indicate that their department offers general education geography courses in both social/behavioral science and natural/physical sciences. This figure is much higher among the Type I and larger Type II institutions. Furthermore, a majority of all departments offer general education courses in both of these areas throughout the four year experience. In no instance does a department report courses offered solely for general education in the humanities although a few offer courses which satisfy requirements in both humanities and some other area. In general there appear to be few differences between private and public institutions in the

characteristics of their course offerings in the general education curriculum with the exception that private institutions have fewer offerings. Moreover, these findings may indicate that there is no clear home for general education geography in the social/behavioral sciences nor at the freshman-sophomore levels.

TABLE IX

GEOGRAPHY COURSE OFFERINGS AS DISTRIBUTIONAL ALTERNATIVES IN GENERAL EDUCATION*

Institution Type	Year Level	Institutions with Course Offerings in Social/Behavioral Sciences	Institutions with Course Offerings in Natural/Physical Sciences
I	Fr./So.	35	25
	Jr./Sr.	21	16
II	Fr./So.	56	27
	Jr./Sr.	27	9
III	Fr./So.	8	4
	Jr./Sr.	5	3
Private	Fr./So.	15	11
	Jr./Sr.	8	3
Public	Fr./So.	84	45
	Jr./Sr.	45	24
TOTAL**	Fr./So.	99	56
	Jr./Sr.	53	27

*No department reports course offerings exclusively for general education distribution requirements in the humanities.

**Some departments indicate course offerings at both levels and/or in both subject matter areas.

It is of some interest in this connection that general education proponents have frequently recommended that integrative learning experiences be offered toward the end of the student's degree program, the premise being that such opportunities would be more meaningful if experienced after the student has acquired breadth from distribution courses and depth in a major.[6] In an effort to identify the existence and nature of general education programs offering this experience, seven major categories based on descriptions by the Carnegie Commission were included in the survey (see Appendix A). Response was low (less than a third) to this section and may have been due to the complexity of the question. Although some respondents indicate that programs of this nature are offered at their institutions, usually at the freshman-sophomore levels, only a few state that their departments are involved in some form of interdisciplinary program--and participate by offering one or more courses. Though there is little to indicate that such curricular arrangements for advanced level students are common at institutions with geography departments, general education in geography does occur to a large degree at the upper division level.

Geography's General Education Competitors

As might be expected from previous discussion, geography's competitors for general education are drawn from the social and physical science areas (Table X). Overall, there is about a three to two ratio of social science competition to natural/physical science courses in general education. This corresponds roughly to the proportion of course offerings geography has in the two areas. Competition also comes from a larger number of individual disciplines in the social and/or

behavioral sciences. Most frequently noted is Sociology followed closely by History with Psychology and Anthropology a distant third and fourth, respectively. In the physical/natural sciences, Chemistry and Physics are the leading competitors followed by Astronomy, Geology and Earth Science.

TABLE X

GEOGRAPHY'S COMPETITORS FOR ENROLLMENTS IN GENERAL EDUCATION COURSES

Areas of Competition	Percent of N
Social/Behavioral Science	59.2
Natural/Physical Science	12.5
Social/Behavioral Science and Natural/Physical Sciences	20.0
Numerous Areas of Competition	8.3

N = 120 institutions reporting.

Competition, its nature and amount, serves as a crucial parameter to geography's role in general education. Another approach toward assessing competition is to measure geography's success in attracting students. Among all departments surveyed, the average percent of the total student body enrolled in some geography for general education is 7.6 % (Table XI). The range for four-fifths of all institutions is 1 - 12 % with some noticeable differences among institution types.

Overall, geographers at public institutions are slightly more successful than their private counterparts in attracting enrollments and Type II institutions appear to be doing better in this area than other institution types.

TABLE XI

PERCENT OF TOTAL SCHOOL ENROLLMENT IN GEOGRAPHY FOR GENERAL EDUCATION

Institution Type	N	1-6%	7-12%	13% or more	Mean Percent
I	34	61.8	26.5	11.7	6.1
II	62	33.9	43.5	22.6	8.1
III	15	66.7	26.6	6.7	5.3
Private	24	66.7	29.1	4.2	5.4
Public	87	41.4	37.9	20.7	7.7
TOTAL	111	46.8	36.0	17.2	7.6

The comparatively greater success of geography departments at Type II institutions (most of which are public institutions) in attracting enrollments for general education may be due to several factors related to their relative strength and position within the institutional setting. First, many do not offer graduate programs and are therefore able to focus exclusively on their undergraduate program. Second, many have enjoyed a long tradition of providing service courses, especially in teacher education programs. As institutions of this type have

become broader in scope and more comprehensive in their mission, their geography departments have often been able to follow suit by offering service courses for other fields. A related factor may be the possibility that these institutions are more generous in permitting students to receive general education credit for courses taken as cognates and/or to satisfy requirements in the major. Third, geography at these institutions was probably least affected by setbacks incurred by the discipline in higher education during the 1950's. Finally, geography has always found more favorable acceptance at Type II institutions than at Type III (liberal arts) and private institutions in general.

In the historical context much of geography's success in the development of other roles, as well as its survival as an academic discipline, has been dependent upon its ability to compete with other disciplines for enrollments, frequently in the context of delivering general education opportunities. The subject of the next section is focused upon the relative importance of the general education role within the context of the geography department.

The Role of General Education in the Geography Department Context

Approximately one-half of all responding geography departments describe their total undergraduate enrollments as being in excess of 500 students for the Spring term, 1979. The average among institutions varies considerably as does the range among institutions of the same type (Table XII). All of the responding departments in Type III institutions have comparatively smaller enrollments as is the case at most private institutions. Nearly all of the departments in Type I

TABLE XII

SIZE OF ENROLLMENT IN GEOGRAPHY
BY INSTITUTION TYPE

	Small	Medium	Large	Mean
Range =	15-499	500-999	1000-2720	623.5
Type I (N = 46)				886.9
Percent of N	23.9	37.0	39.1	
Percent of all Institutions	17.1	40.5	64.3	
Type II (N = 70)				576.4
Percent of N	50.0	35.7	14.3	
Percent of all Institutions	54.7	59.5	35.7	
Type III (N = 18)				133.7
Percent of N	100.0	0.0	0.0	
Percent of all Institutions	28.1	0.0	0.0	
Private (N = 28)				264.8
Percent of N	82.1	10.7	7.1	
Percent of all Institutions	35.9	7.1	7.1	
Public (N = 106)				718.3
Percent of N	38.7	36.8	24.5	
Percent of all Institutions	64.1	92.9	92.9	
Number of Institutions	64	42	28	

institutions have enrollments in either the medium or large categories and two-thirds of the large departments are in Type I institutions. Geography at Type II institutions appears to have greater differentiation in size of enrollments. One-half are in the small category but these departments also constitute more than half of all departments in this category. They further make up nearly 60 % of the medium size of enrollments and over a third of the large category. The great majority of departments in private institutions are in the small enrollment category while those in public are more evenly distributed. Departments in public institutions also account for over 90 % of the cases in both medium and large enrollment sizes.

Departmental Missions

Although departments do tend to vary in the size of their enrollments on the basis of institution type, this in itself says little about the overall role of the department in the institutional setting. In order to gain some idea of any relationship between the size of enrollment and the relative importance of general education within the departmental context, respondents were asked to report the percentage of their enrollments for different purposes (Table XIII).

The large majority of geography courses in most departments apparently serve multiple purposes in that they are offered as requirements for geography majors, cognate requirements for majors in other fields, general education requirements, and as free electives. (No information was requested or obtained regarding enrollments for free electives.) A few departments report they have no majors or that their courses are exclusively for one purpose (i.e., majors, cognate, or

general education) and this tends to make comparisons on the table more difficult. These findings do indicate, however, that geography majors constitute a small minority of the total enrollment in most geography courses. In Type III institutions they make up an average of 12.7 % but overall they average only 6.7 % among all departments which offer a major in geography.

TABLE XIII

ENROLLMENT CHARACTERISTICS IN GEOGRAPHY
SPRING TERM, 1979*

Institution Type	Enrollment in Geography (Mean)	Number of Majors (Mean)	Percent of Enrollment as Majors (Mean)	Percent of Enrollment as Cognate (Mean)	Percent of Enrollment for General Education (Mean)
I	886.9	49.3	5.4	21.4	57.8
II	576.4	49.6	7.8	24.6	59.2
III	133.7	23.9	12.7	22.9	46.5
Private	264.8	24.5	6.4	28.5	51.8
Public	718.3	50.9	6.7	22.2	58.3
TOTAL	623.5	47.1	6.7	23.4	57.1
Total Respondents for Each Column**	134	116	116	109	118

*The percent of enrollments exclusively for free electives was not reported.

**Totals of individual columns vary due to variation in responses by some departments.

The cognate role of geography courses is substantial but a distant second in terms of enrollments (Table XIV). Two-thirds of all respondents report that 20 % or less of their total enrollment is for that purpose.

TABLE XIV

PERCENT OF TOTAL ENROLLMENT IN GEOGRAPHY CLASSES FOR COGNATE PURPOSES

	N	Low 1-20%	Medium 21-50%	High 51% or More	Mean
TOTAL	109	64.2	20.2	15.6	23.4

In terms of total enrollments, it appears that general education continues to comprise the largest single group in geography courses (Table XV). Over one-half of all responding departments report that 60 % or more of their total enrollments are for general education purposes. The amount is somewhat less at Type III institutions where two-thirds report that 50 % or less are for general education. The remaining students not accounted for in these findings apparently enroll in geography courses as free electives which most likely serve purposes similar to those of general education.

TABLE XV

PERCENT OF TOTAL ENROLLMENT IN GEOGRAPHY CLASSES FOR GENERAL EDUCATION PURPOSES

Institution Type	N	Low 1-20%	Medium 21-60%	High 61-100%	Mean
I	38	13.1	34.2	52.7	57.8
II	65	15.4	26.1	58.5	59.2
III	15	20.0	53.3	26.7	46.5
TOTAL	118	15.3	32.2	52.5	57.1

Departmental Character and General Education

The size of total enrollments in geography courses appears to have little bearing on the purposes of courses or the proportion of enrollments for specific purposes. Some contrasts are evident among geography departments in the average number of faculty, the student-faculty ratio, and whether a graduate program is offered (Table XVI).[7] These factors have an obvious influence on the extent, diversity, and nature of general education within the departmental context. Moreover, they may serve to further differentiate the relevance of general education to the department's role in the institutional setting.

A major criticism of general education courses has been that they are frequently too large. The argument proceeds that size limits the flexibility of course objectives and the amount of individual attention instructors are able to provide students. In this area, departments at Type III institutions would appear to be in a more favorable position.

Although they attract a lower percentage of students from their total student body than departments at Type I and especially Type II schools, their lower student-faculty ratio and almost exclusive emphasis on undergraduate programs may say something about the quality of geography's role in general education at these institutions. Larger departments, however, are able to provide more diversity in the number as well as types of geography courses for general education. This advantage may be increased at departments which offer graduate programs.

TABLE XVI

QUALITATIVE ELEMENTS IN THE GENERAL EDUCATION ROLE OF THE DEPARTMENT

Institution Type	N	Number of Faculty (Mean)	Students per Faculty (Mean)	Percent with Graduate Departments
I	50	13.3	66.6	74
II	73	6.9	83.5	38
III	18	2.4	55.7	0
TOTAL	141	8.6	72.5	47

Graduate programs in geography are more prevalent at Type I schools and at some of the larger Type II institutions. Of those departments at Type I institutions having graduate programs in geography, a majority report that graduate students are utilized in courses

as assistants or in some instructional role, frequently with their own courses. When graduate students are utilized at Type II schools, they usually have the role as assistant and only rarely as instructor. Whether the use of graduate students in general education courses affects the quality of learning was not pursued in this study. It may be significant that general education teaching experience provides, in addition to financial remunerations, an important (and often the only) opportunity for graduate students to gain direct experience in some aspect of college teaching. Viewed from yet another perspective, the use of graduate students in general education courses may substantially lower the student-faculty ratio, especially in lower division courses, and permit a broader offering of courses or sections of the same courses. For those departments able to offer courses in the physical sciences, the use of graduate students may amount to a crucial pre-requisite since courses meeting general education science requirements frequently require that a laboratory session be included. There seems to be little doubt that the utilization of graduate students enables the department to engage itself more fully in the pursuit of other roles. Advantages of their use in general education are often said to offset any disadvantages.

