

# History

*Norman A. Stahl*

NORTHERN ILLINOIS UNIVERSITY

*James R. King*

UNIVERSITY OF SOUTH FLORIDA

---

College reading has been an established field within reading research and pedagogy for over a century. In fact, according to Manzo (1983), college reading is both a generator of new ideas and a repository for considerable wisdom. Yet, to this day, college reading receives scant respect compared to other subfields of literacy. It is ironic then that many noteworthy scholars in reading research and pedagogy (see Israel & Monaghan, 2007; Robinson, 2002) wrote about college readers and/or college reading and study strategy instruction (e.g., Guy Buswell, William S. Gray, Nila B. Smith, Ruth Strang, Miles Tinker, George Spache, Francis Robinson) such that much of our historical, if not foundational, understandings of basic reading processes rest on research conducted with college readers.

It is equally ironic that our professional associations (e.g., International Literacy Association (ILA), Literacy Research Association (LRA), Association of Literacy Educators and Researchers (ALER), and College Reading and Learning Association (CRLA) were founded with the major instigation from college reading professionals. Given this legacy, it remains a paradox why the specialization of college reading is an intellectual pariah, confined to the liminal spaces of the discipline of Reading/Literacy.

In any quest for parity in the reading profession, the onus continues to be on current and future college reading professionals to learn of the field's contributions to reading research and pedagogy (Armstrong, 2012; Stahl, Boylan, Collins, DeMarais, & Maxwell, 1999). That being the case, the purpose of this chapter is to provide postsecondary reading specialists with opportunities to learn of the field's rich heritage. In addition, the chapter discusses one's responsibility to help the field of college reading grow in stature by undertaking historical work.

## Resources for Historical Study of Literacy Instruction

The history of any field can be viewed through a multitude of lenses of primary and secondary historical sources. Too often, reading educators have relied solely on Smith's *American Reading Instruction* (1934b, 1965, 1986, 2002). Such limited source selection is tunnel vision that begs two questions. The first question to be satisfied is "Does a distinct body of historical resources exist for the field of Reading?" The answer to this question is "yes." Important works on the history of literacy are increasingly available as both book-length texts and articles in impactful journals (Stahl & Hartman, 2011). The second question is "Does such a body of historical resources exist for the more specific area of college reading research and praxis?" As this third *Handbook* edition comes

to press, the answer continues to be only a qualified “yes” as this affirmation relies not only on the field of literacy but also on the allied fields of developmental education and learning assistance.

In an earlier call to undertake historical research in college reading, Stahl, Hynd, and Henk (1986) proposed that three categories of historical materials were available for study. The first category included chronicles synthesizing numerous primary and secondary sources (e.g., Leedy, 1958). The second category was comprised of summaries or time lines that highlighted major events or trends in the field (e.g., Maxwell, 1979). The third category was made up of texts and monographs that had earned a place of historical importance in the field (e.g., Ahrendt, 1975). In reviewing the extant historically oriented sources, it was obvious that the literature was sparse. Furthermore, Stahl et al. (1986) suggested that this dearth of materials might explain why college reading specialists tended to overlook the field’s history when designing curricula, developing programs, writing texts, and conducting research. In retrospect, the lack of supportive literature may also be related to low prestige.

Now, three decades after Stahl et al. (1986), it is useful to revisit the corpus of resources available to researchers and practitioners who are interested in the history of college reading and study strategy instruction. In reviewing these works, two of the categories (historical chronicles, and historical summaries and time lines) will be redeployed, along with a category from the first edition of this *Handbook* for historical writings that investigate specific topics (e.g., study strategies), specific historical eras, and organizational/institutional histories. Finally, in this current chapter, we discuss the methods of interpretive biography (Denzin, 1989), including oral histories, autobiographies, and biographies of leaders in the field. This organizational scheme reveals the field’s breadth of historical knowledge as well as its place within the larger field of literacy theory, research, and praxis.

### *Historical Chronicles*

The first category of historical sources is comprised of doctoral dissertations drawing extensively on primary and secondary sources. In all but one case, the historical work was but one component in each dissertation, again indicating the lack of specific focus on historical accounts of literacy. Six of the studies (Bailey, 1982; Blake, 1953; Heron, 1989; Leedy, 1958; Shen, 2002; Straff, 1986) focus directly on college reading instruction. A seventh study (Brier, 1983) investigates academic preparedness for higher education.

A seminal, historical work for the field is the dissertation undertaken by Leedy (1958). Through the extensive use of primary sources along with secondary sources (total  $n = 414$ ), Leedy traced the role of reading, readers, reading materials, and reading/learning programs in American higher education from 1636 to 1958. From this massive undertaking, Leedy (1958) put forth two important conclusions. First, the college reading improvement programs circa 1958 were the result of a slow but orderly evolution in the recognition of the importance of reading’s role in postsecondary education. Second, reading programs were implemented over the years because both students and representatives of the institutions recognized that ineffective reading and study skills created problems in academic achievement. Leedy’s historical work is to college reading as *American Reading Instruction* (Smith, 2002) is to the overall field of Reading – not surprising as Nila B. Smith served on Leedy’s dissertation committee. An analysis of Leedy’s work is found in Stahl (1988).

Four other dissertations provide major historical reviews or historical analyses of the literature in the field. Blake (1953) examined the historical, social, and educational forces that promoted the growth of college reading and study skills programs during the first 50 years of the 20th century. Blake’s work was part of an analysis of the program at the University of Maryland, as augmented with a national survey of programs.

Straff (1986) undertook a historical analysis of selected literature on college reading ( $n = 74$  sources) to determine what research, theory, and praxis was covered from 1900 to 1980. The

intent of this inquiry was to provide a foundation for future program development. His overall findings were similar to Leedy's (1958): (1) College reading programs grew at a slow and deliberate pace over that 80-year period, and (2) this purposeful growth reflected disparate, local needs in contrast to a coordinated national movement. Straff also stated that the field had grown in both quantity and quality. He concluded that the literature had matured from the simple acknowledgment of reading/study problems in higher education to the discussion of the implementation of programs to research on the effectiveness of programs. Still, this literature review led Straff to believe that over the first eight decades of the 20th century, there was little credible research on program rationales, instructional objectives, student populations, curricula, staffing, reading behaviors, funding sources, and shifts in societal priorities, suggesting that there was little upon which to base recommendations for program development in college reading.

Heron (1989) considered the historical context for then current postsecondary reading requirements, the particular needs of at-risk college readers, and the instructional levels and approaches employed by 89 college reading programs. Her research analyzed resources dating from 1927, which she reviewed through the lens of Chall's developmental reading theory (Chall, 1983). The study led to multiple conclusions, including that (1) the reading requirements in higher education had increased dramatically over the history of American higher education; (2) reading proficiency in college was dependent upon reading skills and strategies as well as domain-specific knowledge; (3) reading problems of college students spanned Chall's developmental stages, and these deficiencies were compounded by lack of knowledge and language of the academic discourses; (4) programs could be categorized by Chall's development levels; and (5) historically, lower-level programs emphasizing diagnosis and skills (Chall's stages one-three) were decreasing in number, whereas higher-level programs emphasizing content strategies and critical reading (stages three and four) were increasing in number. Bridge programs, such as the developmental education model (stages one through four), were also increasing in number but more slowly than those designated as the higher-level programs. Heron also noted that published reports containing appropriate qualitative descriptions of instructional techniques as well as acceptable quantitative measures of the effectiveness of instructional methods were uncommon.

Within this category of historical chronicles, we also include the dissertation undertaken by Bailey (1982). Bailey's critical analysis summarized, classified, and evaluated 170 research studies from 31 different journals published between 1925 and 1980. While this work cannot be called a true historical study, it does provide an extensive annotated bibliography and is, therefore, an important reference source for the college reading field. Furthermore, researchers interested in reading rate, technology (precomputer), teaching methods, test-taking skills, note-taking, textbook study methods, listening, instructional materials, vocabulary, physical factors, comprehension, or combined methods may find Bailey's categorical analysis of the research to be of value.

Shen (2002) provided a historical survey of the field, beginning with our progenitors prior to 1900. She then traversed five eras, with attention directed to the social context impacting college reading as well as the psychological theories and reading research during each respective time period. The three purposes of the content analysis were to (1) examine the physical and content features of the texts, (2) trace the changes in textbooks, and (3) determine the relationships between text features and the development of theory, research, and practice.

Shen's analyses of 88 college reading and study strategy texts lead to 10 conclusions: (1) Authors tended to be experts in their respective fields; (2) textual features did not increase in relation to the size of the book; (3) texts had more in common than in difference; (4) the number of physical features in texts expanded across the eras; (5) common physical features across the eras included introductions, heads and subheads, indexes, student exercises/questions, illustrations, and charts; (6) common topics included attention, dictionary use, test-taking skills, vocabulary

mastery, reading rate, note-taking, and mathematics; (7) text features' prominence varied during different eras; (8) early college reading texts introduced many skills/strategies found in texts currently on the market; (9) some textbooks integrated the era-oriented research and best practice; and (10) topics in the texts tended to draw from psychology and education.

Finally, Brier (1983, 1984) undertook a historical narrative that explored the actions undertaken by the newly formed Vassar College and an equally new Cornell University between 1865 and 1890 to meet the academic needs of underprepared, college-aged students. This dissertation draws from primary sources to document the controversy that developed when both institutions enrolled a sizable number of students requiring preparatory instruction, often in basic skills, in order to achieve academic success. While Vassar College responded by developing a preparatory program, Cornell University referred students elsewhere for assistance. Brier demonstrates conclusively that issues associated with modern open-door and special admissions programs have been of concern in higher education for well over a century. The study also underscores the historical nature of the devaluing of college reading by some and the meeting of the challenge by others. (See Arendale, 2001, 2010 and White, Martirosyan, & Wanjohi, 2009, 2010a, 2010b for additional coverage of preparatory programs.)

Before moving on to another classification of texts, we would be remiss if we did not cover Smith's dissertation (1934a), which later evolved into four editions of *American Reading Instruction* (Smith, 1934b, 1965, 1986, 2002). It was an important contribution for the era in which it was released, and reprintings continue to have great impact (Stahl, 2002). College reading instruction is integrated into Smith's discussions. Still, finding information about the history of college reading often requires a working knowledge of each era's scholarship on the college reading field as well as the situated relationship the field had with other reading specializations, such as secondary school reading and adult reading, along with shared topics, such as eye-movement research or linguistic/literacy interfaces.

