THE HUMANITIES COURSES IN THE GENERAL-EDUCATION PROGRAMS OF THE OKLAHOMA STATE COLLEGES

By

DAVID T. W. STEVENS

Bachelor of Science
Southeastern State College
Durant, Oklahoma
1932

Master of Arts
Oklahoma State University
Stillwater, Oklahoma
1952

Submitted to the faculty of the Graduate School of
the Oklahoma State University
in partial fulfillment of the requirements
for the degree of
DOCTOR OF EDUCATION
August, 1960

STATE U[illegible]SITY
LIBRARY

JAN 3 1961

THE HUMANITIES COURSES IN THE GENERAL-EDUCATION PROGRAMS

OF THE OKLAHOMA STATE COLLEGES

Thesis Approved:

James W. Richardson
Thesis Adviser

George H. White

Willard Scherich

Solomon Sutton

Doreen MacInnis
Dean of the Graduate School

458186

ACKNOWLEDGEMENTS

The study to follow was developed and completed over a four year period of time. Its successful completion was brought about by means of the guidance, cooperation, and inspiration provided by several persons who were concerned with either the investigation or the investigator. The author wishes to express his sincere appreciation to these persons whose aid made this work possible.

Dr. James W. Richardson, who served as chairman of the Advisory Committee, worked diligently, long, and ably during the planning, execution, and culmination of the study. For Dr. Richardson's counsel and aid the author is especially thankful.

Dr. Solomon Sutker, Dr. Millard Scherich, and Mr. George White, the members of the advisory committee, were exceedingly generous with their help and suggestions.

The teachers and administrators of the Oklahoma state colleges cooperated fully during the investigation and gave freely of their time during a busy spring semester.

Madeline Westbrooke Stevens, the author's wife, was the main source of encouragement and inspiration, and contributed to the study in many ways. To her, the author is deeply indebted.

TABLE OF CONTENTS

TABLE OF CONTENTS (Concluded)

LIST OF TABLES

LIST OF TABLES (Continued)

LIST OF TABLES (Concluded)

CHAPTER I

THE NATURE, DEVELOPMENT, AND METHOD OF THE PRESENT STUDY

During the past forty years increasing numbers of American colleges have established courses in the humanities. This has often been referred to as a "revival" of the humanities, since in many ways the present courses are distinct from anything offered in the colleges of the past century. Today the term humanities is generally used in education to designate a group of disciplines distinguished in content, method, and objectives from the physical and biological sciences and, though less decisively, from the social sciences. Philosophy, literature, languages, music, and art are the disciplines most often found within the framework of the courses and programs labeled as humanities. Emphasis is usually placed upon the study of man as a creative individual rather than upon man as a social being, but frequent use of history either in the form of parallel subject matter or as a method to correlate and unify other disciplines narrows the gap between the humanities and the social sciences.

Humanities courses, offered in two distinct forms, have constituted a portion of the general-education requirements in the Oklahoma state colleges for the past nine years. These courses are the objects of the present study.

The Problem

This study was concerned with a comparison of the humanities

courses that are offered to satisfy the general-education requirements of the six state colleges of Oklahoma. These six similar schools, originally established as normal schools, still function more or less as single-purpose colleges, although each of the schools offers degrees in fields other than education. The schools by name and location are East Central State College at Ada; Northwestern State College at Alva; Southeastern State College at Durant; Central State College at Edmond; Northeastern State College at Tahlequah; and, Southwestern State College at Weatherford.

The problem of this study may be stated specifically in this manner: What is the nature of the humanities courses that were established to fulfill the requirements of the general-education program in the six Oklahoma state-supported teacher-education institutions?

Following are subordinate problems to which consideration will be given:

1. What are the humanities courses attempting to accomplish? (the objectives)
2. What are the general means of the humanities courses? (the philosophy, approaches, and integrative principles)
3. What are the special means of the humanities courses? (teaching procedures)
4. What subject matter is taught in the humanities courses? (the content)
5. What are the beliefs of the teachers concerning the humanities courses? (viewpoints and opinions)

Basic Hypothesis

Humanities courses which are intended to satisfy the requirements of the general-education program in the Oklahoma state colleges have basic differences and similarities.

Needs for the Study

In an inductive process descriptive science or knowledge must precede normative science or knowledge. The properties of an object must be examined and described before any generalizations can be established. The inductive method applied to education, as it often is, demands that evaluation, standardization, or any other normative process be preceded by the prior establishment of a descriptive base. Objects that are new in education, therefore, need to be investigated and described. The humanities courses of the state colleges have been offered over the past nine years and are relatively new. The courses have been established long enough, however, that it may be assumed that reliable data may be obtained by an investigation. A descriptive study of the humanities courses is needed, then, as a first step toward evaluation.

Knowledge gained by a descriptive study is useful in other areas. Such a study is always important in the field of comparative education. In fact, when a descriptive study is made of several courses in either one or more schools it becomes of itself a comparative study, since description is aided by placing things side by side in comparative fashion. It may also become a reference for comparison with courses beyond the provinces of the present study.

There is a need among teachers of the humanities to know what others are doing and how they are doing it. With this knowledge teachers may re-evaluate their own work and improve it by the acceptance of the work of others that they judge as excellent and adaptable to their own situations and problems. A preliminary investigation revealed that there had been no workshops, committees, or other collective attempts to exchange information or to clarify the function of the humanities in the

general-education programs of the state colleges. Certainly, then, this is a need which can be at least partly satisfied by an interested investigator, whose effort may lead to more complete interaction among the teachers. Closely associated with this is the problem of adjusting to a rapidly changing college climate. Enrollment has already more than doubled at one of the subject schools in a three-year period, and the other colleges can well profit from its experience. Another college is in its first year of a new experimental general-education program, instituted after a detailed faculty study. Data concerning this experiment may be of great value to those who wish to begin similar studies or to compare their own programs. Unique methods and experiences of certain humanities teachers may satisfy the needs of other teachers who may wish to adopt or to experiment with something new. Preliminary inquiries indicated, for example, that some teachers were using new techniques of group dynamics which may be of value to others.

A status study may also answer a need of the subject schools by showing where order and application may be improved and how rapport among the schools may be established for their pursuit of common goals.

Descriptive studies also answer an historical need by recording the present from which trends in the future may be established and comparisons made with the past.

Basic Assumptions

For the purposes of this study it was assumed that general education constituted a necessary and valuable portion of the curriculums of the state colleges and that the humanities courses were a basic and essential part of general education.

It was also assumed that the nature of the humanities courses could be ascertained by an investigation and comparison of the objectives, content, and methodology of the courses and of teachers' viewpoints concerning the courses.

The assumption was also made that data appropriate to and sufficient for the description of the nature of the humanities courses could be obtained through the combined use of observational, questionnaire, and interview techniques.

It was further assumed that there was a specific need for a descriptive study of the humanities courses in the general-education program of the Oklahoma state colleges.

The Purposes of the Study

The major purpose of the study was to describe and compare the humanities courses that are a part of the general-education requirements of the Oklahoma state colleges.

Consequential and essential to this major purpose are the following purposes:

a. To discover and compare what the teachers are attempting to do in the various courses.

b. To ascertain the means, both general and special, used by the teachers to accomplish their desired ends.

c. To ascertain and compare the topical subject matter used by the teachers to achieve their desired outcomes.

d. To discover what forces and conditions influence the teachers in their present practices and what they would otherwise do if freed from these restraints.

e. To record the opinions, viewpoints, and experiences of the teachers in regard to the humanities courses.

f. To develop, validate, and pretest appropriate means of carrying out an investigation designed to yield data relevant to the foregoing purposes.

Scope of the Study

The study was concerned with the six state-supported colleges in Oklahoma that were originally established as normal schools and have to the present retained teacher education as a major function. These colleges are located in the cities of Ada, Alva, Durant, Edmond, Tahlequah, and Weatherford.

The study was concerned with the status of the humanities courses as they were offered and taught during the school year of 1958-59. The study was not concerned with the history or development of the humanities courses except in places where it was necessary to provide a background for a fuller understanding of the present.

The study was concerned with the objectives, content, and methods of the humanities courses that are a part of the general-education programs of the subject colleges. The study was concerned with other factors such as administration, guidance, finance, teacher load, physical plant, and facilities only insofar as there was some direct influence upon the humanities courses. These courses with their titles, numerical designations, and descriptions were as follows:

General Humanities 203
Study of significant ideas of Western man as manifest in art, music, literature, and philosophy.

General Humanities 213
Continuation of Humanities 203.

Introduction to Literature 222 or 223
An area course identical in objectives respecting literature with General Humanities 203-213.

Art in Life 232
An area course identical in objectives respecting art with General Humanities 203-213.

Music in Life 242
An area course identical in objectives respecting music with General Humanities 203-213.

Philosophy in Life 252
An area course identical in objectives respecting philosophy with General Humanities 203-213.[1]

Courses in psychology and sociology which were elective as partial fulfillment of the humanities requirements in certain of the subject schools were not considered in this study.

It is recognized that value judgment is unavoidable in a descriptive and comparative study, but evaluation was not the purpose nor intent of this study.

Sources of Data

The data for this study were obtained from the following sources:

1. Recent and available literature on general education, liberal education, the humanities, and related subjects.
2. Literature concerned with the methodology of instruction in higher education.
3. Literature concerned with the general-education programs and humanities courses in the colleges of the United States and Canada.

---

[1]The numbers, course names, and descriptions are identical for all of the subject schools except Southwestern State College at Weatherford. This college inaugurated a new experimental general education program in 1958-59 and renumbered the two general courses.

4. State publications including reports from the Board of Regents of Oklahoma State Colleges, college catalogs, schedules, and unpublished college materials.
5. Textbooks, syllabi, mimeographed or typed course outlines, and bibliographies used in the humanities courses of the state colleges.
6. Written answers to a check-type survey instrument or questionnaire submitted to the teachers and department chairmen in the state college humanities programs.
7. Electronically recorded answers to questions of the open-end and specific-answer types in interviews with teachers and department chairmen in the state-college humanities programs.
8. Interviews with presidents, deans, and registrars in the subject schools.
9. Personally observed conditions and situations obtained by visitations to the subject schools.

Definitions of Terms

1. General Education: Definitions of general education vary from short negative statements as "education that is nonspecialized and nonvocational"[2] to the three-page statement of the Executive Committee of the Cooperative Study in General Education.[3] Stickler, more recently, has stated that there is no agreement among institutions of higher

---

[2]A design for General Education, American Council of Education Studies, ed. by Dorothy L. McGrath, Series I. Reports of Committees and Conferences, No. 18, Vol. VIII (Washington, D. C., 1944), p. 7.

[3]Cooperation in General Education, A Final Report of the Executive Committee of the Cooperative Study in General Education (Washington, D. C., 1947), pp. 202-5.

learning as to what general education is or how its goals may be reached.[4] General education, however defined or conceived by the respondent schools or their teachers was accepted for the purposes of this study.

2. General-Education Program of the Oklahoma State Colleges: This term refers to the particular program designed to give a general-education background to those entering into specialized fields of teaching. This program was adopted by the State Board of Regents of Oklahoma Colleges on April 26, 1952.[5] The program is essentially a collection of required and elective subjects within a distributive framework to be completed within the first two years of college as described in Chapter III of this study.

3. The Humanities: This term is variously defined as "polite learning," the study of man as a creative being, knowledge of the "higher needs of man," or education that "humanizes." As in the case of general education, whatever was designated as humanities by the subject colleges, however defined, was accepted, but with one important difference; namely, that courses concerned with sociology or psychology, or both, were not considered as humanities in this study. Preliminary investigation revealed that many humanities teachers vigorously opposed the inclusion of sociology and psychology among the humanities courses.

4. Humanities Courses Required in the General-Education Program of the State Colleges: The terminology here refers to the specific

---

[4]W. Hugh Stickler, ed., Organization and Administration of General Education (Dubuque, Iowa, 1951), p. 416.

[5]Oklahoma State Regents of Higher Education, "A Resolution Regulating the Curricula of the Six State Colleges Located at Ada, Alva, Durant, Edmond, Tahlequah and Weatherford" (Oklahoma City, Oklahoma, April 26, 1952, Multilithed).

introductory courses that satisfy the general-education requirements in the program approved by the Board of Regents of Oklahoma State Colleges. Such courses are usually taken during the sophomore year and include subject matter in the fields of art, literature, music, and philosophy in either separate or combined courses. The titles, numbers, and descriptions of these courses have been given before in describing the scope of this study. Courses in sociology or psychology that are elective to fulfill the humanities requirements were not included in this definition. "The Humanities Program" and "The Humanities Courses" have been used in this study as shortened forms of the above, especially after prior statement of the longer and more descriptive term.

5. Disciplines of the Humanities: This term or the term "disciplines" used alone in the proper context refers specifically to disciplines, except sociology and psychology, that are considered the subject matter of the humanities in the general-education programs of the state colleges. The disciplines, then, are art, literature, music, and philosophy.

6. General Courses, Combined Courses, or Integrated Courses: These terms have been used in this study in reference to the Humanities 203 and 213 courses in which the disciplines of art, literature, music, and philosophy are taught concurrently.

7. Separate Courses or Area Courses: These terms have been used in reference to the Humanities 222, 223, 232, 242, and 252 in which the course is concerned with only one of the disciplines as its major study.

8. Models: This word has been assigned a special meaning and has been used throughout the present study to designate the selected works of art, literature, music, and philosophy that are the objects of study

and form the content of any of the humanities courses. "Model," here, is preferred to the word "example" since it may carry the implication of a person or thing of greater eminence, worth, or value.[6] Such a connotation should be placed upon works, however selected, as objects worthy of study in the humanities.

9. Objectives: This term refers specially to the statements of goals which a course or program hopes to achieve or to the ends for which the course content and/or methodology provide the means.

10. Content: Reference is made here to the models, examples, persons, topics, or other subject matter which are the objects of study or inspection in the humanities courses.

11. Methodology: This term refers to the procedures utilized by the teacher, students, and others concerned with the course to achieve the course objectives and to evaluate such achievement.

12. Other terms: In the construction of the instrument of investigation it was necessary to make use of several other terms of an operational nature and also to devise some new descriptive terminology. These terms were defined and explained as each was introduced. (See Appendix C.)

Organization of the Study

The chapter following the present one will describe the development and application of the procedures used in obtaining the data for the study. A third chapter will provide a general description of the subject schools and their programs from data gained by personal observation and

---

[6] Webster's New Collegiate Dictionary (Springfield, Mass., 1953), p. 540.

examination. Chapter four will describe and compare successively the objectives, the content, and the methodology of the humanities courses from data obtained by the questionnaire. Chapter five will record the viewpoints and opinions of the teachers from information obtained during the interviews. The sixth and final chapter will contain the conclusions of the study.

CHAPTER II

THE DEVELOPMENT AND APPLICATION OF THE INVESTIGATIVE PROCEDURES

The major purpose of this study was to describe and compare the humanities courses that were a part of the general-education programs of the Oklahoma state colleges. It was assumed that this purpose could be fulfilled by an investigation and comparison of the objectives, general means, specific procedures, content, and of teachers' viewpoints concerning the courses.

A choice of several research procedures was available to collect data pertinent to the problem of this study. However, one must consider not only the nature of the problem and the practicable research procedures, but also the other influencing factors relating to the investigator himself, to the objects being investigated, to the timeliness of the investigation, and to the effectiveness of the communication between investigator and investigatee.

These influencing factors were considered in the light of the existing facts in the planning of the proper strategy to be applied during the investigation. The investigator has been employed at one of the state colleges for eighteen years in a position which formerly required him to make frequent visits to all of the subject schools. Because of this he has enjoyed a wide acquaintance with the administrative officers and faculties of the schools. Geographically the schools were compact enough to permit visitation without too great a time-money cost, the

greatest distance between two schools being about 330 miles and the shortest distance, seventy miles.

Four principal means of obtaining the required data were open to the investigator. Data could be obtained first, from existing literature; second, from a prepared questionnaire; third, from planned interviews; and fourth, by on-the-scene observation. The existing literature was incomplete and also lacked the specificity needed for the study. The questionnaire, interview, and observational techniques all have advantages and disadvantages well known to research students. The use of all three of these techniques together would tend to diminish the disadvantages without diminishing the advantages. By this means the questionnaire could ascertain short-answer specific data, and would be supported by the more open-ended interview in which the interviewee was not limited in expressing himself. Thus the questionnaire, which supplies answers to questions that may not even closely approximate the respondent's best answer, can be checked against an answer during an interview. On-the-spot observation and unplanned questioning have a flexibility that overcomes the rigidness of both the interview and the questionnaire, and often provide additional data to show the distinctiveness of a given situation. The combined use of the three techniques, each providing a check on the others, seemed to be the best means of gathering data for the purposes of this study. For these reasons, then, it was the decision of this investigator to employ mainly the questionnaire and interview techniques. Observational procedures would also be used to supplement the main techniques. It was hoped, moreover, that by scheduling two trips to each school, handing out the questionnaires individually, and returning for prescheduled interviews, that a return of one hundred per cent could

be obtained on the questionnaires. In the actual investigation this proved to be the case--all teachers of the humanities returned the questionnaire, and all were interviewed.

The actual development and application of the investigative procedures followed in five stages as described in the remainder of this chapter.

The Preliminary Stages of Work

In the present study the reading of related literature became more purposive as a result of the prior recognition of the problem. Reading was pursued first to obtain background and familiarization concerning general education, liberal education, and the humanities. Most helpful in the areas of general and liberal education were books analyzing existing programs and approaches.

During another, although not a distinct part of the preliminary work, reading was concentrated on literature describing humanities courses and programs at colleges in the United States. During these readings the investigator particularly noted the models used in the content, the procedures used in teaching, and the objectives toward which the courses were directed. Syllabi of several American colleges were available and were used to reinforce these readings and to gather additional information concerning content of the courses. During this stage of the reading a record of the items in content, procedures, and objectives was kept, and the frequency of the items noted.

At this time it was readily realized that the greatest deficiency in the literature concerning the humanities courses lay in the fact that teaching techniques and procedures were described very generally if

described at all. Much information was available on what was taught, and why it was taught, but very little on how it was taught. It was further realized that since the humanities consisted of both ideational and aesthetic materials that could be transmitted, enjoyed, or learned by so many means, an extremely wide range of techniques and procedures could be employed. These conclusions guided the preliminary reading toward studies concerned with analyses of methods and procedures used in the various disciplines of higher education. The investigation of this particular segment of the literature uncovered many new items to be added to the list of techniques and procedures.

Finally, in the preliminary investigation of the literature, an examination was made of materials pertaining to the subject colleges and the development of the general-education program in these institutions. The bulletins of the colleges and unpublished materials from the office of the Oklahoma State Regents for Higher Education were inspected to gain a knowledge of the framework of the general-education program and the place of the humanities courses therein. Unpublished proceedings and recommendations of the Intercollegiate Curriculum Committee, from which the present general-education program emanated, were examined to obtain background information about the development of the program.

The Development of the Questionnaire

It was assumed, as previously noted, that differences and similarities in the humanities courses could be ascertained by an investigation and comparison of the content, methodology, and objectives of the courses at each of the subject colleges. It was, therefore, planned that the questionnaire should consist of three main parts complying with the

elements to be investigated, and that a fourth part would be added to obtain data concerning the educational experience and interests of the persons involved in the teaching of the courses. Each section of the questionnaire was developed separately.

Development of the Questionnaire on Content. The vast amount of subject matter appropriate to the humanities contrasted markedly with length of time allotted to the courses in the Oklahoma state colleges. One of the most difficult problems in the construction of the content section of the questionnaire was the condensation of the subject matter into divisions and topics that would be appropriate for the investigation of a wide range of courses. Moreover, the subject matter of general education, particularly the humanities, is often less an end-in-itself than the subject matter of specialized education. Specific data, meanings, processes, and skills peculiar to specialized courses are lacking in the humanities. Conceivably the humanities courses could show great variation from one college to another or even from one teacher to another. Whereas one, for example, might consider Shakespeare or the Bible as basic and necessary, another might consider these as too familiar and commonplace, or too likely to be duplicated elsewhere in the student's education.

The construction of the content section of the questionnaire was facilitated by an examination of general course syllabi from two of the subject colleges and from Oklahoma State University, as well as from other American colleges and universities.

Art, literature, music, and philosophy comprised the major disciplines of the humanities in the curriculums of the state colleges. Separate, or area, courses were offered in each of these disciplines,

and it could be assumed that they were the major concern of the general or integrated courses. It seemed logical, then, to divide the questionnaire on content into four parts, which could be used to separately investigate the disciplines of art, literature, music, and philosophy. The practicability of such a division became more evident when it was recalled that the questionnaire would need to be designed for the investigation of courses dealing both separately and inclusively with the four disciplines.

Each of the disciplines was divided into items representing creative works, personalities, groups of either works or persons, epochs or topics, as determined by frequencies noted in the preliminary reading. The items were placed chronologically in a list and a scale devised to estimate the number of classroom hours. Each discipline was also divided into the major generalized forms. These forms were listed, and a scale was devised to estimate the percentage of the total semester time allocated to each. Instructions for the use of the scales and the items with scales were combined to form the first copy of the questionnaire on content. Space was provided in each part for the listing of items not included on the questionnaire.

Figure 1 is an excerpt from the questionnaire illustrating the structure of the part concerning the content of the humanities courses. The first section (after the numeral 1) was used to estimate the fractional part of the course devoted to major generalized forms. This was given in fractions of tenths for easy conversion into percentage. The second section (after the numeral 2) was used to estimate the number of classroom hours devoted to the study of topical subject matter.

FIGURE 1

EXCERPT FROM THE HUMANITIES QUESTIONNAIRE CONCERNING THE CONTENT OF THE COURSES

1. Approximate, by circling to the nearest tenth, the fractional portion of the total time during the semester that is allocated to each of the following forms: (In 203 and 213 consider the total time devoted to literature as ten-tenths.)

   a. Poetry (Non-dramatic) 1 2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9

   b. Non-Fictional prose (essays, criticism, biography, etc.) 1 2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9

   c. Fictional prose 1 2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9

   d. Drama 1 2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9

2. Approximate, by circling, the number of hours in the classroom devoted to the study of each of the following: (M = more than 6 hours.)

   a. Survey of literary types . . . . . 1 2 3 4 5 6 M

   b. Homer . . . . . 1 2 3 4 5 6 M

   c. The Bible . . . . . 1 2 3 4 5 6 M

   d. The Greek Dramatists . . . . . 1 2 3 4 5 6 M

Development of the Questionnaire on Methodology. Publications concerning general education have frequently stated that procedures and methods are of greater importance than content in the general-education courses.[1] The immensity of appropriate subject matter and the brevity of the time allotted for any one course require that the content of a course be little more than a mere sampling of the total. Content in general education and especially in the humanities is subject to great variation according to the judgment of the planners.

---

[1] Cf., for example, John P. Wynne, General Education in Theory and Practice (New York, 1952), pp. 25-9, or, Earl J. McGrath, "General Education: Theory and Practice." General Education: A University Program in Action, ed. W. Hugh Stickler et al. (Dubuque, Iowa, 1950), pp. 43-51.

The objectives of general education and the humanities are such that emphasis is usually placed upon qualities of experience rather than on the acquisition of information. The memorization of facts is less important in the humanities than experiences that give an enjoyment, appreciation, and understanding of man's ideas and artistic accomplishments, together with the skills of critically selecting, analyzing, and evaluating them. Models and materials may be judiciously selected to conform with almost any given teaching aim. It is indeed a task requiring teacher-ingenuity to transmit the subject matter of the humanities in a manner which will make it alive and important, create an appreciation of and preference for it, and develop the skill and habit of critical inspection.

A preliminary study of the subject colleges, coupled with the investigator's own experiences in connection with these schools, gave information about the presence of other conditions that would reinforce the primacy of methodology: (1) the greater part of the clientele came from backgrounds of limited cultural experiences; (2) the courses were usually required and, hence, would be less motivated by student interest than the elective courses; (3) under the schools' plan of general education the humanities were taught during the first or second college years at a time when classes tended to be larger and to contain students who were less mature, less adjusted, and less purposive; and (4) the courses contained many of the unteachable students who undergo natural elimination before they reach their junior year. For these several reasons, methodology and classroom procedures assumed a position of considerable importance among the subject colleges.

It seemed practicable to the investigator to divide methodology

into four components, namely: (1) preplanning, preparation, and organization; (2) classroom procedures; (3) required, or optional, out-of-class procedures; and (4) testing and evaluation. The literature on methodology in higher education seldom used a division precisely like this. Most of the consulted references dealt primarily with classroom procedures and evaluation. Planning and out-of-class procedures were often relegated to an inferior position or mentioned briefly. The investigator's concern over this was alleviated when agreement on the above division was found among members of the education department at Southeastern State College of Durant, Oklahoma.[2]

The practices collected during the preliminary reading were explicitly identified and defined and listed under the four component headings. The list was supplemented with other practices which the investigator supplied from his own experience and knowledge. The nomenclature and definitions of most classroom procedures and of many of the out-of-class procedures were modified from those used by Umstattd.[3] Space was provided at the end of each group of classified practices for the respondent to list any unique or unusual practices. A scale appropriate to each classified group of practices was devised to enable the respondent to estimate the frequency of use of certain practices or the amount of time devoted to certain other practices.

Preliminary study also seemed to indicate a probability that the teachers would not always have a situation where they would be able to

---

[2]Statements by Dr. Marshall L. Nagle, Dr. A. L. Pool, and Dr. M. K. Fort, personal interviews.

[3]J. G. Umstattd, College and University Teaching Procedures (Austin, Tex., 1954), pp. 5-7.

employ all of the procedures and devices that they would prefer to use. Student enrollment; classroom facilities and equipment; availability of cultural objects, events, and materials; scheduling and other time factors; and administrative policies might separately, or collectively, stifle the teacher's use of certain favored procedural techniques. To allow for this probability the methodology section of the questionnaire was constructed in a manner that permitted the respondent to indicate his present practices and also to indicate the practices that he would use under ideal conditions.

The questions were generally of four types as shown by the excerpts from the methodology part of the questionnaire in Figure 2.

Development of the Questionnaire on Objectives, Approaches, and Integrative Principles. Education may be defined as "the reproductive part of a culture, the process of development in the immature of the knowledges, skills, attitudes, and appreciations cherished by the mature members of a group or society."[4] Education by this definition can be regarded as a process of transmission from the mature to the immature of the acts (skills and patterns of behavior), objects (tools and things made with tools), ideas (knowledges, symbols, and beliefs), and sentiments (attitudes and appreciations) of the race. These things compose the culture and because of man's ability to indicate them in both written and spoken symbols, they are readily transmissible from one organism to another. A society is an organized group of individuals whose organization is manifested in several institutional patterns. The school is the organized pattern of individuals whose major concern is the transmission of the culture. Education, therefore, is a social process.

---

[4]Millard Scherich, An Educational Philosophy of Reconciliation (Revised Edition), (Stillwater, Okla., 1953), pp. 1-3 (mimeographed).

FIGURE 2

EXCERPTS FROM THE HUMANITIES QUESTIONNAIRE CONCERNING THE METHODOLOGY OF THE COURSES

1. Approximate by circling to the nearest tenth the fractional portion of <u>total class time</u> spent during the semester in the following activities.

   a. Formal or uninterrupted lecture 1 2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9

   b. Informal lecture 1 2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9

   c. Discussion 1 2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9

2. Approximate, by circling, the approximate number of hours of <u>class time</u> spent during the semester in the following activities. (M means more than nine hours).

   a. Viewing movies (silent or sound) 0 1 2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 M

   b. Viewing slides or film strips 0 1 2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 M

   c. Viewing still pictures 0 1 2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 M

3. Approximate, by circling, the frequency during one semester that each of the following types of tests are used. M means more than 9 times; W means weekly (17 or 18 times); D means daily.

   a. Essay or free answer 0 1 2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 M W D

   b. Multiple choice or best answer 0 1 2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 M W D

   c. Completion 0 1 2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 M W D

4. If under ideal circumstances (class size, time, materials, etc.) your preference differs from your present procedure draw an "X" through the preferred condition in No. 1 above.

5. In the following, place a check in Column S (for status) after each practice you now follow. In Column P (for preference) check the practice that you would follow if circumstances permitted.

	S	P
1. The planning for the course is done		
a. In advance for the total course		
b. Day by day		
c. Week by week		

Objectives. The school is composed of three main elements: the mature who transmit (the teachers); the immature who receive (the students); and the culture which is transmitted (subject matter). Systematic beliefs regarding the role of each of these three elements, the means of transmission of the culture, and the nature of the transmitted material form the varying philosophies of education. A school, thus, may be either "subject-matter-centered," "child-centered," or "teacher-centered." Ideas and items selected from the culture may be used to orient the educand toward the past, the contemporary, or the future; toward the spiritual, the essential, the real, the pragmatic, or the utopian.

Philosophic viewpoints as to the method of transmission of the culture may be classified generally into two types: "preparation and growth-as-its-own-end."[5] The "preparation theory" holds that education should transmit knowledge to equip the student for his mature social, vocational, civic, spiritual, and avocational life. The "growth-as-its-own-end theory" considers how knowledge may best be used as an instrument for this growth and for the experience of present living which will imbue the student with values and methods that will persist into maturity.

The one general objective of education, however achieved, is the transmission of the culture. Prior to the Industrial Revolution, the fulfillment of this objective was not difficult. It was possible, at this time, for a man to obtain almost a total learning of the knowledge contained in books. Since Leibnitz, who is often described as "the last man who knew everything," knowledge has increased in scope and volume to an amount that makes it impossible for one man to know everything.[6]

---

[5]Ibid., pp. VI-1-4.

[6]Ibid., pp. VIII-6-7.

The growth of knowledge, combined with a socio-economic pattern in which the divisions of labor are being increasingly broken down into more highly specialized tasks, required men to direct their learning into narrower channels. The transmission of the totality of the culture to one individual was no longer possible.

As knowledge increased and as labor was further divided, the schools likewise increased the curriculum and divided it. The introduction of the elective system, concurrent with a surge in democracy during the latter half of the nineteenth century, supplied the impetus to this fragmentation of the curriculum. Scherich has described the elective system as follows:

> The elective system represented a triple revolt. It was a revolt against authoritarianism in all its forms. It was a revolt against a certain type of disciplinary theory. And it was a revolt against a narrow or exclusive curriculum, a curriculum that was, at least theoretically, rich in the humanities, but poor in the sciences. As revolutions frequently are, it was radical; and it is of no small significance that since World War I, but to an even greater extent since World War II, there has occurred a partial return both to compulsion and to the humanities.[7]

The elective system also made its impact upon certain contemporary educational philosophers. Educators could not easily establish goals or objectives in a curriculum dictated by student choice. Student-derived goals were often pseudo-choices lacking mature judgment. Often they became goals that were accessory to some unstated remote desire. For example, a student actually having adventure and travel as a remote desire might choose engineering as his immediate and accessory goal.

The philosophies of education that hold to the "growth-as-its-own-end" theory--that education has no objective beyond immediate experience,

---

[7]Ibid., pp. VIII-7.

developed after, and were influenced by, the surge of electivism. Sarah Lawrence, Bard, and Bennington are probably the best known of the schools that have used a student-centered, or individualized approach, to general education based upon this type of educational philosophy. A preliminary investigation of the subject schools seemed to indicate that none adhered to this theory of education, although conceivably some individual teachers might hold this philosophy. This had an important impact upon the method of investigation. Needless to say, the questionnaire would be an awkward instrument if used to obtain specific data on courses using an individualized approach.

The fact that the greater number of educationists hold the theory that education is preparation is not surprising. There is a very natural feeling among the mature that they can direct the way to a full life on the basis of their own experience and knowledge. They feel also that the rights of society are better protected and that learning can be controlled and directed better by preparation. This is not to imply that education as growth is anti-social, or that it lacks control and direction. The difference is mainly one of degree of emphasis.

Preparation is directed toward some goal or objective and requires that an analysis be made of the objective toward which preparation is directed and of the student who is to be prepared. Since the total culture is beyond all possibility of transmission it has become necessary for the school to establish specific objectives in reference to the acts, objects, ideas, and sentiments that it wishes to transmit. Divisions of the curriculum and particular courses may be directed toward the acquisition of a skill, toward the understanding of certain meanings, or toward the implantation of particular sentiments. All of

the subject schools have stated objectives and adhere to the idea of education as preparation.

There seems to be general agreement in the literature that the humanities constitute an important part of the general-education program. Some writers go so far as to suggest that it is the most important part or the part most closely aligned with the objectives of general education. It has been pointed out by some that the emphasis of the humanities on human values and on aesthetic creativity is needed to balance the practical values and mechanical creativity of the sciences. Others point to the value of a knowledge and understanding of the great works and ideas of man. Still others see a need for improved judgment, evaluation, critical thinking, and communication which they believe can best be taught by means of the humanities. Although stated in many ways it seems that basically these arguments pertain to certain knowledges, particular values, and skills that are believed to be transmitted better through the humanities than through the sciences. These knowledges, values, and skills are usually stated as the special objectives of the humanities courses.

The literature on the humanities is profuse with statements of objectives toward which the courses are directed. In the analysis of these statements for use in the questionnaire the chief problem was one of rewording and clarifying a large number of statements, many of which had more or less the same meaning. The most rewarding source for the objectives used in the questionnaire was a study of the humanities courses in the general education programs of nineteen American universities and colleges.[8]

[8]Earl J. McGrath, ed., The Humanities in General Education (Dubuque, Iowa, 1949), pp. 289-92.

Approaches. The term "approach" as used in this study refers to the general plan by which the student is conducted from his state of assumed insufficiency toward the fulfillment of the objectives of the course. Since none of the subject schools, according to a preliminary survey, seemed to hold to an experimentalist type of philosophy, the approach here would pertain to the plan for the selection, organization, and dispensation of the subject matter.

Several different methods of organizing the subject matter of the humanities were described in the literature. Usually, however, the method was described without being named or identified with any particular educational nomenclature. It became necessary, then, to invent terms to identify the various approaches to be incorporated into the questionnaire. The following terms and general descriptions were devised for this purpose:

1. Historical-parallel: An historical or chronological arrangement of works or events in which the art, literature, music, and philosophy of each period are studied more or less simultaneously and together.

2. Historical-separate: Each discipline studied separately, following an historical or chronological sequence.

3. Random-parallel: Works or events of art, music, literature, and philosophy chosen regardless of time to illustrate identical elements, parallel ideas or modes, or other mutual relationships.

4. Random-separate: Each discipline studied separately without regard for chronological order. Models often chosen at random to illustrate continuity of one idea or mode.

5. Creative approach: A study of fundamentals with emphasis on the student's own creative efforts. Models selected and introduced

when needed. Art, literature, music, and philosophy may be studied either separately or parallel. Original work usually produced by the students.

6. Great books and masterpieces: Intensive study of great works as judged by authorities. May or may not be chronological and parallel.

7. Regressive approach: Starting with an interest in contemporary work, ideas, or modes, and tracing their development backward in time.

8. Individualized approach: Emphasis on the needs and interests of the individual student. The teacher usually acts as a guide, advisor, and resource person as the students pursue their own individual problems. Groups of students may work on identical or similar problems. The subject matter varies with the individual or the group.

In the design of the part of the questionnaire concerned with approaches, the individualized approach was not included since a preliminary survey indicated that it probably was not used. It should be noted that the approaches, like objectives, were not mutually exclusive. The historical-separate or the historical-parallel, for example, could be used with the "Great Books" approach, and the creative approach could be combined with any other approach. Conceivably the teachers could also vary their approach in the treatment of different segments of the subject matter.

Integrative techniques. "One of the characteristics of the general education movement is an attempt at integration."[9] The term "integration" has been used so frequently in connection with general education that the two terms are thought by many to have entered educational vocabulary

[9] Cooperation in General Education, A Final Report of the Executive Committee of the Cooperative Study in General Education (Washington, D. C., 1947), p. 202.

simultaneously. Actually the word "integration" was used in the world of education for a considerable time prior to the beginning of the general-education movement.[10] The dictionary defines the word "integrate" as "to form into a whole; to unite or to become united so as to form a complete or perfect whole."[11] Integration, then, would be the act of unifying education. Since education is concerned with the transmission of the culture to the immature in order to produce a mature individual, this unification has two possible directions in which it may occur. It can be directed, either toward the culture being transmitted, or toward the individual receiving it. In other words, integration can be directed toward the unification of subject matter, sometimes called horizontal integration, or toward the performing-thinking life of man, sometimes called vertical integration. Horizontal integration becomes a matter of organizational and procedural patterns, as manifested in the use of broad-area courses, correlated subject matter, logical and chronological frameworks and common ideas, events, or modes. The general course in the humanities which treats several disciplines in a parallel manner can be called an integrated course. Some degree of horizontal integration would be inherent in such a course simply because the disciplines are placed together. Vertical integration is more closely aligned with the objectives of the general course although it, too, is dependent on organizational and procedural patterns. Since the objectives consist of goals that have to do with the future

---

[10] Roy J. Defarri (ed.), Integration in Catholic Colleges and Universities (Washington, D. C., 1950), p. 3.

[11] Webster's New Collegiate Dictionary (Springfield, Mass., 1953), p. 437.

acting-thinking life of the student, then the means of attaining these goals becomes a means of vertical integration. The experimentalist type of philosophy, which is concerned with the student's immediate life problems as a means of providing for future life, would advocate vertical over horizontal integration despite the fact that it has no objective other than the immediate problems of the students. The functional type of approach, such as that at Stephens College, would also place its greater emphasis upon vertical integration. Vertical integration is usually directed toward a particular kind of mature product and toward this end can be furthered by some great unifying principle, philosophy, or creed. Catholic education has enjoyed considerable success in integrating education with life through its religion and Thomistic philosophy.[12] The Nazis were successful in producing the mature product that they desired through their creed of the "super race." A totalitarian state can more readily achieve vertical integration through its use of some dominant ideology to which all must conform. On the other hand, democracy does not have any one dominant, encompassing idea to which conformity is required.[13] Instead, all beliefs, creeds, and philosophies are embraced. Democracy officially respects differences of opinion and nonconformity so long as these do not endanger others or infringe on their rights or beliefs. For this reason a single, great, unifying idea compatible with democracy is not easy to find. Dressel and Mayhew have suggested critical thinking as an integrating principle which would offend no one's philosophy or

---

[12]Bernard T. Rattigan, A Critical Study of the General Education Movement (Washington, D. C., 1952), p. 167.

[13]Scherich, p. III-5.

creed.[14] It is to be noted, however, that this has the nature of a skill rather than an idea or belief.

All of the possible integrative techniques are not described in the literature. Creative teachers are probably still discovering new ways or modifying old ways to bring about effective integration. Approaches have often been chosen because the matter of integration was inherent in the approach. Historical and functional approaches and also approaches organized around some central purpose or idea have integrative qualities. Integration may be also sought through techniques or principles used within the framework of the approach and teachers may have their own individual techniques which they believe to be integrative. The list of integrative principles and techniques contained in the questionnaire was, therefore, a sample list to which the teacher might make his own additions. This sample list was also taken mainly from the summarizing chapter of the study named above.[15] Supplements to this list were made from the investigator's own teaching, reading, and inquiring experience.

Since objectives, approaches, and integrative techniques needed to be compatible with the philosophy and objectives of the general-education programs at each of the subject schools, there was the possibility that the teacher might be somewhat forced into compliance with beliefs not his own.

To provide for this possibility the scales were devised to give

---

[14]Paul L. Dressel and Lewis B. Mayhew, "A Basis for Integration in General Education," Educational Record (July, 1954), pp. 224-28.

[15]McGrath, pp. 280-308.

teachers the opportunity of expressing an answer in accord with their own beliefs when given an ideal situation.

The questions on objectives, approaches, and integrative techniques were of two general types as illustrated in the excerpts from this section shown in Figure 3.

FIGURE 3

EXCERPTS FROM THE HUMANITIES QUESTIONNAIRE CONCERNING OBJECTIVES, APPROACHES, AND INTEGRATIVE TECHNIQUES

In the following list of objectives indicate the degree of emphasis that is at present being placed on each under status. Under preference indicate what degree of emphasis would be placed on each if ideal conditions prevailed. Circle the proper letter according to the following code:

G--Great emphasis is placed on this objective.
M--Moderate emphasis is placed on this objective.
S--Some emphasis is placed on this objective.
X--No emphasis is placed on this objective.

	Status	Preference
1. The objectives of the course are: a. To provide the student with a broader understanding of his cultural heritage.	G M S X	G M S X

2. Indicate which of the following principles you now follow in the integration of subject matter vertically with life, or horizontally with the curriculum. Check under column "S" for present practice and under column "P" for your preference under ideal circumstances (Mark more than one if applicable.)

	S	P
a. Key concepts of philosophic or scientific thought.		
b. A chronological framework		

Improvement of the Questionnaire

The questionnaire received its first revision from suggestions made by personal acquaintances of the investigator. Members of the English department of Southeastern State College, with no prior knowledge of the problem, read it to discern its degree of clarity and understandability.