The relative high percentage of students who are enrolled in geography courses for general education may present a mixed blessing for geography departments. Their predominance most certainly influences the goals and objectives of courses which may not always be consistent with those deemed desireable for students enrolled as majors or to meet cognate requirements. This also means that a substantial amount of the faculty's time must be allocated to general education thus limiting

their pursuits in other roles. On the other hand, the general education role probably provides the greatest amount of visibility for the department in the institutional setting and is the most important source for generating enrollments in other geography courses and for the recruitment of majors. Viewed historically, the importance of these factors cannot be overstated. Any changes in the general education role of geography, whether produced from within the department or without, always present the possibility of affecting other programs and priorities of the department.

The Effect of Curricular Revisions on the General Education Role of Geography

Geography has not been immune from curricular revision in the past, and recent efforts by institutions to improve upon their general education programs have affected geography. Eighty-three (almost 59 %) of all responding departments in this survey report that general education requirements have undergone revisions at their institutions in the last three years (Table XVII). Type III, and private institutions in general, have been most subject to reform. It is noteworthy that this is the same general group which, during the late 1960's and early 1970's, rushed to reduce or eliminate general education requirements.

Of those institutions experiencing revisions, fifty-three (64 %) of the respondents cite effects upon the general education role of geography (Table XVIII). This figure does not include eleven institutions where revisions have been too recent for their effects to be evaluated plus a few others which indicated changes to be still in the planning-discussion stage.

TABLE XVII

INSTITUTIONS WITH CURRICULAR REVISIONS
IN GENERAL EDUCATION

Institution Type	N	Not Revised or No Answer	Revised, but No Effect on Geography	Revised, but Too Current for Evaluation	Revised with Effect on Geography
I	50	26	7	4	13
II	73	26	9	7	31
III	18	6	3	0	9
Private	29	11	4	0	14
Public	112	47	15	11	39
TOTAL	141	58	19	11	53

TABLE XVIII

NATURE OF EFFECTS FROM CURRICULAR REVISIONS ON
THE GENERAL EDUCATION ROLE OF GEOGRAPHY

Institution Type	N	Increased Geography Enrollment (%)	Decreased Geography Enrollment (%)	Changed Enrollment Patterns in Geography (%)	Major Changes in Course Structure (%)	Multiple Effects (%)
I	13	38.4	30.7	30.7	7.7	7.7
II	31	40.6	37.5	43.8	31.3	37.5
III	9	55.6	22.2	33.3	0.0	11.1
Private	14	64.3	14.3	28.6	21.4	21.4
Public	39	35.9	41.0	43.6	20.5	28.2
TOTAL	53	43.4	33.9	39.6	20.8	24.4

As a group, departments in Type I institutions more frequently believe that they have been unaffected by measures of reform. Revisions appear to have been most beneficial to geography in Type III, and in private institutions of all types where revisions have generally caused increased enrollments. This should be especially encouraging for the discipline since geography has historically had more difficulty at such institutions. Effects from revisions have been more variable and complex on geography at Type II institutions where enrollment patterns have been altered the most and more departments report multiple effects. In a typical example, the department reports that revisions have caused increased enrollments in physical geography but decreases in cultural (social) geography. Furthermore, many institutions cite effects in all major categories listed on the table. Almost a third of Type II departments which have experienced effects report major changes in course structure. It is interesting that departments in this type of institution also report a higher incidence of stated institutional requirements governing content and instructional objectives for general education courses. (See Table VIII.)

Among institutions as a whole, revisions have affected geography primarily in the area of enrollment numbers rather than course structure. It is difficult to identify the specific element of revisions responsible for these changes but in view of the findings discussed in an earlier section regarding agents of decision and locus of control, it would appear that curricular reform has been most successfully aimed at the selection of courses which serve as distribution alternatives. The contrasts among institution types in the nature of effects on geography may signify a trend toward more uniformity in the proportion

of students at an institution who enroll in geography for general education.

With the exception of a number of Type II institutions, these findings demonstrate further that significant autonomy still exists at the department and course level in determining the content and instructional objectives of general education courses. They also demonstrate the dynamic nature of interest in curricular revisions at all types of institutions which house a geography department and the susceptability of geography to their effects. The potential effect on geography departments where revisions have not yet occurred, or where they are too recent to evaluate, would seem most likely in the selection of course offerings rather than structural changes in individual courses.

Standardization in General Education Geography

In spite of reports that autonomy in course structure has received little modification from recent curricular revisions, some courses are subject to more standardization than others. Geography has always been subject to a more rigorous set of criteria for acceptance in the physical sciences than in the social sciences, and the present study demonstrates a continuation of this. The survey findings reveal a clear tendency for geography courses offered for general education in the physical sciences to have more standardization or conformity among multiple sections taught by different instructors than is the case in social science courses (Table XIX). This conformity is expressed in such areas as content, instructional methodology, learning activities, grading, textbooks, and other resource materials. More than half of all departments responding to this question report a high degree of

conformity in physical science courses, while fewer than ten percent indicate that conformity is low. The highest incidence of standardization in physical science courses is found among the larger departments at Type I institutions. In geography courses with a social science orientation, a majority of all departments report they have either some or only a low amount of conformity. Private institutions tend to have more standardization in both social and physical science courses than do public. This phenomenon is most prevalent in those private Type III schools which offer multiple sections in both areas. No clear reason for this is evident from the survey but a possible explanation may be that smaller private institutions have more cooperation among faculty in the coordination of curricula, and this may extend to the structure of individual courses.

As a parameter to the general education role of contemporary geography, standardization in courses meeting science requirements is probably as much a result of the discipline's early involvement in this area as it is a need to meet certain criteria established by the administrative divisions of curricula in the institution. As general (universal) geography, the discipline has had a much longer tradition in the physical sciences which were also more fully developed at an earlier period than the social sciences. From the institution's point of view, the essential criteria of courses qualifying as a physical science are found perhaps most often in a more specifically defined area of subject matter along with the inclusion of a laboratory experience.

TABLE XIX

AMOUNT OF CONFORMITY AMONG MULTIPLE SECTIONS OF THE SAME COURSE (STANDARDIZATION)

Institution Type	Course	Institution N	High (% of N)	Some (% of N)	Low (% of N)
I	Social Science	41	34.1	53.7	12.2
	Physical Science	35	74.3	20.0	5.7
II	Social Science	55	23.6	45.5	30.9
	Physical Science	35	51.4	34.3	14.3
III	Social Science	11	27.3	45.4	27.3
	Physical Science	9	33.3	66.7	0.0
Private	Social Science	15	53.3	33.3	13.3
	Physical Science	13	69.2	30.8	0.0
Public	Social Science	92	23.9	51.1	25.0
	Physical Science	66	57.6	31.8	10.6
TOTAL*	Social Science	107	28.0	48.6	23.3
	Physical Science	79	59.5	31.6	8.9

*Over one-half offer courses in both areas.

For the department, standardization may be viewed as an important organizational device in the administration of multiple sections of courses which may also serve as prerequisites for advanced study, not only in geography but in other areas of the physical sciences. Using courses which are prerequisites for advanced study has been criticized by general education proponents on the grounds that it results in priorities which are not in congruence with those of general education. This may, however, be a less serious problem than the need to insure a

more equitable opportunity for students enrolled in different sections of a course requiring a laboratory experience. Standardization of multiple sections of laboratory sessions (often conducted by graduate students) is more or less common practice in the sciences and most likely contributes to the need for tighter uniformity in other aspects of the course such as lectures, textbooks, and evaluation measures.

Standardization is a controversial subject in that it is often held by individual faculty to be related to the issue of academic freedom. How standardization, or the lack thereof, may affect the quality of general education for the student has not been fully determined. For departments able to offer courses in the physical sciences it appears to remain an important, and perhaps necessary, administrative tool.

In summary, the role of geography departments varies considerably among individual institutions, and differences are most obvious in such areas as department size (i.e., number of faculty and size of enrollment), existence of a major program, presence of a graduate program, and the nature and extent of a cognate role for other fields of study. These factors serve as endogenous parameters in defining and delimiting the role of general education within the context of a department. Conversely, the department's role in general education contributes substantially to success in each of these areas. Recent curricular revisions by institutions have affected the general education role of geography most significantly in the area of enrollment numbers, more often favorably than not. The long-range effect of these changes on other roles pursued by geography departments is yet to be determined. One final area which may be the most important endogenous parameter in

defining the general education role of geography is found in the views and opinions of geographers.

The Views of Geographers Regarding the Role of Geography in General Education

As the discipline has evolved, geographers' views on the role of geography in general education have changed. Also, at any given time their views have not been consistent throughout the profession. On the basis of these observations there was reason to believe that geographers at different institution types might currently hold differing opinions regarding critical issues germane to geography's role in general education. To learn what the current status is, respondents were asked to indicate their level of agreement or disagreement with eight statements dealing with critical areas or issues in general education.

The high response rates to these questions reveal that geographers are willing to share their views on the issues as presented. Among institution types there are for the most part no great differences in the responses to any of the statements. In order to summarize the geographers' reactions, a level-of-agreement index has been applied in the following manner: strong agreement, 4; moderate agreement, 3; moderate disagreement, 2; strong disagreement, 1; and the weighted balance between agreement and disagreement, 2.5. Individual responses to each statement have been awarded their assigned weights, summed, and a weighted average has been determined from the cumulative responses. In addition the total percent of agreement has been included for each statement. This serves to differentiate between agreement and disagreement whereas the level-of-agreement index identifies and accounts for

TABLE XX

THE VIEWS OF GEOGRAPHERS ON THE ROLE
OF GEOGRAPHY IN GENERAL EDUCATION

A - Agree Strongly = 4 C - Disagree Somewhat = 2
B - Agree Somewhat = 3 D - Disagree Strongly = 1

2.5 = Weighted balance between agree and disagree

Responses A	B	C	D	Percent Agree	Weighted Average		
84	36	14	5	86	3.43	1.	Geography instructors and others in the discipline should be the primary judges of what general education objectives should be for geography courses offered for general education credit.
68	46	13	9	84	3.27	2.	Geographers, by the nature of their training, are especially well suited to teach general education courses.
34	57	29	16	67	2.80	3.	Upper division level (junior-senior) courses should be included more extensively in general education programs.
27	30	56	21	43	2.47	4.	To be most effective for students, integrative learning experiences are best left to courses provided by individual disciplines rather than courses or programs involving multiple disciplines.
21	45	45	25	49	2.46	5.	Instructors charged with teaching geography courses as general education should have specialized training in addition to that provided by the discipline.
13	58	39	26	52	2.43	6.	Geography courses offered for general education credit should stress skill development as opposed to a particular body of content or information.

TABLE XX (Continued)

A - Agree Strongly = 4 C - Disagree Somewhat = 2
B - Agree Somewhat = 3 D - Disagree Strongly = 1

2.5 = Weighted balance between agree and disagree

Responses A	B	C	D	Percent Agree	Weighted Average		
10	48	48	24	45	2.34	7.	If learning skills are major objectives in general education geography courses, they should be restricted to just those most commonly associated with geography as a discipline.
12	23	49	53	26	1.96	8.	If students have the opportunity to take only one geography course for general education purposes, their best choice would usually be a regional rather than a topical course.

N varies between 113-122

variation in the degree of support. Finally, the statements have been rank-ordered on the basis of their weighted averages and are presented as a group in Table XX. The results indicate a relatively high amount of agreement with three statements. There is substantial difference in opinion on four with almost a fifty-fifty split, and there is a high amount of disagreement with the last statement. To present a clearer picture of the distribution of responses as they relate to other elements of this study, each statement is discussed individually according to its numerical ranking.