The individual strengths of the documents in the category of historical chronicles are found in the depth and/or breadth of coverage by each author on the particular topic. As a whole, the documents draw from era-based primary sources. Researchers of both historical topics and the historical roots of current topics will find these sources most useful. The Smith (2002) text is readily available in libraries. The dissertations will be available either as text or in digital format through ProQuest. Older dissertations are often available via interlibrary loan.

## Historical Summaries and Time Lines

The sources in this category include chronological representations of watershed events in the history of college reading. These works appear as chapters or sections in comprehensive books or in edited texts focusing on the fields of college reading, learning assistance, or developmental education as well as parts of yearbook chapters and/or journal articles that are more specific in nature. These chapters and articles cannot be expected to contain the same depth of coverage for each historical era as those found in the dissertation studies. Another issue to consider is that many of these works, such as Spache (1969), were written with the purpose of providing a historical survey along with a state-of-the-art review or speculative discussions about the profession's future. These works are categorized as college reading, learning assistance, and developmental education.

## College Reading

The historical works focusing on college reading are limited. During the height of the National Reading Conference's (NRC's, now the LRA) and the College Reading Association's (CRA's, now ALER) influence on college reading in the 1960s and early 1970s, Lowe authored two papers providing college reading professionals with concise histories of the field. In his first paper, he

(1967a) analyzed 49 surveys of college reading programs undertaken, from Parr's survey (1930) to Thurstone, Lowe, and Hayden's (1965) work. Lowe pointed out that over the years, the number of programs had grown in number and size, and this growth paralleled an emergence of greater professionalism in the field. Lowe's (1970) second paper, which evolved from his dissertation (Lowe, 1967b), traces the field's history from the founding of the Harvard University program in 1915 to the late 1960s. Focusing on each decade, Lowe examines the growth of programs in the field along with curricular trends and instructional innovations.

Not for another 20 years did a wide-ranging historical chronicle of the college reading field appear. Wyatt (1992) draws upon secondary sources as well as primary sources in the fields of college reading, developmental education, learning assistance, and higher education to provide a chronological discussion of the underprepared college reader and writer since the early 1800s. Woven throughout the article is the description of how a number of "prestigious" institutions (e.g., Harvard University, Yale University, the University of California, Stanford University) responded to their respective students' reading needs.

Finally, in a period before the digital age, annotated bibliographies were helpful sources of information both current and historical. The International Reading Association (now ILA) issued an annotated bibliography series, including Kerstiens's work (1971) on junior/community college reading and Berger and Peebles's bibliography (1976) on reading rate research and programs for secondary and postsecondary students. A decade later, Cranney (1983a, 1983b) released two annotated bibliographies detailing valuable sources about the field's contributions. With the advent of search engines, such sources are thought to be obsolete.

### *Learning Assistance*

The evolution of the learning assistance movement has been covered by a number of writers. Enright (1975) provides a frequently referenced history of the origins of the learning assistance center (LAC), which proposes that the movement went through five eras: (1) the age of clinical aspiration: Programs become scientific (1916–1940), (2) the age of disenchantment: Remedial reading is not the answer (1940–1950), (3) the age of integration: Programs treat the whole student (1950–1960), (4) the age of actualization: Good ideas become realities (1960–1970), and (5) the age of systematization: The LAC is organized (1970–1980). This work, based on extensive literature review, illustrates how learning assistance is intertwined with the history of college reading and that it developed a broader orientation in which college reading was an intricate component.

Enright and Kerstiens (1980) revisited the history of the LAC in the historically important but short-lived *New Directions for College Learning Assistance* sourcebook series. The authors provide an overview of historical events from 1850 to 1940 and then move into a decade-by-decade review of the evolution of the LAC. They demonstrate that over the decades, the terminology describing the reading/learning programs evolved along with changes in philosophy and instructional method.

Drawing heavily from secondary sources, Lissner (1990) discusses the LAC's evolution from 1828 through the latter 1980s. The 19th century is described as the prehistory of learning assistance as it focused on compensatory designs, such as preparatory programs and tutoring schools. The 20th century is presented as an evolution of learning assistance through the Depression, World War II, the GI Bill era, the Sputnik era, the open admissions era, and the learning center moment. An important conclusion emanating from Lissner is that learning centers originated as one of a long series of responses to two themes in higher education: the recurring perception that students entering college were less prepared for academics than the preceding academic generation and that new segments of the population had increased opportunities to attend college.

Maxwell's (1979) classic text *Improving Student Learning Skills* contained a detailed outline of events and trends, illustrating how colleges had been concerned with students' qualifications for

academic work since the 1850s. Given the importance of her work to the field of learning assistance, it is not surprising that many of the historical works, literacy centered and otherwise, and appearing after its publication, used her outline as a foundation. Maxwell's (1997) thoroughly revised edition of this text provides rich narratives combined with personal anecdotes based on her 50 years of leadership in the field. Included as well is information from historical sources on topics such as at-risk students, tutoring, learning centers, writing instruction, and reading instruction.

With the turn of this century, Arendale (2004) authored a historical perspective on the origins and growth of the LAC. After providing an overview of the LAC mission, drawing heavily from the pioneering work of Frank Christ, Arendale makes the case that the LACs were a product of factors influencing postsecondary education as a whole. These factors include changes in federal policies and economic resources, dramatic growth in enrollment, increased diversity in the student population, and a dissatisfaction with the existing approaches to promoting retention. Further, Arendale documented the growth of professionalism that came with the founding of the Western College Reading Association (now the CRLA), the Midwest College Learning Center Association (now the National College Learning Center Association (NCLCA)), and the Annual Institute for College Learning Center Directors (the Winter Institute). [A chronology of the evolution of the Winter Institute can be found at Learning Support Centers in Higher Education (LSCHE) (n.d.b).]

### *Developmental Education*

The history of developmental education cannot be separated from the history of college reading instruction. The two fields are mutually entwined. Cross (1971) provided one of the first historical discussions on the still-evolving field of developmental education. Indeed, the tenuousness of the new developmental education label is observed in Cross's use of the term *remedial* in juxtaposition with *developmental* in the chapter's title. The historical discussion is directed at two themes: (1) causes of poor academic performance and (2) historical trends in the evaluation of remediation in higher education. In discussing how poor academic performance had been viewed, Cross proposed that there was a predominant vantage held by educators in each of five eras, respectively defined and roughly delimited as (1) poor study habits – pre 1935, (2) inadequate mastery of basic academic skills – late 1930s through early 1940s, (3) low academic ability or low intelligence – postwar 1940s through early 1960s, (4) psychological and motivational blocks to learning – mid-1960s, and (5) sociocultural factors related to deprived family and school backgrounds – latter 1960s through 1976. Cross's analyses conclude that educators in each succeeding era saw the problems associated with lack of success in college as having greater complexity than in the preceding eras and that solutions tended to be additive over the years. In looking at the trends in the evaluation of remedial programs, Cross notes that the 1940s and 1950s was a period of relatively unsophisticated methodological analysis of program effectiveness. Evaluation in the 1960s focused on the emotional defenses of both the programs of the era and the students entering higher education through such programs. In the 1970s, evaluation was concerned with the degree to which programs helped students meet academic goals.

A number of articles (Boylan, 1988, 1990; Boylan & White, 1987, 1994; Jones & Richards-Smith, 1987) on the history of developmental education come from the National Center for Developmental Education. These articles show how developmental education services have been provided to college students since 1630. Specific attention is directed toward each academic generation's understanding of nontraditional students as they were served by the new categories of postsecondary institutions or institutions with evolving missions. The authors argue that it is the nation's way to induct newer groups of students into higher education, label them in a pejorative manner,

and then watch them overcome the stereotypes and their “lack of preparation” to become functional members of the ever-evolving traditional class of students. The cycle continues with the enrollment of new groups of nontraditional students. Jones and Richards-Smith (1987) present a particularly important chronicle investigating historically black colleges as providers of developmental education services.

Roberts' (1986) and Tomlinson's (1989) summaries of the trends in developmental education from the mid-1800s to the modern era parallel many of the historical sources mentioned in this section. Both authors concur that programs have grown from being isolated, narrowly conceived, and inadequately funded to being more integrated, broadly conceptualized, and regularly funded campus entities. Tomlinson provides a useful graphic presentation of the changes in the terminology used to identify developmental education-style programs as well as the labels for the students receiving such services during three different eras (1860s–1890s, 1900s–1940s, 1950s–1989). Carpenter and Johnson (1991) provide another brief historical summary that closely mirrors the discussions provided by Roberts and Tomlinson.

Bullock, Madden, and Mallery (1990) cover the growth of developmental education starting in the Pre-Open Admissions Era (prior to 1965), moving to the Equality and Access Era (1965–1980) and continuing through the Accountability Era (1980–1989). So as to adequately situate the field in the larger milieu, each section covers (1) the social milieu for the time, (2) the era's impact on American education, (3) the university setting, and (4) the place of developmental education in the university setting.

The work of Casazza and Silverman (1996) and later Casazza (1999) and Casazza and Bauer (2006) combines the events common to the fields of learning assistance and developmental education with events shaping higher education. Casazza and Silverman (1996) argue that the tension created between each generation's traditionalists' viewpoints and reformists' philosophies has promoted gradual change in education. Given this premise, three eras were identified. The first era (1700–1862) is characterized by the tensions that evolved from the development of a new American system built upon democratic ideals, while the educational touchstones for those times were the classical colleges of Europe. A second era (1862–1960) stressed the tensions that evolved as higher education continued to open, or be forced to open, its portals to a more diverse clientele. Finally, the third era (1960–2000) looks at the tensions that existed in the movement to provide support services to an increasingly diverse body of students. As Casazza and Silverman review each era, they strive to answer three key questions: (1) What is the purpose of postsecondary education? (2) Who should attend college? and (3) What should the curriculum look like? In this work, it is important to note that the authors show that learning assistance and developmental education do not operate in a vacuum. Rather, they are imbricated into the culture and the events that shape higher education.

Over the past decade, Arendale carried the mantle of telling the history of developmental education. His now classic work “A Memory Sometimes Ignored” (2002b) not only provides the story of the early history of developmental education, beginning with preparatory programs in the 1800s, but also offers a cogent argument as to why the field has a pariah status in texts authored by higher education historians. He clearly shows that higher education histories and institutional histories focus on great leaders, political issues, and growth of infrastructure. When students are of interest, it is through the lens of white males as opposed to women, students of color, or students from lower-status economic or academic castes. Arendale concludes that the story of higher education requires a deeper and more diverse study of developmental education and its students, even if the inclusion of such topics proves to be uncomfortable.

