DEPARTMENT OF THE INTERIOR
BUREAU OF EDUCATION

BULLETIN, 1921, No. 8

# FOREIGN CRITICISM OF AMERICAN EDUCATION

By

W. J. OSBURN

Of the Department of Education of the State of Wisconsin


WASHINGTON
GOVERNMENT PRINTING OFFICE
1922

ADDITIONAL COPIES

OF THIS PUBLICATION MAY BE PROCURED FROM
THE SUPERINTENDENT OF DOCUMENTS
GOVERNMENT PRINTING OFFICE
WASHINGTON, D. C.
AT
20 CENTS PER COPY

# CONTENTS.

# LETTER OF TRANSMITTAL.

DEPARTMENT OF THE INTERIOR,
BUREAU OF EDUCATION,
*Washington, D. C., October 6, 1920.*

SIR: From time to time, and particularly within the last few decades, a large number of educators and intelligent critics of education from other countries have visited and studied our American schools, usually for the purpose of gaining such information and ideas as would be helpful to them in the improvement of the schools of their country. Many of these have made reports to their home governments containing much valuable criticism of our schools from their points of view. The manuscript transmitted herewith for publication as a bulletin of the Bureau of Education consists of extracts from these reports so organized and arranged as to enable the American reader to get the largest possible value from them at a minimum of time and effort. The comment on the criticism by the author of the manuscript, Mr. W. J. Osburn, of the Department of Education of the State of Wisconsin, gives a fair and helpful interpretation of these criticisms.

It is always good to be able to see ourselves as others see us. The criticisms and excerpts from the reports of these intelligent observers of American schools and educational processes will be especially helpful at this time when all our educational theories and practices are undergoing severe criticism at home and we are trying to reconstruct them to meet the new and growing needs of our democratic society. This bulletin will, I feel sure, constitute a valuable contribution to our literature on education.

Respectfully submitted.

P. P. CLAXTON,
*Commissioner.*

The SECRETARY OF THE INTERIOR.

# FOREIGN CRITICISM OF AMERICAN EDUCATION.

## INTRODUCTION.

The late war has emphasized the fact that the United States is playing, and will continue to play, a leading part in the development of democratic ideals. From a small beginning in 1776, the Nation has grown to vast dimensions. At first the little democracy, hemmed in by two great oceans and busy with the conquest of the wilderness, had little connection with the remainder of the world. Entangling alliances with Europe were avoided, and our country was left to work out its own destiny. Our experience in self-government appealed strongly, however, to the oppressed peoples of Europe, and a constant stream of immigrants, which represented the most vital elements of European life and civilization, kept pouring in upon our shores. As the struggle for existence became less acute, as means of transportation were improved and as new inventions were discovered, the isolation of America diminished. The culmination of the process came during the war with Germany. Henceforth the United States, willingly or unwillingly, must take its place as a leader in the forward movement of the world, and particularly in the social reorganization which the war has made necessary. Such a task requires an accurate balance between social stability and social progress.

Social stability is the result of cherishing old ideals, while social progress can come only through a diversity of viewpoint. Truth is many-sided. No one nation can see all sides of it, but a combination of judgments from representatives of several countries contributes greatly to clearness of vision. It is, therefore, desirable and advantageous to know what other nations think of us. The purpose of this study is to gather this information with reference to our educational system.

In such a task certain limitations are necessarily involved. In the first place, the evidence is based largely upon individual opinions, and it is only natural that many of our critics, unfamiliar as they are with the details of our national life, are wrong in the inferences which they draw. None of them can possibly understand us thoroughly, and most of them base their judgments upon what they saw during relatively short visits in this country which were of necessity restricted to local and sometimes atypical areas. Nothing approach-

ing a scientific survey of conditions as they exist here has ever been attempted by foreign visitors.

On the other hand, while it is true that individual opinions will vary, the central tendencies of two hundred such observers is likely to be near the truth. The local character of the observations is largely counterbalanced by the fact that the underlying ideals and methods of procedure have been fairly constant everywhere. Thus while few of the visitors got as far west as the Pacific States, the localities which they did visit are in a large measure representative of the country as a whole. The quotations have been restricted so as to include only the opinions of highly qualified men and women who were occupying important positions as educators in their own countries. Many of them were representatives delegated by their governments to study our educational system. The most extensive body of criticism is the Report of the Mosely Education Commission, which was sent from England with instructions to find out to what extent our commercial prosperity has been due to our educational system. Much of the criticism of our universities comes from French university professors who have done exchange work in this country, while a particularly valuable type of criticism is given by three men who came as immigrants and have remained in the United States as educators.

While the documents which have been studied are confined for the most part to those produced by French, English, and German observers, it should be remembered that the ideals of these three countries are typical to a large degree of those of the rest of the western world.

An effort has been made to give the background upon which the observers based their criticisms. This has seemed advisable on the theory that the criticism given would naturally center around those features of our system which were markedly better or at least markedly different from the corresponding features in the native country of the person giving the observations.

An effort has also been made to show the growth of our system during the period since 1850 as it is reflected in the criticism. A bibliography of works cited in the text is appended to this bulletin.

# Chapter I.

## AMERICAN EDUCATIONAL PHILOSOPHY.

The educational system of any nation is closely related to the ideals of that nation. Therefore, all who would understand American education must study American ideals: and all criticism of American education must be considered in the light, both of American ideals and of the ideals of the nation which is represented in the criticism. The ideals upon which the American system of education rests are well portrayed in the work of De Tocqueville, provided some allowances are made for the changes which have occurred since his time. The keynote of his criticism is the assumption that all men are created equal in every respect. While this assumption is unwarranted, his work is valuable because he enumerates certain ideals of democracy which he proceeds to explain in terms of his fundamental thesis. Furthermore, this principle of equality, at least in its political sense is still looked upon as fundamental in democratic nations. De Tocqueville ([24][1] Vol. II, Chapter I) summarizes American philosophy as follows:

> To evade the bondage of system and habit, of family maxims, class opinions, and to some degree of national prejudices. To accept tradition only as a means of information and existing facts only as a lesson to be used in doing otherwise and doing better. To seek the reason of things for oneself and in oneself alone; to tend to results without being bound to means, and to aim at substance through form.

According to De Tocqueville, American belief in equality leads to a lack of regard for ancestors, since ancestral opinions and methods of procedure are based upon an intelligence and knowledge which is in no way superior to that possessed by those who belong to the present generation. The idea of equality leads also to better acquaintance among men since social barriers do not exist. Each man feels that his own opinion is as good as that of his neighbor, and each man tends to decide things for himself. Expert authority is looked upon with disfavor. On the other hand, the span of human life is so short and time is so fleeting that no one man can think out all things for himself. The best that he can do is to assume most of the things which he believes and build his own thought system

[1] The numbers in brackets throughout the text refer to the numbered items of the bibliography.

upon that basis. It thus happens that amid the utmost diversity which is to be found in the United States there are certain fundamental beliefs which are present in every village and hamlet, and in the cabin of every pioneer. Like-mindedness and individualism exist side by side, the one leading toward stability and the other toward change. To establish a proper balance between these two forces is the problem of government, as it exists in every form of human society. If it is assumed that men are not equal politically, it follows that the small social class which is looked upon as the best and the fittest must rule while the majority of the people are compelled, by force or indoctrination, to follow. This idea was held by many of the colonists at the time of the formation of the Union. The people who lived near the Atlantic seaboard in the early days were suspicious of popular government while the pioneers who had pressed inward were generally in favor of a more popular form of control. The present Constitution represents a compromise between these two opposing points of view. The principle of equality emerged slowly and it is only in very recent times that political equality even has been fully recognized.

The democratic conception of government which finally prevailed was based upon the principle of equality. It places the sovereignty in the hands of the majority. It is asserted that there is more intelligence in a number of men united than in any single individual and that the number of legislators and voters is more important than their quality. It also follows that the interests of the many are to be preferred to those of a few. All of this is diametrically opposed to the guiding principles of despotic societies. As a natural result we find marked evidences of lack of understanding and sympathy in most of the criticisms coming from autocratic countries like Germany, while critics from democratic England understand us quite well.

A further outgrowth of the doctrine of equality, according to De Tocqueville, is the conception of the "indefinite perfectibility of man." In aristocracies the essential characteristic is the idea of class. The limits to which any individual may improve are definitely fixed within the social stratum of which he is a member. Within those limits he can rise but not beyond them. In democratic societies, in theory at least, no limit of improvement is recognized. No condition is looked upon as a final state. There is always a possibility of further activity and further growth. Whatever is done is looked upon only as a makeshift which shall serve its purpose only until a better solution of the problem is discovered. This doctrine likewise met with strong opposition in the early days. Politically, the struggle centered around the question of the interpretation of the

Constitution. In this conflict the forces favoring stability prevailed to such an extent that it is still quite difficult to amend the Constitution. The tendency, however, has been in general toward the policy of loose constructionism.

De Tocqueville was also strongly impressed with the rather pronounced tendency of America toward mediocrity. He is inclined to attribute the cause of this to our boundless economic opportunity. He thinks that supernormal achievement is largely the result of meditation and leisure, but the economic opportunity is so great that few Americans have time to meditate long enough to get interested in the pursuit of truth for its own sake. In the practical application of truth and in the discovery of principles of immediate practical utility the Americans excel. Hence we find great American inventors, but almost no great scholars, poets, artists, or authors.

Seventy years after De Tocqueville's work was published, Hugo Münsterberg wrote a statement of another ideal which is back of the American Constitution. He says ([68], p. 457):

> The end of all social striving [in America] is the happiness of individuals. That is positivism—reality based upon that which is.

Contrasting this with idealism based upon what *ought* to be, he writes:

> The first philosophy assumes that the purpose of man is to be pleased, the second, that his purpose is to do his duty. Knowledge is not for the pleasure of individuals but for the realization of ideals.

He calls attention to the fact that American ideals had their origin in the philosophy of enlightenment which centered in France during the early part of the eighteenth century. He believes that the meaning of life lies not in the greatest pleasure for the greatest number but in the realization of eternal ideals. What Münsterberg calls the greatest pleasure for the greatest number is evidently the same thing which De Tocqueville calls the "love of easy access and present enjoyment," and which he classes as a secondary characteristic due to environment. Instances are plentiful which go to show that the American people are capable of sacrificing their love of present enjoyment and can achieve notable success in the realization of ideals. The conflict between the two viewpoints, however, is none the less a real one and is the key to one phase of American education which will be considered further in later chapters.

It is noticeable that Münsterberg says nothing about equality. This is due partly to the fact that the term is foreign to German thought and partly to the fact that the progress of science since De Tocqueville's day has proved that men are not created equal. It has become necessary, therefore, to state our philosophy in more

modern terms. The best effort toward such a statement by a foreign critic is that of Shadwell ([83], p. 379): "The fundamental principle of national education in America is equality of opportunity and grows out of the American democratic spirit." He thinks that the school is the chief stronghold and perhaps the last hope of this spirit because, "the home and church are visibly disintegrating and the State * * * well—no one pretends that public life any more than private is moving toward the ideal of democracy." The truth is, of course, that absolute equality of opportunity is almost as impossible as the older doctrine of equality. Yet the American people stand for it and strive toward it as an ideal. Shadwell believes that they look to the school with faith and hope tempered with no little misgiving. Thus the school comes to be identified with democracy, and it is here that we find the cause of the keen interest in education, which is the thing that is commented upon by practically every foreigner who visits our country.

The interest of the American people in education is such a prominent element in the criticism of so great a number of foreign critics that it is worth while to see what evidence they produce to show that America has such an interest, and has it to such an unusual degree. The critics themselves seem to consider this point important and several of them have gone into the matter in some detail. The most important type of evidence presented is the amount of money spent upon education, particularly with reference to the provision of buildings and equipment. According to our critics, America has the finest and best-equipped schoolhouses in the world. The following is one of the more conservative statements as given by Wallage ([88], p. 106):

> Everywhere one finds splendidly built and splendidly planned schoolhouses. Each city, yes, each village—even the smallest in the land—vies with its neighbors in the erection of up-to-date structures, and one seeks to surpass the other in new and more practical reforms. They gladly pay right large costs and without a murmur give to education more than any other country in the world * * *. It is, in general, a striking characteristic of the American people to appropriate splendid sums of money for the erection and maintenance of schoolhouses and school equipment.

Such a statement becomes more significant when we remember that Wallage is a German. Germany has had better school buildings than either England or France, and the Germans have been educated to believe that their country excels in every respect. Such a complimentary criticism is rather unusual on the part of a German critic.

Another phase of American educational life which has been pointed to as indicative of American belief and interest in education is the practice of giving large sums for the endowment of educational

institutions. This type of activity seemed to appeal particularly to those who visited this country during the eighties and nineties. These critics argue that wealthy men would not give their money to endow schools if they did not thoroughly believe in the value of education. That business men believe in the work of the schools is shown in the fact that they are anxious to get university and high-school men to take positions with them. The day of the self-made man is passing, and the college and university graduates are in great demand. The business man feels that the schools are giving a training which helps to prepare his employees for their work.

Such belief in education is not confined to those who are wealthy. It shows itself as a general tendency in the remarkable fact that local communities are glad to vote generous taxes for school support. More remarkable still is the fact that men who own property and have no children are, nevertheless, willing to pay taxes in order to educate the children of other people. To many of our critics the free school system, especially the free secondary schools and universities based upon local taxation imposed by the people upon themselves, seem nothing less than a marvel. They argue that such a practice can be explained only upon the basis of a profound belief of all the people in the value of education.[2]

Our visitors are also strongly impressed by the sacrifices which are made by both parents and pupils in order that the latter may remain in school. The idea of parents willingly denying themselves the luxuries of life in order to provide for the education of their children is to them an enigma. Still more strange to them is the fact that boys and even girls will and can "work their way" while in school. Part of their bewilderment is of course due to the fact that the caste system is largely missing in this country. This makes it possible for boys and girls to wait upon tables, wash windows, and perform the types of unskilled labor which is performed in Europe only by the servant class and still retain the respect and even the admiration of their fellow students. The foreigners can explain this only in terms of a popular belief in education and the general principle of equality. Such a thing is unheard of in Europe, and therefore it is argued that it must be due to principles and beliefs which are unique. The interest of the young in education is shown also by the tremendous increase of attendance at high schools of all kinds and in the marked growth in the number of such institutions. The large attendance at evening schools is also mentioned in this connection.

[2] It is doubtless true that many of our visitors have not realized the long struggle which was necessary in order to bring this condition about. The policy of free education, particularly on the secondary level, has met with strong opposition. But even so, the battle has been won, and in this respect America is in advance of the nations of Europe.

Evidence of the general belief in education is also found in the attitude of the teachers. They are generally enthusiastic and industrious in everything which leads toward improvement. A limited amount of the criticism deals with our teachers' associations. For the most part it is favorable. Barneaud ([3], p. 21) says:

> The work in the association [N. E. A.] presents an interest more lively because membership in it is optional only and because its work is not at all possible in any other country.

Fitch ([31], p. 104) says:

> The American National Educational Association is the British Association raised to the third or fourth power.

The strong influence of the American teachers' organizations upon school procedure and upon the public sentiment is thought to be due to the unusual educational interest in education of both teachers and general public.

A further example of such an interest is said to be furnished by the amount and character of our educational literature.[1]

The attendance of American teachers at summer schools is also a source of wonder in this connection. They consider the American teacher to be thoroughly awake and alive to every means of self-improvement. Our visitors also note with much approval the evidences of educational interest which are shown in many of our daily papers. The existence of educational departments in such papers is looked upon as indubitable evidence of the general interest in education on the part of the readers.

The American people are not only interested in education, but they are interested in the public schools. The critics are impressed by the frequency with which parents visit the schools, and by the number of parent-teachers' associations. Such is the view of the majority of the observers. But there is a minority which is inclined to take an opposite point of view.

The criticism of Langlois ([51], p. 128 and ff.) is interesting in this connection. While he recognizes the fact that Americans spend a great deal of money upon education, he doubts that this is first-class evidence of their interest. He points out that while America has some splendid schoolhouses, she also has many, particularly in the rural districts—

> which are far from satisfying the most modest requirements. Wealthy men give great sums to endow and build school palaces, but the teachers are poorly paid. Consequently, there is a shortage of teachers and many of the finest buildings are badly overcrowded.

If the wealthy men were really interested in education, he thinks, they would spend their money where it is most needed.

---

[1] See also Chap. III, p. 61.

Having denied that the great educational endowments are due to the interest of the donors in education he involves a theory of his own to explain their motive in the matter. He thinks that America, being a young nation, is passing through a stage of development which Europe passed through during the latter part of the Middle Ages. Then great amounts were given to endow the various religious and educational foundations, and the motive was to provide for the future welfare of the donor. So in America in a similar stage of development we find large gifts which serve to construct a monument to the donor so that his name will be known and remembered by future generations.

He sees a similar parallelism from also another point of view. The time when the educational foundations of the Middle Ages were being established was also the time of beggar students who begged and worked for their living; so to-day in America, in the most richly endowed universities, poor students are compelled to work their way.

> University pauperism (among students) is not so much a sign of popular enthusiasm for science as the mark of a defective and barbarous education. For a student to work his way may be an honor to him, but not to the system which forces him to do it. The universities should provide scholarships for all such students (p. 137).

The inference seems to be that the wealthy would provide such scholarships if they were really interested in education. He concludes that the practice of endowing schools is due partly to a desire on the part of wealthy men to imitate the nobility of Europe, partly to personal vanity, and mostly to obscure social forces which come to the surface and become the symptoms of a certain stage of social growth through which each nation must pass. He thinks that a day will come when the practice of endowing schools and the presence of pauper students will be only memory in America.

Such a point of view is of interest, coming as it does from a man of such high standing at Langlois, but it is hardly fit evidence for the case in point. It is rather fanciful to compare American civilization with that of medieval Europe in such a manner. Some endowments may have been due partly to personal vanity, but it is very doubtful if any of them are due to a desire to imitate the nobility of Europe. But even with these admissions, there is nothing to show that our wealthy men have not been interested in education. The presence of poor students is not good evidence, because many of these students prefer to work their way, and it may even be best for them to do so. In order to prove the point it would also be necessary to show that the wealthy men are unwilling to help such students. Langlois has clearly failed to understand the spirit of America in this connection. America believes that all who are really worthy of a higher education will possess the initiative and

energy to get it in spite of financial handicaps. In recent times, however, the unequal distribution of wealth and the rise in the cost of living are developing a new side to the question. The United States must soon face the question as to whether as a nation it can afford to allow highly intelligent young people to work under such a handicap. There is a growing feeling that such a policy involves a dangerous waste in the country's most precious resources. The day is surely approaching when worthy students will be educated at public expense.

Several critics call attention to what seems to be a curious anomaly in connection with American interest in education. Grasby ([37], p. 23) says:

> It is odd, I think, that * * * in the National City, grand in its proportions, with its marble edifices, its palatial and sumptuous offices, unsurpassed by those of any capital in the world, the just pride of over 60 millions of the freest people under the sun * * * that the Bureau of Education is permitted to be the worst accommodated of any Government department.

In regard to our lack of a national university, he says:

> To disregard the fervent wishes and wise admonitions of noble men, while employing sculptors' aid to perpetuate their memories, to march in triumphal procession and listen to fervid orations in honor of their doings on the Fourth of July, and for the remaining 364 days of the year pay no heed to their advice is so unlike the usual practical wisdom of the American people that such an exception is the more remarkable.

Here again there is a lack of understanding on the part of the critic. The real cause of the condition which Grasby points out is the fear of bureaucracy and of domination by central authority. The American people are interested in education, but not in centralized control.

The conclusion growing out of the combined criticisms seems to be that the American people have a very general and very unusual interest in education, but that it manifests itself unevenly and in a manner that is unwise, or at least inequitable. The reason for this lack of equity is not suggested. Possibly it may be explained by the fact that the American people are not yet fully conscious of their educational philosophy. They have strong beliefs, but these beliefs have not yet reached the stage of rationalization. Public sentiment is not yet fully awakened, particularly in the rural districts. Doubtless there are still remnants of the *laissez faire* policy in some places. On the whole, America believes in equality of educational opportunity, but many of our people do not yet understand the full implications of that term. Interest in education is often present, while the knowledge of what to do and how to do it is still lacking. There is a more or less blind impulse to do the right thing, but rational aims and conscious guiding principles are needed.

American educational procedure is still in the making. It has many imperfections, but it is free to grow and improve. With growth in centralized control and improved means of communication, injustice in educational affairs will gradually disappear.

Assuming the existence of a profound interest in education, what are the causes which lie back of it? Langlois ([51], p. 99) suggests the following:

> (1) A general realization that a people who govern themselves must be educated.
> (2) The necessity of education in the assimilation of foreign people.
> (3) The idea that each person has the right to make the most of himself.
> (4) The effort to prevent the rise of a caste system.

Hausknecht ([42], p. 1) in this connection mentions, (5) "The unbounded possibilities which each individual in America possesses." Barclay, in the Mosely Report ([66], p. 398) gives, (6) "The desire to insure adaptability."

Buisson ([10], p. 1) mentions, (7) "The influence of Protestantism."

All of these causes fit in well with the outlines of American philosophy as given earlier in this chapter. The doctrine of equality involves universal suffrage, which in turn necessitates a general education for all, if it is to be safe. While the doctrine of individual perfectibility calls for provisions that will enable each person to make the most out of his opportunities, the "tendency to seek the reason of things in one's self and for one's self alone," is the essence of Protestantism.

These causes are typical of those given by other critics and they imply all that is mentioned in this connection. Ravenhill ([72], p. 407) prefers to state the first one in terms of general welfare, which agrees more closely with the doctrine of positivism. The same critic states the third cause in the more modern term of "self-realization." Schmidhofer ([82], p. 46) summarizes American interest in education by saying:

> The conviction has developed that for the schools and the youth the best is just good enough, while in many localities of the Old World the idea prevails that for the schools the worst is too good.

As a natural result of the American interest and belief in education, several critics notice an unusual type of energy and enterprise. Rathbone, in the Mosely Report ([66], p. 256), says:

> I was much struck with the energy, enterprise, boundless hopefulness, consciousness of power, resourcefulness, adaptability, and above all rapidity and decision of the people with which they endeavor to supply deficiencies and meet modern requirements.

In comparing the education of America with that of Germany and England, Sadler ([78], p. 457) says:

> There is a wonderful keenness and "go" in American education. Germany can not rival America in vigor and enthusiasm. It is the atmosphere of American life which permeates American schools and makes men and boys more adaptable than they are here (in England). We get into grooves more than the Americans do and stick there. * * * The German has methodical perseverance, scientific precision, and patient forethought; the American, unresting activity, brilliant dash, and intellectual ingenuity.

Some of our critics think that we have too much energy. They see a tendency toward hurrying which is objectionable. Mark ([65], p. 258) believes that American educators should infuse all the pulse-steadying influences which they command into the schools as an offset to the restless individuality. Papillon ([66], p. 246) sees an American inventiveness and energy which England does not possess, but calls attention to the danger of hurry and overpressure.

Rowley ([66], p. 345) thinks that solid education and workmanship are suffering from the same cause.

> As a result, the products in the arts and crafts lack real originality in design, in ornament, in anything where the brain and hand and higher emotions work together. * * * Raw utility comes into glaring evidence.

All of this is but another evidence of the American tendency toward achievement rather than toward meditation. Energy and enterprise are invaluable, but like all other good things they may be overdone. There is always danger that what is gained in speed may be lost in power. One problem of American education is to guard against a misuse of the tremendous power which resides in our people.

Like all other forces it must be controlled and guided if it is to be useful.

## ASSIMILATING THE IMMIGRANT.

One of the most remarkable phases of our education as shown in the criticisms is our success in assimilating the immigrant. All agree that the schools are the great agencies which are achieving this wonderful result. The German critic is particularly interested in this part of our educational achievement. In general the German would much prefer to have the German immigrant keep up his mother tongue and preserve his home traditions. He seems to lament and almost envy our success in the Americanization of the German. His criticism is almost a complaint. Thus Walther ([89] p. 22), who is particularly unsympathetic toward American ideals, says:

> It is wonderful that in spite of all the different races which the immigrants represent they are in a short time welded together in the great melting pot into a

united mass, and very shortly feel themselves to be free Americans. In a correspondingly short time they also come to look upon the English language as their mother tongue.

Other German critics seem to feel that this process can not be real. Leubner ([58], p. 15) says:

All the hosts of polyglot immigrants become welded in a very short time into a people which is, at least outwardly, homogeneous.

Griebsch ([39], p. 598) wonders if a national consciousness can really be built up in such a conglomerate of races. He is inclined to think that such a result is possible because—

America offers freedom in its business, social, political, and religious sense to the immigrants from every nation. The key to the system is a free people in a free country.

Klemm ([48], p. 40) thinks that the American emphasis on education as nationalization is due to the presence of the immigrants. He believes that the—

Anglo-Americans were not at first conscious of this task. For 200 years the colonists neglected the schools * * *. Only in the middle of the nineteenth century did they recognize the part which the schools were to play in the assimilating process * * *. The social equality of all the pupils, rich and poor, commended itself to the immigrants, who had been compelled to suffer from the effects of European class prejudice. In short, the schools won the confidence of the immigrant and kept it.

The nationalization process assumes still greater importance when we recall with Buisson ([10], p. 4) that the original Anglo-Saxon stock is disappearing. Thus, if our ideals are to be preserved the task of seeing that this is done will fall upon the children of the immigrant.

Buisson, with many others, calls attention to the fact that all of our hopes of education as nationalization are endangered by the disturbing influence of politics. His conclusions are that more and more money must be spent upon education if our ideals are to survive

By educating the new generations in the best manner, by giving everywhere the education which is suited to free men to children of the lowest social strata, they will little by little lessen the number of intriguers and dupes. This idea is one form of American patriotism.

On page 15 attention was called to the fact that American ideals are in the process of emerging upon the level of nationalization. Further evidence of this fact appears in connection with the criticism concerning citizenship and nationalization. Griebsch ([39], p. 600) says:

The Americans are in development at the stage of a grown young man in the fullness of his strength, who does not yet know how to use this strength with measure and discretion, who often, in spite of the best purposes, overshoots the mark and throws to the winds the advice of older and more discreet persons. All the powers of the Nation must find a use which will serve the general

welfare. National pride must unite with a consideration of the value of other nations and not degenerate, as is so frequently the case, into rudeness, prejudice, injustice, and superficiality. To offset these things is the chief duty of the American school. The school must make the people capable of acting in accordance with their claim that they have a government of the people, by the people, and for the people. The individual must have a clear judgment in order to participate in the government. He must learn to place his powers in the service of society.

In similar vein, Shadwell ([83], p. 383) says:

I do not find evidence of any clear or general conception of what education should be in the United States beyond the general principle of equality of opportunity. * * *. There is a lack of uniformity even in the provision of free education. (The length of the school sessions varies so that some children get better opportunities than others.) Beyond this the only general conception is a vague idea that school is necessary for producing good American citizens.

It is doubtless true that American education has shown some "adolescent" characteristics, and doubtless some national ideals are still almost entirely in the subconscious stage. The fact of most transcendent importance is that growth is taking place and that the avenues for growth are open. The growth of our pedagogical literature and of the great educational and popular self-consciousness is necessarily slow and is still far from complete. Such growth in regard to the ideals of citizenship and nationalization has doubtless been greatly accelerated by the late war. Hippeau pointed out in 1870 ([44], p. 3):

Before a citizen puts his talents into the service of his country, the country on its part must furnish to the children the means of acquiring the greatest amount of talents and aptitudes in order to be able to accomplish this duty. The American Constitution, seeing in public education a great national interest, has taken care to assure to the central government the right of protection and guardianship over the schools by means of funds for their maintenance.* Public education conforms to democratic principles to which everything is subordinated in this most free country in the world. Its purpose is training in citizenship. The minimum of education can not be less than the instruction which every man must possess in order to fulfill his duties toward society and to the State as juryman, witness, and citizen * * *; intelligent participation in everything which is of interest in municipal or national affairs and the ability to acquit himself in the obligations which are imposed upon one who possesses a portion of the national sovereignty.

Laveleye ([56], p. 337) says:

The American believes that the safety of society and the future of democracy depends upon the diffusion of instruction in all the ranks of the people.

The English critics note the same tendency and point out the fact that America has abandoned the older *laissez-faire* policy. Sadler ([78], p. 218) points out the early conflict between the New England

* The American Constitution does not provide a school fund. Such funds have been established by congressional enactments.

educational policy and the Virginia policy. That conflict terminated in the victory for the former. Therefore those who study American education must look to New England for the sources of the movement.

## EXTENT OF EDUCATION.

A great amount of comment centers around the fact that education has been extended to all. There is no greater attraction for our visitors than the sight of the children of the "rich and poor sitting on the same school benches."

The cause of such an unheard-of practice is clearly due, at least in part, to the constantly growing feeling that universal education is necessary to the perpetuation of the Nation.

Some critics, however, think that universal education has its drawbacks. Brereton ([8], p. 29) believes that equality of opportunity may possibly become undesirable in that it does not provide sufficiently for the elimination of the unfit.

> Should America persist in her splendid endeavor to give each child that stays in her schools a general education, the question naturally arises, Is she not in the long run likely to raise up that undesirable hybrid that other nations have produced, * * * a literary proletariat?

This criticism was written at a time when the openings for educated people in France were rather restricted, particularly in commerce and industry, and Brereton fears that the schools may produce more liberally educated people than are needed in life outside of the school. One can hardly imagine such a condition in the United States.

Some of the German critics see a danger of mediocrity in this connection. Thus Dunker ([29], p. 42) says:

> The Americans become patriotic citizens and captains of industry, but they must call on the Germans to do the skilled workmanship.

In another place ([29], p. 35) he intimates that the American type of universal education produces a sort of superficiality:

> There is a devout optimism, harmless dilletantism, and generous good will, but a lack of solidarity of detail. The German ideal is higher and therefore aristocratic, since only a few can attain it.

Böttger, another German ([5], p. 21), says:

> In America they look upon the raising of the ability of the average man as their aim, while in Germany the main purpose is to enable the best to come to a full development. The American system involves unsuspected dangers. For example, if the measure of requirements is set too low it will favor the invasion of the learned callings by those who are less able.

These two criticisms emphasize a fundamental difference between the ideals of democracy and those of aristocracy. Both recognize

that growth and progress are not to be had without a price. They must always be paid for in terms of sacrifice. Disagreement, however, arises as to who should make the sacrifice. America considers education as the inalienable right of every child. Germany prefers the higher education of the few only. In America the original ideal was that of equality—a doctrine which is invariably opposed by those whose ideals are an outgrowth of the class system. This is an old and fundamental difference of opinion, and will in all probability persist for an indefinite time to come. Stated in the terms of modern science the question becomes: Shall a nation sacrifice the interests of the lower fourths of the intelligence distribution to the interests of the upper quartile, or should the upper and lower portions each be neglected for the welfare of the larger middle portion? Democracy prefers the welfare of the greatest number even at the risk of superficiality and mediocrity. This is not to admit that leadership and genius are impossible in a democracy. It only means that they may be neglected. While it is true that America did call upon Germany for skilled workmen and that our talented pupils have been neglected, this is only an evidence of the fact that the interests of the majority must take precedence over those of the minority in point of time. As soon as the majority are taken care of, attention will turn toward the needs and rights of the minority. In fact, there are evidences at hand to show that this adjustment is actually occurring and that the Americans are becoming increasingly conscious of the existence and needs of both the subnormal and the supernormal. Democracy, and the education which makes it possible, are worth all that they cost. America is right in insisting upon a free liberal education for all, since each person is to be a citizen and a voter.

## INDIVIDUALISM OF AMERICA.

Thus far the criticism of American education has dealt mainly with the point of view of social welfare. But there is another side. America is a land of strong individualism. This has resulted partly from the doctrine of equality and partly from the environment. The first has already been discussed (p. 2 ff.). As to the second, it is evident that the pioneer who lives far from the haunts of other men must develop strongly those qualities which lead to survival when such survival depends largely upon one's own initiative, resourcefulness, and courage. Quick decision and resolute action often won the day when the pioneer was compelled to fight for his life against savage animals and men. It was natural, therefore, that he should wish his children to develop the qualities that were of

such signal service to him. This ideal soon spread from the home to the school. It has been one of the first things to attract the attention of the visitors from Europe. Mark ([63], p. 27) says:

> The key word of the new aim is to train the individual will to recognize and respond sympathetically to the larger will of society. This, in a word, is the doctrine of individualism as accepted by the leading American educators.

Such will training results from the formation of correct habits. If the people are to be capable of self-direction when free to act, situations must be provided in which the children may practice free choice. Initiative must be stimulated, the personality of the child must be respected, and freedom must be accorded to him. If he misuses his freedom he must suffer the consequences. Some of the critics understand this situation. Thus Passy ([71], p. 146) says:

> The young people must learn to conduct themselves, to use the freedom which they will have later on. If certain faults are developed by this régime of independence, so much the worse. A presumptuous, peremptory, rash, disrespectful child is worth more than one whose will has been broken. If there are those who can not have freedom without making a bad use of it, so much the worse. All that can be done is to point out, make them feel, the sad consequences of their manner of acting. Whether or not they accept the suggestions is their own affair. One can not sacrifice the welfare of the great number who profit by this freedom. The school must furnish the armor necessary for the struggle of life and show how to use it for the best. If there are those who prefer to use it badly, the school is not responsible.

In another connection (p. 143) Passy says:

> A quite characteristic trait of moral education in the United States is the confidence which they show in the pupils * * *. In everything they assume as certain, until proved to the contrary, that the pupils can not lie nor deceive.

In contrasting the ideals of America with those of Austria, Schmidhofer ([82], p. 58) says that in Austria—

> The child is an inferior being, whose thinking, feeling, and willing is entirely dependent upon parents and teachers, * * * but America is the land in which the basic ideal is that children are creatures possessing a free will and are not merely inconvenient burdens and playthings to be supported by parents.

Sadler ([76], p. 131) says:

> The striking things in American education are not its curricula, but its point of view and attitude of mind. Its aim is to develop individuality through discipline in the common schools. It derives its extraordinary influence from the fervent faith which inspires it.

The foregoing statements are typical of the general trend of opinion among our observers. They point out some rather well-marked tendencies. America, in general, believes in respecting the personality of the child and in permitting free play to his spontane-

ous activity, so far as it is consistent with the rights of others to do so; but nothing is permitted which interferes with the welfare of the majority. Beyond that boundary American individualism is not permitted to go. The children themselves seldom wish to go thus far when they truly understand the situation. There is also a strong tendency away from the old notion of total depravity. It is no longer considered that children are "little vipers" whose every movement should be repressed. It is thought better to develop the instincts of the child through properly guided activity. Children are not diamonds in the rough which need polishing; they are not mere containers waiting to be stuffed with knowledge, but they are living beings possessing talents which must be developed and rights which must be respected.

Some of the critics, however, are opposed to the idea of respecting the personality of the child. They believe that the game is not worth the candle. This is particularly true of the German observers. Thus Dulon ([28], p. 273) says:

> The American child shows a lack of discipline. He is arrogant and presumptuous. Accusation, slander, denunciation of misdemeanors committed is a choice activity. I never saw children more zealous nor more inclined to exaggeration on the one hand, and arguing and denial on the other. There is a lack of respect of elders. The American child knows nothing of the bashfulness, attention, modesty, and reserve of the German child. He is not sensitive of beauty, art, science, and the love of truth * * *. He shows obedience to the teacher no further than the door of the schoolhouse or no further than the eye or the stick of the teacher extends. The discipline desires superficiality, commands superficiality, and punishes superficialities. Hence it can only attain superficiality.

It must be remembered, however, that Dulon is writing of the United States at a time when it was made up largely of pioneers and when individualism was naturally strong. Such schools doubtless still exist in remote regions, but not generally. The change which has taken place is reflected in the following criticism of Griebsch ([39], p. 615):

> The tendency of the American educational system to remain entirely superficial and to be satisfied with outward appearances is noticeable in the discipline. The uninitiated person upon entering the school will be astonished at the ideal order which prevails. With machine like punctuality and exactness every movement of the classes or of individual pupils takes place. Yet this discipline does not exercise the expected influence upon the growing character of the pupil. He is under constant watch and behaves either from compulsion or for a reward. His education in moral freedom is not furthered, and in spite of such showy discipline he knows not the respect for authority nor the honor due his elders. This lack is reflected in the indifference and disdain for authority in civil life which is the most dangerous obstacle in the way of the healthy national development.

Clasen ([16], p. 353) says:

> The apparent and recognized individualism and impudence of the American child betrays an indifference concerning the real demands of home discipline and parental responsibility.

The substance of the three criticisms seems to be that American children are not obedient or reserved. They are lacking in respect and modesty. These statements are, undoubtedly true when one compares the American children with those of Germany, France, and England. But, as has been already suggested, America prefers to sacrifice blind obedience in order to gain alertness, initiative, and self-control. This means that it is better to allow some children to seem impudent and disrespectful if the plan is successful in general. It may be true, as Griebsch suggests, that the innate individualism breaks loose in some children when they get out of sight of the teacher, yet this does not prove the American system bad as a whole. American children are orderly when it is necessary for the general welfare that they should be so. This is not superficiality. To do otherwise would mean to develop a subdued and broken-willed type of child, a forerunner of adults who would be a menace to American institutions. It would mean a nation of people who might be very efficient in obedience to authority but utterly helpless as citizens constituting the sovereignty of the American Nation.

The doctrine of individualism requires that each child be taught to reason things out for himself. But Beck ([4], p. 128) points out that young children are not capable of reasoning and concludes that—

> Since reason is lacking in the pupil, he can not understand things on that basis. Thus a teacher who has once begun the practice of appealing to the child's reason must go from bad to worse. He must bring about a situation in which the will of the pupil is the thing that counts.

