
Lee J. Cronbach, the Vida Jacks Professor of Education Emeritus at Stanford University, died of congestive heart failure in his Palo Alto home on October 1, 2001. One of his children, Janet, was at his bedside.

Lee made major contributions in the fields of educational psychology, psychological testing, and program evaluation throughout a career that spanned over five decades. Harbingers of his career in testing were evident at an early age in Fresno, California, where he was born on April 22, 1916 to a homemaker and salesman. According to his sister, Lee was overheard at age 4 in a grocery market calculating the unit price of potatoes, drawing the conclusion that the market his mother shopped at charged far more than the market he was in with a babysitter. The eavesdropper reported this feat to Blanche Cummings, a school psychologist and disciple of Lewis Terman, who gave him an IQ test in 1921, publicized his test score (200), used him in Binet demonstrations, and enrolled him in the Terman gifted program. His mother was eager for him to begin school and enrolled him in the upper second grade just as he turned 5 years old; she continued to push him and others to advance him throughout his schooling. He graduated from Fresno High School at age 14 and Fresno State College (majoring in chemistry and mathematics) at 18.

Lee’s awareness of Terman and IQ testing attracted him to psychology and as a college junior he came across a monograph by Thurstone and Chave on measuring attitudes. He was particularly impressed with “Thurstone’s inventive use of mathematics to sharpen the central construct and ferret out equivocal items; the virtue of rigorous engineering analysis of psychological measuring devices became fixed in my mind” (Cronbach, 1989, p. 65). The connection between psychology and education came in a course on history of American Education at Fresno State (then a teachers’ college). Asked to review and present a curriculum-improvement study to his fellow students, a class he “detested,” he dissected the study with the scorn of a chemistry student. After the presentation, which the students’ loved, the professor asked if he’d thought of a career in educational research; Lee asked if there was such a thing. The suggestion came at a time when he had decided against pursuing chemistry and the path was set toward educational psychology.

To become employable upon completing college, in 1937 he completed a master’s program while also getting his teaching credential at Berkeley. He was hired by his old high school where he taught chemistry and mathematics from 1936 to 1938 before completing a doctorate in education at the University of Chicago in 1940, getting married to Helen Claresta Bower along the way, and having a family of 5 children between 1941 and 1956. He rushed through the doctorate “so fast that Chicago had little chance to educate me” (1989, p. 67) but did meet up with Ralph Tyler and became his research assistant on the Eight-Year Study; this exerted a lasting influence throughout his life. In 1940 Lee took an assistant professorship in psychology at Washington State University teaching introductory, social, child, applied and industrial psychology and operating a reading clinic as well! Toward the end of the war, he served as a military psychologist at the Navy’s sonar school in San Diego becoming deeply engaged in instructional psychology. Following the war, he returned to Chicago as an assistant professor in 1946, then went to the University of Illinois in 1948, and finally to Stanford University in 1964, retiring in 1980 but remaining intellectually active right up until the time of his death: He completed a book begun by his close colleague, Dick Snow, on a new theory of aptitude (Corno, Cronbach, et al., 2001) and subsequently worked on a paper in which, upon the 50th anniversary of the coefficient alpha paper, he reflected on the uses, misuses and misunderstandings of the reliability coefficient.

Lee’s research can be clustered into three areas: measurement theory, program evaluation, and instruction. His most widely cited measurement paper is “Coefficient Alpha and the Internal Structure of Tests,” published 50 years ago (Cronbach, 1951). The coefficient, known as “Cronbach’s alpha,” proved useful for (at least) three reasons. First, it provided a measure of reliability from a single test administration so that repeated occasions or parallel forms of a test were not needed to estimate a test’s consistency (following on the work of, for example, Hoyt, Kuder, and Richardson). Second, the formula was general; it could be applied, for example, to dichotomously scored multiple-choice items or polytomous attitude scales. And, third, at a time before computers, it was very easily calculated from statistics well known by students with only a first course in statistics. Perhaps more important was his work on alpha linked mathematics with the “real world”; he came to the realization that, “[c]riticizing test theory [e.g., Kuder-Richardson’s assumptions] thus becomes a matter of comparing what the mathematician assumes with what the psychologist can reasonably believe about people’s responses” (1989, p. 82).

As was his wont, Lee was dissatisfied with reliability theory, recognizing that, in practice, different methods of calculating a reliability coefficient defined “true score,” the consistent part of a respondent’s performance, and measurement error, the inconsistent part, somewhat differently. For example, remembering an answer to a particular question when the same test was administered twice meant that “memory” contributed to a respondent’s consistency or true score, but not so upon taking parallel forms of the test. Moreover, he reasoned that error was more complex than a single undifferentiated error term revealed;
In the 1970s, Cronbach directed the Stanford Evaluation Consortium, a research, service and training organization sponsored by the School of Education that included faculty from the communications and psychology departments, as well as Education. The Consortium worked with the state of California to examine its relationships with local school districts, among other projects. The evaluation research influenced program evaluations across many fields, from health programs to juvenile delinquency programs; his work recognized the merits and limitations of randomized field trials, the importance of local contexts on performance, and the social and political aspects of program evaluation. Two influential books resulted from this work—Towards Reform of Program Evaluation, which was written by a team of consortium faculty led by Lee, and a parallel volume, Designing Educational Evaluations, in which Lee pushed his own ideas further. (The latter volume was selected as one of the top 100 education-related “Books of the Century” by the Museum of Education, University of South Carolina, 2000).

