





THE LIBRARY
OF
THE UNIVERSITY
OF CALIFORNIA
LOS ANGELES

GIFT

A MODERN SCHOOL

•The  Co. •

A MODERN SCHOOL

BY

PAUL H. HANUS

PROFESSOR OF THE HISTORY AND ART OF TEACHING
IN HARVARD UNIVERSITY

New York

THE MACMILLAN COMPANY

LONDON: MACMILLAN & CO., LTD.

1913

All rights reserved

COPYRIGHT, 1904,
By THE MACMILLAN COMPANY.

Set up and electrotyped. Published February, 1904. Reprinted
March, 1905; June, 1909; November, 1911; October, 1913.

Education
Library

LB

1657

H 17 m

PREFACE

THIS book is published with the hope that it may interest the general reader as well as the professional student and teacher. The book endeavors to set forth the scope and aims of a modern school, more particularly of a secondary school, and the conditions essential to its highest efficiency. The last chapter offers some testimony on the working of the elective system,—a contemporary question of great importance to both schools and colleges,—but the testimony offered pertains only to the college.

The first chapter, which gives its name to the whole book, deals specifically with the central theme; and in it I have endeavored to extend and strengthen conceptions already set forth in certain portions of an earlier book, "Educational Aims and Educational Values." Where it has served my present purpose, I have occasionally used the language of the earlier presentation.

v

1030039

The next seven chapters contain a fuller treatment of certain topics than was appropriate or expedient in the first chapter, and discuss also the internal and external conditions which seem to me essential to a high degree of success in the work of any school.

Thus, Chapter II, by means of a brief historical survey of the development of American secondary schools, supports the contention that no public school can survive and prosper that does not offer equal opportunities to all who contribute to its support; Chapter III similarly contends that, next to adequately comprehensive instruction, the elective system, and complete articulation of the secondary school with the lower grades are natural and rational means for making the secondary school serve impartially the needs of all; Chapter IV describes a strong contemporary tendency toward a six-year programme ("course") for all public high schools, and toward regarding that programme as a part of a well-articulated scheme from the primary school through the college,—a tendency which has already been approved in the preceding chapters; Chapters V and VI set forth the

responsibilities of the individual home and of the community as well as of teachers and administrative officers in the practical endeavor to make the school serve the ends for which it exists; Chapter VII urges the necessity of organizing contemporary educational experience in order to bring the testimony of experience to bear in effective fashion on the solution of educational problems, and Chapter VIII emphasizes the help the university can give in the training of teachers,—both matters of serious import to all who are interested in making the school a progressively efficient instrument of education.

Here and there the reader will find occasional repetitions. These are due mainly to the fact that the several chapters were written (and all but two of them published, although not in their present form) as independent articles in the periodicals named below; but the repetitions have been allowed to remain because they seemed to me to serve a distinct purpose in their present context.

My thanks are due the *Educational Review*, the *Popular Science Monthly*, the *International Monthly* (now *Quarterly*), the *Forum*, the *Har-*

vard Monthly, and the *Harvard Graduates Magazine* for permission to print as chapters of this book the articles or portions of articles referred to above, which appeared in their columns at various times from 1899 to October, 1903.

PAUL H. HANUS.

JANUARY, 1904.

CONTENTS

	PAGE
I	
A MODERN SCHOOL	3
II	
THE ACADEMY AND THE PUBLIC HIGH SCHOOL	43
III	
TWO CONTEMPORARY PROBLEMS IN EDUCATION	71
IV	
A SIX-YEAR HIGH SCHOOL PROGRAMME	99
V	
THE SCHOOL AND THE HOME	113
VI	
OUR FAITH IN EDUCATION	155
VII	
OBSTACLES TO EDUCATIONAL PROGRESS	211

VIII

	PAGE
EDUCATION AS A UNIVERSITY STUDY AND THE PROFESSIONAL TRAINING OF COLLEGE-BRED TEACHERS . . .	251

IX

GRADUATE TESTIMONY ON THE ELECTIVE SYSTEM . . .	287
---	-----

I

A MODERN SCHOOL

I

A MODERN SCHOOL

THE education demanded by a democratic society to-day is an education that prepares a youth to overcome the inevitable difficulties that stand in the way of his material and spiritual advancement; an education that, from the beginning, promotes his normal physical development through the most salutary environment and appropriate physical training; that opens his mind and lets the world in through every natural power of observation and assimilation; that cultivates hand-power as well as head-power; that inculcates the appreciation of beauty in nature and in art, and insists on the performance of duty to self and to others; an education that in youth and early manhood, while continuing the work already done, enables the youth to discover his own powers and limitations, and that impels him through oft-repeated intellectual conquests or other forms of

productive effort to look forward to a life of habitual achievement with his head or his hands, or both; that enables him to analyze for himself the intellectual, economic, and political problems of his time, and that gives the insight, the interest, and the power to deal with them as successfully as possible for his own advancement and for social service; and, finally, that causes him to realize that the only way to win and to retain the prizes of life, namely, wealth, culture, leisure, honor, is an ever-increasing usefulness, and thus makes him feel that a life without growth and without service is not worth living.

That is to say, the education demanded by democratic society in modern times must be a *preparation for an active life*. Now, the only real preparation for life's duties, opportunities, and privileges is *participation* in them, so far as they can be rendered intelligible, interesting, and accessible to children and youth of school age; and hence the first duty of all education is to provide this participation as fully and as freely as possible. From the beginning, such an education cannot be limited to the school arts—reading, writing, ciphering. It must acquaint the pupil

with his material and social environment, in order that every avenue to knowledge may be opened to him, and every incipient power receive appropriate cultivation. Any other course is a *postponement of education*, not education. Such a postponement is a permanent loss to the individual and to society. It is a perversion of opportunity, and an economic waste.

We have but lately learned this lesson. We have learned that reading, writing, arithmetic, and English grammar—the school arts—constitute only the instruments of an elementary education and not education itself. To concentrate a child's attention on the school arts during eight or nine years is to exaggerate their importance, is to regard them as an end in themselves, instead of a means to an end. It is true the school arts must be learned: the pupil's later progress will depend largely on his command over oral, written, and printed speech, but it does not require eight or nine years of almost exclusive devotion to the school arts to acquire this command. Such exclusive devotion to the school arts cuts the pupil off from the very education we are aiming at, namely, preparation for life interests through par-

ticipation in them. Eight or nine years spent on the school arts together with book geography and a little United States history have usually left the pupil at about fourteen years of age without a permanent interest in nature, or in human institutions and human achievements, whether in the field of literature, science, and art, or in the industrial, commercial, and political life of his time; and, what is worse, without much inclination to acquire such interest by further study.

This is the natural result of an attempt to prepare for life without using life's opportunities as the source and means of such preparation. Accordingly we have changed our plan. Through elementary natural science we are bringing nature into the schoolroom and we go out to meet it; we bring literature, history, civics, art, manual training, and an elementary study of industry and commerce into the school as a means of preparation for life, instead of "preparing" our pupils for contact with these sources of inspiration, guidance, and training, in an indefinite future. We have learned that a child should know how to read and write by the end of the third school year, *i.e.* at about nine years of

age; that in about five years (by eleven years of age) he can learn all the arithmetic he needs for the ordinary affairs of life and for further progress in mathematics; and that during the rest of his elementary school training the pupil's progress in the school arts should be incidental to his pursuit of other subjects.

That is to say, we have learned that elementary or pre-secondary education, should provide the most salutary environment for the pupil, and promote his normal physical development through appropriate training; it should stimulate and gratify curiosity in every field of worthy human activity, and utilize this curiosity both for the acquisition of knowledge, and for the development of permanent interest in and power over this knowledge; it should acquaint the pupil with his duties and his privileges as a temporarily dependent member of society, and promote the development of habits of thought and conduct in harmony with his growing insight. At about the age of twelve or thirteen, the period of secondary education should begin. This brings me to the question I am to discuss, namely, What is the function of a modern

secondary school, and how should it be organized and administered to discharge this function satisfactorily?

This question must be answered both for the individual and for society; *i.e.* we are to ask what should a modern secondary school do for the individual as an individual; and at the same time, how can it meet the legitimate demands of society? It is clear that the needs of the individual and of society are but different aspects of the same fundamental need. Individuals are to be made responsive to the varied interests of life, and to acquire a command over them. But society demands that the knowledge and power of individuals shall conduce to the general welfare; that each individual shall not only be wise and good, but that he shall be wise to some purpose, be good for something; that a man's knowledge, power, and character shall not only afford him personal satisfaction, but that they shall be available for social service. In the following discussion, these two aspects of the function of the modern school will be kept in mind throughout, and, in general, no attempt will be made to keep them distinct. But it may conduce to

clearness if we consider them separately, at the outset.

First, then, how may the school meet the legitimate demands of society? The school is the institution set apart by society for the education of children and youth. Remembering that education means preparation for life's worthy interests and activities through participation in them, I answer that a modern school can meet the legitimate demands of society only by adapting its aims, means, and methods to the changing needs of a progressive civilization. This is true whether the school is supported by public funds or by private generosity and fees. Such adaptation is, indeed, the only condition on which any human institution can survive and prosper. No human institution, and, in particular, no school can flourish in any age unless it conspicuously promotes the material or the spiritual interests of men as then understood—and it does not deserve to. The proof of this statement is afforded, if proof is needed, by the history of secondary schools in the United States.

I have pointed out elsewhere that our secondary schools originated in Massachusetts, as col-

lege preparatory schools; that, as such, they served, from the beginning, the educational needs of only a limited portion of the community, since their aims and the scope of their work were technical—designed to provide the necessary pre-collegiate training of clergymen; that this technical character of the schools, in spite of the fact that the narrow curriculum, consisting only of the elements of Latin and Greek and later a little mathematics, comprised the elements of liberal culture, as then understood, could not, alone, permanently hold the support of the majority of the community; that even as preparatory training for clergymen, it gradually possessed a diminishing value to the whole community, since the growth of liberality in religion pointed to the possibility of many roads to salvation and to the real service of God, to say nothing of the gradually diminishing lustre of the clergyman's calling, and his declining influence in secular even more than in spiritual affairs; that, meanwhile, the whole community necessarily felt the steadily increasing pressure of comprehensive and imperative secular interests for which the school made no

direct provision whatever, and, also, the harassing burdens laid upon it by poverty, struggles with the wilderness, and conflicts and wars with the Indians, and, later, the great struggle for independence; and that, owing chiefly to these causes, together with the rise of the academies and the establishment of the district system, the town grammar school—the public secondary school—declined, until it seemed likely to die out, save in a few of the largest towns of the Commonwealth.¹

At the same time, I tried to show that when, through private initiative and private generosity, the New England academies arose to take up the work of preparation for college which the Latin grammar schools had failed to perform, they clearly demonstrated the possibility and the wisdom of providing also, at the same time, a secondary education adapted to the special needs and the briefer educational careers of non-collegiate pupils of both sexes; that this demonstration gradually enabled secondary education to win widespread recognition, as possessing distinct functions of its own, whatever

¹ Chapter II, "The Academy and the Public High School."

the future career or future educational opportunities of the pupils might be; and that the interest in public secondary education, thus extended and enriched, gradually gathered the necessary strength to overcome the indifference and most of the opposition on the part of the general public, and ultimately brought about, during the years from 1826 to the present time, the enthusiastic support of our public high schools as we know them to-day.

In other words, I have tried to show that although this country, through the Commonwealth of Massachusetts, was early committed to the duty of maintaining secondary schools supported partly or wholly by local taxes, it took nearly two hundred years for the communities of Massachusetts to really accept the duty they had recognized from the very beginning; and this duty was accepted then only because, meanwhile, a new conception of the scope and meaning of public secondary education had been gradually evolved.

So much for the influence of conformity or want of conformity to the contemporary demands of society on the permanence and prosperity of

the school. It is equally true that unless the school meets the needs of the individual, unless it promotes conspicuously his development as an individual, he will turn from it with dissatisfaction as soon as he becomes aware of the discrepancy between his needs and the opportunities which the school affords for meeting them. And this is particularly true of the secondary school and the college, because the pupil is then old enough to measure their influence on his expanding and developing interests, needs, powers, and duties.

It need hardly be pointed out, therefore, that the period of secondary education is extremely important. The years covered by it, say from the pupil's thirteenth to his nineteenth or twentieth year, mark the transition from early childhood into later childhood and youth; the period during which the child learns to put away childish things and to appreciate the interests and purposes of men; to find his place in the social whole, and to realize the interdependence of public and private interests. It is the period when life aims and life habits emerge distinctly, and, under wise direction, become dominant life

influences; or when, under adverse circumstances, these aims become atrophied for want of proper cultivation, or even perverted through false training. In any event, they rapidly develop stability; and, so far as they are amenable to education, may, therefore, be permanently influenced.

Now, an individual's dominant interests and powers wholly determine the kind of work he voluntarily engages in, and also the sources of his pleasure, and thus, ultimately, wholly determine the range and quality of his productiveness and the character of his public and private life. To carry forward the work of development already begun in elementary education, and so to discharge its duty to the individual, it is, therefore, clear that the *secondary school should especially promote the discovery and development of each pupil's dominant interests and powers; and further, that it should seek to render these interests and powers subservient to life's serious purposes, and also to the possibility of participation in the refined pleasures of life.*

The serious purposes of life are, first, self-support; or, when that is unnecessary, some

worthy form of service; second, intelligent, active participation in human affairs—the intention to be one who, while performing his private duties and enjoying whatever leisure he may earn or deserve, is to work with his fellow-men for the continuous improvement and happiness of his race, his nation, and his own immediate community.

The refined pleasures of life are found in the ability to participate with intelligence and appreciation in the intellectual and æsthetic interests of cultivated men. These pleasures, like most of the inspiration to worthy living in the pursuit of the serious purposes of life, are brought within the reach of men through general culture.

• The important place occupied by secondary education in a democratic society is now apparent. It covers the plastic years of later childhood and youth, the years during which the youth's mental life is organized and permanently fixed; and it is the most widely available organized social force for elevating, refining, and unifying a democratic society.

It will be seen that the foregoing statement

of the function of a modern school comprises three classes of aims: namely, *vocational aims*, *social aims*, and *culture aims*. These three aims are, of course, not separable in practice, although they can be rarely, if ever, equally influential in determining any particular phase of school work. Moreover, the only way to realize the culture aims, for many pupils, will be the close affiliation which the pupils must be led to see between these and the vocational and social or civic aims. These three aims, then, ought together to permeate and underlie all the activities of the secondary school. We may, however, discuss them separately.

But what is general culture? Ever since the Renaissance the meaning attached to this term, until recently, has been well-nigh restricted to acquaintance with the historical culture of the race embodied in the language, history, and literature of ancient Greece and Rome, together with some knowledge of mathematics; that is to say, general culture has been nearly synonymous with classical scholarship. But a glance at modern programmes of study in secondary schools and colleges, whether these programmes

are prescribed or elective, or a moment's reflection, will show that the modern idea of general culture is much broader than classical scholarship. It is a truism to say that the range of life interests, the problems, and the resources of civilization, have increased enormously since the Renaissance. While we feel on every hand the influence of classical traditions in our modern culture, and while, therefore, we can never wish to dispense with classical scholarship as an element of general culture, it still remains true that a new culture and a new civilization have arisen since the Renaissance, and especially since the eighteenth century, which have their own resources of inspiration and guidance, and present their own problems for solution. *To be ignorant of these resources and problems is for the modern man to be out of relation with his time, is to miss general culture.*

The process of adjusting ourselves to this revised and enlarged conception of general culture is now going on. The old narrow ideal is tenacious of life. It is powerfully entrenched in existing programmes of study, and in educational traditions; in particular, it is sustained

by collegiate preferences for classical studies in secondary schools ; and, lastly and chiefly, it is strong by virtue of real achievements in the education of many generations of men. But alone it can no longer suffice.

The progress of civilization has brought with it new problems, and hence new demands on the individual. While it is true, in a sense, that no one can study the civilization of Greece and Rome without indirectly studying our own, because our own civilization is rooted in those older civilizations, such study cannot be successfully attempted in the secondary school by studying the classical languages themselves. A more or less thorough acquaintance with the elements of these languages, together with a very limited appreciation of small portions of say three Latin authors and two or three Greek authors, is all that is really accomplished. I need hardly insist further (and yet the fact deserves emphasis) that an acquaintance with the elements of two languages is a very different thing from an acquaintance with the civilizations which those languages express — from an appreciation of the thought and institu-

tions of the people who used those languages. Incidentally, through the historical and explanatory notes, an approach to such comprehension and appreciation may be gained; but this can be obtained much better in the secondary school, by studying the *history* instead of the *languages* of the nations concerned.

How clear a comprehension of our civilization could a Greek youth of the age of Pericles, miraculously transferred to the twentieth century, get from a few pages of General Grant's memoirs, Lockhart's "Life of Scott," and two or three books of Chaucer's "Canterbury Tales"? Or, how thoroughly would our institutions be understood by a young Roman of the Augustan age from a few pages of Lord Roberts's "Forty Years in India," Macaulay's speeches, and "Paradise Lost"? Or, again, no one thinks of arguing that secondary school pupils can best understand Germany and France and the influence of their culture and institutions on our own by studying the elements of the German and French languages and small portions of the writings of say Goethe, Schiller, and Bismarck, and of Molière, Victor Hugo, and Guizot. Such

a claim would be preposterous. When we wish a secondary school pupil to understand France and Germany and their influence on our own development, we very properly set the pupil to studying the history of those nations and of our own. And so it should be with Greece and Rome: *Ancient history*, not *ancient languages*, will enable the pupil to understand Greece and Rome, and if rightly taught, will help him to an intelligent appreciation of the important place held by those nations in the development of modern civilization.

But even this, important and necessary as it is, is not a direct study of our own age at home and abroad. Modern civilization is a new and complex thing. To be understood it must be studied in its present form as well as in its origins.

To induce pupils who are not going to college to spend much time on Greek and Latin in the secondary school is, accordingly, in my opinion, an economic and educational waste. While the pupil is studying Greek and Latin, we must bear in mind not only the little he gets, but what he does not get,—the vast resources he necessarily leaves untouched.

It seems clear to me, therefore, that although secondary school pupils may have pursued the classical languages and elementary mathematics for several years with diligence and more or less success, for most of that great majority who never go to college, a secondary education consisting of Latin and Greek, like the barren elementary education that formerly preceded it, is a perversion of opportunity and an economic and educational waste.¹

Such an education has been justified, however, on the ground of its *disciplinary* value. No matter whether knowledge, or interest in the acquisition of knowledge, or interest in the great contemporary concerns of life and some power to deal with them, has been acquired or not, the mind, it has been said, has received a training that will fit it to undertake, with every expectation of success, any problems or career whatever.

This view is, however, untenable. It is true that all mental training is, to some extent, general, just as all physical training is, to some extent, general. But we do not expect to make

¹ Compare "Educational Aims and Educational Values" (The Macmillan Company, 1899), pp. 116-119.

a good all-round athlete by restricting his training to two or three particular kinds of exercise. We know that we must provide appropriate exercises for his legs and his arms to develop both sets of limbs. Leg exercises alone, or arm exercises alone, would do little for the limbs we do not exercise. Neither mental nor physical power can be cultivated "in general." This power is always primarily power to do some specific thing, and only power "in general" in a very restricted sense. That is to say, power cannot be trained, apart from the subject-matter on which it is brought to bear. No one would be foolish enough to seek to train a physician by making him study law, or vice versa.

Hence it is false to assume that because a youth has studied Greek and Latin for several years, he has been trained to apply himself with vigor and success to any mental problem that may be presented to him. The truth is that he has been trained primarily to study languages, and, in particular, Latin and Greek; and only incidentally to exercise his mental powers on intellectual problems outside of the field of linguistic study.

The first step toward realizing our revised conception of general culture through secondary education is, therefore, to admit frankly that general culture means much more to-day than classical scholarship; that it may, indeed, mean something entirely different. The next step is, I think, to admit as frankly that classical scholarship, *i.e.* literary appreciation of the classics, is not attainable anyway in the secondary school. As was asserted above, what is attainable is a fair to good elementary acquaintance with the classical languages, which is a very different thing. This achievement for many pupils is desirable, but, at present, it is not economically attained.

Now, is it not true that what we value most in the classics for all secondary school pupils who do not go to college, what we regard as most important, is to bring to bear on them the refining and enlightening influence of Greek and Roman thought, whether embodied in ancient art, or literature, or institutions, on the thought and life of to-day and of all time? A moment ago I indicated my belief that this influence can best be realized in secondary education, not primarily through an extended study of the

classical languages, but through a serious study of history and art, and I may add through a study of translations of the classical literatures into the mother-tongue. What secondary school pupil can appreciate Homer or Xenophon, Virgil, Horace, or Cicero in the original, as he can appreciate them in admirable translations? We have begun to recognize the magnificent possibilities of instruction in the language and literature of English-speaking nations for their own sake; why should we not also use the mother-tongue to bring the minds of our boys and girls into actual touch with the inspiring literatures of antiquity? What they now see "through a glass darkly" they would then see "face to face." If such study, preceded or accompanied by a *serious study* of the modern languages, be then followed by a brief course in one of the classical languages, or both of them, during the last year or two of the secondary school course, sufficient to enable a youth to realize the importance of these languages to a full comprehension of the history and structure of his mother-tongue, and the significance of Latin and Greek in all advanced linguistic study, the full educational value

of the classics for secondary school pupils would be economically and fully realized.

Accordingly, a modern secondary school must provide for a serious study of modern subjects — physical and biological science; history (including the history of industry, of commerce, of education, of art, and of philanthropy, as well as political history); government and economics; the literature of the mother-tongue; modern foreign languages; the elements of the fine arts and of the mechanic arts; and the elements of commercial training — all adapted to the needs of both sexes. Let no one be surprised to see manual training for both sexes and the elements of commercial training included in the studies to be pursued for general culture. All teachers are aware that the only way to arouse the minds of some pupils lies through “practical studies.” Some minds are for a time quite inaccessible to intellectual pursuits as such. To such pupils intellectual pursuits acquire interest and significance only as they are seen to be associated with trade, manufactures, or commerce. Mathematics, natural science, and foreign languages acquire significance for many minds only when

it becomes clear that these subjects underlie important phases of industrial or commercial life. Undertaken at first because of an interest with which they are associated, these subjects acquire, under wise guidance, the significance that belongs to them as such, and the way to general culture lies for a time at least through manual and commercial training.

Only through such programmes can we realize the culture aims of modern secondary education ; for general culture means *the capacity to understand, appreciate, and react on the resources and the problems of modern civilization*. These resources and problems are found in the preservation of the health, physical vigor, and material well-being of the race ; in natural science ; in modern governments ; in modern industry and commerce ; in modern literatures and languages — the record of the ideals and aspirations of the race in modern times ; in history, the record of the achievements of the race ; and in the art treasures of all times. As I have just said, we can never wish to exclude from the modern conception of general culture the ancient classics ; but the place to attempt the realization of the

influence of classical antiquity on modern civilization *through a study of the classical languages* is, in my opinion, not the secondary school, but the college and the university.

While the needs of individuals and of society require comprehensive programmes of studies, it is manifestly impossible for any one person to compass all the training required for modern life. Further, each individual best promotes his own development and his capacity for social service by adapting his education to his own tastes, capacities, and future needs. Hence, secondary education in a democratic society must *permit each pupil to choose his own curriculum*. Let me not be misunderstood. I would not have a child twelve or thirteen years old freely choose his courses of study. But I would have his training, from his thirteenth year onward, a *training in choice*.¹

Accordingly, we require of secondary education a *flexibility* that deliberately cultivates the power of choice. To do this is to give free play to the right of opportunity, and to cultivate the habit of independent initiative, so

¹ See below, p. 72 ff.

important in a democratic society. *Flexibility* in secondary education accordingly means that the pupil shall, under certain obvious restrictions, choose his own studies in accordance with the gradual discovery of his dominant interests and consequent future needs; and that this freedom shall lead gradually to his complete emancipation from external restraint and guidance,—that it shall lead to self-direction.¹

At the same time, *intensiveness* of pursuit must not be lacking. Any subject once undertaken must be pursued long enough and earnestly enough to make it yield its educational value for the pupil within the appropriate limits of secondary education; or to make it clear that further pursuit of it would not be profitable for him. For most subjects and pupils one school year would ordinarily be long enough to reach this decision. It is clear, however, that no such decision is possible without tactful teachers

¹ The apparent difficulties of administration under such a system are not so great that they do not yield readily to wise and determined management. It implies, however, the coöperation of the entire teaching corps of any school that adopts it. Many interesting experiments of this sort are, at present, under way in the public high schools of the United States.

whose interest in their pupils is at least as great as their interest in the subjects which they teach.

To assert that secondary education should minister to vocational aims means, primarily, that the school should acquaint the pupil with the meaning and the importance of a vocation; but it also means that the school should offer the pupil some training that begins the preparation for the life pursuit for which his tastes and aptitudes especially qualify him; so that when he leaves the secondary school he may enter on that pursuit itself, or on further preparation for it, with some knowledge of its scope and meaning, some knowledge of the underlying principles on which success in it depends, and some power over its fundamental facts and processes.

This means that, in addition to the purely intellectual or academic courses, we should offer in every secondary school, whether public or private, courses in manual training and commercial courses, and in some schools courses in agriculture, all of which, together with their general educational aims, minister directly to

vocational and social aims. We provide the general literary and scientific training required for intelligent participation in a wide range of the life interests of to-day. Can any one assign a satisfactory reason why we should decline to provide the training in the mechanic arts, and in the fundamental principles and processes of commerce essential to intelligent participation in an equally important range of contemporary life interest? I cannot. Democratic education, that offers equal opportunities to all, must, therefore, in my opinion, provide as adequately for the vocational aims of future artisans, merchants, and farmers as for future professional men.

It has already been intimated that the instruction which ministers to culture and vocational aims also ministers incidentally and in an important sense to social aims. But the social aims themselves are too important for all classes of pupils to permit us to be satisfied with this. These social aims must themselves receive special recognition. We justly expect a modern school to do its share in arousing interest in, and insight into, our institutional life — our municipi-

pal, state, and national institutions, our political, industrial, commercial, and educational affairs. Accordingly, we ask that history, civics, economics — the social studies — shall receive much fuller recognition in secondary school programmes of study than has been accorded to them hitherto, and that these subjects shall not be sundered, but be kept in intimate association.¹

We ask that our meagre and inadequate courses in history shall really comprise an elementary descriptive sociology, and an account of the development of the institutions of modern society. Instead of consisting chiefly of accounts of wars, dynasties, and court intrigue, we ask that courses in history shall deal by preference with the arts and occupations of peace, with the history of industry, of commerce, of scientific inventions, and, ere long, let us hope, with the history of art, education, and philanthropy. In all this, righteous wars will have their place; but the war hero, as such, will no longer be the sole or even the chief example of moral heroism with which to

¹ For suggestions concerning the teaching of Economics in Secondary Schools, see the *School Review* (Chicago), IV, 604, and V, 27, 577; and *Education* (Boston) for January, 1897.

fire the imagination and arouse the spirit of emulation of our hero-worshipping and impressionable youth.

But there are other ways in which the school can train for citizenship. The school itself, through its teachers, may and should become a participator in the life of the community. The teachers should identify themselves with public concerns. If they have a share in promoting community interests, small or large as the case may be, the life of the community will flow through the school, and the meaning of citizenship, its functions, problems, and privileges, will be brought home to the pupils. Again, those who have public concerns in charge, the mayor, park commissioner, chief of the fire department, city engineer, chairman of the school board, or the director of some bank, railroad, or factory, may be invited to the school, and may, by lectures or by informal talks, impart to the pupils an insight into the civic, commercial, and industrial interests amid which they live. Thus, through its course of study, through the active participation of its teachers in the interests of the world outside the school, and by bringing representa-

tives from that world into the school, the school may be made a participator in the social, the industrial, the commercial, the civic life of to-day; may afford that comprehension of the duties and the privileges of a citizen, which only a participation, however limited, is capable of affording.

By implication, this discussion concerns itself quite as much with the secondary education of girls as with that of boys. But I wish to emphasize the need of such special provision for the general education of girls as will help them to become capable and tasteful managers of household affairs. Sewing, cooking, household hygiene, and domestic economy, generally, not omitting household decoration, certainly deserve the attention from girls bestowed by boys on manual training in wood and iron. If boys should find in a modern school general preparation for participation in vocational activities, either as actual workers or as directors of workers, it is no less important that girls should find in the same school their opportunity for intelligent, interested, and successful participation in carrying on or directing household affairs. In both

cases this vocational training is not to become narrow preparation for a trade or for domestic service in the restricted sense; but it is to provide the general preparation for vocational activity that systematic training in fundamental facts, principles, and processes can give.

At least two important considerations remain. We have seen that a modern school must have a comprehensive programme of studies to meet the demands of modern life, *i.e.* modern secondary education must possess scope—a scope as broad as human interests. We have also seen that it is impossible for any one pupil to compass the whole of such a comprehensive programme; that, considering the relation of his dominant interests and capacities to his future usefulness and happiness, it is not even desirable that a single pupil should attempt to compass the entire programme even if he could do so. That is, we have seen that a secondary school programme should possess flexibility as well as scope; that, indeed, it should be as flexible as human capacity requires and permits. The questions to be answered are, therefore, how shall we provide this adequate scope, and at the same time adequate

flexibility, taking into account in both instances the pupil's immaturity and ignorance?

I think it is impossible to provide a good modern secondary education for pupils of ordinary capacity by means of a programme requiring only four years for its completion. Somehow our high schools and many academies have attached an almost superstitious reverence to this number four, as if a secondary education required of necessity four years and no more. In consequence, the pupil is fourteen or fifteen years of age before he enters the secondary school. To defer the pupil's secondary education until he is fourteen or fifteen years old is to lose two or three most important and valuable years of his life for educational purposes.