In the second work in his trilogy, Arendale (2002a) intertwines six phases of developmental education's history with the history of higher education. These phases are presented as a chronology that highlights both the common instruction of the time and the students most likely to have been served in developmental education: (1) mid-1600s to 1820s (tutoring that served privileged white males),

(2) 1820s to 1860s (precollege preparatory academies and tutoring that served privileged white males), (3) 1860s to mid-1940s (remedial classes within college preparatory and tutoring that served mostly white males), (4) mid-1940s to early 1970s (remedial education classes integrated within the college, tutoring, and compensatory education, serving traditional white males; nontraditional students; and federal legislative priority groups, such as first generation to college, economically disadvantaged, and diverse student groups), (5) early 1970s to mid-1990s (developmental education, learning assistance, tutoring, and supplemental instruction programs that served returning students as well as those from previously mentioned groups), and (6) mid-1990s to the present (developmental education with expansion into enrichment activities, classes, and programs, serving the previous groups along with students wishing to gain greater breadth and depth of content knowledge).

Throughout his discussion, Arendale interrelates the six phases with the economic, social, and political movements and events that influenced, if not promoted, each respective phase. The author concludes that developmental education grew and expanded not because of a carefully conceived plan but rather due to an exigent response to the expanding needs of a population that grew more ethnically, culturally, and economically diverse over the years.

In a third work, Arendale (2005) approaches the history of developmental education through the analysis of the labels that have represented the field as it has redefined itself over the years. He begins with Academic Preparatory Programs (early 1800s through the 1850s) and then moves through Remedial Education (1860s–1960); Compensatory Education (1960s); Learning Assistance (late 1960s–2005); Developmental Education (1970s–2005); and, finally, ACCESS Programs (the European ACCESS network). Arendale offers a prognosis for the future and suggests that the field must articulate its mission to others in higher education as well as to those outside the field. (Also see Arendale, 2006.)

Arendale's landmark scholarship from over the first decade of the 21st century culminated with the release of *Access at the Crossroads: Learning Assistance in Higher Education* (2010), in which he covered a range of topics impacting learning assistance from a "big tent" perspective. The text, through its coverage of the history of learning assistance, serves as a "bully pulpit" as it was disseminated to a wider higher education audience with a greater likelihood of enlightening and perhaps of influencing those who possessed little knowledge of the history and contributions of the field. [Arendale's chapter has been reprinted in Boylan and Bonham (2014).]

Boylan and Bonham (2007) provide a chronicle of the field from the birth of the National Center for Developmental Education in 1976 through landmark events such as the founding of the National Association for Remedial/Developmental Studies in Postsecondary Education in 1976 (the progenitor of the National Association of Developmental Education), the release of the first issue of the *Journal of Developmental and Remedial Education* (now the *Journal of Developmental Education*) in 1978, the first Kellogg Institute for Training and Certification of Developmental Educators in 1980, the advent of the CRLA Tutor Training Certificate in 1989, the first Technology Institute for Developmental Educators in 1999, and the first inductees into the Fellows program of the American Council of Developmental Education Associations (ACDEA).

The articles in this category provide summaries of where the field has been and, in several cases, interesting speculations of where the field was expected to move. Many of these works can be found in academic libraries, both as published articles and as archive versions in the ERIC (Educational Resources Information Center) document collection or on JSTOR (Journal Storage). More recently, such publications can be found on open-source websites, on sites such as ResearchGate, or on personal home pages.

A weakness of the materials in this category is that there is a degree of redundancy from article to article. Because of this redundancy, there is a blurring of the distinctions between college reading, learning assistance, and developmental education. It is true that there is much common history between the fields, and it is also true that there are modern interrelationships as well. Still, there are



differences in breadth of mission and in underlying philosophy. Reaching common ground is important, but so is the systematic identification of differences. Perhaps this redundancy, particularly in the more recent articles, is due to an overreliance on certain sources (e.g., Brier 1984; Maxwell 1979). The bottom line, however, may very well be that the field is saturated with historical surveys, and writers should turn to more focused topics, as presented in the next category.

## **Historical Topics, Eras, and Institutional Histories**

As a field reaches a developmental stage in which its history is valued and there is an academic commitment to more fully understanding the contributions of individuals and colleges within historical contexts, the studies begin to focus on specific topics or specific eras. In the case of the topical papers, these articles were often logical historical outgrowths of popular research trends or theoretical postulates from the era in which the piece was authored. In other instances, the papers were part of an ongoing line of historical work by an author or an authoring team. In the case of era-focused articles, the authors present works that, when organized into a concerted whole, tend to define the era(s). Comparisons to other eras, both historical and present, may be integrated into the works as well. Finally, as our associations and institutions come of age, there are a growing number of works that focus on organizational history. In the paragraphs that follow, we begin by addressing studies that are of a topical nature, follow with work focused on historical eras, and then review organizational or institutional histories.

### *Topical Studies*

During the latter 1980s and early 1990s, there was an initial interest in the relationship between reading and writing as modes of learning. Quinn's (1995) article traced the impact of important pedagogical influences, instructional trends, theories, and research upon the integration of reading and writing instruction in higher education from the turn of the century to the mid-1990s. The article drew upon historical work in the fields of writing across the curriculum, reading and writing instruction in grades K-12, college reading instruction, content field reading instruction, and reading research. Quinn showed that interest in the reading-writing connection arose on several occasions over the 20th century, but it was with the 1980-1990s discussions of reading and writing as powerful tools for promoting thinking and learning that the integration of the two fields evolved into a powerful instructional model. Ironically, this curricular model did not fully flower in the community college until the coming of the developmental education reform movement with its emphasis on acceleration.

Learning strategies (also known as work methods, work-study methods, study methods, study skills, and study strategies during different eras) have been the topic of several historical texts. Stahl (1983) and Stahl and Henk (1986) traced the growth of textbook study systems through the development of Robinson's Survey Q3R (SQ3R). Specific attention was given to the birth of study systems through their relationship to the scientific management theory (i.e., Taylorism) up to the advent of World War II. In addition, these studies covered the initial research underlying the design of SQ3R and analyzed the research undertaken with the system through the late 1970s. Finally, the authors detailed over 100 clones of SQ3R up through the 1980s. They found that at the time of its introduction in the postwar period, SQ3R was a most effective sobriquet and organizing mechanism for a set of well-accepted reading strategies based on era-appropriate theory and reading research. In discussing the same topic, Walter Pauk (1999) presented a historical narrative of how SQ3R was developed. While this work covers some of the same ground, it also provides insight into the decades following World War II from an individual who single-handedly defined the study skills field in the 1950s, 1960s, and 1970s.

In another historical text, Stahl, King, and Eilers (1996) examined learning strategies such as the Inductive Outline Procedure, the Self-Recitation Study Method, SQ3R, the Block Method, and the Bartusch Active Method, which have been lost to varying degrees from the literature. The authors suggested that a study strategy must be perceived as (1) efficient by the user, regardless of the innovative theory or research validation underlying it; (2) associated with advocates or originators viewed as professional elites in the field; and (3) in line with the tenor of the field, past or present, to be accepted by students and instructors.

Textbooks and workbooks published for the field of college reading and study strategy instruction also merit historical analysis. Two articles provide focus on this topic. The first article (Stahl, Simpson, & Brozo, 1988) used historical contexts to examine content analyses of college reading texts published since 1921. The data from specific content analyses and the observed trends in the body of professional literature suggested that no consensus existed across texts as to what constituted effective study strategies. Research evidence for most of the techniques was not present. Both the scope and validity of the instructional methods and the practice activities were limited. The transfer value of many practice activities was questionable. Overall, the content analyses issued since 1941 suggested that there had been a reliance on impressionable evidence rather than research when designing college reading textbooks.

The task of conducting a historical analysis of instructional materials for college reading instruction has been limited in the past because an authoritative compilation of instructional materials was not available. Early attempts at developing such a resource (Bliesmer, 1957; Narang, 1973) provide an understanding of two historical eras, but both were limited in breadth over the years as well as in depth across editions for specific texts. Hence, Stahl, Brozo, and Hynd (1990) undertook the compilation of an exhaustive list of texts pertaining to college reading instruction. These authors also detailed the archival activities undertaken to develop the list. By employing texts published in the 1920s as an example, the authors explained how the resource list might be employed in conducting research or designing a curriculum. The final compilation contained 593 bibliographic entries for books printed between 1896 and 1987, along with the dates for each identified edition of a respective text. The full bibliographic list is available in the technical report that accompanied the article (Stahl, Brozo, & Hynd, 1989). More recently, this work had influence upon the dissertation undertaken by Shen (2002).

Walvekar (1987) investigated 30 years of evolving practices in program evaluation as these impacted the college reading and learning assistance fields. For instance, Walvekar showed how three forms of program evaluation (humanistic evaluation, systematic evaluation, and research) were, in fact, responses to larger issues associated with the "open door" at community colleges, the expanded diversity in students at universities, and the call for greater retention of all college students in the 1970s. Overall, Walvekar felt that the evaluation practices were undeveloped in the 1960s, inadequate through the early 1980s, and still evolving as of 1987.

Mason (1994) provides a comparative study in a historical context of seven college reading programs, founded in most cases in the 1920s or 1930s at elite institutions (Harvard University, Hamline University, Amherst College, the University of Chicago, Syracuse University, the University of Pennsylvania, and the University of Iowa). In comparing and contrasting instructional programs, institutional mandates, academic homes, assessment procedures, and staff qualifications across the institutions, the author reported as much variation existed as did commonality in programs.

### *Era Studies*

There are four era-focused studies that can be found in the literature. These works cover the post-World War II scene. A professional field does not operate in a vacuum.

The field of college reading has been influenced by a number of events, such as the mid-century civil rights movement and the community college boom years. One of the historical events to influence the field was the passing of the Serviceman's Readjustment Act of 1944 or, as it is best known, the GI Bill of Rights. Bannier (2006) investigated the legacy of the GI Bill on both colleges and universities as well as its current impact on developmental education. The author traced the roots of the GI Bill back to a lack of action when the veterans came home from World War I. This led to the realization that for political, economic, and even social reasons, a similar lack of action could not be the case with returning vets from World War II. The GI Bill's impact on curriculum, instruction, and enrollment trends was tremendous. Variations of the legislative acts to serve the vets from the Korean War, the Vietnam conflict, and more recent military actions are covered as well (also see Rose, 1991).

Another valuable era-focused work is Kingston's (1990, 2003) discussion of the programs of the late 1940s through the 1960s. This narrative rests in part on the insights, experiences, and knowledge of Kingston as an important leader in the field during the period in question, and as such, the work might be categorized as a self-study (Denzin, 1989). Kingston covered changes and innovations in assessment, elements of the curriculum, and instructional programs. Finally, Kingston discussed the birth of the Southwest Reading Conference and the CRA as well as the *Journal of Developmental Reading* and the *Journal of the Reading Specialist*, which were to serve the field during the period and the years after.

