This article was downloaded by: ["Queen's University Libraries, Kingston"]

On: 31 December 2014, At: 01:47

Publisher: Routledge

Informa Ltd Registered in England and Wales Registered Number: 1072954 Registered office: Mortimer House, 37-41 Mortimer Street, London W1T 3JH, UK

Religious Education: The official journal of the Religious Education Association

Publication details, including instructions for authors and subscription information:

<http://www.tandfonline.com/loi/urea20>

THE RESPONSIBILITY OF THE SCHOOL TOWARD THE FAMILY

Walter S. Athearn^a

^a Professor of Philosophy of Education and Religious Pedagogy , Drake University , Des Moines, Iowa

Published online: 10 Jul 2006.

To cite this article: Walter S. Athearn (1910) THE RESPONSIBILITY OF THE SCHOOL TOWARD THE FAMILY, Religious Education: The official journal of the Religious Education Association, 5:2, 124-130, DOI: [10.1080/0034408100050205](https://doi.org/10.1080/0034408100050205)

To link to this article: <http://dx.doi.org/10.1080/0034408100050205>

PLEASE SCROLL DOWN FOR ARTICLE

Taylor & Francis makes every effort to ensure the accuracy of all the information (the "Content") contained in the publications on our platform. However, Taylor & Francis, our agents, and our licensors make no representations or warranties whatsoever as to the accuracy, completeness, or suitability for any purpose of the Content. Any opinions and views expressed in this publication are the opinions and views of the authors, and are not the views of or endorsed by Taylor & Francis. The accuracy of the Content should not be relied upon and should be independently verified with primary sources of information. Taylor and Francis shall not be liable for any losses, actions, claims, proceedings, demands, costs, expenses, damages, and other liabilities whatsoever or howsoever caused arising directly or indirectly in connection with, in relation to or arising out of the use of the Content.

This article may be used for research, teaching, and private study purposes. Any substantial or systematic reproduction, redistribution, reselling, loan, sub-licensing, systematic supply, or distribution in any form to anyone is expressly forbidden. Terms & Conditions of access and use can be found at <http://www.tandfonline.com/page/terms-and-conditions>

THE RESPONSIBILITY OF THE SCHOOL TOWARD THE FAMILY.

WALTER S. ATHEARN,
*Professor of Philosophy of Education and Religious Pedagogy, Drake
University, Des Moines, Iowa.*

The three institutions which more or less consciously participate in the education of the child are the church, the school, and the home. The harmonious development of the child cannot be secured until these three institutions come to work with a common purpose, each recognizing its own limitations, and appreciating fully the functions and importance of the other factors. If there must be division of labor, there must also be unity of purpose.

In the early days of the Republic a deep religious spirit dominated the home life. The father was at the same time priest and teacher. The family contained all the elements of social, industrial and moral education. From such homes the child was turned over to the school for six hours per day, to be trained for citizenship. One day in the week the child was surrendered to the church for brief formal instruction in the Bible. The home retained full control of the vocational training.

The specific work assigned to the public schools was that of training for intelligent citizenship. A government resting upon the will of all the people, must provide all of its citizens with an education which will render them capable of using the franchise intelligently. The product of the public schools must be intelligent citizens.

To this end courses of study were framed and text-books written. The home was looked upon as a source of raw material. The school was to take what the home provided and turn it over to the state worthy of the rights and privileges of citizenship.

It must be admitted that the school has done its work well. It has given the state trained minds. If America is suffering from ills today, it is not from the ills which the public schools are supposed to remedy, but rather from ills which are due to failures of the home and the church. The schools have furnished intelligent citizens.

The church denied the public schools the privilege of Bible teaching, claiming the exclusive right to train children in religious matters. To this end Sunday schools were established to supplement the regular preaching services of the church.

It is clear that the burden of teaching morals and manners is shifting from the church to the school, and that the public is even now looking to the school, rather than to the church, for that kind of training.

CHANGING HOME CONDITIONS.

But what of the home? How has it succeeded in its *industrial* training? In the early days there was opportunity for industrial training in the home. Practically everything used in the home was made in the home. The mother had companionship with her daughters all day long as they worked together at the spinning, weaving, sewing, knitting, cooking, etc. The father and his boys lived together either on the farm or in the shop, and the boys usually learned the father's trade.

The discovery of the power vested in steam and electricity gave rise to the factory system and within a few years the factory had robbed the home of its opportunity for industrial training. Articles once made in the home are now purchased, factory made. It is no longer practicable for the home to teach the industries.