Beck, however, overlooks some important facts. If the child is permitted to use his reason under the right conditions, he will rapidly improve his ability in that respect. Then, too, why should not the will of the child be the thing that counts, provided that the child has had proper training in deciding things for himself? Finally, Beck forgets that children whose rational and volitional powers are undeveloped may be easily controlled through suggestion. They have continually before them the example of their older comrades. The skillful teacher reinforces this example by pointing out that the students in the upper grades do so and so, at the same time appealing to the higher thought and volitional powers of the little ones so far as this is possible. In all probability, the orderly pupils whom Greibsch accused of superficiality were orderly because

they wanted to be and not because they were afraid not to be, or because they were hoping for a reward. Order can exist independently of blind obedience, but not among those who have been trained to look upon obedience as the one cardinal virtue.

Beck ([4], p. 128) also objects to individualism and respect for personality because it sometimes leads to the parade of the child's virtues.

> The idea that * * * whatever the child does should be exhibited seems to me to be like the public dance and the rubrics for children in the newspapers, merely the crying of market wares which destroys the modesty of the youth which should be the true atmosphere of his development.

Here again it is a question of paying the price for a desirable thing. Young children are all inclined to be individualistic and self-centered. The German would utterly suppress this tendency, while the American simply allows its exercise but redirects it and saves it as a basis for the self-confidence which is so valuable for the American citizen.

While the practice of respecting the personality of the child involves paying a price—even a high price—yet it is worth all that it costs. It is perhaps our most cherished ideal. Bain ([2], p. 29) says:

> The station of no child can be predicted in a country where all boys are potential Presidents and all girls potential Presidents' wives, and where all are regarded as entitled to an equal opportunity of making the best of his or her own individual life. The aim of American education is therefore to discover the natural bent of each boy or girl and to develop it to the utmost.

Rathbone, in the Mosely report ([66], p. 261), says:

> To encourage self-government, self-expression, and self-activity is the constant aim—sometimes it may be to an extent which may leave little room for the cultivation of modesty and reverence. * * * There is no other department in which we have so much to learn from America as from this new spirit of school discipline.

Mark ([63], p. 108) says:

> The American schools aim distinctly at individuality, but it is an individuality tempered and enlarged by social conditions and social needs. Freedom without license, movement without disorder, ease without idleness, represent the American standard of discipline.

Sadler ([76], p. 130) says:

> American education derives its greatest strength, not from its technical aim, but from the fact that it is animated by an intense and indeed religious belief in the rightness of giving to every boy and girl in the community, as far as possible, an equal chance to make the most of his or her natural powers. This is the real secret of the immense force of American education.

The last three criticisms are from the nation which undoubtedly understands us best. Each of them is based upon a profound respect

for the individual. Without such a respect the criticisms would have been impossible. They therefore serve as a fitting conclusion to the discussion of individualism and respect for personality as elements of the American educational ideal.

## THE IDEA OF LIBERTY.

In the discussions of equality and respect for personality, much has already been said concerning freedom. In the Declaration of Independence liberty was given the same rank with equality. It is undoubtedly a fundamental part of our philosophy, and its influence will be particularly marked in the criticism considered in Chapter II. It is worth while, however, to mention one criticism here as a type of what our visitors have to say in this regard. Buyse ([13], pp. 8–9) says:

> We wish our children to be obedient and disciplined while the Americans * * * wish, before all, young people of initiative, independent, and self confident. They willingly support the caprice and almost tyranny of the children to attain this end. At school, one has the impression that the pupils are leading the teacher. The young Yankees have not the humble and servile attitude of our children toward those who instruct them * * *. To free the thoughts and feelings from all guardianship, to gradually reduce the rôle of the teacher to the profit of the responsibility of the young man or young women. Such is the purpose of education.
>
> To cause children to act quite freely as if they were alone in the world; to increase the pleasure of effort and the joy in conquest, to secure the possession of self-control * * * such is the high task of the school.

In the performance of this high task, the schools are furnishing an ever-growing realization of the ideals of all the sturdy American patriots who have fought, bled, and died in the cause of human liberty.

Closely connected with the ideals of freedom is the doctrine of indefinite perfectibility, which also implies a strong power of adaptability. If men are to be free to improve themselves they must not be restricted to any one activity. A change from one environment to another must be possible. Barclay, in the Mosely Report ([66], p. 400), says:

> The acquisition of knowledge is becoming of less and less importance as compared with the development of character, health, and adaptability and with the making of handy men and women who can turn themselves to anything.

Rathbone in the same report ([66], p. 262) has the same idea:

> American education aims to give children those qualities which will make them good citizens, competent workers, resourceful, self-reliant and adaptable, good observers, able to record their observations correctly, compare, group, and infer justly from them and express cogently the results of their mental operations. Qualities are stressed more than knowledge.

The inalienable right of the American citizen to self-improvement and growth must not be sacrificed. Freedom of movement from place to place must be safeguarded, and changes of occupation must not be impossible. The power of adaptability is therefore one of our most valuable assets.

Adaptability in the individual is a long step toward the power to cooperate with others. It has been pointed out that while the Americans are strongly individualistic, corporate spirit is not absent. Mark ([64], p. 37) says:

> The prize system is not emphasized because it suggests working against each other rather than together. Children are encouraged to help one another. Cooperative assignments are used. School clubs and organizations are encouraged. Athletics is encouraged because * * * it trains in cooperation. * * * Obedience is based upon the value of community control in social welfare and not upon external control.

Armstrong, in the Mosely Reports ([66], p. 7), says:

> They (Americans) have learned to work together and subordinate their individual opinions to an extent which we have difficulty in believing possible.

All of the Mosely committee agree upon the existence of a cooperative spirit among American teachers.

Burstall, however ([12], p. 38), thinks that—

> Corporate life in the school is not so strong as in the great English public schools. There are no monitors or prefects, who are so important a part of character training with us. Athletics is for the few, not for all, and the need for social life is not well met.

While it would be unwise to attempt to transplant the system of the English public school into this country, yet there is truth in what Miss Burstall says. The lesson of cooperation is a hard one for America to learn. Cooperation does not come naturally to us. This is undoubtedly one of the things which need attention and care on the part of our educational leaders. The powerful belief in majority rule will help, but it must be remembered that the American is by original nature strongly individualistic. To attempt to crush this national tendency would be disastrous. The only hope lies in devising some method of redirecting the individualism in such a way as to keep it from interfering with the growth of the cooperative spirit.

One of the characteristics of American education which grows out of the doctrine of the indefinite perfectibility and which is quite frequently stressed is the fact that it is dynamic. It grows. Gizycki ([26], p. 335) says:

> One of the fundamental conceptions which Anglo-Saxon educators wish above all to inculcate in their pupils is the faith in the progress of humanity, both mentally and morally.

This belief in progress will tolerate no limitations of the caste-system type. There is a tendency to throw tradition overboard: at least there is a searching type of self-criticism which refuses to tolerate old things simply because they are old. Nothing is looked upon as being absolute or final. This is what Sadler calls "unrest in education." In his discussion of this topic ([76], p. 139), he says:

> This power of candid self-criticism, coupled as it is with deep insight into the complex nature of educational problems and with the old hearty and vigorous belief in the efficiency of school training in the building up of a great nation, shows that at no earlier period has there been so powerful and enlightened a movement for educational progress as is stirring the United States at the present time. The most impressive characteristic of the new movement is that it combines frank and searching self-criticism with a deep and unflinching faith in the power of education to mold the future of a great people, and in its being able, while inspiring all with a sense of national unity and collective responsibility, to preserve and strengthen what is best in individual character.

In another connection Sadler ([76], p. 159) comments more specifically on American criticism:

> His (Dr. Dewey's) criticism deepens our sense of the intricate difficulty of the problem of industrial reform. * * * His views are a striking expression of the unrest which is at work in American as in European education. * * * He has thrown into a philosophic form the instincts of a rather leveling democracy as applied to the problem of educational reform. * * * He frankly avows his hostility to the old tradition, social and educational. * * * His argument rests on a very sanguine view of human nature and on the assumption that we can safely cut ourselves off from the wisdom latent in a well-established educational tradition. Like Rousseau, he takes it for granted that men, when liberated from the fetters of tradition, will naturally cooperate with one another in happy and fruitful activities. * * * There rings through all his writings a revolutionary note.

This criticism refers to Dr. Dewey's work in his experimental school at Chicago. It was a type that could scarcely avoid shocking a staid Englishman. If that work was revolutionary it was not dangerously so, as subsequent events have proved. But the main point about the last group of criticisms concerning our great educational philosopher is the fact that his ideas breathe the spirit of progress. The same spirit characterizes American educators in general. They have assumed that educational conditions will change, and upon that basis they have done and will continue to do their work. This work may at times lack ballast but it seldom lacks power. Guided by the lessons of history, but not chained to them, the American educational leaders will turn the immense power of American ideals into the channels which lead to universal civilization in its highest and best sense.

Mention has already been made of the fact that the Americans are preeminently a practical-minded people. The boundless economic

opportunity and the hardships of pioneer life left little time for the pursuit of those things which are not of immediate practical value. Waetzoldt says: "As compared to us (the Germans), they (Americans) lack pensiveness, warmth of feeling, tenderness, childlike simplicity, and do not enjoy the fairy life of imagination and heart. They want quick results." Remington ([73], p. 53) says:

> The word useful is the keynote of American education. It does not aim at making cultured men although it often turns them out by accident; it aims at making successful men. It supplies not frilling, but true foundations. * * * a pickax rather than a silver-mounted walking cane.

According to Mark ([65], p. 104):

> America believes in the principle of learning by doing * * *; that education is life rather than a preparation for life. The hand is the instrument of the brain.

Some of the critics see danger in this tendency toward utilitarianism. Rowley, in the Mosely Report, says that both America and England engage in "A race for riches at any cost." Both show "an amazing adoration for mediocrity and the commonplace; both worship quantity rather than quality and both are prone to overstrenuousness." Remington ([73], p. 53) thinks that the "American boy looks upon education as a means of following and outstripping his dad in the rapid piling up of dollars." Sadler ([76], p. 140) says:

> What is going on in America is a fierce struggle between two contending forces and ideals of life. * * * Among the best antidotes of materialism and selfishness are idealism and self-sacrifice in the school. A businesslike idealism is the characteristic feature of American education at its best. This combination of two great qualities will protect the schools from the dangers of vulgar utilitarianism on the one hand and from undue excitement, superficiality, and self-advertisement on the other.

America believes in securing equality of opportunity to each individual. The environment has been such that the greatest opportunity has been in the economic and practical fields. This has naturally given rise to a great love of physical well-being, which is made possible only by the possession of money. The making of money has therefore become our chief means of self-realization. To some it has become the be-all and end-all of existence. This is an extremity which must be guarded against, and it constitutes one of our most serious educational problems. It is well to keep the dangers of this situation in view, and our critics have a right to call attention to these dangers. But those who criticize us most severely should remember that the privilege of casting stones belongs to the guiltless. It would be hard to prove that Americans are striving after money more keenly than are the people of other nations. Our immigrants seem just as anxious to secure wealth as do our native born. Our ability in a practical way has its drawbacks but it, too, is worth

all that it costs. With all of our materialism and mercenary spirit, no true American would prefer to exchange our pride in honest toil in our favorable environment for "white-handed aristocracy" under the economic conditions of Europe.

The following ideals and tendencies of American education have been pointed out by those whose criticism has been quoted in this chapter. First and most fundamental is the belief in equality, particularly political equality and equality of opportunity. Out of this doctrine has grown the belief in the indefinite perfectibility of man. This with the absence of a class system, has made possible a progressive and dynamic spirit which is quite unusual in other parts of the world. It has also been the basis of a strong, though irrational interest in education. In spite of pronounced individualism, there is a vigorous emphasis upon nationalization as is shown particularly in our success in the Americanization of the immigrant. Respect for personality is favored in spite of the difficulties which it involves, while individual adaptability and personal initiative are looked upon as two of our most priceless possessions.

Such are the ideals and guiding principles of American education. They are the subconscious forces of our national life, which profoundly affect every phase of our existence. The remaining chapters are concerned with a more detailed study of their influence in the more limited fields of our educational theory and practice.

# Chapter II.

## THE AMERICAN SCHOOL SYSTEM.

The American school system has had a different history from those of Europe. The European systems are the result of gradual growth *in situ*, while ours originated in a transplantation of European ideals into the American wilderness. The people who first came over were highly civilized and possessed definite and conscious ideals when they came. Furthermore, they represented the hardiest, bravest, and most dynamic spirits of Europe. Otherwise they would not have dared to face the dangers and hardships of pioneer life. They brought many of the European ideals with them, but these ideals were sharply refracted upon entering the American environment. Having felt the oppression of European tyranny, it was natural that being left to themselves they should develop in a manner at variance with European practice. A notable example of this is seen in the type of school organization which was developed. Decentralization was the rule, and this found a typical expression in the district system of administration and control. This was a natural outgrowth of individualism, equality, and the love of freedom, yet the ideals of Europe had an influence. In the southern colonies these ideals were represented by the aristocratic and *laissez-faire* ideals of England, while in the North the most characteristic tendency was a result of the religious ideals centering in Protestantism, and particularly Puritanism, and leading toward governmental control. The latter tendency was the one which finally prevailed. Religious influence was strong at first, but it worked itself out through governmental control of a decentralized type. By the early part of the nineteenth century this decentralization had reached an extreme form which was intolerable. This gave rise to the reforms centering around Horace Mann which started a tendency back toward centralization. This movement, though stubbornly resisted, is still in progress.

This brief survey is necessary in order to understand much of the criticism of American school organization and control. It must be kept constantly in mind that we are concerned with European ideals which have been introduced into a new environment. Some of these ideals failed to function to any great extent in the new surroundings. This was particularly true of European social stratifications. All such notions were replaced by the idea of human equality. Along

with this change come also a weakening of the philanthropic ideal in education. Shadwell thinks that this is an advantage. He says ([83], p. 375):

> He who pays the piper calls the tune. Private schools must meet the demands of their patrons. When schools are free and carried on by philanthropic or religious agencies the schools give the kind of education which those who conduct them think fit. When they are free and paid for by the community they must teach that which will benefit the community as a whole. The community has a right to call the tune and a national ideal is necessary as a basis for national education in the interests of the community at large.

This is not possible under private or sectarian control, because such control always identifies some particular end of its own with the general welfare. Such an end is really a means, yet it tends to be made an end in itself. This quotation gives the reasons why the tendency in America has been toward State control and away from the private and sectarian type. After the Revolution the question of national survival became of dominant importance, and it was felt that such survival was possible only through the universal education of all the citizens. The principle of equality required that each individual should participate not only in education itself but in educational control as well. The general welfare took precedence to a large extent over the aims of any one individual or class. Under such conditions State control was a necessity. State control also has further advantages. Jephson, in the Mosely Report ([66], p. 211), summarizes them as follows:

> An educationalist has control of all the schools. Changes in curricula can be made easily. One man gets accurate knowledge of his teachers and can promote the most deserving at once. The whole system may be easily coordinated. Teachers may be trained and examined, schools may be inspected, pupils may be transferred from elementary to high school, and if the system is not successful those in charge of it may be removed.

Thus State control erects a formidable barrier against the control of the schools by any one class. Narrowness is avoided and progress is guaranteed.

On the other hand there are some disadvantages. Jephson ([66], p. 211) says:

> There is a tendency toward centralization of power. Worthy people may be deprived of helping in education under an autocratic superintendent and such a superintendent, if unprogressive, might foster a stereotyped form of organization.

Kerschensteiner ([47], p. 6) says:

> Imperial control of education is a misfortune. * * * Nothing is more dangerous for the school than an all-inclusive system that reaches out over broad domains, having no regard for territorial conditions, much less for purely local demands. It produces too much uniformity and too little freedom

in administration. * * * Progress is obstructed. New ideas are not taken up. * * * There are too many traditions that are sanctified by law and always vigorously defended.

Sinclair ([85], p. 21) objects to State control because—

It means the omission of the catechism. Children will not respect religion since the State does not encourage it. * * * It causes religious contentions in connection with school elections. * * * It involves compulsion.

Langlois ([52], p. 167) says:

The refusal to give public money to denominational institutions is not consistent with freedom.

Sadler ([66], p. 144) thinks that—

The problem of direct public control in education is far more complex and difficult than many of the more zealous advocates of educational democracy used to realize. Perhaps the final result will be an agreement to differ, and a readiness to put up with that composite arrangement which permits all kinds of schools, all kinds of educational influence, and all kinds of management to coexist, provided that one and all are in *some* direct relation to the State, and that one and all are animated by an intense desire to promote individual culture, moral progress, and national unity. Education can never be left wholly to private effort or individual initiative, but these elements with the many forms of religious belief are necessary parts in any system of national education worthy of the name. No kind of administrative monopoly can ever be sensitive enough to the deeper and ever-changing needs of national life. Educational problems necessarily involve questions in regard to which neither the State nor a transient majority of votes in any particular district nor any one spiritual society can ever hope to succeed in getting the last word. What is needed is some combination of State sanction, of local patriotism, of religious influence and freedom of individual initiative.

These four forces are all represented in American society and their adjustment is the problem of education control as it exists with us. To coordinate these, to provide for progress and avoid narrowness and rigidity is the task which is challenging Anglo-Saxon genius for organization both here and in England. Two dangers threaten: One is the temptation to put portions of our education, such as the vocational, under the control of vocational specialists rather than educators, and the other the tendency toward national paganism due to the exclusion of religious instruction from the schools. They are serious questions but solutions for them will be found.

In spite of all its disadvantages America is tending more and more toward State control, and even more and more to a centralized form of it. This is because local control also has serious disadvantages. Loizillon ([59] p. 10) says:

In the United States there is an educational lack which is keenly felt and which constitutes an inferiority and even a blot upon the school organization. It allows children under school age to be abandoned without surveillance and without direction to all the dangers of the street and, that which is worse, to all the evils and bad influences during a whole phase of their life, the most important perhaps—that in which good habits ought to replace the lack of judgment and reason and act as a basis for their later development.

The truth of this criticism has since been recognized and compulsory attendance laws are the result. The solution of the problem will not be complete, however, until we have better child labor laws, medical inspection and part-time continuation schools. But all of this necessitates some form of centralized control, and there is a growing belief that the State has a right to force the selfish local community to give a square deal to its children.

Griebsch ([39], p. 613) calls attention to two other defects in purely local control:

> Lack of general leadership for the school organization of the United States leads to a great diversity in the school work as a whole. * * * The teachers have the right spirit but they have no teaching plan or guidance.

The first portion of the above refers to the lack of standardization of the schools. It is being corrected by placing more emphasis upon State control. Schools are being inspected and classified and local boards are being brought into line by means of State grants to approved schools. State courses of study and larger units of supervision are meeting the second defect. In a similar manner the injustice arising from small areas of taxation is being adjusted.

Another defect of local control is the influence of politics. Wallage ([88], p. 115) says:

> Since most of the school board members are politicians their presence in such a capacity gives rise to many difficult problems. * * * Above all things, the American system must free itself entirely from political official dilatoriness.

Höfer ([46], p. 647) says:

> Right important is the movement among school authorities, which aims to do away with the motley multitude of school boards, to which the restlessness and unsteadiness of school growth is to be ascribed and to replace them by real steady authority in school affairs. The most important task in this connection is to remove school authorities from the accidents of political elections which every two years bring often an entire change of personnel and therewith also changes in ideals and practices.

Barneaud ([3], p. 144) says:

> The authority of the State superintendent is nil, or almost so. * * * But that which appears incurable in the actual situation as we have examined it all over America and even in New England is the absorption by the local authorities of the power which belongs higher up. It is against the local boards, the trustees, whose horizon does not extend beyond their club or party, that the State is powerless. * * * The townships of New England, like the independent districts of West Virginia, give cause for fear when they are given over to the power of the strong men of the district, the cocks of the steeple, or, as they say over there, the local tenor, or what is worse, to the chief of a gang who gives the school positions and functions over to his faithful adherents as spoils.

Unquestionably there was justice in the criticism of these men at the time of which they speak. But an enlightened public sentiment

has removed much of the evil by strengthening the central authority. There has been some improvement everywhere, though much more of it is still desirable in certain localities and at certain times.

The German critics think that it would be a great help if we were to elect only educational experts to membership on our local school boards.

Dulon ([28], p. 235) says:

> Custom in Germany calls for a group of expert men on an administrative board. Whoever has proved and distinguished himself as a schoolman, whoever has furnished evidence of good results in his scientific studies, to him is open a position upon the administrative board. * * * In house building the educated American recognizes the necessity for the expert hand of the architect, even for the sketching of a plan. He calls on a Roebling when he has in hand the huge work of a bridge across Niagara; even in his private affairs he knows how to find the expert and is justly angry at the bungler. * * * In relation to school control he holds * * * other views. No laws have been passed growing out of the free will of the voters requiring scientific or cultural training for school board members.

Such an arrangement may work in Germany, but there seems to be very small likelihood of its being adopted here. There is something about the plan that seems to call forth resistance because of our belief in the principle of equality. Lay board members have in general proved themselves capable of performing the duties which devolve upon them. Such a plan makes possible a more general participation of the public in the control of education. If expert or professional knowledge of educational affairs were required, the control of the schools would necessarily be in the hands of only a few men, because the number of qualified people would be limited. Common opinion among school superintendents is that the presence of even one former school teacher on the board is undesirable. A board member of this type is apt to possess a strong prestige, accompanied by narrowness and an ultraconservative point of view. For these reasons lay membership of local boards seems preferable so far as America is concerned.

Klemm ([48], p. 41) sees a further disadvantage of local control. He says:

> A democratic form of government * * *, which in all other respects may be looked upon as a blessing, is nevertheless an insurmountable obstacle in the way of rapid and safe advance in school instruction. Local self-government prevents national concentration in school organization control and supervision and this causes slow and painful growth. Teachers must run from one school board member to another to see that essential things are taken care of. Every act of a democratic government calls for long-winded speeches, while one responsible minister of education can perform with one stroke of his pen what requires years of earnest effort to accomplish. * * * For example, Horace Mann had to fight for years with every ounce of his strength and had to beg thousands of dollars from his friends in order that the first normal school in America might be opened.

Klemm is partly right and partly wrong. The difficulty exists but it is not "insurmountable." Advance may not be rapid but it is safe. It takes a long time to arouse public sentiment and elevate public opinion, but when it is once done the results come easily and quickly and they are permanent. This is the reason why democracies show such tremendous strength. They have built slowly but well. That is why Horace Mann and other great reformers stuck to the task for so long. They knew that they would finally and permanently prevail. A faith such as theirs was never so much needed as now, when changes in educational affairs are in such great demand, and never was there less tendency to adopt the autocratic ideal which Klemm suggests.

Such are the chief difficulties arising from local control. Yet America is very loath to part company with it entirely, for it has some splendid advantages. Even our German critics recognize this. Kerschensteiner says ([47], p. 7):

> German communities do not control their schools. They take what emanates from the Government. * * * The average American is much more interested in the local schools than is the average German. There is more discussion and more space in the newspapers for education. Such democratic conditions are conducive to progress when the average intelligence of the community is high.

Kuypers ([49], p. 130) says:

> The transfer of the right of voting upon school affairs into local neighborhood enables the school to suit itself to the community in which it is situated and increases interest and devotion on the part of that community.

Also on page viii of the same treatise the author says:

> Democratic provisions are made from below upward, and not the reverse as in a monarchy. This gives rise to a happy initiative. New thoughts are at first realized as experiments only, but they carry with them all of the profound joys of creation. Progress grows out of error.

In regard to decentralization of control Compayré ([19], p. 11) says:

> Is it not true that local control, though slow in its system of evolution, even if it does go with much groping, error, and loss of time, has at least the advantage of making fruitful the activities which it does not repress, of sustaining the life which it guards against being inclosed in advanced fixed forms? (Is it not true) that, under the control of attentive and wise leaders even at the price of some instants of confusion, it can lead toward definite order in which will be found, disencumbered from all practices which experience shall have condemned, all which the spirit of freedom, goodness, and usefulness can inspire?

Thus with all its defects, local control brings interest, devotion, adaptability, and the hope of progress. On the other hand, centralization provides unity of control, speed in reform, intelligent su-

pervision, coordination and standardization of the schools, more intelligent board members, equality of opportunity for all the pupils, equalization of the burdens of taxation, and insurance against narrowness. Each type has advantages which the other can not supply. Some combination of the two is needed and Anglo-Saxon genius for organization is working it out through the administration of Government grants, through requirements for the certification of teachers, and through the practice of classifying and standardizing the schools. No local community is compelled to meet the demands of the central authorities, but they lose the aid from the State if they do not do so. The process of adjusting the balance between these forces is still incomplete, but the way is open to a nearer and nearer approach to a plan which will combine the advantages of both types while it avoids their disadvantages.

Perhaps the most difficult phase of the foregoing adjustment has centered around the question of compulsory attendance. The existence of State laws of this type has long been justified: first, on the ground that an educated citizenship is essential to the very existence of a democracy; and, secondly, because education has been looked upon as an inalienable right of every child. On the other hand the American parent has stubbornly insisted that if he wishes to keep his child out of school he has a right to do so. Klemm ([48], p. 6) says:

> It seems to me as though in the United States everything is permitted which is not expressly and legally forbidden; in Europe the reverse is the case.

The long struggle concerning compulsory attendance represents a conflict between State and local forces. The fight does not end when the laws are passed but continues as a question of enforcement. Many critics see our shortcomings in this respect. In another connection Klemm ([48], p 43) says:

> In spite of the money spent on schools and in spite of the compulsory attendance laws, 7 per cent of the whites and 47 per cent of the colored are still illiterate. There are thousands of school classes in which only half of those who are enrolled are present * * *; in which those who are present to-day are rarely the same as those who were present yesterday, or as those who will be present to-morrow. School boards even expect the absence of a large number of pupils each day, because they do not provide sufficient desks to seat all who are enrolled. A classroom with a seating capacity for 40 pupils may have an average enrollment of 50. * * * Child labor in factories, in newspaper selling, in field and garden work is very widespread in America and the strongest efforts are being made by the well intentioned to remove this evil. But whoever knows the average American will recognize the hopelessness of the Herculean task of bettering school attendance through compulsory attendance laws. * * * As long as the failure of his neighbor's children to attend school does not directly affect the individual citizen, he troubles himself very little about it.

Klemm revealed the facts as they existed when he wrote, but even then the condition was not general. His predictions as to the hope

of improvement, however, have not been borne out. Conditions have improved, at least in general. He did not recognize the strength of the progressive forces which were at work, though still hidden in his day. Here again we have an example of how an apparently hopeless situation in a democracy may suddenly vanish and be replaced by permanently better conditions. Much child-labor legislation has been passed and much more will be passed in the near future. The truant officer has come and the newsboy is disappearing. From the apparently hopeless condition of 15 years ago the question of attendance has become one of our most hopeful prospects. An awakened public sentiment operating through State grants, based upon school attendance rather than upon mere enumeration, has done the work. At present the question of enforcement is already being replaced by that of extending the age limits for compulsory attendance and the foundation of continuation schools upon the employer's time. Thus centralization replaces decentralization even in this difficult field, and all this happens without losing the values of decentralization.

The lack of adjustment between the forces of centralization and decentralization has also led to a neglect of the United States Bureau of Education.[1] However, the bureau is very efficient within the limits which have been assigned to it. According to critics, nothing like it can be found in continental Europe. The German critic is particularly impressed with the value of such a bureau for Germany. For example, Grimm ([40], p. 416) says:

> How much spirit and labor could be made use of, if even the proud German Empire had an official report concerning its educational system * * * within and without its boundaries * * * published annually; independent of definite official control and of political considerations * * *. Such is the United States bureau. Its unfettered judgment and its ability to compare results from the various countries, gathered from year to year, makes each commissioner almost the culture pioneer of the Union.

While the bureau has not yet been invested with executive power, it has, nevertheless, published a mass of school reports and pedagogical literature which may well be the source of great pride and satisfaction to the people of the Nation.

American decentralization has also discouraged the organization of types of schools for the purpose of dealing with retarded and supernormal children. Klemm tells of meeting with this spirit ([48], p. 47):

> Many defects in the knowledge of neglected pupils could be removed if they had more classes for backward pupils. This was tried out in one city but the parents objected, saying that "their children were as good and a good deal better than anyone else's."

[1] See also p. 16.

This tendency is slowly but surely passing away. The belief in the welfare of the majority has caused a temporary neglect of the minority, but there is no evidence to show that the minority will always be so neglected.

## TYPES OF ORGANIZATION.

Having pointed out the forces which are connected with the control of American education, the criticisms pass naturally to a consideration of the type of organization which these forces have produced. The striking characteristic in the eyes of our visitors is the fact that this organization is of the "ladder type"—that is, every student may pass directly from the kindergarten through the university. This characteristic is peculiarly American. In Europe, as a rule, the student who enters the elementary school can not transfer to the secondary school. The two are not coordinated. This is due chiefly to three reasons, all of which are historical in their nature. In the first place, the European elementary school has had a different origin from that of the secondary school. The latter is represented by ideals which are radically different from those of the former. Secondly, the elementary school is a school for the lower classes. Thus a pupil who has entered such a school finds his way into the secondary school blocked, partly because he can not meet the entrance requirements and partly because the secondary pupils belong to a higher social class which objects to associating in school with pupils of lower rank. Thirdly, the secondary schools of Europe are pay schools, which the poor can not afford to attend. In America all this is different. There are no social classes of the European type. The high school, which is our chief secondary institution, is an outgrowth of the elementary school, and all the tax-supported schools are free. The absence of social classes in America leads to democratic elementary and secondary schools. All pupils, rich and poor, high and low, occupy the same school benches. The American high school is also a composite of the two types of European secondary schools. Its course of study is both literary and scientific. All of this seems strange to the European, when it does not exist generally in his own country. In general, he praises our arrangement because it provides the highest of education for each person who is able to profit by it. It is one of the best illustrations of the influence of the American belief in equality of opportunity and belief in the unlimited perfectibility of the individual, and, therefore, the phase of education of which the American is most justly proud.

Though approving the ladder type of organization many critics see imperfections in it. Shadwell ([83], p. 380) says:

> The ladder formed by a generous but judicious system of scholarships is superior to the door nominally open to all but really closed by circumstances, for some go in who can not profit, and others who might profit are kept out. The selective agency is wrong, and it is shown by the significant fact that female students outnumber the male in the public high schools.

It will be shown in the chapter on secondary education that the preponderance of girls is due to other causes, but Shadwell's point is still well taken. The problem is one that merits more attention than it is getting. There are pupils who can not profit by the present type of curriculum, and there are those who must discontinue their school life in order to go to work. For the first, a richer curriculum and better teaching methods are needed; for the second, some form of economic aid must be devised; otherwise, some of our people will be deprived of the right to improve themselves to the limit of their abilities. Here again we meet the need for continuation schools.

Another and a more general type of criticism suggests that the coordination of the different levels of instruction is far from perfect. The most serious maladjustment is between the elementary school and the high school. For instance, Mark ([63], p. 171) says:

> The separation between grammar grade and high school subjects is far too great. Far too much of the drudgery of commencing new subjects is left to the first year of the high school. It is common testimony that it takes some months for the pupils to feel their way into the high school, and a great number leave at the end of the first year. This is seizing young ambition by the throat and giving a quietus to many bright hopes; for the high schools should be a part of the careers of each boy and girl. The cry against overloading is the result of the gap between the elementary and the high school. The pupils are compelled to make up lost time.

This is undoubtedly one of our most serious problems. It will be taken up again in the chapter on secondary education.

A similar gap is pointed out between the high school and university, but it has been largely remedied by the practice of classifying and standardizing the high school.

Another type of criticism centers around the character of American institutions. Thus Compayré ([22], p. 144) says:

> In the American school system we note the absence of precise lines of demarcation, in consequence of which hardly any institution of instruction presents a pure type. It is, as it were, of mixed blood. Thus the high school is at once secondary college and a higher elementary school. Some universities are nothing more than colleges. In the same way the normal school is a hybrid institution, which sometimes takes the title of normal college or even that of normal university.

In [19], page 4, he says:

> Perhaps the Americans are not as sensitive as we would be to the incoherence of an organization which attributes to different establishments successive stages of the same degree of instruction. One manifest inconvenience which results from this is that the major part of the high-school pupils fail to enter college. While in France almost all of our pupils continue in school at the age of 18, hardly one-sixth of the high-school population in America does so. Perhaps the Americans do not discern clearly enough the confusion and abnormality of the administration of their high schools * * *; establishments half secondary and half elementary, into which are admitted at the same time pupils who do not wish to go beyond the high school in their studies and those who are preparing for college.

Barneaud ([3], p. 16) says:

> Even to-day one does not know (in America) just what is meant by the term "university"; one has not a definite idea of the true field of the high school, of the secondary educational program, or the scope of the elementary school.

Lanson ([54], p. 5) describes the situation thus:

> An infinite diversity, an incoherent independence, different names for the same thing, different things under the same name * * *, a coexistence of all kinds of systems, of all kinds of types, no unity, no coordination, no authority.

Undoubtedly there is much confusion in the last group of criticisms, but there is as much confusion in the minds of the critics as in the American system. The chief difficulty arises from the fact that the French organization is greatly different from the American. In the first place, when this criticism was written America had nothing which corresponded to the École primaire supérieure. Corresponding work was done partly in the upper grades of our elementary school and partly in the high school. Secondly, the term secondary education in continental Europe includes all of the work between the completion of the elementary school and the baccalaureate. It thus includes all the work of the American high school and half that of the college or undergraduate department of the university. Third, in Europe the term "university" applies only to those institutions giving what is here called graduate work. It is not surprising, therefore, if the French observer fails to find a "pure type of institution" in America. It may easily seem to him to be "a coexistence of all kinds of systems, of all kinds of types, no unity, no coordination, and no authority."

But the confusion was not all in the minds of the critics. At the time of this criticism the United States was going through a period of standardization. The academies were passing. Some of them were trying to become colleges and even called themselves colleges, though they were in fact only of high-school rank. A similar thing was happening with some colleges which wished to become universities; many institutions which called themselves universities were

not so. On the other hand, many institutions succeeded in raising themselves to the higher level. In general, every American college as it exists to-day started as a secondary school, then gradually raised its curriculum, and finally dropped its secondary department. In like manner many of the universities were colleges previously. They have added departments of graduate work and some of them may in the future drop their undergraduate departments. The chief value of the criticism lies in the fact that it gives a picture of a stage of the growth of American organization which is now largely outgrown. Unfortunately, in the case of the normal school the tendency is still obscure. Probably they will soon all offer three or four years of work above the high school, but whether they will be academic or professional in character is still in doubt.

In his statement that relatively fewer high-school graduates enter college in America than in France, Compayré overlooks the fact that the American high school includes all social classes rather than only one, as in France. The high school prepares for life in general as well as for the university, while the lyceé prepares for the university and for entrance into a few professions only. In America it is not expected that all high-school graduates will enter college. On the other hand, the fact remains that many who should continue their education fail to do so. This fact merits more attention than it has yet received.

Compayré is right when he points out the complexity of our high-school population. It includes pupils of different destinies and those representing every social class, but we can not agree with him in his suggestion that such a condition is undesirable. The policy of bringing as many social types as possible under the same roof for their education can not fail to contribute to a breadth of view and to a social sympathy and solidarity which is of inestimable value in a democracy.

Difficulties are involved, but such difficulties must be met and provided for if the high school is to be a thoroughly democratic institution. The rise of a caste system must be avoided at all costs. How to avoid it and still provide for the needs of the complex social population is the problem of secondary education in America. Some confusion and abnormality will necessarily result, and it is right that it should, for out of this confusion comes the opportunity of the high school to perform one of its greatest functions—that of harmonizing the various discordant elements of our Nation into one great harmonious whole.

Barneaud and Lanson mention a lack of definiteness that was unavoidable at the stage of growth which we were in at that time. Since then the distinctions between the different levels have been

much clarified, while in Europe these distinctions have become less clear. All Europe is confronted with a problem of educational reorganization which is more serious than ours. They thought they had it solved but they were mistaken. This is the general fault of autocratic control. The solutions which it provides "by the stroke of the pen" prove to be delusions, while democracy plods on slowly but surely, never quite satisfied with itself yet ever growing.

## EDUCATIONAL ORGANIZATION.

The criticism reflects a further defect in our educational organization which appears quite serious. The critics from all three of the nations agree that American students are required to remain in school too long. The disadvantages of this practice are variously stated. In the Mosely Report ([66], p. 18) they are listed as follows:

1. It involves serious limitation upon the individual's period of independence.
2. It casts an improper burden upon parents.
3. It postpones marriage unduly.
4. The individual is withdrawn from the world of experience during the most susceptible period of youthful freshness.
5. He is dominated too long by teachers.
6. The time is so entirely spent on learning from others that there is no possibility of properly developing either imaginative power or individuality.
7. Mental procreative power is sacrificed, whereas it should be developed.

Miss Burstall ([12], p. 15) says:

> The American school organization is in one piece but it requires too long to complete it, since it lasts from 6 to 25. * * * Twenty-five is too late to begin one's professional career. * * * Secondary work should begin two years earlier and the college period should be shortened.

Langlois says ([51], p. 293):

> It is not normal for the American to keep young people in college up to the age of 21 or 22 in order to give them instruction which Europeans have at the age of 18.

Here we have good statements of the difficulty and suggestions of the remedy. The European student begins his secondary work not later than 12 and finishes work at 18, which is equivalent to our junior college work. The American student reaches this level at 20 or 21. Thus two or three valuable years are lost. To remedy this loss, some change in American school organization is necessary. For reasons which will be given later, it seems advisable to end elementary education at the end of the sixth grade. The American junior high school movement is an effort to solve this problem, and there is hope of a satisfactory solution. The chief difficulty lies in arousing sufficient public sentiment to secure a general adoption of the plan. As in the case of all movements toward reform in a democracy, progress is slow but sure. Much patience and tireless effort will be required, but the results to be obtained will be worth the cost.

## SUPERVISION.

American supervision has either been ignored by the critics or it has been criticised adversely. One defect is the fact that the supervisor's tenure is uncertain. Ryerson ([75], p. 178) says:

> Our American friends appear to me to suffer * * * in their educational interests from their love of rotation in office and frequent popular elections. * * * Their system appears to me to be inconsistent, as a general rule, with the selection of competent superintendents, or with the impartial and thorough administration of the law among those by whom the local superintendents are elected or opposed, and to whom such superintendents are looking for votes in the approaching election. Under the operations of such a system, it appears to me, there must frequently be as much electioneering as school superintendence and administration and that the latter will often be warped to advance the former.