Dr. James W. Richardson of the College of Education at Oklahoma State University, who, being the investigator's advisor, had personal acquaintance with the problem read it to note particularly its coherence, scaling, and technique. The suggestions received as a result of these critiques were incorporated into the first revision.

The suggestions of two independent groups of critics, one at the University of Oklahoma and the other at Oklahoma State University, formed the basis for the second revision. Selected members of the faculties of these two universities were assumed to be competent consultants on the grounds of having greater familiarity with the curriculums of the state colleges and with local conditions or problems that could influence methodology, content, or objectives. Out-of-state schools were eliminated as possible sources of critics for lack of familiarity with the problem. Denominational schools of the state were not included because of the likelihood that viewpoints would be slanted toward a particular religious philosophy.

The selection of two bodies of critics was done by consultants familiar with the staffs at each of the two schools. Dr. John W. Morris, Professor of Geography at the University of Oklahoma, acted as consultant and was requested to select a body of five broadly educated persons from the faculty of his school. Since the University of Oklahoma has no general-education humanities courses it was decided that these persons should represent several departments. Dr. Richard E. Bailey, Professor of Foreign Languages and Chairman of Humanities, was the consultant at Oklahoma State University. Dr. Bailey consented to serve as a critic and selected, by request, four other persons experienced in the teaching of the course in general humanities at his school.

The persons serving as critics from the University of Oklahoma were Dr. William Richard Hargrove, Assistant Professor of Education; Dr. Edwin Clarence McReynolds, Professor of History; Mr. Samuel Olkinetsky, Director of the University of Oklahoma Museum of Art; Dr. Donnell MacClure Owings, Associate Professor of History; Dr. Glen R. Snider, Associate Professor of Education and Director of Teacher Education.

At Oklahoma State University the following persons served as critics: Dr. Richard E. Bailey, Professor of Foreign Languages and Chairman of Humanities; Dr. Agnes Mary Berrigan, Professor of English; Dr. Cyclone Covey, Assistant Professor of Music; Dr. Millard S. Everett, Professor of Philosophy; Mr. George H. White, Director of General Education.

For the convenience of the critics the questionnaire was reproduced on heavy bond and arranged in book form with the items of the questionnaire on the left-hand page and a worksheet on the right-hand page. The worksheet consisted of questions and space for comment that paralleled the items of the questionnaire on the opposite left-hand page. An additional worksheet was inserted at the end of each section of the questionnaire to provide space for the critics to write questions which they felt would be important in the interviews with the teachers of the humanities. The critics were asked to use either proofreading notations or their own system of corrections to change any items or statements. They were also asked to add to or delete from the items as they judged to be necessary, to revise the scaling system, if needed, and to criticize any parts of the questionnaire.

An initial interview was arranged with each of the critics for the

purpose of handing out the questionnaire, explaining the details of the investigation, answering any questions of the critic, and arranging a second interview. The second interview with each of the critics was scheduled for a date ten days after the first interview. During this second interview the critic was asked to analyze each section and to express himself as to how adequately the questionnaire and each of its sections fulfilled the intended purpose.

The critics were unanimous in their belief that the questionnaire was both adequate and appropriate for the purpose intended. The critical remarks were directed for the most part towards the changing of the wording of the questionnaire to provide clarity and towards the addition, deletion, or regrouping of certain items of content to improve the structure, unity, and/or continuity of the section on content. On the section regarding objectives one criticism was instrumental in effecting a change in the plan of the investigation. This critic remarked that instead of forcing an answer on pre-selected objectives as presented in the questionnaire it would be better to have the respondents state their objectives in their own terms. As a result it was decided to obtain data concerning objectives by means of questions included in the interview as well as by means of the questionnaire.

The criticism and suggestions of the critics were incorporated into the third form of the questionnaire.

The Development of the Interview Questions

The interview was considered as a distinct, rather than supplementary, part of the total investigation. The questionnaire, it was felt, would economically obtain specific data within a patterned framework suitable for quantitative comparison. The intimate nature of the

interview, however, would lessen the distance between the investigator and the problem. It was expected that the interview would draw out responses to important questions that could not be asked--perhaps not anticipated--in a questionnaire. The type of interview that was planned might best be described as informal, diagnostic, and structured. It was designed to be as informal and friendly as possible so as to obtain maximum rapport between interviewer and interviewee. It was diagnostic so that it could critically scrutinize, probe, and discover. It was structured so that it could be conducted from an interview guide of questions already known to the interviewee. It was planned, however, that the questions of the interview guide would be highly generalized and that from each question would come unstructured interaction between the interviewer and interviewee as new specific ideas were explored. By this type of interview it was hoped that the interviewee could be "kept talking" and that he would voluntarily introduce important new areas of his own personal concern.

The type of interview and its purposes had been explained during the first meeting with the persons who served as critics and consultants. Spaces for listing suggested interview questions were included on the worksheets that accompanied the tentative questionnaire which the critics examined. Suggestions emanating from the critics, however, were few. The suggestions of the critics who had had experience in teaching the humanities were more plentiful and helpful. These suggestions, though, did not include questions to cover all the main issues. The notes from the prior readings used to construct the questionnaire and additional readings on issues in the humanities were

helpful in the framing of questions to fill the gaps. The final interview guide questions are to be found in Appendix D.

Pretesting the Questionnaire and Interview Guide

The pretest of the method of investigation had two important purposes. First, it would reveal any misunderstandings, vaguenesses, or other faults better seen by persons detached from the research problem but confronted with the personal task of communicating how and what they teach. Second, valuable experience would be gained by the investigator in the administration of the questionnaire and the interview.

For the purposes of the pretest Connors Agricultural and Mechanical College seemed suitable. This school, a junior college located at Warner, Oklahoma, had a general-education program that was patterned after that of the subject schools. Moreover, both of the general humanities courses and three separate courses in art, literature, and music were offered as a part of the general-education program. The names, numbers, and descriptions of these courses were identical with the humanities courses offered in the general-education programs of the subject schools.

The Dean of Instruction at Connors was informed by letter of the nature and purpose of the pretest, and permission was asked to meet with the teachers at a free period. The Dean displayed strong interest in the project and cooperated by voluntarily setting up a schedule for the first interview with the teachers of the humanities courses. Because of schedule conflicts the teachers were met separately at the first meeting.

At the first meeting with the pretest-respondents the investigator explained the nature and purposes of the pretest and of the investigation

that was to be made later of the humanities courses in the subject schools. The questionnaires and interview guides were handed out, their structure was examined, and their use explained. An interview was scheduled with each of the pretest-respondents at a convenient hour one week after the first meeting. The pretest-respondents were asked to complete the questionnaire prior to this second interview.

At the second scheduled meeting with the pretest-respondents the questionnaires were collected and an interview was conducted following the general outline of the questions contained in the interview guide. These interviews were electronically recorded on magnetic tape. At this juncture it should be observed that the procedure up to this point followed precisely that which was to be used during the actual investigation of the subject schools. From this point on, however, unscheduled questions were asked of the pretest-respondents. These questions invited criticism of the questionnaire and the interview guide, each of which was re-examined page by page with the pretest-respondents. Questions were also framed to gain the pretest-respondent's evaluation of the techniques employed by the investigator.

As a result of this pretest further improvements were made on the questionnaire. These improvements involved the rewording of some parts for clarity and the correction of some typographical errors. This corrected version of the questionnaire became the final revision and was the one used in the investigation of the subject schools. This final revision of the questionnaire is found in Appendix C. No revision of the interview outline was made, but its use during the pretest was of great value. It was discovered, for example, that special efforts

would be needed on the part of the investigator to place the interviewees at ease when in the presence of a microphone.

Administration of the Investigative Procedures at the Subject Colleges

Prior to the scheduling of interviews two letters were sent to the administrative offices of each of the subject schools on behalf of the investigator. Dr. Allen E. Shearer, president of Southeastern State College, addressed a letter to each of the presidents of the state colleges; and Mr. M. C. Collum, executive secretary to the State Board of Regents of Oklahoma Colleges, addressed a letter to each of the deans of instruction of the state colleges. These letters described the investigation. Shortly afterward the investigator wrote to the deans of instruction asking permission to interview the humanities teachers and suggesting a date for the visitation. Because of the excellent cooperation from the administrative officers of the subject schools a convenient schedule was arranged. Operating from a base at Durant, Oklahoma, the investigator visited the colleges at Ada and Edmond on successive days and, after an interim of two weeks, the colleges at Alva and Weatherford were visited on successive days. The visit to Tahlequah and the investigation at Durant were made following another two-week interval.

The visitations followed the same plan as that used in the pretest. Most of the initial interviews were arranged at a time convenient for the teachers to meet as a group. The nature and purpose of the study were explained, the questionnaires and interview guides were handed out, and the group was instructed as to their use. Teachers who were unable to meet with a group were instructed individually. During the group or individual meetings a second interview was scheduled with each

teacher on a date one week later. Teachers were asked to complete the questionnaires by the time of the second interview.

The first visit to each school was also used to interview the deans, registrars, and other administrative officers concerned with the humanities or with general education. Class schedules, data from personnel files concerning the teachers, statistics on class enrollments, copies of syllabi, and other data apposite to the study were collected.

The questionnaires were collected and the interviews, based on the outline of questions, were conducted during the second visit to each school. One hour was allotted to each interview on a scheduled program. The length varied, however, from thirty minutes to over one and a half hours. All interviews were electronically recorded on magnetic tape excepting those that were conducted at Northeastern State College. During the week following the investigator's first visit these teachers agreed among themselves not to have their remarks recorded. Although some were experienced with tape recorders several felt that the presence of a microphone might cause an uneasiness that would hinder their free expression.

CHAPTER III

THE SUBJECT SCHOOLS: CHARACTERISTICS AND OBSERVATIONS

The purpose of the present chapter was to describe and compare, in a general way, the programs and educational climate of the subject schools. This comparative description constitutes the first step in the presentation of the data obtained during the investigation. The data contained in this present chapter were gleaned from relevant literature, from on-the-scene observation, from the records and files of the subject colleges, and from interviews with the administrative personnel.

It was recognized by the investigator that the nature and function of any component should be considered in its relationship to the whole. It would follow, then, that the humanities courses should be considered in affinity with the setting provided in each of the subject colleges. But, in view of the intimate nature of the present study and the desire of the majority of the respondents to remain anonymous and unidentified with their locale, it was necessary to examine the setting for the programs in a chapter separate from the analyses of the courses.

The Origin and Development of the Oklahoma Colleges

Northeastern State College, the oldest of the six colleges, had its beginning in 1846 when the National Council of the Cherokee Nation passed an act providing for the establishment of the National Male Seminary and the National Female Seminary. These schools were

established to provide a "public and higher education" for the youth of the Cherokee Nation. Except for a period during the Civil War, these institutions remained in operation until 1909.[1] Central State College was created in 1890 by an act of the legislature of Oklahoma Territory which authorized a Territorial Normal School at Edmond.[2] The Territorial Legislature also authorized normal schools at Alva in 1897 (now Northwestern State College) and at Weatherford in 1901 (now Southwestern State College).

In 1907 the present state of Oklahoma was formed from Indian Territory and Oklahoma Territory and admitted to the Union. The State Legislature of the new state passed an act in 1909 that provided for the creation of three normal schools in what formerly had been Indian Territory. New schools were created at Ada (now East Central State College) and at Durant (now Southeastern State College). The third school was recreated from the Cherokee Female Seminary by the purchase of buildings, land, and equipment at Tahlequah (now Northeastern State College).

The six normal schools existed for ten years with programs that consisted of four years of high-school study and two years of work at the college level. The state Board of Education, then the governing board of the schools, was given authority in 1919 by the Oklahoma State Legislature to provide for a four-year curriculum leading to a bachelor degree. The resultant action by the board also changed the names of the schools to state teachers colleges.

---

[1] Northeastern State College Bulletin, 1958-59 (Tahlequah, Oklahoma, 1958), p. 17.

[2] Central State College Bulletin, 1957-59, Vol. XLVI, No. 3 (Edmond, Oklahoma, July, 1957), p. 10.

For the next twenty years the state colleges existed as teachers colleges and offered only a degree in education. The slowness of the colleges in complying with the general-education movement can be attributed mainly to the existence of a plan for the issuance of temporary teaching certificates. As late as 1936 the colleges issued a two-year elementary or secondary certificate upon the completion of forty semester hours of college work, much of which was prescribed preparation for teaching. A similar five-year certificate was issued upon the completion of sixty-four semester hours and a life certificate was granted with the degree. After 1936 the temporary two-and five-year certificates were abandoned, and a new one-year certificate was introduced. The one-year certificate could be obtained in either elementary education with a total of 76 hours or in secondary education with a choice of several majors and a total of 90 hours. In 1950 a three-year probationary period was established during which all holders of temporary certificates were expected to complete the requirements for the degree. A new standard teaching certificate requiring a degree was established and required of all teachers after July 1, 1953.

Even before the hindrance provided by temporary certification had been removed, the colleges had begun planning for general education. In 1936 a new program was inaugurated which divided the four-year curriculum into what was known as Group I and Group II requirements. The Group I requirements consisted of from 30 to 40 hours of required courses with electives to total 64 hours to be completed during the freshman and sophomore years. In effect this was a general-education program, but it was not referred to by that name in the college catalogs. This program continued with minor changes until after World War II.

One change during this interim that must be noted was the act of the Oklahoma Legislature in 1939 that converted the teachers colleges into state colleges and authorized the granting of degrees other than in education.

The increase in enrollment and the diversification of the clientele that occurred after World War II caused the Council of Presidents of the State Colleges to become aware of a need for a re-examination of the curriculum. To this end representatives from each college were appointed by the presidents. The membership consisted mainly of deans of instruction and registrars but also included some teaching personnel as its membership changed from year to year. This committee met over a four-year period and was concerned with all facets of the curriculum. A program was submitted by this committee through the Council of State College Presidents to the Oklahoma State Regents for Higher Education on March 20, 1948. This program consisted of both required and elective courses in the fields of English, humanities, social science, natural science, and health and physical education for a minimum total of 38 hours. It indicated also that the remainder of the freshman and sophomore hours were to consist of electives and work in a chosen major field.[3] For the most part this program was a redistribution of old courses, but it had one new feature in that it required five or six hours in the humanities. Except for an experimental course that was instituted at Southeastern State College, the humanities had never been previously offered in the state colleges. In their proposed revision the curriculum committee had this to say:

---

[3] Oklahoma State Colleges Proposed Revised Requirements in General Education (From the files of the Oklahoma State Regents for Higher Education, March 20, 1948), pp. 2-3. (Hectographed)

> The proposed revision of the general education program in the first two years of the four-year degree course reflects certain desirable modifications of the program which has remained virtually unchanged since 1935. No radical changes are involved. The purpose is to effect adjustments which will assure a better balanced coverage of the principal area of social science, natural science, and the humanities. The only new feature of the program is the humanities . . . .[4]

The recommendations of the curriculum committee were approved by the Oklahoma State Regents for Higher Education, and the new program for general education appeared in the bulletins inssued by the colleges during the summer of 1948. It was listed as being an "Experimental Humanities Curriculum,"[5] Group I requirements, previously described, were also in the bulletin in the same manner as in years prior to 1948. In the state college bulletins of 1949 the recommended general-education program replaced the old Group I requirements, but the program retained its former title. In fact the program was not referred to as a general-education program until the bulletins issued in 1952. During this latter year the general-education program became stabilized with the issuance of a resolution by the Oklahoma State Regents for Higher Education, who acted on proposals presented by the Council of State College Presidents. This resolution changed the program in only a few details from the program instituted in 1948. It increased required English from six to eight hours, reduced social science from twelve to nine hours, and required a new limited election of five hours from foreign language, fine arts, practical arts, mathematics or psychology. This program has remained in effect to the time of the present study.

---

[4]Ibid., p. 1

[5]Southeastern State College Bulletin, Vol. XL, No. 1, Catalog Issue, July, 1948, p. 19.

The program and the parts of the resolution pertinent to this study are to be found in Appendix A. The humanities requirements were not changed by the resolution of 1952.

Two observations should be made at this point. First, the sudden creation of the humanities courses, which had never before existed in the curriculums of the state colleges, resulted in the courses being taught by persons already on the faculty. No new humanities teachers were employed by any of the schools. Second, the curriculum committee suggested courses totaling at least 28 hours that could be taken for a minimum five hours of credit in the humanities. Psychology, sociology, social psychology, and mental hygiene were included as fulfilling the humanities requirement. The new general-education program resulted in the development of varied patterns at the subject schools as each made its best adaptation to the sudden change.

The Clientele and Setting of the Subject Colleges

The text that follows describes individually the setting of each of the subject schools and includes generalizations as to the nature of the clientele. The schools are described alphabetically by city of location.

East Central State College is located at Ada, Oklahoma, about 75 miles southeast of Oklahoma City. The school serves a district comprised of eleven counties most of which have a predominately rural population. Only one city, Shawnee, has a population greater than 20,000. Ethnically the students were of typical established American stock. There were, however, some of recent Italian and Sicilian origin whose parents or grandparents were brought in by the railroads as miners

in the Henryetta and Coalgate areas. Quite a few of the students were of Indian blood, mostly Creek, Seminole, and Chickasaw. Only a few Negroes were enrolled. In 1958 there were approximately 1500 resident students counting those taking both full-and part-time work. Forty-one per cent of the students were residents of Pontotoc County in which the school is located. Approximately twenty per cent of all freshmen completed their degrees. Eighty to ninety per cent of the graduates obtained degrees in education.[6]

Northwestern State College is located at Alva, Oklahoma, about 150 miles northwest of Oklahoma City and only fifteen miles from the Kansas border. It serves an extensive area of twelve counties including the Oklahoma Panhandle with points as distant as 250 miles from Alva. This is the most sparsely settled region of Oklahoma. The land is devoted mostly to large wheat farms or cattle ranches. Enid, with a population of about 40,000 was the only city in the area larger than 7,000. The students generally come from families of pioneer stock or families of long residence in northwest Oklahoma. The frequency of German names among the students attested to the origin of many of these people. Relatively few Indians or Negroes were in this region. The student enrollment was the smallest of the state colleges, numbering slightly less than 1000 in 1958. This, however, was a one-hundred per cent increase over the 1955 enrollment. The students come generally from the northwestern section of Oklahoma and southwest Kansas. In

---

[6]Personal interview, statements by William H. Faust, Registrar, East Central State College, Ada, Oklahoma, February 25, 1959.

recent years about eighty per cent of those graduating took their degrees in education.[7]

Southeastern State College is located at Durant, Oklahoma, about 150 miles southeast of Oklahoma City and only fifteen miles from the Texas border. Twelve counties comprise the district served by Southeastern. Most of these counties are rural in nature, especially in the region dominated by the Kiamichi Mountains. Ardmore and McAlester, both having slightly less than 20,000 persons, are the main urban centers. Aside from the established American stock which predominated, there was also a considerable number of students of Indian descent. Choctaws and Chickasaws were most numerous, but many tribes were represented because of the presence of Oklahoma Presbyterian College which provides scholarships for Indian students. Academic work, except for religious education, was taken by the students of this college at Southeastern. There were no Negroes among the full-time students in 1958, although the district has a heavy Negro population. Total resident enrollment in 1958-59 was just under 1500. Approximately one-third of the students were from Bryan County in which the school is located. A large number of Texans were enrolled, most of whom were commuters from Denison and Sherman. About ninety per cent of the graduates take their degrees in education.[8]

Central State College is located at Edmond, Oklahoma, very close to the geographical center of the state. This school serves fourteen

---

[7]Personal interview, statements by Aurice Huguley, Bursar-Registrar, Northwestern State College, Alva, Oklahoma, March 11, 1959.

[8]Personal interview, statements by Sam O. Pool, Registrar, Southeastern State College, Durant, Oklahoma, March 16, 1959.

counties that stretch from Kansas to Texas across the center of the state. This is the most urbanized and most populous of all the state college districts. It includes the largest population agglomeration at Oklahoma City and at least five other cities of over 20,000 population. Edmond itself is a part of the Greater Oklahoma City area. Ethnically the student population is more heterogeneous than that of any other state college. It is also more racially integrated and has a larger number of Negroes than any of the state colleges.

The enrollment in 1958 at Central State College was about 3,300, considerably greater than that of any other state college. More than half of the students were from Oklahoma City or its metropolitan district. Central obtained more transfer students than any other state college, since both of the state universities are in the central district and Edmond is located about halfway between them. The number of graduates taking their degrees in education in recent years ranged from sixty to seventy per cent. The composition of the graduating class, however, did not reflect the composition of the total student body. There were, for example, large numbers of students enrolled in the pre-professional program who would complete their education elsewhere. The urban nature of Central's clientele was reflected in an analysis of the 1958 departmental enrollments. General business was the largest degree program with about 650 enrolled. Elementary education was second with about 450 enrollees. Pre-professional students numbered nearly 650 with over 300 in pre-engineering.[9]

---

[9]Personal interview, statements of E. Truman Wester, Registrar, Central State College, Edmond, Oklahoma, February 26, 1959.

Northeastern State College is located at Tahlequah, Oklahoma, about twenty-eight miles east by north from Muskogee, Oklahoma, and about thirty miles from the Arkansas border. Northeastern serves an area of fifteen counties. The area is the least extensive of all the state college districts but is exceeded in population only by the central district. The area includes Tulsa, Oklahoma's second largest city, and two other cities of over 25,000 population. The students were generally of established American stock, but the largest percentage of those with Indian blood were to be found at Northeastern. Northeastern ranks second to Central in the number of Negroes to be found among its student body.

Approximately 2,000 students were enrolled at Northeastern in 1958. Thus, in enrollment Northeastern ranked second to Central among the state colleges. The majority of the students were from small high schools. Nearby Muskogee, however, furnished a large number of students, many of them commuters. About 85 per cent of the graduates obtained degrees in education.[10]

Southwestern State College is located at Weatherford, Oklahoma, about seventy miles west of Oklahoma City. Its district is composed of thirteen counties covering an extensive area in southwestern Oklahoma. The area is composed largely of small cities, town, and villages. Lawton, third largest city in Oklahoma, and Altus are the largest population concentrations with populations of about 60,000 and 20,000. Each of these two cities has about doubled in population during the last decade. Many pioneer Oklahoma families live in this area and, as in the

---

[10]Personal interviews, Statements by Noble Bryan, Registrar, Northeastern State College, Tahlequah, Oklahoma, April 9, 1959.

area to the north, many are of German descent. Also numbered among the students are many Indian descendants of the plains tribes who formerly lived on reservations in this area. These tribes were the Kiowas, Comanches, Arapahos, Cheyennes, and Caddos.

The 1958 resident enrollment averaged around 1,700. This included about 200 students enrolled in the School of Pharmacy. The School of Pharmacy began in 1939 when the school was renamed Southwestern State College of Diversified Occupations. In 1941 its name was again changed to Southwestern Institute of Technology. During this period pharmacy, arts and science, and trade-school curriculums were established in addition to teacher education. The present name was adopted in 1949, but the School of Pharmacy was retained. Students enter the School of Pharmacy during their freshman year and take four years of highly specialized work that almost completely bypasses the school's general-education program.

The percentage of students pursuing the Arts and Science program was greater at Southwestern than at any other state college. The number taking degrees in the Arts and Sciences nearly equaled the number in education.[11]

The Objectives of General Education in the Subject Schools

It was not a purpose of this study to examine the entire general-education program. The objectives of these programs, however, were of particular interest since the humanities, as an important and distinctive

---

[11]Personal interviews, Statements by Millie Thomas, Registrar and Dr. Donald Hamm, Chairman of General Education, Southwestern State College, Weatherford, Oklahoma, March 19, 1959.

part of these programs, should be designed to fulfill one or more of the objectives.

East Central State College. The objectives of East Central were incorporated in a statement of the college bulletin which also gives certain concepts as to the nature of general education.[12]

> A program of general education [which is] designed to extend and enrich the common basic educational experiences of all students. This program is at the college level a continuation of the kind of education predominant in the secondary school, being concerned principally with fundamental learning in the areas of social science, natural science, and the humanities, and receives chief emphasis in the first two years of the four-year college course. The studies are essentially nonspecialized and nonvocational, although they provide background for advanced and specialized work. General education aims primarily at a balanced development of the individual's knowledge, understanding, attitude, and behavior for responsible and intelligent maturity, successful and satisfactory adulthood, and civic competence in contemporary democratic society. . . . .

Northwestern State College. The objectives at Northwestern were established by the General Education Committee of 1956 and reaffirmed by the committee of 1957.[13] They were as follows:

1. To guide the individual in forming such personal philosophy as will lead him to happiness and the good life for himself and others.

    (a) To develop the potentialities of personality.
    (b) To cultivate the sense of beauty and aesthetic appreciation.
    (c) To apply habits of scientific thought to both personal and civic problems.
    (d) To prepare the student for responsible citizenship in the community, the nation, and the world.
    (e) To promote sound mental and physical health.

---

[12] East Central State College General Catalog 1958-1960, July, 1958, p. 15.

[13] Paper in the files of Andy Clarke, Dean of Instruction, Northwestern State College, Alva, Oklahoma, March 12, 1959. (Hectographed)

2. To develop such critical understanding of the accumulated traditions and heritage from the past as to inspire confidence in sound and orderly evolution for the future.

   (a) To enable the individual to approach with broader understanding the situations that may arise for him as a member of society.
   (b) To develop orderly habits of clear, critical thinking and the ability to make sound judgments for the solution of problems and for discrimination among values.
   (c) To acquaint the student with major areas of knowledge which are the common denominator for educated persons functioning as enlightened persons in a free society.

Southeastern State College. The objectives of general education at Southeastern were completely revised in 1957 by a committee charged with this task. The following statement delineates the objectives that were adopted.[14]

The program of general education attempts to provide specifically for the following objectives:

1. A rich individual life with a broad cultural background, which will enable one to understand and enjoy literature, art, music, philosophies, sciences and other disciplines.

2. Participation in some forms of supervised creative activities in order that the student may develop himself to his fullest capacities.

3. The desire and ability to do critical and constructive thinking.

4. The desire and ability to continue growth in various fields of study.

5. Increased skill in using desirable methods of learning.

6. An understanding by the student of himself, and of others.

7. An understanding of current life problems.

8. The development of an effective individual in his social, economic, and natural environment.

---

[14]Paper from the files of James Morrison, Dean of Instruction, Southeastern State College, Durant, Oklahoma, April 23, 1959. (Mimeographed)

9. The assumption of the privileges and responsibilities of a free man and a good citizen in the American democracy.

Central State College. Objectives for the general education program are stated in the catalog as follows:[15]

1. To promote democratic ideals in the local, national, and world community.

2. To aid the student to think critically in order to adopt proper standards and solve the problems of life.

3. To develop the ability to speak and write effectively and to listen and read with critical intelligence.

4. To prepare the student for happy and successful living as an individual, as a member of his family, and of society.

Northeastern State College. The college bulletin contained a statement of beliefs concerning general education as well as a list of explanatory objectives.[16] Both are included in the following excerpt:

> As a result of continuing study, the faculty at Northeastern State College believes that all students should participate in certain common experiences during the first two years of college work and that such a program of common experiences is best designated as General Education. It is believed that a program of General Education must make available to the student extensive experiences, which are both rich and important, in preparation for the major aspects of living in a democratic society; and that these experiences should provide for the development of personal talents and abilities, and for a satisfying participation in activities involving democratic procedures.
>
> With this general philosophy, the entire pattern of General Education has these objectives:
>
> (1) the development of skill in communication, by which is meant the development of a degree of skill in oral or written composition together with the development of skill in reading and listening;
>
> (2) in the realm of scientific training, the student should acquire knowledge and understanding of the

---

[15] Central State College Bulletin, 1957-59, Vol. XLVI, No. 3, Edmond, Oklahoma, July, 1957, p. 1.

[16] Northeastern State College Annual Bulletin, 1958-59, Tahlequah, Oklahoma, p. 17.

natural phenomena, both physical and biological, in his environment, not from the point of view of the specialist or professional, but from the point of view of understanding the natural phenomena in his environment in their implications for human society and human welfare;

(3) to train the student to do his part (on the basis of knowledge and thinking) as an active and intelligent citizen in dealing with interrelated social, economic, and political problems;

(4) acquaintance with a core of knowledge of history sufficient to enable the student to see clearly that the present is a product of the past -- that it represents "the lengthened shadow of the past." This core should be limited to knowledge of periods and epochs in history that can be shown to have genuine significance in relation to the world of today. It is the man and world of today to be understood;

(5) to give the student knowledge of and to lead him to an appreciation of old as well as new culture in western civilization as these cultures find expression in philosophy, literature, art and music;

Southwestern State College. A statement concerning the purposes of general education and a statement of the specific objectives were found in the college catalog as follows:[17]

General Education: The purpose of General Education is to provide a group of experiences common to all educated persons that will enable each to function more effectively as an individual, as a parent, as a worker, as a citizen in a democracy, and as a member of a world community. More specifically, General Education at Southwestern seeks to accomplish the following objectives:

1. To develop in students more effective communicative skills.

2. To foster a greater appreciation of our political, social, and cultural heritage.

3. To stimulate a greater appreciation for literature and the fine arts.

4. To develop in students an awareness of responsible citizenship.

---

[17] Southwestern State College Catalog, 1956-58, Vol. 42, No. 1, March, 1956, p. 16.

5. To create understanding and a desirable attitude toward matters of personal hygiene and public health.

6. To develop a deeper understanding of physical and biological phenomena, particularly as they apply to every day living.

Southwestern made a comprehensive institutional study of general education during 1956-57 that resulted in many changes in courses, procedures, administration, and philosophy. The objectives, however, were not changed. In addition to the objectives stated above, the report of Southwestern's study on general education had this to say:[18]

> To develop ability to think critically is an objective frequently listed among a group of general education objectives. In the case of Southwestern, it certainly may be regarded as an inherent part of the objective pertaining to communicative skills. All general education courses can provide a climate whereby students may not only learn ABOUT forms of reasoning and thinking, but may actually EXPERIENCE such intellectual activity.

It is important that Southwestern was cognizant of the value of this oft-repeated objective. It is not apparent, however, that it "may be regarded as an inherent part of the objective pertaining to communicative skills." The frequent emphasis that was put on this objective by so many schools would indicate that it should have been listed among the objectives.

The Humanities Courses in the Subject Colleges

It has been observed in the preceding text that considerable freedom was given to the state colleges in the establishment of the courses to satisfy the humanities requirements in general education. The sudden adoption of a program requiring the humanities and the admission of

---

[18] An Institutional Study on General Education, Southwestern State College, Weatherford, Oklahoma, (multilithed) p. 39. (Not dated, but report was of a total-faculty study completed during 1957.)

certain courses in sociology, psychology, social psychology, and mental hygiene to be counted as humanities courses caused the schools to make, in most cases, a convenient adaptation to the teachers and courses already at hand. The new program, then, sometimes resulted in only minor changes. In this connection it might be mentioned that one school still did not refer to the program as a general-education program in their 1958-1959 catalog, but continued to follow an older pattern of listing it as "Lower Division Requirements."[19] In the text immediately following, the humanities requirements and courses offered at each school are briefly described.

East Central State College. East Central required a minimum of four semester hours that were elective from the areas of the humanities, foreign language, and practical arts. Students could take six hours of foreign language to complete the requirements. The general courses in the humanities were not offered. Students could choose any two of the separate humanities courses in art, literature, and music, or a history survey course in early western civilization, or a lower-level course in either business, home economics, or industrial arts.[20] Philosophy 252 was offered but was not listed among the general-education requirements. The philosophy course was actually taught as a course in practical psychology. An analysis of the class loads during 1957-58 showed that most of the students in the general-education program took the separate course in literature with a course in practical arts.

There was neither an organizational nor an administrational division of the humanities courses at East Central. Each discipline of

---

[19] Northeastern, p. 48.

[20] East Central, p. 45 and p. 55.

the separate courses was taught under the relevant department. Usually only the separate literature course was offered in more than one section per semester. There seemed to be little or no liaison among the various departments under which the separate courses were taught.

Northwestern State College. The Northwestern catalog gave the humanities requirements as seven to nine semester hours. Five semester hours were required in the general courses or in the separate courses in art, literature, or music. The other two or three hours could be taken in Humanities 252 (philosophy) or in sociology or psychology.[21] Since the philosophy course was seldom offered, the humanities (by our definition) is five or six hours. The Humanities 223 (literature) was the most popular selection, with Humanities 242 (music) ranking second. These two courses constituted the choice of about eighty per cent of the 200 sophomores enrolled in 1958-59. Only eight per cent took the general courses. The difficulty of the course and teacher personalities may somewhat influence these choices, but the greatest determinant seemed to be that separate courses totaling only five hours could be taken instead of two general courses totaling six hours.

The humanities courses were not a part of any one department but rather were administered under different specialized departments according to type of course. General humanities were taught by one history teacher.

Southeastern State College. Southeastern offered only the two general courses of three semester hours each for a total of six hours in the humanities.[22] All sophomores were required to take these two

---

[21] Northwestern, p. 61.

[22] Southeastern, p. 31, also p. 33 and p. 45.

courses. Thus, there was no means by which the student could make an election whereby he was able to escape what is considered as the humanities in this study. The humanities courses were taught in most classes by members of the English department. The head of the English department, hence, was unofficially in administrative charge of the humanities.

Central State College. Central required either five or six semester hours of humanities selected from the two three-hour general courses or from four separate courses. Of the latter, only literature was offered for three hours credit; others were for two hours each.[23] Classes in both the separate and general courses were large at Central (there were over 700 sophomores in 1958-59). From an analysis of class loads it seemed that most students preferred the program requiring the fewest hours and thus took the literature course for three hours with a two-hour course in either art, music or philosophy. Central, unlike any of the other subject schools, also offered each of the two general courses in a two-hour version (Humanities 202 and 212). Students frequently combined one of the two-hour general courses with the three-hour literature course in order to complete the requirement of five hours. It should be further mentioned that Central, with its large enrollment, found itself handicapped in satisfying the choices of the students in an elective program. Usually it was a matter of the students getting into any available class that would fulfill the requirements. During 1958-59 more sections of the separate literature course were offered than any of the three-hour general courses since it provided the best accommodation to student election and to scheduling. There

---

[23] Central, p. 24-5.

seemed, also, to be some agitation at Central toward giving humanities credit for band, orchestra, and glee-club participation. There were many among the humanities staff who deplored using a general-education requirement as a means of encouraging participation in these extra-curricular activities. Central also enjoyed the unique distinction among the state colleges of having a chairman of the humanities department. His duties, however, were quasi-administrative and advisory, the separate courses remaining, as in the other state colleges, under the specialized departments.

Northeastern State College. Northeastern required five or six hours in the humanities with a choice of either six hours in the two general courses, or five hours in the separate courses, of which one must be Humanities 223 (literature). In addition to these choices, Psychology 203 could be taken in the place of any of the separate courses, except that, if taken instead of the separate course in literature, two semester hours in other literature courses would be required.[24] Freshmen at Northeastern were permitted to enroll in any of the humanities courses; in fact, the total of those enrolled in the humanities ran close to fifty per cent freshmen in the spring of 1959. Recent averages show that about sixty-five per cent of the students chose the two general courses. Of those taking the area courses nearly one hundred per cent took the course in literature as one choice and sixty-five per cent took psychology as the second choice. The remaining thirty-five per cent of those choosing the area courses were about evenly divided among the courses in art, music, and philosophy.[25]

---

[24] Northeastern, p. 48.

[25] Personal interview. Statements by Noble Bryan.

Freshman-sophomore advisement at Northeastern usually recommended the general courses to their advisees.

In its recent catalogs, including the 1958-59 issue, Northeastern has listed the humanities courses under the department of home economics.[26] Faculty members, when asked about this, were unable to give any reason. Actually there is no connection whatsoever between the humanities courses and this department. The courses were taught and administered under the relevant specialized departments, or else, as in the general courses, were separate entities under complete control by the teacher of the course.

Southwestern State College. There seems to have been no bulletin published by Southwestern since the 1956-1958 issue. The next issue will be forthcoming in 1960. Undoubtedly the next issue will be greatly changed as a result of the comprehensive study made by the faculty on general education. The program listed in the 1956-1958 bulletin required six or seven semester hours in the humanities chosen from any three of two-hour area courses in literature, art, and music or in psychology 203, a three-hour course.[27] The general ("integrated" is the preferred nomenclature at Southwestern) courses were offered for the first time during the school year of 1958-59. At the same time psychology was eliminated as counting toward credit in the humanities. The separate courses were still offered and would be continued only as long as there was a demand from those who had originally started on a program of area

---

[26] Northeastern, p. 88.

[27] Southwestern, p. 38.

courses.[28] Southwestern has given new numbers to the general courses designating them as Humanities 133 and 143. The school was also distinct among the state colleges in that it required these courses during the freshman year. During the school year of 1958-59 the number enrolled in the integrated courses slightly exceeded the number in separate courses.

Southwestern, as a result of the institutional study of general education, has installed an administrative system for the general-education program. The administration of the program became the responsibility of a faculty-elected committee known as the Coordinating Committee for General Education. The chairman of this committee was appointed by the Dean of Instruction from its elected membership. This committee was responsible for the selection of the general-education teaching staff, for the development of courses consistent with the school's philosophy of general education, for the approval of course syllabi, for leadership at staff meetings, for leadership in the development of evaluation, and for the reporting of progress in general education to the total faculty.[29]

Besides the establishment of administrative procedures, other changes created by the Southwestern study were of significance to the setting of the humanities in the general-education program. Courses underwent a complete change with the introduction of broad-area courses designed to include materials integrated from several disciplines. Check sheets for candidates for graduation furnished by the registrar's office showed thirty prescribed semester hours of general education to

---

[28] Personal interview, Statements by Dr. Donald Hamm.

[29] An Institutional Study on General Education, Southwestern State College, pp. 65-6.

be taken in the following areas: Introduction to Social Studies, three hours; Fundamental Concepts of Science, four hours; Health and Physical Education, four hours; Basic Mathematics, three hours; Mental Health, two hours; and Family Relations, two hours.[30]

The Southwestern study also revealed some distinct convictions in the area of teacher effectiveness in general education that have relevance to the present study. Following are a few paraphrases of convictions expressed in greater detail in the report on Southwestern's study of general education:

1. Since the general education courses lack the personal motivation "which may be assumed" in the specialized course of their choice "the need therefore, is for those instructors who are best able to TEACH the student." "The General Education faculty should be our best teachers."[31]

2. Teaching should be done by those "sincerely interested" in general education and "sympathetic with its aims." Hence, teachers "should be given a choice as to whether or not they wish to teach in general education courses."[32]

3. "Groups, rather than individuals, should be encouraged to develop courses."[33]

4. Acceptable grammatical usage, spelling, and "clear expression of ideas" should be "concrete factors used in grading" general-education courses.[34]

5. Fundamental skills, especially critical thinking, should be stressed, used in real life situations, and considered in the construction of and grading of exams.[35]

---

[30]Paper from the files of Millie Thomas, Registrar, Southwestern State College, Weatherford, Oklahoma, November 12, 1959.

[31]An Institutional Study on General Education, Southwestern State College, p. 24.

[32]Ibid., p. 25 and 72.

[33]Ibid., p. 72.

[34]Ibid., p. 73.

[35]Ibid., p. 74.

The above are probably the most significant of twenty recommendations made by the committee on effective teaching which were being observed at Southwestern during 1958-59.

Summary and Comparisons

Function and Clientele. Since the establishment of the state colleges their main function has been the education of teachers. This is still the main function, but one that is being challenged as enrollments continue to increase. Degrees in education have declined to only one-half the total conferred at Southwestern. Central has somewhat taken on the function of a municipal college with a growth in the number of students taking general business. The others still confer eighty to ninety per cent of their degrees in education. As the universities become more crowded and perhaps more selective, a further decline in the number of education degrees may be expected. It is probable, then, that in the future there will be a further expansion of the liberal-arts programs and perhaps the development of new specialized or technical programs.

For the most part the colleges serve a clientele that comes from a rural, small-town, or small-city background with their secondary education from high schools with limited curriculums and cultural opportunities. Because of geographical location all the schools, except Central, can expect to continue to serve persons of such backgrounds. Racial integration is new to Oklahoma, and as it increases even more students with limited educational and cultural backgrounds may be expected.

The General-Education Programs. Under the resolution of the Regents for Higher Education the state colleges are committed to what is often referred to as the "layer-cake" plan of general education.