The greatest agreement is reached on the issue of who should determine objectives in general education (Table XXI). The respondents tend to strongly favor "home rule" or individual freedom from any central authority in the determination of course objectives for general education. This is probably representative of the vast majority of all faculty in higher education and in particular those belonging to departmentalized disciplines having roles in addition to that of general education.

An inherent quality of the discipline is that it has traditionally approached academic studies across disciplinary lines and its members are often comprised of those who have received training and practice in several major fields. A large majority of the respondents express a belief that the nature of their training makes geographers especially well-suited to teach general education (Table XXII). Strong agreement on this is particularly high at Type II and public institutions in general and may reflect their more extensive involvement with general education courses. In contrast, the less than enthusiastic agreement from geographers at Type III institutions may reflect a different

TABLE XXI

INSTRUCTORS SHOULD BE PRIMARY JUDGES
OF COURSE OBJECTIVES IN
GENERAL EDUCATION

Institution Type	N	Agree Strongly (%)	Agree Somewhat (%)	Disagree Somewhat (%)	Disagree Strongly (%)	Percent Agree	Weighted Average
I	48	58.3	22.9	14.6	4.2	81	3.35
II	74	64.9	24.3	8.1	2.7	89	3.51
III	17	47.0	41.2	5.9	5.9	88	3.29
Private	28	50.0	35.8	7.1	7.1	86	3.28
Public	111	63.1	23.4	10.8	2.7	86	3.47
TOTAL	139	60.4	25.9	10.1	3.6	86	3.43

TABLE XXII

TRAINING IN THE DISCIPLINE RENDERS GEOGRAPHERS
WELL-SUITED TO TEACH GENERAL EDUCATION
COURSES

Institution Type	N	Agree Strongly (%)	Agree Somewhat (%)	Disagree Somewhat (%)	Disagree Strongly (%)	Percent Agree	Weighted Average
I	45	40.0	37.8	13.3	8.9	78	3.09
II	73	60.3	31.5	5.5	2.7	92	3.49
III	18	33.3	33.3	16.7	16.7	67	2.83
Private	28	42.9	25.0	17.8	14.3	68	2.96
Public	108	51.9	36.1	7.4	4.6	88	3.35
TOTAL	136	50.0	33.8	9.6	6.6	84	3.27

interpretation, on their part, of general education.

Recent proposals in general education have emphasized a need to include upper division courses which do not have prerequisites in general education programs. The offering of upper division level courses in geography for general education has been a common practice and as reported in an earlier section on these findings, this has not changed. The subject of prerequisites was not directly pursued in the survey but respondents tend to agree that upper division courses should be included more extensively in general education (Table XXIII).

TABLE XXIII

UPPER DIVISION COURSES SHOULD BE INCLUDED MORE EXTENSIVELY IN GENERAL EDUCATION

Institution Type	N	Agree Strongly (%)	Agree Somewhat (%)	Disagree Somewhat (%)	Disagree Strongly (%)	Percent Agree	Weighted Average
I	45	22.2	44.4	17.8	15.6	67	2.73
II	74	25.7	40.5	21.6	12.2	67	2.80
III	17	29.4	41.2	29.4	0.0	71	3.00
Private	27	25.9	55.6	14.8	3.7	81	3.04
Public	109	24.8	38.5	22.9	13.8	63	2.74
TOTAL	136	25.0	41.9	21.3	11.8	67	2.80

Proponents of general education have always stressed the importance of integrative learning experiences, preferably those which involve

participation by two or more disciplines. In theory this concept has found support among geographers but in practice such programs have been beset with staffing difficulties. Also, this survey was unable to determine any current widespread practice of interdisciplinary programs in general education which include participation from geography. There is wide variation but a tendency toward disagreement among the respondents with the idea that integrative learning experiences are most effective for students if left to individual disciplines (Table XXIV).

TABLE XXIV

INTEGRATIVE LEARNING EXPERIENCES SHOULD BE LEFT TO INDIVIDUAL DISCIPLINES

Institution Type	N	Agree Strongly (%)	Agree Somewhat (%)	Disagree Somewhat (%)	Disagree Strongly (%)	Percent Agree	Weighted Average
I	46	17.4	23.9	43.5	15.2	41	2.43
II	70	22.9	22.9	40.0	14.2	46	2.54
III	18	16.7	16.7	44.4	22.2	33	2.28
Private	29	17.3	20.7	31.0	31.0	38	2.24
Public	105	20.9	22.9	44.8	11.4	44	2.53
TOTAL	134	20.1	22.4	41.8	15.7	43	2.47

At Type II and public institutions in general, less than half agree with the statement but the weighted average reflects that a substantial number do agree strongly. On the other hand, Type III and private

institutions are least in favor of the statement. These differences may be more related to characteristics of the institutional setting and the experience geographers have had with these types of programs than whether they disapprove of the principle.

Proponents of general education have long claimed that a major shortcoming of general education courses lies in the inadequate training of instructors for dealing with problems of the greater heterogeneity among students enrolled in their courses. Special training is also needed, they say, to demonstrate interrelationships between the course and other subject areas, a principal goal in general education. In spite of the vote of confidence respondents attribute to their training as geographers to teach general education, they reveal little consensus on whether there should be additional specialized training for this role (Table XXV). A slight majority, but with wide variation in opinion overall, do not agree that geographers need specialized training.

The more recent proposals in general education have not dismissed the importance of studying carefully defined areas of content information in a subject, but they also have called for more emphasis on the development and practice of learning skills which require more from the student than simply reading the text and taking down lecture notes. In addition, they call for the selection of skills which offer the greatest amount of transfer for use in other areas. These concerns have amounted to a skill information continuum in which geographers have historically taken diverse and extreme views, especially since the 1950's. There is wide variation in the opinions of contemporary geographers but a majority do agree that geography courses in general education should stress

learning skills development as opposed to a particular body of content or information (Table XXVI). Geographers at Type II institutions were in most agreement and this may reflect a noticeable departure from their previous preoccupation with the more content-oriented regional courses. Among geographers as a whole, however, the weighted averages indicate that this remains a controversial issue. More than twice as many disagree strongly with the statement in contrast to those who express strong agreement.

TABLE XXV

INSTRUCTORS NEED SPECIALIZED TRAINING TO TEACH GENERAL EDUCATION COURSES

Institution Type	N	Agree Strongly (%)	Agree Somewhat (%)	Disagree Somewhat (%)	Disagree Strongly (%)	Percent Agree	Weighted Average
I	48	14.6	35.4	27.1	22.9	50	2.42
II	71	16.9	32.4	33.8	16.9	49	2.49
III	17	11.8	29.4	47.0	11.8	41	2.41
Private	27	11.1	40.8	33.3	14.8	52	2.48
Public	109	16.5	31.2	33.0	19.3	48	2.45
TOTAL	136	15.4	33.1	33.1	18.4	49	2.46

TABLE XXVI

LEARNING SKILL DEVELOPMENT SHOULD BE STRESSED IN GENERAL EDUCATION COURSES

Institution Type	N	Agree Strongly (%)	Agree Somewhat (%)	Disagree Somewhat (%)	Disagree Strongly (%)	Percent Agree	Weighted Average
I	47	4.2	42.6	31.9	21.3	47	2.30
II	72	13.9	41.7	26.4	18.0	56	2.51
III	17	5.9	47.1	29.4	17.6	53	2.41
Private	27	7.4	48.2	25.9	18.5	56	2.44
Public	109	10.1	41.3	29.3	19.3	51	2.42
TOTAL	136	9.6	42.6	28.7	19.1	52	2.43

While general education proponents have endorsed the need for more emphasis on learning skill development, many have been quick to caution against the overemphasis of those which are narrowly oriented toward advanced training in some specialization. Their argument is that such practice is not in harmony with the broader purposes of general education. Geographers as a whole, with little differentiation among institution types, support this in that they disagree that if learning skills are stressed they should be restricted to just those most commonly associated with the discipline (Table XXVII).

It is probably fair to assume that most geographers would agree that nearly all students need to take geography and more of it for general education purposes. In practice, a range of courses are offered by many departments for general education in both the social/behavioral sciences and to a lesser extent in the natural/physical sciences. But

the nature of competition for enrollments among distribution alternatives usually precludes a student taking more than one course in geography and this course will usually be in the social/behavioral sciences. Because content and instructional objectives among geography courses are often dissimilar, the question arises as to which type is best for the student taking only one course.

TABLE XXVII

LEARNING SKILLS SHOULD BE RESTRICTED TO THOSE MOST COMMON TO THE DISCIPLINE

Institution Type	N	Agree Strongly (%)	Agree Somewhat (%)	Disagree Somewhat (%)	Disagree Strongly (%)	Percent Agree	Weighted Average
I	44	4.5	38.6	45.5	11.4	44	2.36
II	70	10.0	35.7	31.4	22.9	46	2.33
III	16	6.2	37.5	37.5	18.8	44	2.31
Private	25	8.0	36.0	36.0	20.0	44	2.32
Public	105	7.7	37.1	37.1	18.1	45	2.34
TOTAL	130	7.7	36.9	36.9	18.5	45	2.34

The merits of regional courses for general education have traditionally received strong support from geographers. Reference to Schwendeman's Directory indicates that these courses remain quite common and that they continue to attract substantial enrollments.[8] Exposure to the international dimension and cultures other than our own has also

been a perennial goal among general education proponents and their recent proposals have again emphasized this need.[9] The ever broadening range of courses offered by geography, however, and changes in the predominant thought and practice by the discipline since the 1950's may have altered the views of geographers regarding which type of course experience is best for general education. In addition, there has never been universal support among all institution types for regional courses. Historically, regional courses have found strongest support among public Type II institutions and least acceptance within the private liberal arts schools, reflecting contrasts in the philosophies and missions of these institutions.

The results of this survey indicate that there is currently strong disagreement with the idea that regional courses would be the best choice for general education students if they are to take only one course in geography (Table XXVIII). It should be acknowledged, however, that if this question had been worded so that "topical" preceded the word "regional" or if it had included the word "physical" the responses may have been different. (See Table XX.) Nevertheless, the high rate of disagreement with the statement does seem to indicate that regional courses no longer enjoy the often dominant role they once had outside the private liberal arts colleges. These results would also seem to indicate rather clearly that the general association which was made in the past between regional courses and their predominance at Type II institutions is no longer a valid description of geography's general education role or indeed its overall role at these institutions.

TABLE XXVIII

REGIONAL COURSES ARE BEST FOR GENERAL EDUCATION

Institution Type	N	Agree Strongly (%)	Agree Somewhat (%)	Disagree Somewhat (%)	Disagree Strongly (%)	Percent Agree	Weighted Average
I	48	8.3	14.6	39.6	37.5	23	1.93
II	72	8.3	18.1	34.7	38.9	26	1.96
III	17	11.8	17.6	29.4	41.2	29	2.00
Private	27	7.5	11.1	37.0	44.4	19	1.81
Public	110	9.1	18.2	35.4	37.3	27	1.99
TOTAL	137	8.7	16.8	35.8	38.7	26	1.96

In summary, views and opinions geographers have regarding critical issues in general education appear to be more varied among members of the discipline as a whole than between geographers at different types of institutions. Three critical issues regarding geography's role in general education remain controversial: 1) whether geographers need special training in addition to that provided by the discipline to teach general education; 2) whether learning skills should be stressed as opposed to an established body of content or information; and, 3) which type of course is best for general education students who may take only one course in geography for that purpose.

FOOTNOTES

[1]A search through ERIC reports, DISSERTATION ABSTRACTS, and professional journals produced no major curriculum study pertaining to geography and general education in the last five years.

[2]Personal interviews were conducted with Dr. Keith Harries, Dr. Robert Norris, Dr. Stephen Tweedie, Dr. George Carney, Dr. Jerry Croft, and Dr. Jack Vitek during the Spring of 1978.

[3]Only departments listed exclusively as geography were selected from J. R. Schwendeman, Sr., and J. R. Schwendeman, Jr., Directory of College Geography of the United States, Vol. XXX (Richmond, Kentucky, 1979).