Gray ([38], p. 148) says:

> The incursions of politics into American education has been doubtless a retarding obstacle to the best interests of the teaching profession. Graft is an ugly word but truth compels its use in this connection. Men of unquestioned ability and lofty ideals have been thwarted and supplanted even when, and sometimes because, their administrative success has been conspicuous. * * * Superintendents of education, supervisors, and principals. * * * men who in the old world might be thought permanently secure in the tenure of their office, have often been overthrown.

Barneaud ([3], p. 18) calls attention to the fact that this practice often means untrained superintendents.

> It is popular whims, tyranny, and shameful political oppression which give the administrators their office and which, also alone, certify their incompetency.

Fitch ([32], p. 63) summarizes the defects of the superintendency as follows:

1. Uncertainty of tenure.
2. Dogmatism.
3. Lack of pension and lack of compensation for the loss of his office.
4. Too much connection with politics and patronage.
5. Interference by book companies who wish their books adopted.

This group of critics has pointed out one of our besetting sins. The belief that one man is as good as another naturally leads to the idea that the offices should be passed around. But conditions are no longer so bad as they were in Barneaud's day. The practice of electing city superintendents by popular vote is happily gone, while is also a tendency to employ city superintendents for more than a year at a time. Best of all, there is a growing public sentiment the practice of their appointment by mayors is in disfavor. There against ousting a good man. There is still room for improvement, however, for the superintendency is not yet safe. The children of the board members and those of prominent politicians still enjoy

too much freedom because the superintendents and teachers fear to make them "toe the mark" as other children do. With county and State superintendents conditions are still very bad in some of the States. The old system of popular election still prevails. While the term of office has lengthened, the candidates are still required to be citizens of the area in which they are elected. In the case of county superintendents this evil is particularly acute, since desirable candidates are often not available among the residents of the county. Consequently, the superintendents are usually politicians rather than educators. They have a narrow outlook and an uncertainty of tenure which makes truly good service impossible. State and county superintendents should not be elected by direct vote. The practice of popular elections and rotation in office for such officials is a natural outgrowth from the doctrine of equality, but it is a decided disadvantage to the cause of education. It is one of the evils of democracy which must be outgrown.

On the other hand, there is an equally great danger in making the superintendency too safe. Siljestrom ([84], p. 149) thinks that, as long as there is a frequent change of superintendents—

> American schools can never be exposed to that listlessness and indifference, which, under a different system of management, may sometimes impede the progress of an educational establishment for years.

Miss Burstall ([12], p. 38) says:

> America suffers from an excess of system in the public organization, schemes and rules as drawn up and worked by local educational authorities and their officials. Very little initiative is left to the teacher in the public-school organization; curricula, textbooks, even methods of teaching are settled by the committee and the superintendent. Officials are supreme and the teacher is often little better than a cog in the machine. All this must have the effect of driving the best men out of the profession. There is neither freedom of experiment, of initiative, or of organization, nor a tradition of personal influence in the development of character. One would have more scope outside in a private school. It may be that this excessive system, this rigidity and bondage is inseparable from an educational system fully organized and controlled by the State; if so, we may pray never to have such a system in England.

The preceding criticism clearly points out two evils, and it seems at first sight as though our problem could never be more than that of a choice between them. How to provide a greater permanency of tenure for the superintendency and still avoid autocracy and rigidity is still an unsolved problem. The same problem also exists to a greater or less degree in the case of the presidents of colleges, universities, and normal schools. At present the tendency is toward a more secure tenure in all cases. At the same time the cry of autocracy is being raised against these officials and against the boards. The hope of relief seems to be in the direction of the idea of checks and balances, which has so often proved useful in other

types and phases of control. In general, the superintendent and president have too much power. In particular cases there are such officials who do not abuse this power; but the fear of dismissal is never entirely absent among teachers. Teachers are accused and condemned by boards and administrative officers without having opportunity to defend themselves, and often before they know what is happening. They learn the results when it is too late to make a defense and impossible to do anything except hunt another position with another superintendent, who often insists on inquiring into any previous dismissals suffered by the candidate. Neither teachers, superintendents, nor presidents should be deprived of their position without due process of law. Secondly, all teachers should have free access to their boards through representatives of their own choosing. Thus the power of the superintendent will be limited without sacrificing his tenure of office.

Such are the main problems of organization, supervision, and control in the eyes of our critics. In each case they are worthy of consideration, and such consideration can not fail to bring about a clearer conception of what these activities should be in the United States.

# Chapter III.

## THE TEACHER.

It has been pointed out that the doctrine of equality is fundamental in American philosophy. Its influence on the attitude of the public toward the teaching profession has been especially pronounced. Since, according to the basic principle, the ideas and opinions of one person are as good as those of another, the notion easily followed that one person was as good a teacher as another. Hence, in the early days special teaching qualifications were not recognized, and teaching positions often went to those who were most needy, to those who were willing to work for low salaries, and to those who were able to give only drill and memory work. The amount of knowledge possessed by the applicant was not always taken into consideration. On the other hand, the strong individualism of the pupils led to various types of misbehavior, and often the chief qualification of the teacher came to be physical prowess. Educational opportunities were very limited and it was impossible in many places to secure teachers who had been educated above the elementary level. Very limited intellectual attainments were sufficient to secure certificates for those who wished to teach. The general tendency, however, has been toward higher academic standards. Public sentiment now demands that the teacher shall have a fairly thorough knowledge of the subjects which he is expected to teach.

With regard to the professional training of the teacher, advancement has been much slower. While the educational leaders of the Nation have been urging better professional qualifications, their appeals have usually fallen on deaf ears so far as the general public is concerned. Professional training has failed to establish itself on a solid foundation. Even to-day it is highly probable that the great majority of those who have left the teaching profession during the past quarter of a century are of the opinion that they still know all about how pupils should be taught. All progress toward requiring universal professional training for teachers is made against tremendous odds. The old doctrine of equality is now represented by the dominant view that anyone who knows a subject can teach it equally as well as one who possesses such knowledge plus professional training. Normal schools tend to become academic rather than

professional institutions, and the United States has relatively fewer trained teachers than any other civilized country.

In view of these conditions it is not surprising to find that our critics unite in condemning us for the lack of training shown among our teachers. Klemm says ([48], p. 58):

> The worst defect of all is the lack of training. One must admit that this is the cancer of the school body which undermines its health. The German teacher will ask with astonishment: "How is it possible to furnish the schools with teachers if the normal schools do not supply enough graduates to meet the demand?" You innocent nurseling of European culture! Here is the answer: To whomever God gives an office, to him He * * * gives sufficient wisdom to manage it. The examining boards see that the candidates know what they are to teach, but whether they know how to teach, whether they know anything concerning the history of pedagogy, methods, logic, ethics or psychology, * * * all this they seldom ask.

Grasby ([37], p. 240) thinks that their lack of training is shown in the behavior of teachers when they are being visited.

> They tend to change their work. Many find it impossible to conduct the work in the ordinary way in the presence of visitors. Both teachers and pupils become uncomfortable, both deserve the strongest sympathy and neither gets it. The lazy teacher tries to show off, which adds to him the despicable trait of dishonesty and hypocrisy. The teachers seem to think that the visitor wishes to know how much the pupils have learned and not how they are being taught. This neglect of work is culpable when, as is often the case, the regular work ceases to give place to show work and mere efforts to keep order until the visitor feels the unwelcome nature of his presence and leaves.

Wallage says ([88], p. 114):

> It is well known that many engage in teaching who have no conception of the demands which teaching makes upon them. They have grasped the coattail of the school because they needed the money or because they had nothing better to do.

Clasen ([16], p. 356.) complains of teachers who who "spoke English with a foreign accent." They were also lacking in correct speech, having used such expressions as "Where was you yesterday?" and "It is him again." He thinks that America's most pressing need is a better teaching force.

Progress has been made since this criticism was written. More attention is now given to professional training, but such progress has not been made as a result of popular demands. Even to-day we should hardly dare to put the question of the professional training of teachers to a popular referendum for and against. Certainly it would be impossible to pass a law in Congress or in any State legislature requiring all teachers to undergo a three-year course of professional training, yet such a requirement is made of all teachers in the leading countries of continental Europe.

The lack of professional training results inevitably in the absence of a true teaching profession. Höfer ([45], p. 645) says:

> The lack of a teaching profession is due to a widespread idea that the practice of teaching is not a profession (Beruf), that it requires no special professional preparation. So it happens that, on the one hand, teaching is considered as one of the numerous occupations in which one seeks to earn a living for a while until something better offers itself and that, on the other, the professional training of teachers is not a general requirement.

Clasen ([16], p. 358) says:

> There is no teaching profession. One rarely remains a teacher for life. The method of electing teachers is poor and the board members possess an insight which is not clouded by a knowledge of their business.

Beck ([4], p. 132) says:

> There are not many teachers who look upon themselves as worthy but highly unfortunate priests of learning. The frequent changing of profession and the lack of a teaching profession which is followed as a life work shows this to be true. * * * Interference from patrons, together with the principle of free self-development, produces pedagogical "Männlein," who bow down before the "lieben Kindelein" and who condescend to the basest sort of boot licking. The honorable schoolmaster of old times seems a moral giant in comparison with these "Schulmeisterwelbern."

Walther ([89], p. 34) says:

> In the interest of the American school system it is necessary to so raise the material position of the teachers that their work will not be looked upon as merely a stepping-stone to other occupations. * * * The establishment of a unified teaching profession necessitates complete freedom from political influence and the provision of a general pension system when one is too old to teach.

These are the views of people who come from a country in which the teaching profession is on a firm basis. They seem too harsh at times, but undoubtedly there is much truth in them. America must better such conditions if the results of education are to become what they should be. How to do this in a democracy is as yet an unsolved problem. The European method is largely inapplicable in America because the impulse back of it comes "down from above." Our hope lies in a gradual creation of a public sentiment which will make possible better and more general training, better salaries, larger tenure, and more freedom for the teacher. More detailed consideration will be given to the last two elements later in the chapter.

In spite of the unsatisfactory professional standing of the American teacher, his social standing is better, in some respects, than that of European teachers. The criticism of Grandin ([36], p. 397) is typical on this point:

> For the homes, the teacher is not the fugue entity which he generally is in France, * * * a being without substance and without name, whose influence will be of consequence only in mathematics, history, or chemistry, and

will not otherwise modify the imagination, the character, and the conscience of his pupils. In America teachers are respected and received into the homes of the people.

The English critics also give this type of criticism. They think that the American elementary teacher has a higher social standing than those of England because the English elementary schools are for the poorer classes only, while in America all classes attend them. In general, the criticism indicates that teachers are looked upon as social equals by the people but not as social superiors. This is as it should be in a democracy.

There is much difference of opinion in America as to whether teacher training should be academic or professional in character. This difference of opinion is reflected also in the criticism. Münsterberg, for example, favors the academic type. He says ([68], p. 53):

> My teachers (in Germany) had read no child study, had no reflective theories on aims in teaching. They were enthusiastic and they knew their subjects. They did not hastily learn one day what they were to teach the next. They were not satisfied with second-hand information. Every teacher had reached the level of the doctorate. They had perspective, which raises the most elementary material to the level of scholarly interest. Elements taken for themselves alone are trivial and empty everywhere, and to teach them is intolerable drudgery which fills the schoolroom with dullness and the pupils with aversion. * * * I do not believe in lyrics which are written after the prescriptions of esthetics; * * * the scholar in poetic theory ought not to make the poets believe that they need his advice before they dare to sing. * * * The analytical tendency of the psychological and pedagogical attitude is diametrically opposite to the attitude, full of tact and sympathy, which we must demand of the real teacher. The training in the one attitude inhibits the freedom in the other. * * * The one great reform needed in America is to provide teachers who are expert in their field, who have the perspective of it and whose scholarly interests fill them with an enthusiasm that inspires the class.

A good representative of criticism on the other side of the question is that of Dulon ([28], p. 238):

> How can this hurrying through an excessive amount of subject matter, this memorizing without clear understanding, this meditation without sufficient self-activity, this studying at the hand of and upon the words of a teacher, prepare the student for teaching and teaching efficiently? * * * How can this dry philosophy make students adept in teaching, (an activity) which counts upon the precise knowledge of the mental processes as the most necessary of its principles?
>
> Can the study of history prepare the teacher for the right use of this powerful means of education? Indeed, one must completely renounce all ideas of a teaching efficiency, which is truly grounded upon the tact of the teacher and the rights of the pupil, if one is to think of teaching in the limits of such narrow historical knowledge. Of pedagogy and its history, of school systems and their results, of the fundamental principles of education, of didactics and its secrets, of method and its laws, of the art of explanation and questioning, * * * of all this there is hardly a mention in the colleges and universities

(in America). * * * The conviction that colleges are competent to train teachers fundamentally is very widespread among the Americans. We know valiant normals schools which not long ago justified their existence, in that appropriate colleges were not at hand. * * * Whoever has learned arithmetic can teach arithmetic; whoever knows history can tell these truths to others; whoever understands physics can without doubt instruct in physics. This appears to be the average opinion (in America).

That there is a circle of sciences which makes us familiar with the holy rights of the child, which tells us how we may stimulate or smother his powers, free or enslave his spirit, further or limit his development, stir up or suppress his self-activity; * * * a circle of sciences which insures the children against mishandling by an awkward teacher and teaches us how to obtain a hundredfold higher result from our school time; * * * to the fundamental understanding of which right methods of instruction are unconditionally related; * * * of all this the greater part of the most educated Americans have hardly a faint suspicion.

These two criticisms are worthy of further consideration. The first represents the Prussian ideal under the empire. It is an effort to apply methods of procedure in the German gymnasium, with its highly selected and thoroughly homogeneous pupil population, to American secondary education in general. It suggests that secondary teachers should not reflect upon "theories on aims in education;" that their business is to teach rather than to think. The whole energy of the teacher is to be devoted to the mastery and impartation of knowledge within a narrow field. Outside of that field he is expected to swallow the predigested thought of the philosophical and political leaders. Münsterberg's teachers were not satisfied with second-hand information, but they unconsciously swallowed second-hand theories of education. All of this is implied in the system which Münsterberg sanctions, and that is one reason why his teachers were not in the habit of reflecting upon educational aims.

It is also suggested that a psychological and pedagogical attitude is utterly bad: that it means lack of enthusiasm, ignorance of subject matter, lack of perspective, tact, sympathy, and power to inspire pupils. Such ideas sound strangely to the American ear. Some of our teachers and efficiency experts are lacking in tact and sympathy, but to infer that the psychological and pedagogical attitude necessarily produces such a tendency among teachers and educators in general is clearly going beyond the limits of the truth.

Of more significance, however, is the suggestion that all teachers should have reached a high level of intellectual attainment, that they should be able to get knowledge at first hand, that they should have the perspective of the subjects which they teach. This is also what our educational leaders wish. But why should not education itself be one of the subjects in which the teacher can get first-hand information and perspective? Does not the teacher need perspective in

education, even more than in other subjects? The American educators would undoubtedly say "yes," but the American people as a whole would probably say "no."

Münsterberg's suggestion that teaching is an art will likewise meet with the approval of our educators, but the people as a whole seem inclined to deny it. Münsterberg indicates that poets need practice before they can become expert in their art, but he fails to see that his analogy leads directly to the fact that teachers also need preliminary practice.

Perhaps the analytical tendency of the psychological and pedagogical attitude may be, at times, opposed to the practical, sympathetic attitude; but is not the analytical tendency of the literary attitude much more inclined toward the same fault?

America does need teachers who are expert in their field and who have the perspective of it. The teachers of arithmetic, for instance, should know not only the ordinary details of the subject and the relative value of its various parts, but they should also know its broader relationships, its origin and growth, its relation to the other subjects, its function, and its contribution to human welfare and happiness. But all this is not enough. It is equally necessary that teachers should be expert in their art and conscious of the educational problem in its broader aspects. To create a public sentiment in favor of supplying both these needs is our task. Its accomplishment is a slow and difficult process, but there is hope for better things in the future.

Dulon wrote his criticism in 1853. A comparison of conditions in the United States at that time with those of the present will throw light upon the direction in which we are tending. It is no longer true that colleges and universities entirely neglect the professional side of teacher training. It is unfortunately true that too many normal schools are trying to become colleges, but public sentiment has at least developed to the point where all colleges and universities are compelled to give at least a nominal attention to education as a professional subject. We must guard against the neglect of practice in teaching and must labor in season and out to build up a public sentiment in favor of the professional side of the work.

Thus there are two chief obstacles in the way of improvement in teacher training. One is the belief that such training is unnecessary, and the other that the training is necessary but should be entirely academic. These major obstacles are the source of several secondary defects. Fitch ([32], p. 75) says:

> America gives much attention to educational philosophy and psychology. This sometimes restricts the spontaneity and inventiveness of the students, and leads them to suppose that all lessons of a given character ought to be shaped to one pattern and developed to one particular manner. The students

are too much enslaved by formulas. The young teacher is too much hampered by the fear of departing from the prescribed order. Such methods may be very logical and also very ineffective.

Here, again, we have the influence of the doctrine of equality. If all children were equal and alike, one stereotyped method would be sufficient. This belief in equality is so powerful that it influences, often unconsciously, even the critic teachers in our normal schools. Educational philosophy and psychology are taught and applied in an academic way.

The idea of individual differences in ability and interest is likely to be disregarded, because it is not one of our democratic traditions. The individual differences of both teachers and pupils must be taken into account. The single-pattern method of teacher training must be discarded.

The influence of the academic ideal in teacher training has also led to a disregard of facilities for practice teaching. There are few normal schools that are able to offer adequate facilities for such teaching. Armstrong, in the Mosely Report ([66], p. 15), says of Teachers' College of Columbia University:

> I had hoped to find that in this college academic training had a certain bias imparted to it, but I was disappointed. I was also greatly disappointed by what I heard when attending some of the pedagogy classes; there was a high-flown air of unreality about instruction; too much precept, too little practice; * * * no really severe practice * * *. The whole appeared to me to be good illustration of the tendency that I seem to see in America to be guided by sentiment and emotion, and to work on academic rather than on practical lines.

Here we have a suggestion of conditions which are represented in every teacher-training institution. The academic influence is universally present. Only very recently has there been any evidence of the other method of approach. The universal tendency has been to teach the principles of education first out of the book. The course has begun with an academic study of general principles. We have preached the notion of proceeding from a concrete to the abstract, but our practice has been just the opposite. The application of education to the particular problems of the classroom has been made last, not first.

The high-flown air of unreality which Armstrong mentions is more apparent than real, since Teachers' College has always enrolled only graduate students who have in general had experience in practice teaching before they came to the institution. A danger arises, however, when normal schools over the country attempt to apply the Teachers' College plan, when undergraduate students only are concerned. Practicing or observing teaching in an elementary school attached to such institutions is far different from teaching in a real

public school. Working with the best equipment and under ideal conditions generally has not been all that could be desired as preparation for real teaching under actual conditions.

Several critics have also pointed out the tendency of theory to outrun practice. This is, of course, unavoidable but it should not be overdone. After all, practice teaching must prepare the student teacher for actual teaching situations, not for ideal ones. Ideal conditions are valuable, but such practice must always include a consideration of how to manage affairs when supervision and equipment is defective. The high ideals of the theorist must always connect with the ideals of the community in which the teacher is to work. The truly strong teacher is the one who is the most successful mediator.

It has been pointed out that principles of teacher training in America are often either absent or they are academic in character. It was also noted that as the conception of professional training began to develop the older academic ideal caused the emphasis to be on theory rather than practice. In England the reverse has been true. There the influence of the apprentice idea predominated, and as a result the pupil-teacher system has been the most important type of training. It is natural, therefore, to find some of our English critics commenting upon the absence of pupil teachers in our system. The English, however, do not mean to recommend the pupil-teacher system. In this connection Salmon ([79], p. 15) says: "I know the system (pupil teacher) is utterly illogical, but I also know that it has produced a race of teachers whose technical skill and power of managing large classes is unexcelled." The issue is rather clearly drawn between a professional training which is entirely theoretical and that which is practical. The true solution, of course, lies in a proper combination of the two elements. But one thing seems clear. The pupil-teacher system is better than no training at all. From this point of view, the cadet system under a good superintendent is justifiable in America as a substitute for something better. The danger, however, lies in the fact that the American belief in the principle of self-improvement is likely to cause the substitute type of training to be looked upon as permanently desirable. Hence its defects must never be lost from view.

Bramwell ([7], p. 3) says:

> It would seem better to give purely professional training to teachers of higher grades, to encourage more specialization, and to allow all students some choice of method subjects so that dead forms of method might be made as few as possible. The system of giving detailed methods to all stimulates, too, a tendency to rigid forms of lesson giving, and somewhat encourages the idea that there is only one good arrangement of subject matter for a particular lesson and one good way of giving it.

This criticism seems to apply quite generally, and it is not clear why Bramwell restricts it to the upper-grade teachers only. At any rate the danger is clear, and it is one that is peculiarly discordant with American ideals. A system which leads to stereotyped procedure is utterly at variance with the American belief in unlimited perfectibility.

On the other hand, a system of training which is composed of theory only is also likely to degenerate into formalism though to a less degree. Thus we come upon another reason why teacher training has not prospered in America. The type which we have had has failed to lead to further improvement. Trained teachers have fallen into ruts quite as badly as the untrained.

This defect has been in part due to another condition which Bramwell ([7], p. 38) points out:

> To allow a beginner to feel that he has completed a course in science in 13 weeks is to encourage superficiality and to arouse in him a feeling of satisfaction and attainment. Surely nothing can be more opposed to the true spirit of science.

The real source of the difficulty seems to lie in a conflict between two of the fundamentals of American educational philosophy. The doctrine of equality leads to the conclusion that the training of teachers is unnecessary, while the doctrine of improvability says that the teachers' capacity for improvement is unlimited. The present type of teacher training conflicts with both principles. Although it holds that teacher training is necessary, it yet fails to provide for the growth of the teacher after he has finished the course.

It has been suggested, on page 49, that a great many teachers in America are without professional training. Some of the reasons for this condition have already been suggested, but a further reason remains to be mentioned. Normal schools have not trained secondary teachers. Bramwell ([7], p. 55) says:

> The normal school more than any other institution has adhered to its old traditions. It was designed to train teachers for the lower grades of the elementary school, and in the early days was prepared to accept the only material at hand—would-be teachers, many of whom possessed few intellectual qualifications, and most all of whom were inadequately prepared for training. But with rising standards of work the normal school has not yet closed its doors to students whose general attainments do not qualify them to profit by courses in the science and art of teaching. Admission standards are kept low. College graduation is not insisted upon as a requirement for entrance. As a result most of the teaching in high schools is in the hands of professionally untrained teachers.

This difficulty has been relieved greatly in recent years by departments of education in our universities, but they are not preparing the required number of high-school teachers. In another respect, however, the outlook is still far from satisfactory. The normal

schools still "admit students whose general attainments do not qualify them to profit by courses in the science and art of teaching." The idea of making graduation from college a prerequisite for entrance to the normal is as yet undreamed of. We feel that we are doing very well when we require only the completion of a high-school course. Worse still, there is considerable recent evidence to show that in many normal schools the pupils who enter are low in intelligence. It is difficult to imagine a betterment, particularly in the rural schools, until this condition changes. Yet there is an amazing indifference on the part of the people and on a part of the educational leaders, which is discouraging for the future. Little effort is being made in general to suggest a remedy. It is certainly high time that this most serious matter should receive the thorough study which it deserves.

Not only have the normal schools failed to prepare high-school teachers, but, as Fletcher, in the Mosely Report ([66], p. 144) points out—

> The total output of the normal schools is hardly one-fourth of the supply needed.

This statement is too generous. As a matter of fact even before the war the normal schools were probably turning out not more than one-fifth of the teachers needed annually in the elementary schools. Thus the normal schools have not been able to justify their existence as such. They have admitted too many pupils who did not expect to teach. The purely academic influence has prevailed to a remarkable degree. Too much time has been spent in trying to imitate or replace the college and the high school.

This also is partly due to a desire to work up a large attendance in order to secure more adequate appropriations, though this motive sometimes masquerades under a pretense at serving local needs. The real cause of the whole trouble is the fact that the American people have not believed in the professional training of teachers.

Since no strong public sentiment in favor of normal schools was in existence, such a sentiment has had to be produced. This is a very slow process and requires much patience. But normal school presidents, like other Americans, like to see things happen rapidly. Hence there has been a tendency for theory to outrun practice as has been suggested on page 55. The normal school graduates are therefore likely to have a superior attitude, particularly toward the rural community into which they go. They have often tried to foist upon it ideals "handed down from above" for which the people were not ready. The principle of equality allows no place for such a practice and it tends to injure the normal schools in the public favor.

Since the American people do not want professionally trained teachers they usually refuse to provide adequate financial support for teacher training. Salaries of normal school presidents and teachers are low. The best type of teachers will not teach in a normal school very long, and we have, as Clasen ([16], p. 358) says, "Normal-school teachers who know nothing but what is in the text-books."

The faculty members are interested only in the narrow circle in which they move. The presidents often feel that the large questions of policy and organization are not safe among people of such narrow outlook. They therefore tend to become autocratic even more than do the superintendents.[1] Provision for growth on the part of faculty members is not at hand, and autocratic presidents are apparently anxious that their faculties should not be more than mere teaching machines. A progressive faculty, wide awake as to the larger needs of normal schools, might prove embarrassing.

Such are some of the problems of teacher training in America, with the complex causes which lie back of them. The whole question constitutes a vicious circle. The service is poor because the financial support is meager, and the financial support is meager because the service is poor. The presidents and boards can not employ better teachers because they have not the money, while the people refuse to furnish the money because normal schools are not generally efficient.

But there is a brighter side to the situation. The fight for better normal schools has been going on for 75 years. The academic idea is slowly but surely passing, and there is a growing feeling among the people that school-teachers know just a little more about their business than the man in the street does. Trained teachers are scarce; but whenever one of them is replaced by one who is untrained, the community soon senses the loss. More professional knowledge is being required of those to whom certificates are given, while recent scientific progress is making such knowledge more and more valuable. The recognition of individual differences is growing, and this is one of the best antidotes for the rigid and stereotyped methods of the untrained teacher. Normal schools are beginning to provide opportunities for real practice teaching. Field representatives are being appointed, and normal-school faculties are visiting in their districts to see that theory does not outrun practice. The crowding of the curriculum is being relieved by the provision for three and four year programs. Efforts are being made to help the teacher in the service, and more teachers are taking advantage of such provisions.

[1] See p. 60 and p. 63.

The need for more teacher-training institutions to help supply the annual deficit has been partially met in a temporary manner by the establishment of teacher training in high schools and there is hope of a more cooperative activity among and within the normal schools. The history of these schools has been a story of continual struggle. Public sentiment grows slowly but it does grow. This growth is likely to be accelerated in a time of reconstruction such as this. It is well to remember that genuine progress in a democracy comes only after a long period of apparently hopeless plodding. But when it comes it comes quickly, easily, and almost unexpectedly. The solution of the normal-school problem is perhaps nearer than we think.

Normal schools have been criticized because they do not provide for the growth of the teacher after graduation. This does not mean that there are no such provisions. They exist independently of the normal school. An example of this type is reflected in the criticism of Mark ([64], p. 238):

> A very striking feature of American school life heightening its normal value alike by the interest it engenders and by the intelligence and progressiveness of spirit which naturally flows from it is the continuous training of the teachers at the hand of the city superintendents and special supervisors, the wide reading of educational literature by the teachers, and their extension and correspondence work.

The last of these applies only to undergraduates who have not finished their work and is, therefore, not the same type as is represented by the first two. The training which the teacher gets while at work and through reading is by far the most important part of teacher training as it now exists in the United States. The danger involved lies in the fact that the superintendents and supervisors are often incapable or unwilling to do this sort of thing well. But, even under such conditions, the association with experienced teachers in the same building undoubtedly exerts a strong influence for good upon the beginner. The success of this type of training has the advantage of direct contact with real problems. Furthermore, it may easily continue from year to year and thus coincide with the ideal of indefinite perfectibility. The favor which this practice received is undoubtedly another cause of the indifference to normal-school training, especially when the latter leads the student to believe that graduation means the completion of his education. It would be a mistake, however, to hope, through such measures, to supplant the teacher training as given in special institutions. As a provision for continued growth after graduation association with good teachers is excellent, but as a substitute for undergraduate work it is a makeshift. It is needless to say that it can not operate in the one-room rural school.

Compayré ([22], p. 144) favors the teachers' institute because it, too, provides for further growth.

> They (institutes) keep the teachers wide-awake, prevent them from falling into ruts of routine or trusting to their own individual experiences, and summon the teachers incessantly to supplement their knowledge and revive their enthusiasm.

Mark ([63], p. 23) says:

> A notable feature in educational development is the remarkable desire for self-improvement among teachers. There are continual teachers' meetings. The teachers do not consider themselves trained after having spent one, two, or even three years in a normal school. Education is recognized as a progressive science with which practice must endeavor to keep pace, whereas, 20 years ago, there were many, even among educators, who scouted the idea that there was anything new to be learned in teaching. The teacher is now coming to look upon her work as a means for her own development, as well as that of the children, and she does not limit her knowledge to the mere command of the tools of instruction appertaining to her special grade.

This criticism is, in part at least, a contradiction to that of Miss Bramwell on page 55, where she suggested that normal-school graduates are likely to fall into ruts. Between the two statements the evidence would probably support Miss Bramwell. In fact, the general run of American teachers are not noted for their strong desire to attend teachers' associations. The fact remains, however, that these associations are doing much to stimulate professional enthusiasm. In fact, the very existence of voluntary teachers' associations is a source of wonder to many of our critics. Fitch ([31], p. 112) calls attention to an interesting characteristic of American teachers when he says:

> There is remarkably little discussion of how to obtain professional influence outside of the profession itself. Public opinion, after all, evinces a true instinct when it shows, as it always does, a certain distrust of trading and professional associations, obviously designed to keep up the scale of remuneration, to assert corporate rights and privileges, or otherwise protect class interests. It has a suspicion that these interests are not necessarily or always identical with public interests in general. The creation of a corporate spirit is a good thing, but it may go too far.

This criticism is interesting in its suggestion of what teachers' associations should not do. Recently these associations have been sorely tempted to depart from their traditions and form teachers' unions, but experience has already proved this to be an unwise plan, even when salaries are almost below a living wage. Increases have come and will come, not because the teachers need them, but because the children need better teachers. The best means to extend the influence and increase the salaries of teachers is to increase the enthusiasm and the efficiency of the teachers themselves.

Of all teachers' associations the National Education Association is the largest and most influential. As such, it receives much

favorable comment. Barnéaud's estimate of its work in 1878 was given on page 14. For convenience, it is quoted again here a little more in detail. He says:

> The work of this association presents an interest more lively because membership in it is optional only and because its work is not at all possible in any other country than the United States. That good and fruitful results have been attained by the association is not astonishing to those who believe in the value of everything which calls for individual responsibility and freedom of choice. It is the National Education Association which leads America toward progress.

A few adverse criticisms are also offered. Schmidhofer says ([82], p. 68):

> The American teachers' association does not bloom forth as one would expect. The teachers are too much divided among themselves and do not have sufficiently common aims and as a result the respect of the people is not increased.

Findlay ([30], p. 443) thinks that the programs "reveal remarkable fluency in the use of technical language rather than real depth of thought."

Buisson ([10], p. 634) believes that "pedagogical organization is not in the hands of the teachers but in those of the administration."

The National Education Association has its faults, and they include the ones which are mentioned, but the fact still remains that our teachers' associations and the spirit which makes them possible are invaluable assets in the solution of our educational problems. They are particularly valuable as a means of promoting the growth of the teacher while in the service.

Another means of such growth is that furnished by our pedagogical literature. Yet this literature hardly deserves to rank equally with that of Europe. This is particularly true of our pedagogical magazines. Klemm ([48], p. 56) says:

> The educational magazines offer only baby food—all sorts of petty methods, plans, and devices—but of fundamental educational and instructional principles and of methods which grow out of such principles there is rarely a word.

While our magazines are not what they should be, they are not quite so bad as Klemm thinks. They contain some articles of fundamental value, at least enough to make the phrase "rarely a word" inadequate. Many of them also contain what Klemm calls "baby food," but this is not necessarily a defect. Such magazines are for the purpose of helping the untrained teacher. They do right when they descend to her intellectual level. They will be needed as long as the untrained teacher is permitted to teach. But they should be considered as a means to an end and not as an end in themselves. When the United States catches up with Europe in the matter of trained teachers such magazines will not be needed.

One encouraging feature concerning the training and growth of teachers is noted by a number of critics. For example, Rathbone, in the Mosely Report ([66], p. 259), says:

> I was struck with the cultivation and refinement of the teachers, their enthusiasm for their profession, and readiness to better equip themselves. * * * There is much improvement to be desired, but no one recognizes this any more than the teachers themselves.

This is a very important effect of the generally progressive spirit of America. It seems fundamental in its nature and therefore able to withstand even the discouragement of low salaries. Its importance can hardly be overestimated because it is one of the corner stones upon which an adequate system of training teachers in the United States will some day be erected.

## ACADEMIC FREEDOM.

The question of the freedom of the teacher is a live one in the minds of our critics. Some of them suggest that the American teacher possesses more freedom than the teacher of Europe, but others see the matter differently. All agree, however, that the American teacher's association has freedom so far as governmental interference is concerned. This is not always the case in Europe. Schmidhofer ironically says ([82], p. 67):

> Here (in Austria) wherever two or three are gathered together in order to consider a serious general interest, there is sure to be a police commissioner in the midst of them. Our assembled life enjoys the most affectionate attention of the police. At the least overstepping of the statutes the sword of Damocles threatens to be loosed. Almost every word which is uttered in public is measured before it passes.

From this type of interference we are happily free.

Foster, in the Mosely Report ([66], p. 115), says:

> It is a fundamental principle in the American universities that the man who is fit to teach is also to be trusted to examine his own students. The examiner and the external examination is practically unknown in the United States. The teachers are free and being free they are enabled to give to their courses a breadth and depth that would be impossible, were they hampered by the knowledge that their students were to be tested by examiners who know little or nothing about them.

This criticism is true for the universities and also for the elementary and secondary schools in most States. The whole problem of the external examiner is discussed more fully in Chapter V.

The principle of local control has also tended to increase the teacher's freedom. Salmon ([79], p. 3), thinks that such control

> fosters the American tendency to try new methods. Fear of an inspector would prevent an English teacher from effecting a radical change in method. And if the inspector and teacher should agree on reform, the fear of the central authority would deter them both.

Miss Burstall, in speaking of the Horace Mann School, says:

> The personality of the teacher has free play to develop, improve, and vary the work from time to time. There is no iron hand of the city superintendent to crush initiative.

Thus the American teachers are entirely free from Government interference and largely free from external examinations. But, as suggested by Miss Burstall and as mentioned in Chapter II, there is another side to the question. American school superintendents and school officials in general are often despotic. Kerschensteiner ([47], p. 7) thinks that—

> Germany has a great advantage over the United States in that the independence of the teacher is incomparably greater. He can be deprived of his position and livelihood only for neglect of duty or violation of the law. When sick he continues to draw his pay. When too old to teach he draws generally 75 per cent of his salary. Whether he is liked or not by the board and by the inspectors has nothing to do with his livelihood. He is free from the anxiety that occasionally handicaps his American colleague. He does not need to curry favor with his superiors, much less with the citizens of the community, and in case of sickness or other misfortune he does not have to use up his strength to the point of exhaustion.

Langlois ([52], p. 158) says:

> American teachers are employed for a short interval only. They are at the mercy of unreasonable demands and local intrigues. * * * School discipline suffers in America because the pupils know very well that the teacher can be removed from one day to the next if she does not please the public, of which their parents form a part. If teaching is not yet a regular profession in the United States it is not alone because of low salaries, it is because of the absence of security and independence.

The criticisms of Kerschensteiner and Langlois suggest several problems which will be discussed under other headings. The point to be noted here is that the American teacher lacks freedom because of his insecurity of tenure and his lack of support in old age. Langlois is, of course, wrong when he says that "teachers can be removed from one day to the next," but they can be and are being removed from one year to the next under the conditions which he mentions.

Kerschensteiner also calls attention to another respect in which teachers lack freedom. He ([49], p. 9) says:

> The affairs of education are of too delicate a nature to allow those who are intrusted with their execution to be allowed to differ too loudly or too openly from the political and religious views of those who have employed them. This is just as true in the freest democratic nations as in constitutional monarchies. Any teacher in the United States who in public meetings or in the classroom would push a vigorous campaign in behalf of an absolute monarchy would feel as little security in his tenure as a German teacher who in like manner advocated the abolition of absolute monarchy and the introduction of a pure democracy.

Thus we come again to emphasize a point already mentioned. The teacher's ideals must not be too divergent from those of the community. There must be a strong connecting link between them. The freedom of the teacher must be curtailed in so far as it means freedom to teach ideals which are fundamentally different from those of the Nation. This does not mean that teachers should not try to elevate the ideals of their community. The latter is a difficult but worthy task. It must be done gradually and with due regard to the beliefs and prejudices that prevail. This limitation affects teachers particularly, because they deal with the children when they are in a very impressionable age, and are still lacking in reasoning ability and power to judge.

In still another way the freedom of teachers has been limited. Compayré ([21], p. 457) says:

> They (the Americans) have decided to exclude married women from teaching in the schools. Young America thus revives one of the most foolish traditions of the old university of Paris, where celibacy was obligatory. Why this exclusion of married women? They give as a reason that she has a husband to support her, and that she has not the need to make her own living as the maiden lady has. * * * The real reason is prejudice. * * * It seems quite strange that Americans should be compelled to recall to their fellow citizens such truths as "Marriage does not disqualify a woman," that "Every human creature has a right to life, liberty, and the pursuit of happiness, and when she is healthy and sound a natural right to marriage."