As I have already pointed out, near the beginning of this chapter, the period of secondary education should begin when the pupil is twelve or thirteen years of age. This gives us six years for the work of the secondary school. With only four years there is much driving and crowding of the great majority of the pupils. In six years all the work that ought to be done can be done without danger to health, or the impaired interest

that inevitably accompanies overpressure. The school should be from beginning to end a place of serious pleasure. This it cannot be unless the pupil has sufficient time to assimilate his acquisitions. I therefore answer the first question just proposed by saying that a secondary education of adequate scope and intensiveness requires most pupils to devote six years to it. Some pupils may be able to do it in five,—a very few may get through it in four, but to be adapted to the great majority the programme of studies should cover six years of substantial work.

Let us then begin the pupil's secondary school career when he is twelve or thirteen years of age, with the following studies: English, a modern language, history, elementary science (chiefly field work), simple Algebra, and constructive geometry; and let us add to these chiefly intellectual studies, for afternoon occupations, appropriate manual training for both sexes, drawing and the history of art, music, and physical training together with plenty of free play in the open air; and let us build on this foundation a substantial course of study for every pupil in the school. We shall have time enough in six

years to do well what is done, and our first problem will be solved.¹

I have still to answer my last question; namely, how shall we make our comprehensive programme sufficiently flexible to meet the needs of every pupil without overburdening any? I answer, by a wise use of electives. The work of the first year is simple enough to be required of all pupils. No electives are to be permitted in that year, but the teachers and the pupil should be on the alert to discover special aptitudes and tastes, and to help the pupil in the process of self-discovery and self-development in harmony therewith which is to be an important result of his whole school career. To prevent the harm which might result from the pupil's ignorance and immaturity—to guard against the possibility of the pupil's cutting himself off from an illuminating acquaintance with nature and her ways on the one hand, and the historical culture of the race, as embodied in books, social institutions, and art on the other, some of the secondary school pupil's work must be prescribed. To insure that training in choice

¹ Compare Chapter IV, "A Six-year High School Course."

that was emphasized above, and the best possible preparation for complete living in the fullest sense of the term, a considerable part of the instruction should be offered without other restrictions than those of sequence and amount. The final questions are, of course, what studies shall we prescribe for all pupils, and when shall we permit a pupil to discontinue a study once undertaken?¹

The most serious contemporary obstruction to the development of modern secondary education in some such way as has been set forth in this chapter, has been the unwillingness of colleges and universities to recognize non-classical secondary education, no matter how well done, as equal in dignity and solidity to classical education for preparatory training. This disparagement by the colleges and universities of non-classical secondary education will doubtless continue to cast its shadow over the free development of modern education for some time to come. Universities have always been the strongholds of educational conservatism. Nevertheless, a demo-

¹ These questions are answered in Chapter III, "Two Contemporary Problems in Education."

cratic society must seek some way to overcome it. University education and social elevation go together. To close the door of the university on an aspiring student merely because he has not pursued a prescribed set of required studies, no matter how good as to quantity and quality his pre-collegiate work in other studies has been, is to close the door of the highest educational opportunity a democratic society can command. Fortunately, the universities are gradually adjusting themselves to modern demands in this regard; and it is daily becoming clearer that before many years all universities will admit that any good secondary education, either with or without the classics, is a good preparation for college or university education. It is even safe to predict, I think, that before many years it will be clear to all higher institutions of learning that unless they recognize this truth, the main line of progress will lead past instead of through their doors.

II

THE ACADEMY AND THE PUBLIC HIGH SCHOOL

II

THE ACADEMY AND THE PUBLIC HIGH SCHOOL

THE origin of American secondary schools may be sketched almost in a sentence, as follows:—

The Boston Latin School was founded in 1635; the Roxbury Latin School in 1645. These schools naturally resembled, as closely as possible, the grammar schools of England with which the colonists were familiar. They were, accordingly, classical schools. As such they were also, naturally, college preparatory schools. It is well known that in 1647 the Colony of Massachusetts Bay decreed that every town of one hundred householders should “set up a grammar school, the master thereof being able to instruct youth as far as they may be fitted for the University.”

That is to say, our public secondary schools originated as college preparatory schools.

In 1647 the colony had been in existence seven-

teen years. The colonists had planted at least forty towns and villages. Industry and thrift were beginning to convert the wilderness into the abode of civilized man, with its appropriate occupations, represented by the farm, the shop, the factory, and the means of communication and transportation by land and by sea. Like Boston and Roxbury, some other towns were maintaining schools and sending boys to college. But there was danger lest, in the engrossing and increasingly successful conquest over the wilderness, temporal and material interests should outweigh or endanger the conservation and propagation of spiritual interests, and that education would be neglected. Accordingly, in 1647, when Harvard College had been in existence for eleven years, the law was passed which was intended to avert this threatened danger, — the law which was intended to secure organized means for preparing boys for college throughout the colony, for all time to come. And this end it has accomplished both directly and indirectly with varying success from that time to the present day.

I do not intend to follow in detail the vicissitudes of our public secondary schools during the

250 years since that time.¹ But it is necessary for my present purpose to point out again that the law of 1647, with its successive amendments, fixed the aim and determined the scope of secondary education in this country for nearly two hundred years; and I wish to lay stress on the fact that the traditions thus established have been a powerful, if not always a helpful, influence in American secondary education.

Although the law of 1647 was an expression of the desires of the colony — especially of the clergy and of the governing classes — that law was never, so far as I can ascertain, generally effective. Indeed, in spite of the great interest in learning and piety so well expressed by the writer of “New England’s First Fruits,” when he says that “after building houses and churches, providing the necessaries of life, and settling the civil government, one of the next things we

¹ Those vicissitudes have been set forth by Mr. George H. Martin in his “Evolution of the Massachusetts School System,” and they have been more recently sketched by the late Dr. Frank A. Hill, in his admirable paper, “How far is the public high school a just charge on the public treasury?” printed in the Report of the Massachusetts Board of Education for 1897–1898. (Sixty-second annual report.)

longed for and looked after was to advance learning and perpetuate it to posterity; dreading to leave an illiterate ministry to the churches when our present ministry shall lie in the dust"¹ in spite of this noble sentiment almost universally cherished, the more the population grew and the more towns were founded and developed, the smaller relatively was the number of towns that complied with the requirements of the law; so that in 1789 a new law freed 120 towns from the obligation resting on them under the law of 1647, but it still left this obligation on 110 towns. The decline of the town grammar school continued, however, so that in 1824 a new law exempted all towns having less than five thousand inhabitants. When the new law went into effect only seven towns were legally required to maintain other than elementary schools — whereas 172 towns would have been required to maintain grammar schools had the law of 1789 remained in force. These seven towns were Boston, Charlestown, Salem, Marblehead, Gloucester, Newburyport, and Nantucket.

¹ These lines are inscribed on one of the gates of the Harvard College yard.

Several of the causes of this decline of the public grammar schools have often been dwelt upon; namely, the inevitable poverty of communities in a new State, struggling to maintain themselves against many obstacles, among which the conflicts with the Indians were not the least; later² the disturbances and the expenses of the war for independence; the rise of the academies³; and still later (after 1769) the establishment and development of the district⁴ system which disintegrated the towns for educational purposes and developed the district spirit at the expense of the town spirit.

But there was another⁵ cause which increasingly affected the fate of the grammar schools as time went on. The schools were technical, in a narrow sense; and this in spite of the fact that the narrow curriculum covered the elements of general culture as general culture was then understood. So that the grammar schools really met the educational needs of only a limited number of the community, namely, of those parents whose children were destined for the ministry, or for other "learned professions."

Although all other interests were, at first, and

for a long time afterward, subordinated to the religious interest, it was inevitable that secular interests should gradually come to occupy a place in the public mind not less important and quite as urgent as the religious interest. In the century and a half that followed the enactment of the law of 1647, a huge task was accomplished by the colonists. The frontier had been pushed westward, towns and cities had grown up, trade and industry had increased enormously, the war for independence had been fought and won, a national consciousness had been gradually developed, and international relations had been established with European governments. All these internal and external changes of social, industrial, and political life gradually developed strong and varied interests in secular affairs; the hereafter, though impending and inevitable, no longer engrossed the interests and attention of men. In 1789, and still more in 1824, the clergy, though influential, were no longer dominant; secular affairs had assumed a magnitude and a complexity which they had never possessed before; and thousands of influential people were making them the chief concern of their lives;

the minister had become a less important personage, and the ministerial career no longer possessed its former attractiveness to an ambitious youth.

Under such circumstances a secondary education that was, in its aims and scope, determined primarily by the needs of but one calling was, naturally, an object of comparative indifference to an increasingly large number of persons in the growing commonwealth. The changed social conditions just sketched demanded a readjustment of education to contemporary needs. But this readjustment was long delayed. The traditions of a hundred and fifty years had fixed the curriculum. Throughout nearly the whole of this period the requirements for admission to Harvard College included scarcely anything but Latin and Greek. As late as 1798 Harvard College did not require either arithmetic or geography. The elements of arithmetic and geography were demanded, however, as early as 1807; and in 1814 the announcement was made that "in and after the year 1816 the whole of arithmetic would be demanded, and that candidates presented in and after the year 1815 must

have well studied ancient and modern geography." These narrow requirements covered what the college deemed essential for entering upon higher education, and hence also, by an easy inference, owing to the influence of the higher education on the lower, what educated people believed secondary education, in general, should consist of. All else was regarded as incidental, if not superfluous; and hence the "grammar schools" taught little else than Latin and Greek during the greater part of the time from the beginning down to about 1814.

As has already been intimated, such a narrow secondary education was unprofitable to an increasing majority of the growing population, and general apathy toward the town school was a natural result. It was only in the largest towns, where a considerable number of collegiate preparatory pupils were sure to be found, that the town grammar school survived. No public institution can survive and prosper unless it serves impartially the needs of all who contribute to its support. Until the town schools were organized on such a plan as to meet the wants of the non-collegiate as well as the collegiate

pupils, they did not flourish, and they did not deserve to.¹

¹ The histories of Massachusetts towns, and the official town records, afford abundant evidence of the difficulty of obtaining pupils for the town grammar schools, and of the various devices adopted by the towns to evade the law requiring them to maintain these schools. I give only two examples, namely, Woburn and Worcester. Quotations are from Samuel Sewall's "History of Woburn," Boston, 1868, and from William Lincoln's "History of Worcester," Worcester, 1862.

"In 1685 the town [Woburn] having increased indisputably to the number of one hundred families or householders, and so being obliged by law to set up a grammar school, 'the instructor whereof should be able to instruct youth so as to fit them for the college,' the selectmen appointed Mr. Samuel Carter, probably a son of Rev. Thomas Carter, their pastor, a graduate of Harvard College in 1660, and then resident in Woburn, to keep a grammar school that year, with a salary of five pounds per annum. But, though Mr. Carter was doubtless competent to teach such a school, *there were no scholars to attend it.* . . . Likewise, at the same meeting, the selectmen, feeling unwilling to expose the town to the penalty of ten pounds prescribed by law for neglect to keep a grammar school by towns of one hundred families each, and yet reluctant to obligate themselves to pay a master five pounds the second time for doing nothing (as they seem to have been apprehensive they should have to, if they positively engaged to give that sum), again employed Mr. Carter to keep such a school in Woburn, in 1686, but promised, *absolutely*, to give him only thirty shillings in pay for that year; but that if he should have any scholars they would give him five pounds, as they had stipulated to give him five pounds the year before." The apprehensions of the selectmen were fully realized; there were no grammar-school scholars in 1686, as there had been none in 1685.

In 1704 a Mr. Bradstreet had agreed to serve as grammar school-

Meanwhile, another kind of secondary schools had arisen through private generosity and private initiative, namely, the academies. The first acade-

master, and the committee who had engaged him reported that he had been "personally at Wooburne at the time of Charlestown Court," but no scholars presenting themselves, he had returned to Andover again. Mr. Sewall remarks: "Here is another striking token of the indifference of the people of Woburn for grammar-school instruction at the commencement of the last century. But why is it specified in the committee's report that Mr. Bradstreet was at 'Wooburne at the time of Charlestown Court'? He was doubtless here at that particular time by an understanding with the committee, and to answer the same purpose that another teacher, some thirty years afterwards, was expected to, who had a consideration made him by the town 'for standing in (as the records express it) Schoolmaster Two Courts.' In both these cases, and in others that might be named, the school committee (though men of good character and very respectable standing), wishing to save the town expense, and yet avoid a legal presentment, resorted to artifice. In making an agreement with a schoolmaster they would stipulate with him that he must, by all means, be at Woburn and keeping school in court time, even if he were to be off the very next week, fearing that otherwise the Grand Jury, who were the eye of the country, might spy out the deficiency and present the town; and 'that the Justices of the Sessions might impose on it a fine of £20 for its default, as the law required.'"

"In 1766 the representative [of Worcester] was instructed to endeavor 'that the law requiring a Latin Grammar school be repealed, and that not more than one such school should be kept in a county;' and in 1767 to use his exertions 'to relieve the people from the great burden of supporting so many schools of this description, whereby they are prevented from attaining such degree of English learning as is necessary to retain the freedom of any state.'"

mies in New England were Dummer Academy, Massachusetts, founded in 1763, and Phillips Academy, Andover, Massachusetts, founded in 1778. The founding of these two academies was soon followed by other foundations of the same sort. "By 1840 academies had been authorized in 88 towns, though not all of them were actually established." The purpose of the founders was to provide a means by which young men could be fitted for college, and through it for the requirements of public and professional life; and *also* to provide the elements of a liberal education for the youth of both sexes, whether they subsequently went to college or not. This is plainly shown by the list of studies which was included in the acts of incorporation: English, Latin, Greek, and French languages; writing, arithmetic, and geography; the art of speaking; practical geometry, logic, and philosophy; together with "such other liberal arts and sciences as the trustees shall direct."

Every one must gratefully acknowledge the great service which the academies have rendered to the cause of secondary education in this country. When Leicester Academy was founded,

says Mr. Martin, "there was not in all Worcester County an educational institution higher than the district schools. The few boys who were fitted for college learned their Latin and Greek by their own firesides, or as they followed the plough, and they recited them to the parish ministers." The academies gave to these boys the opportunities for education which they craved; and many of them showed in their subsequent careers of private and public usefulness how much they had profited by these opportunities. Even more than this, the academies kept alive and nourished public sentiment in favor of a higher standard of popular education than the district schools afforded. By keeping before the people opportunities for education they undoubtedly stimulated a demand for it, and by satisfying that demand, so far as they could, whether their pupils went to college subsequently or not, they served as the most important means for the dissemination of the elements of general culture, until the reaction against the long apathy toward public secondary education could gather strength enough for an effective revival of public schools.

The founders of the academies, therefore, de-

serve the gratitude of all who value intellectual interests. But, in another respect, these foundations were not so beneficial, and this was perceived clearly enough at the time. In 1795 Governor Samuel Adams says, in his inaugural address: "It is with satisfaction that I have observed the patriotic exertions of worthy citizens to establish academies in various parts of the Commonwealth. It discovers a zeal highly to be commended. But while it is acknowledged that great advantages have been derived from these institutions, perhaps it may be justly apprehended that multiplying them may have a tendency to injure the ancient and beneficial mode of education in town grammar schools.

"The peculiar advantage of such schools is that the poor and the rich may derive equal benefits from them; but none, excepting the more wealthy, generally speaking, can avail themselves of the benefits of the academies. Should these influences detach the attention and influence of the wealthy from the general support of the town schools, is it not to be feared that useful learning, instruction, and social feelings in the early parts of life may cease to

be so equally and universally disseminated as it has heretofore been?" He adds, characteristically, "I have thrown out these hints with a degree of diffidence in my own mind. You will take them into your candid consideration, if you shall think worthy of it." What Governor Adams feared we know actually came to pass.

The dearth of good town schools led to the founding of the academies; and the more the academies multiplied and prospered, the fewer became the town grammar schools.

Nevertheless, the academies deservedly hold an honored place in our educational history. We have just seen that for many decades they provided the secondary education which the towns failed to provide throughout the greater part of the colony, and kept alive an interest in public secondary education that was in danger of extinction. But they did even more than this. By the broader courses of study which they set up they promoted the revival, in an improved form, of the very schools they had helped to displace. They conspicuously promoted the development of an enlarged conception of secondary education by gradually

investing the secondary school with the dignity and importance of an independent educational institution, with functions of its own. Hence they not only kept alive public interest in secondary education, but helped in a most important way to enable that interest to gather strength enough to cause the founding of our public high schools.

We have seen that, from the beginning, many boys attended the academies who never went to college, and yet who valued as a priceless possession the elements of liberal culture which they had there acquired. A year, or even a term, in an academy, not seldom stimulated a youth to achievements which would have been impossible without the inspiring and illuminating help which the academy had given him. Moreover, many of the academies were equally accessible to both sexes; and this, in an age when girls scarcely even dreamed of a college education, helped to give to the academy that character of an independent educational institution with functions of its own which has just been referred to.

Here was a school doing excellent work for

all who had the necessary means to profit by its advantages. Men naturally began to inquire why such schools should not be made accessible to all instead of to only a favored few. And very soon the reaction from the long apathy to public secondary education came; at first quick and sharp, but wavering; then settling down into the increasingly steady and generous support which has made possible the extraordinary development of our public high schools during the last fifty years.

“In 1826 towns of four thousand inhabitants were required to maintain a first-grade high school (practically one with Greek); and towns of five hundred families, a second-grade high school (practically one without Greek). The requirement for towns of five hundred families was shortly after repealed. In 1836 it was restored; in 1840 repealed again; and in 1848 restored again. In 1891 every town was ordered to provide free high school tuition; if not in a high school of its own, then in that of another town. To relieve certain towns from the hardship of this law, the State reimburses their expenditures for tuition. In 1838, of 43 towns

required to maintain high schools, only 14 were doing so. In 1852 there were 64 high schools; in 1866, 156; in 1876, 216; in 1886, 229; today, 261. In 1898 the legislature abolished the distinction between first-grade and second-grade high schools, and defined more fully the aims and scope of high school instruction. In 1886 evening high schools were authorized for places whose population exceeds fifty thousand. Nearly all the high schools are for both sexes and have been since 1826."¹

Thus far I have endeavored to show that our secondary schools originated as college preparatory schools; that, as such, they served, from the beginning, the educational needs of only a limited portion of the community, since their aims and the scope of their work were technical—designed to provide the necessary pre-collegiate training of clergymen; that this technical character of the schools, in spite of the fact that the narrow curriculum comprised the elements of liberal culture as then understood, could not, alone, permanently hold the

¹ Sixty-second annual report of the Board of Education (Massachusetts), 1897-1898, p. 381.

support of the majority of the community; that even as preparatory training for clergymen, it gradually possessed a diminishing value to the whole community, since the growth of liberality in religion pointed to the possibility of many roads to salvation and to real service of God; to say nothing of the gradually diminishing lustre of the clergyman's calling, and his declining influence in secular even more than in spiritual affairs; that, meanwhile, the whole community necessarily felt the steadily increasing pressure of comprehensive and imperative secular interests for which the school made no direct provision whatever; and, also, the harassing burdens laid upon it by poverty, struggles with the wilderness, and conflicts and wars with the Indians, and, later, the great struggle for independence; and that, owing chiefly to these causes, together with the rise of the academies and the establishment of the district system, the town grammar school—the public secondary school—declined, until it seemed likely to die out, save in a few of the largest towns of the Commonwealth.

I have also endeavored to show that when,

through private initiative and private generosity, the academies arose to take up the work of preparation for college which the grammar schools had failed to perform, they clearly demonstrated the possibility and the wisdom of providing also, at the same time, a secondary education adapted to the special needs and the briefer educational careers of non-collegiate pupils of both sexes; that this demonstration gradually enabled secondary education to win widespread recognition, as possessing distinct functions of its own, namely, that of providing the elements of liberal culture and useful knowledge, whatever the future career or future educational opportunities of the pupils might be; and that the interest in public secondary education thus extended and enriched gradually gathered the necessary strength to overcome the indifference and nearly all the opposition on the part of the general public; and ultimately brought about, during the years from about 1826 to the present time, the enthusiastic support of our public high schools as we know them to-day.

That is to say, I have endeavored to show

that, although this country, through the Commonwealth of Massachusetts, was very early committed to the duty of maintaining secondary schools supported partly or wholly by local taxes, it took nearly two hundred years for the communities of Massachusetts to accept the duty they had recognized from the very beginning; and that this duty was accepted then only because, meanwhile, a new conception of the scope and meaning of public secondary education had been gradually evolved.

The old conception of public secondary education, the one that had failed, was preparation for college through a rigidly prescribed, narrow programme of studies. This programme, unless followed by collegiate training, was seen to be unproductive for most pupils, either as a preparation for the duties of life or as a stimulus to self-culture. Since only a small number of the pupils could go to college, such a secondary education interested relatively few. The new conception was a share in the elements of liberal culture and in useful knowledge and appropriate mental training for the duties and refined pleasures of life through an enlarged and

flexible programme of studies; this programme of studies to be so administered as to be adapted to the briefer educational career of the youth who had to get what liberal culture he could and the best preparation for life accessible to him without the help of the college, as well as to the longer educational career of the more fortunate youth who could go to college. This programme was developed by the academies. The academies naturally insisted on the superiority of the traditional classical programme; it was duly emphasized in the equipment and work of all of them; nevertheless, most of them offered their additional educational resources to all comers of both sexes freely, and so permitted a pupil to combine some classical training with a training in modern subjects, or to leave the classical training out altogether, as he saw fit. Such an education, whether of short or long duration, would be a help and an inspiration to its possessor. When the public high schools multiplied, in accordance with the law of 1826 and the laws passed subsequently, this enlarged conception of secondary education everywhere formed the basis of their aims and work.

Everywhere each school had its English department as well as its classical department; and the example of Massachusetts has been followed by the country at large.

The last 250 years have, accordingly, given an enlarged significance to secondary education. During those years, the public secondary school has grown into the stature of an independent educational institution with a function of its own; and, at the same time, it has never ceased, and, I trust, never will cease, by means of at least one of its "courses of study," to be closely articulated to the college, whatever the arbitrary demands of the college may be. How much importance we attach at the present time to this independent function of the high school is everywhere apparent. Our contemporary educational literature is full of it; and it has found frequent recent and emphatic indorsement by important educational associations, and particularly by the National Educational Association. In the Report of the Committee of Ten on Secondary School Studies (1893) we read: "The Committee of Ten unanimously agree with the Conferences.

Ninety-eight teachers, intimately concerned either with the actual work of American secondary schools, or with the results of that work as they appear in students who come to college, unanimously declare that every subject which is taught at all in the secondary school should be taught in the same way and to the same extent to every pupil so long as he pursues it, no matter what the probable destination of the pupil may be, or at what point this education is to cease." And from the Report of the Committee on College Entrance Requirements (1899) I quote the following: "Many high schools find it impossible to offer one or another of the subjects required for admission to college at present, while they do offer instruction in subjects which there seems to be no adequate reason for excluding from the category of accepted branches. . . .

"Resolved, That we recommend that any piece of work comprehended within the studies¹ included in this report that has covered at least

¹ English, German, French, Latin, Greek, algebra, geometry, trigonometry, history, civics, economics, physical geography, botany, zoölogy, physics, chemistry.

one year of four periods a week in a well-equipped secondary school, under competent instruction, should be considered worthy to count toward admission to college."

Evidence is not wanting that the college, also, is adopting this view of the secondary school, and that we are nearer than ever before to that close articulation of modern secondary and higher education which many of us have so long hoped for, and which has been so long deferred. The modern secondary school has gradually widened the historical path leading to the college by showing the college that there are many ways of preparing for the higher culture which it offers. It thus steadily increases the facility of the transition from school to college, and, consequently, increases the number of those who find themselves at the end of their school career not only impelled to seek a college education, but ready to enter on it.

All this does not mean that the esteem in which the college is held has suffered diminution. It only means that, first of all, the public high schools can and shall be made to serve

the purpose of extending and deepening the education obtainable in the public elementary schools, at home, as a better preparation for the duties and the refined pleasures of life; and that the college, wherever it may be found, shall serve to carry still farther that better "preparation for life" which the high school carries as far as it can; in other words, it means that the artificial distinction, once very marked, between the two historical functions of secondary education, namely, "preparation for college" and "preparation for life," is disappearing. Whether it will wholly disappear within a generation or two can only be conjectured; but I think it will.

III

**TWO CONTEMPORARY PROBLEMS
IN EDUCATION**

III

TWO CONTEMPORARY PROBLEMS IN EDUCATION

Two of the important problems that the contemporary interest in education has brought prominently before the public are (1) What shall we do about the elective system of studies which is daily extending its sway over schools and colleges throughout the country? and (2) How shall we bridge the gap between the high school and the lower grades; *i.e.* how shall we minimize the waste in the pupil's school education and make his entire school career serve continuously and progressively — as it should — his gradually expanding interests, needs, powers, and duties?

I

It is well known that even those secondary schools and colleges which do not recognize

electives, as such, and cling to "courses of study," permit not merely a choice between different "courses," but they usually also permit substitutions of studies in one "course" for studies in another; so that, really, if not nominally, a considerable range of choice, or election of studies, is permitted in most secondary schools and colleges nearly everywhere throughout the country.

Both experience and observation seem to justify this widespread adoption of the elective system, in some form, in secondary schools and colleges.¹ During the years of secondary school and college education, the pupil passes through the important stage of adolescence and youth. He emerges from childhood to manhood. During these years, he may be, and should be, led to self-revelation, and he should be aided to organize his mental life in accordance with his dominant interests and capacities, both for vocational and extra-vocational activities. After an individual's interests have emerged dis-

¹ See, for example, "The Elective System in American Education," by D. E. Phillips, "Pedagogical Seminary," viii, 206; "Some Results of the Galesburg Plan of Electives," by F. D. Thomson; "School Review," ix, 13.

tinctly, all voluntary effort is reserved for his preferences; and that achievement is most productive when it is based on interests and capacity, need not be argued. Daily experience proves that an individual's dominant interests ultimately determine the extent of his private and public usefulness and the sources of his pleasures—that, in short, they determine the richness or the poverty of his life, in the broadest sense of those words.

If this be admitted, the importance of discovering and cultivating a youth's dominant interests is apparent. He should, therefore, choose his own curriculum as soon as possible. He can learn to choose wisely only by choosing repeatedly, under guidance, as wisely as possible. Hence, although a child twelve or thirteen years old should not freely choose his own course of study, he is, nevertheless, entitled to have his preferences considered in the choices which his parents and teachers permit him to make. As he grows older, his ability to choose wisely should be deliberately cultivated, so that usually, by the time he has completed his secondary school education—

rarely before that time—he may be prepared to choose his further studies without restrictions. A youth of eighteen or nineteen, who has been learning to choose, who has had training in foresight for five or six years, is not likely to abuse his privileges; nor is he likely to be ignorant of the importance of wise counsel, nor to wish to dispense with it.

But it may be said that if a youth is allowed to choose his own studies, he is not trained to “work against the grain.” I am not sure that I understand the meaning attached to this phrase by those who use it. But, in my opinion, the only sense in which any sane person, in adult life, works “against the grain,” is when he applies himself to a disagreeable or even repulsive task for the sake of some ultimate end that is intrinsically agreeable to him, or recognized as good by him. There is no other working against the grain worth cultivating. No one, not even an ascetic, habitually does disagreeable things for their own sake.

When an adult works faithfully at a disagreeable task, he does it primarily because it

is clear to him that his personal interests are at stake—that his daily bread, or honor, or social elevation, depends on the performance of his work or his duty, however disagreeable it may be. In other words, there are strong extraneous motives, *the force of which he can appreciate*, that cause him to apply himself to the uninviting or repelling task before him. True, many a man does live his life under just such disadvantageous conditions. But it is a life of mere drudgery, from which he might have been saved if he had learned in youth to choose that calling which is in harmony with his dominant interests and capacities. His work might then have been hardly less a pleasure than his leisure; and he would, of course, have been a more useful member of society, and would have earned more leisure, because of the increased efficiency of his work.

But can any one with any knowledge of boy nature assert that faithful application to the positively and permanently uninteresting can be cultivated by extraneous motives, even if it were desirable? The motives which appeal to the adult are meaningless to the boy. More-

over, he feels instinctively that consciousness was added to the equipment of mankind, in the process of human evolution, for guidance, and he insists, as long as he can, on using it for that purpose. The remote reasons in the minds of his governors which apparently weigh heavily against the pupil's strong disinclination do not and cannot appeal to him as intrinsically valid. One can, of course, compel the performance of disagreeable tasks, and by repetition of compulsion one can convince a refractory youth that *some* achievement is always possible and necessary, in spite of strong aversion to a particular kind of work. But what one usually cultivates, under such circumstances, is not a growing strength to master difficulties, but chiefly the habit of skilful, even of subtle evasion—the habit of calculating, not how much one can do, but how little one must do.

Again, the effect of compelling a youth to pursue a subject permanently uninteresting is pernicious in another way. It cultivates the abominable habit of being satisfied with partial or inadequate achievement. Permanent lack of interest in a given field of work is an indi-

cation of corresponding incapacity; for growing interest and capacity always go together. Under such circumstances a youth never feels the glow of conscious mastery of the subject for its own sake; half-achievement is the result of forced, half-hearted endeavor, and both become the rule.

The result may be even worse. To be constantly baffled undermines one's confidence in one's own powers, and ultimately imperils self-respect. To force a youth to work "against the grain" for its own sake is, therefore, futile, and worse than futile; for it not only fails to accomplish its purpose, but actually cultivates the evasion of school work, the aversion to school work, and, in extreme cases, it may even destroy the capacity for work of any sort. Moreover, it must not be forgotten that evasion of work, aversion to work, and *ennui* are the fertile soil in which all the vices flourish.