[4]The Carnegie Foundation for the Advancement of Teaching, A Classification of Institutions of Higher Education (Berkeley, 1973).

[5]Richard Hecock and Michael Garrett, "The Role of Geography Courses in the General Education Curriculum," paper presented at the annual meeting of the National Council for Geographic Education, Mexico City, Mexico (1 November 1979).

[6]The Carnegie Foundation for the Advancement of Teaching, Missions of the College Curriculum: A Contemporary Review with Suggestions, the Carnegie Council Series (San Francisco, 1977), p. 180.

[7]These sources were used to supplement and cross-check information received from the survey. J. R. Schwendeman, Sr., and J. R. Schwendeman, Jr., Directory of College Geography, Vol. XXX (Richmond, Kentucky, 1979); and Association of American Geographers, Guide to Graduate Departments of Geography in the United States and Canada 1979-1980 (Washington, D.C., 1979).

[8]J. R. Schwendeman, Sr., and J. R. Schwendeman, Jr., Directory of College Geography, Vol. XXX (Richmond, Kentucky, 1979).

[9]Malcolm G. Scully, "A New Era of Concern for International Education," The Chronicle of Higher Education 16 (31 July 1978), pp. 1, 6.

CHAPTER VI

SUMMARY AND CONCLUSIONS

American Higher Education is in a constant process of change which historically has responded, often belatedly, to the needs and preferences of society. While certain general features are held in common in higher education, for example, the major, professional programs, graduate degree programs, research, and general education, uniformity in such programs is far overshadowed by their heterogeneity. The type and size of student body, the institution's tradition, the faculty, its funding sources and many other factors shape the structure of the educational experience offered by a particular institution. Furthermore, the system is dynamic. Some of the elements interact with one another in important ways, ways which have not been well-documented. One of these interactions is the relationship between the general education programs and the individual constituent disciplines which contribute course offerings.

The variable success of geography's growth and expansion in different institutional settings has historically been intricately connected to its role and place in the general education curriculum. In view of the contemporary interest in redefining the concept and practice of general education, there is the likelihood that subsequent revisions may significantly alter the parameters of geography's role in providing this service. This study has examined the historical

evolution of geography as an academic discipline in its role of delivering general education and has attempted to construct a descriptive profile of this role and its parameters in contemporary higher education. Answers to the following questions were sought:

1. What is general education and how has it been implemented?
2. In what ways has general education been a part of geography's evolution and growth as an academic discipline and how has the discipline served this role?
3. What is the contemporary role of geography in general education?
4. What has been the effect of recent curricular revisions on the parameters of geography as general education?

General Education

General education is a device to provide the breadth of study and balance required of a more fulfilling college education. In both the professional literature and common parlance of academic discussion, general education is frequently equated with liberal education. There are indeed close similarities in the meanings of the two terms and distinctions are difficult to make. Both are oriented toward the non-vocational aspects of a college education. Both are concerned with the goals of the learning experience which aim to prepare the individual for lifelong learning and the ability to function independently as a responsible member of society. These ideals are in contrast, yet complementary, to the narrower purposes of specialization which, by design, seek to serve their own ends. Liberal education is a much older term which has often been associated with the study of a particular body of subject matter; but historically, its emphasis on different areas of knowledge has varied considerably.

Perhaps a more meaningful definition of liberal education is found in its philosophical intent as a goal to develop the whole person for a richer and more rewarding life as a human being. In this context, general education is concerned with subject matter, its selection, organization, and instruction. It specifically focuses upon the provision of a common foundation in knowledge and a balance to the student's own particular area of concentration or specialization. It further provides the student an opportunity to identify a major field of study while gaining information and skills which will enhance that study in addition to serving lifelong needs. In a functional sense general education seeks to provide the structure and organization in which a liberal education is more likely to occur; but because these terms are used interchangeably, they have been utilized in this study to mean one and the same. General education is defined here as that part of a college degree program providing learning that:

1. builds skills for advanced studies and lifelong learning,
2. distributes time available (coursework) for learning in such a way as to expose students to the mainstreams of thought and interpretation--humanities, science, social science, and the arts, and,
3. integrates learning in ways that cultivate the student's broad understanding and ability to think about a large and complex subject.[1]

General education is what the process of American higher education has always sought to provide. Until the mid-nineteenth century, a college education was exclusively reserved for a relatively small and elite element of the population. Most students pursued a narrowly prescribed course of studies in the "liberal arts," which though experiencing periodic alterations in content, permitted few alternatives.

Any specialized training in professional or vocational areas was left to other sources. During the latter half of the century this situation began to change dramatically as the missions and purposes of many institutions became increasingly diversified and more accessible to a rapidly expanding population. To be more correct, changes affected institutions variably. Some held steadfast to a more traditional and prescribed curriculum, particularly church-sponsored and other privately funded liberal arts colleges, and many of these were able to postpone the inevitable for several decades.

The modern concept of general education began during the second decade of this century as an effort to restore some of what had been lost in the traditional liberal arts curriculum and to insure some basis for a common culture among an educated citizenry. It was targeted at a fragmented and rapidly expanding curriculum which permitted excessively narrow specialization and minimum student guidance in other academic pursuits. Over the years general education took on the form of a movement which peaked in the mid-1950's. During this period the concept became more or less institutionalized and a variety of models and curricular experiments were introduced, some of which were revolutionary in both concept and practice.

The model eventually adopted by most institutions, and the one most politically acceptable to the diverse elements of academe, was one of concentration-distribution. This system has ranged in structure between prescribed courses distributed in various areas outside the major to almost total student autonomy in the selection of courses. General education requirements have also varied proportionately from a single course to as much as one-half or more of the entire degree program.

The ideals of a general education have been fairly popular in theory. Broadly defined goals and purposes have been easy to establish but in practice there has been little consensus as how best to implement and maintain programs which fulfill their purposes. Symptomatic consequences have been a lack of specificity in goals, their attainment, and their measurement. These are generic problems which are manifested in the structure and content of course arrangements and have led to perennial questions of relevance and lack of support by students, faculty, and the general public. The nature of these problems, however, are systemic and emanate from two interconnected elements.

The first is specialization. General education has always lacked wholehearted support from the various areas of specialization. Demand for cooperation in the implementation of general education programs has had the effect of putting the interests of faculty and their departments at cross purposes with other roles they pursue. A major goal in general education has been to provide breadth in knowledge through learning experiences which devote some attention to the interrelationships of different subject matter fields.

Two approaches with this goal which involve individual disciplines are integrative course arrangements requiring cooperative efforts between two or more disciplines and survey courses offered separately by contributing disciplines. Although faculty generally support the former in theory, course arrangments of this type have been difficult to staff and administer. Students have also voiced dissatisfaction with their experiences in such arrangements. The more common practice has been to offer survey courses from individual departmental areas as alternatives in some form of distribution requirements. For many

departments this is regarded as a mixed blessing. It places departments in a competitive situation for enrollments in which they must participate to augment the support needed for other endeavors. Frequently, these courses have large enrollments and/or attempt to serve purposes in addition to those of general education such as an introduction to the discipline, special requirements for majors in the discipline, or as cognate requirements for majors in other fields. The ensuing and related peripheral problems are considerable with the overall effect being a general lack of satisfaction by all parties concerned.

The second element, which is perhaps the key to sustaining the quality of a strong general education program and avoiding many of the problems attributed to specialization, is locus of control. Most programs able to keep such problems to a minimum have had a central authority over the administration and implementation of general education. This has usually included a separate administrative head, budget, and sometimes instructors assigned exclusively to general education courses. Programs without strong centralized control have generally been more susceptable to erosion of support, relaxation of requirements, and increased tendencies to permit students to elect courses more freely without professional guidance. Yet, even those successful highly centralized programs have fallen from grace or have become vulnerable to agents of erosion, as exemplified by the recent dismantling of the University College at Michigan State University.

Interest and support for general education has waxed and waned over the years and many of the same critical themes seem to surface with each generation--the dangers of specialization without breadth, the need to provide a common awareness of societal goals and problems,

a basic understanding of the world community, and understanding of the natural environment and interactions between it and the human element. The most recent proposals have addressed all three components of general education (i.e., advanced learning skills, distribution and breadth, and integrative learning experiences) by redefining the objectives and how they are to be met. Attention has also been given to more extensive use of upper division courses and requirements for some type of exposure to non-Western cultures. Writing and quantitative reasoning skills have been targeted for strengthening and more emphasis is to be given to their practice in all course work, not just those which specialize in their instruction. Distribution and breadth requirements are to be more carefully selected with tighter guidelines for instructional content objectives. A number of institutions are also strengthening distribution requirements in the sciences by requiring that they include a laboratory experience. Finally, the need for more centralized control over the administration and implementation of general education programs has been advocated.

The extent and nature of actual changes in general education programs resulting from curricular revisions vary among institutions, both geographically and on the basis of institution type. Factors which may influence the response of a particular institution include: 1) the degree to which general education requirements were relaxed over the past decade; 2) the amount of interest and support provided by individual faculty and departmentalized disciplines; 3) the current missions and functions of the school as well as its traditions; and, 4) the background and special needs of the students. For contributing disciplines the nature and extent of impacts will largely be dependent upon

the same factors as well as their own relative strength and position within the institution. Related factors include the present role of general education in the department and its relative importance to other roles, the backgrounds, training, and interests of the faculty, and the views and opinions they have regarding critical issues in general education.

Geography

By its nature, geography's approach to knowledge has rendered it a suitable vehicle for meeting many of the goals and purposes of general education. The reciprocal relationship between geography and general education has been vital for the discipline. Geography as general education has provided the foundation for growth and expansion into all types of institutions and has contributed immensely to the establishment of separate departments, the generation of majors, development of professional programs, and to some extent the support needed for graduate programs and research. In terms of enrollments geography's involvement in higher education has been closely related to general education. With few notable exceptions, however, geographers have given slight attention in the professional journals to documenting this role and even less to describing the discipline's dependency on it.

Over the course of three centuries in American higher education, academic geography has had an intermittant and variable role in the college curriculum. For the first half of this period, the discipline enjoyed a major role in the narrowly prescribed course of studies which constituted the college curriculum of most early institutions. In view of the declared purposes of that education, geography's role was

essentially one of general education. The circumstances related to geography's dismissal after so much success and the difficulties encountered in becoming reestablished in the latter nineteenth and early twentieth centuries vividly demonstrate the vulnerability of any discipline in its efforts to accommodate change or meet the criteria of acceptance in higher education.

As an academic discipline, geography's role in American higher education has been characterized by identifiable cycles. The variable success of geography has been accompanied by periodic changes, both internal and external, which have enhanced its position in some institutions and reduced or eliminated its role in others. The nature of changes encountered during these cycles have been compounded because the prevailing views of the discipline, the needs and demands of society, and the standards set by academic circles (real or perceived) have not always coincided.

In its efforts to respond to, and incorporate, changes in each of these areas, the discipline has taken on different characteristics as an academic subject which at times have been contrasted by differences in the types of institutions that have emerged. Moreover, the changing profile of geography's historical role in higher education is characterized by shifts in emphasis between two basic approaches to geographic thought and practice which have been reflected in the types of courses offered by the discipline and their degree of acceptance at different institution types. Despite efforts by many geographers to show the complementarity of both approaches, in practice they have been manifested in what has been described as a false dualism between a "general" geography and a "special" geography. The differences between

the two approaches and the various ways they have been interpreted and applied is of fundamental importance to understanding geography's evolution as an academic discipline, its degree of acceptance in different institutional settings, and its role and place in the general education curriculum.

The precepts of general geography are focused upon a generic approach to geographic study. Attention has been given to the need, and ability, to pursue and establish universal principles explaining the causal relations of phenomena and their spatial arrangements. Special (or particular) geography has emphasized the need for studying the unique characteristics of phenomena as they occur over the earth's surface. Attention has been focused upon the areal relationships of phenomena of specifically defined places and through careful synthesis describe the character or regional distinctiveness of those places as they have developed over time and through interrelationships with other places. In essence, general geography subscribes to a nomothetic approach to geographic study and special geography pursues an idiographic approach. Adherence by the discipline to one form or the other at different times has paralleled the level of advancement and sophistication in intellectual thought, changes in the perceived needs of a contemporary society, and the need to gain acceptance in academic circles.