General education under this plan is placed at the bottom layer of the four-year college curriculum and is to be completed during the first two years. Authorities on general education are not in agreement as to whether this plan, or one of concurrent general and specialized education, or one with general education at the top is best.[36] For the purposes of the Oklahoma state colleges the "layer-cake" plan has certain advantages. Since student mortalities are high in the state colleges the student has, by this means, the opportunity to obtain his general education first. General education aims toward the transmission and integration of that portion of the culture which will raise the student to the levels of education judged as adequate by his teachers. The desired levels of education are concerned with skills, behaviors, competencies, understandings, attitudes, appreciations, or values, as well as, knowledges. These levels form the objectives of general education in the respective schools. It is, then, to be expected that students coming from backgrounds, such as the clientele of the state colleges, have an immediate need for general education. The "layer cake" plan is also in agreement with the ideas of the President's Commission on Higher Education which recommended the establishment of the two-year community college to better fulfill the general and semiprofessional needs of the "49 per cent of our population /which/ has the mental ability to complete 14 years of schooling."[37]

---

[36]John B. Schwertman, "General Education and Specialized Education: A New Notion About Their Relationship." The Journal of General Education, Vol. IX, No. 1 (October, 1955), pp. 54-5.

[37]Higher Education for American Democracy, A Report of the President's Commission on Higher Education, Vol. I, Establishing the Goals (New York, 1948), p. 41 and pp. 67-72.

The type of program that was authorized by the Regents for Higher Education can be briefly described as a semi-elective program within a distributional framework. It consists of a sampling of courses within the six broad areas of English; science and mathematics; social studies; health and physical education; the humanities; and foreign languages, psychology, fine arts, or practical arts. Within these areas certain courses, totaling less than twenty semester hours, are rigidly required; certain other courses are elective from a strictly limited choice; and the remaining courses are more or less freely elected from the freshman and sophomore courses. This type of program is followed in all the subject schools except Southwestern which has instituted an experimental, prescriptive program.

The Objectives of General Education. General education, as observed above, may be thought of as an attempt to raise the students from the educational level at which they enter college to levels in various areas which are defined by the objectives of general education. In the subject schools, then, it is an education that fills the gap between where the student is when he enters college and where his educators think he should be at the end of the sophomore year. Moreover, it is an education that attempts to give the student carry-over values that will endure with him into the most probable activities of his adult life. The status of where the student is as he enters college and where he should be at the end of the sophomore year is based upon an assumption. It is assumed, in the subject schools, that the knowledge and experience of educators who have worked over a period of time with college students are sufficient to recognize the student's degree of insufficiency, to identify his present needs, and to predict his future needs. These

present and future needs are stated as the objectives of the general-education program. This is a tenable assumption, but it could be supplemented by more objective means of diagnosis and prognosis. The few attempts that have been made toward objective measurement have usually resulted in little or no change. Some of the subject schools have established local percentiles from standardized freshman tests. One school has evaluated needs from the opinions of former students, but this evaluation was directed toward professional education. The most promising innovation is the experimental general-education program at Southwestern State College. It is, however, too new to yield helpful and reliable information.

The needs, as exemplified by the objectives of general education in the state colleges, were not easy to analyze due to the variety of statements, some of which included several specific objectives. One school, East Central, made one statement so generalized that it could well include almost any specific objective. The following analysis consists of a list of reworded short statements indicating specific objectives and a numeral following each to indicate the number of state colleges having that objective:

1. Development of personal and/or social adjustments (5),
2. Development of democratic citizenship (5),
3. Development of critical thinking (4),
4. Knowledge, appreciation, or understanding of cultural heritage (4),
5. Skill in speaking, writing, listening, and/or reading (3),
6. Understanding, knowledge, or skill in science (3),
7. Mental and/or physical adjustment (2),

8. Knowledge or understanding of "the major areas of knowledge" (2),

9. Adjustment for home, family, and/or parental life (2),

10. Development of world citizenry or world outlook (2),

11. Aesthetic appreciations and attitudes (2),

12. Participation in creative activities (1),

13. Adjustment to the environment in its several forms (1),

14. "Acquaintance with a core of knowledge of history" (1),

15. Development of a personal philosophy (1),

From the above list it should be noted that there was no unanimous agreement on any one specific objective of general education. On only the first two paraphrased objectives were there as many as five of the six schools in agreement. One of the most surprising revelations, however, concerned the third and fourth paraphrased objectives. Studies that have been made of general education objectives have shown these two objectives--critical thinking and appreciation of cultural heritage--receive almost unanimous acceptance. Physical education is a requirement in the general-education programs of all the subject schools, yet only two schools stated an objective (No. 7 above) that was concerned with it. Aesthetic appreciation, which is an objective of most humanities courses, was also chosen by only two schools as an objective of general education. On the other hand, it might be difficult to pinpoint particular courses of the schools' general-education programs that would implement such objectives as numbers 9, 12 and 15. One administrator when queried about this replied that it was an "implied objective of the total program."

The Administration of the General-Education Programs. In the catalogs of the subject schools and among the administrators of the

schools the general-education program is recognized, along with the specialized and professional programs, as being one of the three main divisions of the college. It is also recognized by most administrators that the general-education program involves a larger number of students and teachers than either the specialized or the professional programs. It is further acknowledged that the general-education program is basic and necessary to the other two programs, as well as to the finished college product. Despite these admissions the general-education program is the only one of the three main divisions of the subject schools without a structure to bring about effective organization, coordination, control, and evaluation. Southwestern State College, whose committee system for administration was previously described, is the one exception. In all other of the subject colleges the dean of instruction is nominally the chief administrative officer of the general-education program, but coordination and evaluation are almost non-existent; and control is a highly divided matter, existing within the various specialized departments that offer the courses within the distributional plan.

This practice traces back to the time when the subject colleges existed as normal schools with departmentalized high-school and junior-college subjects. As the college evolved through a teaching-certificate program, through the Group I and II requirement stage, and through the present general-education program, the specialized departments have maintained control. This fact probably influenced the committee which authored the present program to select a distributional framework that, by its nature, would tend to preserve departmental control. It is significant to note that the committee did not make provision for any other type of administration.

Meanwhile, the new program at Southwestern, because of its organization and administration, holds future promise as being capable of giving coordination and unification to the general-education program.

The Humanities Courses and Escapism. The resolution of the Regents for Higher Education, which authorized the present general-education program, was for the most part a reshuffling of old courses. It created new courses in only two departments, science and the humanities. The new program did not permit any elective escape from the general-education science other than by an election of a more advanced science course. In the humanities, however, a loophole was left so that at least a part of the humanities could be avoided by taking psychology or sociology. The responsibility for the origination of this goes back to the intercollegiate curriculum committee whose recommendation passed unchanged through the Council of Presidents and the Regents for Higher Education. Moreover, interviews with persons who served on the curriculum committee indicated that the inclusion of psychology and sociology, to fulfill the humanities requirements, was due to one person who tenaciously insisted on such a plan.[38]

Under the present program of general education, as adopted by the regents, only a partial escape from the humanities can be gained by taking psychology or sociology. However, at least one school has made its own changes and permits a total escape. East Central requires only four or five hours which can be taken in foreign language or in a combination which includes history with a course in either business, home

---

[38]Personal Interviews. This statement was made by three persons who expressed the wish to be anonymous if quoted. For obvious reasons the name of the subject of the statements is also omitted.

economics, or industrial arts. Northeastern permits partial escape in that psychology may be taken in place of any of the area courses except the one in literature. In all of the remaining state colleges, students are required to take five or six hours of either the general or separate courses. During 1958-59 only Southeastern offered the general courses exclusively.

General vs. Separate Courses in the Humanities. Probably no issue concerning humanities courses has been argued more than the matter of the general, or integrated, courses, as opposed to the separate, or area, courses. Advocates of the area course claim that the best teaching can be done by the specialist and that few persons are broad enough to teach the general course. They claim also that better motivation can be gained when students are permitted to choose their own areas of study. Those who favor the general course often claim that the courses taught by specialists tend to become too technical and consist of too much memorized information. They say, also, that the teacher need not be a specialist but merely a capable teacher, well informed, willing to become a learner, and one who is challenged by the task. Motivation, the general course proponents claim, is inherent in the humanities and can be found and utilized by the resourceful teacher. These and still other arguments are rife, but the greatest division of opinion is over the matter of integration. Harold Taylor says: "Integration comes from within and no amount of integrating and correlating of subjects in external ways will achieve a genuine integration unless the student himself is affected totally, both in intellect and emotion . . . . It is hard to achieve this aim through a prescribed curriculum

in the humanities."[39] Graeffe, on the other hand, wrote a sizable volume to show that it is both possible and advisable to correlate, by particular teaching procedures, the various disciplines of the humanities.[40] Probably the larger number of humanities teachers hold this latter view, but the end of the argument is not in sight.

There is no indication that the founding committee of the general-education curriculum for the subject schools was aware of the separate-general humanities conflict. Most likely the two types of courses were created to give the schools a choice for easier adjustment. But in creating the two types of courses, they created the greatest difference to be found in the humanities programs.

When the new general-education curriculum went into effect only Southeastern State College offered the general course. This school had introduced it as an experimental course a year earlier. Northeastern adopted the general course during the second year of the new general-education program but continued to offer the separate courses. Northwestern and then Central likewise adopted the general course while retaining their separate courses. During the school year of 1958-59, the time of the present investigation, Southwestern also introduced the general course. At the time of the present study, Southeastern alone offered only the general courses while East Central was the only state college that exclusively offered the separate courses. All others offered a student election of either the general or separate courses.

---

[39]Harold Taylor, On Education and Freedom (New York, 1954), pp. 207, 213.

[40]Arnold Didier Graeffe, Creative Education in the Humanities (New York, 1951).

The trend over the past ten years, then, indicates a movement toward the adoption of the general courses. At least one school plans to eventually eliminate the separate courses.[41] A department head in still another school would like to drop the separate courses but fears that he will not be able to obtain teachers capable of teaching the general course.[42]

Student preference for one type of course over another cannot be judged by class loads. Factors regarding the teacher, the time of the class, and the number of classes offered, determine the choices made at schools offering both types. Moreover, since the students, except in a few cases, take only one of the two types, they are in no position to judge their comparative merits even if it were to be assumed that they were capable of doing so. Specific differences between the two types of courses and preferences for either, must, then, be examined by other means. One of the basic tasks of the remaining parts of this study will be to examine in greater detail the two types of humanities courses.

---

[41]Personal Interview, Statement by Dr. Donald Hamm.

[42]Personal Interview, Statement by Dr. Guy C. Chambers, Chairman, Division of Language Arts and Humanities, Central State College, Edmond, Oklahoma, March 6, 1959.

CHAPTER IV

THE FINDINGS OF THE QUESTIONNAIRE

The purpose of the present chapter was to present in summary form the data obtained by the questionnaire and to analyze and compare these data by the type of humanities course. The data of the questionnaire were pertinent to the objectives, approaches, integrative techniques, content, and methods of the humanities courses of the Oklahoma state colleges. The questionnaire was the second of the three major means by which the data of the study were collected.

The decision to combine the questionnaire with observational and interview techniques gave the investigator the opportunity to personally give the questionnaire to each respondent and to personally collect it from him. As a result of this procedure every teacher engaged in teaching the humanities in the Oklahoma state colleges during the spring of 1959 returned the questionnaire. The total number of teachers teaching the humanities during the investigation was forty. Thirteen of these forty were teaching the general course. Among the separate course teachers, fifteen were teaching literature, five were teaching art, four were teaching music, and three were teaching the separate philosophy course.

Objectives, Approaches, and Integrative Techniques

In the actual questionnaire (see Appendix C) the section on objectives, approaches, and integrative techniques was preceded by

the sections on content and on methodology. This, it was hoped, would prevent the respondent from being influenced in his answers by his prior response to questions regarding his aims and general means of achieving these aims. The logical order of placing the objectives first has been reverted to in the presentation of the questionnaire data.

Objectives. A simple index was developed to measure the degree of emphasis placed in the separate and general courses on each of the objectives contained in the questionnaire: First, values of 0, 1, 2, 3 were assigned respectively to "No emphasis," "Some emphasis," "Moderate emphasis," and "Great emphasis"; secondly, the values from a data sheet compiled on the questionnaire answers were totaled for each objective; and finally, an average was computed as the degree-of-emphasis index. Indexes for the degree of emphasis placed on the selected objectives of the questionnaire by twenty-seven teachers of the separate course and thirteen teachers of the general course are shown in Table I. Since the indexes are averages of weights that were assigned to the word-descriptions with which each objective was checked, the tabulated figures of Table I can be directly reverted to the same word descriptions indicating the various degrees of emphasis placed on the objectives. Thus, an index of 2.4 would indicate an average emphasis of between great and moderate.

An inspection of Table I suggests that there was close similarity between the general and separate courses as to the degree of emphasis placed upon each objective. This is further borne out by the application of the rank-difference correlation formula to the ranked indexes

TABLE I

INDEXES OF DEGREE OF EMPHASIS ON SELECTED OBJECTIVES IN THE GENERAL-EDUCATION HUMANITIES COURSES OF THE OKLAHOMA STATE COLLEGES

	Objectives	Sep. Crs. N-27	Rank	Gen. Crs. N-13	Rank	Rank Diff.
a.	To provide the student with a broader understanding of his cultural heritage.	2.4[a]	1	2.6	1	0
b.	To develop the student's abilities of critical analysis and judgment.	1.8	4	2.0	4	0
c.	To make the student cognizant of the great issues of living that man has had to confront in the past and must face today.	1.3	6	2.1	2	4
d.	To develop the student's interest in his own distinct creative abilities.	0.6	11	0.5	11	0
e.	To develop a set of sound moral and spiritual values by which the student may guide his life.	1.0	9.5	1.3	8.5	1
f.	To develop aesthetic values and an appreciation for the creative work of man.	2.3	2	2.0	4	2
g.	To correct, eliminate, or supplant any undesirable fixed beliefs, attitudes or emotional preferences of the student.	1.1	8	1.2	10	2
h.	To develop the student's courage in expressing and standing firm in his own convictions.	1.0	9.5	1.3	8.5	1
i.	To help the student in expressing his thoughts and ideas clearly through speaking and writing.	1.2	7	1.5	6.5	.5
j.	To help the student to observe, listen, and read with understanding and with an open mind.	2.1	3	2.0	4	1
k.	To aid the student in living intelligently and fully under a democratic form of government.	1.4	5	1.5	6.5	1.5

[a]Index of degree of emphasis computed as follows: Values of 0, 1, 2, 3, were assigned to "No," "Some," "Moderate," and "Great" emphasis; the values were totaled and an average computed.

for the two types of courses in Table I. This formula, as given by Garrett is:[1]

$$\rho = 1 - \frac{6\Sigma d^2}{N(N^2-1)}$$

In solving for the rank correlation coefficient (ρ or rho) a figure of .866 is obtained:

$$1 - \frac{6 \times 29.5}{11\ (120)} = .866$$

A rank correlation coefficient of .86 indicates a very significant similarity in the ranking of the objectives by the two types of courses. With a df. of nine (N - 2) a correlation coefficient of .735 would be significant at the .01 level.[2]

As depicted in Table I, both the general and separate courses put maximum emphasis on an "understanding of man's cultural heritage." (objective a.) Likewise, the least emphasis was placed by both types of courses on the objective of "Developing the student's interest in his own creative ability." The greatest difference between degrees of emphasis placed by the two types of courses on any one objective occurred on objective c. This objective, concerned with cognizance of great issues of the past that have present relevance, varied 0.8 points between the two courses. This variance would be equivalent to 20 per cent. All other selected objectives of Table I had indexes that varied no more than 0.3 points along a continuous scale of from 0 to 4. This figure (0.3) would be equivalent to 7.5 per cent.

---

[1]Henry E. Garrett, Statistics in Psychology and Education (New York, 1953), pp. 354-56.

[2]Ibid., p. 200.

The respondents were urged to indicate any other objectives peculiar to their courses that were not among the questionnaire items. Most of these were restatements in different words of the objectives already listed. One respondent, however, listed as a major objective of a separate course in literature the "cultivation of abilities for the expression of abstract ideas." Another somewhat distinct, major objective for a general course was given as "an emphasis on the responsibilities of freedom and growth toward a willingness to accept them."

Approaches. The frequency of the use of the selected approaches in the two types of humanities courses is summarized in Table II. In the examination of Table II it must be remembered that the selected approaches were not mutually exclusive, and it is not necessary for the total to equal the number of respondents. Also certain of the approaches were much more suitable for one type of course than for another. A separate course would seldom, if ever, be taught to include other disciplines in a parallel manner. However, it will be noted in Table II that some of the separate courses did teach other disciplines in a parallel manner along with their discipline of major concern.

It is evident from Table II that there were wide differences between the separate and general courses in regard to the favored approach. Among the general-course respondents all but one used the historical-separate approach. The only general-course respondent who failed to mark this checked instead the Great Books approach. The separate course used a wide variety of approaches. Among the separate-course teachers, the historical-parallel approach was one of the two least favored. The random-separate, the Great Books, and the

TABLE II

APPROACHES: FREQUENCY OF USE IN THE GENERAL EDUCATION HUMANITIES COURSES OF THE OKLAHOMA STATE COLLEGES

Approach	Frequency of responses							
	Separate courses						Gen. Crs.	
	Art N-5	Mus. N-4	Lit. N-15	Phl. N-3	Total N-27	%	Total N-13	%
a. Historical-parallel	0	1	1	0	2	07	12	92
b. Random-parallel	1	0	3	1	5	18	0	00
c. Historical-separate	2	2	2	1	7	26	0	00
d. Random-separate	0	2	8	1	11	40	0	00
e. Creative-approach	2	1	0	1	4	15	1	07
f. Great Books and Masterpieces	1	2	7	0	10	37	4	30
g. Regressive-approach	0	1	0	0	1	04	0	00

historical-separate approaches, in that order, were the ones most often employed by the teachers of the separate courses. All but a very few of the separate-course teachers marked at least one of these three approaches. It should be pointed out, however, that some of the respondents probably did not have a clear idea of the Great Books approach. The questionnaire was at fault in not giving a more detailed description. The Great Books approach, as used at St. Johns College of Annapolis, Maryland, makes use of seminars, discussion groups, and tutorials of small numbers; extensive outside reading assignments; intensive study with frequent memorization of classical passages; and required attendance at extra-curricular lectures, recitals, concerts, and plays. Modifications of this approach, such as the Great Books adult study program, still insist on concentrated reading and discussion

by small groups. The interviews revealed that probably only two of the general courses used a modification of this approach. In these a large class was divided into small groups for discussion and intensive group work.

The approaches listed in the questionnaire were evidently comprehensive enough to include all of the general means used by respondents toward the attainment of their objectives. None of the respondents listed any other type of approach that was used. Likewise, none of the teachers marked any preference for an approach other than the one they were using. It could be inferred from this that none of the teachers were under any restraint that forced them into using an approach they did not prefer. It should be mentioned here that, although no preference was marked on the questionnaire for approaches other than those in use, two teachers of the general course expressed interest later, during the interviews, in the regressive approach. Both of these teachers wished to learn how it was used, by whom, and with what success.

Integrative techniques. The data from the questionnaire concerning the integrative techniques used in the humanities courses of the subject colleges are summarized in Table III. Since several techniques could be used by one teacher the items of Table III are not mutually exclusive. Furthermore, in the examination of Table III it is well to remember that there were twice as many separate courses and, hence, twice as many questionnaire responses as compared with the general courses.

A noticeable difference between the two types of courses existed in their comparative use of item i as an integrative technique. This item was stated as, "emphasis on the student knowing and accepting what

TABLE III

INTEGRATIVE PRINCIPLES AND TECHNIQUES: FREQUENCY OF USE IN THE GENERAL EDUCATION HUMANITIES COURSES OF THE OKLAHOMA STATE COLLEGES

Integrative principles or techniques	Frequency of responses							
	Separate Courses						Gen. Crs.	
	Art. N-5	Mus. N-4	Lit. N-15	Phl. N-3	Total N-27	%	Total N-13	%
a. Key concepts of philosophic or scientific thought	0	1	5	2	8	29	9	70
b. Association with historical events or affairs not necessarily chronological	2	1	5	1	9	33	1	07
c. A chronological framework	0	1	3	0	4	15	4	30
d. Association with cultural epochs	2	3	6	1	12	44	11	85
e. Emphasis upon one great idea or unifying principle (e.g., the creativeness of man, the Christian religion, etc.)	2	0	2	0	4	15	1	07
f. Emphasis on more than one great unifying principle or trend of civilization	0	2	5	2	9	33	6	46
g. Correlation of similar ideas in the several areas of knowledge (e.g., realism, idealism, experimentalism.)	0	1	6	1	8	29	6	46
h. Emphasis on the development of the student's own ability to analyze and evaluate	3	1	7	3	14	52	8	61
i. Emphasis on the student knowing and accepting what is authoritatively known to be good	2	3	8	0	13	48	2	13
j. Dependence upon the student's own ability to synthesize fragmentary material	0	0	3	1	4	15	1	07

is authoritatively known to be good." This statement has implications that are rooted in the basic issues concerned with what the teacher is attempting to accomplish when he teaches the humanities. Is the teacher attempting to indoctrinate--to mold the student into a conformity in which he and his fellow students all accept something because authorities say that it is "good"? Or, on the other hand, is the teacher attempting to urge the student to make choices based upon his own judgment--choices that he has critically analyzed and accepted despite the judgment of others? Those who favor the general course sometimes criticize the separate courses taught by specialists for their indoctrination. Table III seems to bear this out. The specialists level their criticisms of the general courses at the lack of control existing in courses that are not directed toward what the mature members of the culture generally accept. This, too, seems to be borne out in Table III. It is not a purpose of this study to attempt to evaluate or resolve this issue, but rather to point out that this difference did exist between the general and separate courses in the subject colleges. It should be added, however, that difference can be a matter of degree and that probably none of the respondents, on either side, held an extreme viewpoint.

Other major differences were noted in the greater use by the respondents of the general course of "key concepts of philosophic and scientific thought" (item a.) and "association with cultural epochs." (item d.) The latter integrative technique was used with the greatest frequency in the general course and is in accord with the use of the historical approach. Among the separate courses "emphasis on the development of the student's own ability to analyze and evaluate"

(item h.) received the most responses. This somewhat conflicts with item i, but several respondents checked both items.

In addition to the items of the table, the following principles or techniques were listed as being used by single respondents:

"In functional material related to its use and appreciation in present life." (an art teacher)

"Correlation of related areas with the subject matter of literary selections." (a literature teacher)

"Correlation of similar elements in the several areas of knowledge." (i.e., Organization, Unity, Balance, Variety) (a general course teacher)

Summary. On the basis of the data obtained by the questionnaire the following conditions seem to be present:

1. There was great similarity in the objectives professed by the teachers of the humanities courses of the subject schools.

2. There were wide differences in the approaches used by the separate and general courses toward the attainment of their objectives. The historical-parallel approach was used in over ninety per cent of all general courses. A wide variety of approaches were used in the separate courses with none showing any great predominance.

3. The data concerning integrative techniques seemed to reflect wide differences in basic beliefs in regard to the humanities. Generally the separate-course respondents seemed to have held more rigidly to materials judged as good by authorities. The general-course respondents seemed to have depended more upon the association and correlation of objects, ideas, and time; and to have depended also upon the student making his own judgments after critical examination.

Content of the Separate and General Courses

It was the intention of the investigator to obtain data on all the courses that were taught at all the colleges. One school, however, was in the process of changing its general-education program. Although the separate course in philosophy was planned, it was not to be taught until the school year of 1959-60. The course had not been taught previously by any member of the staff. One other school had only one general humanities teacher and offered only one course each semester. This teacher agreed to respond to both the content and methodology sections of the questionnaire for both courses. In still another school preliminary investigation uncovered the fact that the two teachers of the general course conducted their courses very differently. These two teachers also agreed to fill out the content and methodology sections for both their first and second semester courses. As a result three additional responses were made to the sections on content and on methodology. This in no way affected the section on objectives, approaches, and integrative techniques, since these, according to the teachers concerned, remained the same for both of their courses.

Content of the General Courses. A basic assumption used in the construction of the questionnaire was that the content of the general courses would consist mainly of the same disciplines that were included in the separate courses; namely, art, music, literature, and philosophy. The first page of the content section of the questionnaire was for the purpose of testing this assumption. History and science, two disciplines that might also find inclusion in a humanities course, were added to the items of the first page as a means of making a comparative check. The data obtained from the responses of the general course

teachers to this question are summarized in Table IV for the first course (Humanities 203) and Table V for the second course (Humanities 213).

TABLE IV

CONTENT OF THE FIRST GENERAL COURSE IN THE HUMANITIES: PER CENT OF CLASSWORK DEVOTED TO VARIOUS DISCIPLINES

	Discipline	No. of responses to indicated %[a]						Avg.
		0	10	20	30	40	50	%
a.	Literature (not including philosophical or historical writing)	0	0	1	2	3	1	35.7
b.	Philosophy	1	2	2	1	1	0	18.6
c.	Music	2	2	2	1	0	0	12.9
d.	Art (Graphic and plastic including architecture)	0	2	3	2	0	0	20.0
e.	History or historical writing (not included as literature)	2	3	1	1	0	0	11.4
f.	Science (scientific theory, discoveries, etc.)	6	1	0	0	0	0	1.4

[a]Table IV based on responses for seven courses.

TABLE V

CONTENT OF THE SECOND GENERAL COURSE IN THE HUMANITIES: PER CENT OF CLASSWORK DEVOTED TO VARIOUS DISCIPLINES

	Discipline	No. of responses to indicated %[b]						Avg.
		0	10	20	30	40	50	%
a.	Literature[a]	0	0	2	4	0	1	32.2
b.	Philosophy	2	4	2	1	0	0	12.3
c.	Music	2	2	3	2	0	0	15.5
d.	Art	0	2	3	4	0	0	22.2
e.	History	1	6	1	1	0	0	12.3
f.	Science	5	3	1	0	0	0	5.5

[a]For fuller descriptions of the disciplines, cf. Table IV

[b]Table V based on responses for nine courses. Three teachers completed two questionnaires each to give full coverage of all courses at all schools.

The data of Tables IV and V support the assumption that was made concerning the content of the general courses. In the first course literature composed about one-third of the course while philosophy and art each composed about one-fifth. Music ranked fourth and was only slightly ahead of history. As had been previously shown the general courses used principally an historical approach. Music, on the other hand, has had its greatest development since the Renaissance, the period with which a chronologically-taught first course would normally end. In the second course music was taught to greater extent but philosophy declined to a position equal with history. No reason for the decrease in philosophy can be given other than philosophy since the Renaissance was not regarded as important as classical and medieval philosophy. The division of philosophy into other disciplines; such as, science, mathematics, psychology, and sociology may also partly explain the decrease. It must also be pointed out that both music and philosophy would have greater indicated percentages of the total study if those courses that did not include them in the course syllabi were excluded. Philosophy was not included in one Humanities 203 course and in two Humanities 213 courses. Music was not included in two 203 courses and also in two 213 courses.

Literature Content. The section of the questionnaire concerned with the literature content of the general humanities courses and with the separate literature course was divided into two parts: first, a check list of generalized forms of literature; and secondly, a check list of selected, specific topics. Tables VI and VII present summaries of the data on the literature content of the two general courses. Each table gives the average time devoted to the selected, generalized forms of literature.

TABLE VI

CONTENT OF THE SEPARATE HUMANITIES COURSES IN LITERATURE: PER CENT OF TOTAL CLASSWORK DEVOTED TO VARIOUS FORMS

Form	No. of responses to indicated %						Avg. %
	0	10	20	30	40	50	
a. Poetry (non-dramatic including epics)	0	1	1	6	5	2	34.0
b. Non-fictional prose (essays, criticism, biography, etc.)	9	1	5	0	0	0	7.3
c. Fictional prose	0	0	3	5	6	1	33.3
d. Drama	0	0	8	6	1	0	25.4

TABLE VII

LITERATURE CONTENT OF THE TWO GENERAL HUMANITIES COURSES: PER CENT OF TOTAL CLASSWORK DEVOTED TO VARIOUS FORMS

I. First Course (Humanities 203 or 133)

	No. of responses to indicated %								Avg. %
	0	10	20	30	40	50	60	70	
a. Poetry	0	0	5	2	0	0	0	0	22.9
b. Non-fictional prose	1	2	2	1	1	0	0	0	18.6
c. Fictional prose	0	2	2	1	1	0	1	0	27.1
d. Drama	1	0	0	3	2	1	0	0	31.4

II. Second Course (Humanities 213 or 143)

a. Poetry	0	1	5	1	0	2	0	0	26.7
b. Non-fictional prose	3	1	2	2	1	0	0	0	16.7
c. Fictional prose	0	2	4	3	0	0	0	0	21.1
d. Drama	0	0	2	4	1	1	0	1	35.5

Several differences are to be noted between Table VI--concerned with the separate courses, and Table VII--concerned with the two general courses. In the separate courses nearly equal average time was devoted to poetry and to fictional prose while drama ranked third in average time. The largest per cent of average time in both of the general courses, however, was devoted to drama. In the first general course fictional prose ranked second and poetry third, while in the second course the positions of the two forms were reversed. In the separate literature course non-fictional prose (essays, criticism, biography, etc.) received little attention and in nine of the fifteen courses it was almost entirely neglected. On the average it received twice as much attention in the general courses, and in two general courses it constituted forty per cent of the average time.

Tables 1 and 2 of Appendix H present summaries of the data for the two types of courses on the number of classroom hours devoted to selected topics of literature.[3] The data for the separate course in literature are found in Table 1 and for the literature content of the two general courses in Table 2. In Table 1 it was necessary to make an adjustment of the number of hours devoted to each topic. It has been previously noted that the separate literature course was offered for either two or three semester hours credit. Since the other separate courses were offered for only two hours of credit it was deemed expedient to reduce the responses of those teaching the three-hour course to a two-hour basis. This was done by multiplying the responses

---

[3]The summaries of the topical content of the humanities courses are included in a special appendix. (Appendix H) The length of these tables would cause a disruption of the text if included here.

of those teaching the three-hour course by two-thirds. It is also to be noted that the two general courses, as noted in Table V, devoted approximately one-third of their total class time to literature. Since these courses totaled six semester hours, this means that approximately two semester hours of the general course consisted of literature. Thus, the reduction of all responses to a two-hour basis affords a direct comparison of the data on the separate courses (Table 1) with the data on the general courses. (Table 2)

The reduction of the two sets of data to the same level also provides a means of direct empirical comparison of the validity of this particular part of the questionnaire. For this purpose the total classroom hours can be directly compared with other known measures. The total hours of Table 1 are 35.1, which closely compares with the 36 classroom hours of a two semester hour course. The total hours of both general courses in Table 2 was 38.7 which compares favorably with 34.0 per cent (average literature content of both courses from Table V) of the total classroom hours in two three-hour courses--a figure of 36.4.

There were many differences and only a few similarities between the number of classroom hours devoted to selected topics of literature in the two types of courses. This can best be seen when the main topics are placed side by side. The following listings from Tables 1 and 2 include all topics to which at least one hour of class time was devoted in either the separate courses or in the combined general courses:

Topic	Separate	General
Survey of Literary Types	3.6	1.6
Homer	0.5	4.1
The Bible	0.4	1.4

The Greek Dramatists	3.9	5.4
The Roman Poets	0.5	3.7
Dante	0.2	3.0
Malory	0.1	1.0
Shakespeare	1.3	1.3
Other English Poetry	5.0	2.3
Other English Prose	3.4	2.7
American Poetry	3.1	0.3
American Prose	3.8	1.5
Russian Literature	1.0	0.6
German Literature	0.4	3.0
French Literature	1.1	2.3
Modern American and English Poetry	3.0	1.1
Modern American and English Drama	2.0	1.0

In the listing above nine topics varied by as much as two hours and in only one topic (Shakespeare) was the time approximately the same.

In addition to the responses to the selected topics of the questionnaire some respondents listed other topics of importance. Topics listed for the separate course and the time spent on each were: History of the English language, two hours; Geography as related to literature, two hours; Literature for the development of a personal philosophy, two hours; Mythology, two hours; Epics, two hours; and Techniques of reading, eight hours. Additional topics and time spent on each in the general courses were: Goethe, fifteen hours; Mythology, five hours; Schiller, five hours; the short story, four hours; Pericles, two hours; Oedipus

Rex, two hours; Freud, two hours; Einstein, two hours; Korzybski, two hours; and Pasternak, two hours.

Art Content. As in the case of the literature content, art was divided into two check lists to obtain data about the generalized forms and about the specific topical content. The data concerning the per cent of total classwork devoted to generalized forms of art in the humanities courses of the subject colleges are summarized in Tables VIII and IX. Table VIII presents a summary of the data on the separate courses in art and Table IX summarizes the data on the two general courses.

Several differences are to be found in a comparison of Table VIII with the two parts of Table IX. Table VIII seems to suggest that the separate art courses were more balanced than either of the general courses. It must be remembered, however, that the content of the general courses was presented chronologically; hence the emphasis depended upon the forms and mediums coincident with any given epoch. Printing and the graphic arts, for example, would not be included in a course that ended prior to the Renaissance. The main emphasis in either the separate or the general course was on paintings and drawings, but the emphasis was greater in the general courses. Likewise, the general courses, especially the first one, placed more emphasis, as evidenced by per cent of total classwork, on architecture.

One of the five teachers of the separate art course did not respond to the content section of the questionnaire. This teacher used an individualized approach with the subject matter varying according to each student's interests. Emphasis in this course was placed upon the

TABLE VIII

CONTENT OF THE SEPARATE HUMANITIES COURSES IN ART: PER CENT OF TOTAL CLASSWORK DEVOTED TO VARIOUS FORMS AND MEDIUMS

	Form or medium	No. of responses to indicated %						Avg. %
		0	10	20	30	40	50	
a.	Architecture	0	2	0	2	0	0	20.0[a]
b.	Sculpture and carvings	0	0	4	0	0	0	20.0
c.	Paintings and drawings	0	0	0	2	1	1	37.5
d.	Printing and graphic arts	1	2	1	0	0	0	10.0
e.	Other forms and mediums	0	3	2	0	0	0	12.5

[a]Averages based on four respondents. A fifth respondent found the content questionnaire not applicable to his individualized course.

TABLE IX

ART CONTENT OF THE TWO GENERAL HUMANITIES COURSES: PER CENT OF TOTAL CLASSWORK DEVOTED TO VARIOUS FORMS AND MEDIUMS

I. First Course (Humanities 203 or 133)

	Form or medium	No. of responses to indicated %										Avg. %
		0	10	20	30	40	50	60	70	80	90	
a.	Architecture	0	1	3	1	1	0	0	0	1	0	31.5
b.	Sculpture and carving	1	1	3	2	0	0	0	0	0	0	18.5
c.	Paintings and drawings	0	1	1	0	2	2	0	0	0	1	42.9
d.	Printing-graphic arts	7	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	00.0
e.	Other	3	3	1	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	7.1

II. Second Course (Humanities 213 or 143)

	Form or medium	No. of responses to indicated %									Avg. %
		0	10	20	30	40	50	60	70	80	
a.	Architecture	0	4	2	1	1	0	0	0	1	25.5
b.	Sculpture and carving	0	5	2	2	0	0	0	0	0	16.6
c.	Paintings and drawings	0	1	0	1	1	4	0	0	2	48.9
d.	Printing-graphic arts	7	1	0	1	0	0	0	0	0	4.5
e.	Other	5	4	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	4.5

student's research, creative effort, and upon his transmission of newly acquired knowledge to other class members.

Tables 3 and 4 of Appendix H summarize the topical content of the two types of humanities courses. Table 3 contains data on the number of hours devoted to selected topics of art and Table 4 contains similar data on the two general courses. The total of the average hours of the separate art course from Table 3 was 31.4. Although this was 4.6 hours less than the full 36 hours of classwork in a two semester hour course, it was within reasonable limits of responses estimated on a full hour basis. In the two general courses the combined totals of the hours devoted to the selected topics equaled 26.4. This figure was equal to 24.4 per cent of the 108 hours in the two three-semester hour general courses. It compares favorably with the per cent of classwork devoted to art as estimated by the respondents in Tables IV and V. It may be concluded from this that the respondents gave careful thought to the estimates that they made on the topics of art.

A comparison of Tables 3 and 4 shows much similarity in the time devoted to the selected topics of art in the two types of courses. The separate courses seem to have devoted more time than the general courses to modern painting, sculpture, and architecture. The general courses seem to have spent more time on the art of the medieval and early Renaissance periods. The general courses gave only 0.4 hours of attention to ancient art and architecture. All other topics received at least one hour of attention in both types of courses. The following list is a side-by-side comparison of the average hours devoted to the selected topics in the separate courses and in the two combined general courses:

Topic	Separate	General
a. Fundamentals of art	4.2	3.8
b. Ancient art and architecture . . .	1.0	0.4
c. Classical art and architecture . .	3.2	3.4
d. Medieval art and architecture . .	3.0	4.1
e. Italian Renaissance art	2.8	3.2
f. Flemish, German, and Dutch Renaissance art	2.0	2.3
g. English, French, and Spanish Renaissance art	2.0	1.8
h. Modern French painting	2.5	2.0
i. Modern European painting excluding French	2.0	1.2
j. Modern American painting	3.0	1.7
k. Modern sculpture	2.5	1.1
l. Modern architecture	3.2	1.4

Some of the respondents utilized the space provided in the questionnaire to list other topics of importance. The separate teachers named the following topics and indicated the number of hours spent on each: "Music as related to art," 3 hours; "Poetry as related to art," 2 hours; "Drama and the theater as related to art," 2 hours; Photography, 2 hours; Printing, 2 hours; and, "laboratory work in the use of various art media," more than six hours. In reference to this last named item it should be mentioned that at one school the humanities course in art was taught as a laboratory course. Original work in several art mediums was produced in this course. The study and criticism of master works in various mediums were conducted collaterally with the laboratory work. None of the respondents who taught the general courses indicated other topics.

Music content. The questionnaire explored music content from the standpoints of generalized forms and specific topics. Tables X and XI are concerned with the data on the per cent of total classwork devoted to the generalized forms of music in the separate and general courses. A comparison of Table X, containing data on the separate courses, with Table XI, on the two general courses, showed wide differences between the two types of courses. Differences as shown by Table XI were also very noticeable between the two general courses. The data on the separate courses seem to indicate a balanced distribution of study on the generalized forms of music with all average figures falling within fifteen percentage points of one another. The data on the first general course are consistent with the historical approach that predominated in this type of course. Consequently the vocal music of the medieval period averaged fifty per cent in the first general course. Two of the first general courses devoted all of their time for music study to vocal music. In the second general course the main emphasis was on sonatas, symphonies, and concertos. The average per cent of time spent on these instrumental forms nearly equaled the sum of the next three ranking forms.

The questionnaire revealed the important fact that not all of the general courses included music as a part of the course study. Four of the courses, including two each of the first and second courses, omitted the study of music. In the calculation of the averages in Table XI these courses were not included.

Tables 5 and 6 of Appendix H summarized the data concerning the topical music content of the humanities courses of the subject colleges. The data on the separate courses were summarized in Table 5. Table 6 summarizes the data from both the first and second general courses.

TABLE X

CONTENT OF THE SEPARATE COURSES IN MUSIC:
PER CENT OF CLASSWORK DEVOTED TO VARIOUS FORMS

	Form	No. of responses to indicated %					Avg.
		0	10	20	30	40	%
a.	Sonatas, symphonies or concertos	0	0	2	2	0	25.0
b.	Opera, ballet, oratories, cantatas and other dramatic and/or theatrical music	0	2	1	1	0	17.5
c.	Vocal music (Chants, canticles, hymns, masses, motets, madrigals, songs, etc.)	0	0	4	0	0	20.0
d.	Dances, galliards, pavane, minuets, mazurkas, waltzes, etc.	0	3	1	0	0	12.5
e.	Folk music and primitive music	0	2	2	0	0	15.0
f.	Jazz	1	2	1	0	0	10.0

TABLE XI

MUSIC CONTENT OF THE TWO GENERAL HUMANITIES COURSES:
PER CENT OF TOTAL CLASSWORK DEVOTED TO VARIOUS FORMS

I. First Course (Humanities 203 or 133)

	Form	No. of responses to indicated %						Avg.
		0	10	20	30	40	100	%
a.	Sonatas, symphonies or concertos	5	0	1	0	1	0	12.0[a]
b.	Dramatic or theatrical music	4	0	1	2	0	0	16.0
c.	Vocal music	2	1	2	0	0	2	50.0
d.	Dances	4	1	1	1	0	0	12.0
e.	Folk and primitive music	5	1	1	0	0	0	6.0
f.	Jazz	5	2	0	0	0	0	4.0

II. Second Course (Humanities 213 or 143)

	Form	No. of responses to indicated %							Avg.
		0	10	20	30	40	50	60	%
a.	Sonatas, symphonies, etc.	2	0	2	0	2	0	3	42.9[a]
b.	Dramatic music	2	3	3	0	1	0	0	18.6
c.	Vocal music	3	5	0	1	0	0	0	11.4
d.	Dances	2	3	4	0	0	0	0	15.7
e.	Folk music	7	0	2	0	0	0	0	5.7
f.	Jazz	5	4	0	0	0	0	0	5.7

[a]Music is omitted from two 203 courses and two 213 courses. Averages based on the five 203 and seven 213 courses that include music.