This criticism is doubtless justified, though conditions in Europe are fully as bad in this respect as they are here. Most countries have had a prejudice against permitting married women to teach. Such general prejudices usually have good reasons back of them which a groping humanity has vaguely sensed. Doubtless such reasons exist in this case also. The factor in any final decision, however, must be the welfare of the children. From this point of view there seem to be very good reasons why married women should teach. If they have raised children of their own they are likely to be better qualified to teach the children of other people. Then, too, marriage tends to increase the stability of the teacher. Repressed desires connected with celibacy tend to cause unrest. The married teacher is more likely to be satisfied with her position and is therefore more permanent in the system. She is more likely also to have a strong and beneficial influence in the community. Therefore the present tendency to employ married women as teachers seems to be a movement in the right direction.

In a very important sense the value of the teacher's service is conditioned upon the amount of his freedom. Leobner ([58], p. 19) says: "The freedom of the school goes hand in hand with the freedom of the teacher."

One of our most cherished ideals in America is the development of free personality in the children. The hope of the realization of this ideal seems to be a forlorn one unless the personality of the teacher is free. Those who are not free themselves can scarcely develop a desirable type of freedom in others.

One of the most common criticisms concerning the American school system is the predominance of women teachers. Höfer ([46], p. 644–645) says:

> In the face of the fact that almost all of elementary school instruction is in the hands of women teachers, one can not keep from asking what will be the effect on the permanence of the Nation when boys over 10 years of age receive only this type of education?

Armstrong, in the Mosely Report ([66], p. 13), says:

> It seemed to me * * * that the American boy is not being brought to punch another boy's head or stand having his own punched in a healthy and proper manner; that there is a strange and indefinable feminine air coming over the men, a tendency toward a common, if I may so call it, sexless tone of thought * * * Women can not in general compete successfully with men. They are indefatigable workers and have shown that they can pass examinations with brilliant success. But what has been the character of the examinations? Almost invariably they have been such as to require the reproduction of learning, not original effort; it proves the sex to have been lacking in creative and imaginative power. Those who have taught women students are one and all in agreement that, although close workers and most faithful and accurate observers, yet, with the rarest exceptions, they are incapable of doing independent, original work. And it must be so. Throughout the entire period of her existence, woman has been man's slave; and if the theory of evolution be in any way correct there is no reason to suppose * * * that she will recover from the mental disability which this has entailed upon her, at least within any period which we for practical purposes can regard as reasonable. Education can do little to modify her nature. * * * From this point of view women teachers must be for most purposes relatively inefficient; and as teaching is an occupation in which, more than any other, imaginative power, individuality, insight, and originality are wanted, it is important that men rather than women should exercise the predominating influence.

American men will scoff at the idea that they are lacking in manhood because they had women teachers, and experience has not borne out the truth of such a statement. The statement that women can not in general compete with men is also of very doubtful value. There is some evidence that women are lacking in originality and individuality, but they undoubtedly excel in patience and capacity for details. These qualities are perhaps of as great value in teaching as are the more masculine ones. The suggestion that education can do little to modify the nature of women is undoubtedly false. Armstrong reaches a wrong conclusion because his argument is based on the theory of acquired characteristics. Woman has been man's slave, but that does not prove that she will always be so. No doubt women

are too submissive at times, but that may be due to social rather than to biological inheritance. When the social restrictions are removed it is hard to see how the biological inheritance will keep women submissive, because in reality women have the same biological inheritance as men have.

A slightly different point of view is shown by Klemm ([48], p. 45):

> The women teachers, well meaning and motherly as they are by nature, help the pupils too much with their difficulties instead of stimulating their self-activity. The passion of the female sex for self-sacrifice is a real hindrance to genuine fundamental instruction.

On the other hand, some of the criticism favors the woman teacher. Siljestrom ([84], p. 186) says:

> It sets men free for the harder tasks of life. Women perceive more quickly. They are more conscientious, punctual, patient, persevering, and are therefore more able to stimulate these qualities in others. They bring a home atmosphere into the schools. School management is also an excellent preparation for the managment of children in the family. They can also be hired for less salary.

Laveleye ([56], p. 350) says:

> The teaching of women has less pedantry and more patience, imagination, and gentleness. The school is no longer the somber prison bristling with punishment and ennui which the child dreads. It has acquired a home atmosphere.

Grasby is in general opposed to women teachers yet he says ([37], p. 234):

> Where education is worst, the proportion of male teachers is the highest; while in centers where it has made the greatest progress, and where the schools are the most efficient it is becoming a curiosity to find a male teacher in the primary or grammar grades.

One fact is noticeable when the criticism for the woman teacher is compared with that which opposed her. The former is older than the latter. The former points directly to one great contribution of the woman teacher. She has brought the home atmosphere into the school. It also points toward her undeniable superiority in the lower grades of instruction. The older criticism belongs to the period following the Civil War when women first began to teach in large numbers.

The more recent observations are a protest against the disappearance of men from the teaching profession. While we may disagree with the argument, we must approve of the conclusions. There is something radically wrong when so many of the boys of America finish high school without having had a male teacher. Brereton ([8], p. 295) says:

> Woman's power lies in an appeal to boys to respect her sex, if she does not still further rely on her natural attractions as a woman. The male teacher sets before his pupils the necessity of obedience for the sake of obedience, of loyalty to an ideal and not to a sex, of reverence for the strong rather than respect for the weak.

Ravenhill ([72], p. 410) thinks that—

> Woman's instinctive insight, sympathy, and natural wisdom and morality need leavening with the harder logic, more active critical powers, and broader views of man.

These criticisms seem to be valid; and the question arises, why are so many women teachers employed? A great many of our critics say that the reason is an economic one. Home girls can be employed for the home position at a very low wage, because they are partly supported by other members of the family. When teaching away from home, they may be had for less money than it takes to employ a good man teacher. While all this is true, there must be some more profound reasons why school patrons will tolerate women teachers in greater numbers than would be tolerated in other countries. Some possible reasons have already been suggested in the criticism of those who favor the employment of women. Perhaps the chief explanation of the present state of affairs comes from a conflict between two of the profound national beliefs. On the one hand, the belief in equality is being gradually extended so as to include women as well as men. This is a phase of the woman's rights movement, and it has manifested a tremendous growth during the last century. Waetsoldt says ([86], p. 28):

> Woman is a national luxury in America, and her claims and inclinations meet little opposition in state and society * * *. She is accustomed to be recognized and considered as the equal of man.

On the other hand, the ideal of the monarchical form of the family, in which the word of the father was supreme and universal, is gradually losing its ancient strength. The first force sanctions the employment of women teachers, particularly when they can be had for less money, while the second makes it very difficult for adolescent boys and young men to submit themselves in school to what they look upon as "petticoat rule."

The difficulties resulting from the preponderance of women teachers arises out of these two conflicting forces. But since one force is growing stronger while the other is growing weaker, we may expect the preponderance to continue while the lack of adjustment between the women teachers and their boy pupils is likely to grow less. This also helps to explain the apparent anomaly of a Nation which has so strong an interest in education refusing to pay sufficient salaries to keep men in the teaching profession.

## TEACHERS' SALARIES.

It has been pointed out that the preponderance of women teachers arises, in part at least, out of the fact that salaries are low. Low salaries are also responsible for much of the poor teaching, for the

lack of trained teachers, for the transient character of the teaching population, and the lack of a teaching profession.

On no point is there more adverse criticism than that of teachers' salaries. Beck ([4], p. 111) says:

> Seven hundred and thirty-six dollars is the salary of the average teacher in New York State. That is not much in a land, in which household servants receive $220 to $300 per year and where a tailor-made suit costs $35. Every man who can seeks a position in which he can earn more money. If he remains a teacher, he suffers the odium of being looked upon as an incapable; for the American does not conceive of an idealism which renounces the goods of this world in order to become and to remain a teacher.

The figures which Beck gives are not out of date and the actual conditions are very much worse. On the other hand, the suggestion that Americans in general can not conceive the idea that teachers should renounce worldly goods in order to teach is still true. As was said in Chapter I, the American environment has been such that the ideals of self-realization work out mainly in terms of money making. The general public is fairly familiar with the working of the law of supply and demand in economic matters, and it is quite natural that they should apply it to teachers' salaries. The prevalent attitude on their part, therefore, is to expect the teachers to seek more remunerative employment in some other line of work if they feel that their salaries as instructors are too low. Those who prefer to stick to their profession are quite generally looked upon as incompetents. The idea that teachers should deny themselves the comforts of life because of their devotion to the cause of education is incomprehensible to those who secure self-realization through participation in economic activities.

The evils resulting from such a situation are pointed out by the critics. Gray ([38], p. 154) says:

> At present strong evidence, negative as well as positive, is forthcoming to show that many who are disposed by character and love of the young to enter the teaching profession are deterred by the lack of financial reward.

Dunker ([29], p. 40) says:

> The teachers are poorly paid and have no old-age or retirement funds. Men who can and wish to do something else leave the profession for more remunerative ones.

Klemm ([48], p. 60) says:

> A teacher with insufficient salary gives only a minimum of his strength to his work, and I am the last to blame him for it.

Rathbone, in the Mosely Report ([66], p. 259), says:

> People everywhere, and not least in America, are likely to estimate the importance of a man's work at the price which it commands. That a people who are so generous in the expenditure on school buildings should not be more

liberal to their teachers is surprising and disappointing. It is to this false economy more than anything else that the difficulty of getting a sufficient number of capable male teachers is due.

Waetzoldt ([86], p. 566) says:

> The teacher is a poor day laborer who earns his bread in sorrow and fear of the Damoclean sword of loss of position which hangs over his head.

The foregoing criticisms are typical of a great number. The whole question is very complex and the outcome is not yet clear. The danger, however, is quite evident. The tendency to leave the whole question to the law of supply and demand is an impracticable one. An essential element in the working of this law is that of time. It requires time for the demand to stimulate an increased supply, and even after this occurs it will take from 5 to 10 years to provide the necessary experienced teachers. But during all this time millions of children are growing up in ignorance and are being deprived of their rights to an education. Thus untold loss results to the Nation.

From one point of view, the critics may not be justified in their contention. Teachers' salaries are low everywhere. European countries are not guiltless in this respect. But they have provided pensions and permanence of tenure for the teachers. No doubt many American teachers would be willing to sacrifice themselves in the present emergency if they were not afraid of poverty in their old age and premature loss of position. An adequate pension system is sorely needed.

But the most perplexing question is that suggested by the critics of whom Rathbone is a type. "How does it happen that the Nation which is in all the world the most generous in educational matters should be so parsimonious to its teachers?" Several of the critics raise the question, but none suggest the answer. There is a tendency to blame the people of the United States for this condition. Whether or not such reproach is deserved depends upon the point of view. The majority of the American people will doubtless resent, or at least ignore, such censure. They argue that if good teachers are to be had cheaply, the school board would be false to its trust if it did not hold salaries down to lowest possible level. Furthermore, the doctrine of equality makes the American distrustful of experts. He employs one only when he is compelled to do so, and he begrudges the money which he spends in that way, particularly when the income of the expert is known to be greater than his own. Having little use for experts as such, he refuses to pay adequately for expert service on the part of the teacher, particularly if the teacher happens to be a single woman. He is strongly opposed to paying her a monthly salary that is as large or larger than the income of school patrons who have families to support. In the case of the school-

house and the equipment conditions are different. He compares his income with the teacher's income, but for evident reasons he does not compare his home and its equipment with the school plant. Therefore, he gladly votes the money to construct a school palace, but refuses to pay relatively large salaries unless compelled to do so.

It thus happens that America is parsimonious with its teachers without wishing to be so, and the salary question, instead of being a simple phenomenon, becomes a symptom of the fundamental conflict between the spirit of nationalism and the doctrine of equality. The former calls for the best teachers possible, while the latter prevents the payment of salaries adequate to employ and hold them. The remedy lies in emphasis upon the value of good teaching and in the improvement of the service rendered, rather than in censuring the people for parsimony. Expert service will come into its own in the long run, but in order to do so it must avoid all suspicion of class distinctions.

Closely related to the question of salaries is that of tenure. Most of the critics look upon the uncertainty of tenure as an evil, though one or two see advantages in it. Siljestrom ([84], p. 133) says:

> The insecurity of tenure forces the teachers to make good continually. When we see how frequently persons who hold such positions have disappointed the expectations raised and how soon they sink into a state of apathetic indolence, we can hardly find fault with the regulation * * *. The enactments of the American law on this subject are therefore well-formed, and no doubt contribute greatly to maintain an active spirit among teachers and to make them circumspect in their conduct.

This again calls attention to a very important problem in America. Teachers do tend to grow apathetic and lifeless. Some means must be provided to enable them to continue to grow. It may be better to bring in annually a host of new teachers who are young and enthusiastic than to retain those who are utterly dead and out of touch with the spirit of youth. But this is a crude method. It would be much better, and the children would be much better taken care of, if a host of new ideas could be introduced without changing the teachers.

Before indorsing the idea of rotation in office for teachers in order to secure progress it is advisable to look into the disadvantages of such a plan. They are reflected in no uncertain manner in the criticism. Laporte ([55], p. 45) says:

> American teachers have less initiative because they change positions so often. This has led by force of circumstances to very precise regulations for the application of school laws and detailed courses of study indicating for each kind of school, each class, each division even, for each term, if not for every month, the material which is to be taught in the different branches. The textbooks are chosen by outside authority; * * * nothing of importance is left to the initiative of the teacher. He is not allowed to try experiments in teaching.

Such experiments are almost always looked upon as irreparable loss of time. He finds on arriving at his school that a way has been completely traced for him and traditions to which he must conform. * * * Books and methods remain, while teachers change.

Grasby ([37], p. 231) says:

The transient character of the teaching population is a defect because the hearts of the teachers are not in their work. The best people quit the profession. Of those who continue, some do so because they love the work, while more continue because nothing better turns up. The latter class forms the drag that hinders the progress of educational reform.

Schlee ([81], p. 544) says:

Owing to the frequent changing of teachers the normal schools can not nearly meet the demands made upon them for trained teachers.

All three of these criticisms go to prove that the practice of changing teachers in order to secure progress defeats its own end. In reality it leads to a rigid system of rules and courses of study. It causes the better classes of teachers to quit the profession and it prevents the growth of a real teaching profession because an adequate number of trained teachers is not to be had.

The frequent changing of teachers is therefore an evil, which must be removed. But its removal necessitates a consideration of the causes which produce it. These causes are not hard to find. One of the most important of these is given by Griebsch ([39], p. 2):

Most of the women teachers follow their calling only until the haven of marriage shines upon them. They are a disadvantage to the general development of the school system, and they interfere with the more profound working of the school.

Schlee says ([81], p. 544):

The business atmosphere of America causes men to quit the teaching profession. Poor salaries, the lack of pensions, and the lack of sick leave make teaching unsatisfactory.

It has already been pointed out that teachers also suffer from certain repressions of fundamental instincts. The teacher who is denied all opportunity for initiative in an autocratic organization is sure to rebel if he or she is truly worthy of the name of a teacher.

From a practical standpoint, the absence of a suitable boarding house and of opportunities for social life are important causes of the roving tendencies of teachers. This is particularly true of rural districts. These are the main reasons why teachers voluntarily leave their positions. To these one must add the influence of those forces which compel teachers to move, such as failure to secure reappointment. This is due partly to political influences and more largely to the tendency of the American people to judge their teachers on the basis of what the pupils say concerning them.

All of these causes may be removed. A teacher who marries can be encouraged to continue teaching. Salaries can be raised; pensions can be provided. Suitable boarding houses and social life are not out of the question. But the most important thing of all is to get rid of the idea that the teacher is a machine to be controlled by a lever in the hands of autocratic officials. Such a situation will always make it impossible to keep intelligent and ambitious teachers in the schools. The belief in the freedom to develop one's personality is fundamental in America. But the avenues for such development lead in the wrong direction. The ambitious teacher must seek to rise to a higher grade or she must aim at administrative work. Thus elementary-school teaching suffers. The elementary teachers spend their time studying secondary education or administrative problems instead of specializing in elementary education.

Such a situation is, undoubtedly, undesirable, yet Beck ([4], p. 116) sees a good side to it:

> A school system in which the school itself helps to remove the bounds which separate one type of school from another and makes the change from one to another possible, I consider an eminently valuable arrangement.

From the standpoint of the teacher this is true, but from other points of view it leads to a lack of permanence of the teacher in one position. To remove this tendency and to provide for growth on a given level is one of our most pressing problems. The most promising hope for a solution seems to lie in providing more freedom for experimentation and in a stimulation of professional spirit on the part of the teacher.

## THE TEACHER'S LOAD.

The teacher's load also has some effect upon her tenure. Most of the critics seem to think that the American teacher has greater burdens to bear than those of other countries. Klemm ([48], p. 54) lists the peculiar difficulties of the American teacher as compared to the teachers of Germany. He believes the work of the American teacher is more difficult for the following reasons:

1. The heterogeneity of the people, due to immigration.
2. The tendency of the people to move about so frequently.
3. The irregularity of attendance.
4. The shortness of the school year as compared with that of Germany.
5. The English language is more difficult than the German.
6. Our system of weights and measures is more difficult to teach than is the metric system. He estimates that this sets us back a whole year.
7. The school is used as a hospital for all of the errors of society, for all of the defects and crimes in the State, and for all of the diseases of the social structure.
8. The various social and philanthropic agencies expect too much of the teacher.

Some of these burdens may be removed, but some seem unavoidable. The irregularity of attendance and the shortness of the school year may be, and are being, dealt with. Movements toward simplified spelling and simplified weights and measures spring up occasionally, but so far they have done little to relieve the burden to the teacher. The freedom of the people to move from one place to another is deeply grounded in American traditions and will never be given up. The standardization of all of the schools so that those who move during the school term may enter another school without loss seems to provide the main hope of betterment, though there is undoubtedly a sentiment which favors moving between school sessions rather than in the midst of them. On the whole, however, the conditions of economic life and the belief of personal freedom to move will make it impossible to lighten this burden to any great degree.

It also seems necessary for the school to shoulder the burden of assimilating the immigrant, and that of the moral training which is necessary to the remedy of social defects. Other organizations are doing and will continue to do what they can, but all indications point to the fact that the school must continue to bear the chief burden.

Thus it seems that the American teacher is to-day carrying a greater burden than the teacher of any other country. In spite of this, however, individuals and social organizations seem to be demanding more and more of the teacher's time and efforts. Many of these movements are thoroughly commendable and the school can render great service in popularizing them. Yet there is a limit to what the already overburdened teacher can do.

Some of the critics concentrate their attention alone upon the overburdening of the university professor. Foucher ([34], p. 192) tells how the class period of one professor is broken into by calls over the telephone "either from the Metropolitan Museum, from a buyer of antiquities, from some curious idler for information concerning some manuscript or other, some object of art, or simple trinket in the realm of India or Persia." From this he concludes that "the Americans have the very clear and marked impression that university professors are at the service of the public."

Foucher ([34], p. 193) also says:

> If one adds to the already manifold teaching duties the demands of life in the great cities, one may conceive that our colleagues in New York feel still more keenly than we the difficulty in being able to live in a day of only 24 hours. * * * The European exchange professors endure ordinarily quite philosophically the overdriving of their colleagues in America. They console themselves by the thought that after all the work done on the basis of 15 or 20 hours per week can not possibly be above the undergraduate level, and that necessarily much of the work must be repeated from year to year.

The question of how much the public should expect of its teachers outside of school hours has two sides to it. If the teachers do no outside work the schools tend to lose touch with the community, as has happened in France, the nation which these critics represent. This is highly detrimental to progress, but it is also very detrimental to have teachers who are overworked to such an extent that their teaching becomes a mere repetition of what they have taught before. The problem seems to be that of steering between two undesirable extremes. Leadership by the teacher in the social activities of his district may easily be overdone, but it would also be dangerous to swing too far the other way.

Teachers are overburdened often by too many duties within the institution. Caullery ([14], p. 57) says:

> The professor has a too heavy teaching load. He must have freedom of mind and time in which to undertake and conduct research. But in America the classes recite almost every day. The most of these require much preparation. But in the meantime the professors have too many reunions, commissions, and administrative cares. They must take too much time with individual students.

Grimm ([40], p. 421) says:

> The high-school teacher who teaches one or two subjects can keep in training, but the elementary teacher has too many branches. It is not to be wondered at if even an able teaching force gradually sinks to the level of a soulless mechanism.

Both of these criticisms again call attention to the danger which results when teachers are overworked. The chief difficulty in removing the present burdens, particularly so far as the higher institutions are concerned, grows out of the principle of equality and the suspicion of experts. The average member of a State legislature undoubtedly thinks that every teacher should teach at least eight hours a day. The holidays on Saturday are begrudged. The idea that teaching is an expert service, for which a great deal of preparation is necessary, is not yet born in the minds of the general public. Many of the teachers themselves have not realized this fact and are consequently growing fossilized as the years pass by. Thus we come again to one of our most serious educational problems, the provisions for the growth of the teacher while teaching.

In one respect only it seems is the work of the American teacher less arduous than that of the teachers of Europe. Miss Burstall ([12], p. 158) says:

> The teacher appears to do too little. The new ideas do not come from her. She acts more like the chairman of a meeting, the object of which is to ascertain whether the pupils have studied for themselves in a textbook and what they think about what they have been studying.

This undoubtedly sums up the American popular view of the function of teaching. No more is expected by the people in general; and if American teaching is measured by this standard, it will prove to be all that could be desired. Right here is the secret of the difficulties of teacher training in America. From such a point of view little training is needed. Not being needed, it is not wanted. The only hope lies in making the work of the expert teacher so valuable that the community will feel that it can not afford to do without him. When this is done the troublesome questions of salary and tenure will solve themselves.

## RELATION BETWEEN TEACHERS AND PUPILS.

On the question of the relation between teachers and pupils the critics are divided. The Germans think it is a bad relationship, while the critics from England approve it. The French critics are divided among themselves. On the adverse side Grimm's criticism is typical ([40], p. 42):

> To the German teacher it appears strange for the children to use satirical criticisms against the school and the teacher when free hand is given on certain days of the year. As a relic of the Middle Ages * * *, the young hopefuls ape the teacher before everybody and draw caricatures of him on the blackboard with more or less writing under them in which they give praise or blame in a more or less humorous way. The bantered teacher, *. * * led around by the nose by the sly children, is a continual figure in the newspapers. The average American sanctions this because he considers the American boy more wise and shrewd than any other.

Grimm also speaks of pupils who "stubbornly yawn in the faces of the lady teachers." On the other hand, Ravenhill ([72], p. 414) says:

> The free and easy attitude of American boys and girls to their elders is undoubtedly a surprise at first to a visitor from the old country, yet one is conscious throughout of the existence of a very pleasant spirit of freedom on the part of the pupils.

Bain ([2], p. 21) says:

> Children, when they first attend school are taught to regard one another as brothers and sisters and the teacher as their school mother. The classroom is their home, it belongs to them as much as to the teacher; they learn to keep it tidy; to beautify it, and to love it. From that they go on to a love for the whole school building, which they share in common with boys and girls from other families, who are equally attracted to it, proud of it, and anxious to make it as beautiful as possible. The school is their city and in it they learn something of the duties and privileges of citizenship. They also acquire a knowledge of a higher obligation, viz, that of their country and National Government whose flag flies over and protects their school home.

In general the English critic tends to look upon the friendliness and familiarity of the pupils and teachers as desirable rather than otherwise. Even one of the Germans, Beck ([4], p. 94), says:

> The friendliness of the teacher and the good humor of the pupils are the rule. The schools are happier than ours, the casa giacosa of Vittorino de Feltre has arisen anew in America.

Black ([66], p. 38) says:

> The personality of the pupil is respected. There is a freedom and familiarity between teachers and pupils that would seem strange in England.

The disagreement among our critics seems to be due mostly to differences of opinion concerning the value of respecting the personality of the child. This question has been discussed on page 23 and will be considered further in Chapter IV.

The following brief summary is offered as a conclusion to this chapter: The work of training teachers in America is being carried on under formidable difficulties. The general public and even many of our educational leaders still believe that thorough academic training is alone sufficient to produce good teachers. Consequently, professional training in America is not satisfactory. The annual output of teacher-training institutions is less than one-fourth of what it should be. The quality of the training is also inferior to that of the leading European countries. The general condition of normal schools is unsatisfactory. Many of them fail to concentrate their efforts on the main problem. The attendance is relatively meager and irregular. Adequate facilities for practice teaching are not available. Entrance requirements are still too low.

Conditions in the teaching service as a whole are unsatisfactory. Salaries are inadequate, the tenure is uncertain and the pension system is very limited. The social standing of the teacher is good, but he has little or no standing professionally. While there is a progressive spirit among teachers in general it results mainly in a striving toward higher levels only. There are too many women teachers, and they are suffering under some limitations which are inconsistent with their freedom. Many teachers are also carrying a teaching load which is excessive.

Such are the chief elements of the complex problem of the teacher and his training in America.

# Chapter IV.

## ELEMENTARY EDUCATION AND THE KINDERGARTEN.

In order to understand and evaluate the criticism which foreigners offer concerning our elementary education it is first of all helpful to consider the function of such education. What does the American elementary school aim to do and what does it accomplish? The answer to this question, so far as it is revealed in the criticism, indicates that the American elementary school is emphasizing ideals rather than knowledge. Sadler ([77], p. 433) lists the following aims:

> To develop citizenship in a common nationality, to secure freedom of individual development, to promote variety rather than unity, to secure progress through free discussion rather than through administrative order, to promote fitness and adaptability rather than general culture.

Miss Burstall ([12], p. 19) says:

> The pupils and teachers are aiming at power and facility of mind rather than knowledge. In America, the boy learns to use a textbook and a library, to get hold of a subject and talk about it in class, clearly and thoughtfully. Six months afterwards he may not be able to pass a written examination on it, but that does not matter. He could get it up again if it were worth while. It is this difference in aim which makes the unsympathetic English observer call American education superficial and say that it lacks thoroughness and accuracy. The American teacher aims to stimulate thought. In England the pupil learns lessons. * * * What the American has gained from school training is a general intellectual experience over a wide area, the power of self-directed work, a readiness for emergencies, the power of rapid acquisition, adaptability, and quickness.

Rathbone in the Mosely Report ([66], p. 263) says:

> American boys on leaving school do not in general know as much as the English boys, but they are more intelligent, resourceful, adaptable, harder working, and more anxious to improve their education. * * * The American people do not consider their education at an end when they leave school or the university, but realize that they must go on learning all their lives. School education is not something separate from life, it is a part of life.

Groser in the same report ([66], p. 174) says:

> A spirit of inquiry, individuality, and initiative is produced. These qualities lead the workman to continue his education and to read newspapers. His intelligence upon leaving school is not highly developed but it is of a curiously alert type.

All of this criticism comes from the English. Some of it is undoubtedly too complimentary, but it serves to call attention to the striking parts of our ideals as they impress our English visitors. In so far as it throws light on the function of the elementary school, it seems to indicate that the function is not to impart knowledge or develop culture but to set up ideals and increase power. The control of the tools of knowledge is not an end in itself but an essential means which leads to further education. Resourcefulness, adaptability, alertness, initiative are the cardinal points. To consider the American elementary school as an institution whose sole aim is to impart knowledge is to overlook the true source of its greatness. Each of these values centers closely about the individual. The emphasis is on the child rather than upon the curriculum. This statement is borne out by Höfer ([45], p. 28), who says:

> A single purpose is shown in the schools of America that is to prepare the pupils for life. The schools do not ask what the Government, or the church, or any party demands, but what does the youth demand. In its independence, politically, religiously, and socially, from special interests lies the power, the respect, and the success of the American school.

Hippeau ([44], p. 87):

> The Americans believe in allowing the pupils freedom in the expression of their thoughts. The teacher guides, counsels, and directs but does not believe that he should impose his ideas and sentiments on the pupils. One can not deny that this appeal to the individual reason, reflection, and free examination can give to young girls and boys an exaggerated confidence and sometimes a tone of sufficiency, yet it leads toward a more efficient mental development than does the dogmatic instruction which has so long been given as the criterion of truth of the teacher's word.

Such is the function of the American elementary school in so far as it grows out of American respect for personality. It includes the development of the spirit of inquiry, initiative, freedom in self-expression, self-education, alertness, resourcefulness, and adaptability. Such qualities are essential to successful living. We need them and must have them, even if, as Hippeau suggests, we must pay a high price for them.

On the other hand, the growth of the spirit of nationalism has put other duties upon the elementary school. Mark ([64], p. 19) says:

> Public education is felt to be the essence of nation building. It must establish a democracy, but of complex material and it must create a great western civilization * * *. It must create right tastes, occupy the hands and minds of the children in useful ways, which stimulate industry and in ways which appeal to the love of beauty and use. It must develop the sense of wonder at, and sympathy with nature and must encourage a reverence for the beautiful, the good, and the true * * *. The keyword of the new aim is to train the individual will to recognize and to respond sympathetically to the larger will of society. This, in a word, is the doctrine of individualism, as accepted by the leading American educators. The will of society requires free schools for

all classes, the fusion of nationalities, the inculcation of civic and moral virtues, and the growth of the power of voluntary organization into cooperating groups. In short, the school is asked to furnish life to its members. Individuality built up in this way is not that which separates one from all others, but it represents the community life each single member of the community, * * * that which, in a sense, is common to all.

Mark ([64], p. 28) says further:

The schools are the great democratizing influence, incarnating the American spirit as nothing else does * * *. They are the greatest force in the assimilation of the immigrant.

Laveleye ([56], p. 339) says:

The American elementary school is the base and cement of their powerful Republic * * *. Without it, the Union would have long ago ceased to exist.

These quotations speak for themselves and form a fitting supplement to those given on page 18. The coming of the immigrant and the gradual disappearance of the original Anglo-Saxon stock have placed a new burden upon the elementary school and one which no other institution is able to carry.

It has been shown that the development of the elementary school is based upon two great needs in American society. On the one hand, there is a great demand for the development of the individual personality while, on the other, a strong spirit of nationalism is required. Under autocratic control a gain in one of these elements has generally led to a loss in the other; but under democratic conditions, the conflict may be avoided, because in a democracy, the best way to develop the personality of the individual is through training in participation in those great social activities which lead to national stability and progress. The performance of this high and delicate task is the chief function of the elementary school.

The general subject of school organization has already been discussed in Chapter II. Much of the general discussion applies to the elementary school in particular. Some points, however, are emphasized in a new way and applied in a particular manner to the narrower field. Grasby ([37], p. 15) characterizes some of the weaknesses of the rural school organization as follows:

The board members are often ignorant without being conscious of it. Some farmers think—

"There ain't no great good to be reached
By tiptoein' children up higher than ever their fathers was teached."

Like all small communities, they have party disputes; and energy which should have been given to education is devoted to quarreling. * * * Boards are apt to agree that—

"Whatever is done as to readin',
Providin' things go to my say,
Shan't hang on no new-fangled hinges,
But swing in the old-fashioned way."

This criticism applies to a time which has passed away to a large extent. It is a reflection of conditions where the peculiar type of the environment tends to emphasize individualism and to interfere with the belief in perfectibility. Fathers are jealous of the improvement of their sons, because they fear the effect of such a thing on the condition of equality. Happily, such a condition is no longer general. We still have, however, the narrowness of outlook which causes valuable strength to be wasted in quarrels. To remedy this is the present problem of rural education.

Miss Burstall ([12], p. 284) raises another point concerning elementary school organization which is worth considering:

> If England needs a warning she should find one strong and impressive enough in the rigidity and uniformity of the American public-school system and the consequent faults of their public schools. Such is the attempt to standardize individuals, as if they were pieces of a watch or a locomotive.

To correct this tendency is clearly one of our chief problems. To put pupils of every type of intelligence in the same grade and compel them all to go at the same rate means a curriculum which is adapted to the abilities of the lower half while the upper half is compelled to mark time. More attention should be given to the brighter pupils and opportunities must be provided so that their advancement can be more rapid. Recent progress in the art of testing intelligence has brought a satisfactory solution of this difficulty much nearer. It is now possible to organize special classes for subnormal and supernormal pupils and handle them in a much more effective manner than was possible a few years ago. There is also another respect in which our present type of organization seems unsatisfactory to our observers. Laporte ([55], p. 147) says:

> Half of the pupils, at least, remain unoccupied or badly occupied while the others are reciting * * *. The use of time seems to be the most feeble part of American school organization. There is nothing to indicate what the divisions of the class are doing to which the instructor is not giving direct attention.

Some Americans justify this practice by calling attention to the fact that the class which is not reciting is learning to study for itself amid distractions. They say that this is a very valuable power to develop; that it provides a discipline which is quite worth while. The prevailing view, however, holds that all distractions should be removed as far as it is possible to do so. Much better work is possible when the teacher has only one class in her room. Much more individual attention can be given and supervised study may become a reality. This is an end toward which every school community should work. Many of the city schools have already attained the desired end, but much remains to be done in the country. A much more complete consolidation of rural schools must take place before

even a beginning can be made. Where this is impossible there is little hope of relief.

These defects of our system of classification can be relieved in part by easy stages of promotion. Thus Mark ([63], p. 39) says:

> This classification system is defective sometimes when all the poor pupils get into one class, but if there are easy stages and frequent promotions a continuous stream of bright pupils is created which, passing upward through all grades and sections, makes stagnant pools impossible.

The tendency toward easier stages for promotion is becoming more general but it is impracticable in many places, because it tends to multiply the number of classes and because the resulting classes are often too small. Under such conditions it seems necessary to stick to the present system in spite of its defects.

The organization which is represented by the Gary system is mentioned by one of the more recent observers. Gray ([38], p. 69) thinks that—

> The Gary plan is economical, but its weakness is the fact that academic and manual work receive equal emphasis. A given group of children may spend all of the morning hours in manual work while it devotes most of the afternoon work to recitation when the mental and bodily activities are not at their best.

Gray also questions the value of making the elementary school work vocational in character. The recent Gary survey seems to bear out his contention. The academic work has proved to be deficient; insistence upon vocational work at the expense of a general education seems more and more questionable.

In Chapter II attention was called to the gap that exists between the elementary school and the high school. This point is worth emphasizing again. Mark ([64], p. 180) says:

> The difficulty requires a division of the curriculum at the end of the sixth grade. * * * Where intellectual stimulus fails, moral earnestness will also flag. The consciousness of progress is a part of our moral making. Rob a child of it, and he can not but suffer in character. Or, again, looking toward the high school, the power to progress is a strength akin to virtue. Replace it by a baffled feeling, and in place of strength there will be hurtful discouragement. The grammar grades do not stimulate to hard study and the lack of this virile ingredient is the moral flaw in all seventh and eighth year courses, which are duly overlaid with recollection of what was done in the first three years of school. * * * The worst possible thing to do is to pass a boy or girl through a school which bears the description of being in a deplorable condition of dry rot owing to the extreme poverty of subject matter offered by the curriculum and in this anaemic state to introduce him or her into a high-school course bristling with new studies taught by unfamiliar methods. There is a two-fold ethical consideration, * * * the evil that is and the evil that will be. In the case of those who do not go beyond the elementary school, it is dangerous for the school to have lost its grip upon its pupils before they leave it. A boy ought not to go out into the world in a spirit of reaction. A

large proportion of the city's outlay upon his education is wasted if he does, and compulsory attendance may come to be injurious. So soon as the school ceases to be a place where the boy can live to the full his intellectual life, * * * so soon does the intellectual character of the boy suffer, with all that that implies in loss of well-adjusted will power, balanced judgment, self-esteem and high self-command. The danger is increased by the comparative absence of sound teaching methods in the upper grades.

This rather lengthy criticism is typical of much that is offered concerning our need of something like the junior high school. It also suggests the fact that the purpose of the upper grades of the elementary school above the sixth grade is really twofold. Some of the students are being prepared for life, while some are being prepared to enter high school. Some adjustment of our organization is required so that the needs of both types of students may be cared for in an adequate manner. In reality, the most important step to make in providing for the needs of both classes is to keep constantly in mind the fundamental fact that true education is life rather than a preparation for life or for high school. Such a realization would do more than any other one thing to prevent the serious weakness which Mark points out. Perhaps the European plan of dividing the students at the twelfth year into separate groups will prove to be the best plan here also. It seems certain that the present plan of organization is quite inadequate. There is an urgent need for a break in our system of instruction at the end of the sixth grade and again at the end of the ninth. The present junior high school movement is a most promising attempt to strengthen this weakest part of our school organization.

Before leaving the question of organization and control of the elementary school it is worth while to recall the criticism dealing with our type of supervision which was given on page 45. The superintendents and supervisors tend to grow autocratic. Too much of the policy of the elementary school is of the type which is handed down from above. American supervisors should learn to avoid such undemocratic procedure. They should get their results through inspiration and stimulation rather than by dictatorial tactics.

Some of the criticisms center on the curriculum of the elementary school, though this does not seem to have been interesting to any great number. Several of them mention the tendency of the curriculum to widen so as to include more and more modern culture material. Klemm says [48], p. 54):

There are, along with and generally subordinate to, the superintendent, special supervisors of writing, drawing, singing, handwork for boys and for girls, cooking, sewing, physical training, temperance, and God knows what else. All these break into the school day like a hungry child who wants his butter and bread * * * so that little time is left for real school work. The results in writing, reading, and arithmetic get worse and worse and the school suffers loss of respect. The distress caused by the special teacher is lamentable

in many places. * * * Some of the pupils can do hemming, stitching, and cooking, can sing and dance, weave pretty baskets out of variegated threads, fold paper without injuring their thumbs, but they have not learned the four fundamental processes. There are also children who learn to mold the head of Hercules, who can draw the picture of a horse on the blackboard without forgetting to draw its tail, but can not write its name.

Beck says:

The children know something of everything but nothing accurately; they can do something of everything but nothing in an orderly way. They are always careless. But, worst of all, the child does not feel that his ignorance is a defect.

These criticisms call attention to a problem which we are just beginning to realize. To fill the curriculum with too much culture material leads to the neglect of the tools of knowledge. The school activities which Klemm mefitions received their emphasis largely from the culture-epoch theory. They have been and are of great value in lending life and interest to the elementary studies, but recent evidence[1] goes to show that Klemm is right. The schools which emphasize this culture material the most are likely to show correspondingly poor results in the fundamentals. This is the most serious objection to general use of the project method. In order to justify itself the project method must show results which are up to standard in the tool subjects, which are after all the essence of the elementary school curriculum. Education is life in the present, but it is also more than that. It must provide for independent growth in the future. Such growth is based upon the ability to get clear impressions and the power of forceful expression. Thus an elementary curriculum which fails to produce satisfactory results in reading and which does not develop facility in oral and written expression is of doubtful value. Yet the cultural side also is invaluable. The mistake has been made of trying to attain both ends in six years of elementary work. The remedy seems to lie in raising the age of compulsory attendance up to at least 16 and in the provision of continuation schools for those who must begin work before that time. To make such provision is the next problem which America will be called upon to solve.