Again, all such efforts to make a youth work "against the grain" by the pursuit of permanently uninteresting studies are artificial, and wholly unnecessary. What we want a youth to acquire is the power of overcoming difficulties, and the corre-

sponding habit of adequate achievement. This power and the corresponding habit are cultivated *by overcoming difficulties*, not by forced and *unsuccessful attempts* at overcoming them. Every subject affords abundant opportunity for overcoming difficulties, and when it is in harmony with the pupil's interests and powers, those difficulties *will be overcome*; first, because they lie in the way of further progress in a subject which the pupil wishes to master; and second, because he possesses the requisite natural capacity for conquest, because he daily feels the *sense of achievement*—the strongest of all incentives to exertion. Hence, conquest may become the rule. Through conquest alone comes the habit of *working in spite of difficulties*, which is the kind of working “against the grain” worth practising.

Finally, as was pointed out above, a man's life is more significant and richer in every way the more his dominant interests and powers determine both his serious pursuits and his pleasures. The natural preferences of pupils during the stage of secondary education should, therefore, be *heeded*, not thwarted. There is no

other effective way to cultivate the habit of "working against the grain," in the only sense in which such work is wise. It is no argument to say that generations of men have been trained to work against the grain under rigidly prescribed programmes of study. The sufficient reply to such an argument is already contained in what has been said about the relative effect of extraneous motives in youth and in adult life. It may be added, however, that this capacity, where it exists, has been developed in spite of, not because of, the rigid prescription of studies.

Of course, nothing that has been said applies to shirking. The shirk deserves no concessions, and should have no mercy. What the pupil has chosen to do, both the home and the school must insist that he *shall* do.

The question about elective studies is, accordingly, not "shall we recognize electives?" That question has been answered in the affirmative. The question is, "What is the wisest administration of electives in secondary education?" While each school is seeking the answer to this question in its own way, there is substantial

agreement on one point: namely, that there should be restrictions on the pupil's freedom to choose his own curriculum of studies. But opinions vary widely as to what these restrictions shall be, and how they shall be administered. I hold that these restrictions should be few. The fundamental questions are, of course, what studies shall we prescribe for all pupils and when shall we permit a pupil to discontinue a study once undertaken?

The experience of teachers who have worked under both prescribed and elective systems seems to point conclusively to the fact that no study, however highly esteemed by parents or teachers, will be a real influence in the pupil's development, and so contribute to his future usefulness and happiness in any important way, unless it is, in some degree at least, intrinsically interesting to him. Hence, no pupil should be required to pursue a study after it is clear that it does not appeal to him. Under most circumstances one year is enough—and it is not too much—to ascertain whether a study does, or does not, really challenge a youth's interest and capacity. Hence, to answer the

second of the two questions just proposed, first, I should say that, in general, after a pupil has made his choice of a study, he should be required to pursue it for a year.

As to the other question, namely, What studies shall be prescribed for all? it seems to me clear that no youth should be allowed, through ignorance or caprice, to cut himself off from any one of the great sources of human inspiration and guidance. If we could rely on having a varied and substantial programme of studies during the pre-high-school years, some of the prescriptions I am about to suggest might well be omitted; notably the mathematics. But as long as the pre-high-school grades, even those immediately preceding the high school grades, cannot yet be seriously regarded as the beginning of high school education in most school systems—among them some of the best in the country—in order to guard against the blindness of ignorance when pupils come up to the high school, it is necessary to insist on a considerable amount of prescription.

I would, therefore, prescribe for every non-collegiate pupil, during his secondary school

career, at least one year of the study of his mother-tongue, giving most of the time to literature with its inspiring and guiding influences; at least one year of science, so taught as to show the pupil how man is coming to master nature by understanding her, and at the same time, also, how completely one who knows nothing of natural science is cut off from participation in some of the most interesting, profound, and far-reaching problems of contemporary thought; one year of a modern foreign language, through which he may learn to appreciate fully his mother-tongue, and through which at the same time he may widen his mental horizon so as to include ultimately the literature, the institutional life, the ideals—in a word, the intellectual resources of another modern nation besides his own; one year of history—English or American—so taught as to show the meaning of democratic institutions and the means of safeguarding and improving them. If American history is prescribed, I would have it so taught as to fill the pupil's mind with the most important truths about what his country is, and what it really stands for; not glossing over its

past and present defects and unduly exalting its merits, but bringing into strong relief our worthiest political ideals, and laying special emphasis on the lesson that the approximate realization of worthy political ideals has always been and still is possible only through the intelligent participation of citizens in public affairs, not primarily as office-holders, but still more as alert and active private citizens; to do this, not so much by didactic instruction or exhortation, as by the inevitable logic of events skilfully portrayed. I would prescribe, further, one year of the history of industry and commerce, together with the elements of civics treated historically, that the pupil may see the interdependence of material prosperity and social stability, and learn to look upon contemporary social and economic problems in the light of their historical evolution; one year of elementary algebra and geometry that may open his mind to one of the most useful, the most profound, and to some minds most fascinating systems of thought which man has developed—a result which can never be expected to follow from what the pupil has learned in the narrow field covered

by arithmetic; one year of drawing and manual training that will introduce the pupil, on the one hand, to the elements of the fine arts, the decorative arts, and the mechanic arts, and on the other, lead him to a just appreciation of the importance of all three in ministering to the æsthetic and the material interests of men, and help him to adjust his own relation to them in thought and deed.¹

That is to say, under existing conditions, I mean with the existing unsatisfactory pre-high-school programme of studies, still unsatisfactory in spite of the well-nigh universal and decidedly creditable recent attempts to improve it, it seems to me wise to prescribe for every high school pupil at least one year of the language and literature of his mother-tongue; one year of American or English history (chiefly political); one year of English and American economic history and civics, or, when possible, one year of elementary political economy; one year of a modern foreign language; one year of science

¹ Of course I do not mean to imply that these results can be fully realized in a single year's instruction in the subjects named in this paragraph. I mean that these results are to be aimed at, whatever the duration of the instruction may be.

(physical geography, or botany and zoölogy); one year of algebra and geometry (together); one year of drawing and manual training; each of these subjects with a time allotment of from three to four periods a week.¹ This prescribed work includes subject-matter comprising about one-third of all the work a pupil of ordinary capacity should be required to do during four years of the ordinary high school programme, chosen from each of the great divisions of human culture. It thus affords a reasonably satisfactory basis for the guidance of pupils, teachers, and parents, in the choices which they make or advise in harmony with the pupil's real tastes and capacities. It seems to me, therefore, a safe basis for the administration of the elective system in our secondary schools.

¹ I suggest the following time schedule for these studies: English, 3; English history, or American history, 3; economic history and civics, or political economy, 3; modern language, 4; physical geography, or botany and zoölogy, 4; algebra *and* geometry, or algebra or geometry, 4; manual training and drawing, 4. (The numbers mean so many exercises per week.)

II

The other problem which I wish to discuss is closely connected with the problem of electives. It is, in effect, how shall we overcome the persistence of the artificial separation of the high school from the rest of the school system — a separation that sometimes almost amounts to isolation?

Reference was made above to the unsatisfactory condition of our pre-high-school education in spite of the widespread endeavor to improve it. The grammar school is still emphasizing, too much, a very large remnant of the old formal curriculum. Arithmetic, English grammar, and political geography are still looked upon as the solid studies of the later years of the grammar school, as they were before the days of enriched programmes. The work in foreign languages, algebra, geometry, history, elementary science, manual training, where any or all of these studies are recognized at all, is still looked upon in most school systems as a new and more or less ornamental addition to the real work of the grammar school.¹

¹ The reluctance of some communities and some teachers to abandon the old time grammar school studies in the later years of the

In other words, we have not yet taken the newer studies in the grammar school programme *seriously*. Hence, as I have already mentioned, most high schools do not regard the work done in these studies in the lower grades as really *done*; and so, in spite of the congested grammar school programme, due to the insertion of the new studies without elimination, *root and branch*, of the old ones, from the last years of the grammar school, the high school still assumes—and probably in most cases justly—that everything below the high school is still chiefly a drill in the school arts, just as it used to be; and that such beginnings of a real education grammar school programme, and to substitute for them the studies that constitute a real education, is largely due to the mistaken belief that the really unpractical and purely technical details of arithmetic and English grammar, and the statistical geography, that still consume so large a share of the pupil's time and attention in the last two or three grammar grades, possess more practical utility and have more educational value than good courses in history, literature, foreign language, elementary algebra and geometry, manual training, sewing, and cooking. It should be said, also, that many principals and superintendents doubtless hesitate to adopt the improved programme because they have not in their corps a sufficient number of properly equipped teachers—teachers who can be assigned to teach both in a given high school and in the upper grades of one or more grammar schools in its vicinity. But such teachers are not hard to find. Our colleges are sending them forth by the score every year.

as have been attempted in the lower grades are not really beginnings—they are only trifling with high school subjects; and that, consequently, all those subjects must be begun over again. The result is that the separation of the high school from the lower grades—the “gap,” as it is often called, between “the grades” and the high school—still exists, very much as it always has.

This curious break, in what is intended to be a thoroughly unified educational scheme, is such a contradictory phenomenon, in spite of its serious reality, that it would be incomprehensible if it had not followed naturally from the different origins of our elementary and our secondary schools. As we have seen, our secondary schools originated as (Latin) grammar schools, *i.e.* as college preparatory schools, designed for a particular social class, and hence possessing no essential articulation with the public elementary schools. The academies, although not class schools to the same extent as the older “grammar schools,” still concerned themselves little, if at all, with the elementary education of their pupils. When the high schools were founded on the

combined model of the "grammar school" and the academy, these traditions of secondary education were perpetuated — below the high school not a real education, only a preparation for education; education itself was deferred to the high school. Hence, the gap between the high school and the lower grades — the artificial isolation of the high school from the lower grades, which still persists in spite of our recent and contemporary endeavor to bring them together.

Nevertheless, the remedy is really not difficult to apply. We have already made so much progress that the final steps ought not to be hard to take. We shall take them when we discontinue elementary English grammar as a distinct study, at the end of the sixth grade, and begin there a modern foreign language; when we cut out all the arithmetic in and after the seventh grade, and substitute elementary geometry and algebra; when we similarly cut out most of the political geography in and after the seventh grade, and gradually transform all our nature study during the same time into elementary natural science. When we seriously make these and some other equally important

changes, and add them to the other improvements already substantially accomplished in our contemporary pre-high-school grades, we shall bridge the gap between elementary and secondary education; and the artificial isolation of the high school in a system of which it is really intended to be an integral part will be outgrown.

It would be interesting to discuss the effect of these suggested changes more at length, but I content myself with touching only one of them. It will be noticed that I have spoken of a modern language, not of Latin, as a suitable foreign language for pre-high-school pupils. The reasons for this suggestion are not far to seek. Latin is a difficult language, and when begun at an early age, and without any previous study of a foreign language, is not economically acquired. By economically, I mean the minimum expenditure of time and energy required to make substantial progress in the language. This is becoming apparent in the very stronghold of classicism itself—in Germany. It may not be generally known that during the past few years a very interesting experiment has been in progress in Germany; namely, the experiment of cutting off the first

three years of the nine years devoted to Latin in the gymnasium and real gymnasium, and substituting instead three years of French. Some years ago there were in Germany twenty-six gymnasiums and real gymnasiums, in which this experiment was in progress. Now, I am told, there are more than seventy. The head masters of these schools were unwilling, in some cases that came under my observation, to express any opinion on the probable results of this experiment until more time had elapsed. The experiments were begun not long after the celebrated conference on secondary education, called by the emperor in 1890. But others were emphatic in their belief that the experiment would be a success in the interests of Latin itself; and it was chiefly on this alleged ground that the experiment had been permitted at all. I have no doubt that the results will justify the expectations entertained by its promoters. In this country one of our best known classical schools¹ has substituted for some years past, for the first year of a six-year course in Latin, a year of French; and there is no disposition whatever to return to the former régime.

¹ The Roxbury Latin School.

A further argument for deferring Latin until after a modern language has been studied could be derived from the analogy of the very successful courses in elementary Greek now established in several American colleges—courses in which at least two, and sometimes three, years of “preparatory” Greek are done in a single year; and the work is done much better than it can be done in the preparatory school, on account of the greater maturity of the pupils, and their previous linguistic training. All this points to the wisdom of deferring Latin to the later secondary school years *in the interests of the Latin*.

But there is another even stronger reason why a modern language, instead of Latin, should be begun in the grammar school. Of course, I have in mind a *serious* study of the modern language—as serious as if the language were Latin, and with a similar expectation of building on it a superior language training later on. These reasons are, first, that in two or three years a serious study of a modern language will yield a result in general culture infinitely superior to what can be derived from Latin at the same

age—*i.e.* it will give the pupil the power to enjoy and to use another literature besides his own, and especially a literature that he *can* use and enjoy, whether he ever goes to school another day or not; and this cannot be asserted of Latin. It is hardly necessary to remind the reader that most pupils do not enter the high school; and hence, unless they have an opportunity to study a foreign language in the grammar school, they do not get it at all.

Other arguments for such sequence of our language courses as I am pleading for are near at hand; *e.g.* a pupil's knowledge of, and command over, his mother-tongue gains enormously through the study of a foreign language—a modern language is as good for this purpose, for young pupils, as Latin, or even better than Latin; and a modern language in itself may have a commercial value which Latin never has, except, at present, for some teachers.

Now, if we had two or three pre-high-school years of a modern language, followed by at least one year—the first high school year—of another modern language *in* the high school, and this followed by three years of Latin and two of Greek

for those who care for the ancient languages, who can doubt that our present somewhat meagre achievements in the classics in the high school would be greatly increased in quantity and that they would be vastly better in quality? This is the sensible language course of the future for those who study the classics in the high school, as I conceive it, when the high school is completely articulated to the grammar school. When that time comes I think, also, that we shall have precisely inverted the relative emphasis we now place on the classics and on the modern languages in pre-collegiate education for collegiate pupils. We shall follow the pre-high-school modern language courses by substantial high school courses in those languages, and so continue the real education of the pupil begun in the grammar school, instead of deferring it as we now do for the classical student until he reaches the college. For, at present, classical education in the secondary school, like the formal education that used to precede it in the elementary school, is, for most pupils, only an alleged preparation for education, not education itself.

When we articulate our pre-high-school courses in history, science, mathematics, manual training, and the rest, with the corresponding high school course, in some such way as has just been suggested for foreign language courses, we shall then make the pupil's school career a *real* and not a deferred education at every stage of his progress; and the historical disparity between the *kind* of studies pursued below the high school and those pursued in the high school will disappear. There will be no artificial separation of the high school from the rest of the school system. We shall have adjusted our educational endeavor to the real process of the pupil's unfolding development, and shall make our schools minister equally to all classes of pupils, whether they have the good fortune to be born of wealthy and socially superior parents, or whether, merely equipped with ability and earnestness, they are obliged to make the most of the brief educational career their circumstances will permit.

IV

A SIX-YEAR HIGH SCHOOL PRO- GRAMME

IV

A SIX-YEAR HIGH SCHOOL PROGRAMME

OUR experiments during the last two decades or so have taught us, I think, that, in general, about six years should be assigned to the elementary school course, the time needed for the acquisition of the school arts, the tools of learning. We have learned further, that, during those same years the beginnings of general culture should have been undertaken; and that, after six years, the emphasis should be on the acquisition of general culture, while the emphasis on the school arts should diminish, until after the eighth year there is no emphasis on the school arts at all. Incidentally the school arts will be involved, of course, in further acquisition.

It seems to me, therefore, not difficult to point out the meaning we attach to "elementary education" and "secondary education" to-day. Elementary education means the acquisition of

the school arts, together with some beginnings of general culture, during the first six years of the pupil's school career. Secondary education follows. It means that although the school arts still demand some attention, the emphasis, thenceforth, shall be on the acquisition of general culture.

The tables at the end of this chapter will serve to give somewhat further definiteness to the ideas which have just been expressed. These tables were prepared by Mr. George D. Pettee, Principal of the University School, Cleveland. He was chairman of a committee to report on an extended high school curriculum; and this committee made a report at the conference of collegiate and secondary instructors at Western Reserve University, on November 29, 1902. "The investigations of the committee," he says, "are condensed and exhibited in tabular form, as best expressing the professional judgment and the recommendations of nearly two hundred teachers, principals, and school superintendents, who have made detailed replies to the inquiries of the committee." This report, therefore, represents a contemporary tendency. No single individual and no single school would probably be

content with this summary as a programme of studies. That is not the intention. The intention is to represent the consensus of opinion so far as that consensus can be expressed in tabular form.

When we examine the tables, we observe that the ages indicated for secondary education are from twelve or thirteen up to seventeen or eighteen. That is, according to the opinion of these two hundred secondary school teachers, principals, and superintendents, the time limit of secondary education is fixed at six years, and the age of the pupils during that time is fixed at from twelve to eighteen years.

Now precisely this period from twelve to eighteen years of age is the period of secondary education as defined by many private schools and endowed schools. They recognized long ago that four years, on the basis of our contemporary elementary education, is too short a time to do the work that should be done in secondary education. Consequently for a long time they have given more than four years to secondary education. We are now pleading for an extension of the time of secondary education for the public school pupil, too; so that he, as well as the private school pupil,

may profit by all the resources that schools with good teaching and good equipment can offer him.

I do not intend to dwell on the details of Mr. Pettee's tables. My object is rather to call attention to them as an expression of a contemporary tendency approved by teachers, principals, and superintendents. The tables plainly show a desire to secure, if possible, a six-year high school programme.

The difficulty of assimilating the two upper grades of the elementary school with the high school has often been pointed out by teachers and school officers. I have always felt, however, that as soon as we have fixed our minds on an object which we regard as decidedly worth attaining, we shall find the means of attaining it. I therefore feel strongly that the first thing to do in order to promote this reform (for I regard it as such,—the universal six-year secondary course),—the first thing that we need to do is to fix the six-year secondary school as a desirable conception in the minds of superintendents, principals, and teachers. Having done that, a demand for teachers who

can meet the new requirements will be set up; and that demand will be met by the colleges.

Hence, I do not think that it is necessary, although it may be desirable, in order to have a six-year secondary programme, to have the first two secondary grades in the high school building. I see no reason why the necessary instruction could not be given in the several grammar schools, or, at least, in some of them; and I see no reason why pupils could not be transferred to the buildings where that instruction is going on.

I cannot refrain in passing from alluding to a kind of education which the secondary schools should supply, in part, and the grammar schools, in part. If our six-year secondary school is to offer equal opportunities to all, as it should, its privileges should be so administered that during the last two years of the grammar school (first two years of secondary instruction), those pupils who cannot go farther may secure various kinds of technical training; and, also, during the last two years of the secondary school, those pupils who cannot go to college may secure similar, but more advanced, technical training.

Let me put the thing in another way. It does not seem to me desirable that all the pupils in the last two years of our grammar schools to-day should study foreign languages. Nor does it seem to me advisable that all of our pupils in the secondary schools should spend their time entirely on what are called the academic subjects. It seems to me desirable to provide for many of them appropriate vocational (industrial or commercial) training. We might have two years of secondary academic training in some grammar schools, and two years of appropriate technical training in some others; and appropriate technical training at the upper end of all secondary or high schools.

There are always many objections to a change in contemporary practice, but I believe that no change is impracticable which is deemed advisable.

A SIX-YEAR HIGH SCHOOL COURSE

AGES	LOWER HIGH SCHOOL				UPPER HIGH SCHOOL		
	12 TO 13	13 TO 14	14 TO 15	15 TO 16	16 TO 17	17 TO 18	
LANGUAGE: The vehicle of thought and expression.	1. English Grammar . . . 2 2. French or German . . . 3 Periods per Week 5	English Grammar . . . 2 French or German . . . 3 French, German, or Latin . . . 5	16. Latin . . . 5 or French, German, or Spanish . . . 5	Latin . . . 5 18. Modern Language . . . 5	Latin . . . 5 Modern Language . . . 5	Latin . . . 5 Modern Language . . . 5	
MATHEMATICS: The processes of thought and expression.	3. Algebra . . . 2 4. Geometry . . . 2 5. Arithmetic . . . 1	Algebra . . . 2 Geometry . . . 2 Arithmetic . . . 1	17. Arithmetic . . . 3 Geometry . . . 2	Algebra . . . 2 Demonstrative Geometry . . . 3	Algebra . . . 4 Mechanical and Geometric Drawing . . . 1	19. Solid Geometry and Trigonometry . . . 5	
HISTORY: The world: Its books, men, and institutions.	6. English Literature . . . 2 7. History . . . 2 8. Geography . . . 1	English Literature . . . 2 History . . . 2 Geography . . . 1	English Literature . . . 2 History . . . 2 Geography . . . 1	English Literature . . . 2 History . . . 2 Civil Gov't . . . 1	English Literature . . . 2 History . . . 2 Economics . . . 1	English Literature . . . 2 History . . . 2 Current Events . . . 1	
SCIENCE: The world: Its form, substances, and uses.	9. Physiology . . . 2 10. Clay and Wood . . . 2 11. Drawing . . . 1	Geology . . . 2 Wood and Wood-working . . . 2 Drawing . . . 1	Botany or Physiology . . . 2 Wood and Metal-working . . . 2 Drawing . . . 1	Zoölogy or Physiology . . . 2 Wood and Metal-working . . . 3	Chemistry or Forging and Machinery . . . 5	Physics . . . 5 or Cosmography and Applied Philosophy . . . 5	
CULTURE: Physical, rhetorical, musical, etc.	12. Physical Culture . . . 2 13. Voice Culture . . . 1 14. Declamations and Essays . . . 2	Ditto . . . 5	Ditto . . . 5	Ditto . . . 5	Ditto . . . 2	Ditto . . . 2	
15. Instrumental Music.	30 minutes	30 minutes	40 minutes	40 minutes	50 minutes	50 minutes	
Length of periods	30 minutes	30 minutes	40 minutes	40 minutes	50 minutes	50 minutes	

NOTES

No attempt is made in this report to give a prospectus adapted to a particular school, locality, or type of pupil. Radical changes within the several groups are wholly consistent with the proposed outline as a whole. Adaptations to the needs of girls' high schools may be made in several groups of studies. The condensation in the present primary and grammar grades is approved by many teachers who have considered the possibility and the need of this reduction. The various topics of arithmetic which relate to technical business transactions or which are best studied after the elements of algebra and geometry are mastered, should be postponed to the proper grades of the high school course. The following notes aim to give brief interpretation to the outline schedule:—

1. It is assumed that a twelve-year-old pupil has neglected the technical forms of English grammar, but has mastered a limited vocabulary of words in reading, writing, and spelling. His primary training should insure intelligent reading and an ability to write, in accurate English, simple stories or themes.

2. A fluency in simple conversation, reading, and writing, and to be followed at about fourteen by a grammatical study of the modern language, or of Latin.

3. Such elementary processes in algebraic equations as simplify or replace arithmetic processes.

4. Concrete geometry, constructive and mensurational, with little attention to formal logic or demonstration. The essential computational and structural facts of geometry (plane or solid) may be covered.

5. Mental arithmetic and reviews.

6. A carefully selected course, adapted to the several grades,

and involving the writing and personal correcting of frequent themes.

7. Digests of books, by topics and character analyses, should be made, and the six-year course should cover a wide range of reading. Classical students should not neglect the study of English and American history nor fail to know, at least in substantial outline, the beginnings of the history of the world, and the essential facts of mediæval and modern European history. Pupils not pursuing the study of Latin or Greek should in their own tongue make a critical study of Greek and Roman civilization.

8. Political, historical, and commercial geography, as a complementary study in the history course.

9. A course giving skill sufficient to illustrate the materials and processes used in the laboratory or at the bench.

10. Definite physical training supplementing the games, recess recreation, and athletic sports.

11. Singing and vocal calisthenics.

12. The refined forms of the art of expression. Practice in public speech and preparation of formal essays and debates.

13. If taught within the school programme, it may properly displace some other form of manual training.

14. In this or in the preceding year should begin the regular college preparatory Latin. Students unlikely to enter college may profitably continue Latin through a year's translation of simple Latin prose.

15. Largely commercial arithmetic, meeting the business needs of boys who leave school at this age.

16. A student entering college or technical school without Latin should have practically a mastery of one modern language and at least a limited familiarity with a second.

17. Candidates for classical courses in college will need to substitute a modern language for this higher mathematics.

In general, the course for the last two or three years will conform in some degree to the requirements of the college or technical school.

So long as Greek, or an equivalent language study, is required for admission to particular colleges, high schools and academies will probably sacrifice some part of the history or science groups, with so-called classical pupils.

THE SIX-YEAR HIGH SCHOOL COURSE

AS A PART OF THE COMPLETE CURRICULUM AND WITH A TRIENNium
AS THE UNIT OF DISTRIBUTION

EDUCATIONAL ORDERS	SCHOOLS	AGES	GRADES	CHARACTERISTICS
PRIMARY	LOWER (PRIMARY SCHOOL)	6 to 9	1 2 3	Reading, writing, spelling, arithmetic, drawing, music.
	UPPER (GRAMMAR SCHOOL)	9 to 12	4 5 6	The same, with language forms, geography, and elementary science. Object lessons, with familiar animals and plants, metals, coal, rain, snow, ice, brooks, etc. Making of collections.

THE SIX-YEAR HIGH SCHOOL COURSE (*Continued*)

EDUCATIONAL ORDERS	SCHOOLS	AGES	GRADES	CHARACTERISTICS
SECONDARY	LOWER (HIGH SCHOOL OR ACADEMY)	12 to 15	7 8 9	General studies, aiming at the true appreciation of nature, men, and books. Major half of curriculum devoted to facts rather than to forms.
	UPPER (HIGH SCHOOL OR ACADEMY)	15 to 18	10 11 12	Similar studies, in more technical form. Processes more exhaustive. College preparatory courses.
UNIVERSITY (TERTIARY)	COLLEGE OR TECHNICAL SCHOOL	18 to 21		Greek begun only in college, and forming the basis of the classical collegiate course. The college and technical course largely free from professional studies.
	PROFESSIONAL OR GRADUATE SCHOOL	21 to 24		The age of admission, for average students, two years lower than at present.

The work of the home and of the kindergarten may be disregarded in determining the essentials of a school curriculum; likewise the advanced courses, at home and abroad, elected by specialists. No attempt at the solution of college problems is attempted. The schedule outline which may precede or follow the extended high school course, is here furnished, to illustrate the significance of the three-year period.

v

THE SCHOOL AND THE HOME

V

THE SCHOOL AND THE HOME

WE commonly regard the school as wholly responsible for the education of our children. But that the school alone cannot be responsible for this education is obvious on a moment's reflection. The school has direct control of the children during only five hours of the day, five days in the week, for not more than forty weeks of each year. This is a total less than one-fifth of the waking hours. Hence, during at least four-fifths of the waking hours, the children are responsible to the home, not to the school.

Nevertheless, the home's share of responsibility is not fairly expressed by this simple mathematical statement. Many of the educational influences to which the children are subject do not originate in the individual home any more than in the school, nor are they within its control. These influences emanate from the natu-

ral surroundings, and from the community life as a whole, — its industrial, commercial, and political activities, its amusements, traditions, religion, and contemporary moral and intellectual standards.

It thus appears that our children and youth are subject to an important education — the indirect, but none the less powerful, fortuitous education of natural environment and social experience — which neither the home nor the school is able directly to control. But both are concerned in subordinating this education to their own direct teachings; both seek to reinforce it when favorable to the ultimate ends they have in view, and to counteract it when unfavorable. Both home and school seek to give the coming generation such a command over themselves, and their material and social environment as will enable them to react on it to their own permanent advantage, and the advantage of the social group to which they belong, or to which they aspire.

Now, while the family has other important duties to perform, education is the whole duty of the school. This is the sole ground of its existence.

Hence, whatever the duties of the home may be regarding education, the school must always bear the largest share of responsibility for the result. Still, the home's share of responsibility remains considerable; first, because of the inevitable disparity between the hours spent in and out of school; second because the impressions of the school are easily effaced or weakened unless reënforsed and supplemented by home sanctions, or stimulus, or sympathy; third, because the school, like other human institutions, is too often imperfect, and not infrequently fails in its aims, equipment, or methods, to minister adequately to the high ends for which it is established; and, finally, because the financial support of the school, on which its whole efficiency ultimately depends, must come from the homes taken collectively, — that is, from the community.

One would suppose that, under such circumstances, coöperation would be the established relation between the home and the school. One would suppose that parents and teachers, recognizing their mutual responsibilities to the same children, would find or make opportunities for personal contact with each other; that the par-

ents would seek to learn as much as could be learned by outsiders of the teachers and the school work, and the teachers would endeavor similarly to know the parents and the home conditions of the pupils. But the fact is that such a foundation for effective coöperation is rare. Most parents know little or nothing about the school lives of their children, and the teachers are equally ignorant about the children's home lives.

Sometimes the teachers and sometimes the parents are responsible for this state of affairs. Most private schools and some public schools discourage the visits of parents to the class rooms. Hence parents are often deterred, through the fear of intrusion, from making the acquaintance of the teachers or informing themselves by personal inspection about what the schools are or are not doing for their children. On the other hand, parents are often careless or indifferent, and repeated and urgent invitations to visit the school are disregarded. Sometimes the parents—and these are the less enlightened or the more optimistic parents—consciously charge the teachers with full responsibility for the chil-

dren's welfare, during the school hours, and, having done so, feel that they have done their whole duty, both to the children and to the school, and rest content until something goes wrong.