The averages of Table V were computed on the basis of only the general courses that included music as a part of the humanities study. The basic difference between the topical music content of the two types of courses lay in the fact that more total time was devoted to music in the separate courses than in the general courses. This resulted in more average hours of classwork being devoted to the particular topics in the separate than in the general courses. This was true of every topic except the one pertaining to medieval music. This might be construed as an attempt on the part of the teachers of the first general course to recompense for the sparsity of the knowledge concerning music prior to the Renaissance. In the separate courses an average of at least one hour was spent on all of the selected topics of the questionnaire. The separate courses are compared with the combined general courses as to average hours devoted to the selected topics in the following list:

Topic	Separate	General (comb.)
Music fundamentals	6.2	3.6
Medieval music	1.5	2.2
Renaissance music	1.5	1.4
Bach	2.0	1.2
Haydn	1.5	0.7
Mozart	1.5	1.2
Beethoven	2.8	1.3
Schubert	2.0	0.6
Wagner	1.5	1.0
Verdi	1.2	0.4
Brahms	1.0	0.6

Modern European music.	4.7	2.7
Popular American music	2.2	1.5
Serious American music	3.0	1.2

The total average hours devoted to the topics of music were 32.6. This compared very favorably to the 36 hours of a two semester hour course. The sums of the average hours of Table 6, however, seem to indicate a small error of estimation on the part of the respondents of the general courses. The sum of the average hours of the two courses was 19.6 which is 18.6 per cent of the 108 classroom hours in two three-hour courses. Tables IV and V gave estimates of 12.9 per cent and 15.5 per cent respectively. This seems to indicate that the respondents' estimate of the percentage of time spent on art was low, or that the estimate based on the hours devoted to the selected topics was high. One might safely assume that actual percentage of time devoted to music in the general course was somewhere between these estimates.

The topics selected for the questionnaire on music seem to have been well fitted to the courses of the subject colleges. Only one separate course spent two hours or more on any other topic. The respondent for this course spent five hours on "music in everyday life."

Philosophy content. Philosophy was given less emphasis than any of the disciplines that were considered in this study as basic areas of study in the humanities. Preliminary observation had revealed that this was probably true. The data of the questionnaire verified and quantified the truth of the preliminary supposition. Tables XII and XIII summarize the data relative to the time spent on historical periods of philosophy in the separate and general courses. Table XII represents average percentages calculated from only two separate

TABLE XII

CONTENT OF THE SEPARATE COURSES IN PHILOSOPHY:
PER CENT OF TOTAL CLASSWORK DEVOTED TO VARIOUS PERIODS

Period	No. of responses to indicated %						Avg. %
	0	10	20	30	40	50	
a. Greek philosophy	1	0	1	1	0	0	25.0[a]
b. Medieval philosophy	1	2	0	0	0	0	10.0
c. Philosophies of the 17th, 18th, and 19th centuries	1	1	0	0	1	0	25.0
d. 20th century philosophy	1	0	0	1	0	1	40.0

[a]Philosophy is not taught in one course. Averages based on two courses.

TABLE XIII

PHILOSOPHY CONTENT OF THE TWO GENERAL HUMANITIES COURSES:
PER CENT OF TOTAL CLASSWORK DEVOTED TO VARIOUS PERIODS

I. First Course (Humanities 203 or 133)

Period	No. of responses to indicated %							Avg. %
	0	10	20	30	50	70	80	
a. Greek philosophy	1	0	0	0	2	2	2	66.6[a]
b. Medieval philosophy	1	0	2	3	1	0	0	30.0
c. Philosophies of the 17th, 18th, and 19th centuries	6	1	0	0	0	0	0	1.7
d. 20th century philosophy	6	1	0	0	0	0	0	1.7

II. Second Course (Humanities 213 or 143)

Period	No. of responses to indicated %									Avg.
	0	10	20	30	40	50	60	80	90	
a. Greek philosophy	8	0	0	1	0	0	0	0	0	4.3[a]
b. Medieval philosophy	6	3	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	4.3
c. Philosophies of the 17th, 18th, and 19th centuries	2	0	0	1	0	2	1	1	2	64.3
d. 20th century philosophy	3	1	1	1	2	1	0	0	0	27.1

[a]Philosophy is omitted from one 203 course and two 213 courses. Averages based on the six 203 courses and seven 213 courses which include philosophy.

courses in philosophy. A third was offered under the name of "Philosophy in Life," but this course did not include in its content any material concerning either philosophers or philosophies. Rather it dealt with practical applications of psychology. Three of the general courses summarized in Table XIII, also omitted the study of philosophy. In the separate courses the chief emphasis was placed upon twentieth-century philosophy and the least emphasis upon medieval philosophy. It should be added, however, that deriving averages from only two courses gives a false representation of both courses and is not representative of any course. For example, the average of 25 per cent in Table XII for philosophies of the 17th, 18th, and 19th centuries does not show that one class was ten per cent while the other was forty per cent. Both the first and second general courses, summarized in Table XIII, definitely reflected the use of the historical approach in these courses. The first course dealt almost exclusively with philosophy during the Greek and medieval periods, while the second course was concerned mainly with philosophy since the medieval period.

Table 7 of Appendix H summarized the data on the number of hours devoted to the selected topics of philosophy in the two general courses. Since the data on the separate courses involved only two classes it was not elaborated into the form of a table similar to Table 7. Rather the averages were derived for the topical content for the two philosophy courses and directly put into the list given below.

The following list compares the average number of hours spent on topics of philosophy in the separate courses with the combined average number of hours in the two general courses:

Topic	Separate	General
Fundamentals of philosophy	5.0	1.4
Plato and Socrates	3.0	3.4
Aristotle	4.0	0.9
St. Augustine	1.0	1.3
Thomas Aquinas	1.5	1.2
Francis Bacon	1.0	0.4
Rene Descartes	1.0	1.1
Baruch Spinoza	1.0	0.3
John Locke	1.5	0.9
Immanuel Kant	2.5	0.3
Arthur Schopenhaur	1.0	0.2
August Comte	1.0	0.1
Karl Marx	1.0	0.9
Herbert Spencer	1.0	0.3
John Dewey	3.5	0.9
Bertrand Russell	1.5	0.3
Total	30.5	13.9

At first glance the above list seems to disagree with the responses of teachers in regard to distribution by periods of the study of philosophy. However, the respondents were profuse in listing other topics which were not among those selected for the questionnaire. When these other topics were considered, the response to this section appeared to be reliable from the standpoint of their agreement with the distribution of the study into periods. A consideration of the additional topics listed by the respondents also increases the total hours devoted to the study of philosophy in both types of courses. Thus the total of

30.5 hours in the separate course, which might seem short of the total of 36 hours, represents 12.9 per cent of the 108 hours in two three-hour courses. This, too, would be increased to comply more closely with the percentages given in Tables IV and V.

Other topics and hours devoted to each that were listed by the separate course teachers were: Hegel, two hours; Hume, two hours; William James, four hours; Santayana, two hours; A. N. Whitehead, three hours; and "other modern philosophies," two hours. Among the general course respondents the following were listed: Ancient Greek philosophic schools, three and two hours (two respondents); "The general philosophy of history and government," three hours; "Later Greek and Roman philosophers," two hours; Economic philosophers (Adam Smith), two hours; Biological philosophers (Charles Darwin), two hours; and Mathematical philosophers (Newton and Einstein), three hours.

Summary of the Content. In the literature content a similar amount of literature seems to be taught when the amounts are estimated from the total time devoted by each course to selected topics. There were no other similarities to be found. Wide differences existed both in the percentage of class time devoted to certain forms and to the hours spent on selected topics. Generally it seemed that the separate courses placed primary emphasis on form and selected models to illustrate form. The general courses seemed usually to be concerned with particular creative works and the ideas and values to be derived from them.

Between the two types of art courses similarities were noted in the number of class hours devoted to particular topics. In other respects, however, wide differences were found. Generally the separate course presented a distribution that included more time spent on forms

other than those of painting and architecture, which were emphasized in the general courses. The data of the questionnaire might cause the separate art courses to appear as survey courses. Actually the art courses were taught, as will be seen later, in a variety of ways. It is to be noted that the questionnaire was not suitable for one teacher using an individualized approach. The data on the general courses seemed to reflect the use of an historical approach. The general courses seem to have spent a greater proportion of time on classical and traditional art and architecture in contrast to the separate courses. The separate courses, on the other hand, spent more time on modern works. The total time spent on art in the general course was equal to about three-fourths that of the two-hour separate course.

There were no important similarities between the two types of courses in regard to their music content. The time spent on the various forms of music in the separate music course varied but little on a percentage basis. The general courses definitely reflected a distribution based upon an historical approach. The separate courses devoted a greater average number of hours to all the selected topics except medieval music. In the general courses the total time spent on music was less than two-thirds of the time spent in a two-semester-hour course. This, coupled with the fact that music was not taught in four of the general courses, points to a lack of emphasis on music in this type of course.

The most important finding of the questionnaire in regard to philosophy was the lack of emphasis given to this discipline in both the general and separate courses. This lack of emphasis was reflected in the separate courses by the small number of courses offered in

philosophy in the subject colleges. It was further emphasized by the fact that one of these separate courses offered as philosophy was scarcely, if at all, concerned with philosophy. The lack of emphasis was reflected in the general courses by the absence of the study of philosophy in three courses and by the relatively small number of total hours devoted to it. There were many differences and no similarities to be found between the two types of courses in regard to philosophy content. Generally the separate course seemed to have surveyed philosophy from its beginnings and placed different emphases according to the teacher. The general courses reflected their use of the historical approach and seemingly placed less emphasis on contemporary philosophies.

The responses to the content section of the questionnaire seem to have been thoughtfully and accurately made by the respondents. This was verified by cross-checking the responses for their compliance with previous questionnaire responses and with the total time contained in a two-semester-hour course or two three-semester-hour courses.

Methods and Procedures in the Humanities

The third main section of the questionnaire on the humanities courses in the general-education program of the subject colleges was concerned with methodology. Methodology refers to the special procedures, practices, and acts designed to actuate the educand toward the desired objectives. It has been noted, in the previous section on content, that three of the respondents completed the questionnaire for two courses each. This was for the purpose of including data about all courses taught during the year and also to allow for two identical courses taught with different viewpoints at one school. This section

on procedures will also include data concerned with these three additional courses.

Planning procedures. The important things concerning the planning of a course revolve around the answers to the interrogatives who, when, and how. How the planning is done, who does the planning, and the time at which the planning is done are the questions that need to be answered. All teachers have plans that involve content and procedures. Often this planning is of a class-to-class or day-to-day nature, or it may be present in the form of a rigid syllabus that is adhered to with little deviation. Rigid adherence to a syllabus, however, is probably rare since most teachers make changes as demanded by varying or unusual situations. This is necessarily true in classes in which informal lecture or discussion predominate because of the fact that the students themselves participate, to greater or lesser extent, in setting the pace and giving direction to the class. It is not to be expected, then, that items inquiring into methods of planning could be made mutually exclusive since generalized plans made prior to a class are often subject to changes that involve replanning. Although the questionnaire treated the matters of when the planning was done in one set of questions and who and how in another, the data were combined and summarized into one table in this report. Table XIV, then, summarizes the data concerning the procedures of planning that were used in the separate and general courses. Since the totals of the number of separate and general courses were not the same it was deemed appropriate to give a more direct comparison through the use of difference in percentage. The difference in percentage was derived from the per cent of response on each item to the total number of separate or general course respondents.

TABLE XIV

FREQUENCY OF USE OF SELECTED METHODS FOR THE PLANNING OF SEPARATE AND GENERAL HUMANITIES COURSES

Method of Planning	Number of responses: Separate Courses Lit. N:15	Art N:5	Mus. N:4	Phil. N:3	Total N:27	Gen. Crs. Total N:16	Diff. in %
a. In advance for the total course	13	3	4	2	22	12	-6.4[a]
b. Day by day	2	2	0	1	4	0	-14.8
c. Week by week	2	2	2	0	6	3	-3.4
d. Unit by unit, or topic by topic	8	3	2	0	13	7	-4.3
e. In a flexible manner as the needs or interests of the students are revealed	9	3	4	1	17	8	-12.9
f. Is done by the teacher alone	8	3	4	0	15	11	+13.3
g. Is done by a committee or the department staff	7	2	0	1	10	3	-18.3
h. Is done by the teacher with the students	1	4	0	1	6	2	-9.7
i. Consists of adhering more or less rigidly to a textbook	3	0	0	0	3	2	+1.4
j. Consists of the flexible use of a textbook with frequent deviations from its order or content	11	5	4	3	23	10	-22.6

[a]Difference is derived from the percentage of responses to the total possible for either type of course. General course responses were less by given number of percentage points when marked negative; more when marked positive.

Differences, in which the percentage of general course responses were greater, were marked as positive. Where the separate course was the greater, the difference was marked as negative. Most of the methods of planning, as summarized in Table XIV, were used more in the separate courses than in the general courses. In the general courses only two of the methods of planning were used more often than in the separate courses. Generally, it appears that planning for the course seems to be an individual teacher task more in the general courses than in the separate courses. Although most teachers of either type of course made plans for the course, Table XIV seems to suggest that the plans were more subject to change in the separate courses than in the general courses. The largest difference, however, concerned the use of a textbook. Over twenty-two per cent more of the separate course respondents made flexible use of a textbook with frequent deviations. Balanced against this is the fact that four of the general course respondents did not use a text while only one separate course respondent failed to use a text. This was not an item of this part of the questionnaire, but it can be inferred by a comparison of the sum of the answers to items i and j with the total number of each type of respondent.

It has been previously pointed out that the volume of subject matter appropriate to the humanities is so great that the best the teacher can do in the allotted time is to make a judicious selection of a limited number of models or examples. This selection and the criteria by which it was made also constitute a procedure of planning. Table XV was concerned with certain criteria which may be used in the selection of materials. Again it is to be noted that the choice of one or more of the criteria does not necessarily exclude the choice of others.

TABLE XV

FREQUENCY OF USE OF CERTAIN CRITERIA FOR THE SELECTION OF MODELS AND MATERIALS IN THE SEPARATE AND GENERAL HUMANITIES COURSES

Criteria	Number of responses: Separate Courses					Gen. Crs.	Diff. in %
	Lit. N:15	Art N:5	Mus. N:4	Phil. N:3	Total N:27	Total N:16	
a. They provide a view of the thought or spirit of a particular age	9	4	4	1	18	15	+28.2[a]
b. They are applicable to issues faced in modern living	8	4	1	3	16	10	+3.3
c. They are intelligible and interesting to the students	12	4	2	2	20	6	-36.5
d. They challenge the intellect of the students	12	2	1	2	17	10	-0.4
e. They have been pronounced by authorities as classic examples	8	1	1	1	11	5	-9.4
f. They are readily available	11	2	2	1	16	7	-15.4

[a]For explanation of difference in per cent see Table XIV.

Several major differences were found between the general and separate courses in regard to the criteria used for the selection of models and material. The greatest difference seemed to be in the matter of materials that are intelligible and interesting. Over thirty-six per cent more of the separate-course respondents chose this item than did general-course respondents. Models and materials were chosen mainly by

the general-course respondents as providing "a view of the thought or spirit of a particular age." Fifteen of the sixteen general respondents marked this item which is closely aligned with the historical approach that predominates in the general courses.

Classroom procedures. In general education, conceived in terms of desirable qualities of experience, the primacy of method in achieving its objectives is frequently stressed. Despite the fact that educationists view the curriculum as "all of the experiences of the student under the direction of the school," many look solely to the classroom as the locale for the qualitative experiences of general education. This viewpoint, then, would place particular emphasis upon teacher-student interaction and upon the procedures used by the teacher to enhance such interaction.

The part of the questionnaire concerned with classroom procedures was composed of two groups of items. One group was composed of regularly used procedures while the other group consisted of activities used occasionally. Table XVI summarizes the data on selected often-used procedures for both the general and separate humanities courses. Both types of courses made use of the informal lecture more often than any other procedure. The separate course respondents used this procedure on an average of about two-fifths of the total time while the general course respondents used it about one-third of the total time. Discussion ranked second among the separate courses but third among the general courses. Contrariwise, the use of audio-visual aids ranked second among the general courses but third among the separate courses. In the music course, however, audio-visual aids were the first-ranking procedure. There were no great differences in the per cent of time

TABLE XVI

PERCENTAGE OF TOTAL CLASS TIME DEVOTED TO SELECTED CLASSROOM PROCEDURES IN THE SEPARATE AND GENERAL HUMANITIES COURSES

Procedures	Per cent of total class time						Diff. in %
	Lit. N:15	Art N:5	Mus. N:4	Phil. N:3	Total N:27	Gen. N:16	
a. Formal lecture[a]	15.0	4.0	2.5	6.6	10.8[b]	14.4[b]	+3.2
b. Informal lecture	50.7	32.0	35.0	20.0	41.6	34.4	-7.1
c. Discussion	21.3	8.0	7.5	36.7	18.5	16.2	-2.3
d. Group work	2.0	6.0	0.0	10.0	3.0	1.3	-1.7
e. Laboratory	2.0	22.0	2.5	0.0	5.5	3.1	-2.4
f. Demonstration	0.0	6.0	10.0	0.0	2.6	1.9	-0.7
g. Audio-visual aids	4.0	10.0	40.0	13.4	11.2	20.0	+8.8
h. Student reports	4.0	10.0	2.5	6.6	5.2	6.8	+1.6
i. Forums, panels, or debates	1.0	2.0	0.0	6.6	1.6	1.9	+0.3

[a]For fuller definition of procedures see Appendix C.
[b]Averages based on all responses in either of the two types of courses.

devoted to the selected procedures. The greatest difference between the two courses was in their use of audio-visual aids, but the difference was less than ten per cent. Although there was only a small difference between the two types of courses, the general course made greater use of the formal lecture. It should be pointed out that this procedure was sometimes employed as the one most feasible for large classes. The separate courses showed a varied pattern of procedures depending upon the kind of course. Discussion, for example, was the principal means employed in the separate philosophy course, while laboratory work was used more often in the art course than in any other course, separate or

general. The separate music course, as mentioned above, used audio-visual procedures more than any other means. This was mainly in the form of listening to recorded music. Group work, panels, forums, and debates were used most in the separate philosophy course; demonstrations ranked third among the procedures in music; and student reports were often used in the art course. It seems, then, that greater differences existed among the various separate courses than between the averages for the two types of courses.

Table XVII is a summary of the data from the two types of courses concerning the use of certain, occasional, learning activities. The response to this part of the section on methodology was in terms of estimated hours of participation in the selected activities. Since the data of Table XVII were not analyzed in terms of per cents, based upon the total number of respondents for each type of course, an adjustment of the data was necessary. Data in Table XVII were given in terms of average hours of participation in the selected activities for each kind of separate course. Theoretically, then, the sum of the averages of the four courses would be equal to the total average time spent on the various activities in an eight-hour course in which the disciplines were taught separately. In order to compare this theoretical eight-hour course with the two general courses totaling six hours, it was necessary to multiply the latter by 1.33 or four-thirds.

All four respondents of the separate music course marked recordings (item f.) with M. (Meaning more than ten hours) For the purpose of calculating averages this was assigned a value of twelve hours. This figure when added to average estimates for other audio-visual aids equals forty per cent of the total time in a two-semester-hour course.

TABLE XVII

AVERAGE TIME DEVOTED TO SELECTED CLASSROOM ACTIVITIES IN THE SEPARATE AND GENERAL HUMANITIES COURSES

	Activities	Average number of hours per class[a]						Diff. in hrs.
		Lit. N:15	Art N:5	Mus. N:4	Phil. N:3	Sep. N:27	Gen.[b] N:16	
a.	Viewing movies	0.1	1.0	1.2	1.0	3.3	1.1	-2.2
b.	Viewing slides or film strips	0.4	3.7	0.0	0.0	4.1	7.3	+3.2
c.	Viewing still pictures, charts, maps, or objects	0.4	1.7	1.2	0.0	3.3	9.2	+5.9
d.	Live radio or television casts	0.0	1.5	0.0	0.0	1.5	0.4	-1.1
e.	Recorded radio broadcasts	0.0	0.0	0.2	0.0	0.2	0.3	+0.1
f.	Other recordings; tape, wire, or disc	1.1	1.0	12.0[c]	0.0	14.1	10.3	-3.8
g.	Guest lecturers or instructors	0.1	0.3	1.5	0.7	2.6	0.6	-2.0
h.	Guest artists, musicians, or actors	0.1	1.0	2.0	0.0	3.1	0.9	-2.2
i.	Field trips to museums, concerts, plays, etc.	0.0	0.5	2.5	0.2	3.2	0.4	-2.8

[a] Averages not adjusted to account for difference between two and three hour courses. Resultant differences are very small.

[b] Figures for the general course are the sum of the averages of the first and second courses multiplied by 1.33 to adjust to an eight-hour level commensurate with the four two-hour separate courses.

[c] M, meaning more than 10 hours, assigned a value of 12 hours.

Forty per cent was the music respondents' estimate in Table XVI of the time spent on audio-visual aids.

The greatest difference between the two types of courses was in the number of average hours spent in "viewing still pictures, charts, maps, or objects." (item c.) The general course spent, on the average, nearly six hours more on this activity than did the separate course. The large portion of time spent on recordings in the separate music course caused this activity, on the average, to exceed the general course by nearly four hours. The only other difference greater than three hours was on the activity of viewing slides or film strips. The general courses averaged higher than the separate course in this activity.

The separate philosophy course made comparatively little use of the selected activities. This could be attributed, at least in part, to the nature of the course and the lack of suitable materials or resources. The separate literature course also made little use of the selected activities, although seemingly many of the activities would have been highly suitable for the course. The greatest use of the selected activities occurred in the separate music course. Aside from recordings, previously mentioned, two hours or more were spent, on the average, on guest artists and on field trips to concerts. The art course also made wide use of the selected activities and spent nearly four hours on "viewing slides or film strips."

Although there were differences, as noted above between the two types of courses, again it appeared that the differences were generally greater among the various kinds of separate courses.

Three of the respondents listed other activities and practices

which they considered of value. A philosophy teacher devoted considerable time to "brain storming" which he described as "an expression of original ideas produced by meditation." A literature teacher made extensive use of dramatization. A teacher of a general course maintained a comprehensive resource file of "tear-sheets," pictures, and articles to be used with an opaque projector. This equipment was used in both planned and unplanned situations as new or old materials were introduced or as student queries were answered.

Out-of-class Procedures: As a setting for qualitative experiences, the classroom is often at a disadvantage. The plan of metering such experiences to a precise rule of so many fifty-minute periods per semester creates difficulties in the humanities as in other areas of study. The teacher, hence, is often dependent upon events and assigned tasks that occur outside of the time and locale of the classroom to provide the student with added desirable experiences. The part of the questionnaire concerned with out-of-class procedures consisted of one check list to obtain data on out-of-class assigned work and another on required out-of-class activities and events.

Table XVIII summarizes the data on out-of-class assignments in the separate and general humanities courses. The analysis in Table XVIII was based upon frequency of responses and upon the differences in percentage of responses to the number of respondents for each type of course. As in previous tables, percentage differences were marked as positive when the general courses were greater and as negative when the separate courses were greater.

Several differences are to be found between the two types of courses according to the analysis presented in Table XVIII. The

TABLE XVIII

FREQUENCY OF USE OF SELECTED OUT-OF-CLASS ASSIGNMENTS IN THE SEPARATE AND GENERAL HUMANITIES COURSES

Assigned out-of-class work	Number of responses						
	Separate courses					Gen.	Diff.
	Lit. N:15	Art N:5	Mus. N:4	Phil. N:3	Total N:27	Total N:16	in %
a. Unsupplemented reading of a text book or other books purchased by the student	6	0	0	0	6	4	+2.3
b. Reading of a text book or other books purchased by the student supplemented by any of the following:	9	5	4	3	21	12	-2.7
c. Daily or weekly reading of assigned source materials	2	2	1	0	5	1	-12.2
d. Occasional readings of assigned source materials	6	3	3	3	15	5	-24.2
e. Reading of two or more complete books	1	0	0	0	1	3	+15.1
f. Reading of one complete book	3	1	1	1	6	6	+15.3
g. Term themes or research papers	2	1	1	0	4	1	-8.5
h. Weekly shorter reports, papers, critiques (oral or written)	2	1	1	1	5	2	-6.0
i. Occasional shorter reports, papers, critiques, either oral or written	5	3	3	1	12	11	+24.2
j. Notebooks of collected material and/or student writing	1	2	2	1	6	0	-22.2
k. Creative work by the student in the form of original prose or poetry	0	0	0	0	0	0	0.0
l. Creative work by the student in the form of original musical composition	0	0	0	0	0	0	0.0
m. Creative work by the student in the form of original plastic or graphic art	0	3	0	0	3	0	-11.1
n. Collections of related current events	0	2	1	0	3	0	-11.1
o. No work outside of class is required	3	0	0	0	3	0	-11.1

general courses required more reading of complete books than did the separate courses. The sum of the percentage difference of items e and f, which together can be interpreted as the reading of one or more complete books, was 30.4 per cent. The separate courses, on the other hand, required considerably more daily, weekly, or occasional reading of assigned source materials (items c and d). The general courses required more occasional short oral, or written reports, an item that was somewhat offset by the greater number of notebooks required in the separate courses. Other differences also existed between the two types of course, but these generally involved fewer respondents. Rather close similarities existed between the two types of courses in the per cent requiring the unsupplemented reading of a text and also the supplemental reading of a text. (items a and b.)

Other facts not of a comparative nature were significantly revealed in Table XVIII. Three of the literature courses, for example, required no work outside of class (item o). Except for three separate art courses, no creative work in any form was required (items k, l, and m). It should be observed that this was consistent with the lack of objectives concerning the development of the "student's interest in his own distinct creative abilities" in Table I.

Other outside assignments were also listed by some of the respondents. A separate music course required thirty hours of listening to recorded music in booths equipped with turntables. Two of the general courses had similar assignments, one required nine hours of listening and the other an unstated amount. One teacher of a general course detailed the assigned work as follows:

> Written evaluations are due each six weeks on relevant outside reading of the student's choice, on relevant outside listening (of recordings) of the student's choice, and on assigned Artext Junior prints. A list of new vocabulary words is due biweekly. Specially assigned written evaluations are made of art exhibits and programs. Special library readings are often made and followed by a test.

Table XIX summarizes the data on required out-of-class activities of the separate and general humanities courses. The analysis in this table was made by compiling and calculating frequencies, totals, and differences in the per cents of the totals as in Table XVIII. The "activities" of this table referred to out-of-class events and occasions that were usually beyond the mandate of the teacher. Since the teacher seldom had control of the time, place, or frequency of such events, he was requested to check this list of items on the basis of an average semestral sequence of events. One respondent of a separate music course, unable to decide on an average semester, marked the list of items as "variable."

One large difference was noted between the general and separate courses in Table XIX. This difference concerned motion pictures (item i.) at which attendance was required in several separate courses, but it was not required in any of the general courses. Some differences were noted among other items, but generally the responses were so few that any other differences could hardly be considered as important. Among the kinds of separate courses there seemed to be some activities that were assigned with greater frequency than others. Literature, for example, assigned amateur dramatics (item d.) most frequently, while art assigned visits to museums most often. (item h.) Following a similar trend, the music course respondents favored amateur concerts

TABLE XIX

REQUIRED OUT-OF-CLASS ACTIVITIES OF THE SEPARATE AND GENERAL HUMANITIES COURSES

Out-of-class Activity	Number of responses: Separate courses: Lit. N=15	Art N=5	Mus. N=3[a]	Philos. N=3	Total N=26	Gen. Total N=16	Diff. in %
a. Lectures by local or visiting people	0	0	1	3	4	3	+3.4
b. Debates, forums, or panel discussions	0	0	0	1	1	0	-3.9
c. Amateur concerts and recitals	1	1	3	0	5	4	+5.8
d. Amateur plays and dramatic presentations	5	1	1	0	7	3	-8.1
e. Professional concerts	0	1	1	0	2	3	+11.1
f. Professional soloists or ensembles in music, dance, acting, etc.	0	0	2	0	2	2	+4.8
g. Professional plays or dramatic presentations	1	0	0	0	1	0	-3.9
h. Visits to museums, exhibitions, displays, etc.	1	3	0	1	5	4	+5.8
i. Relevant and important motion pictures	3	2	2	1	8	0	-30.7
j. Relevant and important television broadcasts	1	1	1	0	3	1	-5.1
k. Relevant and important radio broadcasts	0	0	1	2	3	0	-11.4

[a]One respondent for the separate music course marked this section as "variable" and did not check specific answers.

(item c.) as an assignment, and those of philosophy showed preference for visiting lecturers. (item a.)

A third check list, distinct from the previous two, was included in the questionnaire to investigate the quantity of outside reading required per week in the separate and general humanities courses. Table XX summarizes the data obtained from this check list.

TABLE XX

QUANTITY OF REQUIRED OUTSIDE READING PER WEEK WITH AVERAGES FOR EACH OF THE SEPARATE AND GENERAL COURSES UNDER ACTUAL CONDITIONS

Pages of required outside reading	Number of Responses								
	Separate Courses				Total	General		Total	Total
	Lit. N:15	Art N:5	Mus. N:4	Phil. N:3	Sep. N:27	203 N:7	213 N:9	Gen. N:16	All cour. N:43
a. None	3	0	0	0	3	1	0	1	4
b. Less than 50	9	3	3	0	15	5	4	9	24
c. 50-100	2	2	1	3	8	1	4	5	13
d. 100-150	0	0	0	0	0	0	1	1	1
e. 150-200	1	0	0	0	1	0	0	0	1
f. 200-250	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0
g. More than 250	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0
Av. each course[a]	36.6	45.0	37.5	75.0	---	33.3	58.3	---	---
Avg. all separate courses[a]					42.6	Avg. Gen.		45.3	---
Average all humanities courses[a]									43.8

[a]Mid-points of ranges used for the calculation of averages.

The average requirement of reading per week in the separate courses was very close to the average of the general courses. The differences between the two average requirements was only 2.7 pages of reading.

Despite this similarity between the two types of courses, many differences were to be found among the kinds of courses. It was somewhat surprising to note that four respondents required no outside reading and, moreover, that three of these were teachers of the literature course. One other literature teacher, in marked contrast, required the largest quantity of weekly reading. It was also surprising to note that the separate literature course required, on the average, less reading per week than any of the separate courses. The separate course in philosophy required the most outside reading, and was the most consistent in that each of its three respondents indicated a requirement of 50 to 100 pages weekly. The first and second general courses were consistent in procedures. The second course follows in historical sequence, and one teacher often taught both courses. In the matter of outside reading, however, a wide difference was found in their requirements. The first course required even less reading, on the average, than did the literature course while the second course was outranked in quantity of outside reading by only the philosophy course.

In a further analysis of Table XX it is to be noted that 28 of the 43 respondents required less than 50 pages per week of outside reading. Only two respondents required more than 100 pages per week, and only one of these two required as much as 150 pages of outside reading.

Testing procedures. This part of the questionnaire was concerned with the kinds of tests and the frequency with which they were used in the separate and general humanities courses. The data on the tests are summarized in Table XXI for the separate courses, and in Table XXII for the general courses. In the column designated as "total number"

TABLE XXI

NUMBER OF RESPONDENTS USING SELECTED TYPES OF TESTS WITH AVERAGES OF THE NUMBER OF TIMES USED IN THE SEPARATE HUMANITIES COURSES

	Test types	Lit. N:15 No.	Avg.[a]	Art N:5 No.	Avg.[a]	Mus. N:4 No.	Avg.[a]	Phil. N:3 No.	Avg.[a]	Total N:27 No.	Avg.[a]
a.	Essay or free-answer	13	4.6[b]	2	2.5[b]	1	5.0[b]	3	3.6[b]	19	4.4[b]
b.	Multiple-choice or best-answer	1	2.0	0	0.0	0	0.0	1	1.0	2	1.5
c.	Completion	2	1.5	0	0.0	0	0.0	1	1.0	3	1.3
d.	True-false	1	2.0	0	0.0	0	0.0	2	1.5	3	1.7
e.	Matching	0	0.0	1	2.0	0	0.0	1	1.0	2	1.5
f.	Combined objective	4	5.5	3	3.0	4	3.5	1	2.0	12	3.9
g.	Combined objective-essay	7	3.1	2	3.5	2	1.5	0	0.0	11	2.9

[a]Averages based on number of respondents actually using each test type.
[b]For computation of averages; W(weekly) assumed as 16; and, M (more than nine times) assumed as 12 (midpoint between weekly and biweekly).

TABLE XXII

NUMBER OF RESPONDENTS USING SELECTED TYPES OF TESTS WITH AVERAGES OF THE NUMBER OF TIMES USED IN THE GENERAL HUMANITIES COURSES

	Test types	203 N:7 No.	Avg.[a]	213 N:9 No.	Avg.[a]	Total N:16 No.	Avg.[a]
a.	Essay or free-answer	6	3.0[b]	9	4.7[b]	15	4.0[b]
b.	Multiple-choice or best-answer	0	0.0	0	0.0	0	0.0
c.	Completion	1	2.0	1	1.0	2	1.5
d.	True-false	0	0.0	1	1.0	1	1.0
e.	Matching	0	0.0	1	1.0	1	1.0
f.	Combined objective	2	3.5	1	3.0	3	3.3
g.	Combined objective-essay	3	2.0	3	2.6	7	2.3

[a]Averages based on actual number of uses as in Table XXI.
[b]For computation of averages see Table XXI.

in each of the two tables, the number of respondents using the various types of tests is given. The average is the average number of times each type of test is given based upon the total number of respondents using each type.

The frequency that each type is used deviates very little between the two types of courses. The essay-type test, besides being used by the most respondents in each type of course, was also used with the greatest frequency by those who do use it. In frequency of use by those who did use it, the combined objective test ranked second in each type of course, and the combined essay-objective test ranked third in each type of course. The combined objective test was defined as one using any combination of short-answer forms. (items b, c, d, and e.) The combined objective-essay test was defined as any one or more of the above items in combination with essay questions. All other types of tests were used less than an average of two times during the semester.

Since the number of respondents in the separate courses was not the same as the number in the general courses the frequency of use of the tests can be more readily examined if converted to per cents of the total. The following list, then, is derived from Tables XXI and XXII with the frequencies converted into per cents on the basis of twenty-seven separate-course respondents and sixteen general-course respondents:

Test Types	Separate	General
a. Essay or free-answer	69.3%	93.8%
b. Multiple-choice or best-answer . . .	7.4%	0.0%
c. Completion	11.1%	12.5%
d. True-false	11.1%	6.3%

e. Matching	7.4%	6.3%
f. Combined objective	44.4%	18.8%
g. Combined objective-essay	40.7%	43.8%

The columns of the above list were not expected to total 100% since the items were not mutually exclusive. Many of the teachers used two or more different types of tests in one course. Only two major differences were found between the separate and general courses in regard to the types of test that were used. Although the essay-type test was used most often in each type of course, its percentage of use was considerably higher in the general--in fact, all but one of the general course respondents made use of the essay test. The separate course respondents, on the other hand, compensated for this by a much higher percentage of respondents using the combined objective type of test.

The respondents were also asked to designate the type of test used as a final examination. The responses to this question are summarized in Table XXIII. The essay test was the type used most often in both the separate and general courses. Its percentage of use was again greater in the general course. The essay test, together with the two combined types of tests, was dominant among the types used for final examinations in both the separate and general courses.

Types of tests, varying from the selected types of the questionnaire, were also employed by some of the respondents. Two of the art courses used tests involving the identification of masterpieces. One music course employed a listening test involving identification during the semester, and combined the same procedure with an essay-type test for the final examination. Two respondents from general courses and

TABLE XXIII

FREQUENCY OF USE OF SELECTED TYPES OF TESTS AS FINAL EXAMINATIONS IN THE SEPARATE AND GENERAL HUMANITIES COURSES

Type of test	Number of responses: Separate courses: Lit. N=15	Art N=5	Mus. N=4	Phil. N=3	Total N=27	% of use	Gen. courses: Total N=16	% of use
a. Essay or free answer	9	0	0	2	11	40.7	10	62.5
b. Multiple-choice or best answer	0	0	0	0	0	0.0	0	0.0
c. Completion	0	0	0	0	0	0.0	0	0.0
d. True-false	0	0	0	0	0	0.0	0	0.0
e. Matching	1	0	0	0	1	3.8	0	0.0
f. Combined objective	1	3	1	1	6	22.2	3	18.75
g. Combined objective-essay	4	2	3	0	9	33.3	3	18.75

one literature respondent emphasized the use of a short-essay-type test, usually requiring only one or two sentences for its answer. This type was used both during the semester and as a final examination.

Procedures under ideal conditions. The section of the questionnaire on procedures was structured in a fashion whereby the respondents were able to check all relevant items as to the procedures that they would use under ideal conditions. It was assumed that there would be conditions present in some teaching situations that would prevent the teacher from using procedures that he otherwise might use. Class size, facilities, and equipment were especially suspected of being detrimental or inadequate.

The investigation of what the teacher would prefer to do under

ideal circumstances did not, on the whole, yield satisfactory results. A large proportion of the respondents, either failed to check any of the items preferred under ideal conditions, or checked only items contained in a particular check list. It would be difficult to assume that the failure of the respondents to check relevant items meant that the teachers, in all cases, were already employing the procedures that they preferred. This seems to suggest that it was not advisable to use a second, subordinate frame of reference for checking identical items in a questionnaire. Aside from this, other factors may have accreted to result in the sparsity of response. The questionnaire was already lengthy without the second frame of reference; respondents, often pressed for time, were forced into hurried answers;[4] the remote position of the question, regarding ideal conditions, may have caused it to be overlooked; and the system of checking may not have been satisfactory. The preceding remarks suggest that procedures under ideal conditions need to be investigated more thoroughly, preferably, by a technique designed for just this one purpose.

The responses, generally, were too few, too fragmentary, and too inconclusive to be summarized in tabular form. In the first draft of the present study the responses were tabulated and placed parallel to the summarized responses concerning procedures actually being used. The comparisons between the actual status and the hypothetical status, involved here, showed insignificant and inconclusive differences in

---

[4]During the week intervening between the distribution and collection of the questionnaires, two respondents were confined by illnesses, one became a father, one was preparing to participate in a national conference, and several were engaged in the planning, organization, and/or judging of high-school academic contests.

nearly all cases. Since very little seemed to have been proven by the parallel placement and comparison of actual and ideal conditions, the tabulated summaries on ideal conditions were rejected and the present chapter rewritten with a different approach.

There was, however, one important exception. This exception concerned differences that were noted between actual and ideal conditions in the matter of required out-of-class activities in the humanities courses. Table XXIV presents a comparative summary of the responses, and notes the differences in terms of per cent of gain by preferences under ideal conditions over procedures actually being used. The responses for the two types of courses are totaled for the purposes of Table XXIV.

Table XXIV clearly shows that all of the selected activities would be used to a greater extent under ideal conditions than they were used under actual conditions. Professional dramatic presentations and visits to museums and exhibitions ranked especially high in preferred use over actual. The significance of the comparative responses to the check list of activities seems to indicate a need that was felt among the humanities teachers for more cultural events appropriate to the objectives of the courses.

Although no other large differences were found among the responses to actual and ideal conditions, there were both localized and individual responses that indicated needs in particular situations. At one school where large classes existed, the teachers, in most cases, preferred less use of the formal lecture and more of discussion and other informal classroom procedures. Several individuals with large classes

TABLE XXIV

COMPARISON OF THE HUMANITIES COURSES IN RESPONSES TO USE OF SELECTED OUT-OF-CLASS ACTIVITIES UNDER ACTUAL AND IDEAL CONDITIONS

Out-of-class Activity	Frequency and % of responses				Diff. in % Ideal over Actual
	Actual Conditions		Ideal Conditions		
	No.	%	No.	%	
a. Lectures by local or visiting people	7	16.8	15	36.0	19.2
b. Debates, forums, or panel discussions	1	2.4	10	24.0	21.6
c. Amateur concerts and recitals	9	21.6	16	38.4	16.8
d. Amateur plays and dramatic presentations	10	24.0	17	40.8	16.8
e. Professional concerts	5	12.0	14	33.6	21.6
f. Professional soloists or ensembles in music, the dance, acting, etc.	4	9.6	13	31.2	21.6
g. Professional plays or dramatic presentations	1	2.5	15	36.0	33.6
h. Visits to museums, exhibitions, displays, etc.	9	21.6	20	48.0	26.4
i. Relevant and important motion pictures	8	19.2	15	36.0	15.8
j. Relevant and important television broadcasts	4	9.6	13	31.2	21.6
k. Relevant and important radio broadcasts	3	7.2	8	19.2	12.0

[a]One respondent for the separate music course marked this section as "variable" and did not check specific answers. Percentages based upon 42 maximum possible responses.

[b]The respondents who actually required an activity but failed to check it as preferred were assumed to prefer it under ideal conditions. These were included in the number under ideal conditions.

preferred greater use of the essay-type test rather than their actual use of the short-answer types.