Several critics are pleased with our efforts to make use of a curriculum which is based upon the child's environment. Wallace (187, p. 498) says:

To lead children to feel affectionately toward plants and animals, to ennoble the artistic and ethical nature of the child is good. But much of what is called nature study in America is mere sentimentalism. * * * Teachers in the United States will study under the guise of nature study anything and everything but simple nature, and eschewing any form of investigation, they have a fondness for memorizing classified facts.

[1] See the Gary Survey for instance.

This is a danger that has often been pointed out since the days of Gradgrind. It is still present with us, but we are improving.

The emphasis which American education places upon the teaching of patriotism seems to commend itself strongly to our visitors. A few of them think that our flag exercises are perfunctory and theatrical at times. The practice of teaching patriotism in connection with the celebration of holidays meets with universal approval, particularly from English observers. It has proved very efficient in the Americanization of the immigrant.

## METHODS OF TEACHING.

Much detailed criticism is offered concerning the various subjects. It centers mainly around reading, writing, drawing, geography, history, and manual training. The discussion of the last is given in the chapter on secondary education, page 117. A few of the typical criticisms are noted here as they apply to the other subjects.

Our work in reading is generally commended. Mark ([64], p. 146) commends the practice of reading complete selections rather than mere extracts. Fitch ([32], p. 46) approves of our tendency to emphasize silent reading. Loebner, however ([58], p. 12), suggests that our emphasis upon reading is overdone.

> It may be worthy of note that a large number of students and adults of both sexes wear spectacles, * * * an evidence that the zeal for reading in America when developed into passion is not without harmful influence upon the eyes.

This, however, is probably the case everywhere. There seems to be no evidence that more spectacles are worn in America than elsewhere.

The criticism of our writing is also generally favorable. Several critics think that we are having too much written work. Special mention is made of our emphasis on rapidity in writing. It is also asserted that the writing of children is judged too much according to adult standards.

Much of the criticism centers around the teaching of drawing. Höfer ([45], p. 26) thinks that the practice of using illustrations in connection with written work for the purpose of exhibition is overdone, particularly when the drawings do not correspond closely to the content of the written work. He likes the idea of making free-hand drawings of what the child sees. Armstrong, in the Mosely Report ([66], p. 9), says:

> Simple measurement work in association with drawing is almost unknown.

Beck ([4], p. 126) says:

> They draw, but they attain at best only nimbleness, not art. The drawings in the upper grades are generally as meaningless to the uninitiated as those in the grades below, and the expression impulse has developed into a rage for illustrations.

Muthesius ([70], p. 135) comments as follows upon our failure to use geometrical forms in free-hand drawing for the purpose of practising the eye and the hand:

> The old European notion that drawing from nature and the use of water colors is too difficult for children has disappeared. The freedom with which general impressions are retained and the taste with which they are represented in color is often astonishing. In drawings of the human model in the schools one finds surprising indications of power of observation and naive artistic rendering. Good taste is shown in designing.

On page 142 Muthesius concludes by saying:

> In spite of many peculiarities of the system of American industrial and art education, its suggestions to European schoolmen are most prolific, and persistent. The common-school instruction in drawing was an absolute revelation. It has a new point of view. In Europe drawing is a transfer of academic principles to the children's school, in which the child as an intellectual organism receives but little consideration. In America such instruction is linked to the natural instinct of activity in the child. It rests upon an intimate study of child nature. The results are in accordance with the soundness of the principle, even though the upper classes do not wholly fulfill what the lower classes promise. Germany should organize such a system.

Such is the strength and weakness of our instruction in drawing as seen by our critics. Two things stand out in the criticism, a lack of artistic atmosphere in America and a tendency to center drawing instruction upon the nature of the child. We take pride in the latter and hope to improve the former.

Concerning other subjects of the curriculum, Clasen ([16], p. 355) says:

> Whatever instruction is given in the geography and history of the remainder of America, of Europe (with the exception of England), and of other parts of the earth is not worthy of mention. Instruction in natural science suffers extreme neglect * * *. But with music teaching the conditions are, if possible, still worse. Yet special well-paid music teachers go from school to school, teaching all sorts of theoretical nonsense * * *; for example, the keys of six flats and seven sharps together with head-splitting harmony. What I heard of school singing was more like Indian war whoops.

Griebsch ([39], pp. 614–615) says:

> The most noticeable defect in the plan of instruction in the American school is that the history of the world does not receive even the least consideration. Such instruction would serve more than any other means to remove the so general and so hateful jingoism. The pupils learn of other nations only from what information they receive from the study of American history, and the other nations appear there with little glamor. Thus the young American comes to underestimate other nations and overestimate his own. This makes him blind toward the acquisitions of other countries and injures his own cultural evolution.

The criticisms of our history teaching, science teaching, and music teaching are clearly well taken. This is particularly true in the case of history. Such a provincial spirit is growing more and more

dangerous, because America can no longer live to herself alone. It is becoming more and more important for us to understand what other nations are doing and why they are doing so. If we wish to avoid war in the future, we must cultivate a more intelligent acquaintance with our neighbors in the world. Their problems are our problems. Their successes will help us to succeed, and a knowledge of their failures will enable us to avoid similar failures in the solution of our own problems.

## PROBLEMS OF METHOD.

Most of the criticism of the elementary schools centers around problems of method. On both the elementary and secondary levels the first thing that seems to attract the attention of the critics is the American practice of using textbooks. As to the value of this practice the critics are divided. Waetzoldt ([86], p. 556) says the textbook method

> makes the pupil independent of the teacher. The latter needs only to supplement, help, or direct; * * * must interfere as little as possible with the independence of the pupil.

Miss Burstall ([12], p. 158) adds:

> The method provides for the cooperation of the pupils by bringing out the details of the lesson in a variety of different aspects. Ideas may be brought out which are new even to the teacher. The pupil can understand the statement of an idea better when it is stated in the words of a fellow pupil. * * * The pupils manage to get the various spontaneous contributions of members of the class into form and so obtain a sort of composite photograph of the average of the class.

Miss Bramwell ([7], p. 34) thinks that in this way—

> The pupils are taught how to use books, to rely on their own efforts during class time, and to be alert in thought and speech.

Rathbone, in the Mosely Report ([66] p. 262), says:

> Children seem to catch something of the spirit of research. One of the avenues of knowledge has been opened to their unaided efforts.

All of these values are in accord with American ideals of self-improvement. But there is another side to the question. Waetzoldt says also ([86], p. 556):

> As a result of the textbook method, the American teacher rarely enjoys that supreme pleasure of reading in the eyes of his class that they are following him, nor has he the pleasurable consciousness of developing a subject himself as the exigencies of the moment may demand.

Miss Burstall says ([12], p. 79):

> The recitation method based upon the textbook has its faults; chief among which is dullness. There is also danger that the more backward and feeble

pupils may never really understand the subject at all, for the teacher does not, as a rule, explain the difficulties as our English teacher does, so that even the dullest may understand.

Again on page 159 we have:

> The master is the textbook and here we strike a vital peculiarity in American education. Its aim has been intellectually the mastery of books; with us, education has always been very much more, always and everywhere, a personal relation. The children learn from the master or mistress with or without the aid of a book. In a good school in England we should say that the teacher ought to know more than the textbook. In any case, we feel rather than judge that the child can learn more from the living voice of the teacher than from any book. * * *
>
> According to the German and English ideal, the new material is grappled with first in the classroom by the teacher and pupil together. In America the pupil out of school studies the new material first in the textbook and goes over it afterwards in the class with the teacher. The teacher in America must be familiar, not only with the textbook, as we are, but with what all the leading textbooks say about the subject. Some teachers have to spend hours in a library looking up every possible reference that a pupil might make in class.

Miss Bramwell ([7], p. 34) summarized the defects of the textbook method as follows:

> It leads to the mere "reciting" of the words of the book. Book and references are used where thought and reflection might be better guides. It encourages digressions in class and a resulting slowness in finishing subject matter. It wastes time by causing debate upon subjects involving only individual difference of opinion. There is a tendency to bookishness and slavery to word forms.

Griebsch ([39], p. 604) says:

> The teacher is compelled against her own judgment to use textbooks and to imprison free words in the chains of a textbook, which is often not truthful.

As an example of this he cites histories written from the northern and from the southern point of view dealing with the American Civil War.

Dulon ([28], p. 265) thinks that—

> The true enjoyment of scientific work which is connected with spontaneous discovery and comprehension is impossible in the society of textbooks and recitations. Knowledge may be manifold, but it remains superficial and external.

This series of criticisms seems to sum up our situation in regard to the textbook method quite well. In so far as the use of the textbook makes the pupil independent of the teacher so that he can work things out for himself it is to be desired. It is desirable also in so far as it leads to variety of viewpoint, in so far as it leads to the use of the library, and in so far as it inculcates a spirit of independent study. But continual care is needed to guard against some of the dangers which are pointed out. Waetzolt's objection will have little weight because America prefers to stimulate the initiative of

the pupil rather than have him led by the teacher. Miss Burstall's objection, however, is more serious. Mere reciting is dull. There has been too much emphasis on rote memory and too little upon training in judgment and thinking. This defect has long been recognized and it is no longer to be found if the teacher has been trained properly The topical method is growing in use, while verbatim methods are passing even among untrained teachers.

The tendency for the work to become too intellectual is a danger which besets all methods of teaching. We have suffered from it, but hardly more than have other countries. At least it is not peculiar to the textbook method. As requirements in teacher training are raised undoubtedly there will be less slavery to the printed page. A further help in this connection is the growing tendency to equip each schoolroom with several texts for purposes of comparison. The use of source material is another tendency which helps to offset this difficulty. It is desirable, of course, to have teachers who know more than is given in the textbook, but the teacher does not have to know everything about the subject. Some of our problems should be studied with the distinct understanding that neither the teacher nor the children know the answer, but that they are going to work together to find out what it is. This would avoid the tendency toward didactic formalism and would promote the spirit of inquiry and growth.

It is true that many pupils can learn better through their ears than through their eyes. For such pupils the textbook is difficult. But since so much of our educational matter is now available in printed form, and since the mastery of this form is so essential to the gaining of information after school days are over, it seems desirable that the reading method of learning should be emphasized even for those who are not "eye-minded."

The majority of Americans will for similar reasons prefer to stick to the policy of presenting the new material in printed form first. This does not mean, however, that the assignment should be neglected or that pupils should not be taught how to study the new lesson. In some cases it will doubtless be better for the teacher to go over the new material with the class beforehand. This is the study-recitation idea and it has been recommended and used for just such cases. The ideal, however, is to train the pupils so that they can master the printed page without the aid of a teacher.

The suggestion that unnecessary debating will arise hardly commends itself to the American. Debating and the power to express one's thoughts are too valuable. We should consider this an advantage rather than a disadvantage, even if much time is used in debating seemingly trivial subjects. They may not be so trivial in

the eyes of the pupils; and even if they were, valuable practice in the power of expression would still be afforded.

As Griebsch says, textbooks are not always truthful, but teachers also are likely to be prejudiced. The "free minds of the pupils may also be enchained" in the words of the teacher. In fact, it seems quite certain that too much of that sort of thing has been going on in Germany. When it comes to prejudice and error, the textbook is less likely to be affected than is the individual teacher.

Finally, America will not agree with Dulon when he says that true enjoyment of scientific work is impossible in the society of recitations and textbooks. It is undeniably endangered sometimes, but there is no reason why the two can not exist together when there is plenty of supplementary material and when the pupils know how to study and use books.

Thus it seems that all of the objections which have been raised to the use of textbooks are either negligible or removable, while the values which come from using them can be achieved in no other way. It does not seem probable, therefore, that America will abandon the textbook method. On the other hand, continual effort should be made to avoid the dangers which the method involves.

Closely connected with the use of the textbooks is the use of library books. Our children's reading rooms are a source of amazement to all foreigners. They are peculiar to America and are the result of our belief in the principle of equipping each individual with the power and the means to educate himself without a teacher.

The American practice of teaching through the eye rather than through the ear has emphasized another tendency which is a source of curiosity to our critics, particularly those of the earlier periods. This is the use of the blackboard. The blackboard is neither praised nor condemned in general, though one or two critics seem to like it. Walther ([89], p. 31) thinks that blackboards are good as a means of correcting mistakes in written work and as a means of presenting outlines. "They also lessen the amount of written work at home and relieve the teacher of much marking of papers." The use of the blackboard is an excellent instance of the American belief in teaching through reading and in the value of class discussion.

The criticism which has been quoted concerning the textbook method is typical of that which applies to the recitation. The recitation also excites the curiosity of the critics. They use the class period for imparting information and in reviewing what was previously given, while in America the class period is used for the purpose of recalling what the pupil has learned for himself—in the textbook or from supplementary material—and in discussion of the points involved therein. Thus the emphasis is on the ability to do

independent reading and in practice in oral expression. The dangers involved are the same as those already noted as applying to the textbook method. In order to emphasize these dangers two additional criticisms are given. Fitch ([32], p. 50) says:

> An undue proportion of what was learned was learned by heart. Even the oral exercises, which were supposed to be spontaneous, were too much alike and conformed too often to certain conventional patterns which were in constant use. Memorizing * * * is confined to scraps of information or short passages from the textbooks. Many more rules, aphorisms, and short definitions are committed to memory in American than in English schools.

For example, he mentions the reciting of names and dates of the Presidents in order.

Dulon ([28], p. 265) says:

> The one-sided cultivation of the memory interferes with the general mental development whose more powerful expression must be found in spontaneous and independent thinking. It is unbelievably difficult for the recitations to train the pupil in intelligent thinking.

Much has happened to improve matters since Dulon's day. Training in intelligent thinking is now possible in connection with our recitations if they are conducted in the proper manner, yet it is necessary to be on continual guard against tendencies toward dry formalism. The only safe thing to do is to secure thoroughly trained teachers and provide for their growth while in the work. The teacher who sees his field in its larger relations is seldom, if ever, guilty of permitting his recitations to degenerate into mere rote memory exercises.

The influence of American belief in respect for the individual personality shows quite plainly in our methods and calls forth some very strong criticism from our critics, particularly the Germans. Beck ([4], p. 94), for example, says:

> They have taken care that the way shall be clear for the free development of personality. Therefore, they tolerate no authority in the school other than that chosen by the children themselves. The school as an institution has no standing. It can not hold or go after the children. It entices the pupils and praises their work. The child does not extend his hands toward the teacher in order to grow, but the teacher bows down before the "lieben Kindelein." * * * The teacher does not ask questions. He must wait for the pupil to ask him, in case the pupil can not advance by his own efforts. There is no imparting of information, no giving of attention, no listening but only self-activity, * * * at least such is the demand of the American theory. * * * Compulsory rules are replaced by motivation. As many islands entice one on a boat ride, and as the lower steps invite ascent, so a multitude of easy details entice the pupil along the streets of learning.

On page 127, Beck says:

> The liberal view that everything must grow out of the experiences and initiative of the children gives the recitation a lack of system. The teacher drifts

hither and thither. I have never been able to see the steady progress of a well-planned lesson. I have never heard a right well-connected one in which an end is striven after by the child mind, pressing onward step by step, hesitating often but again taking courage until finally the pleasure of victory rewards the worker. If the child is encouraged to express himself concerning everything, boasting and humoral pride is the result. A pedagogical theory which bases its procedure and aims only upon the powers of the child leads to pedagogical anarchy.

Klemm says ([48], p. 56):

In Chicago there is a school in which the small pupils are not bothered with letters until they themselves wish to learn to read. This is certainly "putting the cart before the horse."

Here we have the old conflict between interest and effort. Both Beck and Klemm object to allowing the child's interest to be the controlling factor, partly, at least, because the doing of what one wants to do is easy. According to the dominant German view which these men represent, the aim in education is training in doing one's duty, especially when this involves difficulty. Carried to an extreme, this means that all educative activity should consist in doing what one dislikes to do. The more one hates the task the more valuable it becomes. This view in a modified form is also represented in this country and is closely related to the old religious doctrine of total depravity and to the disciplinary conception of education.

But recent tendencies have been in the other direction. We are beginning to understand the meaning of the law of effect in learning. Education must, after all, grow out of instincts, emotions, and immediate interests. To attempt to suppress these inner tendencies is to waste vital human energy in a vain struggle against resistance. Such educational effort is sure to be painful, tiresome, and slow, while an education which utilizes and redirects the mighty forces of original nature is pleasurable, refreshing, and rapid. The latter process is called motivation and is founded upon the basic principle that true education is conditioned upon the whole-hearted, purposeful activity of the child. It is considered fundamental that the child should like what he is doing. There is no emphasis upon doing a thing from a sense of duty. The factor of compulsion by external authority is not a dominant one. If such compulsion is tolerated at all it must be justified in terms of the needs of the class. It must not come ex cathedra from the teacher.

So far as the educational leaders are concerned the majority are clearly in favor of the spirit of the more recent tendency. Among the people at large, the principle of motivation is in accord with the respect for personality and the hatred of external authority. The philosophy back of the process is clearly the most successful effort that has yet been made to state American ideals in philosophical

terms. Yet the extreme form of it as stated by Beck is not acceptable to Americans in general. There is still a strong current of public opinion which favors obedience to external authority, particularly on the part of children. The average man, too, is still of the opinion that the school should be a place where children work rather than play. He expects his children to learn to overcome resistance through effort. He has little love for anything that sounds like soft pedagogy.

Here, as in many other situations, the middle course is the desirable one. The problem is not that of avoiding all effort but that of getting the most done with the least friction and fatigue. Above all, the motive force must come from within rather than from without. Pupils must be made willing to put forth efforts in order to attain some cherished and conscious ideal rather than to avoid an external penalty. To impel is better than to compel. The disadvantages which are mentioned by Beck and Klemm are real but they involve less danger, at least in a democratic society, than do the older methods of procedure. In the meantime, it is possible to guard against some of the dangers which are connected with the doctrine of motivation. While the teacher is not to be autocratic, yet she must always be a leader. Skillful leadership will avoid the lack of system which Beck mentions, and will be a safe guaranty against the pedagogical anarchy which he fears. Respect for the personality of the child is not inconsistent with leadership by the teacher.

A more serious danger to be avoided results from the fact that theory tends to be divorced from practice. Beck ([4], p. 90) says:

> Unfortunately many realities are in the way of the theory which bases education on the self-activity of the child. Stronger powers rule the schools than those of their philosophical representatives. These powers shape the principle of self-development to their own ends. One now recognizes that one is walking in the clouds when one uses this idea. It would be better to aim at adjustment, social membership, and citizenship in the surrounding nature and culture world.

The latter aims are also those which the method of education through self-activity claims to attain better than does any other method. It is true that the leaders who are basing education upon self-activity are in advance of current practice. This is as it should be. But to accuse them of "walking in the clouds" is putting the matter too strongly. To institute a new procedure and put it upon a sound foundation requires time, and there is a tendency on the part of some of our leaders to grow impatient and to run too far ahead of current practice. We must continually guard against this mistake. It is not necessary or advisable to abandon the principle; but there is a crying need of a band of shrewd, patient, and tactful teachers, who are sound in theoretical knowledge, who can adjust the theory to the practice, and who are powerful in building up public faith in self-activity as a basis for modern education.

The criticisms so far given are types of the German reaction to methods based on self-activity and respect for personality. The French critics do not touch upon the subject. This seems to be due to the fact that none of them in recent years have been interested in the elementary field. The English generally like the method and are able to appreciate it at its true value.

Ravenhill ([72], p. 407) commends our

> emphasis on self-activity without insistence on perfection of performance. The old idea that the child gets more intellectual and mental discipline when he goes at a matter unwillingly and not spontaneously, out of the fullness of his own heart is fairly shaken to its foundations in the United States. The American method aims to discover the power, not the weakness of the pupil, to emphasize success achieved and not the disheartening shortcomings as in the case of the older methods.

Mark ([63], p. 143) says:

> The children are doing what they like to do rather than liking what they have to do.

Both of these observers seem favorable to the method and able to appreciate it. Mark, however, is not fully in accord with the content which has been used. The principle of self-activity has carried with it the idea that the individual must relive the experience of the race. It is this that Mark questions.

He says ([63], p. 46):

> American children are liable to overtension. Hence the use of adult methods may involve a striving after a community life and a community consciousness, whilst the ordinary child is only a crude little individual. The biogenic law may be overemphasized. Too much vital consciousness may arrest development quite as seriously as too much repression. What is repressed may remain latent, what is permanently expressed is with difficulty recalled to a static state.

The last quotation calls attention to a defect which may arise in connection with basing the curriculum upon the culture epoch theory. This theory is now discredited, and as a result a great mass of our pedagogical literature is out of date. This fact in itself should make us very cautious in assuming that any contribution is the last word on the subject. The passing of the culture epoch theory has in no way invalidated the principle of self-activity. It still bids fair to be a distinct contribution to the theory of education as worked out in America. The results will come slowly but surely. In the meantime improvements in our theory will bring it closer and closer to a correct statement of American belief and ideals.

## THE ELEMENTARY SCHOOL.

Our belief in progress manifests itself in the elementary school as a tendency toward experimentation. The Germans are particularly interested in this phase of our work. In general, they approve it,

though Kuypers ([49], p. 130) believes that it is dangerous to use the child as a subject for experimentation. He believes that it is preferable to hold onto the old methods. Whether or not this criticism is to apply depends upon the character and value of the experiment. The danger of an experiment turning out wrongly may be neglected if the success of the experiment is quite probable, and particularly if it would be of great benefit to the country at large. On the other hand, long-continued experiments of doubtful chances of success are to be condemned. The Gary experiment seems to have been of this type. No experiment should be permitted to run as much as 10 years without a careful inventory of its results.

The general idea and belief in experimentation, however, is essential to progress and, therefore, one of our most hopeful tendencies. In speaking of this attitude Beck ([4], p. 87) says:

> Experiences come over there quicker and more easily than with us. The American is not hindered by a consideration of the present. An entire absence of sentimentality permits old ideas to be forgotten quickly.

As an example of this tendency he says:

> Pestalozzianism has suffered arrested development with us, while over there it has borne real fruit because the Americans energetically carry things through.

Thus we see again the American tendency toward progress which is working itself out through experimentation. With proper safeguards it should keep America at the front in the movement toward educational progress.

Probably the most distinctive characteristic of the American elementary school is the attitude which the children have toward it.

Mention has already been made of the excellent relation between teachers and pupils. The pupils' attitude toward each other and toward the school in general seems equally praiseworthy.

Mark ([64], p. 27) says:

> The teacher aims to make the children proud of each other when they do good work, and the class as a whole brightens up when the teacher praises any member of it. Thus she aims to produce a zest for good work for its own sake, and at the same time an admiration for the right things in the school community. The cultivation of good manners is regarded as a function of the school. Education is not a mere drawing out; * * * a mere training of the powers of the individual. It is also a leading forth into the world and into life. * * * The teacher identifies herself with the social feeling of the class and indeed creates it by her sympathy with the children and by the enjoyment of their work which allows this feeling to develop.

Dunker ([29], p. 37) says:

> There are those in Germany who very often go out into life as sullen natures, without faith in themselves or their calling, without force or impulse to create, angered against the school which did not understand them. Of the best which the school can give of the impulse upward, of the longing after better things, they have felt no trace. Their education is ended.

Dunker believes that America avoids all of these things. Langlois ([52], p. 218) says:

> The children have a decided preference for the school. They love to go and, they hold their school days in loving remembrance. . .

Salmon says ([79], p. 26):

> The tone of the class was more that of a big family than that of a small regiment. The ideal is not restraint from doing wrong, but incitement to do right.

These criticisms are typical of many others, all pointing toward an excellent school atmosphere, involving respect, cooperation, and devotion, which is one of the most unique and most inspiring features of American education.

## THE KINDERGARTEN.

The kindergarten in America has also come in for its share of criticism. In general, this criticism has been favorable, though certain defects are also pointed out. The most complete criticism is that of Mark ([63], p. 182 ff). He says:

> The kindergarten has already had a history in America such as probably no single educational system has had anywhere amongst the Western people, if exception be made of the renascence standards as set up by Sturm and the Jesuits. The only infant school in America is the kindergarten. * * * innocent of all intrusion on the part of the three R's in however simple a guise, and yet containing a preparation of thought and capacity which is of great ultimate value wherever primary-grade teachers are sympathetic toward it. It is based on the principle of "Learning by doing." In the social aspect it is, with the university, the greatest conservator of individualism, * * * which looks out upon the larger social whole between which and the individual, action and reaction, imparting and receiving are ever taking place.

He calls attention to two interpretations of kindergarten principles in America, the one based on the ipse dixit of Froebel which advocates directed play, and the other, a modified form which is based upon the principle of free play: He says:

> The first incorporates play and games merely because they appeal to the child's instincts, while the second selects the universal and typical plays of childhood which have some recognized educational value, some principle of unconscious instruction, some ideal outlook upon society, and a certain amount of ethical content. The first emphasizes the plays which children everywhere follow by sheer imitation. The second selects plays and gifts which are a preparation for mathematics and æsthetics, which are a means of constructing the complex out of the simple and of discovering possibilities of beauty in the elementary type forms such as the square and the circle. The first makes the kindergarten an organized playroom, the second makes it a school. The first type of kindergarten is practically a piece of the occupied life of the child outside of the school, * * * the second is an enlargement of the child's life, thought, and outlook. * * * The aim of the free-play type is to lift the child out of the meager and uninspiring environment of thoroughfare and

kitchen. At the same time its spirit is not merely utilitarian. It aims to cause children to relive and interpret as many of the social experiences as possible, and to appeal to the constructive imagination as well as to cultivate self-expression.

The foregoing seems to be an excellent statement of the aims and achievements of the American kindergarten.

The kindergarten has also given rise to secondary influences which are of value. Mark ([63], p. 193) notes that its influence is spreading upward and giving a new life to the higher schools, particularly those of technical character. It has served also to emphasize the relation between mental and physical activity. Of still greater importance has been its value in bringing about a helpful cooperation between the home and the school.

A few defects are pointed out. Mark ([63], p. 193) says:

> The kindergarten may created a forced atmosphere, overstimulate the individuality of children, and induce artificial consciousness of achievement. * * * In some cases there is a too pedantic following of unassimilated precepts. * * * an overstrained devotion to the theory only partially worked out by Froebel himself.

Grasby ([37], p. 60), Fitch ([32], p. 45), and Salmon ([79], p. 12) point out the lack of coordination between the kindergarten and the elementary school and suggest that this condition should be remedied. Fitch thinks that because of its playful nature the kindergarten does not afford the best preparation for the elementary school. For that reason he prefers the English infant schools. Salmon ([79], p. 12) thinks that the kindergartens should not be confined to the cities only.

On the whole, it seems that the American kindergarten in its modified form is one of our most successful institutions. Its influence has been good and the opportunities which it offers should be made available to every child. The fact that only one child in eight has the advantages which it offers is another evidence of our lack of self-consciousness. The principle of equality of opportunity for all should prevail as far as possible.

# Chapter V.

## SECONDARY EDUCATION.

A consideration of the foreign criticism of secondary education is beset with several difficulties. As has been related in Chapter II, the secondary period in foreign countries is more extensive than it is here. With them it roughly covers the period of the child's life between the ages of 12 and 18. Thus the foreign statements concerning secondary education apply to schools which are represented in this country by part of the elementary school, all of the high school, and part of the college. This point must be kept continually in mind by all who would intelligently study this type of education from the comparative point of view.

It is difficult to arrive at a definition of what secondary education is. The English Board of Education defines it as that type of education which is suited to young people between the ages of 12 and 17. In Germany and France secondary education is that type which prepares pupils to enter the universities. Beyond this there seem to be no definite statements, though the policies of procedure are well worked out. In like manner, there seems to be no comprehensive statement of the function of secondary education. Certain elements of its function, however, are pointed out.

Sadler ([76], p. 150) suggests that the aims and character of the chief part of secondary education should be—

> the preparation of the relatively few highly talented pupils for higher education rather than the education of those who will not proceed beyond the high school * * *. The tendency in America is to prolong the years of general and liberal education and postpone specialization as far as possible. Whether to specialize earlier or to sacrifice expertness in one's calling to the hope of unlimited progress in higher culture is the gravest question at issue in American secondary education.
>
> An effort to meet both of the above demands has led to the multiplication of subjects in the secondary schools, with the attendant hurry and drive. The remedy for this is not narrow specialization but differentiation in types of secondary schools. This would involve a somewhat earlier choice of a profession, but differentiation of types of schools would be a national misfortune if it impaired the free intermingling of boys from all classes of society, which has been one of the great glories of American education. * * * The American leaders show a united front against any narrowly commercial spirit in the secondary schools. American business atmosphere is so tense that it is the duty of the secondary school to provide a counteracting influence rather than intensify the interest in commercial matters. The true claims for second-

ary studies are not based on the advantage in commercial bargaining but on the need for training to the highest possible point the gift of expression through which man enjoys fullness and freedom of intercourse with other men. * * * What is going on in America is a fierce struggle between these two contending forces and ideals of life. The victory of the nobler influence depends in great measure on what use is made of education during the next 20 years. Among the best antidotes for materialism and selfishness in a commercial community are idealism and self-sacrifice in the schools. A businesslike idealism is the characteristic feature of American education at its best. This combination of two great qualities will protect the schools from the dangers of vulgar utilitarianism on the one hand, and from undue excitement, superficiality, and self-advertisement on the other.

Sadler ([77], p. 439) says:

America has rendered a great service to Europe by refusing to put up with a purely linguistic course as the only type of secondary education. Such education should be more varied and should appeal to larger numbers.

These selections from the writings of Sadler have been quoted both because of the high standing of the author and because they are typical of much of the criticism in general. America will not agree with the idea that the most important function of secondary education is to prepare for entrance to college or university. That sounds too much like class education to suit the average American. Imbued as he is with the doctrine of equality, he refuses to support an institution whose most important function is to lead to a level which is attainable by the few only.

On the other hand, the American spirit of initiative and personal freedom, combined with the doctrine of improvability, causes many to enter high school who do not expect to finish college. The high school is thus required to deal with all sorts of intellectual and social types united by a common initiative and a common belief in their own power to improve themselves. To meet the needs of this very complex social group is the chief function of the American high school. The task is tremendous, but every public high school in a democracy must at least attempt it. Complete success is, of course, impossible. With many individuals the school will fail. In such cases the same forces and aspirations which brought them into the high school will cause them to drop out and seek self-realization elsewhere. Those whose interests are satisfied and stimulated will, in general, remain at school in "the hope of unlimited progress in higher culture," while those who drop out will be very likely to seek their individual growth in "commercial bargaining." Such is the origin of what Sadler calls the "two contending forces and ideals of life." Both are due to the same impulse operating in the same direction but along different channels and at different cultural levels. The danger in the situation lies, not in the fact that some engage in the "commercial bargaining," but in the low cultural level at which this

is done. The general tendency is clearly toward a demand for a full 4-year course in liberal secondary education for all who can profit by it. To leave school at a lower level is to run the risk of being handicapped in later life both as a citizen and as a producer.

The complex character of the student population in the high school is responsible for the multiplication of subjects in the curriculum. This tendency has been recognized by the colleges and universities, and it is now possible to make credit for college entrance in practically every subject which the high schools offer. The emphasis, therefore, is on the interests of the individual rather than the entrance requirements of the higher institutions. This protects the schools against rigidity in method and content. With such a policy Sadler seems thoroughly in accord. He says ([77], p. 439):

> Among the most precious qualities are resourcefulness, initiative, constructive ability, artistic power, leadership, trustworthiness, gayety of mind, moral courage, reverence, and faith. Yet these qualities are but little developed in the ordinary kind of school studies. Let us beware, therefore, of riveting down on a nation a system of intellectual tests which shall take no account of the very qualities on which, in the long run, national welfare most depends. Chaos may be a bad thing but overorganization is worse.

To all of this the American Nation will most heartily agree. America believes in the differentiation of the types of secondary schools, but there is a strong tendency, as Sadler suggests, to keep all of the students under the same roof. The practice of setting up separate institutions, as was the policy in Germany, meets with strong objections here on the grounds that it leads toward class education, which is, of all things, most hateful.

The practice of keeping all types of high-school education as nearly as possible under one roof is commended also by Dunker ([29], p. 11), who says:

> The problem of avoiding blind alleys in education is helped toward solution by bringing the different courses under one roof and one principal in order to make the transfer from one to the other possible and relatively easy.

Thus, America escapes a danger which Germany has suffered by separating her types of secondary schools. The choice of a career is postponed. When such a choice is made it can be made more intelligently because the pupil is in direct contact with courses of various types and with the people of different viewpoints. Vocational guidance is made possible and the pitiful condition of the blind-alley situation can be avoided.

The whole question of the function of secondary education can be considered adequately only after one knows what type of pupil is to attend the secondary institutions. If the attendance is to come entirely from the upper classes, as has been true to a great degree in most foreign countries, the answer to the questions of

content, method, maintenance, and the like will be answered in a manner different from the answer which America must give. Here the high school has grown out of the elementary school. It is therefore free and open to all social classes. America believes in equality of opportunity for all, so far as that is possible. Such a belief has brought representatives from all social classes into the high school, and is at the root of all of our most serious problems in secondary education. Several of the critics point out the difficulties which are involved in the working out of a plan of secondary education which will be suited to the needs of all types of pupils. Compayré ([29], p. 24] says:

> The Americans develop a taste for a type of education which is too high in comparison with the social destiny of the pupils who attend.

Compayré says further on page 5:

> The American high schools are not uniformly distributed. They are not made available to all of the pupils.

Sadler ([76], p. 141) says:

> An English student admires the public spirit and patriotic enthusiasm which have produced the new high-school system in America. But it appears to him that intellectual efficiency has been somewhat sacrificed to the desire to cater to the average boy and girl who come from the primary school.

Böttger ([5], p. 21) says:

> In America they look upon the raising of the ability of the average man as their aim, while in Germany the main purpose is to enable the best pupils to come to a full development.

Miss Burstall ([12], p. 41) says:

> There is no provision for bright pupils. If a hundred pupils begin Latin in September, in say three divisions, they are all kept at the same rate through the year. We should reclassify them at Christmas, if not earlier, and have a first pack, a middle average division, and a slow tail, who would need special care. Thus the first set might do twice as much Latin as the third. This result, which we think excellent, would to many Americans be quite improper in that one boy would learn, at public cost, twice as much as another in a year. One principal tried this plan but it was stopped by the authorities because his policy was "contrary to American democratic principles" * * *. A country which provides only for the average youth in its public schools deprives the boy or girl who possesses special talents of the opportunity of cultivating them to the highest degree and thus robs itself * * *. To form an ideal, which demands only the best in the way of intellectual results for every pupil and to make the average man realize it, is probably one of the most urgent tasks of the present day for American specialists in higher education.

All of these difficulties have been recognized and much has been done to relieve them. The broadening of the curriculum has done much to remove the force of Compayré's criticism. In the nineties it was doubtless true that many pupils were entering high school who

were not equipped either mentally or by preparation to pursue high-school studies. In all probability there will always be some pupils of this sort. But the broadening of the curriculum and the adjustment of the entrance requirements which have been made by the colleges and universities have done much to relieve the trouble. Even if the problem is never completely solved, it is much better to inspire all of the pupils as individuals and provide opportunities for them, even if a few must drop out because they have not sufficient ability to profit by what is offered. The statement that high schools are not available for all the pupils is still unfortunately true, but there has been much progress in this respect, and all indications point toward still greater progress in the future.

It was shown on page 22 that American ideals necessitate first taking care of the middle classes as far as ability is concerned. Hence the tendency toward mediocrity and fixed promotion periods. But Miss Burstall's criticism is not a true picture of the general situation. School authorities will not, in general, interfere with high-school principals who seek to provide for the talented pupils. American belief in the perfectibility of the individual will see to that. The chief difficulty lies in persuading the average parent that his child is less talented than other children are. For that reason he will object to having the child put into the slow division. The difficulty arises over the slow pupils rather than over the fast ones. The solution will come as a result of the gradually growing realization of the fact that individual differences exist and must be provided for. Up to date this realization has still failed to influence our school procedure to any marked degree, but there are signs of awakening everywhere and there is much evidence to indicate that much more provision will be made, especially for the supernormal pupils. To neglect this matter, as Miss Burstall says, will result in great loss to society.

A further function of secondary education is suggested in several of the criticisms. Ayrton, in the Mosely Report ([66], p. 37), says:

> The Americans are not so scholarly nor so well read as the Englishmen, but their knowledge is in better form to apply. The British system turns out a man full of knowledge and principles, while the American product is a business man with scientific training. America furnishes the rapid, bold, and successful application of science to industry.

Schick ([80], p. 156) says:

> One great universal tendency pervades the educational work of America, * * * the tendency toward the practical utility of what is learned.

Sadler[4] ([76], p. 128) says:

> American influence on European education shows itself most conspicuously in the growing demand for better school training in view of the needs of modern industry and commerce * * *. It necessitates technical training for the

masses and it also emphasizes the fact that technical training is only a part of the education which every individual is to be given abundant opportunities of enjoying.

Brereton ([8], p. 300) says:

> America will soon feel the need of raising a special army of well-trained commercial travelers, thoroughly versed in modern languages, while their future captains of industry will also require to be more highly educated, not in the practice but in the theory of business, or economics, as it is called.

Thus we find recognition of the fact that the secondary school has a function to perform in educating future workers, but, as Brereton suggests, this part of the work should be broad and liberal rather than specific and practical. The function of secondary education as reflected by a composite of the criticism includes the provision of a broad liberal education for all who can profit by it, and guidance in the selection of a career with ample provisions of subject matter which is fundamental in as many callings as possible. It also includes the creation of a like-mindedness which is the best antidote for a class system and the best basis for citizenship in a democracy. It must be a finishing school and also a preparatory institution, emphasizing in each case the stimulation toward further education. Finally, it must aim to develop broadmindedness, adaptability, judgment, social sympathy, and all of those qualities which count for intelligent participation in social life as a whole.