In a similar self-study, Martha Maxwell (2001) wrote historically regarding the impact of the GI Bill. With the returning service men and women from World War II, through the 1970s, the doors of higher education swung open to this new cadre of nontraditional students. Maxwell's narrative provides recollections about the students, the programs serving them, the professional associations that evolved to serve the fledgling profession, and technology introduced into the curriculum (speed reading) as she encountered each while at various institutions and in varied professional positions.

A study that overlaps the periods covered by Kingston and Maxwell is the work by Mallery (1986) that compared two eras: the 1950s through the mid-1960s and the years 1965–1980. The period before 1965 was characterized by program orientation and organization's being dependent on home department and instructional methods. The demarcation point between the two eras was the point when the "new students" began to make their presence felt in the college reading programs with the advent of the War on Poverty. The influx of federal dollars into higher education led to underrepresented student populations gaining admission to postsecondary institutions in numbers not seen before. Concerns about retention were framed in a glib aphorism that the "open door" was becoming a "revolving door" in the 1970s. Questions also began to arise as to the training that was desirable for college reading specialists. Instructional philosophies differed from college to college, and instructional activities included diagnosis, individualization, content area reading, and study skills instruction. The previously discussed work by Bullock et al. (1990) is an outgrowth of this work.

### *Organizational and Institutional Histories*

As an extension of the era-based studies, it is practical to discuss the contributions of different organizations. Each organization, within its own historical time, provided fundamental leadership for the field of college reading and learning research and instruction. Historical research and content analysis of the various organizations' conference yearbooks and journal articles by Singer and Kingston (1984), Stahl and Smith-Burke (1999), and Van Gilder (1970) discuss how the NRC's (now the LRA's) origins and maturity reflected the growth and development of college reading in the nation.

The NRC held its first meeting as the Southwest Reading Conference for Colleges and Universities in April 1952 with the goal of bringing southwestern-based college reading instructors together

to discuss issues impacting GI Bill-era programs. The content of the conference yearbooks during the organization's first five years focused on administrative procedures, student selection processes, and mechanical equipment for college reading programs. During the next four years, the papers grew in sophistication as the presenters began to focus on research, evaluation, and the interaction of college reading with other academic fields. Speed of reading became less of a topic of import as greater interest was directed at comprehension and reading flexibility. Over the 1960s, the membership was beginning to face a crisis that was both developmental and generational between those who were interested in the pedagogy of college reading and those who were more directly concerned with the research on the psychology of reading and learning. The outcome, with hindsight, was rather predictable. As the years have passed, the LRA has become a premier forum for literacy research. While topics on college reading can still be found on the yearly program, such presentations do not approach the proportional representation that manifested during the organization's formative years.

By the late 1950s, there was a growing interest in the eastern United States in starting an organization that would serve much the same purpose as the Southwest Reading Conference in the west. Hence, in 1958, individuals from Pennsylvania met at Temple University to discuss the possibility of forming an association for individuals from the northeast and the mid-Atlantic states who taught and administered college reading programs. After contacting faculty from across the region, the decision was made to hold the first conference of the CRA at LaSalle College in October 1958. Over the years, CRA (Alexander & Strode, 1999) (now the ALER) would broaden its mission to include emphasis on adult literacy, literacy clinics, and teacher education. Its journal, initially titled the journal of the *Reading Specialist* (now *Literacy Research & Instruction*) regularly published articles and columns pertaining to the college reading and study skills field. The ALER organizational history (Linek, et al. 2010a, 2010b) is a tour de force, serving as a model for other organizations as it includes decade-by-decade histories as well as sections of biographies and recollections of leaders, oral histories, and presidential and keynote addresses, with many of these documents focusing on college reading instruction.

In the 1970s, the onus of leadership in college reading was assumed by a new group in its formative years, the CRLA. O'Hear (1993), writing in the 25th anniversary edition of the *Journal of College Reading and Learning*, examined what had been learned about the field through the articles published in this journal and in the earlier conference yearbooks of the CRLA (known first as the Western College Reading Association and then as the Western College Reading and Learning Association). O'Hear proposed that after the enrollment of the "new students" in the latter 1960s, the field evolved from blind reliance on a deficit model driven by standardized tests and secondary school instructional techniques and materials. It evolved into a model in which students' needs were better understood and more likely to be approached by instruction based on current learning theory and reading research. This article, along with works by Kerstiens (1993), Mullen and Orlando (1993), and Agee (2007), provides important perspectives on CRLA's many contributions.

Boylan (2002) provided a historical narrative of the origins of the ACDEA (now the CLADEA). This unique umbrella council attempts to bring together the leadership of developmental education and learning assistance organizations so as to harness the power of synergy rather than to allow competition or jealousies hamper a common pedagogical mission across the field. Boylan covers the birthing process from 1996, the council's inter-organizational communication and informal mediation roles, and the development of the ACDEA and CLADEA Fellows Program.

A final organizational history category (Dvorak with Haley, 2015) provides the historical perspective on the contributions provided by the NCLCA. Within this work, the authors cover the association's history by discussing the organizational structure, contributions of selected officers, the NCLCA conference and its summer institute, the journal *The Learning Assistance Review*, the Learning Center Leadership Certification, and the designation of Learning Centers of Excellence for the NCLCA.

Organizational histories that have not been published as texts or articles can be found at the websites for each of the CLADEA member associations: National Association for Developmental Education ([www.nade.net](http://www.nade.net)), National College Learning Center Association ([nclca.wildapricot.org](http://nclca.wildapricot.org)), the Association for the Tutoring Profession ([www.myatp.org](http://www.myatp.org)), Association of Colleges for Tutoring & Learning Assistance ([actla.info](http://actla.info)), and the CRLA ([www.CRLA.net](http://www.CRLA.net)).

The articles and texts that are classified as topical works, era-based narratives, or organizational histories focus on depth of issue rather than the broad sweep found in articles on the subfields. Still, several cautions should be noted. A single author or team of coauthors have researched most of the topics within these works. Hence, there is little in the way of alternative viewpoints upon which to base conclusions. Second, the era studies tend to be focused on the times in which the author(s) were professionally active. While these "lived studies" are important, there is a danger of individuals trying to set themselves within history through personal interpretations. Furthermore, there is a need for era studies that go beyond the rather recent past. Finally, institutional studies have a tendency to paint a positive picture of the organization under study. Such a work, particularly when commissioned by the organization, must be read with an open mind.

### Oral History, Autobiography, and Biography

Norman Denzin authored *Interpretive Biography* in 1989. To this day, the text serves as a seminal source for those planning to undertake a range of biographical endeavors, including oral history, life history, biography, memorials, autobiography, and case histories, among others. As our field ages with the respective aging of those who have served over the years, opportunities for undertaking interpretive biography have grown. Works focusing on oral history by Stahl, King, Dillon, and Walker (1994) and Stahl and King (2007) provide guidelines for projects that have been undertaken by members of the profession. One of the first oral histories to appear was the interview with Martha Maxwell (Piper, 1998). Piper traces Maxwell's career of 50 years at the American University, the University of Maryland, and the University of California, Berkeley, as she served the fields of college reading, learning assistance, and developmental education [also see "Martha Maxwell" (2000) and Massey & Pytash (2010)].

Several years later, Casazza and Bauer (2006) produced a major oral history endeavor that preserves the perspectives of four groups of individuals who have impacted, or have been impacted by, developmental education over the years. The individuals interviewed can be classified as *pioneers* who worked to open the doors of higher education to diverse populations, *leaders* of the professional organizations, *practitioners* serving nontraditional students, and *students* who entered higher education through access programs. Across 30 interviews of the elites (e.g., David Arendale, Hunter Boylan, K. Patricia Cross, Martha Maxwell, and Mike Rose) who have left a published legacy and of the non-elites who will not have left an extensive legacy of publication and presentation, there emerged four common themes. These include (1) the power in having a belief in students, (2) the struggle between providing access to those who may be underprepared for postsecondary education and holding standards in learning, (3) the importance of institutional commitment to developing and supporting access, as well as the integration of support services into the mainstream of the mission and goals for the institution, and (4) the value of having a purposeful repertoire of strategies, both academic and personal, that promotes student success. From the themes that evolved came both recommendations and action steps that can promote access to higher education and ensure that the experience is meaningful for students.

As an outgrowth of the aforementioned project, Bauer and Casazza recrafted selected interviews so as to present intimate portraits of three of the field's enduring pioneers: K. Patricia Cross (Bauer & Casazza, 2005), Mike Rose (Bauer & Casazza, 2007), and Martha Maxwell (Casazza & Bauer, 2004). Through this oral history series in the *Journal of Developmental Education*, readers are

able to learn of major events and seminal works that influenced key players in our field. More recently in the organizational history of ALER, oral histories covering the lives of college reading specialists Maria Valeri-Gold (Mahoney, 2010) and Norman Stahl (King, 2010) were published. Both oral histories cover many of the contributions to research and praxis provided by the programs in Georgia over the latter 20th century.

The autobiographic account can also have tremendous impact on the field of developmental education. *Lives on the Boundary* by Mike Rose (1989) is an example of autobiography as we see its author overcome the effects of being branded a *remedial* learner as a youngster in South Los Angeles and later become a leading advocate of quality education for all students. It is through Rose's exploration of the self that we, as readers, are able to participate vicariously in the shared life so as to understand and become sympathetic for the argument he puts forward.

The profession has a growing number of biographies of individuals who shaped the field or who undertook research with college readers, influencing instruction over the past century (Israel & Monaghan, 2007; Taylor, 1937), in addition to the Reading Hall of Fame's (RHF's) website at [www.readinghall.org](http://www.readinghall.org). Brief biographies of Walter Pauk (Johri & Sturtevant, 2010a) and Martha Maxwell (Johri & Sturtevant, 2010b) are found in the ALER organizational history.

Finally, a kindred source to biography is the memorial. A professional field that has come of age begins to post memorials for the field's elites at the time of their respective passings. Such memorials serve as a type of interpretive biography with historical merit. They are found in the files for deceased members of the RHF on its website well as in the memorial section of the website for the LSCHE at [www.lsche.net/?page\\_id+1438](http://www.lsche.net/?page_id+1438).

