EDITORIALS.

In reading the utterances of college presidents, professors and others the writer has recently been impressed by the tardiness with which investigations in educational psychology percolate into the thinking of college administrators and become a part of their intellectual substratum. We speak of the "antiquated faculty psychology," yet that is the type of psychology that is most in evidence in educational discussions. The limitations of "mental discipline" have been shown in dozens of investigations, yet this is made the cornerstone of argument after argument in the arrangement of curricula or the defense of particular subjects. Any new theory or any attack on an old theory in physics or medicine is quickly taken up and becomes a mental asset to be exhibited on appropriate occasions, but the field in which educators might logically be
expected to be most keenly interested seems to be generally ignored. Even so progressive an administrator as President Nichols of Dartmouth recently gave utterance to the following: "It may reasonably be doubted if one man in a hundred ever takes any single fact from college which he can turn directly into money. What he should take from college are well-trained faculties which he can turn into anything he chooses. It does not matter so much in what studies these faculties have been trained, but it does matter a great deal how much and in what spirit he has worked over them." Obviously President Nichols has not become saturated with recent studies in educational psychology.

J. C. B.

The information lecture, which had a reason for its existence before the art of printing, holds persistent sway from graduate school to kindergarten in spite of the long recognized condemnation of it by educational economy. The university professor lectures because he believes himself giving advanced information; the college teacher dictates a manual of systematic zoology because he has discarded the textbook method; the secondary school teacher of mathematics "prepares" the lesson because the text does not have the right point of view; the elementary teacher "explains" the lesson because the pupils do not have the habit of reacting to the lesson itself. These lectures are all of the same brand of predigested intellectual food.

There are many reasons for this pedagogical error; lecturing is easy as compared with the skillful eliciting of a pupil's reaction; it gives opportunity for the exploiting of personal opinion; it satisfies the pupil's craving for authority, for excuse from self-exertion, and for the ready-made pellet of serviceable knowledge. Many other such reasons might be given, but the fundamental reason lies in the fact that the teacher feels that this method is successful.

Psychologically, the lecturer may be said to be subject to an illusion which is characteristic of an inceptive elational state. He entertains a warm feeling of satisfaction over the ease, clearness, correctness, frictionlessness, economy and natural fitness of the presentation, and this subjective state of well-being is supported by the objective expression of hearty approval from the pupil and the absence of friction with ignorance. The fallacy lies essentially in the fact that this feel-