If a comparison be made between the function of the secondary school and that of the elementary school (see p. 77 and ff.), it will be noticed that there is much overlapping. This is as it should be, because the transition from elementary to secondary education should be gradual. Children who pass from the elementary school to the high school are after all the same individuals, with much the same interests and needs. The chief distinction between the functions of the two institutions lies in the fact that the elementary school has for its chief function the control over the tools of knowledge while the high school is more directly concerned with the mastery of knowledge. Yet both of these functions are in reality determined by the same great aim—the perpetuation and growth of American ideals.

The secondary school, as has been said, must provide for a broad, liberal education, and also an education in those subjects which are fundamental to success in the various callings of life. These two phases of the function of secondary education often interfere with each other. It is generally admitted that of the two, the liberal education should come first. Disagreement arises, however, as soon as an attempt is made to answer the question as to when the emphasis should change from the liberal to the vocational and professional subjects. This problem, being common to all countries, occupies the

attention of the critics to a large extent. In all cases there is strong opposition to early specialization. The criticism of Douarche ([27], p. 23) calls attention to the argument in favor of early specialization. The idea is brought out that with the increasing complexity of modern life, one can not commence one's professional education too early, even when the neglect of general education is involved. The lawyer and the physician, for example, need so much knowledge for the exercise of their profession that it is useless to learn first the natural sciences and history. To this argument Douarche replies:

> Nothing is more deceptive than this utilitarianism when pushed thus far. In reality, the higher the profession is for which the student is preparing himself, the more necessary is a broad, general education; or, in other words, the higher the intellectual level upon which specialization rests, the more effective the specialization. For the young student will always have to face social, political, moral, and religious problems. He will live in continual contact with nature, science, art, and literature. He must always live with his nation and within a certain epoch. This experience is common to each of us—to the banker, as well as to the laborer, to the priest as well as to the teacher, to the lawyer as well as to the physician. The technique of our profession appears, therefore, as the least element of the common task at which we work; and if the education of the child is to be adapted to his life as a man, it is quite necessary that there be a common fund of general education in any social community.

This criticism was written in response to a tendency on the part of some of our educational leaders to overemphasize vocational and professional education in comparison with that of a broad liberal type. American public opinion seems to support Dougarché in his opposition to this tendency. The average man no longer wants his son to prepare himself for the same calling in which he himself is engaged. In general he realizes that a broad basis of general education is necessary. The laboring men and the farmers are justly suspicious of a type of educational program which will equip their sons solely for the occupation which the father follows. The average American seems willing to put forth strong efforts to give his son and daughter better intellectual and social advantages than he has enjoyed. He is inclined to excuse his own ignorance by the fact that his children will possess a more liberal education than he has had. He often goes so far as to believe that if he gives his children a broad general education, he can safely leave it to them to learn a trade or take up a profession. In failing to sense the popular view in this matter, some of our vocational experts have plainly laid themselves open to the charge of unworthy propagandism. But a reaction is setting in as it always does when popular beliefs have been violated. The most recent tendency everywhere is toward extending general education at least up to 15 with differentiated courses after that time. This calls for increased differentiation in the high school but not for a narrow type of specialization.

## SPECIALIZATION IN EDUCATION.

Douarche mentions and opposes another reason for early specialization in America which is also worthy of consideration. That is the desire to teach only what appeals to the interest of the child. Against this tendency he says ([27], p. 22):

> What is the use of education if it does not mean that discrimination of good and bad instincts? The purpose of education is precisely to suppress the lower instincts in order to develop those which are more noble. It also aims, in general, to create new desires and new interests. What would modern civilization be if education could not subdue and organize our natural tastes and instinctive desires? Then, too, the child who is permitted to give free rein to his inclinations will not possess sufficient energy to triumph over his daily difficulties and will necessarily be badly prepared for the struggles of life. It is the sacred mission of education to raise man to the realization of his duties, to overcome the wicked instincts in order to strive continually toward higher and nobler ideals.

On page 503 Douarche adds:

> Unfortunately the elective system always has the fault of encouraging premature specialization. It makes possible an incomplete and fragmentary education and does not insure a general education to every pupil.

In this quotation the critic is no longer speaking particularly of specialization, but is treating the question of the elective system as well. The argument applies also to giving the student the right to choose between subjects, each of which is liberal in character. Thus we come to a consideration of the American elective system. In regard to it we find a great amount of comment on the part of the critics. Most of them agree with Douarche in opposing it. Kerschensteiner ([47], p. 14) says:

> If the student does not like the strict methods of any particular teacher or the difficulties of a certain course he may choose a different course and so evade the severe training. To an entirely too great an extent the American high-school student does only what he likes to do or what can be accomplished with a minimum of effort and not what really helps him intellectually.

Langlois ([51], p. 29) says:

> But a course of study in order to be profitable must be rational. Is it not absurd to allow children to make such a course for themselves on the pretext that they are interested in such studies? Such freedom has been discredited by those quackish schools, which, in order to throw dust in the eyes, advertise 30 or 40 subjects on their lists of instruction and which allow free choice between bee culture, stenography, and mathematics, for example.

Clasen ([16], p. 365) says:

> To permit this freedom of choice to young pupils who have no power to judge, and, who, frequently, owing to the American love of freedom, will be advised neither by their parents nor by their teachers, is an unsound arrangement in the high schools.

Miss Burstall ([11], p. 107) says:

> The elective system appears to encourage superficiality and to fritter away time, while the student can never acquire that sense of the vastness of knowledge and arduousness of really good work which is one of the greatest advantages of a university education.

But the elective system also has some good points in the eyes of the critics. Douarche ([27], p. 503) says:

> The system has the great advantage of developing early in the life of the student a feeling of responsibility. That which a person does voluntarily is better done than that which is imposed upon him by administrative authority.

In speaking of the American schools, Compayré ([19], p. 15) favors the extent and elasticity of the program of studies. He says:

> How different from the uniform and tyrannical rules which govern European secondary education! We shall not hesitate to say that the elective system with optional courses as practiced in the American secondary schools * * * confers upon these schools a sort of vitality to which the classes in our French lycées can not pretend. There, without distinction and pell-pell, pupils of every type of intellect and every social destiny are compelled to follow the same course of instruction.

The same author says ([94], p. 218):

> How can one compare without envy the supple and mobile régime of instruction, in which the opportunity to choose diversifies the studies, with the French mechanism of secondary instruction which drives a troop of students under uniform rules from class to class, nolens volens.

Walther ([89], p. 16) says:

> The elective system is an agency by which the education of the head, hand, and heart is provided rather than one along narrow intellectual lines.

Ashley ([1], p. 426) says:

> The elective system gives free play to the personal tastes. By freeing the pupil from distasteful studies it leaves him more time and energy to devote to those studies for which he has a natural inclination and in which he is therefore likely to do better work.

Gray, in the Mosely Report ([66], p. 170), says:

> The elective system is a valuable protest against the cut-and-dried courses in the English schools. It does not disgust nor repel. It produces few if any hopeless cases. Superannuation, the artificial means by which hopeless cases in the narrow groove system are eliminated, with all of its attendant injustice, is unknown.

Such is the argument for and against the system. Some of the objections are serious and worthy of thorough consideration. The strongest objections center around allowing the child to study only what he wants to study. It is again the question of interest and effort which was discussed in Chapter IV, page 89. Here, however,

it takes the form of protest from those who favor the disciplinary subjects. They are afraid that these subjects will disappear from the curriculum if they are made elective. Experience, however, has shown that this is not true. The study of Latin, for example, has shown a remarkable tendency to persist even when it is possible to avoid taking it.

America will agree with Douarche when he says that one purpose of education is to discriminate between the good and bad instincts. They will question, however, his policy of suppression as applied to the undesirable behavior. They prefer a policy of redirection, and they believe that such redirection is possible by means of courses with prescribed prerequisites. For example, a pupil may dislike mathematics but be interested in engineering. In such a case it is far better to show that mathematics must be taken if the pupil wishes to become an engineer than to compel him to take that subject in an ex cathedra manner. The principle of respect for personality is involved and this is dear to the Americans. The provision of prescribed elective courses will also take care of the objection of Langlois and of the general accusation that the elective system leads to superficial and choppy work.

The argument that the pupils are too young to judge intelligently can be met by intelligent guidance and ample provisions for change if it is found that a wrong choice has been made. The tendency on the part of some pupils to shun difficult courses and unpopular teachers is inevitable; but it is not serious enough to spoil the whole plan. Furthermore, it is not entirely without compensation, since it often furnishes a valuable check upon the teacher. Courses should not be too difficult and an unpopular teacher is usually somewhat to blame. The elective system, therefore, tends to stimulate the unpopular teacher to better his policies and to improve his methods of teaching.

All of the favorable criticism will appeal to Americans. Indeed, the belief in the value of the law of effect, in the principle of respect for personality and in provision of opportunities for all classes, makes some form of the elective system a necessity. No pupil can study everything. Some elimination is unavoidable. Therefore, America must and will make use of some kind of an elective system. The values of the system, on careful consideration, far outweigh its disadvantages.

Criticism of the general organization of secondary education is not extensive. The high school is largely a continuation of the elementary school and as such it is subject to the same defects in organization. The most serious weakness is the lack of coordination with the elementary school. This was discussed on page 81. A further

serious defect which has not been mentioned is the lack of continuation schools. Blair, in the Mosely Report ([66], p. 40), makes this statement:

> Neither the German nor the American evening school is comparable to the English in either quality or quantity. This is partly because England educated "heads" and "hearts" together while in the other two countries there is more of a tendency to separate them.

The lack of a system of continuation schools is the most serious gap in the American educational system. The demands of democracy are not being met so long as such a large proportion of our people do not have opportunities for a good secondary education. To meet this need is one of our most pressing problems.

## COEDUCATION.

By far the most voluminous portion of the foreign criticism is that dealing with the subject of coeducation. Such a practice, particularly in the upper grades, is rare in Europe. In some places on the Continent, according to some of the critics, coeducation would be dangerous. It is natural, therefore, that they should wonder why it is possible and even beneficial here. There is no other question upon which the criticism is more evenly divided, or upon which it is more contradictory. All agree that one of the chief reasons why coeducation has prevailed so generally in America is because it is more economical. Some of them accuse America of making a virtue out of a necessity in this regard. Some say that through coeducation each sex stimulated the other, while perhaps an equal number say that each sex embarrasses the other. Some believe that it makes the boys more civil and the girls more self-reliant, while others are sure that it makes the boys effeminate and the girls rude and masculine. Some say that it reduces sexual tension at a critical age and thus improves sex morality, while others believe that it leads to sex immorality. Some like it because it leads to happy marriages, others say that there are too many early marriages and still others that the girls learn the imperfections of the boys and are therefore unwilling to marry at all. Those who favor the plan say that discipline is made easier, that it is more natural for boys and girls to be educated together since they are to associate with each other in life. Some like the system because it means equal opportunities for both sexes. They say it promotes a family spirit in the schools, makes boys and girls respect each other, prevents sentimentality and provides boys and girls with common interests. On the other hand, the opponents say that the work is too difficult for the girls, that the standards must therefore be lowered, that it tends to make girls dissatisfied with home life, that there are not enough of opportunities

for girls to develop themselves along the lines which are in accord with woman's destiny in the world. Some object to coeducation because it leads to a preponderance of woman teachers, while others oppose it because the male students object to the presence of girls in their classes.

This conflicting criticism is no doubt due to the fact that many of the critics have in mind the results which would ensue if the system were suddenly introduced into their own countries. In other words, they have failed to take into account the American beliefs and ideals which are back of the practice.

These beliefs and ideals are fundamental and to a large extent peculiar to America. Respect for personality and personal freedom has not been confined to men only. According to our observers, the American girl is placed more upon her own responsibility than is her European sister. The girls of Europe are more safeguarded than they are here. Under a system of coeducation it is felt that such safeguards would be impossible. This point of view is suggested by Walther ([89], p. 30) who says:

> The association of girls with young men, which with us gives so much cause for misinterpretation and is even feared, is accepted as a matter of course over there. The respect which American women in general enjoy and the honor which the male sex accords to them guarantees them against injuries and attacks to which they are unfortunately so often exposed in Europe. Here women can hardly dare to go on the streets alone in the evening.

There seems to be a general agreement among the critics that American women are more likely to be respected and less likely to be molested than is the case with the women of any other country. It does not occur to the average American that coeducation is a moral danger. The relations of the sexes are based upon the belief that American girls are virtuous and that American boys and men will respect their principles of morality. Thus it is safe to put both upon their honor. Some boys and girls misuse their freedom but there are no indications that sex immorality is any greater in America than it is in the countries where girls are closely watched. The disadvantages are no greater, while the gain is immense. In fact, the only true morality is that which holds good when the individual is free to act.

The American women are also more free intellectually. Lanson ([54], p. 25) says:

> The American women seem to have at least equal powers of attention, intelligence, and an equal degree of physical and mental capacity. They do not want a system of instruction organized for women, emasculated and agreeable; a culture suited for ornamental plants; * * * of the kitchen garden. They want virile discipline which develops the human being in the plenitude of his consciousness and will power.

This criticism suggests the working of a force which has, temporarily at least, obscured some phases of the coeducation question. Historically school curricula have been made for boys. Girls have been challenged to show that they are the intellectual equals of men. Their best opportunity to meet this challenge has been to make good in the boy's studies. For a time at least there was a tendency to overlook the needs of the girls and require them to take what the boys must take. This tendency was greatly strengthened by the American belief in equality. The tendency to allow girls to pursue an education which is suited to their destiny in the world is still far from strong. So far as elementary education is concerned it is undoubtedly better for both sexes to study the same subjects. But in the high school, particularly in the latter years of the course, it seems much better to encourage the girls to elect those courses which are prerequisite to household arts and general homekeeping. Girls and boys may be equal intellectually, but they are not identical. Each sex has its sphere, though, of course, there is much overlapping. The most fundamental division of labor is that which exists between the work of men and the work of women. It seems therefore that the first specialization should be along these lines. The secondary curriculum should be adapted to some extent to the interests and needs of the girls. This adaptation has yet to be arranged in the majority of our high schools. The only serious objection to American coeducation is based upon the fact that these provisions have not been made. The most desirable procedure seems to be to keep the boys and girls under the same roof, but provide special courses for each sex, especially in the latter years of the course.

One thing at least is certain in this connection. America believes in the education of women, and it has provided better educational opportunities for them than are to be found in any of the countries represented in the criticism. The good results of this policy have not been overlooked by the critics. Laveleye ([56], p. 386) says:

> It is the woman who has given strength to the American democracy by communicating to it a moral and religious character of a high order. * * * Educate the woman and the people will be raised out of their ignorance because of her influence on the children.

On the other hand, some of the critics are not so sure of the value of education for women. Caullery ([14], pp. 88–92) says:

> The American woman in a college environment usually has a more solid general culture than the man has, because she prosecuted her studies in a true spirit of culture and not as a means of arriving as rapidly as possible at success in the struggle of life. * * * In a general way, the American woman is more emancipated from masculine guardianship than the European woman is; * * * she sees things for herself. The prospects of life and of marriage have forced her more than in Europe to prepare to support herself. One finds her in a

number of professions which are not open to her in Europe. * * * From the point of view of her studies, she has the reputation of being more industrious than the male student is. She is much less absorbed in athletics and other diversions. In the coeducational universities she has had splendid scholastic success which does not fail to excite a little masculine jealousy at times. * * * A college education largely emancipates the American woman. She is educated and free. She interests herself voluntarily in many things, and particularly in problems of public utility, often in a rather shocking manner.

One can not refrain from thinking all the time that the life which she is leading in college may develop in her tastes for luxury which in many cases will present a serious obstacle to family life. The American population of the ancient stock, the depository of English civilization and Puritan tradition, is threatened with rapid disappearance. This sterility is evidently voluntary, and among its causes is the general comfort of life and economic conditions which it entails. * * * College education for women tends to aggravate this evil. It has developed a strong individualism in women which leads away from the prosaic realities of life.

Caullery suggests here one of the most serious problems of all education. Its importance is being felt in all nations. Women everywhere are trifling to enter into professional, economic, and industrial life. The seriousness of this tendency arises from the fact that it postpones marriage, and therefore interferes with the increase in the population. Since it is so universal, it does not seem fair to blame it alone upon the policy of educating women. It seems better to look upon the belief in the education of women as an effect rather than a cause of the trouble. The essence of the movement is the general tendency to apply the principle of democracy to women as well as men. But society has heretofore been organized on a monarchical basis, in which the men were the more or less autocratic leaders. To give woman equal rights to earn money, acquire an education, control her own affairs, and participate in political activity means a revolution in our social structure which is profound in its influence. To accomplish such a change and avoid temporary maladjustments is impossible. It is likewise impossible to return to the old conditions in which women were kept within the home in ignorance and subjection. America, in particular, can not turn back, because we have advanced more than any other nation from the old position. We are in the midst of changes which must continue. As yet the outcome is obscure, but the tendency is established. The women of all nations will receive more recognition. Equality of opportunity will be provided for them as well as for the men. This means that more occupations will be open to them and more influences to pull them away from the home and marriage. The rate of increase in the population will suffer somewhat, but there will be no disastrous results. After all, the most profound of all human instincts are back of the family, and we can trust them to guarantee its continuation in some form. In the meantime, America must con-

time to improve educational opportunities for girls which will be more and more in line with their opportunities and needs.

America has pledged itself to give women their rights, but the actual process is far from complete. Miss Burstall ([12], p. 274) says:

> The position of women in school administration is conspicuously inferior to what it is in England. As a rule, women are not found on school boards, boards of regents, or committees of the National Education Association. The higher the education the worse the position of women. In the universities organization, initiative, administration, and government are in the hands of men. In assemblies in coeducational schools those who occupy the platform are men. This condition of things in a country where women occupy a far better position generally than anywhere in the world, and where they are given precedence in all kinds of ways, is very remarkable.

This condition is one of the imperfections which are unavoidable when conditions are in a state of transition. Since the above criticism was written the National Education Association policy has much improved, and the tendency everywhere is toward a larger recognition for women.

## EXAMINATIONS.

One other phase of secondary education deserves notice because of its absence in America. There is no general system of examinations. In general, the English critics seem to consider this a great advantage. Reichel ([66], p. 298) says:

> Our schools are dominated by outside examinations and organized for the purpose of winning certificates and scholarships. * * * The ordinary pupil * * * knows that the prize * * * is utterly beyond his reach, however hard he works. Naturally, he soon gives up the struggle and resigns himself to the conviction that headwork is not for such as him. From this incubus the American schools are remarkably free. The pupil of moderate ability is free from the pressure of external competition, and consequently takes more interest in his work.

Foster, in the Mosely Report ([66], p. 116), says:

> The examinations for degrees are left to the individual teacher * * *. The evils resulting from occasional abuses are less great and less widespread than the evils of the examination system in British universities. In the universities of the States there seemed to be an atmosphere of quiet study and scholarly work which is apparently continuous throughout the session and remains undisturbed by feverish outbursts of cramming such as characterize the British colleges and universities. The American system requires elaborate daily care and the guiding, watching, and recording of the student's progress, but that care does not involve a greater expenditure of energy than the organization of the unwieldy examination system of this country. Moreover, as it is spread over a large period, it can not involve the terrible weariness of the British system. From the point of view of the student, the results are far better. Slacking is impossible and the waste of time during some of the most valuable and critical periods of the young man's life is prevented.

The British teacher is compelled by force of circumstances to conceive and direct his work entirely in terms of examinations. As long as examinations control teaching * * * so long will teaching continue to be academic in the worst sense of the word, cribbed, cabined, and confined. In America even the weak teacher gives stronger guidance to his pupils and produces better educational results than he does here * * *. The American teacher is measured by the standard which he makes for himself, while with us the teacher has a standard imposed upon him by an external examining body which is almost inevitably academic. For the English teacher a prescribed amount of work has to be got through in a certain time whether or not such work is suited to the ability of the student or to the teacher's powers. Life is a continual rush. There is no time to deal with the mistakes of the pupils; they are simply told that they are wrong * * *. The American teacher cares for the development of the class as a whole, and not mainly for that of those who will do him the most credit in answering the questions of an outsider.

Rhys, in the Mosely Report ([66], p. 315), says:

The American student is not under the pressure of an ever-growing cramming system which, like an octopus, threatens to strangle in its ubiquitous coils all that deserves to be called education.

Compayré ([19], p. 219) favors the American chain type of examinations because—

the stimulus coming as it does before the examinations is more constant and powerful. The examinations need not be taken so seriously * * * since all does not depend on one throw. The difficulty is divided and efforts begin sooner.

Dosarche ([27], p. 29) says:

A series of examinations accompanies the student through the four years of his college life, to sustain and stimulate him.

Judging by the foregoing criticism, America has done well to escape such a system of examinations. A modified form of the system, however, exists in some of the eastern States, and evidence is not lacking to indicate that it is in general open to the same objections as is the case in England.

For this reason, and because Americans are in general opposed to centralized authority, the examination system has not become general here. Under such conditions the foreigner at once wants to know how we maintain our standards. The answer is the accrediting system. Foster ([66], pp. 117–118) commends it heartily and gives the following reasons in its favor:

1. It strengthens and unifies the system.
2. The universities are looked upon as the counselors and friends of the high schools.
3. The barriers between university and secondary teachers are removed.
4. The teaching is made more direct, stimulating, and attractive to the pupils.
5. Better training results because the teacher and the taught are free.

6. The system provides for a carefully graded and carefully watched course of study.

7. It replaces the race-horse methods that turn the English schools into training grounds for the examination race * * * upon which the boy's future depends to an alarming extent.

8. It recognizes that education is a slow process which must be spread over certain fixed periods of time; * * * that there are no short cuts; * * * that even though the boy may have the information to answer the questions of an outside examiner, it does not follow that he has been successfully educated.

9. It dignifies the teacher by trusting him.

10. It preserves the initiative of the teacher and gives a freshness and attractiveness to the work which it is impossible to exaggerate. * * * The accrediting system is perhaps one of the most noteworthy contributions of America to educational progress.

Those who believe in the external examinations will doubtless claim that some of these advantages can also be attained through such a system, but they will have difficulty in showing that the practice does not interfere with the freedom of the teacher. A still more serious objection is the accusation that the examination system emphasizes training rather than education. The word training has an unpleasant sound to Americans in general. It suggests external authority and a lack of respect for the personality of the pupil. The crux of the whole matter seems to lie in the fact that the examination system emphasizes information and tends to neglect the needs, interests, and individual differences of the pupils. Under such a system whole-hearted, purposeful activity of the right sort seems well nigh impossible. America seems better off without it.

## TEACHING OF MODERN LANGUAGES.

There is one sharp contrast between the criticism which applies to the elementary school and that applying to the high school. In the first case the emphasis is on method rather than content, while in the second exactly the reverse is true. Since most of the critics represent nations which do not speak the English language it is natural to expect much criticism concerning our teaching of modern languages.

Most of the critics call attention to the fact that our aims in this regard are different from those in Europe. Over there the study of modern languages is based upon commercial interest. The students wish to learn foreign languages in order to carry on intelligent conversation with their neighbors, particularly in connection with commercial dealings. But Sadler ([76], p. 153) says:

> The true claims for linguistic study are not based on the advantage in commercial bargaining, but on the need for training to the highest possible point the gift of expression through which a man enjoys fullness and freedom of intercourse with other men.

The isolation of America has caused this aim to be too much neglected. Hence our language teaching does not carry over; it does not lead to further activity. As a result foreign languages are studied too often with the sole view to meet the requirements, after which the student's knowledge slowly evaporates through disuse. There is too little emphasis on thorough mastery of the foreign language with a view toward using it as a tool for the control of knowledge after school days are over. Perhaps the difficulty is unavoidable, but just the same its presence causes a lack of motive and is one cause of the poor results obtained. These results have not failed to attract the attention of our critics. Walther ([89], p. 21) thinks that the difficulty is due to the wrong sort of college entrance requirements. He says:

> One sees to what perverted activities one-sided college entrance requirements lead, how they cause a chase through the literature without satisfactory results. No mental stimulation results from the acquaintance with foreign languages.

Clasen ([16], p. 366) says:

> In foreign languages it is still impossible to arrive at any results worth mentioning even in a four-year course. There is only nibbling without a profound insight. Only crumbs of knowledge are possible.

The French critics complain that French is neglected. Thus Guerard ([41], p. 481–483) says:

> The consequence of neglecting French in favor of German in the United States are evident and heartbreaking. A profound ignorance of modern French is inexcusable in a people which resembles us in so many respects, whose national life rests upon the same principles as ours, and who ought to appreciate and love us more than any other country. There is an almost unbelievable indifference to our better literature, and the impression that Germany has surpassed degenerate France in everything. French is even taught by German teachers at times. For the name of one French professor you will find 10 German or Scandinavian teachers; for one American who has received a French diploma you will meet 10 Ph. D's from beyond the Rhine. The French instruction in the United States is given by a personnel and in a spirit which is neither American nor French. * * * In the country as a whole there are about four courses in old French to one of modern. * * * Linguistics chokes out the study of literature and the Middle Ages eclipse modern times.

America has been strongly affected by German influence, and French has undoubtedly been neglected. The cause of this condition, however, is largely due to the policy of France. It has been and still is very difficult for American students to enter French universities, while the German universities have kept wide-open doors. Since the war Americans no longer desire to attend German universities. France now has an opportunity to replace Teutonic influence in this country, and it is to be hoped that she will rise to the occasion by abolishing her entrance requirements and thus make it possible for Ameri-

can students to study and learn French customs and ideals at first hand.

The fact still remains that, owing to the lack of a practical motive, our instruction in all foreign language tends to become formal and bookish, while literary appreciation and mastery are lacking. This seems to constitute our chief danger in all foreign-language instruction.

In the case of Latin, Höfer ([45], p. 23), in speaking of our exhibits at the St. Louis Fair, says:

> Face to face with the generally dry results of laborious, empty translations of the ancient languages, one asks one's self again and again why the Americans teach Latin and Greek in their schools. Only in rare cases * * * did the work of the pupils show any understanding of ancient life or of classical archæology and the like. It is not a bad thing after all that Greek is disappearing from the high schools.

Walther ([89], p. 11) says:

> Translating and parsing are, in most American schools, the two poles about which the whole language instruction revolves. The use of reading for etymology, synonyms, and for the acquirement of a vocabulary according to form and content are lacking and the exercises are not based upon the words most commonly used. * * * The time allotted to foreign languages in high school and college is too limited and the pupils are too old. * * * When the pupil studies foreign languages his time is taken up by turning through the pages of the dictionary. Such study does not aid in translating, and it hinders the appreciation of the literature. Thus the true basis of language study is lacking.

A few critics suggest the value of the direct conversational method in this connection, and it is very probable that they are right. Any change can hardly avoid being a change for the better. The application of the method, however, is too limited, the power of the traditional teacher is too strong for us to be certain of the value of the newer method, but it seems a step in the right direction. At any rate, our foreign language instruction, particularly that of Latin, will be forced to be continually on the defensive until some means of improvement is discovered. The whole thing seems to have fallen under the disciplinary concept. The idea that the content of the writings of Cæsar, Cicero, and Virgil includes matter which is interesting and beautiful does not occur to the pupils who study these works in the high school. The value of translating foreign languages as an exercise in English composition seems sadly overlooked. The idea that Latin is an important prerequisite for the study of law, medicine, pharmacy, and even for the general mastery of the English language is not emphasized. The student's aim is merely to learn enough parsing and acquire enough ability in prose composition to meet the requirements. There is no suspicion of activity leading to further activity. Latin should remain in the curriculum, but it is high time

that it should be taught in a manner that will justify it in the minds of the pupils at its true value. As a discipline it is becoming more and more questionable, but as a prerequisite to specialization and as a means of appreciating the spirit and value of ancient culture it is still very much worth while.

Much of the criticism, particularly that in the Mosely Report, is written by men who were sent over here to discover the cause of American success in industry and commerce. Hence a great deal of the criticism centers around this type of work in our schools. Shadwell ([83], p. 439) says:

> Broadly, the technical education in the United States resembles the German more than the English system in that it supplies the industries from above rather than from below. It aims at the education of managers rather than that of the rank and file. But it possesses the merits of neither. It has not the specialization nor thoroughness of the one, nor the general diffusion of the other. It is so unevenly distributed and heterogeneous that classification is hardly possible. The most salient feature of the American type is its demand for college-trained men. The schools are due to private initiative and are bunched too much. They are not where they are most needed. This defect is one cause of the correspondence school. American technical education, high and low, appears to suffer from the national defect of a want of thoroughness, which arises from a craving for short cuts. Hence the correspondence schools and the attempt to teach industries in a school where there are inadequate opportunities for practical experiences. American training seems shallow and superficial.

Götte ([35], p. 236) says:

> The American technical schools do not meet the demand as do those of Germany. There is no doubt that technical schools of secondary and lower rank are needed to supply the skilled workmen from native material rather than to depend on immigration. The Americans can learn more from us in regard to technical education than we can from them.

Léautey ([57], p. 704) says:

> In American commercial colleges the instruction appeals too much to the memory and too little to the intellect. The instruction is too practical and requires too much hurrying. It is not vigorous enough and lacks equilibrium.

Muhlmann ([69], p. 24) says:

> The instruction in the technical school is too academic, not enough emphasis is placed upon the history of industrials.

Much of the above criticism seems to get at the facts. American emphasis upon the value of a general education has tended to produce industrial leaders, and there has been a feeling that a general education is necessary for such leadership. As to the rank and file, they have merely been neglected. American respect for personality and belief in improvement have made impossible the narrow type of technical training which Germany has given to her rank and file of industrial workers. It is for that reason that we have no low

grade technical schools. The tendency is rather to postpone specialization until after the high-school course is finished. On the other hand, American restlessness combined with the lack of opportunities for a broad type of secondary education has caused many pupils to take up commercial studies too early.

There is a great need of standardization of our technical schools, and it is also true that the opportunities are too much limited because the schools are bunched in inconvenient localities. Correspondence courses have been the only alternative in many cases. On the other hand, Shadwell's suggestion that American technical schools are poorly equipped is not supported by the evidence as given by other critics. His accusation that American technical training is in general shallow and superficial is also questionable. It is true, however, that the American schools do not meet the demands as they should. We are still too dependent upon immigration for certain types of skilled workmanship. This need must be met and met quickly, but not after the German manner. It is better to be somewhat at the mercy of the immigrant than to adopt a type of training such as Germany has had.

Mere efficiency after all is not the most important thing in the eyes of the American. Our chief need seems to be a wider diffusion of technical schools, a better standardization of commercial education, and a broader basis for specialization. It is to England rather than to Germany that we must look for suggestions in this matter. Our chief hope seems to lie in the provision of a general system of part-time continuation schools upon a liberal basis, leaving the narrow vocational education to the industries themselves.

Finally, it is well to remember the unanimous verdict of the Mosely commissioners to the effect that our industrial prosperity is not due to our system of industrial schools, but rather in part, at least, to the ideals which control our general educational policies. For the present it seems better to continue to emphasize adaptability, alertness, and resourcefulness until a more general and a more systematic type of technical education can be provided.

The American stress upon manual training has attracted much attention from the critics. Muthesius ([70], p. 142) says:

> The emphasis on manual training is almost overdone. In the manual-training schools an attempt is being made to replace intellectual education with the manual. This seems to be going too far, but the widespread use of manual training is very stimulating in its results. America has opened new paths and furnished an example for the whole world in both drawing and manual training. The energetic and practical people of America have vindicated points of view that could scarcely have been considered in the Old World, hampered as it is by theories and prejudices. The great importance of the two subjects is their basic value in technical and art education. America is building a good foundation and it does not matter so much that higher instruction is not

sufficiently developed and matured. Perfection of the latter will come. * * * One finds no really finished cultural results, one is disturbed at every step by imperfections, yet no other country offers such a rich harvest of suggestions. Here a thousand geniuses await future development. Everything urges forward, as yet unhampered by reactionary tendencies. * * * All the deficiencies of youth are compensated by the enthusiasm, cheering hope, and steadfast faith in its success.

To these values Dunker ([29], p. 36) adds the following:

There is no dodging or side-stepping of the problem. Practical and useful knowledge is gained. Truth is taught and the foundation for artistic taste is laid. Manual training develops a feeling of control over one's environment and confidence in one's self and in the future. It prevents the tendency to look with disdain upon manual work. The idea that to do decent work is an honor is one of the strongest pillars of American greatness.

The chief defects of our work in manual training are pointed out by Langlois ([51], p. 302):

The most of the teachers are practicians without pedagogical education. It is fatal for the manual-training high school to tend to take on little by little more or less the character of a technical school, or, at least, that of a school particularly suited to young people who are destined for the technical trades. A very grave inconvenience will result from this if these young students do not follow up their secondary studies with the other students. It is to be feared that they will pass for having received an education which is less liberal and that they will be socially handicapped thereby.

From the foregoing criticism it seems that American manual training is justifiable as a part of a liberal education and as a prerequisite for intellectual work. Its dangers lie in a failure to provide trained teachers and in a tendency to remove such instruction from the general high school and put it in a special institution. Both of these dangers can easily be avoided if we do not shut our eyes to them.

While manual training is mostly for boys, a similar type of educational activity is provided for girls in the study of domestic science. In this connection, Marchis ([62], p. 14), in speaking of the training of this type of teacher, calls attention to some defects. He says:

I do not dare to judge the educative value of attempting to direct a home in connection with this instruction, but it always seemed to me that the equipment of the model cottages was luxurious and little in harmony with the future resources of the young women in their homes. I do not see very well wherein this training will prepare them sufficiently for the direction of a home on the farm which may often be situated many miles from any other habitation. Will the young woman who is expert in the direction of a house so well equipped be able to adapt herself to more simple surroundings?

Will she not feel a certain disgust when she finds herself at close quarters with the difficulties of life? * * * They instruct the young students in the care to give to babies, but this instruction seemed peculiarly theoretical to me. I did not see one nursery in which the students could get practical training.

Here we have again [1] the question as to whether it is better to train students to meet conditions as they really exist or to inspire them with ideals of what should be. The best answer for the present seems to be to stress both sides of the question. To attempt to elevate the ideals of the remote community too quickly leads only to misunderstanding and disappointment. The people rebel against ideals handed down from above, while the students become dissatisfied with life in their home community. It would be much better to meet conditions as they are temporarily, while ever cherishing an ideal of what they should be.

Our science teaching receives some consideration. The critics, in general, approve of the laboratory method. Some of them praise it quite profusely. The older observers, however, are disposed to believe that it can not be carried out properly owing to the overburdening of the teacher. All praise the high character of the equipment. A few think that the work is too academic. Grasby ([37], p. 104) says:

> I am strongly of the opinion that in fully three-fourths of the American schools in which I saw science being taught the pupils were to a large extent being loaded with indigestible facts.

A few of the critics are afraid that the laboratory method in science is being pushed too far. Miss Bramwell ([12], p. 34) says:

> There is a danger of pursuing observation and experimentation in science teaching too far and of appealing to the senses alone, at stages of development in the child when reason and reflection might be appealed to and trusted.

Brereton ([8], p. 297) says:

> American teaching, admirable as it is in rendering the child sensitive to externals and aiding him to store up abundantly a mass of mental impressions, seems halting and inconclusive just at the point where transition has to be made from the state of the sensuous to that of logical knowledge.

Münsterberg ([67], p. 67), who, as a representative of the German gymnasium type of instruction, is inclined to exclude scientific instruction altogether, says:

> Education involving words appeals to a higher power than that based on demonstrations. Words appeal to the understanding, demonstrations to the perception. Words give us laws, demonstrations give accidental realizations. The latter can not really show us the totality of a law. They show always one special case, which as such is quite unimportant. Their importance lies in the necessity which can be expressed merely by words and never by apparatus. The deeper meaning of naturalistic instruction is by far more fully present in the book than in the instrument; and while it is easier to teach and to learn natural science when it appeals to the eye rather than to the reason, I doubt whether it has, from a higher standpoint, the same educational value.

All of these criticisms are worthy of consideration. They have been met very largely by requiring the pupil to do his own experimenting

[1] See p. 54.

rather than merely observing while the instructor performs the experiment. In this manner the "totality of a law" can be arrived at and there is a better opportunity to get at the "deeper meaning of naturalistic instruction" than is possible with books. The process is also more in accord with American beliefs. To the American, learning is, above all, doing. There has always been a strong undercurrent of opposition in America to bookishness in education. This is doubtless due to the fact that after all mere academic learning is undemocratic. It tends to produce a class of polished, white-handed individuals, which has never failed to stir up the fundamental antipathies of the American people in general. Hence, it is highly probable that America will continue to teach science, and that the laboratory method will continue to exist, though in a form so modified as to avoid the objections which have been given.

The critics quite generally recognize that a large part of the educational activities of the secondary school in America do not appear in the course of study. If truly valuable results are to be obtained there must be a healthy school spirit. This spirit has its source chiefly in the spontaneous activities of the students. Such activities are rather conspicuous by their absence in the secondary schools of Germany and France. In America they manifest themselves chiefly in student organizations, particularly in those of the athletic type. The German and French critics are generally favorable toward these clubs. With regard to the value of athletics, however, the critics are divided, with the majority unfavorable. Loebner, however ([58], p. 12), commends athletic activities because as a result of it "the pale student, the wallflower type of girl, and the drunken student have almost vanished."

Concerning baseball, Weulersse ([90], p. 132) says:

> Is not athletics humanizing in its nature? In a baseball game, what a training there is of individual initiative and social discipline, what exercise of silent energy, resolution, hardihood, "go ahead and pluck"; what vehemence of passion; what fighting spirit and even brutality; but yet what respect for opponents, what a desire for fair play and what peaceful submission to the sovereign decisions of the umpire.

But there is another side. Beck ([4], p. 126) says:

> If the value of physical education consists in enabling the person so trained to exercise all possible combinations of movements in a moment of time and to do this almost automatically because the nerve connections are well made, then American physical training is a failure.