Along with growing interest in qualitative research, there has been a concomitant growth in oral histories and life histories that preserve the most important historical artifact, the human memory. Although the selectivity of the human memory over the years does influence the artifact, oral history interviews provide the field with valuable insights that could have been lost to the sands of time. The growth in both autobiography and biography provides important resources, and these are fruitful areas for future work.

### *The Field in History*

A logical question naturally resurfaces at this point in our discussion. We query is there a body of historical scholarship that informs us about the field? The answer is multifaceted. First and foremost, it can be acknowledged that there is a documented history, particularly at the survey level, of the field of college reading and its allied fields of learning assistance and developmental education. Hence, there is little excuse for college reading professionals, including graduate students in programs that focus on developmental education, not to have a sense of the field's history through these readily available texts. It is not enough for the future leaders and researchers in the field to simply know of our history from a distance via historical surveys. They must adopt a philosophy that leads them to seek out and read widely and critically historically important texts, as covered in Strang (1938, 1940) and Stahl (2014), and those included in Armstrong, Stahl, and Boylan (2014) and Flippo (2017).

Second, it is evident that the number of historically oriented texts is growing, both in number and in sophistication. In 1986, Stahl, Hynd, and Henk were able to identify nine texts that covered historical topics about college reading and learning assistance. The current chapter includes over 100 resources with the same historical mission. The burgeoning interest in history is due in part to the field's coming of age with a committed cadre of scholars who have not abandoned college reading or developmental education for what might have been considered "greener pastures" in teacher education. Also with an established, if not graying, professoriate in our field, there has been a growing desire to know our place and roots in the profession, and perhaps to define our role or legacy in the history of the field.

Since the release of the original version of this chapter, a number of sources have been released focusing on historical method in literacy (Gray, 2007; Monaghan & Hartman, 2000; Stahl & Hartman, 2011; Stahl & King, 2007; Zimmer, 2007). It is clear today that the sophistication in historical research methods deployed in literacy has matured over the years. There are a greater number of studies that attempt to be more than simple chronological surveys of past events. The work is becoming more focused on specific topics and defined eras as well as more articulate about its own processes. There are numerous opportunities for members of the profession to become involved in preserving the historical legacy of the field of college reading. Hence, we now turn to the role each of us can play in the history of the field.

## Doing History

While all persons make history, and are part of history on a day-to-day basis, most individuals naively assume that history represents only the scope of events at national or international levels. Hence, the history of our profession is generally viewed as the broad historical chronicles, chronicles that pay scant attention to the field of college reading. History is also erroneously thought of as the story of men of wealth and status. Hence, the thought of being a historian and undertaking historiography, even at a personal or a local level, can seem to be a most daunting task. Still, we believe that each college reading specialist can be and certainly should be a historian of what Kyvig and Marty (2010) call “nearby history.”

## Nearby History

What then is “nearby history” or “local history” (Kammen, 2014), and what is its value to our profession? As an outgrowth of the turbulence and social upheavals of the 1960s, there came to be both academic and practical value for the detailed study of specific institutions and communities through the advent of social history. We hold that college reading programs and LACs are intricate parts of a larger institution and that professionals delivering services, along with students who receive them, are part of a defined community in a postsecondary institution and worthy of concerted and careful study.

It is important to ask questions about (1) the conditions that lead to the origins of a program, (2) the purposes of the program at various stages in its evolving life, (3) the dynamics of the program’s relationships with other academic units, (4) the milestones over the years, (5) the unique program features over time, (6) the traditions incorporated into the design of the unit, (7) the distinctive nature for which the reading program comes to be known, and (8) how the pride of community is promoted. In pursuing answers to these questions, we gain vital information on the history of that program. Furthermore, we have a solid foundation upon which to build for the future or handle pedagogical issues and institutional situations currently impacting the program. Hence, there is a reason that historical method should be utilized to preserve the accomplishments and heritage of specific college reading programs and learning assistance centers. Four examples of historical narratives of programs include Christ’s (1984) account of the development of the LAC at California State University, Long Beach, Arendale’s (2001, 2002c) description of the historical development of the Supplemental Instruction program at the University of Missouri–Kansas City as it grew into an international pedagogical movement, Spann’s (1996) historical narrative of the National Center for Developmental Education at Appalachian State University, and the LSCHE’s (n.d.a) description of the 40-year evolution of the LSCHE resource system.

While it is not the purpose of this chapter to cover the methods and techniques of historiography, we would be remiss if we did not note that there exists a range of documents at the disposal of college reading programs and learning centers that open the doors to the study of an academic

unit's history. These documents include published texts of wide circulation (e.g., scholarly books, institutional histories, journal and yearbook articles, course texts/workbooks, dissertations, reading tests, government reports, LISTSERV archives); documents of local distribution (e.g., campus newspapers, college catalogs, campus brochures, training manuals); unpublished documents (e.g., strategic plans, yearly reports, accreditation documents, evaluation reports, faculty service reports); and media/digital products (e.g., photographs, videos, movies, software, www homepages) from the program's files or institutional archives. Likewise, artifacts such as tachistoscopes, controlled readers, reading films, reading accelerators, and software may seem like obsolete junk that has been shunted to forgotten storage closets. Yet these artifacts have as much value in learning a program's history as old texts or archives of students' work from past generations.

The history of a college reading program as an entity, along with the history of the academic community that instantiates that program, can be preserved through the collection of autobiographies and oral history narratives of current and former faculty and administrators as well as current and former students. The autobiographic account or autoethnography can impact understanding of the self as a professional. It can also impact the workings of an entire program.

Life history and oral history can play an equally important role in preserving the history of a college reading program. With the more established programs, faculty might undertake oral history interviews with retired faculty who served with the program in past years. Second, life history interviews with former students might provide interesting narratives that suggest the ways in which the program played a part in their development as college students and mature readers. Finally, life history narratives of current faculty and staff will provide an interesting picture of the personal histories that underlie the current pedagogical philosophy of the program.

The history of a program can be disseminated in a number of ways. The audience for this activity may be internal to the institution, or it may be an external body of reading professionals, legislators, or community members. Written forms of dissemination include scholarly books; articles in state or national journals, or conference yearbooks; and chapters in institutional histories, whether released in traditional publication venues or through the growing number of open-source texts. The historical study of a program (e.g., Walker, 1980) or an oral history project focusing on individuals associated with a program or professional organization (Casazza & Bauer, 2006; King, 1990) can be a most appropriate but often overlooked thesis or dissertation topic. Program histories can also find avenues for dissemination through conference presentations. In fact, this type of dissemination may be the only method of preserving for the historical record the contributions and stories of national class programs and faculties, such as those in the General College at the University of Minnesota and at Georgia State University (Johnson, 2005; Singer, 2002) that were lost to political winds. Forms of digital media housed on a website that can be used to highlight a program's history include streaming videos, PowerPoint presentations, podcasts, blogs, artifact/document displays, and open-source documents.

### *Historical Research for the Profession*

We now shift the discussion to historical topics that have more nationally oriented foci. In the first edition of the *Handbook*, we built upon Stahl et al.'s (1986) 10 avenues, which provide options for undertaking historical research into the college reading and learning assistance profession. In the second edition, two additional avenues were added to the discussion. Now, at this juncture, we suggest that the 12 avenues for research continue to serve as important options for the field's historical endeavors for four reasons. First, given the depth of each topic, there are many valid and valuable opportunities for research by either the neophyte or the more experienced literacy historian. Second, with the breadth of the field, there is still so much need to undertake historical research in each of the areas. Third, undertaking any of the suggestions may result in history becoming



immediately relevant for the researcher. Equally relevant, although at a later time, the individual who reads the articles or attends any conference sessions that are the product of the historian's endeavors will also benefit. Finally, since the release of the last edition of the *Handbook*, the number of graduate programs training college reading specialists and developmental educators has grown. Hartman, Stahl, and King (2016) have made the case that all doctoral students in the literacy field should undertake an experience with historical scholarship before being granted candidate status.

These 12 avenues for historical study are presented in Table 1.1. Each topic is followed by a focus question. Then, in column three, there are references previously published on the topic, historical studies providing guidance for future research, or resources for historical work on the topic. Each topic provides a rich opportunity for research.

*Table 1.1* Doing the History of College Reading and Learning Assistance

<i>Avenues for Research</i>	<i>Questions to Guide Research</i>	<i>Key Sources</i>
Judging the impact of a historical event	How have pedagogical, sociological, and economic events and trends at the national and international levels impacted the field?	Arendale (2010), Bullock et al. (1990)
Focusing on an era	What was the impact of influential theories, research, individuals, institutions, and instructional texts for a defined era?	Boylan and Bonham (2007), Brier (1983, 1984), Kingston (1990), Pauk (1999)
Assessing the impact of influential individuals (the elite)	What were the critical contributions and influences of key leaders over the years (e.g., Francis Robinson, Alton Raygor, Oscar Causey, Frances Triggs)?	Flippo, Cranney, Wark and Raygor (1990), Israel and Monaghan (2007), Stahl (1983)
Consulting the experienced	What can we learn about the history of the field through the oral histories and autobiographies of leaders (e.g., Walter Pauk, Martha Maxwell, Frank Christ, Mike Rose)?	Bauer and Casazza (2007), Kerstiens (1998), Piper (1998), Rose (1989)
Tracing changes in materials	How have published instructional materials changed or evolved over the years due to theory, research, or pedagogical trends?	Leedy (1958), Shen (2002), Stahl et al. (1988)
Observing changes across multiple editions	What can a case study of a particular text across multiple editions inform us about the field or programs that used it (e.g., <i>How to Study in College</i> by Walter Pauk)?	Shen (2002), Stahl et al. (1989, 1990)
Judging innovation and movements	How do innovations in instruction and curriculum measure up to the records of precursors? How do innovations stand the test of time?	Stahl et al. (1996)
Appraising elements of instrumentation	How have formal and informal measures of assessment changed or influenced practice over the years?	Flippo and Schumm (2009), Van Leirsburg (1991)
Focusing on an institution	How has instruction or research that took place in a particular college impacted the field?	Johnson (2005), Singer (2002), Walker (1980)
Tracking and evaluating an idea or a problem	How has a particular issue (e.g., labeling programs) impacted the field over the years?	Arendale (2005)
Doing history and creating and preserving a legacy	What is the art of the literacy historian? How should we preserve texts, tests, hardware, and software of instruction from previous generations for future generations?	Hartman et al. (2016), Monaghan and Hartman (2000), Stahl and Hartman (2011)

The historical works of the college reading field can be disseminated through a range of activities. Conferences sponsored by CRLA, NADE, and NCLCA welcome historical papers. All of the journals in the field of literacy research and pedagogy, learning assistance, or developmental education publish historical works pertaining to college reading. The *Journal of Developmental Education* publishes biographical-oriented interviews, as with Walter Pauk (Kerstiens, 1998), and oral histories. Still, it must be noted that historically focused manuscripts are not submitted to journal editors on a regular basis, and hence, such work is not published with regular frequency. Finally, the History of Literacy Innovative Community Group of the LRA has supported the study of individuals of historical importance to college reading's history in sessions at the annual LRA conference.