Confusion has been added to problems of interpretation and definition when these approaches have been associated with types of phenomena (e.g., physical versus human) or phenomena versus geographic area (e.g., topical versus regional). Distinctions are also shrouded by the practice of higher education to make somewhat artificial divisions in the

administrative organization of subject matter and geography has frequently been included in more than one division. It can be argued that most courses in contemporary geography embody the precepts of both approaches and that the amount of emphasis for one or the other is only a matter of degree. Nevertheless, the basic differences have had, and apparently still do have, a determining effect on the nature and extent of geography's role as an academic discipline.

Controversies over the merits and shortcomings of both approaches have historically transcended all elements of the discipline, including courses offered for general education. This includes arguments over which goals geography is most suited to serve in general education, and the approach to be followed. Perhaps the most crucial in the historical context has been concern over which is most beneficial for the discipline. In contemporary geography the discipline customarily offers a plethora of courses in both natural/physical sciences and social/behavioral sciences; and geographers have offered a variety of views regarding the content and instructional objectives these courses should have. Any overriding distinctions between general geography and special geography are now more often made on the basis of topical versus regional approaches in the social/behavioral sciences.

In the historical context the concern over which approach is best for the discipline is not unfounded. The precepts of general geography have generally found more acceptance in private institutions, especially private liberal arts colleges where special geography (principally regional) has not been well received. This has been clearly evident in geography's low level of acceptance and even rejection when special geography has been the predominant focus of the discipline. In contrast

special geography found early acceptance in this century where the training of teachers was a concern. The regional orientation of many state universities and especially the "normal" schools and teachers colleges in conjunction with a perceived need to know about different areas of the world made regional courses attractive additions to the curriculum.

At the peak of the general education movement in the 1950's, regional (special) geography was the predominant focus of the discipline and geographers were giving strong endorsements to the importance of regional courses in general education. In their enthusiasm, ambitious claims were made for regional courses as great integrators of knowledge among disparate areas of subject matter and as the ideal bridge between the social and physical sciences. Since then the emphasis has been increasingly associated with the principles of general geography but contemporary geographers have espoused diverse views regarding the most suitable approach for general education. To what extent one view has been favored over the other in general education courses and whether the differences reflect geography's current role at different types of institutions was not known.

Not surprisingly, there are general education proponents outside the discipline who advocate goals and approaches which closely resemble the arguments geographers have made in their preferences for one form of geography over the other. The views geographers hold on this matter and others concerning geography's role in general education are undoubtedly influenced by a number of factors. These include the divided loyalties required of their academic position, extending from background and training, areas of specialization, and the particular nature

of geography's present and past role in each institution as well as its relationship with other disciplines in the institutional setting. For some geographers a clear distinction most certainly exists regarding which courses should be offered specifically for general education and those which should be more narrowly structured for specialization in the discipline. For others, these roles are regarded as one and the same.

At present, geography as general education in different institutional settings is surprisingly more uniform than might have been expected. It can be inferred that the differences which do exist are found more often in those parameters which are external to geography as an academic discipline. Those parameters may include such factors as institutional size and function, characteristics of the student body, as well as departmental size, and the relative strength of the department to that of other disciplines competing for enrollments in general education.

Among institution types there are few distinguishable characteristics in the philosophical views of geographers toward geography as general education. If such differences have existed in the past they have become reconciled in the evolution of intellectual thought within the discipline. This cannot be interpreted to mean that geographers as a whole are unanimous in their views and opinions regarding general education. Differences do exist regarding what goals geography should and can best serve in general education and perhaps more importantly, in how they should be approached. That these views are responses to perceived needs of society, the background and training of the geographer, the particular arrangement of general education at individual

institutions, or some combination of all three is difficult to determine. From an historical viewpoint, all three have been important.

Geography's current role in the general education curriculum is principally to offer an alternative within some form of distributive course requirement situation. The predominent use of this curricular model for general education among institutions, and the corresponding practice to permit a decentralized locus of control over its implementation, appear to have been favorable for geography's interest as a discipline. For example, where geography is offered, it has frequently been able to offer courses in more than one subject matter field, and decentralized administration has generally permitted more academic freedom in determining course objectives and content. The geographers who participated in the survey portion of this study indicate that they appreciate and place high value on the academic freedom they have in this arrangement. Only one-third of all departments surveyed in this study report that their institution has stated guidelines governing the content and instructional objectives of courses offered for general education.

Furthermore, where recent revisions have occurred in general education requirements, there appear to have been few major changes in the locus of control. Changes from revisions have affected geography, however, by causing either increased or decreased enrollments at a number of institutions. Most significant increases have occurred at the smaller liberal arts colleges where enrollments have always been comparatively lower in both number and percent among all institution types. Overall, increases have more than offset decreases. Patterns of enrollments among different geography courses have also been altered. These

have been variable between courses offered in the social and physical sciences but most frequent at a substantial number of public Type II institutions. These types of changes appear to be the result of modified course options in distributive requirements. These same types of institutions also more frequently reported major structural changes in course content and instruction resulting from revisions. Among all types of institutions in general, the comparatively larger number of public Type II institutions appear to be in a greater state of flux regarding general education. This phenomenon may be symptomatic of other pressures with respect to changes occurring within the context of their missions and functions.

General education at institutions offering geography does appear to be almost solidly in the control of the participating disciplines with little likelihood that a shift toward a more centralized locus of control will occur in the near future. This seems to indicate that the most pervasive parameters to geography as general education will continue to be found in its relationships with other disciplines. This includes not only their competitive role in the general education arena but the related need to maintain intellectual ties with non-geographers. The implications of these factors on course structure and content are obvious.

Geography competes for enrollments chiefly in the social sciences with which it has become more extensively associated, especially since the 1930's. To a lesser degree geography offers courses in the physical sciences where it not only meets a proportionate amount of competition but must satisfy a more established set of criteria in the way of uniformity in course structure and content. Courses in both areas are

offered at all college levels and typically serve other purposes in addition to general education, namely, cognate, free electives, and as introductory requirements for the major. The largest enrollments, however, continue to be found in the lower division courses.

Geography has long lost its dependency upon satisfying the criteria of the natural/physical sciences for acceptance as an academic subject, but the ever present need to maintain acceptance from and interact with other academic disciplines appears evident in three areas. First, regional courses no longer occupy a dominant role in general education course offerings. In fact, there is no longer a clear preference among geographers for any particular type of geography course for general education. Second, there is moderate support among geographers for emphasizing intellectual skills over content information in general education--skills which have more universal application than those more narrowly associated with specialized studies within the discipline. Third, there is general support for the idea of two or more disciplines to be involved in programs providing integrative learning experiences rather than leaving this type of experience to courses offered exclusively by individual disciplines. All three of these trends are indicative of the latest switch in emphasis from special geography to general geography which occurred during the 1960's, and furthermore show the close connection between the discipline's need to correlate its mainstream of thought and practice with the existing criteria (real or perceived) for survival in the academic arena.

Survival in the academic arena is perhaps more dependent upon the discipline's success in general education than any other role pursued by a department. Overall, enrollments in geography for general

education at institutions which have geography departments currently amount to approximately 7.6 % of total school enrollments per term.[2] This is encouraging but is still relatively low in comparison to many other disciplines, and among all institutions in general this proportion is much lower. Problems of image and visibility continue to plague college geography in its efforts to attract students and largely because students beginning college are either unaware of geography's existence or have developed a distaste for it from earlier exposure. These appear to be problems not shared by most other disciplines which compete with geography. Yet, the importance of general education enrollments to geography is heightened by their relative predominance in nearly all undergraduate geography courses. This is basically a universal situation for geography departments regardless of size of enrollments, number of faculty, number and type of courses offered or even institution type. The importance of general education enrollments continues to be paramount in establishing visibility on the campus, generating enrollments in marginal courses, and for the recruitment of majors.

The nature and extent of a department's role in general education is largely a function of its relative strength and position in the institutional setting. This includes the number of faculty, number of courses offered, its cognate role, the types of professional training offered, and whether it has a graduate program. All of these factors contribute primarily to variety and the ability to attract large enrollments.

In this area departments at large Type I and II institutions have some advantages. In terms of quality, however, other factors such as low student-faculty ratios and exclusive emphasis on undergraduate

education may be equally important, and in these areas the private liberal arts colleges have a clear advantage. Just how successful a department is with general education is probably more dependent upon the views and opinions of geographers regarding critical issues pertaining to geography's role in general education. Such questions as whether learning skills should be given more attention than established bodies of content information, or which type of geography course is most appropriate for general education students remain as important controversies in contemporary geography. Moreover, these two questions have perhaps been closer to the heart of controversies throughout geography's long evolution as an academic subject in American higher education than any others. How these and related questions are resolved by geographers at any particular institution will be vital to geography's success in general education and consequently to its success in the pursuit of other roles.

This study has been concerned with the general education role of geography as it has evolved over the course of the discipline's higher education history. As with any academic discipline the characteristics of geography are as much a product of its past as they are a reflection of its efforts to serve the multiple needs of a contemporary society in those areas for which it is best suited. Numerous forces affect the general education role of geography and serve as parameters which both define and delimit it. A change in any one of these forces has the potential to alter any or all of the others. Recent revisions in general education requirements have for the most part acted favorably on geography's role in general education. The effect of more extensive revisions stemming from an effort to meet current and forthcoming

budgetary restraints and/or significant alterations in total enrollment trends may have even broader and less favorable effects on geography. The extent of these remains to be seen. However, on the basis of this study as a whole, several specific observations and suggestions regarding the current role of geography in general education are offered:

1. Locus of control at institutions with geography departments will remain with committees deciding which courses are to be included in general education programs and the broader goals they are to serve. Considerable autonomy will continue at the department and course level in the actual formulation of instructional and content objectives. Geographers will therefore continue to make the major decisions about what should be taught and how. There are some signs that this decentralization of control is less likely to be found at public Type II institutions.

2. Distribution requirements will continue to be the principal vehicle for implementing general education requirements. There is little indication that interdisciplinary programs are to have more than a minor role at institutions which have a geography department. There will be an increased role for upper division courses but also more restriction on choice of options for students among all course alternatives. Geography's predominant role will continue to be that of offering an alternative in some form of distribution requirement, most often with lower division courses.

3. Geography will continue to align itself with the social/behavioral sciences but there is no indication that its role in the physical sciences will be abandoned in general education, especially at those institutions where geography offers a graduate program.

4. Competition with other disciplines for enrollments in general education will remain intense despite reports of recent increases by a number of geography departments. The need for more complementarity between general education geography courses and other contributing disciplines will become an increasingly important parameter in the nature of general education geography.

5. Overall, the largest number of enrollments in geography courses are for general education; yet the number of all students at an institution who enroll in as much as a single course has been and continues to be discouragingly low. This situation demands improvement for two reasons. First, all students can benefit from exposure to geography for general education. There are some objectives which have been identified in

general education by geographers and non-geographers alike that have traditionally been inherent qualities of the discipline. Foremost among these is development of spatial awareness in order to better understand, make decisions about, and act upon events and situations concerning both the individual and society and which pertain to the use and quality of the social and natural environment of this planet. The second reason is for survival and improvement of academic geography as a viable and contributing discipline and this is inextricably related to the first. A number of parameters work to limit and define the role of the discipline in an academic setting but the one most crucial for many departments is their role in general education. Limited enrollments in general education is primarily a problem of visibility. It would appear that the most promising gains to be made in this area are through renewed efforts in articulation with both primary and secondary education. Direct attempts to influence the secondary curricula may continue to have limited results. However, more attention could be given to visitations to high school campuses by geographers. Geography departments also could invite high school teachers and their students from a variety of fields to attend special presentations and activities within or sponsored by the geography department. Finally, the NCGE should promote and encourage more of its members to organize chapters at the state and local levels.