Langlois ([52], p. 203) says:

> One-third of the students take no part in competitive athletics. Those who are weak physically can not and those who are most intelligent will not because they need the time for something else.

Coubertin ([23], p. 366) says:

> The athletic training is for those who need it least. Enormous sums are wagered, and while the champions engage in this sort of exaggerated athletics their comrades are kept aside in order not to interfere with their training.

Marchis ([62], p. 17) says:

> It is claimed that no one can play on the teams who is not up to standard in his studies, but I doubt that this rule is strictly applied. The winning of a big game is so important for the reputation of the school that the teachers have to close their eyes to the intellectual shortcomings of the athletes.

These dangers are real, as everyone will testify who has had experience with high-school and college athletics. To meet the objection that athletics is for the few only, classes in physical training are being organized which are compulsory for all and suited to the needs of each pupil. The maintenance of one's studies as a prerequisite to playing on the team is difficult to establish, but it has been accomplished in many cases. Most of the students are on the side lines, as Langlois suggests, but he overlooks the value of the spirit which brings them there. To "root" together for one's team is one of the most powerful means of developing cooperation and healthy school spirit. To take defeat in a sportsmanlike manner and to submit without murmuring to the decisions of the umpire is an excellent training in some of the greatest social virtues. So far as America is concerned, our minds are made up. School athletics is worth while; but it must be watched and guided by those in authority if the best results are to be obtained. It must also be remembered that our facilities for anything like general physical education are far from complete. More medical inspection is needed and better playground facilities.

Rathbone in the Mosely Report ([66], p. 258) says:

> Americans are not yet fully alive to the excellent opportunities for educational work which playgrounds and play fields afford. The value of organized play and games is being recognized more and more, but there are still too many parents who look upon such activities as a waste of time. We need a much more general realization of the fact that the participation in organized play can be of far greater educational value than "exercise upon a woodpile."

Even from the standpoint of physical exercise, the playground activities are preferable to those of the woodpile type. A better type of physical education is sorely needed and there is a growing belief that compulsory health is desirable as well as compulsory education.

As to English teaching in the high school, the criticism is in general favorable, but the observers think that history is being neglected. Compayré ([19], p. 124) says, for example:

> History is much neglected in both elementary and high school. Is not this the case of saying over again that the practical American, absorbed in his care for the present and the future, is disinterested and disdains the past, no longer seeing any use of studying the Old World?

This is another evidence of the effect of our remoteness. With improvement of methods of communication it will doubtless be replaced by broader ideals.

The question of method in the high school is not touched upon to any great extent specifically. Much of the criticism given in Chapter IV is plainly intended to apply to the high school also. The argument offered in connection with the criticism will usually apply equally well in the high school. One further point deserves mention here. Compayré ([20], p. 561) says that many high-school teachers show a disdain for pedagogy. This is undoubtedly a serious defect which is due to the narrow academic tendency. Knowledge is emphasized rather than the needs and interests of the pupils. The need for more professionally trained teachers in the high school was never more acute.

In one type of criticism there is an accusation that school activities take up too much time. Henning ([43], p. 377) says:

> In the high schools, love-making, dancing, secret societies, and an enormous amount of daily football and baseball play the most important part. Learning is an incidental matter.

Such criticism may be deserved in some places, but it is not so in general. On the other hand, nowhere can one find the ascetic type of school surroundings which exists in some European schools. The medium course is desirable. School activities are worth a great deal. They should be encouraged to a moderate degree even if some sacrifice is at times required of the more intellectual interests.

As to the general atmosphere of the high school, Kerschensteiner ([47], p. 14) says:

> The freedom of the American high school fosters individual initiative, courage, cheerfulness, good fellowship, human qualities which are just as important as the patience, persistence, endurance, and thoroughness of the German schools. This freedom also forces a comradeship between the pupils and the teachers. The whole intercourse is based more on mutual confidence than with us. This shows in the loyalty of the American student for his high school, which is unfortunately missing in Germany.

Such is the spirit of the American high school, and it may well be that the good results of such a spirit are, after all, among the most valuable parts of our secondary education. At present it seems difficult to exaggerate the value of social participation as a portion of that education which is best adapted to the needs and spirit of a democracy.

The following points have been mentioned in this chapter as growing out of the criticism which is offered: The high school has several functions to perform. It not only prepares for college, but it is also a finishing school for many of its pupils. It should as far as possible provide a course in liberal education which is suited to

the interests and aptitudes of all. It must protect its students against the narrow spirit of commercialism which demands premature specialization and must foster the resourcefulness, initiative, and adaptability which is so essential in a democracy. It must stress citizenship and social participation rather than efficiency of production. The large comprehensive type of institution is preferable to a multitude of small schools, each with its own vocational bias. The elective system is commendable, provided it is properly safeguarded. A six-year course, beginning at the age of 11 or 12 and with a break at 15, is urgently needed. Continuation schools of a modern liberal type should be provided for those who must go to work. Coeducation should continue, but special courses should be provided for the girls. The lack of an external examination system is an advantage rather than otherwise. The accrediting system should be preserved and improved. The content is varied, but some of the subjects are not taught as they should be. This is particularly true of the foreign languages and physical education. There is a great need of a higher type of professionally trained teachers.

The student activities constitute a vital part of our secondary education and are strong influences in promoting an excellent school spirit.

# Chapter VI.

## UNIVERSITIES AND COLLEGES.

In order to understand foreign criticisms of our colleges and universities, it is necessary to remember that the universities of Europe correspond only to that portion of our university work which is on the graduate level. Europeans class our undergraduate work as secondary in character. For this reason it is quite usual to find the critics calling attention to the twofold character of our university instruction. Thus Langlois ([51], p. 294) says:

> There is a confusion between graduate and undergraduate instruction. The students are often not "étudiants" but "élèves." Everybody knows that the universities of America are still on the "American plan" and that this plan means the existence of professional and scientific schools along with a college or undergraduate department which serves as a feeder, so to speak. Is it not to be feared that the teachers of graduate students will bring along with them undergraduate habits, requirements, and tastes in wisdom and research which will be not at all suitable? Will not the graduate work sometimes or even always be weakened by its close contact with the undergraduate? * * * Original investigation supposes not only activity of mind but also leisure. Yet leisure is impossible when undergraduate work must also be looked after.

Douarche ([27], p. 490) says:

> The American university will not be an institution of the first order until there is a reform of the whole system so that the undergraduate department can be taken away.

Caullery ([14], p. 29) says:

> Everything which has been added to the old college and all that belongs in its train is heterogeneous. The relations of these parts to each other and to the whole have not taken on a character of definite stability.

This double function undoubtedly leads to some confusion at times, especially when graduate and undergraduate students are taught in the same class, but it has one great value. It puts the undergraduate in a stimulating environment and helps to give him ideals and ambition to continue his education. At the same time, there must be careful provisions against allowing the spirit of undergraduate instruction to interfere with the spirit of research and productive scholarship.

The latter is clearly the chief function of all true universities, but it has been late in appearing in America. Münsterberg ([67], p. 94) says:

> The activity of productive scholarship adjusts itself to the financial situation * * *. All the material conditions push the teachers away from pro-

ductive scholarship as strongly in the large universities as in the little colleges, where the instructor is paid like a car conductor * * *. In America the ideal is the distribution of knowledge, and not respect for productive scholarship and the imparting of method. The vital forces are the great teachers rather than the great thinkers. The scholar mingles with men who have not the least ambition to contribute to human knowledge. His productive scholarship is merely tolerated * * *. Men whose names may be among the noblest assets of the United States in future centuries, at a time when the names of the railroad and wheat kings will be forgotten, remain negligible quantities in the public opinion of the day.

Miss Burstall ([12], p. 43) says:

European writers on America have often noticed the comparative scarcity of the highest type of intellectual power among so large and intelligent a population, selected and mixed by immigration and possessing for so long the advantages of a widely diffused education. They ought to produce thinkers, artists, poets, and philosophers. * * * creative powers in every intellectual sphere. Can it be the fault of their education that as yet they do not? Are ideals of political equality reducing all to common level?

Both of the preceding criticisms point toward a lack of encouragement in America for those who are engaged in adding to the sum of human knowledge. It is true that the influence of old college ideals is casting its shadow over the work in research. America does not object to a man's engaging in such work, but it does not encourage him to do so. It is inclined to overlook the value of productive scholarship. There is a feeling that a professor who sits behind closed doors and studies had much better be out teaching classes. This condition of affairs is dangerous, and, as Miss Burstall says, it has probably been at least partly responsible for the lack of creative intelligence in America * * *. Some further means of rewarding productive scholarship should be devised: but in order to do so, one must prepare to meet the opposition of one of America's fundamental beliefs. There will be much jealousy of anything which looks like a privileged class set apart from society in general. The doctrine of equality has no place for experts, hence Americans are slow to reward expert service. The solution of the problem will doubtless be some form of compromise whereby those who possess creative intelligence will be rewarded according to their merit while they are at the same time safeguarded against withdrawing from society and forming a narrow circle of their own.

This leads to another important function of the university. It must serve the practical needs of the people. Gray ([38], p. 158) says:

Science has been studied too much in America for its own sake and has not been applied to the perfection of mechanical devices to be used in industry. It has not been hitherto sufficiently realized that the conclusions

of "scientific" science in one generation have become the industrial dynamics of the next, and that a scientist who spends his time and talents in pursuing a line of knowledge for its own sake without giving its results to the world is committing a crime against humanity; * * * a crime as heinous as that of those in days of old who possessed the key of knowledge and refused to unlock to others desirous of entering in. * * * There are still no settled coordinating relations between the factories and the universities. * * * In recommending men for scientific work in factories too much stress appears to have been laid on mere academic qualities and too little regard paid to the question of whether the man chosen is equally fitted to deal tactfully with the managers of the concern to which he is being sent. The relations between the universities and colleges on the one hand and the manufacturing interests on the other * * * still remain in a disturbed and chaotic condition in most States of the Union. These relations require to be systematized in some manner, either with or without the aid of State legislation. * * * Only in this way can the United States equal the other countries of the world in the utilization of scientific knowledge, and in coordinating the results of that knowledge between academic and industrial interests.

Caullery ([14], p. 155) says:

Some institutions of higher learning in America are in danger of becoming separated from modern life because of the emphasis on speculative science only. They have need of more contact with practical realities. * * * I believe that an organization like that of the modern American university which combines pure and applied science is better in theory than that which is isolated like ours, with faculties of science in one place and with technical schools in another. This avoids the opposition between pure and applied science and at the same time keeps the university in touch with practical life.

Remington ([73], p. 55) says:

The typical American university is not an ivy-covered building with lawns * * * and cloisters where monks have walked and where it is difficult to believe that telephones and railways have been invented, or that anything like the rush and fight of commercial life exists. * * * There are no proctors and no dons, but a number of men as busy, as interested, as eager in putting knowledge and ideas into the students as the students are eager, interested, and busy in grabbing the ideas and knowledge for themselves.

American universities seem to have succeeded much better in meeting the practical needs of the people than the type of institution which Remington describes, yet, as Gray and Caullery say, they are still in danger. There is still a tendency to ignore the chasm which exists between the university and the needs of the people. The institutions which are supported by public tax have been compelled to meet the needs of their constituents to some extent, but even with them the good work is only begun. Even they have not yet attained a general reputation of being able to meet local needs. Industrial and commercial concerns are not calling upon the universities for men as much as they should. Even in educational matters, conditions are little better. Relatively few educational boards ever think of asking the university to recommend a school superintendent or a

normal school president. Whatever the causes of this condition may be, the fact remains that the American university is not doing that which it should do. Conditions are gradually improving, however. Some day the reputation of the universities will be so widespread that no one in need of a skilled man for an important position will think of failing to consult those who should be, and doubtless are now, in the best position to guide the right man to the right job. Such an outcome would also do more than anything else to counteract the suspicion which the common man holds against expert service in general. The universities have truly a great opportunity before them.

The peculiarities of American school organization, as discussed in Chapter II, are also reflected in the criticism which deals with the universities. Compayré ([18], p. 525) says:

> America has no national university. This is due to an early provincialism and a belief in local control, together with objections to the uniformity of a national university. Such a university would not injure the attendance at other universities nor absorb them, but could serve as a guide and model for them.

The idea of a central institution which would be a center of inspiration, particularly for the training of professors for the more local colleges, normal schools, and universities, has appealed to many, but the fear of centralized control and of its almost unavoidable tendency toward red tape and bureaucracy has prevented its realization. In the meantime two or three of the privately endowed universities have become so nearly national in scope that it begins to look like our hopes of a national university were never so far from fulfillment. In some ways the present practice may be preferable, but it is open to at least one serious objection. It does not seem fair, or even safe, to leave such an important matter to be supported by private enterprise. When financial emergencies arise like the present one, private resources are not available to meet the increased demands. That necessitates an increase in the tuition rates, which in turn works a hardship on many of the students. If the privately endowed institutions are to continue to replace a national university they should receive Government aid, so that their opportunities may be within the reach of all.

Another result of the lack of centralized control is mentioned by a number of critics. The criticism of Douarche ([27], p. 481) is typical. He says:

> For the most part there is no appearance of system in the schools. Whatever organization there is has been originally only a group of creations which were adapted as well as possible to American needs and aiming to strengthen and ennoble American spirit and culture. The American university is hard to describe, because many institutions which often have nothing in common

with higher instruction call themselves universities. Many of these are only colleges or lycées. In fact, there is not a single institution in America which is a university in the European sense of the word. In most American universities undergraduate and graduate students are taught in the same class. This is one of their gravest faults. The professor can not devote himself to scientific work because he must always conduct his class as though he were a professor in one of our lycées.

The earlier criticism of our lack of standardization was much more severe than that of Douarche. The situation has been due to two causes. There has been a lack of central authority for one thing, but a more fundamental cause arises out of the fact that we have just emerged from a period in which our colleges were expanding into universities. Naturally, some expanded more rapidly than others, while some relapsed to their former college organization or even passed out of existence entirely. The foreign critic who only saw a cross section of this movement criticized us severely upon the assumption that the condition was a permanent one. Such was not the case, however, and we are now well on the way toward a standardization which has been worked out by the institutions themselves instead of being imposed upon them from above. This method gives every indication of being just as effective as the type of standardization which is brought about by a central authority, and it is infinitely preferable from the standpoint of American ideals.

The latter part of Douarche's criticism, however, calls attention to a difficulty which has not yet been removed. In this connection Douarche ([29], p. 23) says further:

The university instruction is merely a prolongation of the work of the college. The latter are very much like the French lycées. The lycée should give the student a mass of subject matter, while the university should teach him to use this knowledge and should give him a critical and scientific spirit. In the lycée one teaches facts and studies from books, while in the university one teaches methods and instructs himself through personal and independent investigations.

The power to do this type of work is certainly of transcendent value. It is related in a fundamental manner to the American belief in self realization and progress. Anything, therefore, that tends to interfere with it should be watched very carefully. Yet America is not ready to do away with undergraduate instruction in her universities. Such a policy would probably mean placing the undergraduate students in a multitude of small colleges. These have their good points, but they do not furnish the manifold opportunities to the student which are furnished by a large university, and they incline toward class education. There are many, therefore, who would continue the present system and extend the spirit of investigation down into the undergraduate courses. Furthermore, there is a tendency for the college when existing alone to institute a rigorous discipline.

To pass from such discipline to the absolute freedom of the university is often demoralizing. Finally, keeping the two types together tends to unite theory and practice in the same institution. For these reasons America seems likely to continue the present policy. Continual care must be exercised, however, to check all influences which will interfere with the opportunity to develop the power of original investigation.

As with the schools in general, there is much favorable comment on the democratic character of the American universities. Thus Douarche ([27], p. 20) says:

> The great merit of the American universities is that they are both popular and free. They offer all of the merits and all of the faults of independent organizations, accessible to all classes of society.

The real value of this provision can only be appreciated by one who knows the situation which has resulted in other countries where the universities have been until recently open only to the boys of upper classes. America is truly fortunate to be free from such injustice.

A few of the critics have something to say concerning degrees. They agree that American degrees have in the past suffered from a lack of standardization. They are also agreed that the practice of granting degrees upon the basis of examinations conducted by the faculty of each institution is better than to have an external examining board. Barneaud ([3], p. 273) thinks that more emphasis should be put upon the oral examination, particularly for the Ph. D., since most people who get this degree expect to become teachers. He says:

> One quality is indispensable to a professor; that is clear and precise exposition. * * * the ability to communicate his science to others * * *. Since almost all of the candidates for the doctorate expect to teach, why not require that they show themselves as competent in the transmission of knowledge as they have been in acquiring it?

Ashley ([1], p. 420) says:

> One disadvantage of the American Ph. D. requirements is that they make the doctor's degree almost essential to students who desire an academic post. The best way for a man to become known outside of his university is through the publication of a doctor's thesis. The result is rather to make published work the test of fitness for an academic position, whereas it is not necessarily anything of the kind. The qualities which make a good investigator are not always those which make a good teacher, and the two are not always combined. There are many admirable teachers whose published work is quite unimportant.

This points to a fallacy in the plan of basing one's standing as a teacher upon his ability to do research work. All teachers need the research spirit, but it seems that the mere possession of a doctor's degree is not sufficient basis upon which to decide the matter. This

criticism also calls attention to the lack of professional training which many of our Ph. D.'s show. Some provision should be made to remedy this defect, but it would seem better to require preliminary courses in education or preliminary practice teaching, rather than to leave the matter for the final oral examination.

The arguments given in Chapter V against the examination system also apply in full force to college entrance examinations. It seems desirable to abolish such examinations altogether and replace them with a system of mental tests for the purpose of discovering individual differences. The accrediting system is open to the objection that it does not provide for students who have the ability and the self-mastery to educate themselves independently, so that they can finish the secondary course in less than the prescribed time. The criticism of Bowden-Smith ([6], p. 7) brings out the defects of the present system.

> College-entrance requirements involve red-tape procedure. The matter is decided, not upon the basis of what the student can do but upon how much credit he has. * * * It is a little disheartening to find that a "class," which cost much hard work to secure and which ranked at home fairly high, represents nothing worth having abroad and that a testimonial so kind that it possessor is somewhat shy at presenting it is tossed back with the comment, "That won't do you much good." Patience and perseverance, however, will untie the knots of most American red tape. For example, the dean asked: "What did you do at your school?" and the English student could only answer: "I can now do so and so," which did not advance matters a bit. "How much Latin did you read at your school?" "Very little, but," with the courage of despair, "I could deal easily with any Latin charters for my historical work." The dean shook his head. "Have you read Cæsar at school?" "No; I only read what I wanted in illustration of my work during the last two years." "How many books of Virgil did you read?" "Two, I think"—here the student had a sudden inspiration and added, "but I read all of the others for my own amusement afterwards." The dean shrugged his shoulders hopelessly and wearily dismissed the unfortunate applicant to the department which she wished to enter."

The purpose of quoting the experience of this "unfortunate" English student with a rather overconscientious dean is not to call attention to any hostile attitude of American schools toward foreign students. There is much evidence to show that such a spirit does not exist. But there is a suggestion here of the fact that the bright pupil is not properly cared for by either the examinations or the accrediting system. After all, the real question to be decided is whether or not the student is able to do college work successfully. An examination is not always a fair test of this ability, and the accrediting system does not take care of that particularly desirable student who has the ability to work outside of school. Some new provisions are needed. Mental tests seem to meet the need, provided

they are sufficiently reliable, but it also seems desirable to work out some system of credit which is based upon the quality as well as the quantity of the work done. The present efforts to provide such a system are therefore to be encouraged.

It has been pointed out several times that the organization of education in America is such that it takes too long to complete it. Caullery ([14], p. 28) emphasizes the point when he says:

> The classical colleges, with their four years of purely academic work, do not furnish direct preparation for any trade, but retain the student up to the age of 22. Professional studies should be begun before this time. The colleges will have to revise their courses so as to include some professional subjects.

This change is already under way in most of the universities, and the smaller senior colleges have at least introduced courses in education. The movement seems to be a good one, and it is to be hoped that it will continue to grow, though the lack of breadth of curriculum, lack of teachers, and lack of equipment make such growth very difficult in the case of the small college.

The chief adverse criticism and the one in which there is the most agreement is that relating to the control of American higher education. The criticism of Barneaud, though somewhat extreme at times, is a fair representation of the older type of such criticism. He says ([3], p. 271):

> Too often, alas! the donor, who has established or enriched the college, exercises patronage as a right; he puts into the faculty a persona grata, and dismisses those who do not please him. * * * Professors have been dismissed because they opposed certain monopolies or because they entertained certain political views.

He quoted from the London Spectator of July 31, 1897, the following statement:

> The capitalists in America have relieved the churches, bought the press, filled the Federal Senate with their defenders, and, finally, they have extended their hands to the colleges. * * * It is their desire that no word shall go from any mouth until it has received the approval of the conscienceless magnates. * * * I am saying nothing of the State universities, in which the chairs, especially in the new States, are a prey and spoil for the politicians. I affirm, with a certainty of not being contradicted by anyone who is connected with the American colleges, that there is not in the whole organization of instruction a defect more serious, a more complete disregard for professional dignity, or a more fundamental abuse of authority, than that which is displayed in connection with the election and promotion of professors. * * * As for myself, I should never have believed such things possible if I had not been a witness and a spectator of them.

These are strong words and words that are not entirely backed up by the recent criticism. Yet the question of academic freedom is

by no means solved. Professors are still being dismissed for the reasons which Mr. Barneaud mentions. There is certainly a degree of radicalism beyond which a university professor should not go, particularly when lecturing to his classes. Yet it is dangerous to progress to limit his bounds for him. It is probably true that practically all of our ideals have at some time been looked upon as dangerous radicalism. Time was when it was dangerous for a professor to teach that the earth is a sphere.

The control of the capitalist is certainly not as serious as Mr. Barneaud claims, yet the cry that the press and the universities are under capitalistic influence will not down. There is evidence of improvement so far as political influence is concerned, though the whole problem is one of the most important and the most difficult questions which is before the American people to-day. Perhaps the persecuted reformer will always be with us. It may be that this is the price at which progress must always be bought. Yet the American belief in the freedom of personality will always cause sympathy for the one who is persecuted. It will also rebel at any effort at propagandism which endeavors to mold the thought of immature youth into forms which are repugnant to the general belief. Furthermore, it is particularly dangerous when large groups of our people feel that they do not get a square deal in the press or in the universities. The solution of the problem is still very much in darkness, but the outlook is far from hopeless.

In spite of the generally unfavorable criticism, one phase of the American university seems commendable to our critics. Sadler ([77], p. 450) says:

> A national system of higher education is stronger if it rests partly on endowment and partly on public aid. The first gives independence against momentary clamor; the second provides the best security against torpor and decay. Education must not be wholly subject to the vote of political bodies nor wholly removed from public control. Both types are needed so that the weaknesses of one may be checked by the strength of the other.

This situation is met well in America and the value of both types of control is made clear.

Another serious accusation which appears almost equally in the older and in the more recent criticisms is to the effect that the organization of our universities is not sufficiently democratic. Barneaud says ([3], p. 15):

> The professor is treated with no consideration for his personal value and is sacrificed to secret influences and bound hand and foot to the whims of presidents, trustees, and corporations. * * * The assistant or adjunct professor is usually employed or dismissed without consulting the head professor; or, if the latter gives his advice, only too often influences which are the least pedagogical in character have more weight in the matter.

In case of dismissal, Barneaud ([3], p. 349) says:

> Never is the victim given a chance to defend himself against his accusations. It is through proceedings which remind one of the star chamber * * * that the professor is sacrificed.

Bryce ([9], Vol. II, p. 548) says:

> A visitor from Europe is struck by the prominence of the president in an American university or college, and the almost monarchical position which he sometimes occupies toward the professors as well as toward the students. Far more authority seems to be vested in him, far more to turn upon his individual talents and character than in the universities of Europe.

Münsterberg ([67], p. 100) says:

> While in democratic America the appointments are made by the president and by the trustees of the institutions without the official cooperation of the faculty, in monarchical Germany no Government can appoint a professor who has not been proposed by the faculty.

The most recent criticism on this point is that of Caullery. He ([14], p. 47) says:

> The common characteristic of all types of university control is that the professors have no part in the constitution of the governing board, and that of all the interests in play those of the intellectual and technical order are the only ones not to be directly represented in an assured order. This is unquestionably a defect and many voices are being raised in justice against it * * *. The board of trustees was an organization in the old college in which the unity was absolute and which comprised a small number of professors and pupils. It should now be adapted to the new institutions and their needs. The technical incompetence and excess of power of the trustees or regents is evidently a serious fault of the present régime and this defect is increased by the gigantic size which is a peril for the universities as well as for their organization. The problem is evidently to give autonomy to the individuals while maintaining a coordination in the whole institution. * * * The teaching force in general sometimes suffers from the autocracy of the president except where the latter uses his power with discretion or where, without being compelled to do so, he officially consults the competent professors concerning nominations to be made. But even with the best intentions, one man can not comprehend equally all the needs and all the tendencies. He will necessarily favor those who accord with his personal preferences. There result from this situation some abuses of power and some conflicts which, though rare exceptions, are none the less deplorable. Some professors have seen themselves brutally dismissed from certain universities without having an opportunity to defend themselves, simply because they expressed opinions which did not please the president or the trustees. There are evidently legitimate causes for dismissal * * * but the right of defense must be assured.

A comparison of the foregoing criticism, which is arranged in chronological order, does not leave a happy impression concerning improvement. Cases of brutal dismissal are seemingly becoming rare but the fear of such a thing must still be a very strong influence. One thing seems certain, a more democratic type of organization is needed and in case of dismissal the right of defense must be safe.

guarded. A further bad influence of the present system is that it is being imitated in the normal schools. The situation seems undemocratic, and therefore undesirable.

The present system is also detrimental in its policy concerning the recruital and advancement of professors. Thus Caullery ([14], p. 59) says:

> The professors have no regular part in their recruitment and have no permanent tenure. This is due to a characteristic of American customs which has general advantages. There are no permanent positions where one can go to sleep in security and inaction at the expense of general interests. Each professor must justify his position by real activity. They are elected during good behavior or at the pleasure of the trustees. The administration has then at hand a power which it can use almost instantaneously. It is used only in rare cases, but it is none the less a real menace against which the professors are without recourse. They are totally lacking in the guaranties which higher instruction possesses in other countries.

Marchis ([62], p. 7) says:

> The advancement of the professors is not based upon precise rules of choice and length of service. There exists a certain type of bargaining. When a professor feels that he is indispensable in the work which he directs he learns how to elicit from other universities more advantageous propositions from which he may profit in his actual situation. Those whom a somewhat exaggerated deficiency keeps from making overtures are the victims. The professors obtain advancement only when they ask for it.

Münsterberg ([67], p. 106) says:

> The American professor can advance only by building himself up in his own institution, since the possibility of being called to other institutions depends largely upon chance; but he can build himself up in his own institution only by either busying himself with administrative troubles, by becoming a favorite with the elementary students, by being a pleasing speaker or by writing textbooks, but not by original investigation. As a result of such a system higher teachers in America are without means and too often without breeding. They are mostly men with a passive, almost indifferent type of mind, without intellectual energy, men who see in the academic career a modest, safe path of life.

This criticism undoubtedly contains elements of truth. There is not sufficient provision for the growth of the professor. This will mean that many of the best types of men will avoid entering such careers. On the other hand, the Americans believe that the really capable man will find his level. This is true if he is left free to advance. But if certain elements of our organization tend to interfere with such freedom such is not the case. America must avoid the inaction which results when the tenure and advancement is too much guarded. On the other hand, we must also avoid the opposite extreme. The golden mean seems to lie in the direction of a more democratic form of organization—some provision by which the members of the faculty may have more access to the trustees and exert more influence in their deliberations.

There is some difference of opinion as to the value of American departmental organization. Muhlman ([69], p. 12) calls attention to the fact that assistant professors should be permitted freedom of growth in their positions. He thinks that the assistant position should not be a step toward a full professorship.

Foster, in the Mosely Report ([66], p. 115), says:

> Each department of an American university is an organic whole. Each teacher has the opportunity of doing that particular piece of work for which he is most suited, though he is not necessarily restricted to one piece. Thus in mathematics each pupil can get just the kind of teaching he needs, while the teacher though working in a restricted field is kept in touch with the larger aspects of mathematical teaching.

Foster, in the Mosely Report ([66], p. 109), says:

> The unity of departmental organization in the university exerts a modifying influence on the teacher who is inclined to cranks and fads, both in his teaching and his examining, and by constant intercourse of all the members of the department his work becomes unified without being uniform.

All three of these criticisms seem to possess value for America. There is, unfortunately, a tendency for a difference in standing to grow up between the assistants and the head professors. The president, particularly, tends to be set upon a pedestal, as it were. Both the president and the head of the department are often selected for their positions through local or even political influences. To glorify either of these officials is objectionable, because the emphasis tends to be placed upon the ability to play politics rather than upon professional merit. A still more serious objection is the fact that it violates the American principle of equality and respect for personality. It seems much more desirable in a democracy such as ours for the educational policies to be determined by the faculty as a whole or by the department as a whole, thus making the president and the heads of departments merely representatives of the faculty or parts of the faculty in this respect. It should be the duty of these officials to carry out the wishes and directions of the faculty rather than the reverse. Under such conditions the rapidly developing class system of our higher schools could be prevented. The administrative duties of a professional nature should be in the hands of some lower-salaried assistant rather than directed by a high-salaried autocrat.

The influence of American control and organization upon college and university students receives some attention from the critics. De Martonne ([25], p. 428) thinks that—

> In general the American student is followed up, guided, and watched more than the French student is. * * * Each course carries with it an hour of obligatory study in which the student must review his notes and do reading prescribed by the professor, must attend recitations, and stand final examinations. This tends to destroy individual initiative.

Muhlmann ([69], p. 8) says:

> The university students have no academic freedom such as the German students have, but are under a fixed compulsion as to attendance and are subjected to a finely divided examination system.

Miss Burstall ([12], p. 115) says:

> American students are required to attend too many lectures a week. The students are overworked or the work done is not of a very advanced character. When we consider how much freer the discipline of American schools is than that customary in England, it seems strange that college life there should offer so narrow a field for self-direction of the individual. We feel * * * that the cause of this is the exaction of 15 hours per week attendance upon lectures. The pupils need time to think, but such a privilege it seems to us few college students can ever enjoy.

Caullery says ([14], p. 154):

> In accordance with old college ideals, the university has retained a practice of continual and methodical control over the work of the pupils. They are treated in this regard like boys who must be watched attentively and not like men who should be allowed to act as such. The American student is not left to himself enough. Instead of being encouraged to reflect, he is constantly guided.

On the other hand, there is a sense in which college students are more free in America than they are in Europe. The American student is more free to choose his course, and is not driven by the fear of external examinations. The law of use favors frequent practice rather than cramming. While this may interfere slightly with the student's freedom and may cause him to abandon some task in which he is engaged in order to attend class, the advantages of the plan are worthy of serious consideration. Therefore it does not seem advisable to change the present plan, at least below the graduate level. One should carefully avoid encroaching too far, however, upon the student's time for continued work and reflection.

As in the secondary school, there is much favorable comment upon student life in America in connection with the colleges and universities. Walther ([89], p. 15) thinks that the memory of happy college days is one of the causes of the liberal support which is provided for American colleges and universities. College and university fraternities are condemned as snobbish, expensive, and lacking in distinct literary and intellectual ideals. The college dormitory seems peculiarly attractive. Thus Cestre ([15], p. 28) says:

> The college dormitory assures an abundant and sane life to its occupants and nourishes local patriotism. It furnishes conditions of comfort and even luxury, which the French student rarely knows.

The critics are universally attracted by the relations between the professors and the students. Barneaud ([3], p. 272) says:

> The students have entire confidence in their professors. They know that they are in good hands. The most happy impression which remains to me of my visit * * * is the absolute certainty which has resulted from conversation with students that they could not have more devoted or more perfect professors. I have detected among the students none of the criticism, ridicule, or unkind allusions which unfortunately have come to me in some noted schools.

Cestre ([15], p. 28) says:

> The American professor opens his door at all times to those of his students who by their intellect and tact merit this favor. He descends from his professional dignity and receives them into his home and fireside.

Compayré ([19], p. 218) says:

> The students do not live in barracks like ours do. The quarters are pleasant. Self government is the rule, and there is not the least instinct of revolt.

Douarche ([27], p. 503) says:

> The students have much freedom. The old morose pedagogue has disappeared and the growth of athletic games and plays in the open air has improved the moral and physical health of the college population. Moreover, it has created little by little an esprit de corps which is the surest guaranty of happy emulation and progress in American colleges.

It is noticeable that all of the preceding criticisms come from Frenchmen. It seems a convincing testimonial to the superiority of the American practice over the French in this regard.

The critics quite generally agree that American college life is democratic. The students not only respect the professors but they respect each other. The idea that college boys and even college girls can work their way without losing the respect of their schoolmates seems a never-ending cause of wonder.

The criticism with reference to the method and content of American university instruction is quite limited. De Martonne compliments our work in geography, and there is much favorable comment concerning our science teaching. Langlois objects to the content of our work in the educational psychology. The first two criticisms seem merited. In the third case the content of the work has changed so markedly for the better that the criticism no longer applies.

The criticism in method covers the points already noted under elementary and secondary education. It also centers somewhat about the research method which is universally praised.

In general, the part of the American higher education which is of most interest and which is perhaps most worthy of study and improvement is that which deals with the spirit and the organization of the work.

# Chapter VII.

## EDUCATION AS A MEANS OF CONTROL.

The purposes of this chapter is to summarize the criticism of American education as it relates to the behavior of the pupils. The criticism divides itself conveniently into three divisions: That relating to school discipline, that relating to moral education, and that concerning religious education. In regard to discipline, the phase of the situation which seems to command most attention of the critics is the fact that it is based on respect for personality. Thus Rathbone, in the Mosely Report ([66], p. 260), says:

> American discipline is from within and not from without. The children do right because they know that by so doing the school life will be more pleasant and more helpful. In such schools when the teacher directs the children to do anything it seems as if she is making a suggestion rather than giving a command, and because the children know that laughter, talking, and independent movement are not restricted if they do not interfere with the school work, they respond to her suggestions eagerly. The attitude of most American teachers toward their children seems to be that of a guide and friend rather than a ruler, with the result that the atmosphere of the school approximates to that of a good home; the children look happy and appear to thoroughly enjoy their school life; they are cheerful, self-reliant, and, above all, alive and natural.

Gray, in the same report ([38], p. 167), says:

> There is more freedom of expression, more organization between teachers and pupils, with none of the unencouraging, unquestioning discipline of the English public school.

In speaking of the neatness and order with which 2,000 pupils, with no teachers on duty in the halls, changed rooms at the ends of periods in one high school which she visited, Miss Burstall ([12], p. 62) says:

> One could only wonder how it is done and wish all our young people were as quiet and orderly. * * * The good discipline of the American schools is always noted by English observers; the most remarkable thing about it is that it seems to come of itself. It is not maintained by artificial sanctions. Corporal punishment, the inalienable right of the English boy, is all but obsolete. * * * As far as one could understand, their school discipline depends on two natural sanctions, the spirit of the Nation, and the teacher's personal force.

Mark ([63], p. 23) says:

> The guiding principle in discipline is self-respecting and self-governing. On the surface discipline would often appear to have ceased to be a teacher's art and to have become a pupil's art, bound up with the mere fact of going to

school in the same way as the more mechanical parts of discipline already are, such as punctuality, neatness, and regular attendance. In reality, however, the art is the teacher's, while the act is the pupil's. From the teacher's standpoint, the art of allowing liberty which leads to self-government is quite as high as that of repressing liberty which is teacher government. This is evidenced by the almost universal testimony that Old World educators generally fail in the handling of classes of American children. For the same reason eastern teachers often fail in the west, while western teachers, on the other hand, almost invariably succeed in the east.

Quotations like the foregoing are quite common from all of the English critics. It seems to indicate that American school discipline is characterized by a spirit which is quite unique. * * * Nothing of the sort seems to exist in other countries. As Mark suggests, the new spirit in school discipline has originated particularly in the western part of the country, where the influence of English practice has not been so strong. In the early days the English idea of the rule of force was attempted, but it failed to work in America. The change which has resulted, according to Mark ([63], p. 74), is due to the following causes:

1. The idea that everything that has a remote resemblance to slavery should be abolished.
2. The idea that children in a democracy must not be subjected to tyranny.
3. The idea that an appeal to faith and moral suasion is preferable to the appeal to fear as a motive.
4. The personal influence of the great educational leaders.
5. The rise of national consciousness.

All of these imply respect for personality and the belief that the real basis of all discipline is a belief in the mind of the child that it is right and just for him to act in accordance with the generally accepted standards of conduct. On such a basis the children will even behave well when the teacher is absent, a thing which is a source of wonder to foreign observers.

The change which has come over American school discipline is one of the most striking proofs of the value of basing educational procedure upon the spirit of the people in general.

The German critics tend, however, to question the soundness of the American procedure. Klemm ([48], p. 58) says:

> Most people in America go on the assumption that the child will commit no punishable acts if he understands the culpability of them. This is a serious error, because the understanding alone does not keep the child from wrongdoing. It requires will power and moral strength to resist evil. There should be punishment for the sake of moral education. * * * Corporal punishment in the plastic age leads or can lead to educational improvement.

Griebsch ([39], p. 615) says:

> The tendency in the American school system to remain entirely superficial and to be satisfied with outward appearances is noticeable in the discipline of the school. The uninitiated person at his entrance to the school will be as-

tonished at the ideal order which prevails. With machinelike punctuality and exactness every movement of the classes or of the individual pupils takes place. Yet this discipline does not exercise the expected influence upon the growing character of the pupil. He is under constant watch and behaves either from compulsion or for the reward. His education in moral freedom is not furthered, and, in spite of such showy discipline, he knows not the respect for authority or the honor due his elders. This lack is reflected in the disdain for authority in civil life, which is the most dangerous obstacle in the way of healthy internal national development.