### Final Thoughts

Like our nation, the field of college reading and learning research and instruction is in the midst of a period of great flux, leading to ever so many questions about the future. Given an uncertain and perhaps tenuous future, the history of the field has a most important role. Here, we turn to the sage wisdom of Franklin D. Roosevelt (1941) as he addressed his fellow citizens in an earlier time when the nation faced the onset of a most perilous period in our history:

A nation must believe in three things. It must believe in the past. It must believe in the future. It must, above all, believe in the capacity of its own people to learn from the past that they can gain in judgement in creating their own future.

Substituting *the field of college reading and learning* for *nation* in the quote above can provide important guidance to all professionals in the field.

Hence, we remain constant in our belief that the value of studying literacy history is great (Hartman et al., 2016; Moore, Monaghan, & Hartman, 1997). The options for historical research are many, yet researchers' uptake of these options is most uncommon. We are even stronger in our shared belief that each of us must be a historian, and each of us must be a student of history. The conduct of historical work in the field of college reading is alive and growing in a positive manner. In an era of reform in which the futures of many programs are at best tenuous, it is ever more important for the professionals in the field to understand that we have been making history for over a century. We should be learning and interpreting our history through classes, journal articles, and conference presentations, and we should be doing history at both the nearby and national levels on a regular basis. Simply put, we should remain cognizant that our understanding of our past will define and direct our future.

### References and Selected Readings

- Agee, K. (2007). *A brief history of CRLA*. Retrieved from [www.crla.net/index.php/membership/about-us](http://www.crla.net/index.php/membership/about-us)
- Ahrendt, K. M. (1975). *Community college reading programs*. Newark, DE: International Reading Association.
- Alexander, J. E., & Strode, S. L. (1999). *History of the College Reading Association, 1958-1998*. Commerce, TX: A&M University, Commerce.
- Arendale, D. R. (2001). Effect of administrative placement and fidelity of implementation of the model on effectiveness of Supplemental Instruction programs. *Dissertation Abstracts International*, 62, 93.
- Arendale, D. R. (2002a). Then and now: The early history of developmental education: Past events and future trends. *Research and Teaching in Developmental Education*, 18(2), 3-26.
- \*Arendale, D. R. (2002b). A memory sometimes ignored: The history of developmental education. *The Learning Assistance Review*, 7(1), 5-13.

- Arendale, D. R. (2002c). History of Supplemental Instruction (SI): Mainstreaming of developmental education. In D. B. Lundell & J. L. Higbee (Eds.), *Histories of developmental education* (pp. 15–28). Minneapolis, MN: Center for Research on Developmental Education and Urban Literacy, University of Minnesota.
- Arendale, D. R. (2004). Mainstreamed academic assistance and enrichment for all students: The historical origins of learning assistance centers. *Research for Education Reform*, 9(4), 3–21.
- Arendale, D. R. (2005). Terms of endearment: Words that define and guide developmental education. *Journal of College Reading and Learning*, 35(2), 66–81.
- Arendale, D. R. (2006). Developmental education history: Recurring trends and future opportunities. *The Journal of Teaching and Learning*, 8(1), 6–17.
- \*Arendale, D. R. (2010). *Access at the crossroads: Learning assistance in higher education*. ASHE Higher Education Report, 35(6). San Francisco, CA: Jossey-Bass.
- Armstrong, S. L. (2012). The impact of history on the future of college reading: An interview with Norman A. Stahl. *Journal of Developmental Education*, 35(3), 24–27.
- Armstrong, S. L., Stahl, N. A., & Boylan, H. R. (Eds.). (2014). *Teaching developmental reading: Practical, historical, and theoretical background readings* (2nd ed.). Boston, MA: Bedford/St. Martins.
- Bailey, J. L. (1982). *An evaluation of journal published research of college reading study skills, 1925–1980* (Unpublished doctoral dissertation). University of Tennessee, Knoxville, TN.
- Bannier, B. (2006). The impact of the GI Bill on developmental education. *The Learning Assistance Review*, 11(1), 35–44.
- Bauer, L., & Casazza, M. E. (2005). Oral history of postsecondary access: K. Patricia Cross, a pioneer. *Journal of Developmental Education*, 29(2), 20–22, 24–25.
- Bauer, L., & Casazza, M. E. (2007). Oral history of postsecondary access: Mike Rose, a pioneer. *Journal of Developmental Education*, 30(3), 16–18, 26, 32.
- Berger, A. & Peebles, J. D. (1976). *Rates of comprehension*. Newark, DE: International Reading Association.
- Blake, W. S. (1953). *A survey and evaluation of study skills programs at the college level in the United States and possessions* (Unpublished doctoral dissertation). University of Maryland, College Park, MD.
- Bliesmer, E. P. (1957). Materials for the more retarded college reader. In O. S. Causey (Ed.), *Techniques and procedures in college and adult reading programs: 6th yearbook of the Southwest Reading Conference* (pp. 86–90). Fort Worth, TX: Texas Christian University Press.
- Boylan, H. R. (1988). The historical roots of developmental education, Part III. *Research in Developmental Education*, 5(3), 1–4. Retrieved from <http://eric.ed.gov>, ED. #341–434.
- Boylan, H. R. (1990). The cycle of new majorities in higher education. In A. M. Frager (Ed.), *College reading and the new majority: Improving instruction in multicultural classrooms* (pp. 3–12). Oxford, OH: College Reading Association.
- Boylan, H. R. (2002). A brief history of the American Council of Developmental Education Associations. In D. B. Lundell & J. L. Higbee (Eds.), *Histories of developmental education* (pp. 11–14). Minneapolis, MN: Center for Research on Developmental Education and Urban Literacy, University of Minnesota.
- Boylan, H. R., & Bonham, B. S. (2007). 30 years of developmental education: A retrospective. *Journal of Developmental Education*, 30(3), 2–4.
- Boylan, H. R., & Bonham, B. S. (2014). *Developmental education: Readings on its past, present, and future*. Boston, MA: Bedford/St. Martin's.
- Boylan, H. R., & White, W. G. (1987). Educating all the nation's people: The historical roots of developmental education (Part 1). *Research in Developmental Education*, 4(4), 1–4. (Reprinted in *Developmental education: Readings on its past, present, and future*. pp. 5–18, by H. R. Boylan & B. S. Bonham, Eds., 2014, Boston, MA: Bedford/St. Martin's)
- Boylan, H. R., & White, W. G. (1994). Educating all the nation's people: The historical roots of developmental education – condensed version. In M. Maxwell (Ed.), *From access to success* (pp. 3–7). Clearwater, FL: H & H Publishing.
- Brier, E. M. (1983). *Bridging the academic preparation gap at Vassar College and Cornell University, 1865–1890* (Unpublished doctoral dissertation). Columbia University Teachers College, New York, NY.
- \*Brier, E. (1984). Bridging the academic preparation gap: An historical view. *Journal of Developmental Education*, 8(1), 2–5. (Reprinted in *Developmental education: Readings on its past, present, and future*. pp. 11–18, by H. R. Boylan & B. S. Bonham, Eds., 2014, Boston, MA: Bedford/St. Martin's).
- Bullock, T. L., Madden, D. A., & Mallery, A. L. (1990). Developmental education in American universities: Past, present, and future. *Research & Teaching in Developmental Education*, 6(2), 5–74.
- Carpenter, K., & Johnson, L. L. (1991). Program organization. In R. F. Flippo & D. C. Caverly (Eds.), *College reading and study strategy programs* (pp. 28–69). Newark, DE: International Reading Association.

- Casazza, M. E. (1999). Who are we and where did we come from? *Journal of Developmental Education*, 23(1), 2-4, 6-7.
- Casazza, M. E., & Bauer, L. (2004). Oral history of postsecondary access: Martha Maxwell, a pioneer. *Journal of Developmental Education*, 28(1), 20-22, 24, 26. (Reprinted in *Teaching developmental reading: Historical, theoretical, and practical background readings*, pp. 9-18, by S. L. Armstrong, N. A. Stahl, & H. R. Boylan, Eds., 2014, Boston, MA: Bedford/St. Martin's).
- \*Casazza, M. E., & Bauer, L. (2006). *Access, opportunity, and success: Keeping the promise of higher education*. Westwood, CN: Greenwood Publishing Group.
- Casazza, M. E., & Silverman, S. (1996). *Learning assistance and developmental education: A guide for effective practice*. San Francisco, CA: Jossey-Bass.
- Chall, J. S. (1983). *Stages of reading development*. New York, NY: McGraw-Hill.
- Christ, F. L. (1984). Learning assistance at California State University-Long Beach, 1972-1984. *Journal of Developmental Education*, 8(2), 2-5.
- Cranney, A. G. (1983a). Two decades of adult reading programs: Growth, problems, and prospects. *Journal of Reading*, 26(5), 416-423.
- Cranney, A. G. (1983b). Two decades of college-adult reading: Where to find the best of it. *Journal of College Reading and Learning*, 16(1), 1-5.
- \*Cross, K. P. (1971). *Beyond the open door: New students to higher education*. San Francisco, CA: Jossey-Bass.
- Denzin, N. K. (1989). *Interpretive biography*. Newbury Park, CA: Sage.
- Dvorak, J. with Haley, J. (2015). Honoring our past: The founding of NCLCA. *The Learning Assistance Review*, 20(2), 7-11.
- \*Enright, G. (1975). College learning skills: Frontierland origins of the Learning Assistance Center. *College learning skills: Today and tomorrowland. Proceedings of the eighth annual conference of the Western College Reading Association* (pp. 81-92). Las Cruces, NM: Western College Reading and Learning Association. (ERIC Document Reproduction Service No. ED105204.) [Reprinted in Maxwell, M. (1994). *From access to success* (pp. 31-40). Clearwater, FL: H & H Publications.]
- Enright, G., & Kerstiens, G. (1980). The learning center: Toward an expanded role. In O. T. Lenning & R. L. Nayman (Eds.), *New directions for college learning assistance* (pp. 1-24). San Francisco, CA: Jossey-Bass.
- Flippo, R. F. (Ed.) (2017). *Reading: Major themes in education* (Vols. I-IV). London and New York: Routledge.
- Flippo, R. F., Cranney, A. G., Wark, D., & Raygor, B. R. (1990). From the editor and invited guests - In dedication to Al Raygor: 1922-1989. *Forum for Reading*, 21(2), 4-10.
- Flippo, R. F., & Schumm, J. C. (2009). Reading tests. In R. F. Flippo & D. C. Caverly (Eds.), *Handbook of college reading and study strategy research* (pp. 408-464). New York, NY: Routledge.
- Gray, A. (2007). Searching for biographical sources: An archivist's perspective. In S. E. Israel & E. J. Monaghan (Eds.), *Shaping the reading field: The impact of early pioneers, scientific research, and progressive ideas* (pp. 421-426). Newark, DE: International Reading Association.
- Hartman, D. K., Stahl, N. A., & King, J. R. (2016, December). *When topical currency reflects a myopic professional zeitgeist: A case in the defense of the history of literacy research*. Presented at the annual conference of the American Reading Forum, Sanibel, FL.
- Heron, E. B. (1989). *The dilemma of college reading instruction: A developmental analysis* (Unpublished doctoral dissertation). Harvard University, Cambridge, MA.
- Israel, S. E., & Monaghan, E. J. (2007). *Shaping the reading field: The impact of early reading pioneers, scientific research, and progressive ideas*. Newark, DE: International Reading Association.
- Johnson, A. B. (2005). From the beginning: The history of developmental education and the pre-1932 General College idea. In J. L. Higbee, D. B. Lundell, & D. R. Arendale (Eds.), *The General College vision: Integrating intellectual growth, multicultural perspectives, and student development* (pp. 39-59). Minneapolis, MN: General College, University of Minnesota.
- Johri, A., & Sturtevant, E. G. (2010a). Walter Pauk: A brief biography. In W. M. Linek, D. D. Massey, E. G. Sturtevant, L. Cochran, B. McClanahan, & M. B. Sampson (Eds.), *College Reading Association legacy: A celebration of fifty years of literacy leadership* (Vol. 1, p. 171). St. Cloud, MN: Association of Literacy Educators and Researchers.
- Johri, A., & Sturtevant, E. G. (2010b). Martha Maxwell: A brief biography. In W. M. Linek, D. D. Massey, E. G. Sturtevant, L. Cochran, B. McClanahan, & M. B. Sampson (Eds.), *College Reading Association legacy: A celebration of fifty years of literacy leadership* (Vol. 1, pp. 155-157). St. Cloud, MN: Association of Literacy Educators and Researchers.
- Jones, H., & Richards-Smith, H. (1987). Historically black colleges and universities: A force in developmental education, Part II. *Research in Developmental Education*, 4(5). (Retrieved from <http://eric.ed.gov>, ED. # 341-434).