FOOTNOTES

[1]The Carnegie Foundation for the Advancement of Teaching, Missions of the College Curriculum: A Contemporary Review with Suggestions, The Carnegie Council Series (San Francisco, 1977), p. 165.

[2]However, there are indications that among all institutions offering geography this figure is much lower and that overall enrollments are actually decreasing.

A SELECTED BIBLIOGRAPHY

Anderson, Lester G. "Half a Century of General Education." Intellect (October 1973), pp. 41-42.

Association of American Geographers. Guide to Graduate Departments of Geography in the United States and Canada 1979-80. Washington, D.C.: Association of American Geographers, 1979.

Association of American Geographers. "Guidelines." Geography in Undergraduate Liberal Education. Washington, D.C.: Association of American Geographers, 1965.

Baker, J. N. L. "Geography of Bernhard Varenius." The History of Geography: The Collected Papers of J. N. L. Baker. New York: Barnes and Noble, 1963, pp. 105-113.

Baker, J. N. L. "Mary Somerville and Geography in England." The History of Geography: The Collected Papers of J. N. L. Baker. New York: Barnes and Noble, 1963, pp. 51-71.

Barrows, Harland H. "Geography as Human Ecology." Annals of the Association of American Geographers 13 (March 1923), pp. 1-14.

Bell, Daniel. The Reforming of General Education. New York: Columbia University Press, 1966.

Belloti, Helen; Wirk, Betty C.; and Menk, Elizabeth. "Changes in the Geography Taught in Teacher Education Institutions." The Journal of Geography 44 (September 1945), pp. 246-251.

Bengtson, Nels A. "Geography as an Element in General Education." Geography in Undergraduate College Curricula. Professional Paper No. 8, National Council of Geography Teachers (April 1948).

Bengtson, Nels, A. "Geography as General Education." The Journal of Geography 47 (April 1948), pp. 121-131.

Bennington College Bulletin. Vol. 25. Vermont, August 1956.

Bergen, John R. "Geography in Small Liberal Arts Colleges." The Journal of Geography 62 (January 1963), pp. 22-29.

Berry, Brian J. L. "Approaches to Regional Analysis: A Synthesis." Annals of the Association of American Geographers 54 (March 1964), pp. 2-12.

Blackburn, Robert; Armstrong, Ellen; Conrad, Clifton; Didham, James; and McKune, Thomas. Changing Practices in Undergraduate Education. Washington, D.C.: The Carnegie Foundation for the Advancement of Teaching, 1976.

Black, Wilfred. "Do College Students Know Their Geography?" The Social Studies 62 (January 1971), pp. 16-20.

Botstein, Leon. "Liberal Arts and the Core Curriculum: A Debate in the Dark." The Chronicle of Higher Education 18 (9 July 1979), p. 17.

Broek, Jan O. M. "Introductory Geography: The Topical Course." The Journal of Geography 66 (October 1967), pp. 348-349.

Broek, Jan O. M.; Hunker, Henry L.; Muessig, Raymond, H.; and Cirrincione, Joseph M. The Study and Teaching of Geography. Columbus, Ohio: Charles E. Merrill Co., 1980.

Brown, Albert W. "The Role of Introductory Geography Courses in College Curricula." The Journal of Geography 60 (October 1961), pp. 321-326.

Brubacher, John S., and Rudy, Willis. Higher Education in Transition. 3rd ed. New York: Harper and Row, 1976.

Bruner, Jerome S. The Process of Education. New York: Random House, Vintage ed., 1963.

Bulletin of St. John's College in Annapolis. Vol. 6. Maryland, 1954.

Bunge, William. Theoretical Geography. Lund Studies in Geography, Series C. Lund, Sweden: C. W. K. Gleerup, 1962; revised, 1966.

Burke, Richard J. "Two Concepts of Liberal Education. Academe 66 (October 1980), pp. 354-356.

Burton, Ian, and Kates, Robert W. "The Perception of Natural Hazards in Resource Management." Natural Resources Journal 3 (January 1964), pp. 412-441.

California State University, Fullerton. Fullerton General Education. Special Issue, March 1979.

The Carnegie Foundation for the Advancement of Teaching. Missions of the College Curriculum: A Contemporary Review with Suggestions. The Carnegie Council Series. San Francisco: Jossey-Bass, Inc. for the Carnegie Foundation for the Advancement of Teaching, 1977.

Caswell, Hollis L. "Persistent Curriculum Problems." Educational Forum 43 (November 1978), pp. 99-110.

Cattani, Richard J. "Campuses Reflect Middle Ground Goals on Curricula." The Christian Science Monitor (5 April 1978), p. 4.

Chait, Richard. "Mission Madness Strikes Our Colleges." The Chronicle of Higher Education 18 (July 1979), p. 36.

Chamberlain, James F. "Report of the Committee on Secondary School Geography." The Journal of Geography 8 (September 1909), pp. 1-9.

Chase, Alston. "Skipping Through College: Reflections on the Decline of Liberal Arts Education." Toward the Restoration of the Liberal Arts Curriculum. Working Papers - The Rockefeller Foundation. (June 1979), pp. 77-96.

Colby, Charles C. "Changing Currents of Geographic Thought in America." Annals of the Association of American Geographers 26 (March 1936), pp. 1-37.

Columbia University Bulletin of Information. Announcement of the School of General Studies, Winter and Spring Sessions, 1956-57. Fifty-sixth Series, No. 33. New York: Columbia University Press, 18 August 1956.

Cooper, Clyde E. "Status of Geography in Normal Schools of the Eastern States." The Journal of Geography 20 (September 1921), pp. 217-224.

Cooper, Clyde E. "Status of Geography in Normal Schools of the Far West." The Journal of Geography 18 (October 1919), pp. 300-305.

Cooper, Clyde E. "Status of Geography in Normal Schools of the Middle States." The Journal of Geography 19 (September 1920), pp. 211-222.

Coughlin, Ellen K. "Harvard's Report on the Core Curriculum." The Chronicle of Higher Education 16 (March 1978), pp. 2, 15.

Cunningham, Floyd F. "The Present Status of Geography in Teacher Training Institutions." The Teaching of Geography. 32nd Yearbook of the National Society for the Study of Education. Bloomington, Ill.: National Society for the Study of Education, 1933.

Davis, William Morris. "The Progress of Geography in the United States." Annals of the Association of American Geographers 14 (December 1924), pp. 195-210.

De Jong, G. Chorological Differentiation. Groningen, Netherlands: J. B. Wolters, 1962.

Dewey, John. Philosophy of Education. Patterson, N. J.: Littlefield, Adams and Co., 1958.

Dewey, John. "The Significance of Geography and History." Democracy and Education. New York: Macmillan Company, 1919; reprint 1939.

Dickinson, Robert E. The Makers of Modern Geography. New York: Frederick A. Praeger, 1969.

Dressel, P. L., and Delisle, F. H. Undergraduate Curriculum Trends. Washington, D.C.: American Council on Education, 1969.

Dryer, Charles Redway. "A Century of Geographic Education in the United States." Annals of the Association of American Geographers 14 (December 1924), pp. 117-149.

Faculty of Arts and Sciences, Harvard University. "Report on the Core Curriculum." Toward the Restoration of the Liberal Arts Curriculum. Working Papers - The Rockefeller Foundation (June 1979), pp. 37-58.

Faculty of the University of Chicago (present and former members). The Idea and Practice of General Education. Chicago: The University of Chicago Press, 1950.

Fenneman, Nevin M. "The Circumference of Geography." Annals of the Association of American Geographers 9 (December 1919), pp. 3-11.

Fenneman, Nevin M. "Problems in the Teaching of Physical Geography in the Secondary Schools." The Journal of Geography 8 (March 1909), pp. 145-157.

Fine, Benjamin. "Geography Almost Ignored in Colleges, Surveys Show." The Journal of Geography 50 (April 1951), pp. 165-170.

Fine, Benjamin. "U.S. College Students 'Flunk' in Knowledge of Geography." The Journal of Geography 50 (November 1951), pp. 334-341.

Frazier, John W. "On the Emergence of an Applied Geography." The Professional Geographer 30 (August 1978), pp. 133-237.

Freeman, T. W. A Hundred Years of Geography. Chicago: Aldine, 1962.

Ginsburg, Norton. "On Regional and Other Geographies." Introductory Geography: Viewpoints and Themes. Washington, D.C.: Association of American Geographers, Commission on College Geography, 1967, pp. 105-111.

Glacken, Clarence J. "Count Buffon on Cultural Changes of the Physical Environment." Annals of the Association of American Geographers 50 (March 1960), pp. 1-21.

Gould, Peter. "Geography 1957-1977: The Augean Period." Annals of the Association of American Geographers 69 (March 1979), pp. 139-150.

Grant, Gerald, and Riesman, David. "An Ecology of Academic Reform." American Higher Education: Toward an Uncertain Future. Daedalus, vol. 2. Boston: American Academy of Arts and Sciences, Winter 1975, pp. 166-191.

Haggett, Peter. Locational Analysis in Human Geography. London: Butler and Tanner Ltd., 1965.

Harper, Robert A. "Geography's Role in General Education." The Journal of Geography 65 (April 1966), pp. 177-185.

Harris, D. Chauncy. "The Geographic Study of Foreign Areas and Cultures in Liberal Education." Geography in Undergraduate Liberal Education. Washington, D.C.: Association of American Geographers, 1965, pp. 25-33.

Hart, John Fraser. "Geography and Decision Making." The Journal of Geography 77 (December 1978), 252-253.

Hartshorne, Richard. "The Concept of Geography as a Science of Space, from Kant and Humboldt to Hettner." Annals of the Association of American Geographers 48 (June 1958), pp. 97-108.

Hartshorne, Richard. The Nature of Geography, A Critical Survey of Current Thought in the Light of the Past. Lancaster, Pa.: Association of American Geographers, 1939.

Hartshorne, Richard. Perspective on the Nature of Geography. n.p.: Association of American Geographers, 1959.

Harvey, David. Explanation in Geography. New York: St. Martin's Press, 1969; reprint, 1970.

Hecock, Richard, and Garrett, Michael. "The Role of Geography Courses in the General Education Curriculum." (Paper presented at the annual meeting of the National Council for Geographic Education. Mexico City, Mexico, 1 November 1979.)

Heiligmann, Katherine St. Germain. "The Regional Course: Its Growth and Functions in American Higher Education." (Unpub. doctoral dissertation, Oklahoma State University, 1976.)

Herbst, Jergen. "Social Darwinism and the History of American Geography." Proceedings of the American Philosophical Society 105 (December 1961), pp. 538-543.

Hill, A. David. "Learning Geographic Concepts in the Local Area: An Introduction to Geography Through Field Work." Field Training in Geography. Technical Paper No. 1. Washington, D.C.: Association of American Geographers, Commission on College Geography, 1968.

Hofstadter, Richard, and Smith, Wilson, eds. American Higher Education: A Documentary History. Vol. 1. Chicago: University of Chicago Press, 1961.

Hutchins, Maynard. The Higher Learning in America (1936). Clinton, Mass.: Colonial Press, 1974.

Hutter, Harry K. "The Status of Geography in the Liberal Arts Colleges of the United States." The Teaching of Geography. 32nd Yearbook of the National Society for the Study of Education. Bloomington, Ill.: National Society fot the Study of Education, 1933, pp. 556-559.

James, Preston E. All Possible Worlds. New York: Bobbs-Merrill Company, Inc., 1972.

James, Preston E. "Continuity and Change in American Geographic Thought." Problems and Trends in American Geography. Ed. by Saul B. Cohen. New York: Basic Books, 1967, pp. 3-14.

James, Preston E. "Introductory Geography: Topical or Regional?" The Journal of Geography 66 (February 1967), pp. 52-53.

James, Preston E. "On the Origin and Persistence of Error in Geography." Annals of the Association of American Geographers 57 (March 1967), pp. 18-22.

James, Preston E. "The Significance of Geography in American Education." The Journal of Geography 68 (November 1969), pp. 476-480.