Lee’s instructional research with Dick Snow focused on matching learning environments with students’ aptitudes (Cronbach & Snow, 1977). This research can be traced to early work with Goldine Gleser on personnel decision theory, and on his presidential address at the American Psychological Association. In the work on personnel placement, he and Goldine concluded that optimal decisions about person-job matches must acknowledge the interaction of individual differences with job demands. Individuals with one profile of characteristics would be expected to perform well in one type of job whereas individuals with a second profile would be expected to perform well in another job with different task demands.

At about the time the Cronbach and Gleser book, Psychological Tests and Personnel Decisions, went to press, Lee was preparing his presidential address for the American Psychological Association. The work on personnel theory gave him a fresh look at the schism in scientific psychology, one that formed the basis of his presidential address in 1955, “Two Disciplines of Scientific Psychology” (Cronbach, 1957). He called for a rapprochement between the “two disciplines” of differential and experimental psychology. On the one hand, correlational studies that focused on differences in individuals’ abilities assumed these differences generalized across situations; on the other hand, experimental studies that focused on differences between situations (“treatments”) viewed individual differences between people as noise (“error”). He pointed out that these individual differences might be highly predictive of performance in one type of instructional condition (situation) and much less so in another. If individual-difference and experimental psychology came together, he reasoned, it just might be possible to find a link between these individual differences and performance in different learning environments.

Lee’s work on personnel decisions and his presidential address sent him and Dick Snow on a 10 year trek in search of aptitude-treatment interactions (ATIs)—statistical interactions (different regressions of learning outcome on aptitude under different instructional treatments). They sought allocation rules something like this: Assign people with one aptitude profile (high verbal ability, low spatial) to Treatment A and people with the opposite profile to Treatment B to optimize learning (Cronbach & Snow, 1977). In the end, “[a]lmost no ATI effects were confirmed by multiple studies... The evidence was negative. A spatial pretest, for example, may or may not predict outcomes from instruction filled with diagrams” (1989, p. 85).

The strongest ATIs involved general ability where students with above average intellectual development profited from instruction that provided them with considerable responsibility for organizing and interpreting while those below average profited from a highly structured learning environment. Roughly 14 years later, Lee (1975) revisited his presidential address in, “Beyond the Two Disciplines of Scientific Psychology,” where he had come to recognize that ATIs were highly complex—as if a simple ATI were reflected in a ball of mirrors—sometimes rapidly changing, and context bound, far more than he had imagined earlier on. He concluded that “[o]ur troubles do not arise because human events are in principle unlawful; man and his creations are part of the natural world. The trouble, as I see it, is that we cannot store up generalizations and constructs for ultimate assembly into a network” (Cronbach, 1975, p. 123, emphasis in original).
In the end, Lee found himself caught between science and practice, whether in the classroom or in policy. Science took him just so far, and he demanded science as far as it would take him. But he also recognized the contribution that other ways of knowing had to make in understanding teaching and learning, and in human action more generally. “The special task of the social scientist in each generation is to pin down the contemporary facts. Beyond that, he shares with the humanistic scholar and the artist in the effort to gain insight into contemporary relationships, and to align the culture’s view of man with present realities. To know man as he is is no mean aspiration” (1975, p. 126).

Lee’s professional honors were numerous. He was president of the American Educational Research Association, the American Psychological Association, and the Psychometric Society, and a member of the National Academy of Sciences, the National Academy of Education, the American Philosophical Society, and the American Academy of Arts and Sciences. He received many honorary degrees, including ones from Yeshiva University, the University of Gothenburg, Sweden, and University of Chicago. And he was honored by, for example, the Educational Testing Service for contributions to educational measurement, by the American Psychological Association for distinguished scientific contributions, by the American Psychological Society as a William James Fellow, by the American Educational Research Association for contributions to research in education, and by the Evaluation Research Society for contributions to evaluation methodology.

Lee’s wife, Helen, and three of his five children—Janet, Bob, and Joyce—survive him, as does his sister, also named Helen.
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The AERA/Spencer Pre-Dissertation Fellowship

The American Educational Research Association, in partnership with the Spencer Foundation, is soliciting proposals from doctoral students in education research to apply for a 1-year pre-dissertation fellowship. We anticipate making awards of up to $17,000 plus $5,000 in travel funds. Fellows will have opportunities to participate in fall and summer research institutes with a distinguished national faculty, in special activities at the AERA Annual Meeting, and in opportunities to attend the professional meetings of other disciplines. They will also have a national mentor and access to an electronic network linking fellows, mentors, and AERA staff.

Applicants must be U.S. citizens or permanent residents of the United States and enrolled as full-time graduate students, who are approximately midway through their doctoral programs. Students who are seeking support for the writing phase of their dissertation are not eligible for this award, nor are students at institutions which receive research training grants directly from the Spencer Foundation (Harvard University, UCLA, University of Michigan, University of Wisconsin at Madison, Michigan State University, Teachers College at Columbia University, University of California at Berkeley, University of Pennsylvania, Stanford University, Emory University, and Northwestern University).

All awards are contingent upon renewal of Spencer Foundation support.

Application Deadlines
Applications for awards effective September 2002 are due May 3, 2002. Complete guidelines and an application are on AERA’s homepage, www.aera.net.