It may be said in passing that the reluctance of some schools to invite the visits of parents is not without justification. The conception of education and of school work entertained by most parents—just because they are not teachers—is likely to be purely conventional, as regards the course of study; crude and out of date as regards books, equipment, and methods of teaching; and,—just because they are parents,—either too lenient or too severe as regards methods of government and discipline. Under such circumstances helpful coöperation between the home and the school cannot be expected from the visits of parents, unless the teachers are willing to undertake the appropriate and tactful education of the parents,—a process for which there is, ordinarily, no provision, and from which, in the absence of recognized provision, most teachers naturally shrink. Besides, some parents are simply meddling. To invite all

parents to visit the schools is to invite the meddlers among the rest.

Now, it is generally agreed by thoughtful laymen and teachers that the want of coöperation between the home and the school is an unfortunate neglect of educational opportunity. The result of this neglect is not seldom a perversion of the very education which both the home and the school really wish to provide, and certainly the best results cannot be expected unless the home and school reënforce each other, and unless, in case of need, the home insists on a better school, or the school does its best to improve the home.

Coöperation between the home and the school is needed, in the first place, to guard the health and promote the normal physical development of the children. Few parents are consciously indifferent to the physical welfare of their children, but many in all classes of society do not appreciate the serious consequences of neglect in this matter. As long as the children are not perceptibly ill, to the ordinary observer, it is assumed that they are doing well. This assumption may be quite erroneous.

Dr. Francis Warner, basing his conclusions on the examination of fifty thousand school children in England, states that 6.8 per cent of the girls, and 8.8 per cent of the boys showed developmental defects. When these developmental defects were taken in connection with other defects, for example, abnormal nerve signs or low nutrition, the percentage of children possessing the combined defects was 38.4 (boys), 36.2 (girls) and 16.2 (boys), 26.3 (girls), respectively.¹ Now, developmental defects are commonly the result of a disregard of the laws of health in the lives of the pupils themselves, or in their physical surroundings, or both.

The home life of the children of the poor is often a life of drudgery. Once out of school, the girls are occupied with various kinds of domestic duties, and the boys, when not needed to help at home, are engaged in various kinds of work for

¹ "The Study of Children," by Francis Warner (Macmillan & Co.), p. 250. See also a suggestive paper, "Habits of Work and Methods of Study of High School Pupils in Some Cities in Indiana," by N. C. Johnson, in the *School Review* (Chicago) for May, 1899; and Edward Shaw's (The Macmillan Company) "School Hygiene." Dr. Shaw's book is an excellent guide for both parents and teachers. The treatment is clear, brief, and sufficiently non-technical to be appreciated by every intelligent reader.

small wages. The tension of such a life may not be excessive at any moment, — although often likely to be so, — but it is constant. Add to this that the food is probably poorly prepared and not infrequently deficient in quantity or, at least, in nutritive quality, and the time for sleep as much too short as the hours of work are too long. All this may take place in a crowded section of the city, or other locality, where rent is cheap, and the sanitary conditions are unsatisfactory. What wonder that the children from such homes come to school pale, thin, nervous, and irritable ; unable or unwilling to subject themselves to the necessary restraints and constraints and the applications to duty required in the school ? The entire school day means for the pupil a new set of exactions.

Under such circumstances, it is clear that the home life and school life together make demands on the pupil that easily become excessive. The result is that the normal weariness, that disappears completely under the influence of recreation, and rest, becomes chronic fatigue, entailing its whole series of usual consequences, — developmental defects, together with impaired health, — and so ulti-

mately a dismal condition of body and mind that makes all work a burden, and recreation a bore. It is true that such results may, occasionally, be inseparable from poverty; but in general they are traceable, not to poverty, but to ignorance.

But it is not only in the homes of the poor that improper, hygienic conditions constitute a menace to the physical development of the children, and interfere with their general education in school. The children of the middle and the upper classes are not called upon to do housework or to work for wages out of school, but they are permitted, or even encouraged to indulge in time consuming and physically exhausting social diversions. It matters little in the end whether a child or youth undermines his physical strength by excessive work, or excessive play, or by a combination of the two. In each case he misses the physical development that he ought to get, and he therefore unfits himself for the highest efficiency in the duties and for the fullest participation in the refined pleasures of life; and this preparation for efficient and complete participation in all the worthy interests of life, it is the fundamental purpose of education to secure for him as fully

as possible. Complete living demands vigorous bodily health, together with the power of endurance; it ought not, therefore, to be difficult to cause most parents of the ambitious classes to see the importance of hygienic conditions for their children, — the only conditions under which vigorous physical health and efficiency can be secured.

Now the price of health, as of liberty, is eternal vigilance. We have medical inspection of schools, but who will claim that it is more than a merely perfunctory performance? It does, on occasion, serve to check the spread of contagious diseases, and this is, of course, a very important service to the children and the community; but so far as I know, we have nowhere in the United States a thorough-going medical inspection of schools, with appropriate authority to correct abuses wherever found.

Again, it is never assumed that the random, haphazard education of experience and environment is sufficient in the field of intellectual and moral education. It is well known that such an education leaves many gaps; that it fails to arouse and develop many of the child's powers,

because it never reaches them ; or, if it does, it does so only now and then without discriminating selection and appropriate emphasis. Moreover, the strenuousness of persistent application is wanting, and there can be no real training — no permanent benefit — without such strenuousness. Most of the physical training in our schools hardly deserves the name. Not much can be expected of ten minutes once or twice a day, often under unsuitable conditions, given by untrained teachers, and lacking adequate expert supervision. How much progress could be expected in Latin or algebra under such circumstances and with such a time allotment? Dr. Warner, quoted above, lays stress on the benefits to be derived from good physical training. He says : —

“ Evidence is available from comparison of reports on children seen in schools, where good physical training was provided, in contrast with a large school, where no such training was given. In the school without physical training the proportion of both boys and girls with abnormal nerve signs was higher, and a larger proportion of the boys were reported by the teachers as dull pupils. This cannot be attrib-

uted to the developmental cases or to low nutrition, as their proportion was lower than in the other schools; it must, I think, be ascribed to the absence of physical training. . . . It may be inferred that physical training tends to improve the brain condition of children, preventing or removing disorderliness in motor and in mental action, and promotes healthy activity in both directions; this applies not only to children perfectly well made in body, but also to those in some slight degree below normal."

But developmental defects, abnormal nerve signs, and the rest, are traceable to unhygienic school buildings as well as to a disregard of personal hygiene. Improper heating, lighting, and ventilation, cramped and unhealthy positions during school hours, owing to unsuitable or ill-fitting school furniture, — these also contribute their important share to undermining the health and normal physical development of the children.

How far we are from having hygienic school buildings is painfully evident to any one who will read the reports of our city school super-

intendents, or who will take the trouble to look about him in his own community.¹ It is no exaggeration to say that unsanitary school buildings, with respect to light, heat, and ventilation, abound. Suitable physical training, seriously pursued under wise direction, in our schools is still, as I have said, almost universally conspicuous by its absence, and medical inspection of schools

¹ By way of illustration, I quote from the report (for the year 1898) of the superintendent of schools of an important city in New York.

“Nearly all of our rooms do not furnish sufficient floor space or cubic contents for the number of children occupying them. In many, if not most, cases this condition is caused by our being obliged to crowd into these rooms more children than they were planned for.

“In amount of light, study rooms in all our older buildings are seriously defective. . . . In several large study rooms the direction from which the light comes is wrong.

“In the matter of ventilation, we are in a very bad condition. In only six buildings have we any ventilation worthy of the name, while of these six only one gives anywhere near sufficient pure air for the number of pupils now occupying them. . . . The trouble comes mainly from overcrowding in all of the older buildings; in the first twelve or thirteen built there is practically no ventilation except by doors and windows.

“Almost two-thirds of all the desks and seats in use are unhealthful and unsuitable for school use. Only those purchased during the last three years have reasonable approach to perfection.”

See also an article, “The Big Red Schoolhouse,” by Elizabeth M. Howe, in the *Educational Review* for October, 1899.

is still nearly everywhere a perfunctory performance. Under such circumstances, we must not be surprised if the health and physical development of our children suffer. Under such circumstances, it is difficult to escape the conclusion that an examination of our school children would bring to light an alarming amount of school-bred ill health and developmental defects. That is to say, under such circumstances, the school, which should stand for the development of our children into health and strength, may actually promote their development into physical weaklings,—and this is indeed a perversion of education.

But if the indifference or ignorance of parents, unsanitary school buildings, and the absence of proper physical training are responsible for these things, the remedy is not far to seek. In all cases, for rich and poor, for the ignorant and the well informed, the duty of the school is plain. It is the institution set apart by society for the education of the children into physical as well as mental and moral health and vigor. It may, therefore, nay, it *ought* to insist that whatever the home condi-

tions may be, it shall be allowed, yes, *required*, to set the example of providing for children and youth the most salutary physical environment possible, and of devising and enforcing the wisest rules of personal hygiene.

Now it is clear that such a recognition of the function of the school can only be secured by the coöperation of the parents,—for intelligent oversight of the pupils' health from day to day requires the services of trained experts, and these, together, with hygienic school buildings and furniture, and good physical training, cost money. But, if the parents were once convinced of the harm done their children by failing to provide suitable buildings, and furniture, and the best physical training they can secure, these essentials to the children's welfare would be forthcoming.

That the school may present such matters as I am now discussing, and many others affecting the efficiency of the schools, to the parents, either for their instruction or to stimulate their investigation, the school and the home need recognized opportunities for conference. In some schools a rather elaborate

plan has been worked out, during the past few years, whereby parents and teachers necessarily coöperate in caring for the interests of their common charges. By means of question blanks sent to the parents, much information concerning each child is secured by the teachers, and this information is made the basis of conferences between parents and teachers. This plan has also usually included blanks for recording information about pupils by teachers, for transmission to other teachers or schools, as the pupil advances from one grade to another, or from one school to another.

The entire plan has been called "Pupil Study." It seems to be useful and bids fair to win favor gradually wherever it is undertaken. There is no doubt, I think, that when wisely administered such a plan may provide an excellent basis for effective coöperation between teachers, and between teachers and parents, in promoting not only the pupils' physical welfare, but a wise treatment of the pupil in every detail of his school career.¹

¹ For details concerning "Pupil Study," see "Child Study in Secondary Schools," by F. W. Atkinson, the *School Review*, V, 461 ;

Opportunities for conferences between parents and teachers are provided, also, in many places, by parents' meetings called periodically by the teachers—usually by the superintendent or by some principal; and by the "Education Societies," now established in many places throughout the country. The education societies may be made, I believe, the most useful means of communication between the teachers and the parents that can be devised. They represent the organized educational interests of the community. The initiative in founding them is usually taken by the teachers, but the members are chiefly laymen. By means of regular meetings, devoted to the exposition of contemporary educational questions, they serve to inform their members of the scope and meaning of such questions, and so to cultivate public opinion in favor of important measures of progress and reform. Such socie-

"A Study of High School Pupils," by Myron T. Scudder, the *School Review*, VII, 197; "How can the Public High School reach Individuals?" by F. W. Atkinson, the *School Review*, VIII, 377. "The Teacher's Practical Application of the Results of Child Study," by F. E. Spaulding, *Journal of Pedagogy* (Syracuse, N.Y.), XVI, 34.

ties will in time, I doubt not, do much to overthrow the prevalent apathy toward unsanitary school buildings and inadequate and unsatisfactory physical training in our schools.¹

Coöperation between the home and the school is no less essential in promoting the intellectual and moral development of the pupil. This commonplace is so obvious that its importance is likely to be overlooked. But it is just because such coöperation is too often lacking that some of the most serious perversions of educational opportunity take place.

The school is rare that does not set up and consistently endeavor to maintain a high standard of intellectual achievement and of conduct. There may be a few private schools that are, primarily, commercial enterprises, and only incidentally educational institutions; but most private schools are not of this sort; and however much some of them may be justly condemned as mere cramming machines for examination purposes, very few can be justly charged with mere pretence,

¹ See "Beginnings of an Education Society," by Dr. Walter Channing, *Educational Review*, XIV, 354; also the Report of the United States Commissioners of Education for 1898-1899, I, 538.

while consciously adhering to low standards of achievement. In the public schools mercenary motives can have no weight. Occasionally a public school pretends to standards which are not enforced, but nearly all public schools refuse to tolerate indifference, indolence, or caprice, in work, and set themselves squarely against concessions to any divergence whatever from recognized standards of conduct.

Now it is equally true that most homes cherish high standards of achievement and conduct for their children, so far as they are capable of conceiving them, whatever their social grade may be; and, in general, the standards are at least as high as those of the school. Nevertheless, it is not seldom that the school fails to attain a satisfactory approximation to its ideals, just because parents and teachers do not work together in attaining desired results. I think it is fair to say that these failures are more often chargeable to the home than parents are willing to admit; and this is particularly true of parents belonging to the middle and upper classes. While theoretically approving the standards set by the school, these standards are, in practice, not infrequently

regarded as too severe or exacting by the parents for *their* children; or, at least, the importance attached to serious and continuous endeavor to realize these standards in the daily school life of the pupils is practically regarded as excessive by the parents. Under such circumstances, the pupils, being human, abate their devotion to school duties, and the importance of athletics, social functions, and other diversions, is correspondingly augmented in their eyes. I have even known an ambitious but socially inclined young student, in all seriousness, to deplore the fact that he had so much "to do" that he had no time to study.

Now, of course, the coarser adjustments of the home and the school, in the matter of quantity and quality of work demanded of the pupils, are provided for in the official relations between them, and this is also true with respect to the conduct expected and enforced by the school. When A is idle or troublesome and there is danger that he will fail of promotion, or that he will be suspended for misconduct, the teacher or principal fills the proper official blanks, furnished for the purpose by

the superintendent, and sends them to the parents. Usually the pupil's descent to Avernus is checked by this procedure, and coöperation is, temporarily at least, forcibly secured.

But sometimes the administration of this provision for official coöperation between the home and school is rendered unnecessarily difficult; indeed, the efforts of the school are sometimes thwarted by a singular and culpable dishonesty of which some parents are guilty. This dishonesty is the result of weakness. The parents charge the school, in the pupil's presence, perhaps, with full responsibility for enforcing its standards, and, in case of need, its penalties, on the pupil; and promise themselves, the pupil, and the school, that unless the school requirements are met, the pupil shall surely come to grief. But when the pupil's delinquencies have to be dealt with, some parents weakly and unwisely allow themselves to become the pupil's advocates for clemency, in spite of the extended series of reminders which they have received that the pupil has been going astray. No useful, active coöperation can be expected from such a parent, but the school has the right to

expect at least passive coöperation. It has the right to expect that the parent will stand aside, and permit the school to attempt the reformation of the pupil, — unaided, but also unhampered by misguided or dishonest efforts to save the pupil from the consequences of his own misdeeds.

But the greatest need of coöperation is in the finer adjustments of the school and home influences to each other in the case of the ordinary, well-disposed pupils, who constitute the great majority of the school. The activities of the school may be greatly reënforced or weakened by the notice taken of them at home. Of course it is quite possible for parents to repel rather than to invite the pupils' conversation about their school interests. If the children are daily subjected to a running fire of questions about their studies or their teachers in a mere matter-of-fact way; if the parents fail to respond sympathetically to a youthful enthusiasm — temporary it may be, but none the less important to him who feels it — in a book, or a study, or a teacher; if the children have reason to feel that every petty delinquency, or trifling

difficulty, will be looked upon with marked disfavor or met with moralizing comment; or if the parents have no sense of humor and fail to appreciate the children's point of view in some mischievous, but childish and really harmless, prank, and treat such youthful faults with solemnity or severity instead of good-natured raillery or friendly advice—under such circumstances we may be sure that children will say little at home about what goes on in school. But most children respond readily to the intelligent interest of their parents in school affairs and are glad to talk about them to sympathetic and appreciative listeners. Instances of such a good mutual understanding between pupils and parents are, fortunately, not rare, but they are less common than they ought to be.

There is, usually, little difficulty about home sympathy in the matter of interscholastic athletic contests, and this interest, though sometimes productive of excesses on the part of the pupil, is, on the whole, rather helpful than otherwise. It is, of course, a stimulus to participation. Even that widespread vicarious participation known as "supporting the team,"

although not adding much to the physical development of the pupils and seeming rather trivial to us elders, is unquestionably a means of rousing and developing youthful loyalty to a common interest,—the welfare of their common institution,—and so has, on the whole, a beneficial moral effect. The parents share the enthusiasm of their youngsters before and during the games, and afterwards also partake of the bliss of triumph or the torments of defeat. The teachers, the parents, and the pupils make common cause for the time being. After a defeat the determination to win next time is reënforced by all alike; every period of practice is discussed and its bearings on the next contest scrutinized. After a triumph mutual congratulations equally stimulate the determination to hold the preëminence just won. In this way wisely conducted interscholastic athletics may do much to help the school and the home to set up and maintain a high standard of physical development and vigor.

But it is not only in the field of athletic sports that good results are thus secured. There is, fortunately, at this moment, a growing interest in

interscholastic (especially intercollegiate) debates. What has been said of the reënforcement of the school by the sympathy of the parents in respect to athletics cannot be asserted with equal truth about debating. Nevertheless, the interest of the non-participating pupils and of the parents in an interscholastic debate often falls but little short of the interest in an approaching athletic contest, with corresponding beneficial results.

But my object in calling attention to these interscholastic contests is not to emphasize their value as such. My special purpose is to point out how great is the stimulus of a common end conceived and striven for by all alike, — parents, teachers, pupils; and hence, to indicate, to some extent at least, what we might expect if we could secure a similar coöperation in the less dramatic, ordinary activities of the school, day by day. Each pupil is daily making conquests or suffering defeat in his individual work. The extent to which the significance of these daily successes and defeats could be increased through home sympathy varies, of course, with the varying conditions of the home, but there is no doubt that in many of our best homes many valuable oppor-

tunities for encouraging the pupils with timely aid, for augmenting the pupils' interest in their work, and for stimulating them to achieve something more than routine results, are lost because parents do not know and often do not seem to care what the pupils' work or other school interests may be.

A powerful educational influence in every school which the parents may do much to help or hinder is its *tone*. No influence of the school is more powerful. It springs from the community life of the pupils, and of the pupils and teachers. It is, for the most part, developed unconsciously, so far as the pupils are concerned, but a high tone cannot be developed without the wise coöperation of good teachers—men and women who are themselves representative of a high tone. What is this tone, and how may it be maintained? The answer is not difficult.

The tone of a school consists of the standards of work, thought, and conduct which it maintains, and the extent to which these standards dominate the varied activities of the school. Where high standards of work in quantity and quality

exist — that is, where strenuous application to duty and insistence on the best achievement commensurate with health, ability, and maturity are upheld, and where high ideals of thought and conduct are striven for and approximately realized in the daily intercourse of the teachers and pupils, — there the tone of the school is high, and its influence is elevating and refining. “We live by admiration, hope, and love,” and it happens that these qualities are easily aroused and can be wisely controlled and directed in children and youth of school age. Under precisely the same course of study the pupils of two different schools may “live” in very different lives. A mechanical routine which consists in assigning and “hearing” lessons is deadening to this life of “admiration, hope, and love”; an inspiring interest in the subject-matter of instruction, felt by the teacher and sympathetically imparted to the pupils by him is most conducive to that life. An austere or sour demeanor, an unsympathetic censorship over the pupil’s interests and conduct by the teacher, or a moral pedantry that looks with suspicion on every move that the pupil makes, and treats with equal severity the

breaking of an arbitrary though perhaps desirable rule of the school and a moral offence, a martinet system of government and discipline, — these are characteristics of the teachers that detract from the tone of the school and lower the plane of that living which we would maintain. It is an old story that character, scholarship, interest in the teacher are essential to the development of these characteristics in the pupil; that only life begets life.

In marked contrast to what I am pleading for, let me cite two brief illustrations of "how not to do it." Not long ago I heard of a teacher who said to her class in history, which had not been doing very well for some days, "All the monuments of ignorance may rise." As no one rose, she continued, "Miss A, why don't you rise?" Miss A replied, "Because I am not a monument of ignorance." This reply should have brought the teacher to her senses, but instead she sent the pupil to the principal for impertinence.

Another teacher, who had taught Cicero for twenty years, said to me after a somewhat trying effort with a class of boys, struggling with the "Manilian Law," "If there is one thing in this

world I have no patience with, it is stupidity." I could not help telling him that I had seen no evidence of stupidity *in his class*; and, if I had, there was nothing that seemed to me more entitled to patience than stupidity, inasmuch as the victim of stupidity is not to blame for his meagre intellectual endowment. Comment on the effect of such teachers on the tone of the school is unnecessary.

Thus far I have been dealing with general considerations. I wish to devote the remainder of this chapter to a brief discussion of a single problem of great importance in our contemporary education, and requiring for its wise solution the most effective coöperation we can secure of the home and the school.

The problem I refer to is how to secure the wisest possible administration of the elective system in secondary education. The elective system is now happily becoming general in our secondary schools, but it suggests the most imperative necessity for coöperation between the home and the school. The elective system wisely administered in secondary education is a great boon; unwisely or loosely administered,

it may become pernicious. If the elective system is allowed to entail diminished strenuousness in work, it becomes a perversion of educational opportunity; but if wisely administered, a youth may find it, during the period of secondary and college education, his greatest opportunity to make the most of himself for his own good and for the good of society; for his own good, because voluntary effort usually accompanies the privilege of choice; and in case of need the duty of strenuous and persistent endeavor can be justly insisted on; and for the good of society, because strenuous endeavor in harmony with dominant capacities and tastes leads to the habit of adequate achievement — that is, the fullest and most varied usefulness of which men are capable in vocational and extravocational activities. Moreover, it leads simultaneously to the habit of independent initiative, to joy in work, and to real satisfaction in the refined pleasures of life.

These results are worth striving for. But they cannot be procured by a careless or a loose administration of the elective system during that most important period of later childhood and youth, — the period of adolescence. This is the

period when the serious purposes and activities of life begin to have an interest which previously they did not and could not possess. The fleeting and random interests of early and middle childhood are passing away. Aims and habits rapidly acquire permanence. Under wise guidance, they may, therefore, be permanently influenced. If now we seize the fleeting moment and make sure the youth gets from it what he needs for guidance, for solace, and for inspiration,—that is, if we adapt the opportunities of his education to him as an individual,—we may expect to find him in his maturity shaping his career, enjoying his leisure, and behaving toward his fellow-men in accordance with the ideals of work, of pleasure, and of conduct that allured him in his youth.

I said, a moment ago, that such a result could not be secured by a careless or loose administration of the elective system. I mean that it cannot be secured if we do not guard the youth against the blindness of his own ignorance, and if we do not insist upon the persistent and strenuous pursuit of work once undertaken. We must protect the youth against his own ignorance

by suitable restrictions on his choice at first; we must cultivate self-direction by gradually withdrawing restrictions as he grows older; and we cannot expect habits of adequate achievement, unless we insist on a sufficiently long and a sufficiently continuous pursuit of work once undertaken.

Now it is just here that the coöperation of the home and the school is so essential. Both the kind of work needed by the pupil, and his rigorous pursuit of it for a period sufficiently long to determine his capacity or want of capacity in a given subject of study, can only be secured by a good mutual understanding between the teachers and the parents. Of course I am supposing that both parents and teachers are seeking without conscious bias the best good of the pupil; and that they are not unduly influenced in the restrictions or the advice they impose on the pupil by personal predilections or by too keen a sense of the conventionally correct thing. That they, especially the parents, will be influenced more or less by the prevailing fashion in education goes without saying; and, of course, in education, as in other forms

of human activity, one must give sufficient heed to fashion not to be conspicuous for the lack of conformity to it, or for ultra devotion to it. But it is not too much to expect that, on the whole, each parent and every teacher will seriously study the young life entrusted to him, and so deal with it educationally as to bring it to the fullest perfection which native endowment makes possible, and to make it count as much as possible in the sum total of social service. As I have already said, this can be done consistently and economically by a wise use of the elective system, and this requires the completest possible coöperation of the home and school. What the pupil chooses to do both the home and the school must insist that he shall perform. To do otherwise would be to use the elective system as a means of escaping education, and not as the most valuable means of real education, that we have thus far developed.

It must be evident, also, that much of the work of the school, however well and clearly conceived, will fail of reaching fruition, both during the pupil's school life and thereafter,

unless the school can count on the effective coöperation of the homes, taken collectively, of the community. If the school lays stress on a life of service, and consistently aims to fix this idea as a life ideal in the pupil's mind, while most of the influential members of the community persist in acting as if they regarded work in every form as a hardship which they intend to save their children from; if the school uses the lessons of history and of contemporary social interests to inculcate worthy ideals of private citizenship and of public office as a public trust, while the community shows its indifference to these ideals by toleration of, or practical devotion to, their opposites; if the school rouses an interest in culture for its own sake, and beckons the pupil onward to a career of spiritual growth, whatever his vocation may be, while the community is apathetic toward the pursuit of science, literature, and art for their own sake, and niggardly in promoting such pursuit;—in short, if the school aims to prepare its pupils for a life of usefulness, of worthy citizenship, and of refinement, and the pupils are conscious that this threefold prepara-

tion is not valued in the life outside and after the school as it is in the school, how can we expect that the lessons of the school, however well planned, will be a lasting influence in the pupils' lives? It is clear, then, that the community cannot safely evade its share of the responsibility for the right training of our children and youth. That responsibility is summed up in one word, reënforcement. The education which the community is constantly giving our children and youth,—the instruction which the community's life entails, and the habits which this instruction constantly tends to promote, will either strengthen or weaken the influence of the school. I ask the parents, which shall it be?

I place much stress on the necessity of co-operation by the home and the school. But let us not deceive either ourselves, as teachers, or the non-professional public. Professional problems must be worked out, if at all, by professional workers — by the teachers, not by laymen. Laymen — the community — may and should tell us, as nearly as they can, what they desire to have the schools accomplish, but they

can give us very little assistance in carrying out those wishes in the class room. Beyond providing suitable buildings and equipment, for the nature and scope of which they must depend on the teachers, their most effective coöperation is to make sure, from time to time, that they are employing the right persons to carry on the work they want done. In plain terms lay interference in professional matters is not helpful coöperation, but obstruction.

One of the most conspicuous examples of lay interference in professional affairs is the present organization of our city school boards, — an organization which permits, and usually requires, them to exercise executive as well as legislative functions. Sub-committees (of school boards), on courses of study, or on the appointment of teachers, or on the selection of text-books, are as competent to attend to the important professional duties with which they are charged as sub-committees of a hospital board consisting of laymen — supposing such sub-committees to exist — would be competent to decide about the nourishment and care of the patients, and the efficacy of the remedies or exercises pre-

scribed for them, and on the qualifications of the nurses employed. Nobody supposes, nowadays, that any hospital board is competent to discharge such functions. They employ an expert, or experts, whom they can intrust with these professional duties. But, in the analogous case of the school-board committees, it is still supposed that professional duties can be wisely performed by non-professional persons.

To sum up:—

1. The school cannot be wholly responsible for the education of our children. The individual home and the community are jointly responsible with the school for the education of every child.

2. Nevertheless, the school must carry the largest share of this responsibility, because it is the institution which society charges with the sole function of education, while the home and other institutions of society have many other functions. It is, therefore, the business of the school to cast the more or less vague desires of the community respecting education into definite aims, and to find, to organize, and to administer the means, through which these aims are to be achieved.

3. But, in order that the school may really fulfil the function for which it is established, it must have the active coöperation of the individual home and of the community, for:—

(*a*) Unless the work of the school is reënforced by home support, the efforts of the teachers will not meet with an appropriate response from the pupils; the teacher may work as hard as he pleases, he cannot rely on corresponding effort on the part of the pupil if the pupil's parents are indifferent or even averse to the aims and work of the school.

(*b*) Unless the school has the adequate financial support of the community, it can do nothing well; it cannot provide suitable buildings and equipment; it cannot secure and retain teachers who possess scholarship, cultivation, and teaching power commensurate with the work they have to do; it cannot provide the skilled supervision needed to maintain the school buildings and their equipment in a satisfactory condition, and the teaching force at a high level of efficiency.

4. Now, the individual home and the community will not give moral or financial support to the school—will not coöperate with the

school unless they *believe* in it; unless they believe that the school is doing what they wish it to do, and doing it satisfactorily. Hence the necessity for conferences between the homes and the school, in order that the school may know clearly and understand the desires of the home in other than merely formal ways, and that the home may similarly understand and appreciate the difficulties and the efficacy of the school, as well as its shortcomings; and in order that each may recognize its own share of responsibility for the results actually achieved.

Three devices for promoting a good mutual understanding between the home and the school have been referred to, namely: "Pupil Study," Parents' Meetings, and Education Societies. All these devices are, as yet, more or less imperfect, but they are decidedly promising. Through these or similar devices the individual home and the community will gradually learn that every educational demand puts corresponding educational problems to the school; that these problems can be solved successfully and wisely only by professional teachers working in the school, and not by laymen; and that patience and a

willingness to experiment intelligently are indispensable in the wise solution of educational problems; and the school will learn that adjustment to the gradually changing and ever expanding educational needs of individuals and of society is the fundamental condition on which the effective coöperation of the community depends.

VI

OUR FAITH IN EDUCATION

VI

OUR FAITH IN EDUCATION

THE conservation and improvement of any institution of society will always depend on the repetition of searching inquiry into its significance for contemporary usefulness. Such inquiry into the efficiency and satisfactoriness of government in all its forms, means, and instruments; of the church, the school, the family; of the scope, means, and methods of industry and commerce; of the nature and influence of public amusements and recreation; and indeed of every phase of community life, must be perpetually renewed: first, to acquaint each generation with the scope and quality of its resources; and second, to promote the appreciation and further development of what is good, the abolition, modification, and improvement of what is obsolete or unsatisfactory, and to insure appropriate provision for new needs as they appear.