Johnson, B. Lamar. General Education in Action. Washington, D.C.: American Council on Education, 1952.

Kates, Robert. "Links Between Physical and Human Geography: A Systems Approach." Introductory Geography: Viewpoints and Themes. Washington, D.C.: Association of American Geographers, Commission on College Geography, 1967, pp. 23-30.

Kellams, Samuel E. "Students and the Decline of General Education." Journal of General Education 24 (January 1973), pp. 217-230.

Kimber, George C. "The Place of Geography in a General Education Program." The Journal of Geography 48 (October 1949), pp. 265-275.

Knott, Bob. "What is a Competence-Based Curriculum in the Liberal Arts?" Journal of Higher Education 46 (January/February 1975), pp. 25-40.

Kohn, Clyde F. "Geography in American High Schools." Frontiers in Geographical Teaching. Ed. by Richard J. Chorley and Peter Haggett. London: Methuen & Co., Ltd., 1965, pp. 297-308.

Kohn, Clyde F. "The Iowa Approach, or Revisionists at Work." Introductory Geography: Viewpoints and Themes. Washington, D.C.: Association of American Geographers, Commission on College Geography, 1967, pp. 59-64.

Kutsche, Katherine L. "Teaching Planning for Public Awareness." (Paper presented at the annual meeting of the National Council for Geographic Education, Mexico City, Mexico, 2 November 1979.)

Larimore, Ann E. "The World Regional Course: Alternative Approaches." New Approaches in Introductory College Geography Courses. Washington, D.C.: Association of American Geographers, Commission on College Geography, 1967, pp. 40-109.

Leighly, John. "What Has Happened to Physical Geography?" Annals of the Association of American Geographers 45 (December 1955), pp. 312-318.

Levine, Arthur. Handbook on Undergraduate Curriculum. Prepared for the Carnegie Council on Policy Studies in Higher Education. San Francisco: Jossey-Bass, Inc. for the Carnegie Foundation for the Advancement of Teaching, 1978.

Levine, Arthur, and Weingart, John. Reform of Undergraduate Education. San Francisco: Jossey-Bass, Inc., 1973.

Little, D. Richard. "Beyond Careerism: The Revival of General Education." Journal of General Education 26 (Summer 1974), pp. 83-110.

Lockwood, T. D. "The Rush Back to General Education." The Chronicle of Higher Education 14 (23 May 1977), p. 32.

McGrath, Earl J. "The General Education Movement." Journal of General Education 1 (October 1946), pp. 3-8.

McGrath, Earl J. Liberal Education in the Professions. New York: Teachers College Press, 1959.

McGrath, Noreen. "Major Effort to Revitalize Liberal Education is Launched by Association of Colleges." The Chronicle of Higher Education 17 (February 1979), pp. 1, 21.

McNee, Robert B. "A Proposal for a New Geography Course for Liberal Education: Introduction to Geographic Behavior." New Approaches in Introductory College Geography Courses. Publication No. 4. Washington, D.C.: Association of American Geographers, Commission on College Geography, 1967, pp. 1-37.

McNee, Robert B. "Geographic Objectives in General Education: The Regional Method." The Journal of Geography 55 (November 1956), pp. 390-394.

Magarrell, Jack. "How Useful is a Liberal Education? A New Test Tries to Find Out." The Chronicle of Higher Education 17 (23 October 1978), pp. 6-7.

Marbut, C. F. "The College Unit in Physical Geography." The Journal of Geography 7 (May 1909), pp. 193-208.

Marcus, Melvin G. "Coming Full Circle: Physical Geography in the Twentieth Century." Annals of the Association of American Geographers 69 (December 1979), pp. 521-532.

Marcus, Melvin G. "Introductory Physical Geography in the College Curriculum." Introductory Geography: Viewpoints and Themes. Washington, D.C.: Association of American Geographers, Commission on College Geography, 1967.

Mayhew, Lewis B. Colleges Today and Tomorrow. London: Jossey-Bass, Ltd., 1969.

Miller, Vincent. "Observations on the Goals and Methods of Regional Courses." The Journal of Geography 59 (November 1960), pp. 371-377.

Monroe, Charles R. Profile of the Community College. San Francisco: Jossey-Bass, Inc., 1975.

National Education Association. Report of the Committee of Ten on Secondary School Studies. New York: American Book Co., 1894.

Nelson-Jones, Richard. "General Education in American Higher Education: 1955-56 to 1964-65." (Unpub. doctoral dissertation, Stanford, 1967.)

Newman, John Henry Cardinal. The Idea of a University. Ed. by Charles Frederick Harrold. n.p., 1852; revised, 1873; new ed., New York: Longmans, Green & Co., Inc., 1947.

O'Connell, Barry. "Where Does Harvard Lead Us?" Toward the Restoration of the Liberal Arts Curriculum. Working Papers - The Rockefeller Foundation (June 1979), pp. 59-76.

Ohio State University College of the Arts and Sciences. Bachelor of Arts and Bachelor of Science Curriculum. September 1978.

Oklahoma State University. "Philosophy Statement of General Education at O.S.U." Oklahoma State News (26 March 1979), p. 2.

Panel of Geography in the Two-Year Colleges. Geography in the Two-Year Colleges. Publication No. 10. Washington, D.C.: Association of American Geographers, Commission on College Geography, 1970.

Pattison, William D. "The Four Traditions of Geography." The Journal of Geography 63 (May 1964), pp. 211-216.

Peirce, Neal R. "America: Land of the Ignorant." Tulsa (Okla.) World, 14 January 1979.

Phenix, Philip H. Realms of Meaning. New York: McGraw-Hill, 1964.

Picker, Robert D. "Geography and the Learning Process: A Methodological Review." The Journal of Geography 64 (November 1965), pp. 340-345.

Picó, Rafael. "Geography in American Universities." The Journal of Geography 40 (November 1941), pp. 291-301.

The President's Committee on Education Beyond the High School. First Interim Report to the President. Washington, D.C.: Government Printing Office, November 1956.

"Project on General Education Models (GEM)." The Chronicle of Higher Education 16 (31 July 1978), p. 13.

Report of the Ad Hoc Committee on Geography, Earth Sciences Division. The Science of Geography. Washington, D.C.: National Academy of Sciences--National Research Council, 1965.

Report of the Geography Advisory Panel to the Statewide Social Sciences Study Committee on Improving the Education of Teachers of Geography. Sacramento: California State Department of Education, 1967.

Report of the Harvard Committee. General Education in a Free Society. Cambridge, Mass.: Harvard University Press, 1945.

Report of the President's Commission on Higher Education. Higher Education for American Democracy. New York: Harper and Brothers Pub. Co., 1947.

"Revamping of General Education Sought in California State System." The Chronicle of Higher Education 16 (8 May 1978), p. 12.

Robinson, Arthur H. "On Perks and Pokes." Economic Geography 37 (April 1962), pp. 181-183.

Robinson, Arthur H. "The Potential of Cartography in Liberal Education." Geography in Undergraduate Liberal Education. Washington, D.C.: Association of American Geographers, 1965, pp. 34-47.

Rudolph, Frederick. The American College and University: A History. New York: Vintage Books, 1962.

Rudolph, Frederick. Curriculum: A History of the American Undergraduate Course of Study Since 1636. Prepared for the Carnegie Council on Policy Studies in Higher Education, the Carnegie Series. San Francisco: Jossey-Bass, Inc. for the Carnegie Foundation for the Advancement of Teaching, 1977.

Sack, Saul. "Liberal Education: What Was It? What Is It?" History of Education Quarterly 2 (December 1962), pp. 210-224.

Sarah Lawrence College. Bronxville, New York, August 1955.

Sauer, Carl O. "The Morphology of Landscape." Land and Life, A Selection from the Writings of Carl Ortwin Sauer. Berkeley: University of California Publication in Geography, 1925; reprint ed., Berkeley: University of California Press, 1965, pp. 19-53.

Sauer, Carl O. "The Survey Method in Geography and Its Objectives." Annals of the Association of American Geographers 14 (March 1924), pp. 17-33.

Schaefer, Fred K. "Area Study and General Education." The School Review 53 (February 1945), pp. 90-95.

Schaefer, Fred K. "Exceptionalism in Geography." Annals of the Association of American Geographers 43 (September 1953), pp. 226-249.

Schwendeman, J. R. Directory of College Geography of the United States. Vol VII. New York: Thomas Y. Crowell, Col, 1956.

Schwendeman, J. R., Sr., and Schwendeman, J. R., Jr. Directory of College Geography of the United States. Vol. XXX. Richmond: Eastern Kentucky University, April 1979.

Schwendeman, J. R., Sr., and Schwendeman, J. R., Jr. Directory of College Geography of the United States. Vol. XXXI. Richmond: Eastern Kentucky University, April 1980.

Scully, Malcolm G. "A New Era of Concern for International Education." The Chronicle of Higher Education 16 (31 July 1978), pp. 1-6.

Shrode, Ida May. "A Catalog Study of Geography in Educational Institutions Above the High School." The Journal of Geography 28 (May 1929), pp. 189-201.

Smith, Preserved. "The Unity of Knowledge and the Curriculum." Educational Review 45 (April 1913), p. 339-344.

Stickler, W. Hugh. "Senior Courses in General Education." Journal of Higher Education 25 (March 1954), pp. 139-146.

Stoddart, D. R. "Darwin's Impact on Geography." Annals of the Association of American Geographers 56 (December 1966), pp. 683-698.

Taaffe, Edward J. "Geography of the Sixties in the Chicago Area." Annals of the Association of American Geographers 69 (March 1979), pp. 133-138.

Taaffe, Edward J. "The Spatial View in Context." Annals of the Association of American Geographers 64 (March 1964), pp. 1-6.

Taylor, Harold. "The Philosophical Foundation of General Education." General Education. Fifty-first Yearbook, Part I. Chicago: The University of Chicago Press, 1952.

Terry, Joseph. "Geography in General Education: Its Contribution in the Undergraduate General Education Programs of Selected American Colleges and Universities." (Unpub. doctoral dissertation, University of Denver, 1957.)

Thomas, Russell. The Search for a Common Learning: 1800-1960. New York: McGraw, 1962.

Trowbridge, Hoyt. "Forty Years of General Education." Journal of General Education 11 (July 1958), pp. 162-169.

Ullman, Edward L. "Human Geography and Area Research." Annals of the Association of American Geographers 43 (March 1953), pp. 54-66.

The University of Chicago Undergraduate Programs 1957-1958. Vol. 57. Chicago, 25 October 1956.

Veysey, Lawrence. The Emergence of the American University. Chicago: University of Chicago Press for Phoenix Books. 1965; reprint ed., 1970.

Warntz, William. "Geography at Mid-Twentieth Century." World Politics 11 (April 1959), pp. 442-454.

Warntz, William. Geography: Now and Then. New York: American Geographical Society, 1964.

Watkins, Berverly T. "Berkeley Faculty Votes to Raise Standards, Restore Requirements." The Chronicle of Higher Education 16 (3 April 1978), pp. 11-12.

Whitbeck, R. H. "Thirty Years of Geography in the United States." The Journal of Geography 20 (April 1921), pp. 121-128.

White, Gilbert. "Geography in Liberal Education." Geography in Undergraduate Liberal Education. Washington, D.C.: Association of American Geographers, 1965, pp. 13-24.

Whittlesey, Derwent. "The Regional Concept and the Regional Method." American Geography: Inventory and Prospect. Ed. by Preston E. James and Clarence F. Jones. New York: Syracuse University Press, 1954, pp. 19-68.

Wilbanks, Thomas J., and Symanski, Richard. "What is Systems Analysis?" The Professional Geographer 20 (March 1968), pp. 81-85.

Williams, Aston R. General Education in Higher Education. Teachers College, Columbia University: Teachers College Press for the Institute of Higher Education, 1968.

Wilson, Leonard S. "The Position of Regional Geography in Current Liberal Arts Education." Geography in Undergraduate College Curricula. Professional Paper No. 8. National Council of Geography Teachers, April 1948.

Winstead, Huldah. "Geography in American Universities." The Journal of Geography 10 (June 1912), pp. 309-316.