Summary of methodology. The planning of the humanities courses seemed to have been more of an individual-teacher task in the general courses than in the separate courses. In the pre-selection of models and materials for the courses there were distinct differences between the general and separate courses. The general-course respondents mirrored their use of an historical approach by the selection of materials to provide a view of the thought or spirit of a particular age. The separate-course respondents were most interested in the selection of materials on the basis of their intelligibility and interest to the students.

Classroom procedures, when compared by the average responses for each type of course, showed remarkable similarity between the separate and general courses. Among the kinds of separate courses, however, many differences were found. Literature was taught by informal lecture and discussion; art was taught by informal lecture and laboratory work; music by audio-visual aids and informal lecture; and philosophy, primarily, by discussion. Among practices used occasionally in the classroom, some differences were noted between the two types of courses and among the separate courses. On the average, the general courses used more still pictures and objects, as well as more slides and film strips. The separate courses, on the other hand, made greater use of recordings. Among the kinds of courses there were wide differences due to the fact that devices used occasionally were better suited to some disciplines than to others. The nature of the philosophy course made many of the selected activities unsuitable or of little use.

Considerable variance between the two types of courses was found in the kinds of out-of-class assignments that were made by their respective respondents. The general-course respondents tended more toward the reading of one or more complete books, while assigned source materials prevailed among the separate-course respondents. Occasional short, oral or written reports were often used in the general courses. The separate courses used a variety of other assignments including notebooks and term papers. The small number of respondents assigning creative work reflected the lack of emphasis in the humanities courses of the subject colleges on creativeness as an objective. Three respondents of the literature course made no required out-of-class assignments. Outside reading requirements were remarkably the same in the two types of courses when averages were compared. Among the kinds of separate courses, however, wide differences were to be found.

The essay-type test was highly favored by the respondents of both types of courses; although it was used by a higher percentage of the general-course respondents. The objective test, combined with the essay test, found wide, and nearly equal, use among the respondents of both the separate and general courses. In addition the separate-course respondents made frequent use of tests combining various short-answer forms. The types of tests used for final examinations were the same as those used during the semester.

The attempt to use one questionnaire for a second frame of reference was only partially successful. The responses to questions, inquiring as to what procedures the respondent would use under ideal circumstances, were generally sparse and inconclusive. Originally the report of the present study attempted to make parallel comparisons of

actual and ideal conditions for each check list. This was abandoned when differences were found to be insignificant and inconclusive. There was one exception, however, and this was in regard to the required use of selected out-of-class activities. In all instances the selected activities showed a considerable gain in preference, under ideal conditions, over actual use. This seems to indicate that the respondents would make great use of cultural objects, activities, and events if such were more frequent and available.

CHAPTER V

THE HUMANITIES: VIEWS AND OPINIONS

The present chapter is concerned with the views and the opinions of the humanities teachers of the subject schools in regard to the courses they teach, the value of these courses, and their place in both the general-education program and the total curriculum. The two preceding chapters were based upon information obtained by observation and by questionnaire, supplemented from time to time by additional data or explanations obtained during interviews. The interviews were not intended merely to supplement other data collection techniques, but rather to permit the respondents a free expression of their ideas concerning the humanities courses uninhibited by a frame of reference and by choices enforced by a questionnaire.

All of the teachers were interviewed except one who was unable to keep an appointment because of an illness. This teacher, however, wrote out comprehensive answers to all the questions of the interview guide. In one other case an interview was interrupted by an emergency call for the interviewee and was not completed. In all other cases interviews lasting from thirty minutes to an hour and a half were completed. The total number of completed face-to-face interviews was thirty-eight, not counting the two exceptions noted above. A total, then, of forty teachers supplied information. This number is three less than the total number of questionnaires due to the fact that three respondents

supplied questionnaire data on both the first and second general courses. All answers were electronically recorded on magnetic tape, except in the case of seven interviewees of one school who collectively declined to be recorded.

The interviews followed the plan of a question guide which was given to each teacher of the humanities of the subject schools a week prior to the scheduled time of the interview. This interview question guide is found in Appendix D. The questions in the guide served to give the interviewees a prewarning of the general line of questioning and served also to give them confidence in their ability to answer. This procedure was found, during the pretest, to be a valuable means of overcoming "mike fright." During the actual interview the questioning usually led to other questions that concerned the teachers' special interests, problems, methods, or opinions.

The text that follows will summarize the views and opinions as ascertained by the interview. The text will follow the order of the questions of the interview guide with important sample answers as given by the interviewees.

The Importance of the Humanities

The first question was primarily designed to promote the start of a conversational interview. It was one that was easy to answer and one that provoked the interviewee into a defense of the humanities, since it implied that the humanities may not have proved to be an important need in the general-education program. The question as asked was: Do you feel that the humanities courses have proved to be an important need in the general-education program? Why?

All but two of the teachers of the separate literature course responded with an emphatic yes to this question. Of the two who were less certain, one felt that though his course was in itself of value, it was probably misnamed, since to him "the humanities are more of a by-product of the total business of general education"; and to this interviewee it seemed "quite difficult to make a course out of something that is the by-product of many other things." Another interviewee said, "I really don't know how important it /the humanities/ has proved to be, but I think it could be tremendously important. . . . I think it's the thing that makes the difference between the real human being and simply a money-making machine." One of the teachers of the separate art courses also gave an answer other than a positive yes. This person was concerned with whether the courses could be shown at the present time to be fulfilling an important need. His remarks were, "The fact that we are offering them /the humanities/ is a step in the right direction but I don't think that we could ever prove anything at this stage. I think that the proof will come later." One music teacher was concerned with the adequacy of the separate course and said, ". . . . I think they are a need but I don't think we always give them /the students/ what we expect them to have. We don't meet them often enough /for them/ to absorb what we want them to." The teachers of the separate philosophy course and of both general courses in all cases were certain of the need and gave reasons why they held this position.

The most often-used defense of the importance of the humanities was that they filled a cultural gap in the student's education with a vital knowledge not available in other courses dealing with facts and information. For example, one teacher of a general course said, "To

quote Oscar Wilde, our students know the cost of every thing and the value of nothing. [They are] worldly in materialistic knowledge, but have no knowledge of self, or of their own basic needs and values." A literature teacher expressed a similar idea by saying, "It [the humanities] gives the students a different kind of knowledge than they get in other courses. Knowledge that doesn't deal with facts like two plus two equal four, but with the kind of truth and values that one has to know for a full life." Several teachers were concerned with the formation of certain habits of reading, of making choices, or of critical thinking. One art teacher, for example, stated, "They [the humanities] aid the student in developing the ability to think critically and thereby to set higher standards for his own preferences." The humanities were also deemed an important need by several teachers as an aid to solving the problems of life. A literature teacher said, "We try to give them ideas that will help them in life; to face life's problems as well as to train them intellectually." Another literature teacher was even more explicit when he said:

> I believe our youth need to have a broader background for living such as the humanities offers. Business firms have found this to be true. American Telephone [and Telegraph Company], General Electric, and others, have found that they have plenty of men with technical knowledge, but lack the broadly educated men needed for the top jobs in administration. Some [of these companies] have aided in the planning and financing of university programs for the benefit of men who are executive material.

Another idea frequently expressed by the interviewees was that the humanities were, as one expressed it, needed as "an antidote to specialized subject matter." One interviewee felt that the importance of the humanities lay in their value as a "comprehensive kind of summarizing experience. . . . [that] integrates and binds previous

experience and serves as a preview to future experience in other college courses."

The Appropriateness of the Courses of the Subject Schools

Two of the questions of the interview were concerned with the suitability of the present courses. The first of these questions asked the interviewee's opinion as to the adequacy of the present courses as a means of giving students a basic humanities education. This question as posed to the teachers was: Do you believe that the present courses of your school are the best means of giving a basic humanities education to your students? Why or why not?

This question elicited answers that were as varied as the patterns of courses given at the subject schools. The teachers of the general courses were unanimous in their belief that a general course was the best means of giving a basic humanities education. As previously noted, four of the schools permit the students to elect a choice between the separate and general course. In schools following this practice, the general teachers often expressed dissatisfaction with separate courses, either because they lacked integration or because they permitted the students to escape one, two, or even more of the disciplines. The following statement by a teacher of the general course probably reflected the feeling of most:

> I much prefer a general class, required of all sophomores, instead of this election of five to seven hours from separate groups. The students never have a comprehensive study that way. One studies art, one studies literature, another a little bit of philosophy or music, but never does one study, nor find the interrelationship of all. They do not come up with any kind of a common denominator as they would with a good integrated course.

Although all of the general course teachers felt their course to be the preferable means, at least two felt that it needed to be supplemented. One voiced this in the following manner:

> I think the present course is excellent. But the student is not prepared to take the course. The present course lays emphasis on an aesthetic approach and I'm highly in favor of this. But before the student can understand or follow in this aesthetic approach I believe that he needs a year in philosophy. . . . I find that I have to take up entirely too much time giving the ideational background before I can get any aesthetic appreciation.

Another teacher of the general course felt that "ideally we should have a short preview course with emphasis on philosophic thought during the freshman or sophomore year . . . then toward the end of baccalaureate experiences, say at the last year of the student's term, have a comprehensive study or summary that would help tie together all of his experiences in college." This same idea was also advanced by one teacher of the separate literature course.

Among the separate course teachers there was a greater division of opinion in regard to the suitability of the present courses in each school. There was no unanimity among these people, but many were concerned with escapism, whereby a student could avoid the humanities, wholly or in part, by particular elected substitutions. The feeling against permitting the students to escape certain of the disciplines seemed to vary in direct proportion to the degree of escapism permitted in the different schools. One school permitted the substitution of the practical arts for all but one course of the humanities. Opinion opposed to this practice was unanimous and intense among the humanities teachers of this school. "I would say they [the planners of the program] are avoiding the first and foremost idea of the humanities."

"I can not possibly visualize a course in shop as a course in the humanities, but it's listed as such." These are two sample comments concerning this program. Some schools, as noted previously, permitted an election whereby the student could substitute for one or two of the separate or general courses. The teachers of the humanities at these schools were generally opposed to this practice. Some, however, mitigated a censorious answer by suggesting remedies such as an increase in the number of required hours in the humanities, or the prescription of one course in each discipline, or a change over to the general courses. Here are some sample remarks: "In our set-up [sic] a student takes literature and may choose any other one separate course. The choice is often based upon what they have heard is the easiest. . . . if they take the separate courses, the ideal situation would be to have them take all of them," (by a literature teacher); "I believe the general courses should be increased to eight hours and then, if the student should take the area courses, that he be required to take eight hours in the four fields--literature, music, art, and philosophy," (by an art teacher); "Students, here, who take the separate courses must take the three-hour literature course plus two hours in any of the other separate courses. Now they are permitted to substitute two hours of band or vocal music for the separate course. I do not feel that beating a drum or twirling a baton fulfills the general-education need. Neither do I feel that this proliferation of courses is general education. I believe that they can only be generally educated in the general course," (by a philosophy teacher).

Aside from the matter of escapism, no other issue seemed to be of importance except the one impelling issue of the general versus the

separate courses. Since four of the schools have both types of courses in their programs this issue would, as a matter of course, be one of concern to the humanities teachers of these schools. In most cases it was difficult, as may be seen in the foregoing, for the interviewee to discuss his particular course without comparing the two types. But since the trend of the interviews could not be known when the interview guide was devised, it was thought advisable to pinpoint this issue with a direct question. The question as stated was: Would you care to make any critical remarks about the various types of courses? (i.e., integrated courses taught by one teacher, integrated courses taught by several specialists, separate courses taught by specialists.) This question is one that is frequently discussed in the literature and one about which there is a wide divergence of opinion. Any one of the three types may be favored with, or without, a qualified answer. The answers of the interviewees fall into four categories, namely: those who favored the separate course; those who favored the general course; those who favored the general course if teachers with proper qualifications could be found; and, those who thought both the separate and general courses were needed. By classifying the answers into these four categories it was possible to quantify the opinions. Table XXV summarizes the opinions of the 27 teachers of the separate courses and the thirteen of the general courses that were interviewed.

The matter of categorizing the opinion was sometimes difficult in the matter of the qualified answers. For example, one literature teacher said, "I think the general system for offering the humanities is right. . . . Now if you could find the rare individual who really knew all the fields, then he could teach a good integrated course, but

TABLE XXV

OPINIONS OF THE HUMANITIES TEACHERS IN REGARD TO THE TYPE OF COURSE MOST SUITABLE FOR USE IN THE GENERAL EDUCATION HUMANITIES

Categories of opinion	No. of teachers expressing particular opinions						
	Lit.	Art	Mus.	Phil.	Sep.	Gen.	Both
a. Separate course	8	1	1	0	10	0	10
b. Integrated course	1	1	1	2	5	12	17
c. Integrated course with qualifications	4	3	2	1	10	0	10
d. Both courses needed	1	0	0	0	1	1	2
e. Undecided	1	0	0	0	1	0	1

I don't know where such people are; personally, I've never encountered one." This teacher was recorded as favoring the separate courses since he believed that one must be an "expert" in all areas in order to teach the general-education humanities. In other instances where the statement was less positive, the interviewees were quizzed as to whether an expert in all areas was necessary to teach the general-education humanities course and, if so, whether it was possible to obtain such people. If an interviewee felt that expertness in all areas was not necessary he was classified as favoring the general course with qualifications, provided he also felt that teachers might be available. For example, one interview with a literature teacher progressed in this manner:

"I believe the separate courses are the only practical way of offering the humanities. Of course, if one person is able to handle it and that one person is able to teach music, art, literature, and philosophy, that, to me, would be the ideal way. . . ." (continuing

in response to a query as to whether the one person needed to be a specialist in all the areas) "Perhaps not. But a person would have to have a fundamental knowledge and appreciation of each one. . . ." (in response to a query concerning availability) "Well, there are probably a few, for example, Dr. _____ on our faculty would be one." None of the interviewees favored a general course taught by several specialists. One literature teacher who favored the separate course felt that this type "might be successful under carefully controlled conditions." Two of the schools have in the past experimented with this type of course. Interviewees who were familiar with these experiments described them variously as "a resounding failure"; "perhaps /resulting in/ better instruction in some specialties but with a great loss in integration and hence, real meaning"; and, "too difficult to coordinate." However, one art teacher who favored the general course stipulated that he did so with the idea that it would be "taught by one person with the frequent aid of specialists."

Those who favored the separate courses supported their convictions with such comments as "practical," "people /are/ needed who know their subject thoroughly," "because it is flexible and gives individual choice," and "better instruction." Those who favored the general course bulwarked their position mainly from the standpoint of integration as a basic need and objective in general education. Other comments in support of the general course were "they give purpose and direction to the students' thinking," "they establish unity and continuity," and "specialized courses tend to lean too heavy /sic/ on their subject matter" and "become too technical." Those who favored the coexistence of both the separate and general courses felt that "it's good for the

students to have a choice." The one undecided position was that of a person teaching for the second year who stated that his information was too inadequate for him to form an opinion.

Optimum Time for the General-Education Humanities

The question directed to the interviewees to gain their opinion as to the most favorable time to give the general-education humanities courses during the student's college life was stated as follows: The humanities courses are numbered as sophomore courses and are usually taken during the student's second year of work. Would you agree that this is the optimum time?

In one respect an assumption made by this question was incorrect, but it did not affect the interview answers since the interviewees were quick to point it out. It is true that two of the schools adhered strictly to the practice of giving the humanities during the sophomore year. Another school, however, required the courses during the freshman year and the remaining schools permitted them to be taken during either year.

The responses to this question can also be quantified by placing the answers in four categories, namely: those who believed the sophomore year ideal; those favoring a later year; those preferring an earlier year; and, those believing either the freshman or sophomore year to be suitable. Table XXVI summarizes the opinions of the interviewees on the basis of these categories.

More than half of the teachers felt that the sophomore year was the optimum time to offer the humanities. The reason given most often in support of the sophomore year was that "sophomores are more mature

TABLE XXVI

OPINIONS OF THE HUMANITIES TEACHERS IN REGARD TO THE OPTIMUM TIME FOR GIVING THE GENERAL-EDUCATION HUMANITIES COURSES

	Optimum time	No. of teachers expressing particular opinions						
		Lit.	Art	Mus.	Phil.	Sep.	Gen.	Total
a.	During sophomore year	10	1	4	1	16	7	23
b.	After sophomore year	3	2	0	1	6	3	9
c.	During freshman year	0	0	0	1	1	2	3
d.	During either frosh or soph year	1	2	0	0	3	1	4
e.	Undecided	1	0	0	0	1	0	1

than freshmen." Other typical comments offered in support of this position were these: "it [humanities] should be taken after freshman English," "freshmen are not as adjusted or settled as sophomores," "most of the freshmen are not as efficient in reading," and "it is helpful in deciding their [the students'] major program when it comes just before the junior year."

The matter of maturation was also the concern of some who held that the humanities should be given during the junior or senior year. Some also felt that more college background studies, especially history and philosophy, were needed prior to taking the humanities. Two interviewees felt that the best place for the humanities was toward the end of the student's college life, where it could best act as an "integrating summarizing experience." One of these two, however, felt that there was probably also a need for a "preview course" during the freshman

year. Another teacher based his opinion on the comparative performances of classes that contained sophomores, juniors, and seniors to contend that the junior and senior years were the optimum time. One general-course teacher had a particularly interesting viewpoint in answer to a corollary question directed toward his defense of his position. The question as asked was this: Do you feel that it is more important for the student to get the full import of the humanities course or for the humanities course to give the student the full import of things to follow later in college and in life? This was answered by:

> I think your second question is more idealistic than practical. It would be a lovely thing, but the fact is that our students come to us with a narrow perspective of what they are going to get out of college. It's very difficult to jar them out of that perspective; to widen their horizons. And I don't see how in the world you can give him what the humanities can give him unless he is open-minded; unless he is ready to take it. The point of this is that he realizes this later on, but by then he has forgotten so many of the details.

Those who believed the freshman year to be the optimum year for the general-education humanities saw no difference in maturation between freshmen and sophomores. Two of the interviewees based this on observation of classes containing both groups. One interviewee felt that "lack of adjustment, if present, among freshmen is often offset by freshness and enthusiasm." Another interviewee felt that the humanities were an "aid to adjustment to college life by giving the students new ideas, new ways of thinking, and new ways of evaluating and judging, that should be common to other college experiences."

All four of the interviewees who held that either the freshman or sophomore year would constitute an optimum time gave the same reason. This comment by an art teacher is typical of all: "I have about as

many freshmen enrolled in my humanities class as I have sophomores and I can see no difference." The one respondent, a literature teacher who was undecided, stated that he had given the question considerable thought, but could form no opinion.

In the week intervening, between the time the interview guides were handed to the teachers and the time of the scheduled interviews, three of the teachers, without the knowledge of the investigator, asked the same questions of their classes. All three polled the opinions of the classes on each question. This was revealed during the interviews, and some of the differences of opinion between teacher and class were told to the investigator. It is interesting to note that where a general-course teacher felt that the humanities should be given during the senior year the class agreed on the sophomore year. A literature teacher who thought the sophomore year was best found the students of the opinion that either the freshman or sophomore year was suitable. An art teacher who also chose the sophomore year as optimum discovered the students' opinion to favor the junior or senior years. Students evidently can be as divergently opinionated as teachers!

The Objectives of the Humanities and their Relationship to the General-Education Program

Two questions concerning the objectives of the humanities courses were included in the interview question guide. The first of these was: Can you cite any particular objective or objectives that you are attempting to accomplish in your humanities courses? There is considerable doubt as to whether this question should have been asked in this manner and also as to whether the interviewees should have been prepared for it. There was a feeling on the part of the investigator

that, in some instances, the interviewee was ready with an answer too carefully prepared. Even the use of the word "objective" seemed to tend toward placing some teachers in a defensive position wherein they felt compelled to cite some auspicious aim. The interviewing experiences of the investigator led him to believe that it would have been more logically valid simply to ask without prewarning, "What are you attempting to do when you teach?"

In many cases, however, the interviewees had no noticeable attitude-set toward this particular question. One could, for example, hardly doubt the frankness of a literature teacher who replied, "My main objective is to teach them something about literature. . . . if incidental to that I can broaden the student's knowledge to any of the great ideas of the human race I try to do so." At least two other literature teachers were particularly concerned with subject matter. One stated that his main objective was to give the student "the subject matter to orient him culturally." Another related that his main objective was to have the students "learn that the subject matter of literature is life. . . . /to be studied as a means of/ broadening the individual's experience." The largest number of literature teachers, however, were concerned with the matter of developing "critical judgment," "taste," "discrimination," or "ability to make" worthwhile selections. For example, one said, "We attempt to teach the student to analyze what he reads and to acquire high standards for judging literature." Another said, "We would like to have our students develop good taste in what they read and will later want to read . . the ability to analyze /their reading/ more critically." Critical thinking was mentioned by three literature teachers, one of whom said,

"I should like the people in my courses to be able to follow the ideas of the greatest writers of this time and past time and to think on them critically and to learn to select from them what seems to make sense." Appreciation and "personal enjoyment" were frequently mentioned usually accompanied by other abilities or qualities. One literature teacher put particular stress on "good use of leisure time" which he viewed as being brought about through the "appreciation of novels, short stories, and poetry." The attitude of open-mindedness was important in the opinion of another literature teacher who said, "I put the emphasis on the student's ability and willingness to think with an open mind -- to think creatively. I put less emphasis on the mechanics of literature." "The most important [objective], " said one teacher, "is to understand more fully the ideas of man as expressed in literature."

The main objectives professed by the five teachers of the separate art courses of the humanities were briefly stated and can be completely given here. One stated it as "the application of art in everyday life." A second hoped to "break the traditional barriers about art in living." A third art teacher attempted to "give the student some understanding of his cultural heritage and some understanding of the dominant place of art in his everyday life." The fourth stated that "we try to enable the student to know about man in the past through the created art that remains and through this understanding of the past to develop an understanding of man today and the art he produces." The remaining art course was unique in that it somewhat resembled a general course. With art as the main emphasis, music and literature were introduced to show the inter-relationships of form, harmony, style, and other elements.

The teacher expressed her main objective simply as "to demonstrate, and thereby give an understanding of, the relationships in the arts."

The four teachers of the separate music courses can also be completely quoted as to the main objective or objectives that they hold as applicable to their courses. One stated that his principal objective was "to raise their [the students'] standard of taste." Another said that he hoped "to make the students curious enough about music that it would have some carry-over later." The remaining two teachers of the music course made almost identical statements to the effect that they desired to give a broader understanding of the cultural heritage and a deeper appreciation for good music.

There was a remarkable sameness in the main objectives reported by the three teachers of the separate philosophy courses, one of which was primarily concerned with psychology. One stated simply that his main objective was "teaching the pupils to live life at its highest and best." Another was most concerned with making "each student realize the importance of life, how it can be enriched, and what will be the determining factors in enriching it." The third teacher attempted "to give them [the students] the best truths, and what authorities have pictured those truths to be and how they can be made applicable to the student's life."

The teachers of the general courses usually gave lengthier expositions of their objectives. These objectives were concerned with skills, abilities, understandings, or qualities that the general teachers were attempting to improve, modify, or produce. "Arousing the student's interest" or "curiosity" and "creating an awareness" were phrases heard with greater frequency in the general courses than

in any of the separate courses. On the other hand, terms and phrases like "taste," "judgment," "ability to discriminate," and "setting" or "raising standards" were less frequently used by the teachers of the general courses. Neither were "knowledge," "subject matter," and "information" directly referred to in any of the objectives. "Familiarization with the cultural heritage" and the "development of a cultural background," phrases that imply subject matter, were, however, used by two of the general-course teachers. One teacher gave his main objectives simply as "to give the students a familiarization with the cultural heritage and to view the objects and ideas of culture with an open mind." Another statement bearing some resemblance to the latter objective was given by a teacher whose chief aim was "to broaden the student's understanding and appreciation of his cultural background." Still another teacher expressed a similar objective by saying, "I hope to develop a student's insight into culture, an understanding of it, an ability to observe and participate in the immediate culture, and to feel adjusted in a foreign culture."

Values and appreciations were often mentioned in connection with the objectives of the general course. The idea of these values and appreciations complying with certain standards was stressed less often than in the separate courses. One teacher's main objective was to give the students "a smattering of the liberal arts" in order to "develop a sense of values" that they lack. "The stress in my class," he continued, "is on the human values rather than on material values." One teacher made a particularly long and well expressed statement of his objectives in the humanities, a portion of which dealt with values. This teacher said:

> I'm attempting to widen their cultural horizon. I'm attempting to help the student evolve a set of values that is valid and will continue to be valid as his maturity enlarges and as he becomes an operating member in a democratic society which lays emphasis upon the individual and his development. . . . The ability of the student to do critical and constructive thinking, I think, is involved in my statement . . . [regarding] an evolvement of a set of values. . . . this set of values has meaning and, in fact, it is a necessity in this democratic form of society because the individual bears such a great responsibility . . . if he [the student as a future citizen] does not understand these values personally, they will mean nothing. They cannot mean anything as a set of values superimposed upon a mass of people . . . to borrow a term, "other-directedness" applied to the individual must result in loss of status of the individual.

Use of leisure time was a theme stressed by four of the teachers although the stress was always placed secondarily to other emphases. One of the teachers expressed it by saying that he was attempting to "create an awareness [on the part of the student] of his own problems and his own efforts in the light of previous problems and objectives . . . and to make the student more aware of how to approach leisure hours and how to put creativity into those hours through art and art forms." This same teacher also placed emphasis on self-reliance as an objective. One of the most succinct statements concerning objectives was worded as follows: "I am trying to awaken students to an awareness of themselves and their part in the human adventure --an adventure that requires an adult sense of responsibility in solving problems." The skills of critical thinking and communication were frequently given as secondary objectives, but one teacher was particularly concerned with one form of communication. He had this to say: "I have several major objectives, but perhaps I try above all to interest people in various fields of thought and through that interest lead them to read. I think the thing that is wrong with education is that people don't read. If

I can do this one thing I'll feel that I have really accomplished something." Understanding and appreciating culture or man's achievements were very frequently mentioned as major objectives. One teacher of a general course expressed it in the following manner: "I emphasize appreciation . . . and a better understanding of man's efforts to improve himself . . . of man's ideas . . . and human emotions."

The second question concerning objectives that was asked of the humanities teachers was stated as follows: Which of the objectives of the general-education program of your school are best accomplished by means of the humanities courses? Which of the remaining objectives may may be wholly or partly accomplished by the humanities courses? The questions were asked in an attempt to discover the relationship of the humanities courses to the total general-education program in each of the subject schools. They were meant to open up this area of discussion during the interview and to lead to other questions that might give some notion as to the degrees of relationship and coordination assumed to exist between the courses and the program in each school.

The answer to this question was quickly ascertained with little need for further questioning. At the first interview to be held by the investigator the interviewee replied, "I don't know what the objectives /of the general-education program/ are -- I've never read them to my recollection." This remark characterized most of the answers to the above question during the ensuing investigation. Often at the first meeting with teachers, the question would be discovered on the interview guide, and a statement similar to the one above would be made. The question, then, would be asked as to where the general-education objectives could be found. The presence of the objectives in the

college bulletin was pointed out either by the investigator or an informed teacher. Two schools, however, did not include the objectives in the college bulletin. At both of these schools the objectives were--after a search--located in an administrator's file. At one of the two schools the dean of instruction had copies made for the teachers prior to the second visitation by the investigator. At the second school copies were furnished by the investigator.

There was one exception. As previously mentioned, one of the schools had recently completed an institutional study of general education with total faculty participation. Here the objectives of general education had been studied and established; and a further study was made of effective teaching in, administration of, and the curriculum of the program. On the bases of these studies experimental courses were established which were deemed to be compatible with the ideas and objectives of general education. Hence, at this school the humanities teachers, with only one exception, were very much aware of their objectives of general education and of the ones which the humanities best fulfilled.

There was consensus at this school that the humanities courses were seeking "to stimulate a greater appreciation for literature, the fine arts, and the cultural heritage." The teachers were also concerned with the development of two skills: "effective communication" and "the ability to think critically." On the premise of the above first-named objective, the teachers generally were attempting to present subject matter in a manner intended to develop appreciation and preference.

Vocabulary, spelling, and correct oral and written English were stressed and evaluated to develop communicative skills. Group dynamics,

especially "buzz sessions," were used to develop, encourage, and evaluate the individual's ability to think critically.

This particular school was the only one of the subject schools that had a general-education program organized on a departmental basis with a departmental chairman and a committee. The responsibilities of the committee, among other duties, was directed toward coordination and intercommunication among the staff, the approval of course syllabi, initiation of changes for improvement, leadership in the evaluation of the program's results, and the reporting of the progress of the program to the administration and to the faculty as a whole. No other school had developed any organizational procedures in general education that tended toward the amalgamation of the courses to the total program. One other school, however, had grouped both separate and general courses into a department and established a close relationship among them, but this department was much less unified with the total general-education program than the school discussed above.

The Adequacy of the Humanities Courses

Two questions were asked of the teachers in regard to the adequacy, in terms of number of semester hours, of the present humanities courses. The questions were: Do you believe the present requirement of five or six hours is sufficient in a program designed particularly for teachers? Are there any (other) specialized programs that you believe would be helped by additional courses in the humanities?

Only three of the interviewees felt that the present requirement of five or six hours was sufficient. Since only one of these three was in a school which permitted no escape from what is considered here to

be the disciplines of the humanities, it can be concluded that two teachers felt that perhaps less than the five-hour minimum was satisfactory. This was further verified by questioning these two teachers. Three other teachers felt, on the other hand, that the present requirements would be sufficient if students were not permitted to escape the humanities by the substitution of other courses from the general-education electives. Two other teachers expressed yet another idea by opining that the present program was probably sufficient for some but not for others. Their reasons for these beliefs, however, were different. A literature teacher thought that six hours of humanities was enough "for students who would major in English" but that all other students should have more, especially in the area of literature. An art teacher expressed the belief that the present requirements were probably sufficient for a segment of the "students of higher intelligence and from better cultural backgrounds" whereas others should have more.

Except for the four interviewees who said that they were undecided, all others expressed themselves as desiring more humanities than is required under present regulations. A total, then, of twenty-eight teachers favored more humanities in the general-education program as compared with eight who felt present requirements sufficient. Nine of the twenty-eight taught general courses, and nineteen were separate course teachers. Of this number who desired more of the humanities, nine qualified their opinions with the remark that although they would like to have more they could not see how it would be possible in a curriculum already crowded with requirements. Very few of the teachers who believed that more humanities were needed would express an amount that they felt would be an optimum requirement. Three teachers, however,

expressed a wish for eight hours. Two of these teachers felt that an ideal situation would exist if the student had an election between taking two general courses of four hours each or four separate courses of two hours credit for each. The third of the three teachers favoring eight hours would have only two general courses to total eight hours. One interviewee was of the opinion that twelve hours of the general-education humanities were needed.

Most of the teachers felt that there should be no difference in the general-education humanities requirements for any particular specialized programs. One interviewee, as related above, would have fewer requirements for English majors and more for others. Two teachers mentioned the humanities as a special need in the fifth-year program. Another felt that a separate humanities course in mythology was a special need for students majoring in elementary education. Still another teacher, who indicated the need for more humanities, desired a general course for seniors as a means of "integrating college experiences in all areas." And another, previously mentioned, saw a need in all areas for a philosophy course in the freshman year preceding general courses given during the sophomore year.

Evaluation of Changes in Students Accomplished by Means of the Humanities

The question directed to the interviewees concerning efforts toward, or observations of, changes in the behavior of their students as produced by the humanities was this: Do you feel that you are accomplishing any real carry-over change in the behavior or attitudes of your students? Have you any evidence of this?

It was realized before this question was asked that there probably

had been no systematic attempt to evaluate any changes in behavior or attitude among the students who had had the humanities course. For one thing an evaluation of this nature is very seldom carried out for any course. And for another reason a systematic plan intended to yield reliable data on changes in behaviors or attitudes, due basically to a particular course, is exceedingly difficult to devise and to consummate. The committee for the Cooperative Study of Evaluation in General Education of the American Council on Education encountered this problem in their study and found extreme difficulty in devising tests that would reliably measure changes of behaviors or attitudes produced by the great variety of courses in the humanities.[1]

There was a possibility, however, that some interested teacher might have concrete evidence in the form of a before-and-after-the-course check on books borrowed from the library, attendance at cultural programs, or at exhibitions, or perhaps even a test such as used by the above-named committee. There were, however, no evaluations or objective measurements made by any of the teachers in the subject schools. Many of the teachers merely expressed themselves as having a "feeling" that they accomplished some carry-over values. For example, one said, "If I did not feel that I had produced changes that were valuable I don't believe I could stomach teaching them year after year." Others pointed to changes that occurred during the class itself: changes not only in the matter of performances on tests but in the development of interests and appreciations on the part of some students. Often in noting changes during a class, the teacher would relate an anecdote

---

[1]Paul L. Dressel and Lewis B. Mayhew, General Education: Explorations in Evaluation (Washington, D. C., 1954), pp. 139-42.

concerning some student who had undergone a great change. One teacher told of a report on a difficult poem by a student who was "rebellious in his attitude" toward poetry. The student concluded that there was nothing of value in the poem, but a class discussion after the report convinced him that his classmates had found things of value. The student became "an avid reader of poetry and is now majoring in English." Other teachers also mentioned students who became English majors and, in a few cases, art majors probably because of their experiences in the humanities course. Several teachers expressed regret at having no contact with the larger number of students after they had finished the humanities courses. This, they felt, would have given them a better opportunity to observe changes that might be attributed to the humanities. Quite a few teachers told of contacts, often of a chance nature, with students in which the past humanities course played a part. In many of these contacts the student would tell of new experiences that they related back to their humanities course, such as the reading of a book; a current event; a movie of something studied; a visit to a museum; or, hearing or seeing some famed artist. One former student who traveled in Europe was enthusiastic about how the humanities had helped him in his new experiences. Some teachers of the humanities courses also had had the experience of being deliberately contacted by former students. Frequently the student was seeking information on something from this course that was imperfectly remembered. Less frequently the student was concerned about some new experience which he did not fully understand. One teacher told of a long distance call received late at night from a former student contemplating divorce.

The student was seeking the name of a book which she remembered as containing something relevant to her situation.

Problems in the Teaching of the Humanities

The question concerning the problems of the teachers in teaching the humanities course was stated as follows: What do you consider to be your greatest problem in the teaching of the humanities?

The answers given by the interviewees to this question can be classified into the following categories: the student's background; student attitudes; class size; lack of sufficient class time; teaching load; and lack of facilities or equipment. Table XXVII summarizes the opinions of the interviewees about their major problems in the teaching of the humanities on the basis of this classification. Most of the interviewees stressed only one problem of teaching which they felt to be their major concern. Some, however, named two or even three problems which they considered major and of about equal influence on their particular course.

The largest number of teachers felt that the student's educational background constituted the greatest problem. Nearly half of the interviewees who selected student background as a major problem pointed specifically to lack of reading skill and comprehension. For example, one teacher said, "I think the greatest problem . . . is the fact that the students can't read. They can read the words on the page, but they have never been taught that at least half of the reading is their chore; that the author provides a half and they /the students/ provide a half. Their imaginations are not flexible enough to get all of the implications of what they read . . . consequently it doesn't interest them." Student

TABLE XXVII

MAJOR PROBLEMS IN THE TEACHING OF THE HUMANITIES IN THE SUBJECT SCHOOLS AS INDICATED BY TEACHER OPINION

Problems of Teaching	No. of teachers expressing particular opinions						
	Lit.	Art	Mus.	Phil.	Sep.	Gen.	Total
a. Student background	7	3	1	1	12	10	22
b. Student attitudes	2	3	1	1	7	4	11
c. Class size	2	1	2	0	5	4	9
d. Insufficient class time	3	0	0	2	5	0	5
e. Teaching load	4	0	0	0	4	1	5
f. Facilities or equipment	0	1	1	0	2	1	3

attitudes were considered a major problem by about one-fourth of the interviewees. Most of the teachers designating student attitude as a problem believed that the fact that the humanities were required was a contributing, if not a causal, factor to detrimental attitudes. Two teachers had a somewhat different viewpoint toward background. One of these thought that it was "undoubtedly poor" but that it was a "common problem of teaching" which was "not a great handicap to the experienced teacher." Another teacher was more concerned with the differences in the levels of background or intelligence among the students in a typical class. This teacher felt that if the courses were sectionalized on the basis of intelligence that more successful teaching would result. "It might be," he concluded, "more difficult to teach the higher group if this were done." Two interviewees, however, felt that damaging

attitudes were general; one said, "A general complaint on this campus and others is that students are unwilling to do any serious work and I fear it is often the case!" An art teacher and a music teacher at two different schools lamented the fact that with student election in the separate courses too many students chose art or music as snap courses. This attitude, they felt, screened the inferior students into their courses. In speaking of this it should be noted that one of these two teachers spoke of "athletes" rather than "inferior students" but with obviously the same connotation. The concern of one literature teacher was mainly directed toward a student attitude that condones cheating on examinations. This attitude, combined with large classes in "a small class room" and a teaching load that made objective tests obligatory, created a complex situation for this teacher. The teacher of one of the general courses opined at length on a provincial attitude which he felt to be his greatest problem. This teacher said, " . . . it [his major problem] is the Bible-belt attitude; an attitude which indicates a body of prejudices . . . [which] I discover to be political, religious, social, and moral . . . They add up to an anti-intellectualism or a satisfaction with mediocrity. . . ."

Excessive class size was declared to be a major problem of slightly less than one-fourth of the interviewees. Teachers who listed class size as a major problem said in nearly all instances that they were forced into the use of teaching procedures they did not favor. Three of these teachers favored essay-type tests, but found it necessary to give objective tests. Three others were using the informal lecture, but preferred to have discussions. One stated that student reports were desired, but that the class was too large to get around to all

the students in one semester. The remaining teachers felt their interaction with the student suffered and that it was difficult to keep all students interested or even to clearly observe them. Many of the teachers who were known to have large classes did not report this as a major problem. Two of the general teachers commented on this. One of these, when quizzed about class size, said that he felt that it was a matter of an "experienced teacher using the most suitable means of communication" and that to him it did not matter if there were "five or 250" in the class. The other teacher made extensive use of group dynamics incorporating what he referred to as "buzz sessions." This is similar to what is known in group dynamics as the "Phillips 66 plan." In this procedure a class is divided into groups of small size and given a limited time to arrive at a collective decision or answer to a problem or question. Each group has a leader, or a recorder, who either meets with other leaders or recorders for a final decision, or who may directly state the consensus of his group with explanations and defense.

Class size, surprisingly, was minimized as a major problem by the interviewees. Nevertheless, the humanities classes in many cases were of such a size that they must have influenced the procedures of the teachers. Prior to the actual investigation the matter of class size was thought to be a problem of grave concern. It seems, however, that some schools have been successful in holding to classes of a limited maximum while others bear heavy loads. At schools where classes tended to be large, there definitely were more interviewees who indicated class size to be their major problem. Yet many teachers of large classes indicated other problems with which they were more concerned.

To further clarify the problem of class size, data were collected to ascertain as precisely as possible the sizes of the various humanities classes. Table XXVIII summarizes the data for the kinds and types of courses. The courses, at the time of the investigation, ranged in size from a general class of only nine to another general class with 81 students enrolled. It was reported, however, that a separate music course at one school frequently had had over 100 students. The separate philosophy course had the largest average enrollment by virtue of three courses in one school that ran over 65 students in each. Two music courses at the same school contained over 70 students to account for another high average class size. Large classes seem to be no more prevalent in one type of course than in another. Even the separate art courses which might be expected to have a limited enrollment had two classes of over 50 students. Of all classes having 50 students or more the combined total of all separate courses was 13 as compared with ten general courses. This is in almost exact direct proportion to the total numbers of each type.

It was the intention of the investigator to avoid mention, as much as possible, of specific schools and individual teachers. However, the problem of class size is of such a localized nature that it seemed well to look at the problem from the particular school viewpoint. Hence, Table XXIX summarizes data concerning specific school problems as they relate to class size in the humanities courses. More than one-third of all students enrolled in the humanities were at Central State College while two schools, Central and Northeastern, account for 62 per cent of the total enrollment. Three sections of the general course average over 75 students each, and ten sections of separate

TABLE XXVIII

SIZE OF THE CLASSES IN THE HUMANITIES OF THE OKLAHOMA STATE COLLEGES BY TYPE OF COURSE DURING THE SPRING SEMESTER OF 1959

Class size	Distributive frequencies of class size						
	Lit. N:16	Art N:7	Music N:5	Phil. N:5	All Sep. N:33	Gen. N:24	Total N:57
Less than 20	2	0	0	0	2	3	5
20 - 24	3	1	1	1	6	1	7
25 - 29	1	1	0	0	2	1	3
30 - 34	3	2	0	0	5	2	7
35 - 39	1	0	0	0	1	3	4
40 - 44	1	1	1	0	3	2	5
45 - 49	1	0	0	0	1	2	3
50 - 54	0	1	0	1	2	2	4
55 - 59	1	1	0	0	2	3	5
60 - 64	0	0	1	0	1	1	2
65 - 69	0	0	0	2	2	0	2
70 - 74	2	0	2	0	4	3	7
75 and over	1	0	0	1	2	1	3
Total number[a]	605	264	270	275	1414	1093	2507
Avg. per class[a]	37.8	37.7	54.0	55.0	42.8	45.5	44.0

[a]Total number and average per class computed from ranges within the distribution.