On the teachers is laid the responsibility of planning wisely and carrying on efficiently the educational institutions of society. It is, therefore, their special task—ever renewed—to examine carefully into the scope and aims, the limitations, and the means and methods of contemporary education, in order, first, that they may themselves possess a just estimate of its contemporary efficiency and defects, and set them forth clearly and convincingly to the community; and second, that they may work confidently and steadily for its improvement, aided by enlightened and sympathetic public opinion. This chapter is accordingly a contribution to such an examination of contemporary educational aims and practices. I limit myself in the present instance to certain phases of pre-collegiate education only. In this examination I shall avail myself of contemporary lay and professional criticism indiscriminately, and add such comments as may seem appropriate.

Our faith in education as a social force and as a function of society, as well as a means of developing and elevating the individual, is an inheritance from the founders of the Republic. Scarcely

were the Puritans settled on the shores of Massachusetts Bay when this faith was manifested by their deeds. Boston was only five years old when, in 1635, the people besought "Brother Philemon Pormort" to become their schoolmaster. In the following year they set up a college, since known as Harvard College, and a few years later, when the young Commonwealth was but twelve years old, they passed the first American statute concerning education. This statute, the law of 1642, declared that every child among them should be "trained in learning and labor and other employments profitable to the Commonwealth," and made it the duty of the "selectmen" to see that this decree was carried out.¹

By 1647 the people had already profited much by their investment in education; and, as we have seen, being fearful lest the absorbing pursuits of pioneer life might render some of the towns indifferent to their own permanent welfare and to the permanent welfare of the Commonwealth, the people voted that every town as soon as it comprised fifty householders should provide an elementary school either at public expense or

¹ Law of 1642. Records of Mass., Vol. II, p. 8.

otherwise; and also that as soon as it had as many as one hundred families, or householders, it should set up a (Latin) "grammar school" in which children might be fitted for the university; and further that any town that neglected to comply with this vote should be punished.

The vote just referred to—the celebrated law of 1647—and the earlier law of 1642 established the principles on which the public-school system of Massachusetts, and so ultimately of the United States, is based. Those principles are:—

1. The universal education of youth is essential to the well-being of the State.
2. The obligation to furnish this education rests primarily on the parent, but the State has a right to enforce this obligation.
3. The State may determine the kind of education and fix the minimum amount of education to be insisted upon for every member of the Commonwealth.
4. Taxes may be assessed and collected to provide such education as the State demands, and these taxes may be general though the school attendance is not.
5. Secondary as well as elementary education

may be provided at the public expense. Opportunity must be afforded at public expense to prepare for the university.¹

From 1647 to the present day these principles have gained increasing force, and well-nigh universal acceptance; and throughout the northern and eastern portion of the country at least, general embodiment in practice.²

Under the influence of this faith and our growing social needs we have developed the original elementary reading and writing schools and the grammar schools of colonial times into our free public schools and substantially free state universities as we know them to-day. At the same

¹ See "Evolution of the Massachusetts Public School System," by George H. Martin. Appleton, 1901.

² An examination of the statistics published by the United States Commissioner of Education will show that our faith in education has grown with our growth, and was never stronger than it is to-day. During the years from 1870-1900 schools of all grades, both public and private (or endowed), increased in number enormously; and the expenditures for schools now annually reach sums that seem almost incredible. In the public schools, not only is the total expenditure per pupil increasing (\$15.55 in 1869-1870; \$20.21 in 1899-1900); but what is more significant, the increase per capita of the population is increasing also (\$1.64 in 1869-1870; \$2.84 in 1899-1900), and this in spite of the enormous influx of a population that pays no taxes. See report of United States Commissioner of Education, 1901-1902, Vol. I, pp. xii ff.

time we have encouraged the fullest and freest development of private and endowed schools, colleges, and universities, in order that every educational demand, as such, might be satisfied, and every improvement in the adjustment of educational means to educational needs, by whomsoever conceived, might find adequate and speedy recognition.

Moreover the public schools have often learned and may still learn important lessons from private and endowed schools, *i.e.* from private enterprise and from educational philanthropy. Indeed every one knows that some of our most cherished educational institutions have sprung from private initiative and private philanthropy and not from the directors of public education and the public purse. The simple schools of the fathers answering to their simpler needs have accordingly grown into a vast aggregate of private and public educational institutions that aim in their variety and comprehensiveness to meet the diversified and rapidly growing needs of our advancing civilization.¹

¹ In 1901-1902, according to the report of the United States Commissioner of Education, there were enrolled in the public and

The faith of the American people in education is great, but they do not look with satisfaction on an investment of hundreds of millions of dollars in school property, nor do they cheerfully spend more than two hundred millions in a single year for the maintenance of schools, nor listen with approval to the unquestionable assertion that the expenditure for schools, vast as it is, is far from being adequate to meet pressing educational needs, unless they are satisfied that all this outlay, present and prospective, is or will be followed by satisfactory educational results; *i.e.* by a steady growth in high thinking and right living, and a steady increase in the economic and political efficiency of the oncoming generation.

The American people want good schools, just

private schools and colleges of the United States (exclusive of the kindergartens), 17,460,000 pupils. Of this number 16,479,177 were in elementary (*i.e.* pre-high-school) grades; 734,760 were in secondary (high school) grades; and 246,063 were in colleges and universities. Of this number the public schools, exclusive of the state universities, enrolled 15,925,887. These pupils were taught by 439,596 teachers. During the same year these teachers received, in salaries, \$150,013,734, and the value of school property reached the colossal sum of \$601,571,307. The total school expenditure for the year was \$235,208,465.

as they want every other public or semi-public utility, to correspond to their needs; and they have been for some time, and are at this moment, engaged as they never were before in scrutinizing their vast provision of public education. The public press, the daily papers, and, what is more important, the current magazines show the closeness and universality of this scrutiny. Several important magazines contain, in nearly every issue, thoughtful papers on education, and one of them maintains a department for educational research.

Nor are the people content with scrutiny alone. Several of the most important educational undertakings of modern times have been originated and carried forward by the representatives of the lay public, and not by the representatives of the teaching profession. Let me cite a few such instances of what has been most appropriately called "voluntary statesmanship" in education.

Some years ago the city of Cleveland, Ohio, was, like many other cities, suffering from a very bad organization of its school system, an organization that made it well-nigh impossible

for the superintendent of schools and his teaching corps to make the schools really serve the people and not self-seeking politicians and other self-seekers. "The school board was composed of twenty members elected by districts. It was insisted that this system worked badly, that members were bullied by constituents to procure special favors for individuals or the districts they represented, and that they naturally reflected this spirit and disposition in the board. It was said that buildings were unwisely located, certain contractors favored, and, worse than all else, that teachers who were unfit were continually appointed in the schools. The school government was administered by innumerable committees, and nobody could be found who was responsible for anything."¹

Public-spirited citizens scrutinized this plan, condemned it, and ultimately (in 1892) by legislation secured a complete transformation of the organization and administration of the city's school system. ". . . The school bill was prepared by four men, three of them lawyers, of whom one was then upon the bench, and the

¹ *Educational Review*, VI, 9.

fourth was president of one of the city banks. In previous years the bank president had had considerable experience, and had rendered valuable service in the school board, and one of the others also had been a member of the board. While all were men of affairs, they were not connected with the school system, they claimed no expert or professional knowledge of the schools, and they made their bill without the assistance of school superintendents or the aid of the volumes of proceedings of the National Educational Association.”¹

In citing this instance of voluntary statesmanship in education on the part of the lay public, I do not mean to maintain that the school system they achieved was an ideal result, nor even the best that could have been attained under the circumstances. I do not think it was. But it was incomparably better than the system it displaced, and the principles of organization and administration on which it was founded seem to me sound beyond any possibility of doubt. Those principles are chiefly two, namely, the centralization of responsibility

¹ *Educational Review*, VI, 9.

and authority, both for the educational and the business side of the school system, and the restriction of the activities of the Board of Education to legislative functions.

But, however great the services which the voluntary statesmen of Cleveland achieved for their own city, they accomplished still more for the country at large. In other cities of the country public-spirited citizens, moved by the needs of their own cities and the example of Cleveland, took steps to reorganize their school systems in accordance with the principles that had determined the revised Cleveland system. Toledo, Indianapolis, St. Louis, Rochester, Baltimore, New Haven, New York, and other cities have already succeeded in transforming their school systems with great advances in efficiency; and Detroit, Chicago, and Boston have been roused to make similar attempts which, although as yet unsuccessful, are sure to succeed in the end.

Still more recent than these instances of lay initiative in promoting important educational undertakings is the extraordinary and superlatively useful work of the two coöperating boards

now well known as the Southern Education Board and the General Education Board. The scope and aims of the work of these important educational agencies constitute the most conspicuous evidence known to me of the great faith in education that inspires our best Americans, and of the extraordinary power of organizing means and methods that such men can command for the accomplishment of the beneficent results at which they aim.

The magnitude and importance of the movement for the upbuilding of education in the South which these Boards promote, its patriotic and disinterested character, the unusually high quality of the men who take part in it, the good sense displayed by them in handling the many delicate problems involved in a propaganda of educational enlightenment and reform, and the magnificent success which has already been achieved—all this makes this movement one of the most significant undertakings of our time.

The instances just given of a large statesmanship in educational affairs are illustrations of the independent initiative so characteristic of men in a free democratic society. They are

instances in which municipal and state governments have been moved to action by intelligent and determined private citizens. Other illustrations are not lacking.

Some years ago, it was perceived by farsighted men and women, especially the latter, that we were allowing two or three valuable years for a child's education to go to waste. Until a child was old enough to be put to his book he was allowed to run wild, or, at least, to miss the appropriate growth mentally, morally, and physically to which he is entitled, for want of a systematic development of his natural impulses and spontaneous activities. It was perceived that parents rarely gave their children the kind of attention during these early years which they needed, either from ignorance, or absorption in their own pursuits, or both; and hence that a great educational opportunity was being neglected. In the kindergarten these men and women found the instrument they were seeking for the education of both the children and the parents; and, then as now, throughout the land, they gave this new instrument of education moral and financial support, until its

great intrinsic and incidental value for both little children and their parents was recognized by school officers and governing boards. The friends of the kindergarten still have much territory to conquer. But with 4811 kindergartens (in 1900) in the United States, 1815 of them public, comprising 3326 teachers and 131,657 pupils, it is clear that educational faith here, as elsewhere, is followed by results.

The story of the rapid spread of vacation schools and the newly awakened interest in supervised play and playgrounds for children is another instance of educational effort initiated and for a time maintained solely by benevolent and clear-sighted members of the community, who perceived that a great educational need was not recognized by our cities and towns. In New York, Philadelphia, Chicago, Boston, and other cities the public-school system has been gradually awakening to its responsibility in this respect, and the good results are already apparent in greatly diminished juvenile delinquencies in all cities or localities of cities where these new agencies for good have been established. While the decrease in the number of

arrests of juvenile offenders is a striking confirmation of the good thus accomplished,¹ it is beyond question that even more good is accomplished for the great mass of well-behaved children who receive instruction in manual training, sewing, cooking, gardening, nature study, government, and other useful subjects in the vacation schools; and, above all, have a chance for normal development through play—for play, as we now know, is nature's means of guarding the normal life of the young, and of carrying forward their development.

These illustrations serve to show that American faith in education can, under wise direction, remove mountains in the path of educational progress. I have already said that the responsibility of carrying on efficiently the education so universally desired, and of constantly adapting it to contemporary needs, is laid on the teaching profession. To that end persistent vigilance, courage, and energy are essential: ceaseless vigilance to discover defects, courage to acknowl-

¹ See, for example, the interesting article on vacation schools by Charles Mulford Robinson in the *Educational Review*, XVII, pp. 250 ff.

edge and face them, persistent energy to remove them, and to recognize new needs as they arise. This thought gives me courage to proceed with what I have to say; for I believe that all progressive teachers welcome criticism, and are not disconcerted by it—but only stimulated to self-criticism and increased efficiency.

I begin with the kindergarten. There are two kinds of criticism of the kindergarten. One kind emanates chiefly from the less reflective members of the lay public, although it is sometimes traceable to teachers, and is likely to be approved by unthinking persons, whether teachers or laymen. This kind of criticism is apt to be harsh, peremptory, and sweeping, and sometimes satirical. It runs like this: The kindergarten is permeated by a foolish sentimentality that makes mental and moral weaklings; it develops dependence instead of self-reliance; it undermines the capacity for effort instead of stimulating the self-activity of the children; its means and methods are antiquated and appropriate only, or at least chiefly, in the rural parts of Germany, where they originated; the kindergarten is a presumptuous and exaggerated attempt to force

on the infant mind concepts and activities quite unsuited to little children, and hence harmful; that children three to five years old ought not to be in "school" anyway, but at play, in charge of their mothers and nurses; and, finally, that children are kept in the kindergarten too long.

Such sweeping adverse criticism of the kindergarten is, of course, unjust; it commonly springs from narrow observation and imperfect comprehension; and, on occasion, from the search of a clever writer for "material" with which to adorn a tale, such as "The Kindergarten Child after the Kindergarten" and "The Madness of Philip." On the other hand, we may not dismiss these views of the kindergarten as always wantonly unjust, nor regard the welcome accorded the literary embodiment of them as merely the reward of literary cleverness; for I regret to say that I have myself occasionally seen a kindergarten that approaches uncomfortably near the ones portrayed in Miss Carter's and Miss Daskam's literary skits. Moreover, nothing would be gained by dismissing adverse criticism, whether just or unjust, without consideration. Nothing is ever gained by

ignoring opposition or objections to a good cause, since such action merely allows obstructions to accumulate unchecked. Something is usually gained by interchange of opposing views. In this particular instance there is much to gain: for, in the first place, very few will claim that the kindergarten in its present development is a perfected instrument of education; and, in the second place, it is a fact that the adoption of the kindergarten, as an integral part of the public-school system, is proceeding but slowly, — very slowly as compared with the rapid development of the public high school, for example. According to the report of the United States Commissioner of Education, the number of public and private kindergartens in the country was 3100 in 1892; and in 1900 the number of *public* kindergartens was only 1815, or but little more than half the number of public and private kindergartens in 1892. On the other hand, the corresponding figures for public and private high schools in 1892 and *public* high schools alone in 1900 are 4185 and 6005, respectively; *i.e.* there are nearly one and one-half times as many public high schools in 1900 as there were

public and private high schools in 1892, and this in spite of the fact that there are many times as many children who could attend the kindergarten as there are children who could attend the high school; and also in spite of the fact that a high school costs very much more than a kindergarten, and serves, as has just been said, a much smaller portion of the community.

We can scarcely attribute the slowness of the introduction of the kindergarten to the want of enthusiasm and insistence on the part of its friends; for no body of workers in the educational field can compare in enthusiasm and energetic advocacy with the kindergartners and their friends. The cause must be sought elsewhere. Devotion and enthusiasm to a cause are not enough to win widespread public conviction of its worth, nor equally widespread allegiance to it. Indeed, mere devotion and enthusiasm do not constitute enlightenment, although sometimes made to do temporary service for it. My point is, therefore, that whatever the justice or injustice of the adverse criticism of the kindergarten, it has far too serious an effect

to be passed over without consideration, whether voiced by an individual who can scarcely define the cause of his dissatisfaction, or by a clever writer who does it for him.

And this brings me to the second kind of criticism referred to above. It is based on more or less insight into the aims and scope of the kindergarten work, and an appreciation of the value it may possess in education. It emanates from the more thoughtful lay public, from professional students of education, and from the kindergartners themselves. Its tone is not destructive, but judicial. Its most helpful form is that of interested and serious inquiry.

This kind of criticism springs, first of all, I think, from interested observation of the young child. It notes the free and spontaneous activities of children, by which they live and move and have their being. It notes that the child's games and playthings, his coöperations and his collisions with his playmates and elders are not regulated nor limited by any scheme or system. And out of it all comes, under favorable conditions, health, vigor, happiness, alertness, intelligence, successful achievement. It notes the

entrance of such a child to the kindergarten. From free play and spontaneous activities he passes to "gifts," "occupations," "kindergarten songs and games." It seems to some as if the limitations this change imposes on the scope and quality of the child's activities were artificial obstructions, and not natural helps to set free his powers and give him life more abundantly.

This kind of criticism accordingly asks: Do we neglect too much to follow the child's lead, once he is in the kindergarten, and so, on occasion, both underestimate and overestimate his capacities and needs? Is the kindergarten bound by adherence to preconceived notions of the adult mind concerning the best means of normal development, instead of guided by the child's real needs as revealed by himself? Does it make too little use of the child's contemporary, natural, and social environment, and too much of "stories," "gifts," and "occupations" as a means of enriching the child's experience, and hence as a means of promoting self-expression and so of his normal development? Is there too much "dear" and too little kindly but firm

admonition, and, on occasion, compulsion, in the process of socializing the little human animal? Is there an attempt to convey knowledge that a kindergarten child cannot assimilate, and an appeal to powers that he cannot yet possess? Does the kindergarten, therefore, in doctrinaire fashion lead the child to distrust his own experience — an obstructive and a dangerous and possibly a permanent barrier to his growth into enlightened self-dependence? Does it, on the other hand, in the fear of demanding too much, of being “too stimulating,” limit and define, in minutest detail, the range of the child’s thought and conduct, so that he rarely feels the challenge of opportunity, and the satisfaction over small, but to him real, difficulties? Is there still too much of the minutiae and of the symbolism of the German kindergarten left in spite of recent eliminations? To what extent is the kindergarten a real introduction to the life of a good American school, an important means of enabling the child gradually, surely, naturally, to achieve growth in knowledge and power? All these questions and others like them may be summarized as follows: “How far do the pres-

ent method and teacher relate themselves to what has preceded the kindergarten in the life of the child?" and "How far can [they especially] the prescribed gifts and occupations relate to what is to follow in the life of the child?"¹

In formulating anew these questions as an embodiment of contemporary, thoughtful, and sympathetic criticism of the kindergarten, and stating them for consideration, I am assuming, of course, as I have a right to assume, that kindergarten leaders, like other disinterested workers in the field of education, want to get at the truth, and want to see it triumphantly vindicated in practice. I assume also that they are prepared to believe with me that devotion and enthusiasm must be reënforced by a convincing statement of the theory or doctrine on which they are based, and a conspicuous and collective exposition of the efficacy of this doctrine in practice. We have able advocates of kindergarten theory, of course; but their advocacy

¹ Alice C. Dewey, in "The Place of the Kindergarten," *Elementary School Teacher*, III, 274. See also the last two paragraphs of the same paper.

lacks convincing force, because they speak independently instead of collectively. In my opinion, therefore, the real way to win for the kindergarten just recognition is, first, to give its aims and scope clear and dispassionate definition, and secondly, to show the teaching profession and the public as clearly and convincingly the good it accomplishes. That is to say, we need from time to time a convincing exposition of contemporary kindergarten theory — an exposition that embodies recent gains, confesses imperfections, and suggests further investigation, and so free from mysticism or other vagueness that any intelligent adult can grasp it; and, similarly, we need a periodic, equally definite vindication of this theory in a collective report made by competent persons on how this theory works in practice. We need, in short, to *organize* contemporary kindergarten theory and kindergarten practice so that their meaning and efficacy for human development will be clear to all intelligent persons whether they are interested in the kindergarten merely as students of education, or as parents and citizens who have children to educate and school taxes to pay.

To make such an exposition really valuable and effective, it is clear that those who attempt it must be open-minded seekers after truth, and ready to proclaim and apply it. It is also clear that, to this end, the teachers, generally, must be led to coöperate with the kindergartners; indeed, it is clear in this, as in all other educational undertakings, that no isolated workers in a particular portion of the field can solve their peculiar problems alone. Are there not ten kindergarten leaders in theory and practice, and an equal number of teachers, principals, and superintendents, who, working together, could thus enlighten their colleagues and the lay public? And would not such enlightenment necessarily undermine indifference or apathy, remove misconceptions, improve the work done, and, at the same time, establish the kindergarten as solidly in the hearts of the people as it deserves? I need hardly add that this could not be brought to pass, if the kindergartners themselves lack adequate general cultivation and appropriate technical training, as has too often been the case in the past.

But contemporary scrutiny and adverse criticism are by no means confined to the kinder-

garten. In a recent number of the *American Physical Education Review* I find an arraignment by several physicians of contemporary educational practice, which attacks the schools at many points. I summarize it as follows: School life is artificial and unnatural; the programmes are congested and promote cram and haste; the teaching lacks thoroughness; too much home work is imposed on the pupils; children are admitted to school too young; examinations for promotion are an evil; the discipline is too severe and military in character; the school session is too long for the younger children; the number of children to each teacher is far too great, and each teacher has too much to do; kindergartens are not provided for children under seven; physical culture does not conform to the laws of growth, and room and opportunity for free play are neglected; and the final result is overstrain and defective intellectual development.

Now what shall the teachers say to such a broadside of criticism? The first and most obvious reply is that some of the faults referred to are not of their making. These faults exist often against their earnest remonstrance. They

therefore easily fall into two groups. For the first group the public, not the teachers, are directly responsible; for the second group the teachers are chiefly responsible. I take these groups up in order.

It is true that children are too often admitted to school too young; that the school session is often too long for the younger children; that there are not kindergartens enough; that physical training is nearly everywhere very imperfectly provided and inadequately supervised, and that room and opportunity for free play are too often conspicuous by their absence; that in nearly every school system each one of a large number of teachers has too many children to care for; and that all these things promote overstrain and defective mental development; but for these things the teaching profession are not directly responsible. The public, not the superintendent and teachers, demand the admission of little toddlers to the school who ought to be at home or in the kindergarten; the public, not the teachers, insist on two daily sessions for each child; the public, not the teachers, fail to provide kindergartens; the public, not the teachers, fail

to provide appropriate physical training, playgrounds, and gymnasia for every school; the public and not the teachers are responsible for the excessive number of pupils per teacher; the public, not the teachers, are responsible for these things — sometimes even against the earnest remonstrance of the teachers.

On the other hand, it must be admitted that, while the superintendent and the teaching corps are not directly responsible for these defects of our schools, they sometimes lack courage and persistence in reminding each other and the public that these defects exist and can be remedied only by increased expenditures. The public want good schools, as I have said, but they do not know what good schools are, unless they are informed by those who have the technical knowledge to plan good schools and describe them convincingly; and the public will be slow to recognize what good schools ought to cost unless by skilful exposition, reiteration, even expostulation, if necessary, they are compelled to hear and understand. Merely to say, therefore, that these defects of contemporary educational practice are not of our making and exist against our

will, is not to do our whole duty in the matter. We must seek and find a way to remedy them. And the way lies, as I have indicated, through a thoroughgoing recognition and exposition of them, and a wise but ceaseless insistence on the financial support that will make it possible to remove them.

But all the defects above enumerated cannot be charged to want of adequate financial support. Congested programmes of study; unnatural and artificial school life; unsympathetic and purely authoritative, *i.e.* military, discipline; cram and hurry, and the evils of promotion examinations; the imposition of too much home work; lack of thoroughness in teaching, — these things, where they exist, must be charged to the superintendent and the teaching corps. Now, I do not admit that these defects everywhere characterize our schools, any more than I admit the universality of the faulty kindergartens referred to above. But I am confident that they exist to some extent in every school system, and therefore deserve the perennial consideration of every school officer and teacher.

The first question one naturally asks is, Are

the programmes congested, and, hence, do we hurry pupils and cram them with superficial attainments? Do we sacrifice essentials and devote ourselves to frills and fads? What are essentials, and what are frills and fads?

These questions are, on the one hand, questions of contemporary educational theory — questions affecting the adequacy of the scope and aims of contemporary provision for education to meet contemporary needs; and, on the other, questions relating to the efficacy and wisdom of contemporary educational practices as measured by their results in the intellectual, moral, and physical welfare of the children.

These questions are not new. They were attacked nearly ten years ago by the National Educational Association. That body appointed successively three committees to deal with them. The first was the famous Committee of Ten, which dealt more particularly with the improvement of the secondary school programme, but also incidentally it rendered important service in suggesting improvements in the elementary school programme. Then came the scarcely less famous Committee of Fifteen, on the cor-

relation of studies, which was to attack specifically the problem of the relief of congested programmes, and attempt its solution through "correlation"; and, finally, we had the Committee on College Entrance Requirements, which was to improve secondary education by establishing national norms or units of work in the several studies that could be accepted in varying amounts and combinations by any higher institution, in accordance with its requirements, and thus promote a national articulation of secondary and higher schools without crowding the work in the schools or lowering the standards of the best colleges.

I have elsewhere pointed out how great were the services rendered by these committees,¹ and also how far their reports fall short of accomplishing what they might have accomplished. What these committees were appointed to do was to furnish guidance to the teaching profession and enlightenment to the lay public. They did this to some extent, but they also added to the contemporary confusion, because they did not get together. They worked inde-

¹ Chapter VIII.

pendently. I have also tried to show that what we need, in order to answer pertinent questions affecting the aims and work of the schools, is definite guidance which we ourselves should supply. Without it economic and educational waste are inevitable, and helplessness in the face of lay or professional criticism real and disconcerting. Without it we are "blown about by all the winds of doctrine," headed now for this port, now for that; we become confused, frequently shift our course; we abandon measures before their wisdom has been adequately tested, and the result is the contemporary chaos of programmes and management.

The thinkers and workers of the common schools, like the kindergarten leaders,—indeed, with them,—must therefore try to work together. Together they must formulate our educational theory with the best insight they can command, say once in five years. And then they must secure the coöperation of the teaching force in similarly organizing educational experience, *i.e.* in collecting and reporting on the results of theory in practice. A comprehensive organization of our contemporary educational

doctrine and experience is therefore a desideratum. May it not be long delayed!¹

Meanwhile, for the want of it, a reactionary tendency has set in in favor of narrow programmes like those of the past, so that in some parts of the country we are in danger of losing the progress of two decades or more.

For I contend that we have made progress. The programmes of to-day, with all their faults, are vastly better than the narrow programmes of a generation ago. Thirty years ago the school was divorced from life. The programme of studies was a routine drill in the school arts. To-day the school programme does not neglect the school arts,—far from it,—but in addition provides for a participation in life interests. The school aims to be a part of life, that part of the pupil's life that renders all the rest of his life more significant and valuable; it aims at this result not merely by and by, but *now* for every pupil. I believe therefore that we have made progress; and I beg you to bear

¹ In February, 1902, the Department of Superintendence of the National Educational Association appointed a "Committee of Eleven" to report on this subject.

with me while I trace briefly some of the causes that underlie the programme-making of the recent, and to some extent not so recent, past. If, in so doing, I am merely talking commonplaces, I beg you to bear with me none the less. The magnitude of these commonplaces is my excuse for discussing them afresh.

First of all, one must remember that a programme of studies is a growth; that it is an attempt to meet contemporary educational needs; that at any stage of its development it necessarily passes through many approximations to attain even temporary efficiency; that the force of tradition is great; and that the human instruments required to bring the programme of studies to approximate efficiency and to administer it wisely — the teachers — are necessarily slow to abandon old habits of thought and practise and acquire new ones. Further, it must not be forgotten that mistakes under such circumstances are inevitable; that all progress involves risks; and that, therefore, much patience must be exercised by all concerned with any particular shortcomings in plan or execution that appear.

Now let us glance at the evolution of our elementary programme. A report of the Boston Board of Supervisors puts the case admirably. I quote from it, as follows:—

“The extension of the primitive curriculum has been going on steadily for more than a hundred years. Each addition, after being tested and having commended itself to public opinion, has received the sanction of legislative enactment and has become a compulsory study. The causes and the forces behind all this enlargement have been sociological and not pedagogical.

“To the reading and writing of the colonial school, subjects have been added in the following order: English grammar, spelling, and arithmetic in 1789; geography in 1826; history of the United States in 1857; music (optional) in 1860; drawing in 1870; sewing (optional) in 1876; physiology in 1885; manual training in 1898. Several of these subjects were at first allowed, and later required. Thus physiology was allowed in 1850, required in 1885. Drawing was allowed in 1860, required in 1870. Manual training was allowed in 1884, required in 1898.

“The introduction of each of these new subjects has a historical and social setting. Geography was made a compulsory study in 1826. Between 1789 and 1826 there had been great territorial changes in the United States. Florida and Louisiana had been purchased, and the expedition of Lewis and Clark had revealed the magnitude and importance of this great territory reaching to the Rocky Mountains and beyond. Settlement had pushed itself far beyond the Alleghanies, and there was scarcely a town in Massachusetts which had not sent some of its people into the Great Northwest. Eleven new States had been added to the Union. Commerce had been developed and ships of the country were sailing all seas. The navy had distinguished itself in the War of 1812, and Decatur had introduced the United States to the piratical powers of Barbary. Out of all this had grown wide international relations. It is not surprising that in an era of such expansion the thoughtful people of Massachusetts began to think of geography as an ‘essential’ factor in the education of their children.

“The history of the United States was added

in 1857. During the preceding thirty years great social changes had taken place. The establishment of the new manufacturing industries had attracted to the State a large foreign population, and the unsuccessful revolutions throughout Europe in 1848 had swelled the number to 200,000 in 1850. These people were ignorant of the history and traditions of their new home, and they needed and desired to be enlightened. At the same time the country was in the throes of the antislavery struggle, and great constitutional questions were at issue. The appeal on both sides was to the opinions and acts of the fathers—to history. The public discovered that a knowledge of the history of the country had become an ‘essential’ of popular education, and they declared their opinion by a statute.

“Drawing was added in 1870. This followed close upon the great Paris Exposition of 1867, where the superiority of continental nations to England and America in all the artistic features of manufactured products was startling and humiliating. It is most significant that the original petition to the Legislature in 1869

for compulsory instruction in industrial drawing was signed exclusively by business men, leaders in the great industries of the Commonwealth. They declared that for the United States to maintain its standing as a manufacturing nation drawing was an 'essential' in elementary education. For similar reason manual training was introduced.