These quotations point to the fact which has been mentioned before,[1] that German critics can not understand the meaning of the practice of respecting the personality of the child. While, as Klemm says, "the understanding alone will not keep the child from doing wrong," he fails to see the powerful social forces which are at work. Then, too, the understanding is sufficient to act as a powerful control for the older pupils. They set the example and create the school spirit, which is hostile to rowdyism. Under such circumstances the younger pupils who do not as yet possess sufficient understanding are constrained through imitation and the influence of the general school spirit to act in a proper manner. Klemm calls attention to the need for will power, but overlooks the fact that will power grows only when the individual is free to choose. This point is emphasized by Passy[2] ([71], p. 146):

> The young people must learn to conduct themselves to use the freedom which they will have later on, cost what it may. If certain faults are developed by this régime of independence, so much the worse. A presumptuous, peremptory, rash, disrespectful child is worth more than one whose will is broken. If there are those who can not have freedom without making a bad use of it, so much the worse. All that can be done is to point out: * * * make the pupils feel * * * the said consequences of their manner of acting. Whether or not they accept this advice is their own affair. One can not sacrifice the welfare of the greater number who profit by this freedom for that of a few. The school must furnish the armor necessary for the struggle of life and must show how to use it for the best.

The accusation of superficiality seems to be based partly on evidence gathered before the appearance of the new spirit in discipline, and partly from an overemphasis upon the exceptional cases which Passy mentions. The evidence in general will hardly substantiate Griebsch's accusation that the American child behaves either from compulsion or for the hope of reward unless such compulsion and reward be that which comes through the sentiment of his fellow pupils. It would be difficult also to prove that the American disdain for authority in civil life is due to school discipline. The truth seems to be that our practice in school control grows out of respect for the individual personality and the doctrine of equality. The chief objection to it seems to arise from a misunderstanding of

[1] See pp. 22 et seq.

[2] See p. 23.

American ideals. The system itself is one of the parts of American education of which we should be most proud.

American ideals of discipline when carried out to their logical conclusion have given rise to various forms of student government. As might be expected, the German critics are quite generally opposed to the plan. Thus Beck ([4], p. 128) says:

> Pupil government has originated in America out of the conscious and voluntary opposition to a monarchical régime which grows out of false ideals. The teachers are the real leaders, but they make the pupils believe that they themselves would have sought to reproduce the famous ideal character, a power which the children do not possess. To the pupils the full truth of their relationship to the school will be obscured and silly illusion is the result.

Grimm ([40], p. 421) says:

> Above all things, strength and time is lost in the caricature of self-government. * * * In the majority of children it fosters premature and improper self-consciousness. * * * If all the self-discipline, all the feeling of responsibility, and all the skill in government by school boys and girls is ever so highly valued, yet one must not forget that novel arrangements produce resounding results and that the school republic may be the more unreal the longer it lasts.

These criticisms are typical and call attention to the chief defect in the school city plan. When it is introduced too early into the life of the child it fosters a sort of precocity which is objectionable. It is better, undoubtedly, to have it clearly understood that the teacher is the leader. The principles upon which the school city idea rests are sound, but they do not apply to young children. The ideal seems to be to permit as much self-government as the pupils can bear, but the privileges should be withdrawn immediately if there are any evidences that the whole thing is degenerating into a system of hoodwinking the children or when it seems that their growth is being rushed.

The criticism of moral training in America is mostly of a negative character. Several of the critics see the pronounced need for such work to counteract the declining influence of the church and the home and the alarming increase in criminality. It is also pointed out that moral education is as yet poorly organized. Mark ([63], p. 61), in speaking of Dr. Dewey's school at Chicago, thinks that moral and social training is neglected.

> In moral and social training one can not start too soon. The race has done more than merely leave us a history to recapitulate. It has done something for the children of the present generation which they can not and ought not to be allowed to try to work out for themselves. In their spirit of reaction from mechanical school morals * * * the directors of this school have failed to see how many school duties contain in them the elements of life duties, indeed, are in a large measure the life duties at the stage of individual development to which they belong. By ceasing to ask for order and good

behavior on the ground that they are not real if they do not correspond to what the child left to himself and moved by the spur of each occasion, desires to do, the school seems to have furnished the paradox of setting the child free from social tradition in order to give a social training. * * * While it is stimulating in a very high degree to see children studying raw materials, one is nonplussed by an effort to set children to work out the principles of behavior in practical independence of accepted standards. It is the fallacy of the "heuristic" method reappearing in connection with moral education.

In another connection Mark ([63], p. 180) says:

In moral training the emotions appealed to are elevating in kind; and it is not by any means in a sterner discipline that one would think to supply what seems to be lacking. It is rather in subtracting somewhat from a tendency to sentimentalism, and in adding somewhat to the intellectual drill as distinguished from intellectual pleasure. There seems to be too much of the child's doing what he pleases under the name of respecting his individuality, which almost amounts to forgetting in some measure that there are years of real immaturity during which the child is not capable of wisely choosing and can not know what is best for him.

Thus Mark ([63], pp. 180 and ff.) thinks that the American child has been allowed to do too much as he pleases. He mentions the following causes of this condition:

1. The attempt to apply the Froebelian kindergarten philosophy to the upper grades without modifying it. "Self-activity must sometimes be interpreted as prescribed activity. * * * that is of a self in the long run steadier and more enduring than the self which throws the reins to its own free instincts. The child needs to learn the meaning of work."

2. The influence of the child-study movement. "This movement, particularly in the earlier years, involved too much sentimentality."

3. The influence of the child himself * * * who often with his parents * * * thinks himself the most worth pleasing.

4. The predominance of women teachers, "leading to a danger that education may do little to develop the fiber and sinew which come only by wrestling."

The essence of all these criticisms seems to be that the child can not receive moral training when he is doing only what he wants to do. That would mean that moral training is impossible in connection with the method of self-activity; that the performance of hard and disagreeable tasks is an essential element in such training. But such a view overlooks some of the most important elements of the situation. Not a word is said concerning regularity of habits or the respect for the rights of others, and no reference is made to the value of motive in moral education. But these are some of the things which can be developed very effectively when the children are engaged in whole-hearted purposeful activity. Mark's mistake lies in his supposition that moral training grows out of the content of the course of instruction. The truth is that it grows out of the activity of the children as they work or as they play together. Moral behavior is concerned with activity and moral training. In all probability it is gotten to

a far greater degree through play than through work; and it is possible that better moral training can result from the project method than can be gotten in any other way.

Beck is rather disposed to admit this. He ([4], p. 114) says:

> No doubt the experience based on self-government and self-direction will insure a practical morality which will provide general satisfaction and even esteem among Americans. But the most elegant morality is not the most stately nor the most powerful. Since the rest of the instruction does not inculcate moral ideas, since above all morality is not connected with the personality of Jesus Christ, one may fear that the Americans must renounce their claim to true moral greatness as a product of their educational system.

Here we find a suggestion of the fundamental defect of American moral training. Conditions are such that moral and religious training have to be separated. This is truly a danger, and one for which no solution has yet appeared. Buisson ([10], p. 478) furnished a good estimate of American moral training when he said:

> American moral education aims at the freedom of the will instead of bending to passive obedience. We were often struck by the spirit of liberty, freedom, joy, animation, and boldness which reveals itself in many forms. * * * If there is a régime which can profess to be fortified against every spirit of hypocrisy, dissimulation, evil constraint, and compression it is the American school.

The defect of all moral training which is based upon the performance of distasteful tasks is found in the fact that it must necessarily involve the "bending to passive obedience." This is just the opposite of true will training which requires freedom of choice and action. With such freedom provided for, and with a system such as that pictured by Buisson, surely the American school will work out in some satisfactory way this difficult problem of moral training.

The criticism of religious education centers for the most part around the fact that such instruction is excluded from the schools. Some of the critics look upon this as a defect while others take the opposite point of view.

Bain ([2], p. 4) says:

> American education is entirely free from the sectarian strife which is convulsing England and retarding her educational progress.

Leobner ([58], p. 14) says:

> The removal of religious instruction from the course of study results in more time for general, industrial, and physical education.

There is quite a tendency to distinguish between religious education and mere sectarianism. Lanson ([54], p. 33) says:

> Americans are more religious than the French * * * although they have freed the schools from sectarian influences.

Passy ([71], p. 148) says:

In spite of the effect of immigration, the United States is the country of the world in which Christianity has the most influence on the morals and spirit of the people if one excepts Scotland and France * * *. The public school is nonsectarian but strongly pervaded by a Christian spirit.

Siljestrom ([84], p. 16) says:

Schools may be without religious instruction and yet be pervaded with a truly moral and religious spirit. Religion may be taught by other means. Sectarian schools would only lead to such dissensions and intolerance as might eventually prove highly dangerous to civil liberty, as well as to liberty of conscience and to true Christian piety.

Dulon ([28], p. 147) says:

Americans permit no religious instruction in the schools and no religiousness which has crystallized itself into a church of some sect or other * * * and therein they do right. In its proud independence the American school has its most powerful guaranty of splendid success. What has the German school not suffered through priestly encroachment and through the influence of stupid rulers! The Americans are religious and they give great weight to religion in the education of the child. Because of their religion they forbid religious instruction in the schools. Like Schiller they believe in abstract religion, religion free from the influence of crystallized church forms, free from priestly mischief and from all magisterial guardianship. In affairs of everyday life, in artistic effort, and in the results of scientific investigation religion finds its true content and becomes concrete in the spirits of free and enlightened men * * *. Schools without church or religious influence are more wholesome than those in which there is a practice of beginning every school day with the reading of a short extract from the Holy Scriptures.

The American wishes to inculcate reverence for the Bible in the hearts of the children. But the daily repeated, year in and year out, continual reading of material from the Bible which is for the most part incomprehensible to the children can evidently lead only to indifference and final disinclination as a consequence, especially when looked at from the standpoint of the thoughtlessness which it inculcates. It is a means of attaining a superficial piety which has no influence upon heart and life and is as much like hypocrisy as one egg is like another.

Buisson ([10], p. 461) thinks that the exclusion of religious instruction is justifiable for another reason. He says:

We can not keep from seeing in the course adopted concerning religious education * * * a justice and a respect for the rights of others which is interesting to us. This has not been a measure of political radicalism but really an act of conscience.

But the other side of the question is also well represented. Shadwell ([83], p. 389) says:

The religious difficulty has been disposed of * * *. There is no religious question in the public schools and no religion. As the religious instruction has been taken out of the schools, pari passu, the attendance at Sunday schools has dropped off. It is easy to dispose of the religious difficulty by disposing of religion. In like manner the educational difficulty is disposed of in the Andaman

Islands * * *. In the face of the corruption in public life, the growth of lawlessness, violence, and juvenile crime, the increasing prevalence of divorce, the taste for foolish, false, and degrading literature, for immoral and unwholesome amusements, the want of reverence and the failure of the churches, may not one ask, Has education, devoid of an authoritative basis of morality, nothing to do with it? How can the schools be acquitted of all responsibility if they are to be credited with any influence at all? * * *.

Again, on page 397, we find:

Germany is strongest precisely in those moral and religious qualities in which the United States is conspicuously and increasingly weak, and it is impossible not to connect the difference in some measure with the two ways of disposing of the religious difficulty in the schools. The one has preserved religion, the other has thrown it away * * *. In the public schools of the United States the child is taught to be his own god and the results are becoming patent.

It is interesting to compare the English estimate of German religious education as presented by Shadwell with the German estimate of the same thing as presented by Dulon and Kerschensteiner. The criticism of Dulon has already been given (p. 174). Kerschensteiner ([47], p. 11) says:

Many German school supervisors are ministers whether they are equipped for school problems or not. The complete separation of the church and state, however, is not desirable for as a result of it we find regularly, indeed I might almost say necessarily, a large number of private schools, the work of which is entirely removed from the supervision of the State. From such conditions certain real dangers arise for the State itself. Religious instruction is no less essential to popular education than instruction that is intellectual, manual, or moral in a general sense. The duty of the public school is not only to foster the religious needs of the millions but to develop them into a finer religious life. This can be done just as well even in an undenominational school, if the teachers have a genuine religious feeling.

Beck ([4], p. 121) says:

The rich American people seem to be beggars in their hearts, and suffer from arrested spiritual development, because they are not nourished by the solid bread of a religious education based upon God's word, and because of the light food of incidental religious instruction, can not satisfy their hunger.

The London Times, of 1902 ([61], p. 319), says:

There is, we suspect, a tinge of optimism in the reports[3] of the working of a purely secular education. It is logical and symmetrical, but it ignores one of the most powerful motive forces in men's nature, their religious feeling. In spite of all our troubles over the "religious difficulty" we should be sorry to substitute for it the barren peace of mere secularism.

Miss Burstall says:

As to religious education, America seems to be hopeless. Neither the family, the churches, nor the Sunday schools are, under modern conditions, sufficient for the work * * *. America warns us of how terrible is the loss, how

[3] English Special Report on Education, Vol. X, XI.

great the danger to the stability and moral health of the nation if we abandon this essential element in the life and growth of humanity and of the individual.

The American solution of the "religious difficulty," so far as it has been worked out in organized form, is the Sunday school. The criticism of this solution is generally unfavorable. For example, Beck ([4], p. 120) says:

> They have Sunday schools for the children, but what I saw there was not instruction. Those who taught there were not teachers. The content was not religion but only morals. They only sang, prayed, and learned by rote.

Passy ([74], p. 141) says:

> The young Americans often forget their age * * *. Even sacred things are treated among these people, however religious they are, with an unceremoniousness which would shock the indifferent Europe. In the Sunday school I have often seen groups of young boys and girls whose behavior appeared to me to demand summary expulsion. Everything seemed to indicate that they had come merely to laugh and amuse themselves, and yet, an instant later, the same young man who had shot off a satirical arrow against the pastor, the superintendent, or the teacher interrupted, in order to put some question and make some remarks of quite serious nature. These are singular manners, and the Americans agree that there is something very reprehensible in this disrespect. But how is it to be avoided, if one wishes to conserve strength of will, individual initiative, open-speaking and boldness of conception and execution? This is a problem whose solution is difficult for a popular education.

The problem is difficult, as Passy says, but America must solve it. The difficulty lies in the fact that religious forms and observances have all been involved to suit people who are accustomed to a monarchical or aristocratic régime. Now, with the rise of democracy, some type of democratic religion must be provided. America has always stood for "Freedom to worship God according to the dictates of one's own conscience." But this principle unavoidably caused a vast multiplication of religious sects, each of which was anxious to use the schools to propagate its own peculiar creed. This gave rise to sectarian rivalries and jealousies which made it necessary to exclude the Bible from the public schools, in spite of the fact that the vast majority of the American people wished, and still wish, it to remain therein. But when it came to giving up either freedom of religious belief or sectarian instruction it was the latter which had to give way. Then the Sunday school was used as a means of imparting religious instruction. Now, we know both from the criticism and from experience that the Sunday school, in spite of its recent improvement, can not meet the need. In the meantime, a dreadful harvest of criminality and immorality which greatly excels that of [illegible]her nation, and even of all other nations combined, has warned us that something further must be done. What that shall be no one knows. We can not adopt the system of

Germany because it produces a type of subservient religion which is based upon opinions handed down from above. Such a system must ever remain obnoxious to Americans in general. The English policy of government grants to sectarian institutions has been tried and proved inadequate. Yet, as Kerschensteiner says, religious instruction is essential to popular education and we can not afford "to ignore one of the most powerful motive forces of men's nature."

The situation is truly a puzzling one, yet a few facts seem to stand forth quite clearly. Although the present solution by means of the Sunday school is very unsatisfactory, yet it seems certain that America was on the right track when sectarian instruction was prohibited. By this means much energy which would have been wasted in mere controversy has been saved for useful work. Then, too, it is by no means certain that formal religious instruction is desirable. It is certainly undesirable if it involves intolerance or repression. In any case it seems true that Dulon is right when he suggests that formal Bible reading in the schools may lead to disinclination, thoughtlessness, superficial piety, and hypocrisy. The thing that we want is not so much religious instruction as religious living; and, as Kerschensteiner says, this can be had in an "undenominational school if the teachers have a genuine religious feeling." The hope for America seems to lie in this direction, and a good start has already been made. American teachers are religious, and it is quite wrong to say that the American schools are godless. In the meantime the waning spirit of sectarianism seems a hopeful symptom. People will always differ, but there will also always be a great number of points of agreement. It therefore seems possible to hope that ere long a movement will be started among all the churches which will stress the points of agreement rather than the points of difference. When this movement functions it will be possible to give religious instruction in the public schools, because all fear of propagandism will be gone.

The pessimistic critics, of whom Miss Burstall is a type, will do well to remember that religion is after all dynamic and not static. It has safely passed through transition stages before, and there is no reason to believe that it will fail this time. Religious education, like every other social activity, should readapt itself to the needs of the age and nation in which it exists. The rise of democracy and the rapid change in character and complexity of social conditions in America are truly taxing on our powers of adjustment; and while religious adjustment is always peculiarly difficult there is no evidence to show that it is impossible even in these trying times.

## SUMMARY AND CONCLUSIONS.

The criticisms which have been quoted have emphasized two fundamental principles upon which the American educational system rests. The first of these is a belief in the equality of all men. Because of a growing recognition of the importance of individual differences the original belief has been limited somewhat. Now the emphasis is on equality of opportunity. It is now recognized that true equality can exist only when there is an identity of inheritance and of environmental influence. Such conditions are, of course, impossible. In spite of these facts, however, the American Nation still insists upon political equality. The tendency has been to give this term even a broader content than was given to it by the founders of our Nation. Equal political rights have been extended to all races and are now being given to women as well as men.

The doctrine of equality has carried important implications with it. One of the most important of these is the emphasis upon the general welfare. All forms of social organization are measured by their efficiency in providing the greatest good for the greatest number. The controlling element is the majority, yet the rights of the minority are not overlooked. In matters of education, as in all other respects, the general welfare has been the first consideration. Consequently there has been temporarily a certain unavoidable neglect of the subnormal and the supernormal class. There is a general and powerful opposition to anything which savors of social privilege. Class legislation has been tabooed. There is also a tendency to look upon expert service as undemocratic, because it is felt that it tends to elevate certain individuals unduly. The result has been a tendency toward mediocrity in many respects. Productive scholarship has been discouraged. There has been a dearth of first-class musicians, poets, artists, and skilled workmen. Quantity has been looked upon as more important than quality. The qualifications of legislators, officials, teachers, and professional people in general have been kept as low as possible. Rotation in office is preferable to fixity of tenure. The principle of equality has been applied from one generation to another. Hence there is a freedom from the influence of tradition and a lack of regard for ancestry. Respect for the personality of each individual has prevailed rather than respect for the few who are highly intelligent or highly trained. Leadership has been natural rather than artificial.

The second fundamental principle is the belief in the indefinite perfectibility of the individual. This has carried with it a very general interest in education. Present achievement is looked upon as temporary and soon to be superseded by something better. This has resulted in a superficiality which is often criticized by the people of other countries. Since each individual is capable of almost unlim-

ited improvement it follows that the means of growth should be free and open to all. Each individual has an inalienable right to improve himself to the fullest extent and without interference, so long as the rights of others are not infringed upon. Adaptability, resourcefulness, initiative, self-realization, and a demand for activity which leads to further activity are looked upon as essential and have been strongly encouraged. Boundless energy and enthusiasm have combined with a wonderfully progressive spirit.

The observers indicate several respects in which the United States is in advance of their own countries in educational matters. Our educational system is open and free to all. There is a broad highway extending from the elementary school to the university. In each school, equal opportunities are extended to all without regard to sex or social class. This provision of a broad, liberal education for all social classes under the same roof is a powerful impulse toward a more perfect democracy and a stronger spirit of nationalism. Flexibility of organization in the high school and variety of opportunity are secured through the elective system. Free social participation is encouraged in all the schools and particularly in the kindergarten, which has attained its highest development in America.

While our lack of centralized control calls forth some adverse criticism, the work of the United States Bureau of Education is generally praised. The educational reports and bulletins which are published by this institution are almost without equal anywhere.

Our teachers show a spirit of progress and a growing interest in educational research. Though sadly lacking in professional training, they are respected and trusted, as is shown, in part at least, by the absence of a system of external examinations. The National Education Association is one of the most powerful organizations of its kind in the world.

Respect for personality has functioned in emphasis upon methods of teaching based on the principle of self-activity. The textbook method has been adopted as a means of promoting individual initiative and independence. The schools are pervaded by a homelike atmosphere, and the extra-mural and general social activities of the students provide splendid opportunities for social participation together with excellent will training.

On the other hand, some serious defects are pointed out. There is a dangerous lack of professionally trained teachers, while the growth of the teacher in the service is not well provided for. The freedom of the teacher is too much restricted in some respects, and teaching is not a well-established profession. More men teachers should be in the service, and the tenure should be more secure. Brutal dismissals are still possible. Better salaries for teachers

and a more adequate pension system are seriously needed. The American teacher in general is carrying a teaching load which is too heavy. Opportunities for teachers to advance without changing the level of their work should be provided.

Some serious defects in organization, too, are demanding careful attention. A more adequate adjustment of the balance between centralization and decentralization is desirable. There should be an extension of the system of conditional governmental aid so as to offer a better coordination of State sanction, local patriotism, religious influence, and individual initiative. Equality of educational opportunity for all should be provided. The rural schools should be better standardized and a first-class high-school should be within the reach of every boy and girl. Public continuation schools should be available for those who must begin work early. Our system of education is wasteful, in that it requires too much time. There is a serious gap between the elementary school and the high school. A reorganization of secondary education is highly desirable, so that those who leave school at the age of 15 shall be enabled to finish a definite portion of the work. The upper years of the college course should be either discontinued or reorganized with more technical professional or vocational bias.

In the matter of educational control there should be complete freedom from political influence. Autocracy of control should be replaced by a type which is more democratic in its nature.

While the content subjects in the elementary school should not encroach too much upon those of the form type, there is a serious need for more adequate moral and religious instruction. The curriculum of the secondary school should be enriched and enlarged so as to meet the interests and needs of the various types of pupils which attend. More adequate provisions should be made for those who are subnormal or supernormal.

Productive scholarship should be stimulated to a greater degree than is now the case, and the universities should establish a more definite connection with the practical activities of life.

Each of these defects and needs gives rise to problems which are worthy of serious study. But instead of attempting to enumerate them in detail, it seems advisable to devote a few final words to some of the broader questions, which a consideration of the criticism as a whole has suggested. The viewpoint of our observers has been entirely of the long-distance type. They have, for the most part, been unbiased by local prejudices and innocent of a desire to initiate new doctrine. Such a point of view is scarcely possible on the part of an American writer. It thus happens that the foreign observer gets a broader and truer point of view. He sees things nationally rather

than personally. He considers broad social tendencies rather than details, while the local educator is likely to reverse the process. Our leaders often initiate new and helpful reforms which either fail or grow very slowly. Why is this? May it not be because they run in opposition to, or too far ahead of, the strong current of popular belief? Is public indifference the mere inertia of weight, or is it rather an equilibrium of forces? To what extent have the people as a whole the right to pass upon new educational procedure? Are the people always right? Are there crude but powerful social forces which can be harnessed and made to work in the cause of progress? Can it be that much of our educational effort is being wasted in an overcoming resistance which is avoidable?

No general answer to these questions is possible, but it seems very much worth while to consider them more carefully hereafter. With no intention whatever to disparage the recent highly technical studies in American education, it may also be claimed that the broad point of view is after all equally important. The present study has been an effort to approach such a view through the avenue of foreign criticism. Whatever its shortcomings may be, it can be safely claimed that it is a step in the right direction and a part of a movement which should play a valuable part in the future progress and growth of our Nation.

# BIBLIOGRAPHY.


[1] Ashley, Percy. Some Notes on American Universities. English Special Reports on Education. XI, 1902. p. 419–430.

[2] Bain, A. W. Report on a Visit to Schools in Canada and the United States in November and December, 1908, as a Member of a Commission of British Teachers Organized by Alfred Mosely. New York, 1906. 31 p.

[3] Barneaud, Ch. V. Origines et Progrès de l'Education en Amérique. Étude Historique et Critique. Les États Primitifs. Paris, 1898. 364 p.

Report to the Minister of Fine Arts.

[4] Beck, Friedrich. Americana Paedagogica, Bericht über eine Studienreise nach den Vereinigten Staaten von Nord Amerika. Leipzig, 1912. viii + 138 p.

Very detailed criticism, but not always just.

[5] Böttger, W. Amerikanisches Hochschulwesen. Leipzig, 1906. 70 p.

This book is written by a German chemist who had a year's leave of absence to attend the Boston Institute of Technology. It is a description of college life in one institution only.

[6] Bowden-Smith, A. Georgette. An English Student's Wanderyear in America. xii + 322 p.

Much implicit criticism in the first half of the book. This book refers mainly to Cornell College life.

[7] Bramwell, Amy B. *and* Millicent Hughes. Training of Teachers in the United States. London, 1894. xii + 198 p.

[8] Brereton, Cloudesley. Studies in Foreign Education. London, 1913. p. 291–302.

These pages treat of American education.

[9] Bryce, James. American Commonwealth. 1889. 2d edition. 2 vols.

Chapter 101 treats of American education and universities. There is a discussion of co-education in Chapter 104.

[10] Buisson, F. E. Rapport sur l'Instruction Primaire à l'Exposition Universal de Philadelphie en 1876.

The part written by Buisson is contained on p. 1–20. Very interesting and detailed description of the methods of the time.

[11] Burstall, Sara A. Education of Girls in the United States. London, 1894. xii + 198 p.

Miss Burstall, who is mistress at the North London Collegiate School for Girls, was sent by the Gilchrist trustees. Visited here two months during the summer of 1893.

[12] ———. Impressions of American Education in 1908. London, 1909. 12 + 329 p.

[13] Buyse, Omer. Méthodes Américaines d'Education Générale et Technique. Charlerol, 1908. 744 p.

The book is mainly descriptive.

[14] Caullery, Maurice. La Vie Scientifique aux États-Unis. Paris, 1917. xii + 302 p.

[15] Cestre, Charles. Oeuvres pour les Étudiants à l'Université Harvard. Revue Internationale de l'Enseignement, 42: 25–33 (1904).

Describes life at Harvard.

[16] Clasen, Joachim. Beobachtungen und Erfahrungen eines Schulmanns in den Vereinigten Staaten. Padogog. Arch., 55: 350–370 (1913).

The author lived in the United States for 15 years.

[17] Compayré, Gabriel. Les Universités des États-Unis. Revue Internationale de l'Enseignement, 26: 559–69 (1893).

[18] ———. Les Universités d'Amérique, University Extension, L'Idée d'une Université Nationale, L'Avenir des Universités d'Amérique. Revue Internationale de L'Enseignement, 30: 517–536 (1895).

[19] ———. L'Enseignement Secondaire aux États-Unis. Paris, 1896. 230 p.

Report of delegation sent to the World's Fair at Chicago by the Minister of Public Instruction. Much attention is given to the Report of the Committee of Ten, but there is little criticism of it.

[20] ———. États-Unis. Revue Pédagogique, 33: 548–568 (1898).

A series of rather unrelated notes.

[21] ———. États-Unis. Revue Pédagogique, 35: 470–480 (1899).

Has much to say concerning American pedagogical literature. The article is a series of unorganized notes.

[22] ———. États-Unis. Les Expositions Scolaires de l'Etranger à l'Exposition Universal. Revue Pédagogique, 37: 120–159 (1900).

This article was translated and printed in Education, 21: 341–356, 420–435 (1901).

[23] Coubertin, Pierre de. Universités Transatlantiques. Paris, 1890. p. 1–379.

Entirely descriptive. In the words of the author, "A strange report composed of documentary pieces whose fantastic style contrasts with the habitual gravity of pedagogical documents."

[24] De Tocqueville, Alexis. "Democracy in America." Trans. by Henry Reeve. 2 vols. New York, 1898.

[25] De Martonne, Emmanuel. L'Enseignement Géographique aux États-Unis. Revue Internationale de l'Enseignement, 71: 422–433 (1917).

[26] De Glzycki, Paul. Anglo-Amerikanische Erziehungsideale. Revue Internationale de l'Enseignement, 45: 331–341 (1903).

Translated into French under the title: "L'Instruction Morale et Civique aux États-Unis et en Angleterre."

[27] Doumerche, Leon. L'Enseignement Supérieur aux États-Unis. Universités et Collèges. Revue Internationale de l'Enseignement, 61: 481–510 (1913), and 62: 12–26 (1914).

Though inaccurate in places the article contains good criticism.

[28] Dulon, Rudolf. Aus Amerika über Schule, Deutsche Schule, Amerikanische Schule, und Deutsch-amerikanische Schule. Leipzig, 1866. viii+440 p.

Attractive in style and excellent in criticism of its day. Much of the criticism is still good.

[29] Dunker. Die Mittelsschulen in ihren Beziehungen zu Handel und Gewerbe. Reiseberichte über Nord-amerika. Berlin, 1906. 468 p.

A summary of this report is to be found in Bulletin No. 2, 1906, United States Bureau of Education.

[30] Findlay, Miss M. E. The Training of Teachers in the United States of America. English Special Reports on Education, X, 1901, p. 421–461.

[31] Fitch, J. G. Teachers' Institutes and Conventions in America. Teachers' Guild Transactions for 1888-1890. London. p. 96-114.

[32] ———. Notes on American Schools and Training Colleges. London, 1890. 133 p.

[33] ———. The Study of American Education. Its Interest and Importance to English Readers. Special Reports on Educational Subjects. English Board of Education. X, 1901. p. 1-10.

[34] Foucher, Al. L'Enseignement de l'Indianisme à Columbia University. Revue Internationale de l'Enseignement. 70: 190-195 (1916).

[35] Götte, *Prof.* Die Schulen zur Ausbildung von Beamten und Arbeitern für die Metallindustrie im Vergleich zu den entsprechenden Anstalten in Preussen. Reiseberichte über Nordamerika. Berlin, 1905. p. 217-286.

[36] Grandin, *Mlle.* M. L'Education en Amérique dans la Famille et dans l'École. Revue Pédagogique, 25: 385-401 (1894).

[37] Grasby, W. C. Teaching in Three Continents. London, 1891. XV + 335 p.

Grasby was an Australian who traveled in the United States. Interesting criticism in a very readable style. Excellent comparisons of English, French, American, and Australian school conditions.

[38] Gray, H. B. America at School and at Work. London, 1918. 171 p.

[39] Griebsch, Max. Nationale Erziehung in den Vereinigten Staaten. München, 1907. 19 p.

[40] Grimm, *Dr.* L. Zum amerikanischen Schulwesen. Pädagogische Studien, 32: 409-426 (1911).

Prejudiced at times.

[41] Guerard, Albert. L'Enseignement Supérieur du Français aux États-Unis. Revue Internationale de l'Enseignement, 50: 481-487 (1908).

[42] Hausknecht, Emil. Amerikanisches Bildungswesen. Berlin, 1891. 29 p.

[43] Henning, Karl E. Psychologie der Amerikanischen Jugend. Neue Bahnen, 24: 435-449.

[44] Hippeau, M. C. L'Instruction Publique aux États-Unis. Paris, 1870. 16-477 p.

Report of the Minister of Education.

[45] Höfer, A. Eine Studienreise nach den Vereinigten Staaten. Frankfurt A. M., 1906. 28 p.

[46] ———. Das Unterrichtswesen der Vereinigten Staaten im ersten Jahrzehnte des zwanzigsten Jahrhunderts. Monatschrift für Höhere Schulen, 11: 643-649 (1912).

[47] Kerschensteiner, Georg. A Comparison between Education in Germany and in the United States. U. S. Bureau of Education, Bulletin, 1913, No. 24. 15 p.

[48] Klemm, L. R. Warum kann die amerikanische Volksschule nicht leisten was die deutsche leistet. Von einem alten Deutsch Amerikaner. Pädagogische Vorträge, 15. [No date.]

[49] Kuypers, F. Volksschule und Lehrerbildung der Vereinigten Staaten. (Aus Natur und Geisteswelt.) B. 150, x + 144 p.

[50] Kühn, Maurice. Chronique de l'Enseignement—États-Unis. Revue Internationale de l'Enseignement, 68: 129-30 (1890).

[51] Langlois, Christopher V. Notes sur l'Éducation aux États-Unis. Revue Internationale de L'Enseignement, 49: 289-300 (1905).

This is an extract from the Author's "Questions d'Histoire et d'Enseignement."

[52] ———. Questions d'Histoire et d'Enseignement. Éducation aux États-Unis. Paris, 1907. p. 96-229.

[54] Lanson, Gustave. The Problems of National Education. Trans. from the French by Julia Franklin. Reprinted from School and Home Education. 34 p. [No date.]

[55] Laporte, E. Report on American Education. *In the* Buisson report of 1878. Pages 21–126.

[56] Laveleye, Emile V. L'Instruction du Peuple. Paris, 1872. 335–463 pages.
Very good in its day, and still of interest.

[57] Léautey, Eugène. L'Enseignement Commercial et Les Écoles de Commerce en France et dans le Monde entier. Paris, 1886. iv+771 p.
Pages 673–757 deal with the United States.

[58] Loebner, Heinrich. Die Grundzüge des Unterrichts und Erziehungswesen in den Vereinigten Staaten von Nordamerika. Wien und Leipzig, 1907. vi+200 p.

[59] Loizillon, Marie. L'Éducation des Enfants aux États-Unis. Rapport presenté à le Ministre de l'Instruction Publique après une Mission Officiale. Paris, 1883. 109 p.

[60] ———. Les Jardins d' Enfants aux États-Unis. Revue Pédagogique, 11: 528–39 (1883).
This is an extract from the author's L' Éducation des Enfants aux États-Unis.

[61] London Times. (*Editorial.*) American Education.
Republished in Educational Review, volume 24 (1902). Chiefly a review of the articles of Fitch and Sadler.

[62] Marchis, L. Une Visite aux Univérsities du Centre des États-Unis. Revue International de L'Enseignement, 68: 5–17 (1914).

[63] Mark, H. T. Individuality and the moral Aim in Education. London, 1901. xiii+297 p.

[64] ———. Moral Education in American Schools with Special Reference to the Formation of Character, and to Instruct in the Duties of Citizenship. English Board of Education, X. 1901. Special reports on educational subjects. P. 11–254.

[65] ———. The American and English Public Elementary School. Educational Review, 23: 250–263, March, 1902.

[66] Mosely Educational Commission. Report. London, 1904. xxiv+400 p.
The Mosely Commission visited the United States in October–December, 1903. Very complete report.

[67] Münsterberg, Hugo. American Traits. New York, 1901. xii+235 p.
Pages 42–128 treat of education. These essays were also published in the Atlantic Monthly about May, 1900.

[68] ———. The Standing of Scholarship in America. Atlantic Monthly, 104: 453–460 (1907).

[69] Mühlmann, Karl. Reiseberichte über das technische und gewerbliche Schulwesen Nord-Amerikas. 1913. 70 p. *In* Technischen Staatslehranstalten Abhandlungen und Berichte, heft 3, February, 1913.

[70] Muthesius, I. Kunstgewerbliche Erziehung und Zeichenunterricht. Reiseberichte über Nord-Amerika. 1905. p. 99–143.

[71] Passy, Paul E. L'Instruction Primaire aux États-Unis, présenté au Ministre de l'Instruction Publique. Paris, 1885. 217 p.

[72] Ravenhill, Alice. Some Points of Educational Interest in the Schools of the United States. British Special Reports on Education. X. 1901. p. 401–421.

[73] Remlagton, J. S. The Education of To-morrow. London, 1907. 115 p.
American methods, p. 51–63.

[74] Robson, E. S. A. Report of a Visit to Some American Eductional Institutions. London, 1905. 166+7 p.

[75] Ryerson, *Rev.* E. Special Report on the Popular Education of Europe and the United States of America. Toronto, 1868. viii+198 p. p. 150–186.

[76] Sadler, M. E. The Unrest in Secondary Education in England and Elsewhere. English Special Reports on Education. IX. p. 1–191.

Pages 128–159 relate to the United States.

[77] ———. Some Points of Contrast in the Educational Situation in England and America. Edition revised, 24: 217–227 (1902).

[78] ———. A Contrast between German and American Ideals in Education. English Special Reports, XI. 1902. p. 433–470.

[79] Salmon, David. Some Impressions of American Education. A lecture delivered at Swansea Training College. 1899. 32 p. Published also in Educational Review, 18: 437–450, and 19: 36–48.

[80] Schick, C. Kunstgewerbliche Erziehung und Zeichenunterricht. Reiseberichte über Nordamerika. Berlin, 1905. p. 156–189.

[81] Schlee, Ernest. Das öffentliche Schulwesen in den Vereinigten Staaten von Nordamerika. Realgymnasium Jahresbericht, 1894. 16 p.

Republished in English, Annual Report of the United States Bureau of Education, 1892–93. Vol. 1, p. 534–547.

[82] Schmidhofer, F. Schule und Lehrer in Nordamerika. Reiseeindrücke eines deutschen Lehrers auf der Fahrt zur Weltausstellung in Chicago. Zwaim, 1895. 81 p.

The author is an Austrian.

[83] Shadwell. Industrial Efficiency. London, 1906. xx+ 720 p.

Education is discussed in Vol. II, p. 375–446.

[84] Siljestrom, P. A. Educational institutions of the United States. Translated from the Swedish by Frederica Rowan. London, 1853. xvi+ 411 p.

The author thinks his report the first general one in Europe on American education.

[85] Sinclair, *Rev.* Jno. Remarks on the Common School System of the United States. London, 1857. 31 p.

[86] Waetzoldt, Stephan. The Educational Exhibit in Chicago and the School System of the United States. *In* Annual Report of the United States Bureau of Education, 1892–93. Vol. I, p. 548–575.

[87] Wallace, R. H. Nature Study in the United States. English Special Reports on Education, X. 1901. p. 489–525.

[88] Wallage, Von der A. Ein Nordamerikanisches Lehrerseminar. Deutsche Zeitsschrift fur Auslandisches Unterrichtswesen, 6: 105–117 (1900).

[89] Walther, M. Beobachtungen über Unterricht und Erziehung in den Vereinig: Staaten Marburg. 1912. 39 p.

[90] Weulersse, G. L'Education Publique aux États-Unis. Revue Internationale de L'Enseignement, 47: 128–132 (1904).

# INDEX.