- Kammen, C. (2014). *On doing local history* (3rd ed.). Lanham, MD: Rowman & Littlefield.
- Kerstiens, G. (1971). *Junior-community college reading/study skills*. Newark, DE: International Reading Association.
- Kerstiens, G. (1993). A quarter-century of student assessment in CRLA publications. *Journal of College Reading and Learning*, 25(2), 1–9.
- Kerstiens, G. (1998). Studying in college, then & now: An interview with Walter Pauk. *Journal of Developmental Education*, 21(3), 20–24. (Reprinted in *Teaching developmental reading: Historical, theoretical, and practical background readings*, pp. 33–42, by S. L. Armstrong, N. A. Stahl, & H. R. Boylan, Eds., 2014, Boston, MA: Bedford/St. Martin's).
- King, J. R. (1990). Heroes in reading teachers' tales. *International Journal of Qualitative Studies in Education*, 4(1), 45–60.
- King, J. R. (2010). Norman A. Stahl. In W. M. Linek, D. D. Massey, E. G. Sturtevant, L. Cochran, B. McClanahan, & M. B. Sampson (Eds.), *College Reading Association legacy: A celebration of fifty years of literacy leadership* (Vol. 1, pp. 499–506). St. Cloud, MN: Association of Literacy Educators and Researchers.
- Kingston, A. J. (1990). A brief history of college reading. *Forum for Reading*, 21(2), 11–15.
- Kingston, A. J. (2003). A brief history of college reading. In E. J. Paulson, M. E. Laine, S. A. Biggs, & T. L. Bullock (Eds.), *College reading research and practice: Articles from the Journal of College Literacy and Learning* (pp. 7–12). Newark, DE: International Reading Association.
- Kyvig, D. E., & Marty, M. A. (2010). *Nearby history* (3rd ed.). Lanham, MD: Alta Mira.
- Learning Support Centers in Higher Education. (n.d.a.). *LSCHE – a “nearby history.”* Retrieved from [www.lsche.net/?page\\_id=3954](http://www.lsche.net/?page_id=3954)
- Learning Support Centers in Higher Education. (n.d.b.). *History of the institutes.* Retrieved from [www.lsche.net/?page\\_id=3259](http://www.lsche.net/?page_id=3259)
- \*Leedy, P. D. (1958). *A history of the origin and development of instruction in reading improvement at the college level* (Unpublished doctoral dissertation). New York University: New York, NY.
- Linek, W. M., Massey, D. D., Sturtevant, E. G., Cochran, L., McClanahan, B., & Sampson, M. B. (2010a). *College Reading Association legacy: A celebration of fifty years of literacy leadership* (Vol. 1). St. Cloud, MN: Association of Literacy Educators and Researchers.
- Linek, W. M., Massey, D. D., Sturtevant, E. G., Cochran, L., McClanahan, B., & Sampson, M. B. (2010b). *College Reading Association legacy: A celebration of fifty years of literacy leadership* (Vol. 2). St. Cloud, MN: Association of Literacy Educators and Researchers.
- Lissner, L. S. (1990). The learning center from 1829 to the year 2000 and beyond. In R. M. Hashway (Ed.), *Handbook of developmental education* (pp. 127–154). New York, NY: Praeger.
- Lowe, A. J. (1967a). Surveys of college reading improvement programs: 1929–1966. In G. B. Schick & M. May (Eds.), *Junior college and adult reading – Expanding fields, 16th yearbook of the National Reading Conference* (pp. 75–81). Milwaukee, WI: National Reading Conference. (ERIC Document Reproduction Service No. ED011230).
- Lowe, A. J. (1967b). *An evaluation of a college reading improvement program* (Unpublished doctoral dissertation). University of Virginia, Charlottesville, VA.
- \*Lowe, A. J. (1970). *The rise of college reading, the good and bad and the indifferent: 1915–1970*. Paper presented at the College Reading Association Conference, Philadelphia, PA. (ERIC Document Reproduction Service No. ED040013).
- Mahoney, L. (2010). *Maria Valeri-Gold*. In W. M. Linek, D. D. Massey, E. G. Sturtevant, L. Cochran, B. McClanahan, & M. B. Sampson (Eds.), *College Reading Association legacy: A celebration of fifty years of literacy leadership* (Vol. 2; pp. 527–534). St. Cloud, MN: Association of Literacy Educators and Researchers.
- Mallery, A. L. (1986). College reading programs 1958–1978. In D. Lumpkin, M. Harshberger, & P. Ransom (Eds.), *Evaluation in reading: Learning teaching administering, Sixth yearbook of the American Reading Forum* (pp. 113–125). Muncie, IN: Ball State University. (ERIC Document Reproduction Service No. ED290136).
- Manzo, A. V. (1983). College reading: Past and present. *Forum for Reading*, 14, 5–16.
- Martha Maxwell: An oral history. (2000). In J. L. Higbee & P. L. Dwinell (Eds.). *The many faces of developmental education* (pp. 9–14). Warrensburg, MO: NADE. (Reprinted in *The profession and practice of learning assistance and developmental education: Essays in memory of Dr. Martha Maxwell*, J. L. Higbee (Ed.), 2014, Boone, NC: Appalachian State University, NCDE & CLADEA).
- Mason, R. B. (1994). *Selected college reading improvement programs: A descriptive history*. New York, NY: Author. (ERIC Document Reproduction Service No. ED366907).
- Massey, D. D., & Pytash, K. E. (2010). Martha Maxwell. In W. M. Linek, D. D. Massey, Cochran, E. G. Sturtevant, B. McClanahan, & M. B. Sampson (Eds.), *College Reading Association legacy: A celebration of fifty years of literacy leadership* (Vol. 1, pp. 397–400). St. Cloud, MN: Association of Literacy Educators and Researchers.