Wolman, M. Gordon. "Physical Geography in the Liberal Arts." Geography in Undergraduate Liberal Education. Washington, D.C.: Association of American Geographers, 1965, pp. 48-54.

Wrigley, E. A. "Changes in the Philosophy of Geography." Frontiers in Geographical Teaching. Ed. by Richard J. Chorley and Peter Haggett. London: Methuen and Co. Ltd., 1965, pp. 3-7.

APPENDIX A

QUESTIONNAIRE

Oklahoma State University

DEPARTMENT OF GEOGRAPHY

STILLWATER, OKLAHOMA 74074
HOME ECONOMICS EAST
(405) 624-6248

Dear Department Head or Chairman:

I am conducting a survey regarding the current status of geography with respect to "general" or "liberal" education requirements. The precise definitions of these terms are left open to your own interpretation or that of your institution. The information I am seeking is needed as part of my research for a doctoral dissertation dealing with the role of geography in general education.

Will you please assist me by answering the following questions to the best of your current knowledge? I realize that some of the data necessary to answer questions may not be readily available. In those instances, please submit your best estimate. A stamped return envelope is enclosed. All information received will be treated as strictly confidential. The institutional and respondent information will be used for purposes of establishing the representativeness of the returns.

Michael Garrett
Michael Garrett
Geography Department
Oklahoma State University

GENERAL EDUCATION SURVEY (page 1)

Part I Institutional Setting for General Education

Name of Institution_____

Title and/or Position of Respondent

_____

1. Does your institution have a designated program(s) of liberal education, general education, distributive electives, general studies, etc. required of most students?

_____No

_____Yes, If yes, how is it (are they) titled?_____

2. Is the determination of which courses qualify for general education credit made by?

_____Dean

_____University of college wide committee.

_____Department

_____Instructor

_____A combination of at least two of the above.

_____Some other arrangement (please explain)_____

3. Who monitors general education courses to see if they qualify and continue to meet criterias?_____position or title.

4. Are there stated requirements from the institution to the department or person(s) teaching the course(s) as to what broad objectives general education courses should meet?

_____Yes

_____No, but there are implied requirements or objectives.

_____No, there are no requirements.

5. Have general education requirements been revised at your institution during the last three years?

_____No

_____Yes. If yes, have (will) changes

_____Increased geography enrollments?

_____Decreased geography enrollments?

_____Changed the patterns of enrollment among courses in geography?

_____Caused the department to make major changes in course content or instruction?

_____Not applicable.

6. Which department(s) "compete" most directly with geography in fulfilling general education requirements?

_____ _____

_____ _____

_____Not applicable

GENERAL EDUCATION SURVEY (page 2)

Part I (continued)

7. Please indicate in the right hand columns (✓) those characteristics most representative of your institution.

General Education Requirements	LEVEL AT WHICH COURSE(S) ORDINARILY TAKEN			GEOGRAPHY'S INVOLVEMENT		
	Freshman	Sophomore	Junior-Senior	Course(s) Offered	Indirect or Partial Involvement	Not Involved
A. Distribution or Breadth Requirements						
1. Specified subjects						
2. Groups of subjects with limited options						
3. Groups of subjects with numerous options						
4. Numerous options without group requirements						
5. Some other scheme or device for breadth						
B. Integrative Learning Experiences. Please identify one or more of the following if applicable to a program at your institution.						
1. Special Requirements (Required of all students) e.g. American History, Govt., American Lit., Introductory Geography, . . .						
2. Central Subjects, e.g. Western Civ., Contemporary Civ., . . .						
3. Core courses or programs, e.g. two or more semester's study of different themes or areas.						
4. Survey courses - integrating two or more disciplines, e.g. Columbia's Contemporary Civ. course.						
5. Interdisciplinary Programs - Thematically integrated packages, e.g. one yr. study of an ancient civilization and one year of American civ.						
6. Emphasizing the Perennial, e.g. the "Great Books" curriculum.						
7. Integrating themes. Courses from several departments organized around themes or problems. Selected by college or the student, e.g. hist. periods, alternative world views, man and environment, etc.						

*Subdivision titles and examples are generalized and divisions are somewhat arbitrary. Categories and other information modified from Missions of the Curriculum by The Carnegie Commission on Higher Education, 1977.

GENERAL EDUCATION SURVEY (page 3)

Part II The Departmental Setting and Role in General Education

Please provide your best estimates regarding enrollments in your department for the Spring term, 1979:

1. Geography courses which serve general education, distribution, or liberal education requirements.

Level	A. Total Enrollment in such Courses	B. Percent of Enrollment for Gen Ed Purposes	C. Number of Courses	D. Number of Sections	E. Number of Courses by Type of General Education Credit		
					Social Science Behavioral Science	Physical Science Natural Science Environmental Science	Humanities
Freshman							
Sophomore							
Junior-Senior							

2. _____ Total Enrollment in geography classes, Spring term, 1979.

3. _____ Number of majors during Spring term, 1979.

4. _____ Proportion (%) of total enrollment in geography classes for general education purposes, Spring term, 1979.

5. _____ Proportion (%) of total enrollment in geography classes as cognate or service to some other major, Spring term, 1979.

6. _____ Proportion (%) of total school enrollment taking at least some geography as general education, Spring term, 1979.

7. Extent of standardization or conformity among multiple sections of courses taught by different instructors? e.g. instructional methodology, learning activities, grading, textbook or other resource material, etc.

Social Science Behavioral Science	Physical Science Natural Science Environmental Science	Humanities	
			High degree of conformity.
			Some conformity in most aspects of the course.
			Low degree of conformity.

8. Do graduate students assist or have instructional responsibility in any general education geography course(s)?

_____ No
_____ Yes, they assist.
_____ Yes, they sometimes have instructional responsibilities.
_____ Yes, they often have instructional responsibilities.

GENERAL EDUCATION SURVEY (page 4)

Part III The Views of Geographers on the Role of Geography in General Education

The statements listed below represent a variety of views regarding the role of geography courses which are offered to meet general education objectives. Please indicate the letter most closely corresponding to your thoughts in the space provided for each statement.

A - Agree strongly with the statement.
B - Agree somewhat with the statement.
C - Disagree somewhat with the statement.
D - Disagree strongly with the statement.

1. ___ Geography courses offered for general education credit should stress learning skill development as opposed to a particular body of content or information.

2. ___ If learning skills are major objectives in general education geography courses, they should be restricted to just those most commonly associated with geography as a discipline.

3. ___ Geography instructors and others in the discipline should be the primary judges of what general education objectives should be for geography courses offered for general education credit.

4. ___ Geographers, by the nature of their training, are especially well suited to teach general education courses.

5. ___ Instructors charged with teaching geography courses as general education should have specialized training in addition to that provided by the discipline.

6. ___ Upper division level (junior-senior) courses should be included more extensively in general education programs.

7. ___ To be most effective for students, integrative learning experiences are best left to courses provided by individual disciplines rather than courses or programs involving multiple disciplines.

8. ___ If students have the opportunity to take only one geography course for general education purposes, their best choice would usually be a regional rather than a topical course.

APPENDIX B

GEOGRAPHY DEPARTMENTS RESPONDING TO QUESTIONNAIRE

TYPE I INSTITUTIONS*
Research and Doctorate-Granting Universities

Private

Boston University
Brigham Young University
Columbia College,
Columbia University
Dartmouth College
Memphis State University
St. Johns University
Syracuse University
University of Denver
University of the Pacific

Public

Auburn University
Ball State University
California State University,
Fullerton
Georgia State University
Hunter College,
City University of New York
Illinois State University
Louisiana State University,
Baton Rouge
Miami University, Ohio
Northern Illinois University
North Texas State University
Ohio State University, Columbus
Oklahoma State University
Oregon State University
Pennsylvania State University,
University Park
Sam Houston State University
Southern Illinois University
State University of New York,
Buffalo
Texas A. & M. University
Texas Tech University
University of Alabama
University of Alaska
University of California,
Davis
University of California,
Santa Barbara
University of Connecticut
University of Florida
University of Houston
University of Iowa
University of Kansas
University of Kentucky
University of Louisville
University of Minnesota,
Minneapolis
University of New Hampshire
University of Northern Colorado
University of South Carolina,
Columbia
University of South Florida
University of Tennessee,
Knoxville
University of Toledo
University of Utah
University of Vermont
University of Washington
University of Wisconsin,
Madison

TYPE II INSTITUTIONS*
Comprehensive Universities and Colleges

Private

Alfred University
Augustana College, South Dakota
Cannon College
St. Lawrence University
Wittenberg University

TYPE II INSTITUTIONS (Continued)

Public

Bemidji State University
Bloomsburg State College
Bridgewater State University
California State College, Stanislaus
California State University, Chico
California State University, Fresno
California State University, Hayward
California State University, Los Angeles
California State University, Sacramento
Central Connecticut State College
Central Michigan University
Central State University, Okla.
Central State University, Wash.
Concord College
East Carolina University
Eastern Illinois University
Eastern Washington University
East Stroudsburg State College
Edinboro State College
Florida Atlantic University
Framingham State College
Frostburg State College
Georgia College
Glassboro State College
Humboldt State University
Indiana State University, Terra Haute
Indiana University of Pennsylvania
Jacksonville State University
Kearney State College
Lehman College, City University of New York
Middle Tennessee State University
Murray State University
Northeastern Illinois University
Northwest Missouri State University
Northwest Oklahoma State University
Old Dominion University
Pembroke State University
Portland State University
Rutgers University
St. Cloud State University
San Diego State University
Slippery Rock State University
South Dakota State University
Southwest Texas State University
State University of New York, Binghamton
State University of New York, Genesco
State University of New York, Plattsburgh
Tennessee State University
Towson State University
University of Central Arkansas
University of Colorado, Colorado Springs
University of Minnesota, Duluth
University of North Alabama
University of South Colorado
University of South Maine
University of Wisconsin, Green Bay
University of Wisconsin, Stevens Point
University of Wisconsin, Whitewater
Wayne State College, Nebraska
Western Illinois University
Western Kentucky University
Western Washington University
Westfield State College
West Liberty State University
Wichita State University
Winona State University
Winthrop College
Worcester State College
Wright State University

TYPE III INSTITUTIONS*
Liberal Arts Colleges

Private

Augustana College, Illinois
Barnard College,
Columbia University
Berea College
Carthage College
Centenary College
Colgate University
Denison University, Ohio
Emory & Henry College
Gustavus Adolphus College
Howard Payne University
King College
Livingstone College
Marian College
Middlebury College
Mount Holyoke College

Public

California State College,
Dominguez Hills
California State University
San Bernardino
Mary Washington College,
University of Virginia

*This typology is a condensed version of the classification system used by the Carnegie Foundation. Each institution is listed according to its general classification by the Foundation. The Carnegie Foundation for the Advancement of Teaching, A Classification of Institutions of Higher Education (Berkeley, 1973).

VITA

Michael Joe Garrett

Candidate for the Degree of

Doctor of Education

Thesis: GEOGRAPHY IN THE GENERAL EDUCATION CURRICULUM: AN ANALYSIS OF THE CURRENT ROLE FROM A HISTORICAL PERSPECTIVE

Major Field: Higher Education

Minor Field: Geography

Biographical:

Personal Data: Born in Kay County, Oklahoma, son of Mr. and Mrs. E. K. "Joe" Garrett.

Education: Enrolled as an undergraduate in geography at Austin Peay State College, Clarksville, Tennessee and received the Bachelor of Science degree from Oklahoma State University, Stillwater, Oklahoma, in 1968; received the Master of Science degree from Oklahoma State University in 1973; completed requirements for the Doctor of Education degree with emphasis in geography at Oklahoma State University in May, 1982.

Professional Experience: Senior High and Junior High school teacher in geography and earth science for schools in Noble and Kay Counties, Oklahoma, 1969-1975; Graduate Associate and Instructor of Geography, Oklahoma State University, 1976-1979; Instructor and Assistant Professor of Geography, Bemidji State University, Minnesota, 1979-1982.