"Of the authorized subjects several have been forced into the front rank of 'essentials' by modern social conditions. This is true of sewing, cooking, physical training, and elementary science. The latter, under the modern title 'nature study,' has peculiar claims.

"Reading has always been deemed of fundamental importance, and in early times children passed easily through the narrow gateway of the alphabet into the broad fields of literature. The passage was easy because the children and the writers of literature had had the same experiences; both had lived in the country and had been familiar with nature in all its phases. The writers had reflected all these phases in their books. They were observers and lovers of nature, and they wrote for such. Much of the

vocabulary they used, and all their imagery, expressed ideas and scenes of nature. When country life was universal, the children had only to learn the word 'symbol,' and they had the master-key to open all doors. The transition from the primitive country life to the modern city life threw a barrier across the way, and for thousands of children easy progress became impossible. They could learn the symbols as before, and could read words, but the words conveyed no meaning. The language was essentially a foreign language. Now in city schools the road to intelligent reading is through nature study. The same line of work is essential as a preparation for the study of geography. Indeed, it might all be included under the name 'geography,' in any formal statement of a course of study.

“The same change in social conditions is responsible for the introduction of physical exercises into the schools. The limited opportunities which the city affords for free play and the small demands of modern home life upon the bodily activities of children have seemed to call for some counteracting efforts, and tenta-

tive beginnings have been made in various forms of school exercises.

“This sketch, necessarily brief, shows that the present elementary school course is not a miscellaneous collection of subjects brought together by the chance efforts of enthusiasts, but a conscious and intelligent effort of the people to frame a course of elementary instruction and training adapted to the changed conditions of social life.”¹

It thus appears that none of the studies now in the programme can be safely omitted; and hence I seem to approve the congested programmes from which I admit many schools are suffering. But I do not believe that congested programmes are a necessary consequence of adequately comprehensive programmes. Putting the case briefly, and therefore somewhat dogmatically, our contemporary programmes are congested because they comprise too large a remnant of the old rubbish that used to be needed to take up all the time and attention of the pupil for eight pre-high-school years. It took a lot of useless arithmetical puzzles and

¹ School Document No. 3, 1900.

technicalities, of meaningless parsing and paraphrasing, of useless geographical statistics, of spelling up and spelling down, of deadening rereading of a single reader in each grade for several years—it took a lot of such time-consuming and profitless drill to fill up eight years of school life, and to deaden hosts of children's interests in intellectual pursuits forever; but the time was so consumed and the feat was accomplished.

Again, some of the congestion would be relieved, first, if we did not begin formal arithmetic until the third year of school, and did not continue it as a separate study beyond the sixth, except perhaps with a very small time allotment; for both psychological considerations, and some practical experiments now under way in several places point to the conclusion that, if the formal study of arithmetic is begun when the children are under eight or nine years of age, there is unwise forcing of children's minds, and that most of the time so spent is consequently wasted; and, further, that in the four years from his ninth to his twelfth year inclusive, a child can and should learn all the arith-

metic he needs for the ordinary affairs of life and for his further progress in mathematics,—namely, accuracy and moderate rapidity in the fundamental operations with simple fractions as well as whole numbers, percentage and some of its simplest applications. All else is technical, to be learned in preparation for a calling or in that calling itself. Further, all the English grammar except the parts of speech and the simplest facts of syntax should be omitted. Technical *English* grammar, as such, should be confined to the simplest grammatical nomenclature up to the sixth grade, and should not be studied at all thereafter except incidentally as needed in English composition, and in connection with the study of a foreign language. The notion that English grammar teaches English-speaking school children to speak and write the English language correctly is wholly false. It never has done it, and never will. But the attempt to make it serve this purpose has wasted a larger portion of the valuable time of school children than any other subject except arithmetic.

If you ask me what becomes of the valuable “discipline” these studies afford, I reply that

most children derive little or no discipline from them, because their minds really take but slight hold of them; and when they do, the result of the so-called drill is not worth the time and effort devoted to it. I have, of course, heard children solve arithmetical puzzles and parse difficult sentences; some of them can always do it. But before one accords real value to such results, one must remember the uselessness of such acquisitions for culture or for the ordinary affairs of life, the time consumed in getting these results, and especially what the pupils are not getting as well as the little they do get during the process. Out with half the arithmetic and more than half the grammar that still remains in our programme of studies, and a great step will have been taken toward relieving the congestion of the elementary school programme!

Further, while all the pupils should undertake all the elementary school studies, they should not all be required to make the same attainments. No seventy per cent standard for all before they are allowed to pass should be set up. Different pupils do not develop so uni-

formly, nor do the different powers of the same pupil develop so evenly, that all the pupils can be required to attain the same standard in a given grade, or that any one pupil can do equally well in all his studies. On the other hand, I think there is little doubt that too many studies are sometimes pursued at one time. The congestion which now exists in the later years of the grammar school could be relieved by assigning some of the studies to a part of the year, some to another part, and some to the whole year.

So far I have spoken only of the elementary school programmes. But our high school programmes also require attention. The demands of modern life and the demands of the colleges together constitute more than can be satisfactorily accomplished by most pupils in four years. Hence the necessity of beginning all high school work earlier; or, rather, the necessity of planning the school programme so that, so far as the subject-matter of instruction is concerned, it will be impossible to say where the grammar school ends and the high school begins. The difference between high school

and grammar school work should be chiefly in method and not in subject-matter. The transition from the systematic but unscientific pursuit of studies, appropriate to the stage of middle childhood, to the more precise and more scientific treatment appropriate to later childhood and youth, should be gradual, although it should be consciously aimed at. Moreover, the vast array of different studies representing the diversified resources and needs of modern civilization cannot be pursued by any one pupil; hence another difference between grammar and high school work is found in the necessity of a choice of work by each pupil in accordance with his capacities and needs.

Again, choice of studies — electives in secondary education — should cover, not merely the kind, but also the number, of studies pursued by each pupil each year, care being taken that each pupil carries as much work at any one time as his ability and strength permit. There is nothing sacred about four years as the normal number of years for earning a high school diploma; nor is there anything sacred in fifteen prepared lessons a week for every

pupil. But the pupil's health is or should be sacred. I am aware that to permit a large number of pupils to do what is called partial work—to permit a large number of "special students"—involves dangers to the school's best interests. But I am quite sure that these dangers can all be guarded against in practice, and that the results would be greatly prized in the end.

And this leads me to speak particularly of the effect of our modern school life on the girls. My experience and observation have led me to believe that the endurance of girls is less than that of boys at every age; and that the difference in endurance between the two increases from about fourteen years of age, the girls rapidly falling behind the boys. If this be true, ought not the pace of school work for girls to be slower always than for boys, and especially during the high school years? And can we not insist that teachers, parents, and the girls themselves shall recognize this natural limitation of their powers? It seems to me we ought to insist that most girls shall take five years to do the work that boys do in four, *i.e.* that they

shall take fewer studies per year. This would not be a mark of, or a confession of, intellectual inferiority of the girls, but a recognition of the fundamental difference between boys and girls which it is almost criminal to disregard. In Massachusetts the number of girls who suffer from nervous disorders and even from nervous prostration about the time they get ready to enter college, or while in college, is alarmingly large.

There is another defect of our programmes of studies that I must speak of, briefly at least. One of the ideals of the American public school is that it shall provide equal opportunities for all. Yet at two points in the programme of studies we have thus far conspicuously failed to make, or at least we have not provided, such opportunities. We have not provided opportunity for elementary technical training at the upper end of the grammar school for those who know they are not going to the high school, nor at the upper end of the high school for those whose school education must cease on graduation. Higher technical training at public expense is provided in the schools of law, medicine (including dentistry), pharmacy, agriculture, and

commerce in our State universities, and some of this higher technical training is offered in some city institutions. We have thus provided for the free vocational training of those who can manage to continue their school careers beyond the "common school" period. But until very recently we have universally ignored elementary vocational training in our public schools for that great majority of the population who must go to work at the end of the grammar school stage, and almost to the same extent for the smaller majority of those who can continue beyond the grammar school, but must go to work on leaving the high school. In this country we are only just beginning to consider seriously the problem of appropriate elementary technical education. In other countries, France, for example, the so-called "higher primary" schools have long been established for the technical training of boys of from thirteen to sixteen or seventeen years of age in various callings—agriculture, horticulture, the manufacturing and building trades. Appropriate vocational training is also provided in similar schools for girls; and in each case the instruction is adapted to local needs, *i.e.* is agricultural,

industrial, or commercial, in accordance with the dominant pursuits of the locality.

We seem to hesitate about such training at public expense because it is useful! Indeed, we have beaten about the bush a good deal to find other than utilitarian arguments to support the plea for instruction in sewing, cooking, household sanitation, and decoration—the household arts generally. I am prepared to admit that these pursuits have important general educational value. But the chief reason why they should be taught is their supreme usefulness to everybody, not less universally useful in their own sphere than reading, writing, and ciphering—the “school arts”—are in theirs.

I hope we shall soon go a step farther, therefore, and make liberal provision for elementary training in agricultural, industrial, and commercial pursuits, in addition to general manual training at the upper end of the grammar school and also at the upper end of the high school. This is a new “enrichment” of the programme of study, much needed. And it will not add to the burdens of the pupils. Many, probably most, of those who cannot go on to the high school, should

choose, instead of a foreign language in the last two years of the grammar school, where, as I have already suggested, high school work should begin, some form of technical training in harmony with their capacity and future needs. I do not believe it necessary for this purpose that every grammar school in a city should offer the same kinds of technical training. Some grammar schools would offer gardening and kindred instruction, and others would offer plumbing or carpentry, or tool-making, or millinery; still others would offer one or more foreign languages—modern foreign languages, of course: the pupils could easily be transferred to that school wherein the instruction they desire is found. If this is inexpedient or impracticable, then let us offer in the evening schools such technical instruction as can be given. Our present evening schools are too often but weak imitations of the day schools. I have a sufficiently high regard for the achievements of our evening schools; but at present they fail to meet the needs of a large part of the evening school population. Witness the large classes in such institutions as the Drexel Institute in Philadelphia, the Cooper Institute in New York,

and the evening classes of the Y. M. C. A. and other educational philanthropies.¹

And while I am speaking of evening work for the public schools, I wish to refer with great satisfaction to the tendency, now becoming common, to make the school and the schoolhouse a neighborhood centre,—a club for old and young,—a means of providing healthy and pleasure-giving recreations, as well as educational opportunities for all members of the community.

In the light of the foregoing considerations, I plead for a wise administration, not for retrenchment of educational opportunity. If, in the attempt to make contemporary educational opportunity meet varied and comprehensive educational needs, we have merely and unwisely added to an inappropriate, obsolete, and inadequate, but already strenuous, programme of work, our remedy lies, not in a return to the formal and barren programme of the past, but in preventing "hurry" and "cram" by suitable elimination of unsuitable subject-matter, and a wise distribution of all subjects in each grade, by

¹ Compare Chap. IV, p. 103.

suitable adaptation of the work required of each pupil to his natural capacity and future needs, by a wise use of the principle of choice of studies, by a just recognition of the difference between the sexes, and by insistence on appropriate provision for wisely directed physical training and free play.

Who would willingly exchange the well-lighted, well-warmed, well-ventilated school which we are building to-day, with its window boxes and aquaria, perhaps its garden, its baths, gymnasium, and playground, its well-chosen pictures and bits of statuary, its library of choice volumes, its laboratories, its well-fitting furniture and appropriate equipment of all kinds, its atmosphere of cheerfulness and interested industry, — who would willingly exchange this vision, already partially realized to some extent throughout the country, with its modern comprehensive programme of studies which is at once the cause and the consequence of all that it promises for the enrichment of American life, — who would willingly exchange all this for the bare walls and their fitting accompaniment, the bare skeletons of knowledge, — reading, writing, arith-

metic, English grammar, statistical geography, and scraps of history, to which the schoolroom and the school programme of the past were limited?

No; we have made progress. Let us hold fast to what we have gained. We have made mistakes, and shall continue to make them, of course. But we are no longer groping blindly. We are learning daily; and our faith, that our contemporary endeavor from the kindergarten through the high school is an encouraging approximation to the education at which we aim, was never more enlightened or more gloriously triumphant than it is to-day.

As representatives of the teaching profession it is our privilege to share the great faith of the American people in the inestimable benefits of universal education; this is our solace and our inspiration. Are we satisfied with our present attainments? No; and therein lies our hope of permanent growth. We therefore welcome the scrutiny and the criticism of the public and professional self-criticism, for we know that both are but the promise of things hoped for, — better schools, better teachers, better results, — a steady

approximation to that democratic ideal of education by which every individual may attain his fullest self-realization, and at the same time be prepared to seek and find his highest satisfaction in private and public service.

VII

OBSTACLES TO EDUCATIONAL
PROGRESS

VII

OBSTACLES TO EDUCATIONAL PROGRESS

IN the present chapter I limit myself to discussing obstacles to progress in three phases of educational activity: the making of school programmes or "courses of study"; the organization and administration of school systems; and the training of teachers for elementary and secondary schools; and of these I shall treat only the first in some detail.

First, the obstacles to improvement in school programmes or courses of study. The recent history of attempted reforms in school programmes is quickly told. About twenty-five years ago the elementary school programme, with its narrow content and overwhelming emphasis on the school arts,—reading, writing, arithmetic, and English grammar,—was seen to be inadequate

and formal. It provided some acquaintance with the school arts themselves, but afforded little real education.

Accordingly, rather more than a dozen years ago we began to increase the scope of elementary school programmes. We sought to improve them by "enrichment." To the school arts, the formal studies, we added "thought studies," — literature, history, nature study, and an improved geography. To the narrow field of the traditional arithmetic we added elementary algebra and geometry; we laid more stress on the drawing, music, and physical training already represented in the schools' occupations; and we introduced manual training, and occasionally a foreign language. But the result was far from satisfactory. We had become convinced that enrichment was necessary, and had acted on our conviction. But the enrichment had involved us in new difficulties that proved to be formidable obstacles to progress. Our programmes were congested, especially in those portions of the new programmes most affected by enrichment — the earliest and the latest pre-high-school grades. The middle ground was and remains, justly I think, though

perhaps not always intentionally, the territory where the school arts are supreme.

Then it seemed that the elimination of "non-essentials" from the old programmes would solve our difficulties. Such elimination, it was asserted, must precede and accompany enrichment—which was true; and it was also announced, with something of a flourish and a good deal of insistence, that "correlation" would accomplish the rest. Correlation was interpreted to mean such a grouping of the subject-matter that each study could and should be so pursued as to cover, incidentally, adequate instruction in others. Examples of such grouping would be history and geography, history and literature, reading and "nature study," nature study and arithmetic, English grammar and foreign language, elementary algebra and geometry and arithmetic, manual training and drawing. This solution of our programme difficulties also insisted on a subordination of the formal studies to the thought studies. The school arts were no longer to be pursued solely as ends in themselves, but primarily as means to ends—as the instruments by which education is deepened and ultimately

extended, but not as embodying an education themselves.

So promising and important did the solution of our programme difficulties by means of correlation seem that, when the Department of Superintendence of the National Educational Association, in 1893, appointed a Committee of Fifteen on elementary school studies, it was understood that one of the committee's most important duties should be to set forth, clearly and in detail, to what extent the problem of our programme difficulties could be solved by correlation. The Subcommittee on Correlation of the Committee of Fifteen did not solve this problem, however, nor did they attempt it—although they did something of as great or greater importance, as I shall point out later on; and to this day we are without the guidance that a thoroughgoing study of the interrelations of the elementary school studies would afford. I mean such a study as would show to what extent parts of any one of them are naturally, necessarily, and adequately covered in the satisfactory pursuit of another or others. This important study is still awaiting the leisure and inclination of broad-minded students will-

ing and able to devote a long period of time to it.

By this time we had attempted "enrichment," "elimination," and "correlation," which had effected a more or less thoroughgoing revision of the programme of elementary studies from beginning to end; and the result was *chaos*. There is no better term to describe the infinite variety, complexity, and instability that resulted from the successive tinkerings to which the elementary school programmes had been subjected. And chaotic they remain. But it is no longer a discouraging confusion. Before this stage had been reached, we gradually came to see that what we needed was guiding principles, without which it was clear that we should only make confusion worse by further changes.

Out of this demand for guiding principles arose the Committee of Fifteen on Elementary School Studies, the duties of which, it soon appeared, must transcend even the principles that underlie programme-making. To make our educational endeavor effective, good teaching and wise organization and administration are needed, as well as good programmes of study based on

sound educational doctrine. Hence, the Committee of Fifteen divided its work into three sections, covering respectively educational doctrine, the training of teachers, and the organization and administration of school systems.

Before the elementary school programmes had been transformed to any considerable extent, and while they were still substantially what they had been since the beginning of the last century, strong dissatisfaction had been felt with the narrow training furnished by our secondary schools. Although designed to meet the needs of all who could prolong their school education beyond the elementary school stage, our secondary school programmes were determined chiefly by the small fraction of this number who could go beyond the secondary school to the college. Until within the last ten years, preparation for a college course leading to the Bachelor of Arts degree was everywhere either strictly limited to little else than a drill in the elements of Latin, Greek, and mathematics, or such modifications of these requirements as made it more difficult to prepare for college with the alternatives than with the traditional requirements; and, as just

stated, these subjects occupied the lion's share of time and attention in most secondary schools. The narrow and formal character of such a secondary education was gradually perceived to be, like the elementary education that preceded it, chiefly preparation for education, not education itself. The elementary school deferred the pupil's real education to the secondary school; the secondary school deferred it, once more, to the college.

Consequently we began to transform the secondary school programme as well as the elementary school programme — by enrichment. All this was gradual, but none the less real. As it proceeded, it became evident that no pupil could do serious work in the modern subjects and at the same time continue his classics. Twenty-five years ago we already had a bifurcation of the programme into classical and non-classical divisions or "courses of study," dating from 1821, when the Boston "English High School" was established for those boys who were not going to college; and this bifurcation gradually developed into a division of the programme into several parallel groups or "courses of study,"

each group or "course" consisting of a combination of studies comprising both, or one, or neither of the classical languages. To obtain the diploma of the school the pupil must select his group or "course of study," and adhere to it throughout the usual four years of secondary work. The prestige of the traditional classical studies was, however, so great that the non-classical divisions were for a time inferior to the others, and on this account they were avoided by the socially and intellectually ambitious pupils. The inferiority of non-classical studies has rapidly diminished, however, because of a more just appreciation of the intrinsic value of those studies, and a great improvement in the method of teaching them, and particularly because of a growing recognition of them by the colleges for college admission purposes.

We had now transformed our secondary school programme by "enrichment" and by a multiplication of "courses of study." And these changes had led gradually and naturally to the elective system. The result was, however, far from satisfactory, (1) because the courses consisting of the modern studies were in dignity and seriousness

of pursuit too often inferior to the classical course, and (2) because these courses could not be brought up to the standard of excellence of the classical course until the conventional estimate of the efficiency of a school by the community should be based on its general excellence, and not chiefly on its success in preparing pupils for college through the classical course. That is to say, our programme changes had grown out of the demand for a good secondary education for every pupil, whether he went to college or not. A natural corollary to this demand was that just as good work should be done in non-classical as in classical courses of study. But this demand had not been satisfied.

Out of this demand arose the report of the Committee of Ten. That report was to tell us how to combine a good modern with a good classical education; to tell us what a good non-classical secondary education is; and finally to promote uniformity among college admission requirements throughout the country. And this it attempted to do. The attempt was made to give expression to a body of educational authority on the scope of each of the "principal studies"

that had come to be generally recognized as appropriate to secondary education; on the time that should be devoted to each of them; and on the best methods of teaching them—all this whether a given study was to be used for college admission purposes or not. The report was a magnificent document. For the first time in the history of American education the attempt was made through the National Educational Association to give collective expression to eminent professional authority on an educational question. The influence of the report was decided, immediate, and far-reaching. Its good effect on secondary school programmes was felt everywhere; but it probably benefited the smaller high schools of the country most by suggesting the desirability of limiting the scope of their work to what could be adequately accomplished, and by emphasizing the important principles of continuity and adequate intensiveness in the pursuit of all studies undertaken.

The Committee of Ten did not, however, define what a good modern secondary education is, except as that definition was implied in the programmes recommended by them. The

report was lacking in an illuminating, well-defended educational doctrine; it was rich in educational authority. It did, however, state two principles of procedure so clearly and emphatically that they could not be missed or misunderstood, namely: (1) that most of the studies theretofore regarded as secondary school studies should be begun by pupils before the secondary school was reached; and (2) that a study should receive precisely the same treatment for pupils who are not going to college as for those who are. These two principles were intended to promote the solution of two important difficulties in programme-making that the rapid changes in both elementary and secondary school programmes had developed, namely, the articulation of elementary to secondary education, and the articulation of the secondary school to the college, respectively.

The enunciation of the first of these principles did much to promote desirable programme changes in pre-high-school grades, although it found rather scant recognition in the report of the Committee of Fifteen, which, as everybody knows, was prepared after the

report of the Committee of Ten. The second principle has also found general acceptance throughout the country. It has promoted the widespread consciousness of their function as independent educational institutions which the secondary schools now possess and maintain; it has been emphasized in another important report, the report of the Committee on College Entrance Requirements; and finally its influence has been felt by the colleges themselves, which now manifest a steadily growing inclination to accept the proposition that any good secondary education, either with or without the classics, is a good preparation for college.

This last point—the present attitude of the colleges—received special treatment in the latest of the three reports on school studies emanating from the National Educational Association, namely, the report of the Committee on College Entrance Requirements. The demand for guidance in our educational endeavor had now reached the point at which it was felt that a general improvement in secondary education would result if we could establish

national norms or units of work for each study, each of which, no matter what the study, might be accepted by any college toward satisfying its admission requirements. The attempt to formulate these norms was made by the Committee on College Entrance Requirements. This report was another comprehensive and decidedly creditable attempt to bring order out of chaos; this time especially by the articulation of secondary to collegiate education. Incidentally also, in no small degree, it has tended to overthrow shams and superficial work by setting up a reasonable standard of achievement by units of work in all secondary schools throughout the country.

Now, it is clear that all this while, amid the chaos of experimentation and imitation in school programmes, what we have been seeking is *guidance*. Out of this demand for guidance have arisen the three reports already referred to. Out of the same demand has arisen in this country, during the last ten years, a volume of educational literature in periodicals, books, and special reports by individuals and associations, the like of which for quality

and quantity we have never seen before. The question which we have to ask ourselves is this: Why is it that after twenty or thirty years of unparalleled educational interest and activity there is still so much vagueness about our aims, so much indecision about the adaptation of means to ends (programmes and methods), and so much uncertainty about our results, that even to-day we still seem, as of old, "always bound nowhere under full sail"? I think the answer is found in a single sentence: *We have not yet organized our educational doctrine, we have only formulated it piecemeal; and we have not organized our educational experience—we have not gathered the fruits of experience as we went along.*

Each of the documents to which reference has been made, for example, is an isolated piece of work, with but little reference to, and certainly without any correlation with, the others. Each of them was formulated as if there were no other educational literature deserving recognition for work done in its own field, or to which its own peculiar subject-matter sustained important relations. A similar state-

ment applies, almost to the same extent, to the writers of the great body of the educational literature referred to. Each writer seems to regard himself as having received a special revelation of the educational gospel, vouchsafed to him alone; so completely do most of them ignore their fellow-prophets, who of course reciprocate by similar apparent indifference.

I have already said that the significance of the work of the Sub-committee on Correlation of the Committee of Fifteen lies in the fact that they—or rather he¹—declined to bring order out of chaos by a more or less mechanical readjustment of the conventionally accepted studies of the elementary school programme. Dr. Harris set himself the task of setting forth an educational doctrine—the task of formulating the guiding principles that underlie educational endeavor. He therefore pushed the study of correlation beyond a mere inquiry into the relief of congested programmes by means of a readjustment of the various branches of study to each other, to a

¹ Hon. Wm. T. Harris, United States Commissioner of Education, chairman of the sub-committee.

more fundamental inquiry, namely: What is the educational significance of each study? What contribution ought each study to make to the education of a modern child? What is the educational value of each study in *correlating the individual to the civilization of his time?*

That this was the problem of problems was clear to most persons as soon as it had been pointed out, and after the disappointment over what the report did not do had subsided. If further proof is needed, it is furnished by the fact that to-day the progress we are making and the obstacles we encounter in planning our school programmes all centre in the problems of educational aims and educational values. When we, teachers and laymen, see clearly what an equipment for modern life means; how much of this equipment it is feasible and desirable to attempt in the elementary school; and what each branch of study contributes in knowledge and power to this equipment; we shall possess the key to the solution of our programme difficulties, whether they pertain to the distribution and interrelation of studies and time allotment,

or to adaptation to local needs, equipment, or teaching force.

Dr. Harris's report was and is, therefore, a great report. But it has a great weakness: it is the work of but one man—a strong man, but nevertheless only one. The report could, therefore, possess only the strength of that one man. It came with the accumulated momentum of years of educational leadership on the part of its author. Nevertheless, it was not and could not be generally accepted as a contemporary solution of the important problem with which it deals. It had paid too little heed to earlier and contemporary discussion of the same problem. It did not adequately represent collective professional insight.

The earlier report—that of the Committee of Ten—and the later report—that of the Committee on College Entrance Requirements—did not possess this particular weakness. The report of the Committee of Ten presented an overwhelming array of educational authority, and had in consequence, as already remarked, an important and widespread influence in promoting the improvement of secondary school

programmes. The fundamental weakness of that report consists in the absence of a thoroughgoing formulation and exposition of contemporary educational doctrine, to which all good secondary school programmes must conform. Had the report set forth such an educational theory, its strength would have been seen to lie chiefly in Table I, and not in the subsequent tables, and least of all in the specimen programmes of Table IV. Yet so strong a hold had the habit of programme-making acquired that those programmes were seized upon as the real fruit of the committee's labors. Table I not only embodied the important articulation of secondary to elementary and college education, to which reference has been made above, but also exhibited the subjects that ninety well-selected professional teachers regarded as essential to a satisfactory modern school education. Table I therefore embodied the real results of the committee's labors, and not Table IV. No one saw more clearly than the chairman of the committee that the programmes of Table IV could not be a permanent solution of secondary school programme difficulties. President Eliot

said repeatedly that he regarded them merely as "scaffolding," as temporary structures; that they must give way to other and better ones as soon as further study should make clear just what selections and combinations from Table I schools could offer, or local or individual needs should demand; and this view is clearly indicated in the remarks of the committee on Tables II and III (pp. 37-44).

Had the Committee on Correlation of Studies "correlated" its report with the work already done by the Committee of Ten, the result would have been a much more important and serviceable document than either produced alone. Educational theory based on experience and reflection would have criticised and illuminated educational authority based chiefly on experience; and out of the two might have been produced a body of educational principles, the overwhelming weight of which in directing educational practice would no doubt be conspicuous everywhere. That is to say, such a body of educational principles could not fail to *unify* our educational endeavor by a general adherence to common aims clearly understood, while

it would not attempt to make it uniform in respect to either means or methods. In the absence of such generally acceptable unifying educational principles, our experiments in programme-making have continued to be largely imitative instead of intelligent, and hence our programmes are unstable to the last degree.

In the report of the Committee on College Entrance Requirements we have again an important document that pays little heed to the work of its predecessors, and once more collects contemporary educational opinion *de novo*. The Committee on College Entrance Requirements had the advantage, however, of formulating its resolutions in the light of the opinion and experience that had followed the publication of the two earlier reports, although there was no explicit attempt to correlate the work of the committee with that of either the Committee of Ten or the Committee of Fifteen. Its most important contributions to guiding principles are its approval of electives in secondary school programmes, its recommendation of a unified six-years' high school course, its emphatic insistence that any study well taught during a suffi-

ciently long period should be accepted toward satisfying college admission requirements, and its attempt to define national norms or units of work in the several studies of the secondary school programmes.

As already stated, I think the influence of the report of the Committee on College Entrance Requirements, like that of its predecessors, has been considerable. Besides the good it has accomplished, it has, however, like those other reports, also complicated the educational situation by not explicitly taking into account what the earlier reports had done; and in failing to incorporate as explicitly in its resolutions and expositions the cumulative influence of the best educational literature that had developed since the agitation which led to the other two reports commenced. Like the others, the report of the Committee on College Entrance Requirements is therefore an isolated document. Like them it must fail to exert, as it might, that unifying influence for guidance which we need so much, and which is still a consummation devoutly to be wished.

Incidentally these three reports have failed in

another way to become the unifying influence which they might and should have become. Each of them not only ignored the other two, but each of them set itself the impossible task of solving programme difficulties by studying only a limited portion of the pupil's educational career. Once at work, however, each committee found it impossible to limit its field so narrowly. The Committee on Correlation necessarily dealt, incidentally, with secondary school problems, and the other two committees similarly found it necessary to consider, to some extent at least, problems of elementary education. Taking the three reports together, there is probably no single defect that has been so effective an obstacle to their use for guidance as this want of unification of their subject-matter in harmony with the interdependence of the problems with which they deal. We have had a body of educational doctrine that covered elementary education, and one that covered secondary education, as if the two were distinct and independent. We need an educational doctrine that covers the entire school period, and so may serve as a guide to practise throughout the pupil's school career.

We are, therefore, still seeking definite guidance. The want of it has led and still leads to economic and educational waste; and hence to uneasiness and vacillation within the teaching profession and dissatisfaction in the community. How can we expect the great body of teachers to accept the programme changes which we recommend in the only spirit that will render them valuable—the spirit of interested, or at least intelligent, coöperation—as long as we have no such definite guidance? How can we expect the community to be impressed with the wisdom of changes that run counter to all tradition, to be interested in them, and to display the patience that must be exercised before such changes can commend themselves alike to all concerned? And how can we expect the schools to be free from persistent, usually well-meant, but pernicious meddling with the details of school work by school committees, parents, newspapers, and other lay influences?