TABLE XXIX

SIZE OF THE CLASSES IN THE HUMANITIES OF THE OKLAHOMA STATE COLLEGES BY SCHOOLS DURING THE SPRING SEMESTER OF 1959

School	Separate Courses		General Courses		All Courses	
	Total Enrolled	Avg. Per Class	Total Enrolled	Avg. Per Class	Total Enrolled	Avg. Per Class
Central	650	65.0	226	75.3	876	67.4
East Central[a]	189	31.5	---	---	189	31.5
Northeastern[a]	248	48.6	425	60.7	663	55.3
Northwestern	169	42.2	9	9.0	178	35.6
Southwestern	155	31.0	160	40.0	315	35.0
Southeastern	---	---	275	30.5	275	30.5
All Schools	1406[b]	42.7[b]	1905[b]	45.6[b]	2496[b]	43.8[b]

[a]Data obtained from individual teachers: All other data obtained from official records of the registrar's office.

[b]Slight differences from Table XXVIII are due to different methods of computation.

courses average 65 students in its seven sections. These contrast markedly with the one section of the general course offered at Northwestern which contained only nine students. Southeastern, with nine sections of the general course, was close to an average class size of thirty which is often cited as being ideal. The element of escape from the humanities was quite evident in the figures for the enrollment at East Central, a school much larger than Northwestern with whom it compared. Not all of the presidents of the subject schools were interviewed, and only brief remarks were exchanged with those who were. The

remarks of one, however, were significant in connection with class size. This president expressed considerable pride in the fact that his school had successfully held down the size of the specialized courses by increasing the size of the general-education classes, thus freeing more teachers for the specialized program.

Efforts Toward Collation and Correlation in the Humanities

One of the questions of the interview was directed toward the discovery of any efforts that had been made on the part of the teachers or the departments to systematically correlate or compare their courses, either intracollegiately or intercollegiately, with other humanities courses and with other general-education courses. The question that was asked in this connection was this: Have you made any comparisons of your course with other courses of the general-education program either here or elsewhere? Has this been done with an effort toward the integration of the program? Has it been done toward avoidance of duplication? What have been the results?

The answers to these questions revealed a complete lack of knowledge on the part of the interviewees as to what was being done by the humanities teachers of the other state colleges. Two of the interviewees professed having met other humanities teachers at the state teachers meeting and having exchanged views briefly with them, but other than this, no intercollegiate comparisons or meetings among the subject schools were indicated as having been made. Three of the interviewees, however, did indicate that they were familiar with the humanities courses in certain universities where they had either done graduate work or taught. Some teachers deplored the fact that they had had little

opportunity to exchange views with, make visitations to, or compare courses with, other teachers of other schools. This led to one teacher expressing the opinion that the state college teachers should have their own teachers' meeting held successively at the various state schools.

The teachers within the schools very often showed a lack of knowledge concerning other humanities courses, as well as other general-education courses of the school. This seemed to be particularly true among the teachers of the separate courses which are, with two exceptions, under the direct administration of one of the specialized departments. Usually the interviewee gave the briefest negative answer. Only a few gave an explanatory negative answer, such as the literature teacher who said, "No, I know nothing about them [the other humanities courses]. I'm always hesitant to inquire about what teachers, especially those in other departments, are doing. I'm afraid they'll resent it and so far nobody in any of the other departments have [sic] volunteered any information. In the time that I have been here [five years] no comparison has been made."

Two of the state colleges, as previously noted, were organized in a manner whereby the humanities courses of each were under a direct administrative structure. In one of these two schools the courses were grouped directly under a chairman of the humanities with supervisory-advisory powers. In the other they were one part of an integrated, experimental general-education program under a chairman and committee with broad regulatory powers. In each of these schools, particularly in the latter, the teachers were usually aware of what other teachers in the humanities, both separate and general, were doing. Even under these conditions at least one of the separate

teachers at each school seemingly knew little of what others were doing. At the school with the experimental program there was also much awareness on the part of all, except one of the interviewees, as to what was being done in general-education courses other than the humanities and what the program as a whole was seeking to accomplish. This was not generally true in the case of the school operating with only a humanities department.

The teachers of the general courses had, as revealed by the interviews, a much greater knowledge of what was being done in other general courses on the same campus. This could be attributed to the fact that they usually used the same books or the same syllabi. Common, or at least similar, subject matter also provided a framework for frequent comparisons. In the schools which offered both types of courses there was very little familiarity, on the part of the teachers, with what was being done in the courses of the opposite type. The two exceptions to this were noted in the previous paragraph.

The one school which offered only the general courses had no humanities department as such, but the courses were taught by English teachers, except in one case. Unofficially the courses were under the administration of the head of the English department. At another school two teachers taught three sections each of the general course with methods and content that were widely divergent. Each of these two teachers, though, had full knowledge of the work of the other.

In the general-education program adopted for the state colleges there were two courses in the social studies requirements that could, according to their descriptions, duplicate the general humanities courses. These courses were History 103, Early Western Civilization;

and History 113, Modern Western Civilization. These courses are frequently described as cultural or social histories, and the names of the courses coincide with the names of general humanities courses that are given in some schools. With the realization that duplication could occur the investigator made it a point to inquire concerning this with a corollary question addressed to the teachers of the general courses. Only two of the general teachers were able to give an answer based upon more than an opinion. One of these two taught both courses, and because of this dual experience deliberately sought to avoid duplication. This teacher said, "Our history course is confined to the use of an ordinary type of textbook which is factual; which gives events and their results that the student tends to learn from memory rather than through reasoning." Continuing he said, "There's very little duplication. For example, we will mention Plato and I will explain his general theory in /History/ 103 but in the humanities we will actually read it and discuss it and permit the student to reason out his own ideas." The other teacher consulted with his class on the answers to the questions of the interview guide, and directed one question specifically toward similarities between the humanities and the described history courses. During the interview he said, "I did ask the class if they thought that History 113, which corresponds chronologically with Humanities 213 duplicated our humanities course or in any way made it unnecessary and the answer was 'no' in both cases." "Ithink," he said further, "that our /History/ 113 is more political rather than social or cultural."

The question of this section was whether the interviewee had made any comparisons of his course with others. It was anticipated that the teacher probably had made nothing more than cursory comparison.

Teachers ordinarily do not investigate or quiz other teachers on what and how they teach. Probably this was rooted in a teacher's respect for the privacy of others. Yet the investigator found a sincere desire on the part of the teachers to learn more about the work of others and how they could improve themselves. In other words, the investigator, as an interested agent, was temporarily in a position to bridge the teacher-to-teacher communication barrier. However, the lack of communication, both within and among the schools, pointed to the need of a permanent bridge. The question, then, was one of an administrative nature. Coordination and effective communication needed to be achieved by a force, or object, that is external to the classroom. This is a major function of administration.

Experiences of the Teachers as Related to the Humanities

None of the interviewees, as previously noted, were originally employed as humanities teachers, although at the time of the investigation the humanities constituted the greater part of the teaching load of several. The separate courses in literature, art, and music were taught by teachers from the specialized departments in those disciplines. In every case the teachers of these separate courses also taught other specialized courses in the same area. The graduate majors of all the teachers of the separate course, except philosophy, were the same as the areas in which they taught. There were no departments of philosophy in any of the state schools and no philosophy courses other than the humanities and the philosophy of education. Hence, the teachers of the philosophy courses were drafted from other departments. One of the three was from an English department, and the remaining two were from

their respective education and psychology departments. Other course work taught by these three teachers was English, in case of the first one, and educational psychology by the other two. Their graduate majors complied with the specialized courses which they taught.

All of the teachers of the general humanities courses also taught courses in specialized areas, and again, in every case, their graduate majors were the same as the specialized areas in which they taught. This again emphasizes the fact that all teachers of the general-education humanities were employed, not as humanities teachers, but as teachers of specialized courses. The graduate majors of, and the specialized courses taught by, the fourteen teachers of the general courses were as follows: English or literature in English, five teachers; Romance or classical languages, three teachers; music and history, two teachers each; dramatics and painting, one teacher each. The graduate minors of the general humanities teachers were Romance, Germanic, medieval, or classical languages, six teachers; English literature, English philology, or English, three teachers; music or musicology, two teachers; history, speech, and art education, one teacher each.

The teachers of all of the separate courses, except those in philosophy, had an educational background adequate to the teaching of their specialized fields which, as has been seen, complies with the particular humanities course that they teach. In the separate philosophy courses and in the general courses the educational backgrounds of the teachers were widely varied and not necessarily in compliance with all of the subject matter. It was probable, then, that certain non-academic experiences may have supplemented the education of the people who teach the separate philosophy and the general humanities. It was

probable, also, that certain informal educative experiences may have proved of value even to instructors teaching in their chosen areas.

Two questions were asked of the interviewees in regard to their experiences as related to the humanities. The first of these was this: What non-college experiences have aided you most in the teaching of the humanities?

Most of the interviewees named two or more experiences that had been of value to them in the teaching of the humanities. Travel was mentioned most frequently with 14 teachers naming travel in foreign countries, and two naming travel in the United States. Ten interviewees felt that their experiences in going to plays, concerts, and museums had been of much value. These experiences were often mentioned in connection with travel. Experiences in the armed forces were mentioned along with travel by six of the interviewees. In connection with the armed forces, one interviewee specifically mentioned his experience of playing in an army band, and another spoke of his opportunity to do research and writing. Particular hobbies and avocations were often named. Reading led among hobbies with mention by ten of the interviewees. Art, amateur plays, and photography as a hobby were each named by one interviewee. Private music lessons were given recognition by three of the teachers, and private art lessons by one. The Great Books adult study and discussion program was considered very valuable by four of the interviewees, and three others pointed to conversations and discussions with friends and informed persons. One professor particularly mentioned the inspiration gained by personally meeting and talking with "people like Carl Sandburg, Robert Frost and others." Religious experiences had been valuable in the opinions of four of the

instructors. Two teachers mentioned newspaper work; one, as a small-town editor; another, as a foreign correspondent. Four persons pointed to their past or present teaching experiences as being particularly valuable to them in teaching the humanities. One of these had taught in China, the Philippines, and in several states of the union. A teacher of a general course expressed the distinct belief that his past experiences in teaching the humanities had been the one thing of greatest value. He added that, though dubious of his ability at first, he had been able to become a learner along with the students. One professor dwelt at considerable length on experiences of his pre-college home life that contributed vastly to appreciations, knowledges, and skills that were of aid to his teaching of humanities. Other experiences named singly by various interviewees were participation in municipal operas; playing in a university symphony orchestra; working as a librarian; Boy Scout work; educational workshops and conventions; and working as a Ford Foundation fellow.

A second question concerned experiences while teaching the humanities or as a result of such teaching. It was a question quite generalized and included predictions in its scope. The question was this: Would you care to describe any unique experiences, outcomes or predictions that result from your teaching in the humanities?

The answers to this question generally were quite brief. Many of the interviewees, especially those in the separate courses, had little to report as unique. A few did feel that several of their students who were now majoring in literature, and in art, had made up their minds to do so while taking the separate courses in those areas. Some teachers of both the separate and the general courses expressed feelings

of personal satisfaction and enjoyment at seeing certain changes occur in particular students during their course. These changes concerned such things as improvement in reading or in the selection of reading materials; increase of interest; breaking down of prejudices against certain forms of art, music, or literature. Some teachers reported the rewarding experience of having students return to express their appreciation after the grades were turned in "when there was no possibility of apple polishing," as one professor put it. Others reported students returning after having had the course to re-examine former class problems, to tell the teacher of some current event, book, or experience in art or music that he had read, seen, or heard. Two professors who had had the experience of past students returning for counsel expressed the opinion that an evaluation of the work accomplished in the humanities could best be made sometime after the course, "perhaps during the senior year."

One professor told of a unique experience in which he had a Saturday humanities class of more mature students. These students were mostly teachers from Kansas, where teaching was permitted without a degree. The interviewee expressed himself as being "appalled at their lack of knowledge in literature and then highly pleased with their interest in it." "A play discussed in class," the interviewee said, "appeared on television and several in the class saw it. They made the remark that if they hadn't discussed it in class they probably would have turned off the television when it came on."

Miscellaneous Viewpoints and Opinions

The final question was one designed to permit the teacher to say anything that he considered important without being restricted to a

particular question. The question was this: Is there anything further that you would like to comment on that you feel would be significant to an investigation of the humanities courses in the framework of the general-education program?

This question proved productive despite the fact that the majority of the interviewees had nothing further to add. Three of the interviewees felt that there should be certain courses required as prerequisite to the humanities. Two of these thought that the course should be one in reading, or in remedial reading, and the third reiterated a statement made earlier of the need for a philosophy course. Several of the interviewees repeated an earlier statement concerning their lack of knowledge as to what was being done in other courses or in other schools. Some further expressed a wish to have a workshop of the college teachers of humanities or to have a section meeting at the Oklahoma Education Association convention. Some, in the same connection, felt the need for a study, such as the present one, and further expressed the hope that the results would be made available to them. At least two professors at each of the schools expressed this hope.

Some interviewees seized the opportunity given by this final question to restate and reemphasize their beliefs in the importance of the humanities. One of the best statements of belief was made by the professor of a separate philosophy course who said:

> Personally, I feel that if the entire faculty had a little deeper understanding of what the humanities really represent in a well-rounded education that this area of our curriculum would receive a new impetus in importance. I believe it is especially easy to underrate the genuine contribution which the humanities make to the cause of education while such a tremendous emphasis is being placed on science, mathematics, and vocational crafts. These latter fields should be correlates of the humanities--not opponents.

The final question led to a longer discussion of a thought presented by one of the teachers of the general courses. This teacher viewed the general-education program as more than mere courses. It was, in his viewpoint, an idea that should permeate the entire college community. Outside of the classroom the humanities should be emphasized to all of the student body by more plays, concerts, and cultural programs. This teacher deplored the inability of the smaller state college to finance the appearance of professional artists, actors, and lecturers. Paintings, sculpture, and good architectural design, in his opinion, should be present on the campus to "enhance the cultural atmosphere of the college and provide a setting for reflection on the creativity of man."

Summary

There was almost unanimous agreement that the humanities were an imperative need in the general-education programs of the subject schools. The defense of this belief was usually directed toward the humanities as a need to fill a cultural gap in the education of the clientele of the subject schools.

There was a division of opinion as to whether the present courses of each of the subject schools was the best means of giving the humanities. The general-course interviewees expressed more satisfaction with their courses than did the separate-course interviewees. Both the general-and separate-course teachers, but especially the latter, were concerned about programs which permitted the students to escape some of the disciplines of the humanities. The substitution of other courses, or of extracurricular activities, for the humanities was

severely criticized. Criticism was also strongly directed against programs that permitted the election of a limited number of the separate courses.

The general course was unanimously preferred by the general-course teachers as the most appropriate means of integrating the disciplines of the humanities. Surprisingly, the separate course teachers also favored this means with or without qualifications. The qualification, stated by the separate-course teachers, was usually concerned with the availability of persons competent in all of the disciplines. There was a division of opinion as to the degree of competency that was needed; some felt that the teacher should be an "expert" in all areas; others felt that he needed to be a broad person and a willing learner.

A majority of the teachers felt that the sophomore year was the optimum time to give the humanities courses.

Although the questionnaire found great similarity in the objectives of the humanities courses, the interviews revealed differences beyond the scope of a check list. Generally, the separate-course interviewees were concerned more with facts and information, mechanics of the disciplines, practical application to life, and raising the standard of "taste." The general course teachers, on the other hand, were more concerned with the cultural heritage, with ways of thinking, and with the development of the student's ability to make wise choices and preferences.

Except in the case of one school, which had recently engaged in a faculty study of general education, there was little knowledge on the part of the interviewees about the objectives of the general-education program. It could be assumed, then, that in most cases the objectives

of general education existed as "paper-objectives" held in readiness for visiting evaluation committees.

Most of the interviewees deplored the lack of time to appropriately teach their classes. Although few teachers chose to quantify their answers, eight hours in the humanities seemed to be the choice of those that did. There was no noticeable difference of opinion on this between the interviewees of the two types of courses. The interviewees of the separate course, however, again attacked escapism in presenting a reason for their belief in the need for more of the humanities.

Systematic evaluation was being carried on at one school in an attempt to effect an improvement in the humanities courses. Results were not available at the time of the present study. Other than this, no systematic attempts had been made to evaluate changes in student behavior as a result of the humanities.

The background of the students was considered by a majority of the interviewees to be their major problem in the teaching of the humanities. A relatively small number of the respondents chose class size as their major problem, although it was mentioned secondarily by many. Class size seemed to receive most mention in schools where it was most critical; even in these schools teachers with large classes often named student background prior to class size. Nevertheless, there were more classes of large size than would seem to be indicated by the teacher response to the question regarding major teaching problems.

The teachers were not familiar with the humanities courses in other of the subject schools. Usually they were not familiar with the courses in their own school except in cases where several teachers

taught the same separate course in the same department. Among the general-course interviewees familiarity with the work of others in the same school emanated mainly from the use of a common textbook or syllabus. The general-course teachers were scarcely aware of another general-education course in the field of social science that was concerned with similar content. An exception to the above was noted in the school which had recently established an administrative structure for general education. At another school, which had organized the separate and general courses into a department, there was familiarity with the work of others in the humanities, but not in the general-education program as a whole.

The separate teachers were, in all cases, specialists in their particular fields and taught other courses in areas of their specialization. The general-course teachers were also specialists but in a wide variety of areas. All of the teachers felt that certain non-credit educative experiences had been valuable to them in the teaching of the humanities. The teachers of the general courses seemed more dependent upon educative experiences that were non-academic. These experiences included travel, cultural contacts with persons or objects, and particularized occupations and experiences.

In the general remarks of the interviewees, one conclusion of the questionnaire was given further emphasis. A need was expressed for a greater development of a cultural environment on the college campus. The student, in the view of some, needs to be surrounded by more objects and events to produce an awareness beyond the classroom of his cultural heritage and ascendancy.

CHAPTER VI

SUMMARY AND CONCLUSIONS

The major purpose of this study was to describe and compare the humanities courses that were a part of the general-education programs of the Oklahoma state colleges. It was hypothesized that these humanities courses had basic differences and similarities. It was assumed that this hypothesis could be tested by analyzing the basic elements of the general-education humanities courses. It was further assumed that data satisfactory for analysis could be collected by means of the combined use of observational, questionnaire, and interview techniques. A procedure incorporating these techniques was designed for the purpose of testing the hypothesis. The design of the procedure was developed from an initial program of selected reading and study. It was refined by the suggestions of a body of critics. It was still further refined by being put into actual use during a pretest conducted at a college which had a program similar to the programs of the state colleges. The data gathered to test this hypothesis have been analyzed and presented in expository and tabular form in the foregoing chapters. In the present chapter these findings will be summarized and conclusions will be drawn from the findings.

Summary of the Observations of the Subject Schools, Their General-Education Programs, and Their Humanities Courses

The colleges that were the subject of the present study were formerly normal schools. These normal schools were comparable to the

present junior college combined with high school and had as their major purpose the training of teachers. This major purpose has been retained to the present time, but at least two schools have shown trends in other directions. Before their names were changed, these normal schools had adopted a departmental organization which has been retained to the present time. The trend, in this case, has been toward the further solidification of the departmentalized structure.

The earliest establishment of a kind of general-education program was coincidental with the change of the normal schools into the four-year college authorized to grant the baccalaureate degree. The basic requirements for the baccalaureate degree had somewhat the nature of a general-education program. These basic requirements were to be completed during the freshman and sophomore years. During the period in which these requirements were in effect, the colleges were also issuing "temporary" and "life" certificates to teach upon the completion of 40 to 90 semester hours. This conflicting situation continued to exist after the establishment of the present general-education program and until the end of the so-called "temporary" and "life" teaching certification.

The present general-education program was devised by an inter-collegiate committee that retained most of the former graduation requirements. The chief contributions of this committee were the reorganization of the requirements into a distributional framework and the creation of new courses in science and in the humanities. The committee, composed largely of administrators, did not establish any objectives for the general-education program. Objectives, however, have been formulated by all of the state colleges. These objectives

usually resulted from the work of committees within the faculties of the respective schools. The objectives so established have wide differences and reflect, therefore, a varied opinion as to what a general education is supposed to accomplish. Thus, differences exist despite an over-all similarity in the general-education programs of the several colleges.

The curriculum committee neither established nor recommended any administrative structure for the new program. Hence, the program until the present time has existed as an uncoordinated group of courses under the administration of the various specialized departments which furnish teachers for the courses. One of the colleges, however, has established a promising, new experimental program operating under one administrative organization to facilitate interdepartmental coordination.

The humanities requirements were established by the inter-collegiate curriculum committee as one of several major areas of the general-education program. Within the area of the humanities a pattern of courses was established consisting of separate courses in art, literature, music, and philosophy; general interdisciplinary courses; and courses in psychology and sociology. Since no mention was made of psychology and sociology in the literature concerning the humanities these two disciplines were not considered in this study. Agreement on this point was found in preliminary conversations with several humanities teachers. The division of the humanities into separate and general courses was considered to be the major difference within the structure of the humanities in the general-education programs of the state colleges. The establishment of the two types of courses was probably intended to permit the colleges to make whatever they judged to be

the best adjustment to the new program and the new courses. The adjustment was made and has continued to be made by the assignment of the courses to teachers already among the faculty. No teacher, to the present time, has been employed as a humanities teacher in any of the subject schools.

Important differences were found in the humanities requirements of the Oklahoma state colleges. No two of the schools had exactly the same requirements in the area of the humanities. The differences were of varying degrees. For example, one college required four or five hours which could be taken in history and the practical arts, while another college required two particular three-hour general courses. Another school required seven to nine hours, but permitted electives to the extent that only five hours were required in the humanities. Still another college reduced the credit given to some of the general courses to two hours. This arrangement was made as a convenience for the student to obtain a minimum of five hours. This latter college also plans to give humanities credit for certain extracurricular activities.

Summary of the Findings of the Questionnaire

Objectives, Approaches, and Integrative Techniques. The separate and general humanities courses of the subject colleges showed remarkable similarity in the average degree of emphasis that each placed upon the selected objectives included in the questionnaire. A very significant rank-difference correlation of .866 was obtained when the objectives for each type of course were ranked according to their average degree of emphasis. Both the separate and general courses placed the greatest

emphasis on providing the student with a "broader understanding of his cultural heritage." Least emphasis in each type of course was placed upon the development of the student's "interest in his own distinct creative abilities."

There was marked contrast between the general and separate courses in the approaches employed by the teachers toward the attainment of the objectives of their courses. The teachers of the general course overwhelmingly favored and used an historical approach in which parallel ideas and objects of art, literature, music, and philosophy were studied. The separate-course instructors indicated a wider variety of approaches, but very few organized subject matter in an historical sequence. Generally in the separate courses, models were chosen at random as representatives or illustrations of a type of idea or mode.

Content. Literature was the discipline to which the largest amount of time was devoted in both the general and separate courses. Among the separate courses only literature was offered for more than two semester hours of credit. In some of the subject colleges literature was prescribed and required. In all of the colleges offering the separate courses there were, without exception, more sections of the literature course. More than twice as many students were enrolled in literature than in any other separate course.

The disciplines of the general course were compared on the basis of the average percentage of time devoted to them and by the average number of hours spent on selected topics of each discipline. Both comparisons showed that over one-third of the total time in the two general courses was spent on literature. Thus, less than two-thirds

of the time was spent on art, music, and philosophy, plus other disciplines that were sometimes introduced. Wide differences were present between the general and separate courses as to the percentage class time spent on the various forms of literature and as to the hours of class time spent on selected topics.

The time spent on art in the two general courses was nearly equal to the time devoted to art in the two-semester-hour separate course. Actually more general-education art was taught in the general course than in the separate because of the much greater enrollment in the general courses. During the spring of 1959 twenty-four general courses, with an enrollment of about one thousand, were taught as compared with only seven separate art courses, with an enrollment of about 260.

The greatest similarity of content between the separate and general courses was in the time devoted to the selected topics of art. Differences, however, were found in other respects. The art content of the general courses reflected their use of an historical approach. More time was spent on art and architecture of the past than in the separate course. The separate course was more balanced in its distribution of time on various forms of art. Modern art received greater attention than in the general courses.

The music taught in the two general courses was equal to less than two-thirds of the time devoted to it in the two-semester-hour separate course. Moreover, music was completely omitted from some of the general courses. Still there was probably more general-education music taught by means of the general courses than by means of the separate course, since the enrollment in the general courses was four times that of the separate course.

Wide differences were found between the separate and general courses with respect to both the percentage of time devoted to the various forms and the number of hours devoted to selected topics. The content of the general courses mirrored the use of an historical approach. The use of this approach accounted for the sparsity of music in the first of the two general courses as well as the particular emphases that were placed upon the selected topics. The separate courses had a well-balanced distribution of time spent on the various forms. In this respect it had the outward appearance of a survey course, but this was a deception produced by average figures.

Philosophy received the least emphasis of all the disciplines considered in this study as a part of the humanities. A separate course in philosophy was taught in only three of the subject colleges. In one of these three, however, the course was not about philosophy in any strict sense of the word. Four-fifths of all the students enrolled in the separate philosophy course were enrolled in three large classes at one school. Except, then, for this one school, there is little or no emphasis on philosophy among those colleges which have the separate courses. Among the general courses less time was devoted to philosophy than to any of the disciplines of the humanities. About one-fifth of the general-course respondents indicated that philosophy was not a part of the content of their courses. Among the general courses in which philosophy was included the average time devoted to philosophy was less than one-sixth of the total time.

Methodology. In nearly all cases both the general and separate courses were planned in advance. The plan was usually a flexible one from which deviations were made as the needs or interests of the

students were revealed. Planning was done twice as often by the teacher alone as by a committee or departmental staff. Planning by committees or departmental staffs occurred most often in the separate literature courses. In no instances was the general course planned by an interdisciplinary committee representing the involved departments.

Differences were found between the separate and general courses in the criteria used for the selection of models and materials. The separate-course teachers chose materials chiefly upon the basis of their intelligibility and interest to the students. The general courses reflected the historical approach. Materials were chosen mainly because they provided a view of the thought or spirit of a particular age.

There were both differences and similarities in the classroom procedures used in the humanities courses. The informal lecture was used thirty to fifty per cent of the time in all the separate courses except philosophy. Philosophy made the greatest use, among the separate courses, of discussion and of group work. Music teachers employed audio-visual aids as their principal teaching device, mainly in the form of recorded music. Laboratory work was used extensively in the art course where it ranked second to the informal lecture. The formal lecture found limited use in the literature courses.

The informal lecture was also the procedure most often used in the general course. The formal lecture and audio-visual aids were employed more often on the average than in the separate courses.

Approximately three-fourths of the teachers in each of the two types of courses assigned out-of-class work in addition to the reading of a textbook. Occasional short reports, oral or written, were the most frequent assignments in both types of courses. Occasional readings

of assigned-source materials in the separate courses and the required reading of one or more complete books in the general courses were the main supplementary reading assignments. Except for the art courses, very little motivation for creative work was used.

Attendance at amateur plays, amateur concerts, or recitals; visits to museums or exhibitions; and viewing of relevant motion pictures were the out-of-class activities most frequently required in both types of courses. These activities, however, were required to a greater proportional extent in the separate courses than in the general courses.

The number of required pages of outside reading was nearly the same for both the separate courses and the general course. The philosophy courses required the most out-of-class reading. The least amount of outside reading was required in the first of the two general courses and in the separate course in literature. Three of the literature courses required no outside reading.

The essay-type test was the test most often used in both the separate and general courses for class tests and for final examinations. However, it was used a larger percentage of times in the general courses than in the separate courses.

The attempt to use a second frame of reference, whereby questionnaire responses would be indicated for practices used under ideal conditions, was not wholly successful. Since many of the respondents failed to check the items by this frame of reference, it could not be safely assumed that the present practice was also the preferred practice. However, the volume of response that was evoked by one check list was too great to be ignored. This check list had to do with

required-out-of-class activities in the form of attendance at concerts, plays, museums, and other cultural events. It was clear that a large number of respondents for both types of courses desired more of these events that would parallel the work of their courses.

Summary of the Findings by Interviews

In nearly all cases the teachers felt that the humanities constituted an important part of the general-education program, although some teachers felt that the program of courses offered at their particular college was not altogether satisfactory. Programs which permitted an escape from some of the disciplines of the humanities, either by the election of a limited number of separate courses or by the substitution of other courses for the humanities, were severely criticized. This criticism varied in severity as the degree of escape permitted. The general course was highly favored as the best means of teaching the humanities. Only ten of the forty interviewees favored the separate courses, and only two felt that both types of courses were needed. A majority of the teachers favored the sophomore year as the optimum time for the humanities courses.

Although similarity was found by means of the questionnaire in the objectives of the two types of courses, the interview technique was able to detect differences beyond the scope of the questionnaire. The separate courses were more concerned with information, mechanics of the disciplines, practical applications to life and with raising the standard of "taste." The general courses were more concerned with an interest in, or an awareness of, the finer achievements of man as a foundation for appreciations, preferences, and attitudes that were

individual rather than standardized. There was no strict division between the two types of courses, but in general the objectives of the separate courses were more social in nature; the objectives of the general courses were more individual in nature.

The only college at which the teachers were well informed concerning the objectives of their own particular general-education program was one at which an institutional study had been recently completed. Except for this particular school, no efforts were made to plan or coordinate the humanities courses in the light of the objectives of general education. In almost all of the colleges of this study, however, there were stated general-education objectives that were relevant to the humanities.

The majority of the interviewees of each type of humanities course favored the allocation of more time to the humanities courses in the general-education programs of the subject colleges. The general-course interviewees felt that more time was needed to appropriately teach a minimum of content. The separate-course teachers favored enlarged requirements, as well as increased time to prevent the bypassing of certain disciplines by student election or substitution.

No systematic attempts had been made to evaluate the humanities courses in the state colleges. The teachers could only point to personal experiences with particular students as a means of judging desirable outcomes. One college which had set up an experimental program was attempting a continuing evaluation study of the total general-education program and its courses. No evaluation reports were available at the time of the investigation.

The problem most frequently mentioned in the teaching of the

humanities courses was the limitation in the student's background, particularly his lack of reading skill and comprehension. Student attitude ranked second in the frequency of responses. Several teachers mentioned particularly the lack of serious purpose as a detrimental attitude. Class size was indicated most frequently as a major problem at colleges known to be crowded. Even in these colleges, however, class size was often indicated as secondary to the problem of student background. This shows a serious regard for the problem of student background, since it out-ranked in frequency of mention a problem that was known to be critical in several instances.

Communication among the humanities teachers of the various subject schools was nonexistent except for cursory conversation at teacher conventions. Better communication and coordination existed within the schools when the teachers were from a common department (as in the case of several separate literature courses) or when a common textbook or syllabus was used (as in the case of many general courses). A higher degree of communication and coordination was maintained in one college in which the humanities courses were organized on a departmental basis. A still higher degree of communication and coordination was present in another college which had established an administrative structure for the total general-education program. The humanities teachers of the latter college were more cognizant of the objectives of the total program and of the relation of their courses to these objectives than the teachers in the other subject schools. In other colleges the teachers of the general course were often unaware of two general-education courses in history that duplicated the content of the two general courses.

The interviewees supported the finding of the questionnaire concerning out-of-class activities under ideal conditions. Several of the interviewees expressed a need for an improvement of the cultural environment of the college campus. In their opinion this could be best accomplished by displaying objects of fine art in student gathering places and by bringing more artists, lecturers, and exhibitions to the campus.

Conclusions

1. Basic differences were present among the humanities courses that were offered as a part of the general-education programs of the six state colleges of Oklahoma. The most conspicuous difference was the division of the humanities offerings into two distinct types of courses--separate and general. Other important differences were present, some of which were corollary to the basic division of the humanities courses into two types.

   a. There were differences in the course offerings among the subject colleges. These differences also involved the hours of credit required in the humanities, the degree of student election, the kinds of courses allowed as substitutions, and the organizational patterns of the humanities.

   b. There were differences in the objectives of the separate and general courses. These differences often underlay statements of objectives that appeared similar. The objectives of the separate courses were directed, generally, toward the production of a practical-social person. The objectives of the general course were, for the most part, directed toward the production of the discriminating, individualized person.

   c. There were differences between the separate and general courses as to the approaches and integrative techniques that were employed.

   d. There were differences between the separate and general courses in regard to content. These differences concerned the emphases that were placed on forms, mediums, and periods; and on selected topics.

2. Likewise, basic similarities were present among the humanities courses of the subject colleges. Some of these similarities occurred despite the division of the humanities into two dissimilar types of courses.

   a. There were similarities in the purposes, setting, and clientele of the subject colleges; and in the preparation of the faculties for the teaching of the humanities.

   b. There were similarities between the separate and general courses and among the schools in the degree of emphasis placed upon the various disciplines of the humanities. In this connection literature received the greatest emphasis and philosophy the least.

   c. There were similarities in the methods, procedures, and practices of the teachers who teach the two types of courses. Since differences were present among the separate courses this indicated that the general-course teachers utilized many of the procedures of the various separate courses. These similarities occurred in planning, classroom procedures, out-of-class practices, and in testing.

   d. There was a similar--and sincere--desire on the part of the teachers of the humanities courses toward the improvement of themselves and their work by more knowledge of, and better communication with, other humanities teachers. Corollary to this, there was a great similarity in the lack of coordination and communication in the humanities among the subject colleges.

   e. There were similar problems confronting the humanities teachers in the subject schools. There was much agreement among these teachers as to how some of these problems may be solved.

Evaluation of the Techniques of the Present Study

The combination of techniques used for the collection of the data of the present study is suitable for other studies involving a comparison of courses which may be similar or diverse. The techniques complement and supplement each other and also provide a check against each other. The questionnaire was the least satisfactory of the three techniques

that were used. The special faults of the questionnaire in connection with the present study are as follows:

a. The questionnaire is difficult to construct when several courses which may be widely divergent in objectives, content, and procedures are involved.

b. The questionnaire may force an answer that is not precisely the answer that the respondent would give. (The questionnaire of this study showed similarities in the objectives of the two types of humanities course when actually there were finely divided differences.)

c. Data analyzed from a questionnaire may present a false picture of a given situation. (Data summarized in the form of averages caused the art and music courses to appear as survey courses when actually a variety of approaches was used.)

d. The designer of a questionnaire cannot anticipate all the necessary conditions and situations that may exist. (The teacher of an art course marked the content section as "not applicable" without noting that he taught an individualized course.)

e. The questionnaire cannot pursue an important issue nor follow up a unique condition. (The rigid frame of the questionnaire would not have expanded to obtain the important and useful data concerning a new experimental program being conducted at one of the state colleges.)

f. The questionnaire, if lengthy, cannot be successfully used to obtain data under a secondary frame of reference. (Most of the data concerning a hypothetical, ideal situation was rejected in the final report of the present study.)

A Recommendation

Evaluation was not a purpose of the present study, and evaluation was scrupulously avoided. The present study was ended with the presentation of the conclusions stated above. However, the investigator feels that the experience gained in making the study places him in a position whereby he is singularly qualified to make certain recommendations. Some of the recommendations that are to follow are

evaluative in nature, and as such are not, in all instances, supported by the findings of the study.

The time is probably overdue for a re-examination of the general-education programs in the state colleges. The original committee who framed the present program apparently grouped a number of courses, some quite specific in nature, into what they designated as a general-education program. Obviously the committee did not work from a previously determined set of carefully selected objectives. As a result the schools are at present teaching the same courses toward widely divergent objectives. It is, therefore, recommended that a new intercollegiate committee of interested and informed general-education people be constituted among the state colleges for the purpose of re-examining the present general-education programs and courses.

Further Recommendations for General Education

It is recommended that the colleges, each or together, consider the establishment of an administrative structure for their general-education programs. General education is a main division of all of the Oklahoma state colleges. But except for one college there is no operative administrative organization. Some type of organization should be effected to regulate, coordinate, and evaluate the program, and to promote intercommunication among the teachers.

It is recommended that each Oklahoma state college conduct faculty studies of general education. Such studies should be concerned with the needs, means, and ends of general education. The American College Testing program instituted in 1959 should be a help to all of the subject schools in identifying the general-education needs of their

clientele. These tests are oriented toward general education with a premium placed upon the student's ability to read, think, analyze, and determine relationships, rather than on the memorization of information. College studies should particularly examine means of improving the quality of student experiences. Evaluation and effective teaching procedures need also to be given special attention. Most important of all -- a basic philosophy of general education should be resolved to give meaning and guidance to the programs.

Further Recommendations for the Humanities

It is recommended that the Oklahoma state colleges consider a requirement of six to eight hours in the humanities. This should be prescribed in such a manner as to permit no elective escape or substitution on the part of the students. It is recommended also that the colleges give first consideration to the integrated type of course. In any case, the study of philosophy and music, minimized in some courses, should be increased and strengthened. The colleges should attempt to discover and employ broadly educated persons whose main task will be that of teaching the humanities.

It is recommended that the general-education divisions of the colleges make better use of their resources in planning for and providing qualitative experiences for the students. Each state college includes faculty members in the relevant specialized departments that can capably act as resource persons for interdisciplinary planning of the humanities syllabi, or as occasional guest lecturers, or artists.

It is recommended that the humanities teachers of the state colleges be given opportunities to study together and to compare their

purposes and procedures. A state-wide workshop would be indicated.

It is recommended that the colleges consider means to improve the cultural environment of the college community. Music and art should be more abundant in such places as the libraries, dining halls, lounges, and living quarters. In this latter connection it is recommended that the colleges and their respective cities consider plans to cooperate in forming a circuit so that more cultural events and professional artists might be brought to each at lower cost. An intercollegiate committee could choose and contract artists more economically for six engagements with relatively short distances to travel.

BIBLIOGRAPHY

Books

Agard, Walter Raymond, et al. The Humanities for our Time. Dubuque, Iowa: Wm. C. Brown Company, 1949.

American Council of Learned Societies. Liberal Education Re-examined. New York: Harper and Brothers, 1943.

Beesley, Patricia. The Revival of the Humanities in American Education. New York: Columbia University Press, 1940.

Bell, Bernard Iddings. Crisis in Education. New York: McGraw-Hill Book Company, Inc., 1949.

Benezet, Louis T. General Education in the Progressive College. New York: Bureau of Publications, Teachers College, Columbia University, 1943.

Blegen, Theodore C., and Russell M. Cooper, editors. Preparation of College Teachers. Washington, D. C.: American Council on Education, 1950.

Butler, Judson R., editor. Issues In Integration: The National Workshop of the Foundation for Integrated Education. New York: The Foundation of Integrated Education, Inc., 1948.

Carmichael, Oliver C. The Changing Role of Higher Education. New York: The Macmillan Company, 1949.

Central State College Bulletin: Catalog Issue, XLVI, No. 3. Edmond, Oklahoma: Central State College Press (July, 1957).

Cole, Luella. The Background for College Teaching. New York: Farrar & Rinehart, Inc., 1940.

Committee on the Cooperative Study on General Education, Cooperation in General Education. Washington, D. C.: American Council on Education, 1947.

Conant, James B. Education in a Divided World. Cambridge: Harvard University Press, 1948.

Cronkhite, Bernice Brown, editor. A Handbook for College Teachers. Cambridge: Harvard University Press, 1950.

Cross, Neal M., and D. L. Leslie. The Search for Personal Freedom. (in 2 vols.) Dubuque, Iowa: Wm. C. Brown Company, 1950.

Cunningham, William F. General Education and the Liberal College. St. Louis: B. Herder Book Co., 1953.

Deferrari, Roy J., editor. Integration in Catholic Colleges and Universities. Washington, D. C.: The Catholic University of America Press, 1950.

Derbigny, Irving Anthony. General Education in the Negro College. Stanford University, Palo Alto: Stanford University Press, 1944.

Donham, Wallace Brett. Education for Responsible Living. Cambridge: The Harvard University Press, 1944.

Drake, William E. The American School in Transition. New York: Prentice-Hall, Inc., 1955.

Dressel, Paul L., chairman. Comprehensive Examinations in a Program of General Education. East Lansing: Michigan State College Press, 1950.

_____, editor. Evaluation in General Education. Dubuque, Iowa: Wm. C. Brown Company, 1954.

_____, and Lewis B. Mayhew, Directors. General Education: Explorations in Evaluation. Washington, D. C.: American Council on Education, 1954.

_____, and John Schmid. An Evaluation of the Tests of General Educational Development. Washington, D. C.: American Council on Education, 1951.