Boys and girls once employed at home, nights and mornings, Saturdays and during the long summer vacations, no longer have adequate employment at home; the village does not supply the demand, and consequently children are turned upon the streets in idleness.

To meet these changed conditions public sentiment is demanding that the school be charged with the task no longer possible to the home. Manual training, domestic science and other lines of industrial work now find their places in the public schools, and night schools, vacation schools and trade schools must come in the near future.

The school has the children no more hours now than it did a generation ago when it devoted its time to teaching the subjects required for intelligent citizenship, but in addition to these traditional school subjects, it now has the added duties of the church and the home, and, as a result, the school is now facing the perplexing problem of an over-crowded curriculum.

THE WOMAN'S VIEW OF THE HOME.

What has woman substituted for the drudgery of the old-time household work? In an effort to cultivate her mind and become better prepared to perform her duties in the home and in the community she has created modern women's clubs, study clubs, travel clubs, art clubs, social-service clubs, lodges, guilds and sororities.

Many of these organizations attempt worthy enterprises and accomplish much good. Many more organize for purposes of entertainment and diversion. It is hard to say what influences women's organizations have had on home life. Over against the good which has been accomplished must be set many evils which must be eliminated if women's clubs are to commend themselves to the most sensible women of the country.

With the father engrossed in business, or absent at club or lodge, and the mother interested in social activities which require most of her afternoons and evenings, and with the family altar abandoned, and all teaching delegated to the schools, the American home tends to become a cheap tavern where father, mother and children meet to sleep and eat, and then go their separate ways, each finding comradeship away from home. From the early homes where everything was done with the co-operation of the children, we have come upon homes where very little is done for or by the children.

THE SCHOOL MEETING NEW DEMANDS.

During this period of change the schools have automatically responded to the shifting demands of public sentiment; the school-master being more of an opportunist than a professional leader.

When the people wanted practical training, we introduced bookkeeping, commercial law and type-writing; when they wanted culture, we added music and drawing; when they wanted industrial training, we gave them the trade school and the manual arts; if they demanded physical culture, we responded with athletic drills and the gymnasium; and so it has gone, from the teaching of Latin to the darning of stockings. The schools have attempted to do well the things the people wanted done. They have been the servants of a people who, believing that what you would have in a nation you must put into the schools, have transferred to the teacher functions which should be performed by home or church. Accepting the constantly increasing burdens, conventions of teachers have given themselves over to devising ways and means of solving the new problems.

Shall the public school continue to grind the grist brought to it, attempting to add all deficiencies in the raw material: and washing its hands of all responsibility if the product does not meet the demands of modern life? If we were content to continue this course, we should not be here today. If we are to change our course, what are the factors with which we can begin the work?

1. In the first place we have an army of trained public school teachers, who have studied the problems of child development under the direction of educational experts. The country has a right to look to the school teachers for initiative in needed educational reforms. The whole child world is the problem of study and the teacher should feel free to go beyond the door of the school room with his suggestions.

2. The church recognizes the need of help in its teaching activity. Church men are ready to co-operate in any movement looking to better results. Teacher-training classes, graded Bible courses, modern Sunday-school buildings, all bespeak the readiness of the church to respond to progressive leadership.

3. The home found itself unprepared for the changed conditions occasioned by the industrial revolutions of the past fifty years. In fact, the home did not know how to interpret the changes as they came, hence many mistakes have been made. It will be many years before we shall have become completely readjusted to the new order of things, but we must make conscious effort to secure the right readjustment. In this effort the home awaits the leadership of the school.

The freedom of the home from drudgery gives wives and mothers time to study ways and means of improving conditions. If this time has not been wisely used in the past, it may, with competent leadership, be one of the greatest powers for good in the future.

DETERMINATIVE PRINCIPLES.

Two great facts must be learned by the American people as a basis for an ideal system of education.

1. *The Unity of Life*: The child must not be looked upon as a mechanism that can be built up by accretion, or the addition of layers of experience made to suit the fancy of church, school or home. The child is an organism which grows by assimilating the elements of its environment. This organism knows no distinction between secular and religious reactions. Both are alike real to the child. From this point of view all education is religious

education, and religion becomes something to be vitally interested in, not something extraneous and foreign to experience. This conception will add dignity and sacredness to so-called secular education and effectiveness and vitality to the efforts of the church.