The remedy for such obstacles is not far to seek, but experience thus far seems to show that it is difficult to secure. It is this: we need a new formulation of contemporary educational

doctrine that will serve to clarify our own conception of what a modern education means, and therefore serve as a guide to intelligent, coöperative, and prolonged experimentation on a large scale. Such a formulation of educational doctrine would be based on our present knowledge of social needs; and it would be formulated in the light of the best educational literature that the last dozen years or so have brought forth, to say nothing of the educational classics of earlier generations. Such a body of educational doctrine would be more generally and more seriously studied than any formulation of educational doctrine has ever been studied; and it could, therefore, be expected to furnish an insight and a purpose into the now too generally imitative and chaotic experiments in programme-making with which we are familiar. Educational experiments are desirable and inevitable; my plea is for a more rational experimentation than we have yet had; and, as I shall point out in a moment, for an experimentation that enables us to gather the fruits of experience as we go along.

With an educational doctrine thoroughly assimilated and consciously adhered to — no mat-

ter whether it achieves universal acceptance in all its details or not—superintendents, principals, and teachers can face the community with a professional consciousness that must triumph over ignorant or meddlesome obstructions, repeatedly break down indifference, and occasionally promote enthusiastic coöperation, until it is clear just what can and cannot be achieved by it. By that time we would demand a fresh formulation of our educational doctrine; new experiments would follow, but not a repetition of former errors. In this way progress would be steady and sure, in spite of errors; not random, haphazard, and uncertain, as it must be now. It appears, therefore, that we need to repeat our formulation of educational doctrine at intervals—say once in ten years—often enough to embody in it the new insight that changing social needs, a careful study of the best educational literature, and our practical experiments afford.

But a satisfactory educational doctrine is not enough to promote educational progress. Doctrine must achieve success in application over a wide area to be really effective. Now, just as we have not organized and adequately assimilated a

generally accepted educational doctrine, so we are without a body of recorded educational experience. Results actually achieved and collectively presented constitute a force that is capable of sweeping away superficial criticism and paralyzing scepticism on the one hand, or meddlesome interference and impatient clamoring for premature results on the other. Isolated successes have been advertised, to be sure; and failures, more or less obvious, have sometimes been frankly confessed, and sometimes unwisely suppressed. But in neither case have we had an orderly presentation of both successes and failures over a wide area. We have had plenty of experiments; indeed, as I have intimated, our whole educational activity for nearly a generation has consisted of experiments. But we have had little coöperation. Just as every educational theorizer has worked by himself without taking due account of the labors of his fellow-workers in the same field, so every superintendent has pursued his way apparently in blissful indifference to what his fellow-superintendents were doing, multiplying instances and varying conditions *ad libitum*. How is it possible to extract any con-

firmation of alleged results from such a heterogeneous procedure? And we never can get such confirmation until we abandon our absurd extreme of individualism in these experiments *and work together* for the attainment of the same ends. No physicist or biologist would ignore his fellow-workers in the way here condemned. When Roentgen announced his discovery, other physicists confirmed *his* discovery. The facts of embryology and their bearing on the theory of evolution were similarly confirmed by each biologist under the conditions which led to their discovery. The principles of science once established in this way, no one can doubt or belittle them. Each experimenter, then, sees clearly what conditions must be observed to secure certain results, and the application of principles proceeds intelligently, no matter how varied the circumstances under which the application is made. So must it be in education, if we are ever to escape from the quagmire of random and isolated experimenting in which each worker seeks to find the way out for himself, disregarding the landmarks and sign-posts that have already been set up by his predecessors. Briefly, then,

we must organize our educational experience just as we must organize our educational doctrine, if we are to make real progress.

Let me give two or three illustrations of what I mean. Every school system having five thousand or more children, and many smaller ones, is and should be, among other things, an educational experiment station. Suppose that in twenty-five school systems of this country the attempt were made by the superintendents *acting together*, under ordinary conditions of teaching and equipment, to discover just what the accomplishment in the three R's is with a given time allotment, agreement having previously been reached, for the sake of the experiment, as to the conditions under which the experiment was to be tried. Suppose the conditions to be something like this: five hundred or a thousand pupils in each city to begin the study of arithmetic in the first year; a similar number to begin it in the second year; and a third similar group to begin it in the third year of school. At the end of the sixth year of school compare the attainments of the three groups of pupils. Would not the conclusions reached by such ex-

periments have a convincing value which no amount of assertion beginning "in my schools," or "so far as my experience goes," or "I believe," or "in my opinion," could possibly have?

Suppose, again, that in the same twenty-five school systems the study of algebra, geometry, foreign languages, and elementary natural science were undertaken in two pre-high-school grades, with substantially the same aims, equipment (books and apparatus), time allotment, and teaching force. That is to say, suppose that it were understood that these studies, if undertaken at all in pre-high-school grades, were to be undertaken seriously. Suppose, further, that this experiment were continued for not less than five years. If the twenty-five superintendents should then make a collective report on the results of the work, would not such a report have an overwhelming force in determining public opinion within and without the profession, making future progress less doubtful and future experiments more profitable than is now the case?

Or, again, suppose that our contemporary independent experiments with the elective system were correctly reported on and the results so far

attained duly appraised by competent investigators. Would it not be possible to find twenty-five important schools that, for the sake of the educational interests at stake, would be willing to sink minor individual differences in the administration of the elective system and consent to act together? Or, if we couldn't get twenty-five, could we get ten schools to undertake this coöperative enterprise for at least five years?

I do not believe that such coöperation is impossible. Why should it be? Experiments similar to those suggested are everywhere in progress; coöperation in large enterprises of all kinds is possible. Why should it be impossible only in education? Under such circumstances we could face the profession and the public with *facts*, instead of opinions. The enormous difference between the weight of these two very different things in educational affairs still remains to be experienced.

When we consider the obstacles to progress in the organization and administration of school systems, we find them similar to the obstacles already considered in the fields of educational theory and practice, although not identical with

them. We have two important documents embodying collective expression of opinion on wise and efficient organization and administration, but we lack any collective presentation of recorded experience. We have one important document on organization and administration in the report of the Committee of Fifteen, and another in the report of the Chicago school commission. What we need is a clear statement of the improvements effected in various cities throughout the country during the last six or eight years; of the old difficulties that remain unsolved, and of the new difficulties encountered in attempting to carry out the revised administrative policy. The collected experience of Toledo, St. Louis, Cleveland, Indianapolis, New Haven, New York, and the proposed plans for reorganization in Chicago, Boston, Detroit, and other cities, afford material for such a presentation of a wise administrative policy, and the beneficent results that flow from it, or to be expected from it, as we have not had and could not have until now. Shall we not take steps to procure it?

The chief obstacles in the way of better organization and administration of our city school

systems are the failure of the public to recognize the educational expert as such, and the corresponding unwillingness to trust him when found. The chief reasons why this recognition of technical knowledge and skill in the field of education is too often difficult to secure, and the wisdom of following the professional leadership is not realized, are: (1) the unfortunate lack of a genuine professional knowledge and a well-considered administrative policy on the part of many superintendents, even when they have had much practical experience; and (2) the want of courage and initiative on the part of many well-equipped and otherwise efficient superintendents. Such men fail to enlighten their respective constituencies on what a wise organization and administration means, and also fail to insist, even to the point of self-sacrifice, that such an organization and administration shall prevail. In other words, the teaching profession cannot expect recognition for professional knowledge and skill until its members take pains to possess it, and unless they possess also the energy and the courage of their convictions. Lawyers, physicians, and engineers were not accorded professional

standing, could not achieve the confidence of the public they wished to serve, until they could prove by their practice, based on adequate training, that they deserved it; and so it is in our profession. All teachers, but especially superintendents, must show their fitness to lead, not merely by an apparently successful routine practice of their profession, but by a professional career that is based on a professional consciousness born of adequate training—a training that lends significance to every phase of practice and furnishes a safeguard against the presumptuous or ignorant assumption of technical duties by either meddlesome and spoils-hunting or well-meaning but misguided laymen in educational affairs. With a professional consciousness born of a professional equipment, lay interference in organization and administration will not be tolerated. Courage to insist on what ought to be done will be as natural and easy for the superintendent and principal as for lawyers, physicians, and engineers to insist on the wisest measures in their several fields. And, so far as self-sacrifice is concerned, are we not justified in saying, at least to the younger superintendents: Do not

court opposition; try to cultivate public opinion in behalf of wise measures; be patient and long-suffering, but in the end you can afford to lose your place, if it comes to that, *because you insist on what is right*. The man who loses his place because he insists courteously, intelligently, patiently—in a word, *wisely*—will not need to wait long for employment. We are fortunately not without illustrations of the truth of this proposition and of the practical wisdom of the recommendation based on it.

A few words in regard to the obstacles to progress in the third division of the educational field mentioned in the beginning of this chapter, namely, the training of teachers for elementary and secondary schools.

The greatest obstacles to real progress in the training of elementary teachers are want of *scholarship* on the part of both students and teachers in normal schools, and the want of insistence on good professional training by school officers and employers of teachers.

We have had at least two authoritative documents emanating recently from the National Educational Association which set forth the aims,

equipment, and methods that should prevail in normal schools for the training of elementary school teachers. And there seems to be substantial agreement as to the advisability and feasibility of the practical realization of what these documents recommend. We have a normal school doctrine that seems to be fairly acceptable, but have we a normal school practice in harmony therewith, or an adequate normal school practice anyway? It is not uncommon to hear the normal schools and their product disparaged. What ground, if any, is there for such disparagement? Has anybody collected the testimony of superintendents and other competent persons concerning the relative efficiency of teachers trained in our normal schools and of teachers not so trained? What agency, either by states or otherwise, has set itself the task of ascertaining the actual working efficiency of our normal schools? If we had a thoroughgoing report on that subject, say from a dozen normal schools chosen from the country at large — such a report could be made without mentioning in the report the name of a single school — what an incentive it would afford to efficiency! How clearly it might show just what

the obstacles are that thwart or obstruct the progress of their work, or sometimes defeat it altogether! On the basis of such a report, public opinion within and without the teaching profession would soon demand the best professional training attainable, and unwavering recognition of it when obtained.

What I have just said about the failure to demand adequate scholarship of elementary school teachers cannot be asserted to the same extent in the case of secondary school teachers. But, much more than in the case of elementary school teachers do we find the lack of a demand for adequate professional, *i.e.* technical, training in addition to scholarship. Nothing is a more obstructive influence in secondary education than the want of proper professional training of the teachers. Of course they will not seek such training until it is demanded, not in a half-hearted and after-all-it-doesn't-matter-much sort of a way, but in an unmistakable, insistent fashion. If you as superintendents have no confidence in what you think we who are training secondary school teachers are doing, take steps to find out what we are doing, tell us our shortcomings, and point out

what you believe ought to be added to what we are now doing. As soon as your demand for the right kind of professional training for secondary school teachers is strong, persistent, and widespread, such training will be forthcoming. At present a college student who has taken pains to add technical training for his profession to his academic attainments finds himself just as likely to be passed by in the competition for places as one who has not.

Once more, then, I hope that we shall ere long take steps to organize our contemporary educational doctrine and our practical experience in some such way as has been suggested in this chapter; and I commend to all workers in the field of education the words of the Chinese delegate to the peace conference at The Hague! That conference, it will be recalled, took place shortly after Admiral Dewey had destroyed the Spanish fleet at Manila. The Chinese delegate to the peace conference listened to the eloquence of his colleagues for some time, and then remarked, "Too much talkee, talkee; too little Dewey, do-ee."

VIII

EDUCATION AS A UNIVERSITY
STUDY AND THE PROFESSIONAL
TRAINING OF COLLEGE-BRED
TEACHERS

VIII

EDUCATION AS A UNIVERSITY STUDY AND THE PROFESSIONAL TRAINING OF COLLEGE-BRED TEACHERS

THE study of Education in the United States has a very brief history. Three periods are easily distinguishable. There is, first, the normal school period which began in 1839, when the first state normal school in the country was founded, in Massachusetts — the period during which the normal school for the training of elementary school teachers was the only institution in which education was seriously studied. There is, next, the period of the college or university department of Education, which began in 1879 when a professorship “of the science and the art of teaching” was established in the University of Michigan.¹ With

¹ Other colleges and universities had attempted similar professorships before this time; but none of them developed permanence.

this period colleges and universities begin to give their students who intend to teach instruction in the history, theory, and practice of Education, and to college-bred teachers already in service who seek promotion, an opportunity to study their profession under guidance. The third period is the period of the university "School of Education," which began in 1898 with the assimilation of Teachers College in New York City to Columbia University.¹ This period marks the advent of a professional school for the training of teachers which is ultimately destined to be of equal rank with other professional schools of university grade.

Although three periods in the history of the study of Education in this country are thus easily distinguishable, these periods are not independent of each other. The college or university departments of Education have not checked or suppressed the development of normal schools, nor has the university school of Education had a similar effect on its predeces-

¹ Up to the present time (1903) the School of Education of the University of Chicago is the only other conspicuous example of a university school of Education.

sors. All three exist side by side, and afford important provision for the study of Education and the technical training of teachers; and the growth of each has stimulated and promoted the growth of the other two. It is probable, however, that, ultimately, the University School of Education will supplant the chair or department of "Pedagogy," its precursor, especially in the urban universities, whatever may happen in the colleges. The normal schools will and must continue to minister to the needs of that great majority of elementary school teachers who cannot afford the time and money for a college education before entering on the study of their profession.

I do not intend, in this chapter, to trace the history of the normal school, interesting as that history is. But it is pertinent to point out, in passing, that although this country early declared its faith in Education as a social force and as a function of society in the celebrated laws of 1642 and 1647 passed by the General Court of Massachusetts,¹ yet the study of this elevating and upbuilding force itself, together with the

¹ Cf. page 158.

study of the wisest means of organizing and directing it in the rapidly growing municipalities of the land, was long neglected. During the first half of the nineteenth century, however, the persistence and persuasion of Charles Brooks and James G. Carter, and the energy and devotion of Horace Mann—all Massachusetts men—made the people conscious of their needs in this respect, made them feel that the untrained class-room teacher is a menace to the right education of the young, an untrained principal or superintendent a blind leader of the blind, alike within and without the teaching profession, and unenlightened lay opinion in educational affairs a sisyphæan stone, a baffling obstruction that constantly blocks the path of progress. The founding of the first state normal school in Lexington, Massachusetts, was, therefore, an event of more than local significance. In the seventeenth century Massachusetts had laid the foundation of the American public school system. In the nineteenth century she founded an institution for infusing new life into that system for all time to come.

Great as the services are which the normal

schools have rendered and are rendering, they have been for some time totally inadequate to meet our rapidly growing educational needs. The normal schools were founded to meet the need of properly equipping class-room teachers for the elementary schools, and this need they have never outgrown and never can; it is fundamental, imperative, perennial. They have shed their beneficent influence over thousands of class rooms, and, by making clear the great distinction between a trained and an untrained teacher, both at the outset and throughout the teacher's entire career, they have, almost single-handed, gradually transformed the calling of the elementary teacher from a mere routine into a profession.

At the same time it is clear, as I have said, that the normal school alone is no longer able to cope with our rapidly growing needs. As long as the type of our schools was a single, rather small school, with a simple programme of studies, limited chiefly to the school arts of reading, writing, and arithmetic, a single teacher working by himself could do the work of the school fairly well. But the increase of the

native population and the growth of cities, the enormous and steadily increasing influx of foreign immigrants, the geographical expansion, and the much more important and very great commercial and industrial development of the country have naturally been followed by our huge modern schools, our varied and complex programmes of studies, our immense city school systems; and hence a host of new problems have come into the educational field,—problems with which the mere class-room teacher of limited academic training and narrow, even if thorough, technical training, is manifestly unable to cope satisfactorily. It is true that we have many efficient grammar school principals and superintendents to-day who have had only a normal school training; but in no case are they efficient *because* their training has been limited, but in spite of that fact. Moreover, the limitations of even these efficient but inadequately trained school officers have of late become so apparent that some cities now decline to appoint principals or superintendents who have not had a college training as well as technical training and successful practical experience.

At the same time it has been long apparent that many college-bred men of excellent scholarship are poor teachers. The college offered them no opportunity to learn how to teach. Indeed, so conspicuous was the inability to teach of the ordinary college graduate, that many high school principals and a great many superintendents of schools have preferred to employ normal school graduates in high school positions, in spite of their limited scholarship. But it was found, of course, that teaching power without adequate scholarship was largely wasted. At least so much general and special education as a college course affords is essential to the equipment of a high school or academy teacher. The problem was to secure, in addition to adequate scholarship, appropriate insight into Education and technical skill in teaching. This the normal school could not and cannot do for the college graduate; first, because the normal school was and is naturally and properly concerned chiefly with the training of elementary school teachers, and has, therefore, usually neither the teaching force nor the equipment to deal separately with college graduates; and second, because it was

not and cannot be profitable to teach, in the same classes, college graduates and normal school students. The college-bred students are too far ahead of the normal school students in maturity and general scholarship to make a satisfactory combination class.

Out of these considerations arose the university department of Education or "chair of pedagogy." In only a few cases, however, has the university department of Education solved the problem of technical training for college-bred teachers. Teachers of experience, who returned to the university to study the history and theory of Education, and the organization and administration of school systems, found the instruction of any good professor of Education decidedly profitable. But neophytes who needed to learn *how to teach* under direction usually failed to get what they most needed,—the laboratory work of actual teaching under the usual conditions that prevail in the class room. A few institutions, like Harvard University, provided such opportunities from almost the very beginning; but in most cases it has been found impracticable. Of course much is done for the would-be

teacher by instruction in the history of his profession and the theory of his art. But unless accompanied by suitable laboratory work — actual teaching — the most important part of a young candidate's training is not obtained.

But the university department or chair of Education has accomplished and is accomplishing a most important function, quite apart from what it may or may not accomplish in the training of young teachers. *It has made Education a university study.*

Apathetic and even hostile faculties have slowly yielded the absurd position that they once held, namely, that among all the fields of human thought and activity Education is the only one it is not profitable to study; and this is a great gain. The gradual abandonment of false views concerning the study of Education by members of the faculties of our higher institutions has naturally been followed by similar progress on the part of the students. To-day, at Harvard University, for example, the introductory courses in Education are attended, every year, by a considerable number of future lawyers, doctors, and business men who do not care for the technical

courses pursued by future teachers or school officers, but who wish to study the history, theory, and, to some extent, the organization of Education, just as they study the history and theory of economics,—that is, as a part of the proper equipment of a liberally educated man, one who expects to be a participator and not merely a spectator in the world's most important affairs.

The university department of Education has therefore accomplished several important things. It has established the study of Education among the branches of a liberal education by the side of other social studies,—history, government, economics; it has, at its worst, given college-bred teachers an insight into their future profession which they formerly could not get at all; that is, it has helped to determine a professional attitude and temper of mind of great importance for immediate efficiency and steady professional growth; and, at its best, it has done and is still doing all that has just been enumerated, and provides also actual laboratory work for the young teacher—class-room teaching under direction, amid normal surroundings, over a suffi-

ciently long period of time; and finally it provides suitable training for principals and superintendents of schools on the basis of good instruction and a comparative study, under direction, of schools and school systems in actual operation.

The university department of Education has, therefore, contended and, in case of need, still contends that Education, like every other important human interest, may be studied advantageously, to some extent, by every man who aspires to general culture. The history of Education is an important part of the history of civilization; the general principles of Education determine contemporary educational practice in schools and colleges, whether the public or teachers and school officers adhere consciously to those principles, or not; and the organization and administration of schools and school systems are important phases of state and municipal affairs.

Surely the story of the gradual evolution of educational needs in successive stages of the world's history, of the formulation and exposition of those needs in educational classics, and of the schools and universities that arose to meet those

needs — in short, the story of the education that humanity has devised in the course of, say, twenty-five centuries (to take only the most important part of the story), and of the effect of this education on civil, political, and religious development — surely this story may well form a part of the equipment of a “liberally educated” man, whatever his future calling may be. So, too, to gain some knowledge of the scope and meaning of schools and studies, of the aims and methods of contemporary educational practice; to gain a critical insight into contemporary educational needs through a serious study of the development of the individual on the one hand and of contemporary social needs on the other, and hence a just estimate of the value of our vast, diversified, and costly provision for the education of the present generation of children and youth — this is worth some time and effort on the part of every university student, whether he becomes a teacher or not. And, finally, to learn how states and cities seek to secure good schools for their children; to become aware of the dangers that constantly menace the efficiency of the schools because of faulty organization and unwise administration; to study the

successes and the failures of cities in ridding themselves of bad school systems, and the nature and workings of the best systems yet devised — surely such study may well attract a college-bred man whose influence in municipal affairs and especially in educational affairs is certain to be important by and by. But if some study of Education in its several aspects is advantageous to every cultivated man, is it not clear that a thoroughgoing study of this subject must be essential to the prospective teacher?

It may clear the ground a bit, if I say, at the outset, that one function of a university department of Education is to advise some persons to keep out of the teaching profession as well as to encourage and seek to equip others to enter it. Appropriate personal qualities, together with sound general scholarship and special attainments in some one field, are indispensable to the highest efficiency. Only the best are good enough to be intrusted with the important work of teachers. Would that we could always secure the best and the best only!

So much misconception concerning the scope and meaning of the university study of Education

still exists in the minds of intelligent persons that one may be pardoned for emphasizing again what is already clear from the foregoing paragraphs, namely, that the study of Education is not merely a study of methods of teaching. While instruction in methods is an important part of the professional training of a teacher, it is only a small part. Ignorance of this fundamental fact is responsible for the oft-repeated dictum of many otherwise well-informed persons that "the teacher is born, not made." One may, by the way, accept this dictum, and yet hold that the "born" teacher, like the "born" preacher or lawyer, profits enormously by the study of the technique of his calling.

The important thing to note, however, is that neither the teacher, nor the preacher, nor the lawyer devotes most of his time, in preparing for his profession, to studying the rules that govern the practice of his calling. The prospective lawyer's training is not limited to preparing briefs and pleading in moot court cases; the prospective preacher, similarly, does not devote most of his time in the divinity school to homiletics. Just as the future lawyer or preacher devotes most of his time to studying the principles and the re-

corded experience of his profession, leaving the art of pleading or of preaching or of dealing with men to be perfected by actual practice, so the future teacher devotes most of his time to studying the principles and the history of Education, and the organization and administration of schools and school systems; leaving to actual practice, aided by native capacity and good sense, the development of skill in teaching and managing his pupils, or organizing and managing his school or system of schools. Nothing but practice can convert knowledge into power in teaching, as in any other profession.

What sensible advocates of the technical training of teachers claim for such training is this: that, given sound general scholarship, and special attainments in some one field of knowledge, a serious study of his future profession develops in the prospective teacher an insight into its difficulties; a comprehension of the extent and complexity of its problems; a knowledge of its accumulated resources for guidance and for inspiration; and a keen sense of its duties and its privileges — in short, a professional consciousness that lifts the teacher out of the sphere of mere imitation and

mechanical routine into the sphere of rationalized endeavor. Such a consciousness of the scope and meaning of his vocation predisposes and enables the young teacher to organize his experience as he goes along, so that with years comes wisdom and not sterility. It clarifies and energizes his work in the class room, and, while leading him to set a just value on his efficiency as a class-room teacher, gives him at the same time an outlook far beyond the class room. It enables him to see the significance of his individual task in relation to that of his fellow-workers, and gradually makes it possible for him to aspire justly to the higher places in his profession, — to the posts in which the direction of educational affairs and educational leadership are demanded, and, too often, at present, are found wanting.

The foregoing statement of the results claimed for the appropriate professional training of teachers implies no failure to recognize the superiority of "born" teachers over all other teachers. We need more born teachers than we shall ever get. "Born" teachers are, however, not born oftener than "born" preachers, or lawyers, or statesmen. Besides, even genius, as has already been sug-

gested, is rendered more effective, and often needs to be controlled by the insight and the breadth of view that careful study alone can develop. But it must be evident that no calling in life will ever be carried on exclusively or even largely by those of remarkable natural gifts. The world's work will always be done largely, not by geniuses, but by men and women of varying degrees of capacity, from mediocrity to excellence, whose serious purposes are illuminated and rendered effective in practice by good preparation for the work they have to do—whether that work is building bridges, manufacturing or transporting goods, financiering business enterprises, healing the sick, pleading for or administering justice, teaching a class in geometry or history, or organizing and managing a school or a school system.

The truth of the contention that technical training for all teachers is essential to progressive efficiency is attested by the constantly increasing number of college-bred teachers who return to the graduate schools of our universities to study their profession for a year or more; or who come in large numbers to the university summer schools for the same purpose. Such teachers either did

not or could not secure appropriate technical training before entering on their profession, and, having discovered their needs,— or, not infrequently, and more disastrously, having been found needy by their official superiors,— now seek the help which the university can give. The great majority of these teachers, however, are impelled to the study of their profession by the natural ambition of earnest men and women to avail themselves of every means to increase their efficiency. Moreover, the professional responsibilities of principals and superintendents are to-day so much greater than they were a generation ago that the more enlightened communities show a strong tendency to close the door of promotion to the higher posts in the profession, to all aspirants who have not had a thoroughgoing professional (technical) training; and in some important communities the door is closed already.

I purpose now to discuss briefly two phases of the technical training of teachers for their profession, namely, the preparation of the class-room teacher, or training in methods; and the preparation of the principal and superintendent, or training in supervision.

I select these two phases of professional training, because to teach well is the first duty of every teacher; and because college-bred teachers naturally aspire to become, ultimately, principals and superintendents; and, also, because the demand for trained men of liberal scholarship for all the higher posts in the teaching profession is, as I have already intimated, becoming stronger every day. At the same time, it must not be overlooked that one cannot be a trained teacher, in the full sense of that term, without an acquaintance with educational theory and practice far more extensive than can be derived from studying the method of his own subject; and without some knowledge of organization and administration that enables him to see his own work in relation to that of the others who are striving to "educate" the same pupil, which knowledge is not derivable at all from a study of method only. So, too, one cannot become a good principal or superintendent if he has studied only organization and administration. To organize and manage well a school or a school system requires an intimate knowledge of educational principles and of good teaching as well as an acquaintance with

systems of schools; and a professional horizon that includes the educational endeavor of the past as well as of the present, and of other modern nations as well as our own.

It often happens that a teacher of good personal qualities cannot teach. In such cases he may, for a time, get on fairly well with his pupils; but, eventually, the inevitable boredom of tedious and unproductive class exercises will make him impossible. Even proficiency in athletics (which covers a multitude of sins) or in other out-of-school accomplishments cannot long atone for stupid and ineffective teaching. Moreover, every dull or pointless recitation is a perversion of opportunity for the pupils. Hence, to learn to teach well as soon as possible, in addition to the acquisition of good scholarship, is the teacher's first duty.

What, then, may we expect appropriate training in method to do for the intending teacher? The answer to this question may be arrived at by briefly contrasting the untrained and the trained teacher's scholarship *for teaching purposes*, their usual conception of their work, and their teaching.

During his first years of teaching, every young teacher finds that he must possess his resources in a new way. He must command them from the teacher's, not merely from the student's, point of view. To get this command consumes much time and energy, and usually involves some anxiety. For many years, perhaps, he has not concerned himself with the elements of his subject. He has forgotten them, as such; they have become a part of the warp and woof of his knowledge. Now he must become conscious of them afresh. He must go over the details of these elements, as such, with care; he must note the teaching resources at each step, and he must also learn the best means of leading his student to use them.

If left to his own devices in this process of repossessing and revising his subject for teaching purposes, of commanding his resources from beginning to end, of seeing the end from the beginning, he flounders a good deal; his pupils as well as he are the sufferers, and the subject fails to yield its educational value to the pupils under his charge. If, on the other hand, he has recently gone over his subject with a view

to teaching it under the direction of an experienced teacher, — a teacher of method, — the inadequacies of his apprenticeship as a teacher are minimized; because he now feels surer of his ground, he knows how to meet many of the difficulties that his pupils will encounter, and how to prepare his pupils step by step to master them. In short, what he has learned and studied will be for him like the constant help of a friend in need, a resource to which he can refer for counsel. His progress will be steady and sure, and he will be spared the helplessness — the exquisite misery of conscious weakness — that undermines the efficiency of many a scholarly student well freighted with knowledge which he cannot use because he does not know how.

The untrained class-room teacher is likely to be an assigner and hearer of lessons. The trained class-room teacher does not fail to set lessons and to make sure that the pupil has learned them as well as he could; but his attitude toward his pupil is that of an intelligent guide and a sympathetic interpreter, rather than that of inquisitor and judge.

The untrained teacher's interest is likely to

be exclusively in the subject-matter he is teaching — his specialty; the trained teacher's interest in his subject is also great, but his interest in his pupil is equally great, and furnishes the guide to the sequence and correlation of topics and to the distribution of emphasis in instruction. In other words, the untrained teacher is concerned about having his pupils learn as much of the subject as possible; the trained teacher also wishes his pupils to learn the subject, but he teaches the pupils by means of the subject — the subject is a means to an end, not merely an end in itself.

The untrained teacher is rarely interested in the *acquisition* of scholarship, the processes by which mastery is won, and usually dispenses information to all alike by measurement, so much each day; the trained teacher *shares* his scholarship with his pupils as *they need it*, or are able to profit by it; he studies the means of approach to each mind, correcting false impressions here, supplying omissions there, and enriching the whole as opportunity and occasion require or warrant. The untrained teacher usually cares little for the pupil's failures, except to record

them; the trained teacher studies the pupil's failures as well as his successes, and seeks to lead the erring or bewildered or helpless pupil to success; he knows that the struggling pupil's shortcomings constitute the teacher's opportunity. The untrained teacher possesses his subject as the student possesses it, as a personal possession; the trained teacher has worked it over bit by bit, with a view to teaching it to another — with a view to the uses to be made of it in awakening enthusiasm and insight, and especially in the attainment of the sense of achievement by his pupil. The student's attitude and the teacher's attitude toward a subject are therefore quite different. The student seeks to master the subject for its own sake; the teacher has mastered it for its own sake, and now scrutinizes it with a view to *helping another to master it for himself* with the utmost economy of time and effort.