Dunkel, Harold Baker. General Education in the Humanities. Washington, D. C.: American Council on Education, 1947.

East Central State College General Catalog: 1958-1960. Ada, Oklahoma: East Central State College (July, 1958).

Eby, Frederick, and Charles Flinn Arrowood. The Development of Modern Education. New York: Prentice-Hall, Inc., 1949.

_____. The History and Philosophy of Education Ancient and Medieval. New York: Prentice-Hall, Inc., 1949.

Eckert, Ruth E. Outcomes of General Education--An Appraisal of the General College Program. Minneapolis: The University of Minnesota Press, 1943.

Fine, Benjamin. Democratic Education. New York: Thomas Y. Crowell Company, 1945.

Fitzpatrick, Edward A. How to Educate Human Beings. Milwaukee: Bruce Publishing Company, 1950.

Forester, Norman. The Humanities and the Common Man. Chapel Hill, North Carolina: The University of North Carolina Press, 1946.

Fowlkes, John Guy, editor. Higher Education for American Society. Madison: The University of Wisconsin Press, 1949.

French, Sidney J., editor. Accent on Teaching-Experiments in General Education. New York: Harper and Brothers, 1954.

Graeffe, Arnold D. Creative Education in the Humanities. New York: Harper and Brothers, 1951.

Greene, Theodore M. Liberal Education Reconsidered. Cambridge: Harvard University Press, 1953.

_____, et al. Liberal Education Re-examined. New York: Harper and Brothers, 1943.

Grommon, Alfred H., editor. Continuity in Liberal Education. Report of the Fourth Annual Conference held by the Stanford School of Humanities. Palo Alto: Stanford University Press, 1946.

Gross, Chalmer A. Implementing Programs of General Education for Teachers. Oneonta, New York: American Association of Colleges for Teacher Education, 1953.

Guerard, Albert Leon. Education of a Humanist. Cambridge: Harvard University Press, 1957.

Hall, William Webster, Jr. The Small College Talks Back. New York: Richard R. Smith Publishers, Inc., 1951.

Harris, Julian, editor. The Humanities: An Appraisal. Madison: University of Wisconsin Press, 1950.

Harvard Committee. General Education in a Free Society: Report of the Harvard Committee. Cambridge: Harvard University Press, 1945.

_____. General Education in School and College. Cambridge: Harvard University Press, 1952.

Henderson, Algo D., and Dorothy Hall. Antioch College. New York: Harper and Brothers, 1946.

Henry, Nelson B., editor. The Fifty-first Yearbook of the National Society for the Study of Education, Part I: General Education. Chicago: The University of Chicago Press, 1952.

_____, editor. The Fifty-fourth Yearbook of the National Society for the Study of Education, Part I: Modern Philosophies and Education. Chicago: The University of Chicago Press, 1955.

Hillway, Tyrus. The American Two-Year College. New York: Harper and Brothers, 1958.

Hofstadter, Richard, and C. Dewitt Hardy. The Development and Scope of Higher Education in the United States. New York: Columbia University Press, 1952.

Hollinshead, Byron S., editor. Who Should Go to College. New York: Commission on the Financing of Higher Education, 1952.

Hook, Sidney. Education for Modern Men. New York: The Dial Press, Inc., 1946.

Horn, Francis H., editor. Current Issues in Higher Education, 1952. Washington, D. C.: Association for Higher Education, 1952.

_____., editor. Current Issues in Higher Education, 1953. Washington, D. C.: Association for Higher Education, 1953.

Hutchins, Robert Maynard. The Higher Learning in America. New Haven: Yale University Press, 1936.

Johnson, B. Lamar, editor. What About Survey Courses? New York: Henry Holt and Company, 1937.

_____. General Education in Action. Washington, D. C.: American Council on Education, 1952.

Johnson, Francis R., editor. The Humanities Chart Their Course. Report of the Second Annual Conference held by the Stanford School of Humanities. Palo Alto: Stanford University Press, 1944.

Johnson, Leighton H. Fostering General Education in the Community College. Professional Series Bulletin No. 14. East Lansing: Michigan State University, 1956.

Johnson, Roy Ivan., editor. Explorations in General Education. New York: Harper and Brothers, 1947.

Jones, Barbara. Bennington College. New York: Harper and Brothers, 1946.

Jones, Howard Mumford. Education and World Tragedy. Cambridge: Harvard Universty Press, 1946.

Kangley, Lucy, editor. Effective Practices in a Program of General Education. Dubuque: Wm. C. Brown Company, 1954.

Kelly, Fred J., editor. Improving College Instruction. Washington, D. C.: American Council on Education Studies, Series I. Reports of Committees and Conferences, No. 48, XV, 1951.

Leisy, Ernest E., editor. Integration of the Humanities and the Special Sciences. Dallas, Texas: University Press in Dallas, Southern Methodist University, 1948.

Levi, Albert William. General Education in the Social Studies. Washington, D. C.: American Council on Education, 1948.

Livingstone, Stir Richard William. Education and the Spirit of the Age. Oxford: Oxford University Press, 1952.

Lovinger, Warren C. General Education in the Teachers College. Oneonta, New York: American Association of Colleges for Teacher Education, 1948.

Mayhew, Lewis B., editor. General Education: An Account and an Appraisal. New York: Harper and Brothers, 1960.

Mayer, Frederick, and Frank E. Brower. Education for Maturity. Washington, D. C.: Public Affairs Press, 1956.

McDonald, Ralph W., editor. Charting the Course for American Higher Education. Washington, D. C.: Department of Higher Education, 1951.

_____, editor. Current Problems in Higher Education, 1947. Washington, D. C.: Department of Higher Education, 1947.

_____, editor. Current Trends in Higher Education, 1948. Washington, D. C.: Department of Higher Education, 1949.

_____, editor. Current Issues in Higher Education, 1950. Washington, D. C.: Department of Higher Education, 1950.

McGrath, Dorothy Leemon, editor. A Design for General Education - Reports of Committees and Conferences. Washington, D. C.: American Council on Education, 1944.

McGrath, Earl J., editor. Communications in General Education. Dubuque, Iowa: Wm. C. Brown Comapny, 1949.

_____, editor. The Humanities in General Education. Dubuque, Iowa: Wm. C. Brown Company, 1949.

_____, et al. Toward General Education. New York: The Macmillan Company, 1948.

Michigan State College, Department of Humanities. Humanities: A Syllabus. East Lansing: The Michigan State College Press, 1953.

Miller, Robert D., editor. General Education at Mid-Century: A Critical Analysis. Tallahassee: Florida State University, 1952.

Miel, Alice. Changing the Curriculum. New York: Appleton-Century - Crofts, Inc., 1946.

Millet, John D. Financing Higher Education in the United States. The Staff Report of the Commission on Financing Higher Education. New York: Columbia University Press, 1952.

Moore, John M. The Place of Moral and Religious Values in Programs of General Education. New Haven: Edward W. Haxen Foundation, 1952.

Morse, H. T., editor. General Education in Transition--A Look Ahead. Minneapolis: The University of Minnesota Press, 1951.

Northeastern State College. Announcements 1957-1958: Annual Bulletin. Tahlequah, Oklahoma: Northeastern State College, 1957.

Northwest Conference on General Education. Effective Practices in a Program of General Education. Dubuque, Iowa: Wm. C. Brown Company, 1954.

Northwestern State College. Biennial Catalog for 1958-1960. Alva, Oklahoma: Northwestern State College, 1958.

President's Commission on Higher Education. Higher Education for American Democracy. Vol. I: Establishing the Goals. New York: Harper and Brother, 1948.

Proceedings of the Northwest Conference on General Education. Bellingham, Washington: Western Washington College of Education, 1952.

Scherich, Millard. An Educational Philosophy of Reconciliation. (revised edition) Stillwater, Oklahoma: Oklahoma Agricultural and Mechanical College, 1953. 342 (Multilithed).

Smith, G. Kerry, editor. Current Issues in Higher Education, 1954. Washington, D. C.: Association for Higher Education, 1954.

_____, editor. Current Issues in Higher Education, 1955. Washington, D. C.: Association for Higher Education, 1955.

_____, editor. Current Issues in Higher Education, 1956. Washington, D. C.: Association for Higher Education, 1956.

_____, editor. Current Issues in Higher Education, 1957. Washington, D. C.: Association for Higher Education, 1957.

_____, editor. Current Issues in Higher Education, 1958. Washington, D. C.: Association for Higher Education, 1958.

_____, editor. Current Issues in Higher Education, 1959. Washington, D. C.: Association for Higher Education, 1959.

Smith, Houston. The Purposes of Higher Education. New York: Harper and Brothers, 1955.

Snarr, O. W., chairman. Implementing Programs of General Education for Teachers. Oneonta, New York: The Association of Colleges for Teacher Education, 1953.

Southeastern State College. Bulletin 1958-1960, XIX, No. 1. Durant, Oklahoma: Southeastern State College, 1958.

Southwestern State College. Quarterly Bulletin 1956-1958, XLII, No. 1. Weatherford, Oklahoma: Southwestern State College, 1956.

Stevens, David H. The Changing Humanities. New York: Harper and Brothers, 1953.

Stickler, W. Hugh, editor. Organization and Administration of General Education. Dubuque, Iowa: Wm. C. Brown Company, 1951.

_____, James P. Stoakes, and Louis Shores, editors. General Education: A University Program in Action. Dubuque, Iowa: Wm. C. Brown Company, 1950.

Taylor, Harold, editor. Essays in Teaching. New York: Harper and Brothers, 1950.

_____. On Education and Freedom. New York: Abelard-Schuman, 1954.

Tead, Ordway. The Roots of Teaching Power in the American Culture. New York: American Association of Colleges for Teacher Education, 1954.

Tyler, Ralph W., director. Cooperation in General Education: A Final Report of the Executive Committee of the Cooperative Study in General Education. Washington, D. C.: American Council on Education, 1947.

Umstattd, J. G. Teaching Procedures. Austin, Texas: The University Cooperative Society, Inc., 1954.

University of Chicago. An Introduction to the Arts: Humanities 1 Handbook. Chicago: The University of Chicago Press, 1950.

Valentine, P. F., editor. The American College. New York: Philosophical Library, Inc., 1949.

Van Doren, Mark. Liberal Education. New York: Henry Holt and Co., 1943.

Ward, F. Champion, editor. The Idea and Practice of General Education. Chicago: The University of Chicago Press, 1950.

Wynne, John P. General Education in Theory and Practice. New York: Bookman Associates, 1952.

Ziegfeld, Ernest. Art in the College Program of General Education. New York: Columbia University, Teachers College, Bureau of Publications, 1953.

Periodicals

Arragon, R. F. "The Contribution of the Humanities." Journal of General Education, IX (October, 1955), 11-16.

Bergman, George J. "Definitions of General Education." Educational Administration and Supervision, XXXIII (December, 1947), 460-68.

Berndston, Arthur. "General Courses in the Humanities." Journal of General Education, VII (October, 1952), 32.40.

_____. "The Nature of the Humanities." Journal of General Education, VII (July, 1952), 228-38.

Block, Haskell M. "The Humanities and General Education." Journal of Higher Education, XXV (December, 1954), 468-74.

Bushnell, John. "What Are the Changing Characteristics of the Undergraduate and What Do These Changes Mean for Programs of General Education?" Current Issues in Higher Education (1959), 137-42.

Carlin, Edward A. "How Are the Curricular, Teaching, and Personnel Problems Currently Facing Well-Established Programs of General Education Being Met?" Current Issues in Higher Education (1958), 174-82.

Carpenter, Marjorie. "General Education: In the Humanities What Courses Are Proving Most Effective?" Current Issues in Higher Education (1954), 192-97.

Denney, Reuel. "General Education: Integrative Approaches to Humanities, Social Science, and Natural Science." Current Issues in Higher Education (1956), 276-80.

Dressel, Paul L. "Problems in the Evaluation of General Education." Current Issues in Higher Education (1954), 278-82.

_____, and Lewis Mayhew. "A Basis for Integration In General Education." Educational Record, XXXV (July, 1954), 221-28.

Eddy, Edward D., Jr. "How May the Colleges Have A Greater and More Lasting Impact on Student Values?" Current Issues in Higher Education (1959), 250-55.

Faust, Clarence H. "The Humanities in the College Curriculum." Association of American Colleges Bulletin, XXXIX (March, 1953), 30-35.

Glicksberg, Charles I. "The Attack on Humanism." The Humanist, XIII, No. 5 (September-October, 1953), 212-19.

Goodwin, Leonard. "General Education Reconstructed." Journal of Higher Education, XXVIII (May, 1957), 251-56, 293-94.

Hardee, Melvene D. "General Education: In Personal and Social Adjustment What Types of Programs Are Proving Most Effective?" Current Issues in Higher Education (1954), 199-202.

Harkness, Donald R. "Can General Education Be General?" Journal of Higher Education, XXVIII (December, 1957), 493-97.

Hestenyi, L. J. "Who Will Teach the General Education Student?" Journal of Higher Education, XXIX (March, 1958), 141-48, 176.

Hoopes, Robert. "What Should Be the Shape of Things To Come in the Humanities Curriculum?" Current Issues in Higher Education (1959), 108-14.

Hutchinson, John A. and James A. Martin, Jr. "The Humanist Faith Today." The Humanist, XIV, No. 4 (July-August, 1954), 175-83.

Kaminsky, Jack. "Dewey's Defense of the Humanities." Journal of General Education, IX, No. 2 (January, 1956), 66-72.

Kendall, John D. "General Education: Humanities." Current Issues in Higher Education (1956), 204-10.

Leroy, Gaylord C. "Two Problems in General Education." Journal of Higher Education, XXIX (June, 1958), 301-08, 350-51.

Mayhew, Lewis B. "General Education: A Decade of Change." Journal of General Education, IX (January, 1956), 112-18.

_____. "General Education: Special Problems of Smaller Colleges." Current Issues in Higher Education (1956), 238-44.

McConnell, T. Raymond. "Problems Involved in Developing a Program of General Education." The Educational Record, XXVIII (January, 1946), 126-42.

Moore, Asher. "The Philosophy of General Education." Journal of Higher Education, XXVIII (February, 1957), 65-69, 115-16.

Organ, Troy W. "Integration in Higher Education." Journal of Higher Education, XXVI (April, 1955), 180-86.

Schilling, Harold K. "What Should Be the Balance Between Liberal and Specialized Education?" Current Issues in Higher Education (1955), 78-82.

Schwertman, John B. "General Education and Specialized Education: A New Notion About Their Relationship." Journal of General Education, IX (October, 1955), 54-59.

Stickler, W. Hugh "General Education: What Are the On-going Administrative Problems?" Current Issues in Higher Education (1954) 182-90.

Stickler, W. Hugh. "Senior Courses in General Education." Journal of Higher Education, XXX (March, 1954), 139-46.

_____. "Whence and Whither General Education?" Journal of Higher Education, XXVIII (April, 1957), 195-201, 235-36.

Thornton, James W., Jr. "What Are Some of the More Effective Ways of Starting and Appraising a Program of General Education?" Current Issues in Higher Education (1955), 296-302.

Wellemeyer, J. F., Jr., and Pauline A. Lerner. "Higher Education Faculty Requirements in the Humanities." School and Society, 78 (November 14, 1953), 145-52.

Unpublished Materials

Central State College, "Advanced General Humanities 213." A syllabus prepared by the Humanities Department, Central State College, Edmond, Oklahoma, 1958, pp. 8 (carbon copy.)

_____, "General Humanities 203: A Syllabus." Syllabus prepared by the Humanities Department, Central State College, Edmond, Oklahoma, (n.d.), pp. 4 (carbon copy).

_____, "Humanities 232: Art in Life: A Syllabus." Syllabus prepared by the Humanities Department, Central State College, Edmond, Oklahoma, (n.d.), pp. 3 (carbon copy).

_____, "Literature in Life 223: A Syllabus." Syllabus prepared by the Humanities Department, Central State College, Edmond, Oklahoma, 1958, pp. 2 (carbon copy).

_____, "Music in Life (A Syllabus)." A syllabus prepared by the Humanities Department, Central State College, Edmond, Oklahoma, 1951, pp. 5 (carbon copy).

_____, "Philosophy in Life 252: A Syllabus." A syllabus prepared by the Humanities Department, Central State College, Edmond, Oklahoma, (n.d.), pp. 6 (carbon copy).

Harlow, James Gindling. "An Inventory of Instructor's Judgments Concerning Programs in General Education." An unpublished Ph. D. dissertation, Graduate School, The University of Chicago, March, 1954, pp. 406 (Microfilmed).

Intercollegiate Curriculum Committee. "Recommendations for Curriculum Revision, Minimum Programs for Fulfilling 1953 Teaching Requirements, and Certain Changes in Courses Offered." January 16, 1952, pp. 12 (mimeographed).

Lutz, Louis, "A Comparative Study of Objectives, Content, and Methodology of Introductory Courses in Zoology." An unpublished Ed. D. dissertation, Graduate College, University of Oklahoma, 1952, pp. 180 (typed copy).

Northeastern State College, "General Humanities - First Course." A syllabus prepared for one general course, Northeastern State College, Tahlequah, Oklahoma, (n.d.), pp. 3 (memeographed).

_____, "General Humanities - Second Course." A syllabus prepared for one general course, Northeastern State College, Tahlequah, Oklahoma, (n.d.), pp. 3 (mimeographed).

_____, "General Humanities - Second Course." A syllabus prepared for one general course, Northeastern State College, Tahlequah, Oklahoma, (n.d.), pp. 3 (mimeographed).

Northwestern State College, "Humanities 223 - Introduction to Literature." A syllabus prepared by English Department, Northwestern State College, Alva, Oklahoma, 1959, pp. 14 (hectographed).

Oklahoma State University, Department of Humanities, "Humanities 214 Syllabus." A general course syllabus prepared by the Humanities Department, Oklahoma State University, Stillwater, Oklahoma, September, 1957, pp. 61 (multilithed).

_____, "Humanities 224 Syllabus." A general course syllabus prepared by the Humanities Department, Oklahoma State University, Stillwater, Oklahoma, September, 1957, pp. 58 (multilithed).

_____, "Humanities 214." A schedule of reading assignments prepared by the Humanities Department, Oklahoma State University, Stillwater, Oklahoma, 1958, pp. 4 (multilithed).

_____, "Humanities 224." A schedule of reading assignments prepared by the Humanities Department, Oklahoma State University, Stillwater, Oklahoma, 1958, pp. 4 (multilithed).

Rodgers, James F, "The Structure of American Higher Education." A paper read before the Southwestern Philosophy of Education Society, Austin, Texas, November 18, 1955.

Southeastern State College, "Humanities 203 Outline." A syllabus prepared jointly by several departments. Southeastern State College, Durant, Oklahoma, (not dated but used from 1950 to 1952 in a general course taught by several specialists), pp. 77 (mimeographed).

_____, "Syllabus - Humanities 203." A syllabus prepared by the English Department, Southeastern State College, Durant, Oklahoma, (n.d.), pp. 5 (typed copy).

Southeastern State College, "Syllabus - Humanities 213." A syllabus prepared by the English Department, Southeastern State College, Durant, Oklahoma, (n.d.), pp. 6 (typed copy).

Southwestern State College Faculty, "An Institutional Study on General Education." A study completed by the Southwestern State College Faculty, Weatherford, Oklahoma, 1957, pp. 97 (multilithed).

Southwestern State College, "Integrated Humanities 133." A syllabus prepared by the humanities teachers, Southwestern State College, Weatherford, Oklahoma, (n.d.), pp. 14 (hectographed).

_____, "143 Integrated Humanities." A syllabus prepared by the humanities teachers, Southwestern State College, Weatherford, Oklahoma, (n.d.), pp. 12 (multilithed).

Webster, Samuel Omer, "Science in General Education at the Oklahoma State Colleges." An unpublished Ed. D. dissertation, Graduate College, University of Oklahoma, 1958, pp. 335 (microfilmed).

APPENDIXES

Northeastern State College

Tahlequah, Oklahoma

March 20, 1948

Oklahoma State Regents for Higher Education
State Capitol
Oklahoma City, Oklahoma

Gentlemen:

The College Presidents of Oklahoma state colleges are submitting on behalf of their curriculum committee the following changes in the curriculum of the colleges for your consideration and action:

1. A new program in general education, broadening the various fields to conform to more recent developments in general education in colleges.

2. The addition and deletion of certain courses to implement the general education program.

3. A change in our entrance requirement, which provides for high school graduation and which is in keeping with other standard colleges.

Respectfully submitted,

For the COUNCIL OF COLLEGE PRESIDENTS

By: W. Harvey Faust

John Vaughn

EXPLANATORY MEMORANDUM

Proposed Revised Requirements in General Education

Oklahoma State Colleges

3-16-48

The proposed revision of the general education program in the first two years of the four-year degree course reflects certain desirable modifications of the program which has remained virtually unchanged since its adoption in 1935. No radical changes are involved. The purpose is to effect adjustments which will assure a better balanced coverage of the principal areas of social science, natural science, and the humanities. The only new feature of the program is the humanities, in which a minimum of five to six semester credits work is prescribed. This area has not been distinctly represented heretofore in prescribed study, and it is believed that continued omission in this particular would not be defensible.

The proposed program is about 40 semester hours in extent, as compared with the present program of about 50 hours. The reduction represents principally the withdrawal of foreign language and higher mathematics from the general prescriptions. The experience of some twelve years use of the program which included these areas, plus consideration of typical programs in various other progressive colleges of our general type, provided basis for the conclusion that the objectives of the general education program in our institutions do not call for the requirement of this type of material for all students. It is best suited to differential prescription, or election, based on students' respective educational objectives and interests. It is contemplated that we soon shall be prepared to recommend establishment of a wider offering of basic general mathematics probably to be prescribed differentially on the basis of measured pre-college achievement.

The English requirement remains as it has been except that the course in Fundamentals of Literature has been withdrawn to be replaced, in a sense, by the literature component in the humanities unit.

The social science prescription is modified only to the extent that the study of the historical development of western civilization is reduced optionally to half its former extent, by elimination of the portion devoted to early civilization, with provision that instead of this latter course the student may choose courses in current social or economic problems, or geography.

The requirement in natural science has been modified to provide that some college study in both biological science and physical science

must be included by the student whose secondary school program has not included both. Heretofore the pattern has not been such as to make certain that the student would be introduced to all of the principal areas in science in either his high school or his college course.

Degree curricula have for some years been constructed so as to place the emphasis in the lower half of the course on general education, with the upper half being predominately advanced education, plus professional studies in the curricula in Education. It is believed that this plan is essentially valid, and no modification is contemplated. The new program simply represents an effort to improve the general education phase of the four-year course.

Because the new program involves some offerings which have not been heretofore afforded, and because it is desirable in the case of any basic change to have opportunity for its preliminary evaluation in actual operation, it is proposed that the revised general-education program be maintained for a year at least as an alternate with the present program. Students, thus, would be given the choice of pursuing either of the two plans. It is believed that this arrangement will submit to practicable administration, and will make possible the avoidance of complete embarkation upon a new pattern without opportunity first for trial and possible necessary adjustment based on experience.

Curriculum study in the state colleges is a standing co-ordinated function. Certain other early modifications in degree curricula are believed desirable, and it appears that agreements on recommendations in this respect will be reached within the next few months. Curricula must be kept responsive to changing social and professional needs, objectives must be subject to redefinition from time to time, and procedures must occasionally be redesigned. The changes proposed here are not revolutionary in any particular, but represent, in the view of the faculties of the various colleges affected, a needed adaptation to current educational principles.

OKLAHOMA STATE COLLEGES
PROPOSED REVISED REQUIREMENTS IN GENERAL EDUCATION
(Alternate with present requirements - Curriculum Group I)
Degree Curricula in Arts and Sciences, and Education
(Explanatory memorandum attached) 3-16-48

ENGLISH . . . . . 6 hours
English Composition 103 and 113

HUMANITIES . . . . . 5-6 hours
1. 203, 213, General Humanities, 6 hrs.

or

2. In two or more of the following area courses, five hours or more:
   a. Humanities 223, Introduction to Literature, 3 hours
   b. Humanities 232, Art in Life, 2 hours

c. Humanities 242, Music in life, 2 hours
d. Humanities 252, Introduction to Philosophy, 2 hours, or one of the following: 203 General Psychology, 213 Mental Hygiene, 223 Social Psychology; 3 hours

SOCIAL SCIENCE . . . . . minimum 12 hours
1. American History and Government, 6 hours
2. History 113, Modern Western Civilization (See 103 below), 3 hours
3. In one or more of following, 3 hours or more:
   a. History 103, Early Western Civilization (If selected, should be taken before 113, above.), 3 hours
   b. Economics 222, Economic Problems, 2 hours
   c. Sociology 213, Social Problems
   d. History 121, Contemporary Affairs, 1 hour (may be repeated)
   e. Geography: Any course not exclusively physical, 2 or 3 hours

NATURAL SCIENCE . . . . . 8 hours
1. General Physical Science 104, 4 hours
   a. The student who has completed 1 unit or more in high school chemistry or physics may elect to take, instead of Physical Science 104, 4 hours or more in any other courses in natural science, or 3 to 4 hours in mathematics. (If mathematics is taken here instead of science, the science must be taken later by students qualifying for the life elementary teacher's certificate, which requires eight hours of science.)
   b. The student who is to major or minor in chemistry or physics in his college course, or who for other reasons will complete 4 hours work or more in either subject, may omit Physical Science 104, if considered feasible by his curriculum counsellors.
2. General Biology 104, 4 hours
   a. The student who has completed 1 unit or more in high school biological science may elect to take, instead of General Biology 104, 4 hours or more in any other courses in natural science.
   b. The student who is to major or minor in biology in his college course, or who for other reason will complete 4 hours or more in introductory courses of a more limited nature in biology, such as General Zoology or General Botany, may omit General Biology 104 if considered feasible by his curriculum counsellors.

HEALTH AND PHYSICAL EDUCATION . . . . . 6 hours
Personal Hygiene 102 . . . . . 2 hours
Physical Education (Exemptions according to current regulations) . . . . . 4 hours

FRESHMAN ORIENTATION 101 . . . . . 1 hour

(Remainder of Freshman and Sophomore work is in major field, and electives.)

Required Authorizations in Course Offerings

NEW COURSES:

Humanities 203-213 General Humanities — 6 hours
Study of significant ideas of Western man as manifest in art, music, literature, and philosophy

Humanities 223 Introduction to Literature — 3 hours
An area course identical in objectives respecting literature, with General Humanities 203-213

Humanities 232 Art in Life — 2 hours
An area course identical in objectives respecting art, with General Humanities 203-213

Humanities 242 Music in Life — 2 hours
An area course identical in objectives respecting music, with General Humanities 203-213

Humanities 252 Introduction to Philosophy — 2 hours
An area course identical in objectives respecting philosophy, with General Humanities 203-213

History 121 Contempory Affairs — 1 hour
Study of significant social, economic, and political developments and problems. (The course may be repeated.)

General Physical Science 104 — 4 hours
A lecture-demonstration course designed to assist the student to interpret his physical environment. A study of important topics in astronomy, chemistry, geology, and physics.

CHANGES IN COURSES:

Psychology 213 Mental Hygiene
Delete "Prerequisite Psy. 203"

Economics 222 Economic Problems
Delete "Prerequisite Econ. 213"

Biology 103 General Biology
Change number to 104, and credit value to four hours.

Note: These regulations and requirements for the six colleges approved February 29, 1952, at joint meeting of Council of Presidents and intercollege curriculum committee, and are in harmony with basic regulations of broad, general nature adopted by Oklahoma State Regents April 26, 1952.

RESOLUTION NO. _____

A RESOLUTION REGULATING THE CURRICULA OF THE SIX STATE COLLEGES LOCATED AT ADA, ALVA, DURANT, EDMOND, TAHLEQUAH AND WEATHERFORD; PRESCRIBING REQUIREMENTS FOR GRADUATION THEREFROM; AUTHORIZING THE ISSUANCE OF CERTAIN DEGREES THROUGH THESE COLLEGES; AND REGULATING COURSES TO BE OFFERED THEREIN.

Be it resolved by the Oklahoma State Regents for Higher Education:

. . . .

General education requirements for curricula in Arts and Sciences (BA and BS Degrees) and in Education (BA Ed and BS Ed Degrees)

Section 2. The minimum general education requirements for curricula in Arts and Sciences (BA and BS Degrees) and in Education (BA Ed and BS Ed Degrees) in the six state colleges, shall be as follows:

A. Freshman Orientation . . . . . 1 hour

B. English: Grammar and composition 6 hours and elective literature or speech, 2 hours. Elective not required if Humanities 223 or 203-213 completed.

C. Science and Mathematics . . . . . 7 or 8 hours
8 hours science to be required of every student, to include both biological and physical science, except that student having had either kind (other than general science) in high school may elect to take all college science in the other field, or student having had physical science in high school may fulfill the requirement by taking at least four hours science and three hours mathematics.

D. Social Studies . . . . . 9 hours
American history and government six hours, and other social science three hours.

E. Health 2 hours and Physical Education 4 hours . . . . . 6 hours
Requirement and exemptions in physical education: Freshmen and sophomores are required to take physical education during these two years, or until four hours credit has been earned, except that the following students are exempt: (1) married women irrespective of age, (2) all students not less than twenty-five years of age at the beginning of the semester or term in question, (3) any student whose physical condition makes it inadvisable or impossible that he take the work, as attested by designated authority. Exemptions other than physical disability do not apply in any case in which the student has failed to take physical education as required prior to that time. Likewise, a student who reaches junior or senior standing without having fulfilled the requirement is required to take sufficient physical education to complete same, unless his physical condition will not permit.

A student entering from another college as freshman or sophomore is required to take physical education at the rate of a one-hour course each semester or term until he reaches junior rank, or earns four hours credit. A student entering as junior or senior is not required to take additional physical education.

F. Humanities . . . . . 5 or 6 hours
General Humanities 203-213, or 5-6 hours in two of: (a) Humanities 223 Introduction to Literature, (b) Humanities 232 Art in Life, (c) Humanities 242 Music in Life, (d) one of: Humanities 252 Philosophy in Life, Psychology 203 General Psychology, Psychology 213 Mental Hygiene, Sociology 223 Social Psychology.

G. Five hours in a foreign language or in two or more of the following: mathematics, psychology, fine arts (art, music, speech arts), practical arts (agriculture, business, home economics, industrial arts) . . . . . 5 hours

H. Additional work in areas B-G above, to make total 50 hours. In accord with state teacher certification requirements, in the education curriculum ten hours work in general education may apply on the major also, and vice versa.

. . . .

APPENDIX B

LETTER OF TRANSMITTAL
IN REFERENCE TO THE CONDUCT OF A PRETEST

APPENDIX

QUESTIONNAIRE ON THE HUMANITIES COURSES IN THE GENERAL-EDUCATION PROGRAMS OF THE OKLAHOMA STATE COLLEGES[1]

GENERAL INSTRUCTIONS FOR THE QUESTIONNAIRE ON THE HUMANITIES COURSES IN GENERAL EDUCATION

This questionnaire is designed to obtain data concerning the content, methodology, and objectives of the humanities courses that are intended to fulfill the general education requirements in the Oklahoma state colleges. The questionnaire is composed of four main parts listed alphabetically as follows: A. Content, B. Methodology, C. Objectives, and D. Personal Information.

Section A on Content is to be filled out for each course that you teach, but not for each section of a course. Thus, if you teach Humanities 203 and 213 Section A should be completed for each of these courses. If, however, you teach three sections of 213 it is assumed that content will not vary and Section A should be completed only once.

Sections B, C, and D should be completed only once regardless of the number of courses that you teach. It is assumed that your methodology and objectives will show little variance from

---

[1] The original questionnaire was duplicated on 14-inch paper. In this appendix the original page numbers are indicated in the right hand margin.

course to course, as indicated by a questionnaire that asks for generalizations.

The items of this questionnaire, especially those concerning content, may omit many things that you consider important. You are encouraged and urged to make additions at the end of each section in the places provided. Use the backs of the sheets if there is not enough space for your additional listings and comments. Such listings and comments may be of greater value than the direct answers to questions.

There is no intent on the part of this investigator toward impertinent inquisitiveness relative to the content or conduct of your class work. All answers will be held in confidence. Evaluation is not the purpose of this study, and neither schools nor teachers will be judged as to the quality of their work. The study will, however, attempt to describe what is being done at each school and may point out unique practices or materials that may be of interest to all teachers of the humanities.

QUESTIONNAIRE ON THE HUMANITIES

SECTION A

COURSE CONTENT

I. Content of the General Courses (Humanities 203-213)

Circle the number of this course. 203, 213 (Note: If you teach both courses please answer on separate sheets for each course.)

1. Approximate, by circling to the nearest tenth, the fractional portion of time within the classroom that is devoted to the study of each of the following:

   a. Literature (not including philosophical or historical writing) 1 2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9

   b. Philosophy 1 2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9

   c. Music 1 2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9

   d. Art (Graphic and plastic including architecture) 1 2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9

   e. History or historical writing (not included as literature) 1 2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9

   f. Science (scientific theory, discoveries, etc.) 1 2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9

II. Content of the General Courses (Humanities 203 and 213) and the Literature Course (Humanities 222 and 223.)

Circle the number of this course. 203, 213, 222, 223 (Note: Fill out separate sheets for each of the above courses that you teach.)

1. Approximate, by circling to the nearest tenth, the fractional portion of the total time during the semester that is allocated to each of the following forms: (In 203 and 213 consider the total time devoted to literature as ten tenths.)

   a. Poetry (Non-dramatic) 1 2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9

   b. Non-Fictional prose (essays, criticism, biography, etc.) 1 2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9

   c. Fictional prose 1 2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9

   d. Drama 1 2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9

2. Approximate, by circling, the number of hours in the classroom devoted to the study of each of the following: (M=more than 6 hours.)

   a. Survey of Literary types . . . . . 1 2 3 4 5 6 M

   b. Homer . . . . . 1 2 3 4 5 6 M

c. The Bible . . . . . 1 2 3 4 5 6 M

d. The Greek Dramatists . . . . . 1 2 3 4 5 6 M

e. The Roman Poets . . . . . 1 2 3 4 5 6 M

f. Dante . . . . . 1 2 3 4 5 6 M

g. Chaucer . . . . . 1 2 3 4 5 6 M

h. Malory . . . . . 1 2 3 4 5 6 M

i. Shakespeare . . . . . 1 2 3 4 5 6 M

j. Edmund Spenser . . . . . 1 2 3 4 5 6 M

k. Milton . . . . . 1 2 3 4 5 6 M

l. Other English Poetry (excluding modern) . . . . . 1 2 3 4 5 6 M

m. Other English Prose (fictional or non-fictional but excluding modern) . . . . . 1 2 3 4 5 6 M

II. Content of the General Courses and the Literature Course (continued).

n. American Poetry (excluding modern) . . . . . 1 2 3 4 5 6 M

o. American Prose (fictional or non-fictional but excluding modern) . . . . . 1 2 3 4 5 6 M

p. Russian Literature . . . . . 1 2 3 4 5 6 M

q. German Literature . . . . . 1 2 3 4 5 6 M

r. French Literature . . . . . 1 2 3 4 5 6 M

s. Spanish Literature . . . . . 1 2 3 4 5 6 M

t. Modern American or English Novels . . . 1 2 3 4 5 6 M

u. Modern American or English Poetry . . . 1 2 3 4 5 6 M

v. Modern American or English Drama . . . . 1 2 3 4 5 6 M

List below any other personalities or subjects to which two or more hours of class work are devoted and give the approximate number of hours. List these even though they may already be included within some broad category given below.

Subject:	No. of hours:

III. Content of the General Courses (Humanities 203 and 213) and the Art Course (Humanities 232).

Circle the number of this course. 203, 213, 232 (Note: Fill out separate sheets for each of the above courses that you teach.)

1. Approximate, by circling to the nearest tenth, the fractional portion of time during the semester that is allocated to each of the following forms: (In 203 and 213 consider the total time devoted to art as ten tenths.)

a. Architecture 1 2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9

b. Sculpture and carving 1 2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9

c. Paintings and drawings 1 2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9

d. Printing and Graphic arts. (Serigraphy, lithography, etching, wood cuts, etc.) 1 2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9

e. Other forms and mediums (Inlay, mosaic, stained glass, textiles, pottery, jewelry, etc.) 1 2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9

2. Approximate, by circling, the number of hours in the classroom devoted to the study of each of the following: (M = more than 6 hours).

a. Fundamentals of art . . . . . 1 2 3 4 5 6 M

b. Ancient art and architecture (Egyptian, Mesopotamian, Aegean, Etruscan, etc.) . . . . . 1 2 3 4 5 6 M

c. Classical art and architecture (Hellenic, Hellenistic, Roman) . . . . . 1 2 3 4 5 6 M

d. Medieval art and architecture (Early Christian, Byzantine, Romanesque, Mohometan, Gothic, Oriental, etc.) . . . . 1 2 3 4 5 6 M

e. Renaissance, Baroque, and Rococo art in Italy (14th to 19th centuries) . . . . 1 2 3 4 5 6 M

f. Renaissance, Baroque, and Rococo art in Flanders, Germany and Holland . . . . . 1 2 3 4 5 6 M

g. Renaissance, Baroque, and Rococo art in England, France, and Spain . . . . . 1 2 3 4 5 6 M

h. Modern and recent painting in France . . . 1 2 3 4 5 6 M

i. Modern and recent painting in Europe outside France . . . . . 1 2 3 4 5 6 M

j. Modern and recent painting in America . . 1 2 3 4 5 6 M

k. Modern Sculpture . . . . . 1 2 3 4 5 6 M

l. Modern Architecture . . . . . 1 2 3 4 5 6 M

3. List below any other individuals or subjects to which two or more hours of classwork are devoted and give the approximate hours. Especially list individuals and subjects even though they may be included in some broad category above.

Subject:	No. of hours:

IV. Content of the General Courses (Humanities 203, 213) and the Music Course (Humanities 242).

Circle the number of this course. 203, 213, 242 (Note: Fill out separate sheets for each of the courses you teach.)

1. Approximate, by circling to the nearest tenth, the fractional portion of time during the semester that is allocated to each of the following forms: (In 203 and 213 consider total time devloted to music as ten tenths.)

   a. Sonatas, symphonies, or concertos 1 2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9

   b. Opera, ballet, oratorios, cantatas, and other dramatic and/or theatrical music 1 2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9

   c. Vocal music (Chants, canticles, hymns, masses, motets, madrigals, songs, etc.). 1 2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9

   d. Dances, (galliards, pavane, minuets, mazurkas, waltzes, etc.) 1 2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9

   e. Folk music and primitive music 1 2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9

   f. Jazz 1 2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9

2. Approximate, by circling, the number of hours in the classroom devoted to the study of each of the following: (M = more than 6 hours).

   a. Music fundamentals, forms, instruments, and/or vocabulary . . . . . 1 2 3 4 5 6 M

   b. Medieval music (Gregorian chants, organum, the Troubadours, Trouveres, and Minnesingers, etc.) . . . . . 1 2 3 4 5 6 M

   c. Renaissance and Baroque Music (Des Pres, Palestrina, di Lasso, Monteverdi, Purcell, et al.) . . . . . 1 2 3 4 5 6 M

   d. Johann Sebastian Bach . . . . . 1 2 3 4 5 6 M

   e. Franz Joseph Haydn . . . . . 1 2 3 4 5 6 M

   f. Wolfgang Amadeus Mozart . . . . . 1 2 3 4 5 6 M

   g. Ludwig van Beethovan . . . . . 1 2 3 4 5 6 M

h. Franz Schubert . . . . . 1 2 3 4 5 6 M

i. Richard Wagner . . . . . 1 2 3 4 5 6 M

j. Giuseppe Verdi . . . . . 1 2 3 4 5 6 M

k. Johannes Brahms . . . . . 1 2 3 4 5 6 M

l. Modern or recent European composers (Tschaikowsky, Debussy, Stravinsky, Ravel, Bartok, et al.) . . . . . 1 2 3 4 5 6 M

m. Popular American music (Herbert, Gershwin, Kern, et al.) . . . . . 1 2 3 4 5 6 M

n. Serious American Music (Copland, Harris Cowell, Menotti, et al.) . . . . . 1 2 3 4 5 6 M

3. List below any other personalities or subjects to which two or more hours of classwork are devoted and give the approximate number of hours. List these even though they may be already included within some broad category given above. Use the back of this page if needed.

Subject:	No. of Hours:
_____	_____
_____	_____
_____	_____

Page 7

V. Content of the General Courses (Humanities 203, 213) and the Philosophy Course (Humanities 252).

Circle the number of this course. 203, 213, 252 (Note: Fill out separate sheets for each of the above courses that you teach.)