- Maxwell, M. (1979). *Improving student learning skills*. San Francisco, CA: Jossey-Bass.
- \*Maxwell, M. (1997). *Improving student learning skills: A new edition*. Clearwater, FL: H&H Publishers.
- Maxwell, M. (2001). College reading fifty years later. In W. M. Linek, E. G. Sturtevant, J. A. R. Dugan, & P. Linder (Eds.), *Celebrating the voices of literacy* (pp. 8–13.). Commerce, TX: College Reading Association.
- Monaghan, E. J., & Hartman, D. K. (2000). Undertaking historical research in literacy. In M. Kamil, P. Mosenthal, P. D. Pearson, & R. Barr (Eds.), *Handbook of reading research* (Vol. III, pp. 109–121). Mahwah, NJ: Erlbaum.
- Moore, D. W., Monaghan, E. J., & Hartman, D. K. (1997). Conversations: Values of literacy history. *Reading Research Quarterly*, 32(1), 90–102.
- Mullen, J. L., & Orlando, V. P. (1993). Reflections on 25 years of the *Journal of College Reading and Learning*. *Journal of College Reading and Learning*, 25(2), 25–30.
- Narang, H. L. (1973). Materials for college and adult reading improvement programs. *Reading World*, 12(3), 181–187.
- O'Hear, M. (1993). College reading programs: The last 25 years. *Journal of College Reading and Learning*, 25(2), 17–24.
- Parr, F. W. (1930). The extent of remedial reading work in state universities in the United States. *School and Society*, 31, 547–548.
- Pauk, W. (1999). How SQ3R came to be. In J. R. Dugan, P. E. Linder, & E. G. Sturtevant (Eds.), *Advancing the world of literacy: Moving into the 21st century. The 21st yearbook of the College Reading Association* (pp. 27–35). Commerce, TX: College Reading Association. (Reprinted in In W. M. Linek, D. D. Massey, E. G. Sturtevant, L. Cochran, B. McClanahan, & M. B. Sampson (Eds.). (2010). *College Reading Association legacy: A celebration of fifty years of literacy leadership* (Vol. 1, pp. 172–179). St. Cloud, MN: Association of Literacy Educators and Researchers).
- Piper, J. (1998). An interview with Martha Maxwell. *The Learning Assistance Review*, 3(1), 32–39.
- Quinn, K. B. (1995). Teaching reading and writing as modes of learning in college: A glance at the past; A view to the future. *Reading Research and Instruction*, 34(4), 295–314.
- Roberts, G. H. (1986). *Developmental education: An historical study*. (ERIC Document Reproduction Service No. 276–395).
- Robinson, R. D. (2002). *Classics in literacy education: Historical perspective for today's teachers*. Newark, DE: International Reading Association.
- Roosevelt, F. D. (1941). *Remarks at the dedication of the Franklin D. Roosevelt library*. Retrieved from [www.fdrlibrary](http://www.fdrlibrary)
- Rose, A. D. (1991). Preparing for veterans: Higher education and the efforts to accredit the learning of World War II servicemen and women. *Adult Education Quarterly*, 42(1), 30–45.
- Rose, M. (1989). *Lives on the boundary*. New York, NY: Penguin.
- Shen, L. B. (2002). *Survey of college reading and study skills textbooks* (Unpublished doctoral dissertation). University of Pittsburgh, Pittsburgh, PA.
- Singer, H., & Kingston, A. (1984). From the Southwest Reading Conference to the National Reading Conference: A brief history from 1952–1984. In J. A. Niles & L. A. Harris (Eds.), *Changing perspectives on research in reading/language processing and instruction. Thirty-third yearbook of the National Reading Conference* (pp. 1–4). Rochester, NY: National Reading Conference.
- Singer, M. (2002). Toward a comprehensive learning center. In D. B. Lundell & J. L. Higbee (Eds.), *Histories of developmental education* (pp. 65–71). Minneapolis, MN: Center for Research on Developmental Education and Urban Literacy, University of Minnesota.
- Smith, N. B. (1934a). *A historical analysis of American reading instruction* (Unpublished doctoral dissertation). Teachers College, Columbia University, New York, NY.
- Smith, N. B. (1934b). *American reading instruction*. New York, NY: Silver-Burdett.
- Smith, N. B. (1965). *American reading instruction* (Rev. ed.). Newark, DE: International Reading Association.
- Smith, N. B. (1986). *American reading instruction*. Prologue by L. Courtney, FSC, and epilogue by H. A. Robinson. Newark, DE: International Reading Association.
- Smith, N. B. (2002). *American reading instruction (Special Edition)*. Newark, DE: International Reading Association.
- Spache, G. D. (1969). College – adult reading: Past, present, and future. In G. B. Schick & M. May (Eds.), *The psychology of reading behavior, 18th yearbook of the National Reading Conference* (pp. 188–194). Milwaukee, WI: National Reading Conference.
- Spann, M. G. (1996). National Center of Developmental Education: The formative years. *Journal of Developmental Education*, 20(2), 2–6.

- Stahl, N. A. (1983). *A historical analysis of textbook-study systems* (Unpublished doctoral dissertation). University of Pittsburgh, Pittsburgh, PA.
- Stahl, N. A. (January–March 1988). Historical titles in reading research and instruction: A history of the origin and development of instruction in reading improvement at the college level. *Reading Psychology*, 9, 73–77.
- Stahl, N. A. (2002). Epilogue. In N. B. Smith (author) *American reading instruction (Special Edition)* (pp. 413–418). Newark, DE: International Reading Association.
- Stahl, N. A. (2014). Selected references of historical importance to the field of college reading and learning. In S. L. Armstrong, N. A. Stahl, & H. R. Boylan (Eds.), *Teaching developmental reading: Historical, theoretical, and practical background readings* (pp. 42–50). Boston, MA: Bedford/St. Martin's.
- \*Stahl, N. A., Boylan, H., Collins, T., DeMarais, L., & Maxwell, M. (1999). Historical perspectives: With hindsight we gain foresight. In D. B. Lundell & J. L. Higbee (Eds.), *Proceeding of the first intentional meeting on future directions in developmental education* (pp. 13–16). Minneapolis, MN: The Center for Research on Developmental Education and Urban Literacy, University of Minnesota.
- Stahl, N. A., Brozo, W. G., & Hynd, C. R. (1989). *The development and validation of a comprehensive list of primary sources in college reading instruction with full bibliography* (College Reading and Learning Assistance Technical Report No. 88-03). DeKalb, IL: Northern Illinois University. (ERIC Document Reproduction Service No. ED307597).
- Stahl, N. A., Brozo, W. G., & Hynd, C. R. (October, 1990). The development and validation of a comprehensive list of primary sources in college reading instruction. *Reading Horizons*, 31(1), 22–34.
- \*Stahl, N. A., & Hartman, D. K. (2011). Doing historical research on literacy. In N. K. Duke & M. H. Mallette (Eds.), *Literacy research methodologies* (2nd ed., pp. 213–241). New York, NY: Guilford Press.
- Stahl, N. A., & Henk, W. A. (1986). Tracing the roots of textbook-study systems: An extended historical perspective. In J. A. Niles (Ed.), *Solving problems in literacy: Learner, teachers and researchers – 35th yearbook of the National Reading Conference* (pp. 366–374). Rochester, NY: National Reading Conference.
- Stahl, N. A., Hynd, C. R., & Henk, W. A. (1986). Avenues for chronicling and researching the history of college reading and study skills instruction. *Journal of Reading*, 29(4), 334–341.
- Stahl, N. A., & King, J. R. (2007). Oral history projects for the literacy profession. In S. E. Israel & E. J. Monaghan (Eds.), *Shaping the reading field: The impact of early reading pioneers, scientific research, and progressive ideas* (pp. 427–432). Newark, DE: International Reading Association.
- Stahl, N. A., King, J. R., Dillon, D., & Walker, J. (1994). The roots of reading: Preserving the heritage of a profession through oral history projects. In E. G. Sturtevant and W. Linek (Eds.), *Pathways for literacy: 16th yearbook of the College Reading Association* (pp. 15–24). Commerce, TX: College Reading Association.
- Stahl, N. A., King, J. R., & Eilers, V. (1996). Postsecondary reading strategies: Rediscovered. *Journal of Adolescent and Adult Literacy*, 39(5), 368–379.
- Stahl, N. A., Simpson, M. L., & Brozo, W. G. (Spring, 1988). The materials of college reading instruction: A critical and historical perspective from 50 years of content analysis research. *Reading Research and Instruction*, 27(3), 16–34.
- Stahl, N. A., & Smith–Burke, M. T. (1999). The National Reading Conference: The college and adult reading years. *Journal of Literacy Research*, 31(1), 47–66.
- Straff, W. W. (1986). *Comparisons, contrasts, and evaluation of selected college reading programs* (Unpublished doctoral dissertation). Temple University, Philadelphia, PA.
- Strang, R. (1938 & 1940). *Problems in the improvement of reading in high school and college*. Lancaster, PA: Science Press.
- Taylor, E. A. (1937). *Controlled reading*. Chicago, IL: University of Chicago Press.
- Thurstone, E. L., Lowe, A. J., & Hayden, L. (1965). A survey of college reading programs in Louisiana and Mississippi. In E. L. Thurston & L. E. Hafner (Eds.), *The philosophical and sociological bases of reading – 14th yearbook of the National Reading Conference* (pp. 110–114). Milwaukee, WI: National Reading Conference.
- Tomlinson, L. M. (1989). *Postsecondary developmental programs: A traditional agenda with new imperatives*. ASHE-ERIC Higher Education Report 3. Washington, DC: Clearinghouse on Higher Education.
- Van Gilder, L. L. (1970). *A study of the changes within the National Reading Conference* (Unpublished doctoral dissertation). Marquette University, Milwaukee, WI.
- Van Leirsburg, P. J. (1991). *The historical development of standardized reading tests in the United States, 1900–1991* (Unpublished doctoral dissertation). Northern Illinois University, DeKalb, IL.
- Walker, M. M. J. (1980). *The reading and study skills program at Northern Illinois University, 1963–1976* (Unpublished doctoral dissertation). Northern Illinois University, DeKalb, IL.
- Walvekar, C. C. (1987). Thirty years of program evaluation: Past, present, and future. *Journal of College Reading and Learning*, 20(1), 155–161.

- White, W., Martirosayin, R., & Wanjohi, R. (2009). Preparatory programs in nineteenth-century Midwest land grant colleges, Part 1. *Research in Developmental Education*, 23(1), 1-5.
- White, W., Martirosayin, R., & Wanjohi, R. (2010a). Preparatory programs in nineteenth-century Midwest land grant colleges, Part 2. *Research in Developmental Education*, 23(2), 1-6.
- White, W., Martirosayin, R., & Wanjohi, R. (2010b). Preparatory programs in nineteenth-century Midwest land grant colleges, Part 3. *Research in Developmental Education*, 23(3) 1-7.
- \*Wyatt, M. (1992). The past, present, and future need for college reading courses in the U.S. *Journal of Reading*, 36(1), 10-20.
- Zimmer, J. E. (2007). Hints on gathering biographical data. In S. E. Israel & E. J. Monaghan (Eds.), *Shaping the reading field: The impact of early pioneers, scientific research, and progressive ideas* (pp. 417-420). Newark, DE: International Reading Association.




---

# Handbook of College Reading and Study Strategy Research

Third Edition

*Edited by Rona F. Flipppo and Thomas W. Bean*

 **Routledge**  
Taylor & Francis Group  
NEW YORK AND LONDON

Third edition published 2018  
by Routledge  
711 Third Avenue, New York, NY 10017

and by Routledge  
2 Park Square, Milton Park, Abingdon, Oxon, OX14 4RN

*Routledge is an imprint of the Taylor & Francis Group, an informa business*

© 2018 Taylor & Francis

The right of Rona F. Flippo and Thomas W. Bean to be identified as the authors of the editorial material, and of the authors for their individual chapters, has been asserted in accordance with sections 77 and 78 of the Copyright, Designs and Patents Act 1988.

All rights reserved. No part of this book may be reprinted or reproduced or utilised in any form or by any electronic, mechanical, or other means, now known or hereafter invented, including photocopying and recording, or in any information storage or retrieval system, without permission in writing from the publishers.

*Trademark notice:* Product or corporate names may be trademarks or registered trademarks, and are used only for identification and explanation without intent to infringe.

First edition published by LEA 2000  
Second edition published by Routledge 2009

*Library of Congress Cataloging-in-Publication Data*  
A catalog record has been requested for this book

ISBN: 978-1-138-64267-6 (hbk)  
ISBN: 978-1-138-64268-3 (pbk)  
ISBN: 978-1-315-62981-0 (ebk)

Typeset in Bembo  
by codeMantra