The answer to our first question is, therefore, this: We may expect the trained teacher to show more immediate and progressive efficiency than the untrained teacher, because we have helped him to minimize the inevitable

blunders of inexperience by making him conscious of his resources, and showing him how to use them in the interests of his pupil; we have laid the foundation for progressive efficiency by disposing him to find his chief interest in the progress of his pupils in knowledge and power under his guidance, and in their enthusiasm, no matter how often he goes over the "same ground"; we have helped him to make his teaching interesting, because we have led him to see that the pupil's interest depends on the conquests achieved *by the pupils themselves*, appropriately supplemented and enriched by his own contributions; so that although they will often forget details, their sense of achievement may be constant, and their memory of beauties revealed, or insights gained through the teacher's wise ministrations will be a constant stimulus to fresh effort and an abiding pleasure.

If you ask me is this result actually attained by the trained teacher more expeditiously, more surely, and more often than by the untrained teacher, I answer, yes; for, on the one hand, we have the testimony every year of Harvard and

Radcliffe students who have had some training and have begun their apprenticeship under our direction during half a year in some nearby school; and, on the other hand, we have the testimony of many teachers now in service who had no such training, and who, consequently, had to experiment more or less blindly and at the expense of their pupils before they could beat out a reasonably successful routine. We have also the silent testimony of a mass, far too great, of inert and unprogressive teachers who also entered on their vocation without technical preparation, and who ceased to grow many years ago; who work without the inspiration of a deepening and widening professional consciousness, because they have always conceived of their work as a mere routine — a mill for grinding out their daily bread.

It is a pleasure to be able to say that the number of efficient and progressive teachers now in service who have developed a professional spirit by earnest and persistent study of their vocation is fortunately large. But they have attained their present professional attitude and efficiency at a great and unnecessary cost of time and energy, and, of course, in spite of, not because of, their lack of preparation.

So much for the training of the class-room teacher. I have still to answer my second question, What may we expect professional training to do for the college-bred teacher of experience who desires to equip himself for the highest efficiency as a supervising officer? We may approach the answer to this question, as before, by contrasting the actual work of the trained and untrained principal or superintendent, and of the conception held by them of the duties and privileges of their profession. It will be sufficient, for my present purpose, to discuss only with the equipment and work of the superintendent.

The superintendent's task bristles with problems, most of which, as a teacher, he touched only remotely, if at all; and which he must now solve wisely and quickly, or the schools will suffer increasing harm. To expect him to do this without previous serious study of the problems involved is almost always to expect the impossible. Naturally, I shall here deal with only a few of the most conspicuous of these problems.

The traditions of the superintendent's office, whether good or bad, are likely to govern the young or untrained incumbent, and tend to be

come the determining factor in his career. Unfortunately these traditions are often bad, and their badness is so obscured by use and wont that their true significance is not perceived except by the trained observer; the existing conditions and practices, no matter how perverse of the real function of supervision, seem to be the natural and only ones under which, and by which, the superintendent's work can be carried on. Thus the untrained superintendent, like the untrained teacher, is likely to be a mere imitator. If his models happen to be good, he may ultimately work out his own salvation; if they happen to be bad, he is sure, in the end, to work out quite another fate.

Thus, if his models have been "politicians," he shapes his course accordingly, employing means and methods that may accomplish his ends temporarily, but which he must avoid if he is to succeed permanently,—to count as a professional force, and not as a mere school politician. If his models have been administrators of external affairs, he is likely to follow their lead in that direction, and devote himself to working out a smooth-running administrative machine, without perceiving

that machinery is valuable only in so far as it promotes the carrying out of a wise and clearly defined educational policy. If his models have been "popular," because plausible and subservient to faction, — everything to everybody, — he may be led astray by false appearances; he follows in their footsteps, only to realize when it is too late that such a policy renders him and his administration nerveless and halting; discredits his educational authority because he has developed no educational doctrine of his own; and unfits him to justify the expectations he has awakened because he is neither sturdy nor energetic enough to be intrusted with educational and administrative guidance and leadership.

If his models have been passive, timid, and subservient instruments of the school committee, the untrained superintendent is apt to acquiesce in the false view that the superintendent is merely to do as he is told — that though he may be seen he should not be heard save when officially asked to speak; and so he is apt to regard himself, and often is, merely the clerk or "servant" of the school committee. The trained superintendent is, of course, subordinate to the school committee,

but at the same time his obvious superior resources enable him to win, and consistently maintain toward the committee, the relation of professional adviser and chief executive, in whom they, as laymen, have confidence, and to whom they look for the inauguration and clear definition of sound educational and administrative policies; and to whom, also, as such, they naturally intrust large freedom in the management of innumerable technical details. The school committee, as the representatives of the people, want good schools, but they have neither the time nor the knowledge to enable them to secure good schools. Only the trained superintendent can define their vague desires for them and show them what steps must be taken to attain the ends sought. It is for the committee to decide whether the superintendent's plans and policies correspond with their desires; to suggest modifications, if they think modifications are needed, and finally to accept or reject means and measures in accordance with common sense and a wise financial policy.

The untrained superintendent of schools usually frames a programme of studies by simply imitating the programmes already in use elsewhere,

without justifying his adoption by a clear insight into the principles on which a modern programme of studies should be based, and so, like any mere imitator, is easily disconcerted or even overwhelmed by the inevitable difficulties that arise in practice; or, with equal fatuity, he allows the school committee or some sub-committee to attempt the difficult technical task of framing a programme of studies, and then is obliged to abide by the result whatever educational curiosity or monstrosity they construct. The trained superintendent brings to bear on this problem — one of the most difficult of all the unsolved problems that confront the teaching profession to-day — under his leadership, the combined wisdom of his entire teaching corps, or at least of representatives of his entire corps; so that, whatever the imperfections of the result, he and they know it is the best that can be devised for their schools, under the circumstances. Consequently, neither he nor they can be disturbed by inevitable difficulties in practice, most of which have been foreseen; and they can defend it against opposition in their own ranks or in the community by convincing arguments based on technical knowledge and trained

insight. He and they know that any satisfactory programme must be a growth, and not a dead fact, and that one indispensable condition of good work throughout the entire school system is a unified corps of teachers — teachers who work with the same purposes, clearly conceived and consistently adhered to, whatever diversities of method they may employ.

The answer to my second question may, therefore, be stated as follows: The untrained superintendent of schools commonly lacks courage and initiative, and his career is too often determined merely by tradition and routine. When this is not the case, he achieves professional independence and leadership at a great and unnecessary cost of time and effort by dint of much random and useless experimenting. Meanwhile, in either case, the schools suffer. We may expect the trained superintendent to possess the professional equipment that enables him to devise sound educational and administrative policies, and that gives him the courage, and enables him speedily to develop the power to wisely execute his plans. We may expect him to aim at a unified corps

of teachers whose coöperation will infuse life and devotion into the whole school system. We may expect him to realize that, whatever the traditions of his office may be, he cannot be a mere passive "servant" of the school committee without endangering the important interests which they control; that, indeed, the very fact that a superintendent of schools is appointed implies the necessity of professional oversight and direction; and that he cannot win and hold the respect and confidence of the school committee by passively assenting to whatever they may decide or do, but by his ability tactfully, aggressively, if need be, but always wisely, to expose the unwisdom, as well as to approve the wisdom, of means and measures which the committee bring forward or support; and finally, if the committee persist in initiating or espousing unwise measures which he is expected to carry out, we may expect him to tell the committee, respectfully but clearly, that while he will faithfully do as he is directed, he cannot be held responsible for the consequences of a policy which he has warned them against. We may also expect him to win the

position of an educational leader in the community outside the school system altogether, and so promote a unification of all available educational forces. In short, we may expect the trained superintendent to have learned the lesson that without developed resources for leadership he ought not to be a superintendent at all, for the secret of good schools and school administration is *coöperation under leadership*.

IX

GRADUATE TESTIMONY ON THE
ELECTIVE SYSTEM

IX

GRADUATE TESTIMONY ON THE ELECTIVE SYSTEM

THIS chapter is a brief report on a portion of an investigation into the elective system of studies in schools and colleges begun by the Harvard Seminary in Education¹ during the academic year 1901-1902. The investigation differed from other similar inquiries in the attempt to secure the desired information primarily from the students themselves and not from their teachers; and also in the endeavor to secure the testimony of Harvard graduates who had done their college work under the elective system.

¹ The members of the seminary who took part in this work were W. E. Stark, A.B., '95; J. W. Wood, Jr., S.B., '98; C. S. Moore, A.B., '73, A.M., 1900; G. F. W. Mark, S.B., '92, S.M., '95 (Central Pennsylvania College), A.B., Harv. 1900; F. O. Small (Bowdoin), '96; T. A. Hillyer, Ph.B. (Univ. of Chicago), 1900; Wm. C. Hill, A.B. (Brown Univ.), '94; F. P. Morse, A.B. (Bowdoin), '90. All these men are experienced teachers, and all but one (Mr. Wood) had been principals or superintendents of schools.

By asking the students¹ still in school or college the reasons that led to their choices, it was thought that information on the elective system as seen by those who were affected by it could be secured; and by sending a specially prepared set of questions to Harvard graduates, it was hoped that information of unusual value and trustworthiness could be obtained, because such graduates, by virtue of their maturity and experience, should be able to estimate justly and impartially the influence—whatever it was—of the elective system on their development and subsequent careers; and it was assumed, also, that graduates would, as a class, be more ready to furnish some of the information sought than would students still in college.

These expectations were only partially realized; first, because a large proportion of the students and graduates failed to reply to the questions; and second, because the replies received were often vague, contradictory, or superficial. Nevertheless a large number of clear and thoughtful replies were received, and the

¹ Questions intended for students still in school or college were sent to seniors only.

information they embody seems to me both intrinsically interesting and suggestive.

The present report deals only with the replies received from Harvard graduates to the following questions. These questions were preceded by a few paragraphs explaining the general object of the inquiry and stating that it was undertaken with the approval of President Eliot, whose careful discussion of the electives of the classes of 1884 and 1885 is well known. The questions were sent to all Harvard graduates who were members of the classes of 1886 to 1900 inclusive, and to a few earlier graduates.

QUESTIONS

1. Will you kindly state whether you regard the general influence of the elective system on your development and subsequent career as beneficial or harmful, making your answer as detailed as time and inclination permit.

2. So far as the following questions are not already answered in your reply to the first question, and so far as you are willing to answer, please state —

(a) Whether you elected easy courses in college for the sake of evading hard work? To what extent?

(b) Whether you believe that the elective system tended to undermine or to promote strenuousness of application in your own case?

(*c*) Whether you see in the present generation of college and secondary school students "a weakness in attacking difficulties"; and whether you believe that this weakness, if it exists, is traceable to the elective system in schools and colleges, or whether you believe that it is probably due to causes lying outside the pupil's school and college career altogether?

(*d*) Whether you think there are certain studies that should be prescribed for a secondary school student who is not going to college? Whether you would prescribe the same studies if he is?

(*e*) Whether you believe in a prescribed college course, or a college course permitting a considerable range of choice? In the latter case, what studies would you prescribe for all?

It will be seen that questions 1, 2 (*a*), 2 (*b*), and the first part of 2 (*c*) call for testimony, that the rest of 2 (*c*) and the remaining questions ask for opinion. This report deals chiefly with the testimony contained in the answers to 1, 2 (*a*), 2 (*b*) and 2 (*c*). The replies to the remaining two questions are interesting; but they throw little light on the working of the elective system not already derived from the replies to the preceding questions; and a great many of the answers to these two questions are, for the reasons given above, quite useless. Such replies illustrate the general worthlessness of the opinions of unreflecting persons on educational affairs.

With one exception, it is impossible to make any general statement concerning the replies to these last questions; and, of course, any statistical exhibit of them would not be instructive. The one exception is this. While nearly all the men prefer a wide range of choice in college studies, very many of them suggest that English composition and literature be required of all students; many suggest that history, government, and economics be prescribed; and a large number wish to prescribe some science, and at least one modern language. A few wish to prescribe classics or mathematics. The amount of prescribed work suggested for each of the subjects mentioned varies greatly; and, in many instances, is not given at all. These recommendations are suggestive. It is sometimes alleged that undergraduates turn from the traditional classics and mathematics because those studies are "hard." In the light of these graduate recommendations, it appears that the preference for the "modern" subjects shown by most undergraduates is justified by the benefits derived from them which graduates have experienced, or the need of them which they feel.

The total number of question blanks sent out was 4728. The total number of replies received was 987, or nearly 21 per cent. These replies are fairly distributed among all the classes represented. The blanks were mailed during the first half year, and the replies came back during the entire remaining portion of the year. About 50 were received after the close of the academic year. As the replies came in they were distributed in groups of 50 for classification and study to the members of the Seminary already named. Each man tabulated the information contained in his letters.¹ The present report is based on these tabulations, partly verified, and on a study at first hand, of the letters as they were received. The following tables, I, II, III, and IV, give a statistical summary of the information contained in the graduates' letters. They are, of course, themselves summaries of the tables prepared by the students.

¹ A uniform scheme was adopted for this tabulation.

TABLE I

Answers to question 1: Was the general influence of the elective system on your development and subsequent career beneficial or harmful?

Number of letters received	Beneficial	Harmful	Neither	Doubtful	No answer or doubtful
987	712	67	28	59	121
				180	

TABLE II

Answers¹ to question 2 (a): Did you elect easy courses in college for the sake of evading hard work? To what extent?

Number of letters received	No	Yes	Elected easy courses for other reasons	No answer
987	566	173	266	58

TABLE III

Answers¹ to question 2 (b): Do you believe the elective system tended to undermine or to promote strenuousness of application in your case?

Number of letters received	Undermine	Promote	Neither	No answer
987	56	555	150	90

TABLE IV

Answers¹ to question 2 (c): Do you see "a weakness in attacking difficulties" in the present generation of college and secondary school students? Is this weakness, if it exists, traceable to the elective system, or is it probably due to other causes?

Number of letters received	Weakness: traceable to the elective system	Weakness: traceable to other causes	See no weakness	No answer
987	64	313	194	255

¹ Exclusive of doubtful replies.

Any statistical information based on testimony is, of course, affected by the varying personal qualities of the persons reporting. But the replies in these tables come from men, a large proportion of whom have formed the habit of making correct statements on matters of importance, or of refraining from making any statements at all. Of course, men differ materially in their ability to recall and to interpret their experiences; but in such a large number of replies from educated business and professional men it is safe to assume a large measure of reliability, both in regard to the facts or experiences reported, and the conclusions drawn from them by the reporters.

Obviously those who believe the elective system beneficial are in a substantial majority — 712 out of 987, or more than 72 per cent. The reasons given for this belief are interesting, but familiar. The elective system aroused interest in work; it developed a sense of responsibility and self-reliance; it gave increased ability to meet difficulties, and increased power of concentration; it is consistent with breadth of thought and thoroughness. Through the

elective system men say they were able to take work in which they were permanently interested, and so they have been able to get more out of life and have accomplished more than if they had been obliged to take work in college permanently distasteful; "There may be some discipline, but very little progress in wrestling with a permanently distasteful subject." "The planless choosing, so prevalent at Harvard, is a result not of electives, but of the administration of them. Send a circular with suggestive groups to freshmen." The elective system was beneficial to some because it permitted early specialization, or choice of work preparatory to their future vocations; it benefited others for precisely opposite reasons; it stimulated them to take work lying outside the vocational range altogether, and so, as already mentioned, broadened their education and contributed to a many-sided interest in life; it permitted others to discover their natural tastes and capacities, and so led them to careers to which they were best adapted, instead of allowing them to drift into careers arbitrarily chosen for them, in which success

would have been difficult or impossible. "To the man who is worth educating, the elective system is a godsend." "The system works best for the best men." "For students who mean business the system is ideal, but for indifferent students it is perilous." "To the earnest worker the elective system is the best, to the loafer the worst." "No system yet devised can make drones and sluggards other than they are."

Only sixty-seven men believe that the influence of the elective system on their development and careers was harmful. "Doubtful" in the table means men who either asserted that the elective system was beneficial in some respects, *e.g.* in promoting interest and concentration of effort, and harmful in other respects, *e.g.* in permitting too much specialization; or it means that it was beneficial with various reservations; or similarly, that it was harmful, but with qualifications; or that men said the effect on others was harmful, but gave no testimony of its influence in their own cases; or, finally, that men expressed themselves as unable to say whether it was harmful or beneficial. Some

of these last replies are included in the "No answer" column because they were so tabulated by the men who extracted the answers from the letters.

The number who declare without reservation that the influence of the elective system on them was harmful is small. The number of doubtful replies is also small. The reasons given for a harmful influence of the elective system are that it promotes superficiality, planless choosing, the omission of subjects essential to a liberal education, evasion of "disciplinary" courses.

If we add the totals of the harmful column and of the doubtful column, we get 126. At first sight this looks like a respectable minority of those who either disapprove of the elective system with and without qualifications, or who either disapprove of it or approve of it with important reservations; but when the reasons for this state of mind are examined, they are found in many instances to have nothing whatever to do with the elective system in college. That is to say, many of the dissatisfactions with their college careers felt by the writers might have followed a prescribed system exactly as they have the elective system.

For example, "Some of my classes were too large, I could get no individual attention." "The great inequality of courses with respect to amount of work is wrong — many men graduate after taking nothing but 'snaps,' others do the hardest kind of work through the entire course; there should be groups of subjects so arranged that no group would be made up entirely of 'snaps,' nor of the hardest courses." "Many of the courses do not require continuous work, they are spasmodic; a man works himself to death for a fortnight on a forensic, for example, and then has nothing to do for several weeks." "I regret that no science was required." "I regret that it is possible for a man to get an A.B. with no real knowledge of the classics and mathematics." "In Harvard the extreme has been reached, the tendency should be toward more prescribed studies. Requiring less in English was a step in the wrong direction." "I left the — Latin School at the end of the second year and by studying in the summer entered college a year sooner, at the age of seventeen. The cut-and-dried system of the — schools and the long habit of learning merely to recite to a teacher had not developed in me any

capacity for making good use of the elective system." "My friends at Harvard belonged to the 'smart set,' and I didn't see that the elective system led them along any special line except toward the so-called 'snap' courses, whereas if each man had been obliged to elect a group, he would at least have been consistent. Many whom I knew merely wanted to get through, and in this the elective system aided them. The elective system is inferior to the group system for undergraduate work."

It is an interesting fact that most of the men who say the elective system promoted the choosing of easy courses do not say that *they* were led thereby to shirk work, but that others were. Such statements in these adverse replies are common. As testimony, such statements have little value; and even this is diminished when we take into account the testimony afforded by Table II, and the statements accompanying that testimony, summarized below.

The following table shows the distribution of 101 replies to question 1 through the several classes. The letters yielding these replies were taken at random from the entire collection. The

table is taken from a table in Mr. Hillyer's report.

ELECTIVE SYSTEM	CLASSES																	Total	
	64	80	86	87	88	89	90	91	92	93	94	95	96	97	98	99	00		?
Beneficial .			3	5	6	1	1	5		4	6	6	4	4	3	8	21	5	82
Harmful .	2				1								1			1			3
Neither .		1						1										1	3
Doubtful .							1									1	1	1	4
No answer	1			1	2					1						1	2	1	6

None of the statistics will probably have more interest to students of the elective system than those given in Table II. Excluding doubtful replies, *i.e.* replies that leave one unable to decide whether the man in question elected easy courses for evasion of work or for other reasons, or whether he chose easy courses at all or not, the table shows that 173 men out of 987 did elect easy courses for the sake of evading hard work. This is a large number, but the force of this number is diminished when the number of such choices made by each student is considered. Many of the men do not give the number of easy courses chosen by them for evasion; but of those who do, the number who chose more than one or two such courses is very small; and there is good reason to believe that if

the exact number of such choices were known for every graduate, the proportion of men making such choices would not be increased.¹

A good many men (266) chose courses known by them to be easy for various good reasons; namely, to have more time for other studies; for the subject-matter of the courses; because of the instructor; to work off conditions.

The following table, similar to the preceding table, shows the distribution of 100 replies to

EASY COURSES	CLASSES													Total
	86	87	88	90	91	92	93	94	96	97	99	∞	?	
To evade work { Yes	1 ²	1		1		1		1 ³					1	13
{ No	6	5	1	4		3	1	5		1	2	9	2	39
For other reasons .	5	6	1	1	2	1	1		2	1	2	16	5	43
No answer	1	1										2	1	5

¹ Mr. C. S. Moore has made a careful study of the choices of the class of 1901, numbering 448 members. He has shown that 275 men chose courses regarded as "snaps." Of these 1 man took 9 such courses; 2 men took 8 of them; 5 men took 7; 6 men took 6; 17 men took 5; 50 men took 4; 97 men took 3, and 97 men took 2. At least two of these courses, I am informed by excellent authority, are regarded by the students as among the most valuable courses offered; and some of the other "snap" courses, as well as these two, are chosen by the most earnest men for the subject-matter of the courses.

² Other reasons also had influence.

³ Two were influenced by other reasons also.

question 2 (*a*) through the several classes. It happens that Mr. Stark, to whom they were assigned, was able to tabulate them without including a "doubtful" column.

The general significance of the answers to question 2 (*b*), Table III, is, as was to be expected, similar to that of the answers to question 1, Table I. Excluding 136 doubtful replies, 555 men declare that the elective system promoted strenuousness of application, and only 56 that the elective system undermined strenuousness; 150 assert that it had no influence either way. If we add the 150 to 555, we get 705. It will be remembered that 712 men testified that the elective system had been beneficial to them; this agreement of these two figures was to be expected. The reasons given for the belief that the elective system promoted or that it undermined strenuousness of application do not differ from the reasons already given for regarding the elective system as beneficial or harmful respectively, and need not be repeated.

The next table gives a general view of the testimony on question 2 (*b*) by classes. The

table¹ is derived from a group of 186 letters; 17 doubtful replies have been excluded.

STRENUOUSNESS	CLASSES																	Total
	51	79	86	88	89	90	91	92	93	94	95	96	97	98	99	?		
Undermine { Yes . . .								1	1		4	1				1	1	9
Undermine { No . . .	1			3		1					1		1			1	1	10
Promote { Yes . . .		1		3	1	7	3	10	8	13	7	8	5	4	12	12		94
Promote { No . . .								1										1
Neither				4		8	1	4	2	1	2	1	1	2	5	4		35
No information . . .				1		2	1	3		3	3	1	1	1		4		20

The number of definite answers to question 2 (c), Table IV, is smaller than the number of similar answers to any of the other questions; and this is natural. The question is general, and requires a kind of scrutiny of school and college students not likely to have been made by most of the graduates to whom the inquiry was addressed. Yet 64 men state definitely that they see such a weakness as that referred to, and believe it is traceable largely or wholly to the elective system. Three hundred and thirteen do not attribute the weakness referred to to the elective system. They apparently see such a weakness (though relatively few

¹ From Mr. Morse's report.

assert positively that it *does* exist), but attribute it to other causes *if it exists*. It is worthy of note that so many men are willing to assign a cause for a fact not definitely recognized. Among the causes most often specified by these 313 men are home and social influences (luxury, lax discipline), "General prosperity and a full dinner pail," "Kindergarten sentimentalism," poor teaching in the secondary schools, the lecture system. Of these causes the first is mentioned more often than any other. One hundred and ninety-four of the writers assert positively that they see no such weakness, and 255 did not answer the question at all.

The general characteristics of the replies to this question [2 (c)] may be gathered from the following facts¹ collected from a group of 98 letters taken at random, as before, from the entire collection. The classes known to be represented in these 98 letters are '86, '87, '88 '90, '91, '92, '93, '94, '95, '96, '97, '98, '99. Twelve men did not give their classes. Thirty of the men do not answer this question; 17 say they see no such weakness. Of the re-

¹ From Mr. Moore's report.

maining 51, 5 attribute the weakness to the elective system; 12 express their conviction that it is not due to the elective system; 25 attribute it to other causes (if it exists); 7 say they do not know the cause, and 2 recognize the weakness, but say nothing about a cause.

In the foregoing report I have confined myself to such statements as the facts under consideration warrant. When a statement is not as definite as could be desired, or when the information given fails to satisfy an inquiring mind, it is due, in part, to inherent indefiniteness or inadequacy in the information secured and, in part, to the necessary limitations of a brief report. A more detailed account of the replies received would, of course, increase the significance of this report, and it is probable that further study might throw more or clearer light on the whole inquiry. But I think it not likely that the leading facts would be materially affected by further study.

The results of this inquiry may not be a final justification of the elective system as now administered; but so far as they go, I think they confirm the wisdom of electives in Harvard College. One

suggestion occurs so often in these letters that it must be inserted here ; namely, that students should receive more and better guidance in the choice of studies than many of the present graduates received when they were in college. There is much in many of the carefully written replies that should receive serious consideration by college officers everywhere ; and I wish that many of them, or, at least, extracts from many of them, might be published.

THE following pages contain advertisements of a few of the Macmillan books on kindred subjects

Educational Aims and Educational Values

By PAUL H. HANUS

Assistant Professor of the History and Art of Teaching,
Harvard University

Cloth 12mo \$1.25

"Professor Hanus has given us a book which will aid in the development of a large and hopeful view of secondary education; it is a book which should be widely read." — *School Journal*.

"It seems to be a general opinion that Professor Hanus has written the most valuable book on the science of teaching which has appeared in a decade." — *School Weekly*.

The Meaning of Education

WITH OTHER ESSAYS AND ADDRESSES

By NICHOLAS MURRAY BUTLER

Columbia University

Cloth 12mo \$1.00

"I do not recall any recent discussion of educational questions which has seemed to me so adequate in knowledge and so full of genuine insight. I like the frankness, the honesty, and the courage of the papers immensely."

— HAMILTON W. MABIE.

"A volume which will be eagerly sought and thoroughly enjoyed. It is clear, strong, and wholesome."

— State Supt. CHARLES R. SKINNER, *Albany, N. Y.*

THE MACMILLAN COMPANY

64-66 FIFTH AVENUE, NEW YORK

BOOKS ON EDUCATION

- The Teaching of English.** By PERCIVAL CHUBB, of the Ethical Culture Schools, New York City. Cloth. 12mo. \$1.00 net.
- The New Basis of Geography.** A Manual for the Preparation of the Teacher. By JACQUES W. REDWAY, F.R.G.S. Cloth. 12mo. \$1.00 net.
- School Hygiene.** By EDWARD R. SHAW, Ph.D. Cloth. 12mo. \$1.00 net.
- Interest and Education.** The Doctrine of Interest and its Concrete Application. By CHARLES DEGARMO, Professor of the Science and Art of Education, Cornell University. Cloth. 12mo. \$1.00 net.
- Herbart's Outlines of Educational Doctrine.** Translated by ALEXIS F. LANGE, Ph.D. Annotated by CHARLES DEGARMO. Cloth. 12mo. \$1.25 net.
- Fundamentals of Child Study.** A Discussion of Instincts and Other Factors in Human Development, with Practical Applications. By EDWIN A. KIRKPATRICK, B.S., M.Ph. Cloth. 12mo. \$1.25 net.
- Social Phases of Education in the School and the Home.** By SAMUEL T. DUTTON, Superintendent of Schools, Brookline, Mass. Cloth. 12mo. \$1.25.
- Education of the Central Nervous System.** A Study of Foundations, especially of Sensory and Motor Training. By REUBEN POST HALLECK, author of "Psychology and Psychic Culture." Cloth. 12mo. \$1.00.
- The Development of the Child.** By NATHAN OPPENHEIM, M.D., Attending Physician to the Children's Department, Mt. Sinai Hospital Dispensary. Cloth. \$1.25.
- The Physical Nature of the Child and How to Study It.** By STUART H. ROWE, Ph.D., New Haven, formerly Professor of Pedagogy and Director of Practice in the State Normal School, Mankato, Minn. Cloth. 12mo. \$1.00.
- The Teaching and Study of Elementary Mathematics.** By DAVID EUGENE SMITH, Ph.D., Principal of the State Normal School at Brockport, N.Y. Cloth. 12mo. \$1.00.
- The Study of Children and Their School Training.** By DR. FRANCIS WARNER, author of "The Growth and Means for Training of the Mental Faculty." Cloth. 16mo. \$1.00.
- The Nervous System of the Child.** Its Growth and Health in Education. A Handbook for Teachers. By the same author.
-

THE MACMILLAN COMPANY

64-66 FIFTH AVENUE, NEW YORK

UCLA-ED/PSYCH Library

LA 1607 U19m



603 429 1

BOOK

The Teaching
Schools
The Ne

UNIVERSITY OF CALIFORNIA LIBRARY
Los Angeles

This book is DUE on the last date stamped below.

SUBJECT TO FINE IF NOT RETURNED TO
EDUCATION LIBRARY

REC'D COL. ~~EDU.~~

APR 2 1973

APR 17 1973

QL APR 4 1983

RECEIVED

FEB 27 '83-3 PM

RECEIVED

APR 18 1973

EDU./PSYCH.
LIBRARY

ED/PSYCH LIB.

QL JAN 11 1982

RECEIVED

DEC 22 '81 -1 PM

ED/PSYCH LIB.

UCLA-ED/PSYCH Library

LB 1607 H19m



L 005 603 429 1

Ed. Lib.

LB

1607

H19m

UC SOUTHERN REGIONAL LIBRARY FACILITY



A 001 017 178 3