1. Approximate, by circling to the nearest tenth, the portion of time that is devoted to each of the following. (In 203 and 213 consider total time spent on philosophy as ten tenths.)

a. Greek Philosophy 1 2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9

b. Medieval Philosophy 1 2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9

c. Philosophers of the 17th, 18th and 19th centuries (Bacon to Spencer) . 1 2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9

d. Philosophers and philosophies of the 20th century 1 2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9

2. Approximate, by circling, the number of hours in the classroom devoted to the study of each of the following. (M = more than 6 hours).

a. Fundamentals and vocabulary of philosophy . . . . . 1 2 3 4 5 6 M

b. Plato (and Socrates) . . . . . 1 2 3 4 5 6 M

c. Aristotle . . . . . 1 2 3 4 5 6 M

d. St. Augustine . . . . . 1 2 3 4 5 6 M

e. Thomas Aquinas . . . . . 1 2 3 4 5 6 M

f. Francis Bacon . . . . . 1 2 3 4 5 6 M

g. Rene Descartes . . . . . 1 2 3 4 5 6 M

h. Baruch Spinoza . . . . . 1 2 3 4 5 6 M

i. John Locke . . . . . 1 2 3 4 5 6 M

j. Immanuel Kant . . . . . 1 2 3 4 5 6 M

k. Arthur Schopenhaur . . . . . 1 2 3 4 5 6 M

l. Auguste Comte . . . . . 1 2 3 4 5 6 M

m. Kark Marx . . . . . 1 2 3 4 5 6 M

n. Herbert Spencer . . . . . 1 2 3 4 5 6 M

o. John Dewey . . . . . 1 2 3 4 5 6 M

p. Bertrand Russell . . . . . 1 2 3 4 5 6 M

3. List below any other individuals or subjects to which two or more hours of class work are devoted. Give the approximate number of hours. Use back of this page if needed.

Subject:	No. of hours:

SECTION B
METHODOLOGY

I. Preplanning and preparation

1. Circle the number of this course. 203, 213, 222, 223, 232 (Note: Fill out separate sheets for 242, 252 for each course taught.)

In the following, please place a check in Column S (for status) after each practice you now follow. In column P (for preference) check the practice that you would follow if circumstances permitted.

1. The planning for the course is done
   a. In advance for the total course
   b. Day by day
   c. Week by week
   d. Unit by unit or topic by topic
   e. In a flexible manner which is developed as the "needs" or "interests" of the class are revealed
   f. Other methods (please describe briefly)

S	P

S	P

2. Planning for the course
   a. Is done by the teacher alone
   b. Is done by a committee or the department staff
   c. Is done by the teacher with the students
   d. Consists of adhering more or less rigidly to a textbook
   e. Consists of the flexible use of a textbook with frequent deviations from its order or content
   f. Other (please describe briefly) This space may also be used to elaborate on any of the above statements.

S	P

3. Models and materials are selected according to which of the following criteria:
   a. They provide a view of the thought or spirit of a particular age
   b. They are applicable to issues faced in modern living
   c. They are intelligible and interesting to the students
   d. They challenge the intellect of the student
   e. They have been pronounced by authorities as classic examples
   f. They are readily available (in the library, source or textbooks, etc.)
   Add others if you wish.

II. Classroom procedure

Circle the number of this course. 203, 213, 222, 223, 232, 242, 252. (Note: Fill out separate sheets for each course you teach.)

1. Approximate by circling to the nearest tenth the fractional portion of total class time spent during the semester in the following activities.

a. Formal or uninterrupted lecture 1 2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9

b. Informal lecture (a conversational presentation interspersed with questions, comment, and brief discussions) 1 2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9

c. Discussion (extended exchange of ideas stimulated by the instructor) . . 1 2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9

d. Group work (division of class into groups to work, discuss, or study) . . . 1 2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9

e. Laboratory (student application, practice, research, or work 1 2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9

f. Demonstration (objects or materials with verbal explanation or critique) . . 1 2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9

g. Audio-visual aids (films, slides, still pictures, recordings, charts, etc.) 1 2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9

h. Student reports (verbal presentation by student after special study) 1 2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9

i. Forums, panels, or debates 1 2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9

Other. Describe and indicate time spent.

2. If in No. 1 (above) you would allocate your time in different fractional portions under conditions (class size, equipment, facilities) that you would consider most favorable, please indicate this by marking an X through the proper numbers.

3. Approximate, by circling, the approximate number of hours of <u>class time</u> spent during the semester in the following activities. (M = means more than nine hours)

a. Viewing movies (silent or sound) . . 0 1 2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 M

b. Viewing slides or film strips . . . 0 1 2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 M

c. Viewing still pictures, charts, maps, or objects with or without verbalization. . . . . 0 1 2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 M

d. Live radio or television casts . . . 0 1 2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 M

e. Recorded radio broadcasts . . . . . 0 1 2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 M

f. Other recordings; tape, wire, or disc . . . . . 0 1 2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 M

g. Guest lecturers or instructors . . . 0 1 2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 M

h. Guest artists, musicians, or actors . 0 1 2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 M

i. Field trips to museums, concerts, plays, etc. . . . . 0 1 2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 M

4. If in No. 3 (above) your allocation of time would be different under the most favorable circumstances, please indicate this by marking an **X** through the proper numbers.

5. What procedures not listed above do you practice that you consider to be especially valuable?

Procedure	No. of hours

III. Out-of-class procedures

Circle the number of this course. 203, 213, 222, 223, 232. (Note: Fill out separate sheets 242, 252, for each course you teach.)

In the following, place a check in column S (for status) after each practice you now follow. In column P (for preference) check the practice you would follow if circumstances permitted.

	S	P
1. The out-of-class work required of each student is:		
a. Unsupplemented reading of a text book or other books purchased by the student		
b. Reading of a text book or other books purchased by the student supplemented by any of the following:		
c. Daily or weekly reading of assigned source materials		
d. Occasional readings of assigned source materials		
e. Reading of two or more complete books		
f. Reading of one complete book		

		S	P
g.	Term themes or research papers		
h.	Weekly shorter reports, papers, critiques, either oral or written		
i.	Occasional shorter reports, papers, critiques, either oral or written		
j.	Notebooks of collected material and/or student writing		
k.	Creative work by the student in the form of original prose or poetry		
l.	Creative work by the student in the form of original musical composition		
m.	Creative work by the student in the form of original plastic or graphic art		
n.	Collections of related current events		
o.	No work outside of class is required		

List any other out-of-class assignments.

Name below the title and author of the text book or other books purchased by the student for this course.

In the following out-of-class activities, list the number of each that is required of the students during the semester under column "S," and the number you would prefer that the students attend under ideal circumstances under the column "P."

2. Out-of-class activities that the students attend consist of:

	S	P
a. Lectures by local or visiting people		
b. Debates, forums, and panel discussions		
c. Amateur concerts and recitals		
d. Amateur plays and dramatic presentations (opera, operettas, ballet)		
e. Professional concerts		
f. Professional soloists or small ensembles (vocal, instrumental, dance, actors, etc.)		
g. Professional plays or dramatic presentations		
h. Visits to museums, exhibitions, displays, etc.		
i. Relevant and important moving pictures		
j. Relevant and important TV broadcasts		
k. Relevant and important radio broadcasts		

List others and their frequency.

3. Outside-of-class weekly reading assignments (including the text) in pages average about,

	S	P
a. None		
b. Less than 50		
c. 50-100		

S	P

d. 100-150

e. 150-200

f. 200-250

g. More than 250

IV. Testing and Evaluation

Circle the number of this course. 203, 213, 222, 223, 232, 242, 252.
(Note: Fill out a separate sheet for each course you teach.)

1. Approximate, by circling, the frequency during one semester that each of the following types of tests are used. M means more than 9 times; W means weekly (17 or 18 times); D means daily.

a. Essay or free answer . . . . . 0 1 2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 M W D

b. Multiple choice or best answer . . . . . 0 1 2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 M W D

c. Completion . . . . . 0 1 2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 M W D

d. True-false . . . . . 0 1 2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 M W D

e. Matching . . . . . 0 1 2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 M W D

f. Combined objectives (b, c, d, and/or e combined in any manner. 0 1 2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 M W D

g. Combined objective-essay (essay combined with b, c, d, and/or e.) . . . . . 0 1 2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 M W D

h. Other (describe and give frequency) . . . . . 0 1 2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 M W D

2. If under ideal circumstances (class size, time, materials, etc.) your preference differs from your present procedure draw an "X" through the preferred condition in No. 1 above.

3. Which of the above types is used for the final exam?

SECTION C

OBJECTIVES, APPROACHES, AND INTEGRATIVE TECHNIQUES

Circle the number of this course. 203, 213, 222, 223, 232, 242, 252
(Note: Fill out separate sheet for each course taught.)

I. OBJECTIVES

In the following list of objectives indicate the degree of emphasis that is at present being placed on each under status. Under preference indicate what degree of emphasis would be placed on each if ideal conditions prevailed. Circle the proper letter according to the following code:

G--Great emphasis is placed on this objective.
M--Moderate emphasis is placed on this objective.
S--Some emphasis is placed on this objective.
X--No emphasis is placed on this objective.

1. The objectives of the course are:	STATUS	PREFERENCE
a. To provide the student with a broader understanding of his cultural heritage.	G M S X	G M S X
b. To develop the student's abilities of critical analysis and judgment.	G M S X	G M S X
c. To make the student cognizant of the great issues of living that man has had to confront in the past and must face today.	G M S X	G M S X
d. To develop the student's interest in his own distinct creative abilities.	G M S X	G M S X
e. To develop a set of sound moral and spiritual values by which the student may guide his life.	G M S X	G M S X

	STATUS	PREFERENCE
f. To develop aesthetic values and an appreciation for the creative work of man.	G M S X	G M S X
g. To correct, eliminate, or supplant any undesirable fixed beliefs, attitudes, or emotional preferences of the student.	G M S X	G M S X
h. To develop the student's courage in expressing and standing firm in his own convictions.	G M S X	G M S X
i. To help the student in expressing his thought and ideas clearly through speaking and writing.	G M S X	G M S X
j. To help the student to observe, listen, and read with understanding and with an open mind.	G M S X	G M S X
k. To aid the student in living intelligently and fully under a democratic form of government.	G M S X	G M S X
l. List any other objectives upon which great emphasis is put.		

II. APPROACHES

2. Indicate by checking which of the following approaches toward achievement of objectives you now use under column "S." Indicate which you would prefer under ideal circumstances under "P." Check more than one if applicable. (Note: Some items below are probably not suited for the separate or specific courses in art, music, etc.)

	S	P
a. Historical-parallel: An historical or chronological arrangement of works or events in which the art, literature, music, and philosophy of each period are studied more or less simultaneously and together.		
b. Historical-separate: Each discipline is studied separately following an historical or chronological sequence.		
c. Random-parallel: Works and events of art, music, literature, and philosophy are chosen regardless of time to illustrate identical elements, parallel ideas, or other mutual relationships.		
d. Random-separate: Each discipline studied separately without regard for chronological order. Models often chosen at random to illustrate continuity of one idea or mode.		
e. Creative-approach: A study of fundamentals with emphasis on the student's own creative efforts. Models selected and introduced when needed. Art, literature, music, and philosophy may be studied either separately or parallel. Original work usually produced by student.		
f. Great books and masterpieces: Intensive study of great works as judged by authorities. May or may not be chronological and parallel.		
g. Regressive-approach: Starting with an interest in contemporary work, ideas, or modes and tracing their development backward in time.		
h. Other (describe)		

III. INTEGRATIVE PRINCIPLES OR TECHNIQUES

3. Indicate which of the following principles you now follow in the integration of subject matter vertically with life or horizontally with the curriculum. Check under column "S" for present practice and under column "P" for your preference under ideal circumstances. (Mark more than one if applicable.)

	S	P
a. Key concepts of philosophic or scientific thought.		
b. Association with historical events or affairs not necessarily chronological.		
c. A chronological framework.		
d. Association with cultural epochs.		
e. Emphasis upon one great idea or unifying principle (e.g., the creativeness of man, the Christian religion, etc.)		
f. Emphasis on more than one great unifying principle or trend of civilization.		
g. Correlation of similar ideas in the several areas of knowledge (e.g., realism, idealism, experimentalism.)		
h. Emphasis on the development of the student's own ability to analyze and evaluate.		
i. Emphasis on the student's knowing and accepting what is authoritatively known to be good.		
j. Dependence upon the student's own ability to synthesize fragmentary material.		
k. Add any other principles which you may follow or may prefer to follow.		

SECTION D

PERSONAL INFORMATION

Name of respondent_____

Years of college teaching experience, here_____other_____

Years of experience teaching the present humanities course_____

List by number the humanities courses that you teach with the average class load (for past 3 or 4 semesters) of each._____

_____

List any other courses that you now teach_____

List any other college subjects that you have taught in the past._____

_____

Undergraduate major (or majors)_____

Undergraduate minors_____

Graduate major_____Minor_____

If you have traveled in any foreign countries please list them._____

_____

If you have any avocations that you regularly pursue that aid you in teaching humanities, please list them._____

Please list any other experiences that have been valuable to you in teaching humanities._____

Circle one or more and indicate any particular forms, periods, or personalities that you especially prefer.

1. Art (modern painting, classical sculpture, etc.)

2. Literature (Victorian English poetry, Russian novelists, etc.)

3. Music (Modern symphonies, Italian opera, etc.)

4. Philosophy (Experimentalism, Aristotle, etc.)

APPENDIX D

THE INTERVIEW GUIDE

SUGGESTED QUESTIONS FOR INTERVIEWS ON THE HUMANITIES COURSES IN THE GENERAL EDUCATION PROGRAM

Do you feel that the humanities courses have proved to be an important need in the general education? Why?

Do you believe that the present courses of your school are the best means of giving a basic humanities education to your students? Why or why not?

Would you care to make any critical remarks about the various types of courses? (i.e., integrated courses taught by one teacher, integrated courses taught by several specialists, separate courses taught by specialists.)

The humanities courses are numbered as sophomore courses and are usually taken during the student's second year of work. Would you agree that this is the optimum time?

Can you cite any particular objective or objectives that you are attempting to accomplish in your humanities courses?

Which of the objectives of the general-education program of your school are best accomplished by means of the humanities courses? Which of the remaining objectives may be wholly or partly accomplished by the humanities courses?

Do you believe that the present requirement of five or six hours is sufficient in a program designed particularly for teachers? Are there any specialized programs that you believe would be helped by additional courses in the humanities?

Do you feel that you are accomplishing any real carry-over change in the behavior or attitudes of your students? Have you any evidence of this? (Such evidence might be found in changes in reading habits, attendance at cultural programs, visits to museums, exhibits, etc.)

What do you consider to be your greatest problem in the teaching of the humanities? (This might be class load, facilities, student level or background, student attitudes, etc.)

Have you made any comparisons of your course with other courses of the general-education program? Has this been done as an effort toward the integration of the program? Has it been done as an effort toward avoidance of duplication? What have been the results?

What non-college experiences have aided you most in the teaching of the humanities?

Would you care to describe any unique experiences, outcomes, or predictions that result from your teaching in the humanities?

Is there anything further that you would like to comment on that you feel would be significant to an investigation of the humanities courses in the framework of the general-education program?

APPENDIX E

LETTERS OF REFERENCE AND RECOMMENDATION ON BEHALF OF THE INVESTIGATION

STATE BOARD OF REGENTS OF OKLAHOMA COLLEGES
M. C. Collum, Executive Secretary
Room 321, Capitol Building
Oklahoma City, Oklahoma

February 16, 1959

Dr. James D. Morrison
Dean of Instruction
Southeastern State College
Durant, Oklahoma

Dear Dr. Morrison:

In a short time, Mr. Dave Stevens, Associate Professor of Physical Science, Southeastern State College, is beginning a research problem concerning the humanities courses in the general-education programs of the six state colleges. He plans to collect his data by means of both the questionnaire and interview techniques.

We are sure this is a worthwhile project and we will appreciate your cooperation and assistance in aiding him in securing this information.

With kindest personal regards, I am

Yours sincerely,

M. C. Collum
Executive Secretary

MCC:hb

SOUTHEASTERN STATE COLLEGE
Office of the President
Durant, Oklahoma
February 16, 1959

Dr. Max Chambers, President
Central State College
Edmond, Oklahoma

Dear Dr. Chambers:

Mr. Dave Stevens, a member of our faculty, will soon contact you in regard to a research study which he will be conducting this spring.

Mr. Stevens' study will pertain to the humanities courses in the general-education programs of our six state colleges. His study is descriptive rather than evaluative and one that, I believe, will be of interest and value to all our state schools.

I would consider it a personal favor if you would urge your faculty and administrative staff to aid him with this study.

Sincerely,

A. E. Shearer,
President

APPENDIX F

LETTERS OF TRANSMITTAL TO THE ADMINISTRATORS OF THE OKLAHOMA STATE COLLEGES IN REFERENCE TO THE INVESTIGATION

February 13, 1959

Dr. Jesse W. Martin, President
Northwestern State College
Alva, Oklahoma

Dear Dr. Martin:

I am writing to your Dean of Instruction for an acceptable date to visit your school. This visit will be for the purpose of ascertaining data concerning the humanities courses that are taught as a part of the general-education programs in our six state colleges. The study will be a description of the content, methodology, and objectives of these courses. It will not be an evaluative study.

I believe with sincerity that I will be able to produce a study that will be of interest and value to our state colleges. I am hoping, therefore, that my efforts will meet with your approval and encouragement.

Sincerely,

Dave Stevens
Assoc. Prof., Physical Science

February 13, 1959

Dr. Andy E. Clarke, Jr.
Dean of Instruction
Northwestern State College
Alva, Oklahoma

Dear Sir:

I am making a study of the humanities courses that are designated as requirements in the general-education programs of our six state colleges. This will be a descriptive study of the objectives, content, and methodology of such courses. In this study, no attempt will be made to evaluate these courses and programs, or to judge the methods or abilities of teachers. Data for this study will be collected by means of a questionnaire and by interviews with the teachers.

I plan, therefore, on making two visits to each college. During the first visit I should like to meet with all the humanities teachers to pass out the questionnaire and to give them a full explanation of the nature of the study. Also at this meeting I intend to arrange a time schedule for individual interviews during my second visit a week later. This meeting should take no longer than twenty minutes.

I realize that this is quite an imposition on the time of overloaded deans and teachers, but I hope in some measure to make a contribution to your program through an exchange of ideas.

As a matter of personal convenience and economy, I am trying to visit two schools on one trip. I should like, if possible, to visit your school on Friday, March 13. If this is acceptable will you please advise me at your earliest convenience?

Sincerely,

Dave Stevens
Assoc. Prof. Physical Science

APPENDIX G

CONTRIBUTORS TO THE STUDY: CONSULTANTS, RESPONDENTS, AND INTERVIEWEES

INTERVIEWS CONDUCTED IN CONNECTION WITH THE STUDY

Interviews with the Body of Critics on the Construction and Suitability of the Questionnaire

Interviews conducted at the University of Oklahoma at Norman, Oklahoma, on November 6, 12, and 20, 1958.

Dr. William Richard Hargrove,
Assistant Professor of Education.

Dr. Edward Clarence McReynolds,
Professor of History.

Dr. John Wesley Morris,
Professor of Geography and Associate Director,
Institute of Community Development.

Mr. Samuel Olkinetsky,
Director of the University of Oklahoma
Museum of Art.

Dr. Donnell MacClure Owings,
Associate Professor of History.

Dr. Glenn R. Snider,
Associate Professor of Education and
Director of Teacher Education.

Interviews conducted at the Oklahoma State University of Agriculture and Applied Science at Stillwater, Oklahoma, on November 7, 11, and 21, 1958.

Dr. Richard E. Bailey,
Professor of Foreign Languages and
Chairman of Humanities.

Dr. Agnes Mary Berrigan,
Professor of English.

Dr. Cyclone Covey
Assistant Professor of Music.

Dr. Millard S. Everett,
Professor of Philosophy.

Mr. George H. White,
Director of General Education.

Interviews in Connection with the Pretesting of the Techniques of Investigation

Interviews conducted at Connors State Agricultural College at Warner, Oklahoma, on December 5, and 12, 1958.

Dr. Jacob Johnson,
President of Connors State Agricultural College

Mr. A. B. Childress,
Dean, Connors State Agricultural College.

Mrs. Helen Kline,
Instructor in the Humanities and German.

Mrs. Marion Sanders Pantel,
Instructor in Music.

Mrs. Ruth M. White,
Instructor in Art.

Interviews for the Purpose of Collecting Information at the Subject Schools[1]

Interviews conducted at East Central State College at Ada, Oklahoma, on February 25, March 4, and 10, 1959.

Dr. Charles Franklin Spencer,
President, East Central State College.

Dr. Edward W. James,
Dean of Instruction.

Mr. William Harvey Faust,
Registrar.

Mr. Edwin Baker,*
Department of English.

Mrs. Emma Creagh Box,*
Department of Art.

Mr. Robert Wolcott Kaebnick,*
Department of Music.

Mr. Ben Lester Morrison,*
Department of English.

---

[1] Teachers who filled out questionnaires and who were interviewed with guide questions are marked with an asterisk (*).

Dr. Edward Houston Nelson,*
Department of Psychology.

Dr. James R. Shively,*
Department of English.

Dr. Ernest Benjamin Speck,*
Department of English.

Dr. William Rose Wray,*
Department of English.

(Note: East Central State College does not designate faculty by professorial rank or by departmental chairmen in recent bulletins.)

Interviews conducted at Central State College at Edmond, Oklahoma, on February 26 and March 5, 1959.

Dr. W. Max Chambers,
President, Central State College.

Dr. Joe C. Jackson,
Dean of the College.

Mr. E. Truman Wester,
Registrar.

Dr. Guy C. Chambers,*
Chairman, Division of Language Arts and Humanities.

Mrs. Herwanna Becker Barnard,*
Assistant Professor of English.

Mrs. Arteola Dew,*
Assistant Professor of Speech and Dramatic Arts.

Mr. Arthur Gaddis,*
Assistant Professor of English

Mrs. Bertha Hamill,*
Chairman, Department of Art.

Dr. Wendell E. Ralston,*
Assistant Professor of Piano and Organ.

Miss Pauline Ingram,*
Instructor in English.

Interviews conducted at Northwestern State College at Alva, Oklahoma, on March 12 and 18, 1959.

Dr. Andy E. Clarke, Jr.,
Dean of the College.

Miss Aurice Huguley,
Bursar-Registrar.

Dr. Marie Arthurs,*
Chairman, Department of English.

Dr. Myrna M. Boyce,*
Professor of History.

Miss Bess Chappell,*
Chairman, Department of Art.

Miss Ruth Marie Genuit,*
Chairman, Department of Music.

Miss Bennie Henry,*
Associate Professor of English.

Miss Gladys Jullian,*
Associate Professor of English.

Interviews conducted at Southwestern State College at Weatherford, Oklahoma, on March 11 and 19, 1959.

Mr. R. H. Burton,
President, Southwestern State College.

Dr. Donald Hamm,
Chairman, General Education Coordinating Committee.

Mrs. Millie Thomas,
Registrar.

Miss Myrle E. Kelley,*
Associate Professor of Art.

Miss Mary Elizabeth Griffin,*
Head, Department of Music.

Miss Mabel Owen,*
Assistant Professor of English.

Miss June Duncan,*
Assistant Professor of English.

Miss Katherine Rader,*
Assistant Professor of English.

Mr. Richard Taflinger,*
Associate Professor of Art.

Interviews conducted at Northeastern State College at Tahlequah, Oklahoma, on April 2, and 9, 1959.

Dr. Louis H. Bally,
Dean of Instruction.

Mr. Noble Bryan,
Registrar.

Miss Ruth Allison,*
Assistant Professor of Art.

Dr. William C. Evans,*
Associate Professor of History.

Dr. Howard Merle Farnsworth,*
Professor of Modern Language.

Dr. Henry W. Guenther,*
Professor of Psychology.

Mr. Wesley Hall,*
Assistant Professor of English.

Dr. Berte L. Kinkade,*
Professor of English.

Dr. Theo M. Nix,*
Professor of Music.

Interviews conducted at Southeastern State College at Durant, Oklahoma, on April 15, 22, and 23, 1959.

Dr. A. E. Shearer,
President, Southeastern State College.

Dr. James D. Morrison,
Dean of Instruction.

Mr. Sam O. Pool,
Registrar.

Miss Ruth Hatchett,*
Assistant Professor of English.

Dr. Margaret C. O'Riley,*
Assistant Professor of English.

Miss Mildred Riling,*
Associate Professor of English.

Dr. Eugene E. Slaughter,*
Professor of English.

Miss Isabel Work,*
Professor of Latin.

APPENDIX H

SUMMARIZED DATA ON THE TOPICAL CONTENT OF THE SEPARATE AND GENERAL HUMANITIES COURSES

TABLE 1

CONTENT OF THE SEPARATE HUMANITIES COURSES IN LITERATURE:
NUMBER OF HOURS DEVOTED TO SELECTED TOPICS

	Selected Topics	No. of responses to indicated hours								
		0	1	2	3	4	5	6	M	Avg.
a.	Survey of Literary Types	2	2	0	0	1	3	2	4	3.6[a]
b.	Homer	9	1	3	0	1	0	0	0	0.5
c.	The Bible	10	2	1	1	0	0	0	0	0.4
d.	The Greek Dramatists	0	1	2	1	4	1	1	4	3.9
e.	The Roman Poets	6	7	1	0	0	0	0	0	0.5
f.	Dante	11	2	1	0	0	0	0	0	0.2
g.	Chaucer	7	5	2	0	0	0	0	0	0.5
h.	Malory	13	1	0	0	0	0	0	0	0.1
i.	Shakespeare	3	5	2	2	2	0	0	0	1.3
j.	Edmund Spenser	8	5	1	0	0	0	0	0	0.3
k.	Milton	4	7	2	1	0	0	0	0	0.7
l.	Other English Poetry	0	0	1	4	1	0	0	8	5.0
m.	Other English Prose	3	1	2	0	2	0	2	4	3.4
n.	American Poetry	1	2	0	5	3	0	1	2	3.1
o.	American Prose	1	1	0	4	2	0	2	4	3.8
p.	Russian Literature	5	2	4	2	1	0	0	0	1.0
q.	German Literature	8	4	2	0	0	0	0	0	0.4
r.	French Literature	5	3	2	2	1	1	0	0	1.1
s.	Spanish Literature	11	3	0	0	0	0	0	0	0.1
t.	Modern American or English Novels	12	0	0	2	0	0	0	0	0.2
u.	Modern American or English Poetry	1	3	3	2	1	0	1	3	3.0
v.	Modern American or English Drama	2	3	2	3	2	0	2	0	2.0
	Number of respondents = 14[b]							Total hours		35.1

[a]Averages based on adjustment of 3 hour classes to 2 semester hour basis. M assigned a value of 8 hours.

[b]One respondent marked this section of the questionnaire as "not applicable."

TABLE 2

LITERATURE CONTENT OF THE TWO GENERAL HUMANITIES COURSES
NUMBER OF HOURS DEVOTED TO SELECTED TOPICS

	Selected Topics	First Course (302 or 133) No. of responses to indicated hrs.								Avg.	Second Course (213 or 143) No. of responses to indicated hrs.								Avg.
		0	1	2	3	4	5	6	M		0	1	2	3	4	5	6	M	
a.	Survey of literary types	3	0	3	0	1	0	0	0	1.4	8	0	1	0	0	0	0	0	0.2
b.	Homer	1	1	1	0	1	0	1	2	4.1	9	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0.0
c.	The Bible	2	2	2	0	1	0	0	0	1.4	9	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0.0
d.	The Greek Dramatists	1	0	1	0	1	1	1	2	4.7	7	0	0	2	0	0	0	0	0.7
e.	The Roman Poets	1	1	0	2	0	1	1	1	3.7	9	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0.0
f.	Dante	2	1	1	2	0	0	1	0	2.1	8	0	0	0	0	0	0	1	0.9
g.	Chaucer	4	1	1	1	0	0	0	0	0.9	9	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0.0
h.	Malory	6	1	0	0	0	0	0	0	0.1	8	0	0	0	0	0	0	1	0.9
i.	Shakespeare	7	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0.0	5	0	0	0	3	1	0	0	1.3
j.	Edmund Spenser	7	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0.0	9	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0.0
k.	Milton	7	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0.0	9	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0.0
l.	Other English Poetry (excluding modern)	6	0	1	0	0	0	0	0	0.3	3	2	1	0	1	2	0	0	2.0

TABLE 2 (Concluded)

	Selected Topics	First Course (302 or 133) No. of responses to indicated hrs.								Avg.	Second Course (213 or 143) No. of responses to indicated hrs.								Avg.
		0	1	2	3	4	5	6	M		0	1	2	3	4	5	6	M	
m.	Other English Prose (excluding modern)	5	1	0	0	1	0	0	0	0.7	2	4	1	0	0	0	2	0	2.0
n.	American Poetry (excluding modern)	6	1	0	0	0	0	0	0	0.1	8	0	1	0	0	0	0	0	0.2
o.	American Prose (excluding modern)	6	0	0	0	1	0	0	0	0.6	6	1	0	1	1	0	0	0	0.9
p.	Russian Literature	7	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0.0	5	3	1	0	0	0	0	0	0.6
q.	German Literature	7	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0.0	5	0	0	0	0	1	1	2	3.0
r.	French Literature	6	0	1	0	0	0	0	0	0.3	5	2	0	0	0	0	0	2	2.0
s.	Spanish Literature	7	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0.0	8	0	0	0	0	0	1	0	0.7
t.	Modern American or English Novels	6	0	0	1	0	0	0	0	0.4	6	2	1	0	0	0	0	0	0.4
u.	Modern American or English poetry	7	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0.0	4	0	5	0	0	0	0	0	1.1
v.	Modern American or English drama	7	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0.0	6	0	0	3	0	0	0	0	1.0
							Total			20.8						Total			17.9

TABLE 3

CONTENT OF SEPARATE HUMANITIES COURSES IN ART:
NUMBER OF HOURS DEVOTED TO SELECTED TOPICS

	Topics	No. of responses to indicated hours								
		0	1	2	3	4	5	6	M	Avg.
a.	Fundamentals of art	1	0	0	0	1	1	0	1	4.2[a]
b.	Ancient art and architecture (Egyptian, Mesopotamian, Aegean, Etruscan, etc.)	2	0	2	0	0	0	0	0	1.0
c.	Classical art and architecture (Hellenic, Hellenistic, Roman)	1	0	1	1	0	0	0	1	3.2
d.	Medieval art and architecture (Early Christian, Byzantine, Gothic, Oriental, etc.)	1	1	0	1	0	0	0	1	3.0
e.	Renaissance, Baroque, and Rococo art in Italy	0	1	0	2	1	0	0	0	2.8
f.	Renaissance, Baroque, and Rococo art in Flanders, Germany and Holland	0	1	2	1	0	0	0	0	2.0
g.	Renaissance, Baroque, and Rococo art in England, France, and Spain	0	1	2	1	0	0	0	0	2.0
h.	Modern and recent painting in France	0	1	1	1	1	0	0	0	2.5
i.	Modern and recent painting in Europe outside of France	0	1	2	1	0	0	0	0	2.0
j.	Modern and recent painting in America	0	1	0	2	0	1	0	0	3.0
k.	Modern Sculpture	0	1	2	0	0	1	0	0	2.5
l.	Modern Architecture	0	0	2	1	0	0	1	0	3.2
	Number of respondents 4[b]						Total hours			31.4

[a]M assigned a value of eight hours

[b]See footnote a of Table X.

TABLE 4

ART CONTENT OF THE TWO GENERAL HUMANITIES COURSES:
NUMBER OF HOURS DEVOTED TO SELECTED TOPICS

	First Course (203 or 133) No. of responses to indicated hrs.								Avg.	Second Course (213 or 143) No. or responses to indicated hrs.								Avg.
	0	1	2	3	4	5	6	M		0	1	2	3	4	5	6	M	
a. Fundamentals of art	2	2	1	0	0	1	0	1	2.4	5	0	2	1	0	0	1	0	1.4
b. Ancient art and architecture (Egyptian, Mesopotamian, Aegean, Etruscan, etc.)	4	1	2	0	0	0	0	0	0.4	9	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0.0
c. Classical art and architecture (Hellenic, Hellenistic, Roman)	1	0	2	0	3	1	0	0	3.0	7	0	2	0	0	0	0	0	0.4
d. Medieval art and architecture (Early Christian, Byzantine, Roman, Mohemetan, Gothic, Oriental, etc.)	2	0	1	2	0	1	0	1	3.0	6	0	2	0	0	0	1	0	1.1
e. Renaissance, Baroque, and Rocco art in Italy (14th to 19th centuries)	7	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0.0	1	1	4	0	0	0	2	M	3.2
f. Renaissance, Baroque, and Rocco art in Flanders, Germany and Holland	7	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0.0	2	1	4	0	0	0	2	0	2.3
g. Renaissance, Baroque, and Rocco art in England, France and Spain	7	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0.0	3	1	2	1	0	0	1	0	1.8
h. Modern and recent painting in France	7	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0.0	2	1	3	1	2	0	0	0	2.0
i. Modern and recent painting in Europe outside of France	7	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0.0	3	1	5	0	0	0	0	0	1.2
j. Modern and recent painting in America	7	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0.0	2	2	2	3	0	0	0	0	1.7
k. Modern Sculpture	7	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0.0	2	4	3	0	0	0	0	0	1.1
l. Modern Architecture	7	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0.0	1	5	2	0	1	0	0	0	1.4
						Total			8.8						Total			17.6

TABLE 5

CONTENT OF THE SEPARATE HUMANITIES COURSES IN MUSIC:
NUMBER OF HOURS DEVOTED TO SELECTED TOPICS

	Topics	No. of responses to indicated hours								
		0	1	2	3	4	5	6	M	Avg.
a.	Music fundamentals, forms, instruments, and/or vocabulary	0	0	0	1	0	0	1	2	6.2
b.	Medieval music (Gregorian chants, organum, the Troubadours, Trouveres, and Minnesingers, etc.)	1	1	1	1	0	0	0	0	1.5
c.	Renaissance and Baroque Music (Des Pres, Palestrina, di Lasso, Monterverdi, Purcell, et al.)	1	1	1	1	0	0	0	0	1.5
d.	Johann Sebastian Bach	0	1	2	1	0	0	0	0	2.0
e.	Franz Joseph Haydn	0	2	2	0	0	0	0	0	1.5
f.	Wolfgang Mozart	0	2	2	0	0	0	0	0	1.5
g.	Ludwig van Beethovan	0	1	1	0	2	0	0	0	2.8
h.	Franz Schubert	1	0	2	0	1	0	0	0	2.0
i.	Richard Wagner	1	0	2	0	0	0	0	0	1.5
j.	Giuseppe Verdi	1	1	2	0	0	0	0	0	1.2
k.	Johannes Brahms	1	2	1	0	0	0	0	0	1.0
l.	Modern or recent European composers (Tschaikowsky, Debussy, Stravinsky, Ravel, Bartok, et al.)	1	0	0	1	0	0	1	1	4.7
m.	Popular American music (Herbert, Gershwin, Kern, et al.)	0	1	1	2	0	0	0	0	2.2
n.	Serious American Music (Copland, Harris, Cowell, Menotti, et al.)	0	0	2	0	2	0	0	0	3.0
	Number of respondents = 4						Total			32.6

TABLE 6

MUSIC CONTENT OF THE TWO GENERAL HUMANITIES COURSES:
NUMBER OF HOURS DEVOTED TO SELECTED TOPICS

Topics	First Course (203 or 133) No. of responses to indicated hrs. 0	1	2	3	4	5	6	M	Avg.	Second Course (213 or 143) No. of responses to indicated hrs. 0	1	2	3	4	5	6	M	Avg.
a. Music fundamentals, forms, instruments, and/or vocabulary	2	0	4	0	0	0	0	1	3.2[a]	6	3	0	0	0	0	0	0	0.4[a]
b. Medieval music	3	0	3	1	0	0	0	0	1.8	6	3	0	0	0	0	0	0	0.4
c. Renaissance and Baroque Music	6	0	0	0	1	0	0	0	0.8	5	4	0	0	0	0	0	0	0.6
d. Johann Sebastian Bach	6	1	0	0	0	0	0	0	0.2	3	5	1	0	0	0	0	0	1.0
e. Franz Joseph Haydn	7	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0.0	4	5	0	0	0	0	0	0	0.7
f. Wolfgang Amadeus Mozart	6	1	0	0	0	0	0	0	0.2	4	3	2	0	0	0	0	0	1.0
g. Ludwig van Beethovan	7	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0.0	2	5	2	0	0	0	0	0	1.3
h. Franz Schubert	6	1	0	0	0	0	0	0	0.2	6	3	0	0	0	0	0	0	0.4
i. Richard Wagner	7	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0.0	3	5	1	0	0	0	0	0	1.0
j. Geuseppe Verdi	7	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0.0	7	1	1	0	0	0	0	0	0.4
k. Johannes Brahms	6	1	0	0	0	0	0	0	0.2	6	3	0	0	0	0	0	0	0.4
l. Modern or recent European composers	6	0	0	1	0	0	0	0	0.6	2	2	2	3	0	0	0	0	2.1
m. Popular American Music	6	0	0	1	0	0	0	0	0.6	5	3	0	1	0	0	0	0	0.9
n. Serious American Music	6	1	0	0	0	0	0	0	0.2	4	3	2	0	0	0	0	0	1.0
						Total			8.0						Total			11.6

[a]Music not included in two 203 courses and two 213 courses. Averages based on five 203 courses and seven 213 courses.

TABLE 7

PHILOSOPHY CONTENT OF THE TWO GENERAL HUMANITIES COURSES:
NUMBER OF HOURS DEVOTED TO SELECTED TOPICS

Topics	First Course (203 or 133) No. of responses to indicated hrs.								Avg.	Second Course (213 or 143) No. of responses to indicated hrs.								Avg.
	0	1	2	3	4	5	6	M		0	1	2	3	4	5	6	M	
a. Fundamentals and vocabulary of philosophy	3	2	1	1	0	0	0	0	1.1[a]	7	2	0	0	0	0	0	0	0.3[a]
b. Plato (and Socrates)	1	0	1	2	3	0	0	0	3.3	8	1	0	0	0	0	0	0	0.1
c. Aristotle	3	3	1	0	0	0	0	0	0.8	8	1	0	0	0	0	0	0	0.1
d. St. Augustine	1	4	2	0	0	0	0	0	1.3	9	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0.0
e. Thomas Aquinas	3	2	1	1	0	0	0	0	1.1	8	1	0	0	0	0	0	0	0.1
f. Francis Bacon	6	1	0	0	0	0	0	0	0.1	7	2	0	0	0	0	0	0	0.3
g. Rene Descartes	6	1	0	0	0	0	0	0	0.1	2	7	0	0	0	0	0	0	1.0
h. Baruch Spinoza	7	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0.0	7	2	0	0	0	0	0	0	0.3
i. John Locke	7	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0.0	2	4	1	0	0	0	0	0	0.9
j. Immanuel Kant	7	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0.0	8	0	1	0	0	0	0	0	0.3
k. Arthur Schopenhaur	6	1	0	0	0	0	0	0	0.1	8	1	0	0	0	0	0	0	0.1
l. August Comte	7	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0.0	8	1	0	0	0	0	0	0	0.1
m. Karl Marx	7	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0.0	6	1	1	1	0	0	0	0	0.9
n. Herbert Spencer	7	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0.0	8	0	1	0	0	0	0	0	0.3
o. John Dewey	7	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0.0	5	3	0	1	0	0	0	0	0.9
p. Bertrand Russell	7	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0.0	7	2	0	0	0	0	0	0	0.3
						Total			7.9						Total			6.0

[a]Philosophy is not included in one 203 course and in two 213 courses. Averages based on six 203 courses and seven 213 courses.

VITA

David Thomas Wadsworth Stevens

Candidate for the degree of

Doctor of Education

Thesis: THE HUMANITIES COURSES IN THE GENERAL-EDUCATION PROGRAMS OF THE OKLAHOMA STATE COLLEGES

Major Field: Higher Education

Biographical:

Personal data: Born in Mt. Sterling, Kentucky, April 16, 1910 the son of Franklin C. and Annie C. Stevens.

Education: Attended grade school in Okmulgee and Claremore, Oklahoma; graduated from Okmulgee High School in 1928; received the Bachelor of Science with a major in chemistry from Southeastern State College in 1932; received the Master of Arts degree from Oklahoma State University with a major in geography in August, 1952; completed requirements for the Doctor of Education degree in 1960.

Professional experience: Coached athletics and taught science, mathematics, geography, and physical education in high schools at Caddo, Morris, Pryor and Checotah, Oklahoma from 1932 until 1941. Became football coach at Southeastern State College, Durant, Oklahoma, and, except for the war years, remained in this position until September, 1956. Served as instructor of navigation and meteorology for the U. S. Navy during 1943. Served as second and third officer aboard U. S. Army transports from 1943 to July, 1946. Have remained at Southeastern State College since 1946 as associate professor of geography and as associate professor of physical science.

Professional organizations: American Association of University Professors, Phi Delta Kappa, Gamma Theta Upsilon, National Education Association, Oklahoma Education Association.