2. *The Function of the Family*: There are those who justify the present tendency on the ground that the individual is the unit of society. They plead for the development of the individual to the greatest efficiency, forgetting that efficiency of the individual life is conditioned upon the efficiency of the family life.

MacCunn, in "The Making of Character," says on this point: "Victimized by the fallacies of abstraction they have treated the individual as the social unit, and have exhausted their resources in explaining, how out of self-seeking, if not mutually hostile human atoms, the strong and oftentimes self-sacrificing social sympathies can be developed. They might have spared themselves much ingenious labor. *Their social atom is an abstraction.* It is the family, not the atomic individual, that is the block with which, as a matter of fact, we have to build."

Whatever our theories may be, it is a fact that "It is not only from the family but with the family eye that we all begin to look out upon the world. The family plants the seeds of the social virtues. For it is the substantial nurture of the affections within the home that first gives its members genuinely developed affections to carry beyond it." (MacCunn.) Dr. Starbuck in his "*Psychology of Religion*" has made it clear that it is to the fathers and mothers that we must look for the "all controlling external religious influences of childhood and youth." Dr. Oppenheim, in his *Development of the Child*, has a chapter on "*The Profession of Maternity.*" Rishell, in his splendid little volume on *The Child as God's Child*, pleads for the establishment of a "*Profession of Parenthood.*"

EDUCATIONAL DUTY OF THE HOME.

There are kinds of training which can not be delegated by the home. Why should we not tell the home so, and refuse to take the responsibility of burdens which the school should not assume?

The ideas most fundamental in moral and religious growth are developed in the family life. Many fundamental reactions are established by the time the child enters school, and they are intensified by the home influences throughout the school life of the

child. Among the items which the home life will determine are:

1. Habits of industry.
2. Conceptions of God, duty, honor, honesty, etc.
3. Emotional reactions, likes and dislikes.
4. Vocabulary, habits of speech, love of books and literary tastes.
5. Motor reactions, posture, carriage, etc.
6. Habits of cleanliness, neatness, etc.
7. Habits of obedience, accuracy, promptness.
8. Habits of study, depending upon conversation and occupation of the home.
9. Standard of conduct and morals.

The homes should not be permitted to neglect these fundamental elements in character, under the delusion that the school can make up the deficiency. It should be made very clear that these matters can not be determined by the school, for the school gets the child too late in its career and too few hours per day to determine these early reactions.

It is evident that the school has too long been the dumping ground for the problems of the home. Is it not one of the duties of the school to place back upon the home those functions which should not have been delegated to the school.

How can we accomplish this task? Dr. Irving King, in an article in *Unity*, Aug. 30, 1906, says: "We can get at the matter most effectively by giving parents and Sunday-school workers definite, concrete illustrations of how to proceed. The whole problem is not that of telling children this or that, but of putting them into situations which shall demand of them certain types of action, certain responses. How to surround the child with the most healthful ideals; to call forth the best motives and crowd into the background the lower ones; how to utilize to the best advantage the power of example furnished by adults,—in fine, how to furnish stimuli which will incite to desirable activity, and avoid those which will produce undesirable action. All of these must be effectively illustrated and persistently brought home to the parent, making clear to him, above all, that there is absolutely no substitute for it in effective child training."

We all agree, I think, that the public school has its wider responsibility not in doing work for the family, but in teaching the family how to do certain work for itself so that the education of

the family may be alike "preparation and supplement" to the education of school and after-life.

The school can conduct a campaign of education along this line, by using the avenues of publicity which are always open to the teacher. Let me make the following suggestions:

1. The school teachers must first convince themselves that they are something more than servants of the people. They are a part of the people, with rights and duties, and they should assert their power as moulders of public opinion.
2. The school controls the educational press, and educators find the religious and secular press open to their contributions.
3. Full advantage should be taken of parents' meetings, conventions, commencement occasions, etc. These are the occasions for plain speech on vital school topics.
4. Courses of study can be prepared for mothers' clubs.
5. Courses of study on home life, duties of parents, etc., can be offered in the adult classes of Bible schools.
6. Courses in domestic science and home economy in high schools and colleges can be popularized.

In response to Rousseau's cry of "Back to Nature," men left the crowded cities of France and raised their families in the wilderness. Can not the public school raise the cry of "Back to Home Life," so effectively as to cause parents to simplify business and society life and return again to the simplicity of the home and the companionship of their children?