



The Pedagogical Seminary

Publication details, including instructions for authors and subscription information:

<http://www.tandfonline.com/loi/vzps20>

Moral Training in the School

George Edmund Myers^a

^a McKinley Manual Training High School ,
Washington , D. C. , USA

Published online: 30 Aug 2012.

To cite this article: George Edmund Myers (1906) Moral Training in the School, The Pedagogical Seminary, 13:4, 409-460, DOI: [10.1080/08919402.1906.10534370](https://doi.org/10.1080/08919402.1906.10534370)

To link to this article: <http://dx.doi.org/10.1080/08919402.1906.10534370>

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 PEDAGOGICAL SEMINARY.

Founded and Edited by G. STANLEY HALL.

VOL. XIII.

DECEMBER, 1906.

No. 4.

MORAL TRAINING IN THE SCHOOL.

A COMPARATIVE STUDY.

By GEORGE EDMUND MYERS, Principal McKinley Manual
Training High School, Washington, D. C.

Moral Education has received much attention from American Educators in recent years. There is general dissatisfaction with the moral results now attained through the schools, and an earnest, persistent inquiry is being carried on as to how these results may be improved. An important step towards furthering this inquiry seems to be to make a comparative study of what is actually being done for moral culture, directly and indirectly, through the public schools of different countries. It is the purpose of this study to investigate the subject as far as the German, French, English and American educational systems are concerned.

That this investigation is beset with serious difficulties and is subject to important limitations is at once obvious. In the first place it is impossible to measure the contribution of one system of education to moral training in terms of that of another. Hughes puts it admirably when he says: "Each system of education can only be understood in its own setting. Each is an expression of its nation's genius; it is characteristic of its people. . . . The habitat of each system is fixed; it is an indigenous product. Consequently it is not only unscientific, but it is impossible to measure comprehensively any system of national education in terms of another." (14, p. 387.)

Again, it is utterly impossible to analyze an educational system into its elements and say that each element will produce a definite result in the lives of its pupils. This is doubly true of those features of the system which count most for moral training. "The finer elements, the more ethical and spiritual fac-

tors in national culture defy the balance of the analyst and the scalpel of the anatomist. They are susceptible to no quantitative tests." (14, p. 387.) That moral influences are at work is evident; but it is equally evident that the character of many of them, the way in which they work, and the results which they will produce cannot be determined accurately.

Moreover, in any educational system no two schools or even classes stand for exactly the same moral influences. This is, perhaps, more evident in England and America, where courses of study and training of teachers are not uniform and where more is left to the teacher's initiative, than in France or Germany. But the same must be true even of the most fully centralized system. The individuality of the teacher cannot be wholly obliterated. It must impress itself on his work, whatever the course of study he may be required to teach.

Nor is it possible to reverse the process and analyze the characters of pupils on leaving school with a view to tracing the different elements to their sources in the school life. Character is an infinitely complex thing. It does not yield to minute dissection. Only its most general features can be distinguished, and even these cannot always be traced to definite causes. Dr. Partridge made a careful study of a pair of twin boys nine years old. They had been brought up in the same home and had been, as nearly as possible, subject to the same educational environment. In physical features they were so nearly alike as to be indistinguishable to a casual observer. Mentally and morally they exhibited marked differences. One was less careful, less obedient, less dependable, less emotional, less serious, less sympathetic, less affectionate, more impatient, more given to teasing than the other. Galton cites twenty cases of twins where there was striking physical and mental differences from the first. (7, p. 216.) There exist unaccountable, but immensely important, initial differences in temperament, emotional range, mental and moral initiative, sympathy, tact, etc., which make different children react very differently to exactly the same educational environment. Moreover, the home training of the child before entering school, and its entire out-of-school environment after its school life begins, exercise an incalculable influence in the same direction. It is a fact which must be reckoned with in moral training, even more than in intellectual, that school life has a different meaning—a different content—for every child.

But in spite of these difficulties there are certain things which can be done in the way of such a comparative study as is here proposed. It is possible to examine the religious and moral instruction which is required by central authority in some of the systems under consideration. What is taught

with a distinct moral purpose? How is it taught? What is its relation to the lives of the pupils? These are questions which admit of fairly definite answers.

It is further possible to point out, in the schools of any country, certain features which are truly national, not withstanding local diversities, and which are, in the light of human experience, of special significance for moral education. These are indirect moral forces of the school. To be sure one cannot state the effects which these will have in any particular school or with any particular pupil. But he can indicate results which they tend to produce under ordinary conditions—conditions which prevail in the majority of schools and with the majority of pupils. However, the individuality of the teacher and the individuality of the pupil—the two most vital factors in moral education—must remain, for the most part, beyond the scope of this study.

MORAL TRAINING IN GERMAN SCHOOLS.

No provision is made for formal instruction in morals in German schools. There is, however, in every grade of all German schools below the universities, very definite and very direct instruction in religion. This will be discussed later.

Let us first consider the indirect contribution of German schools to moral training, the contribution made through the regular organization of the school and the routine of school life.

But before proceeding to this it is necessary, for the sake of clearness, to make a few statements concerning the German school system. There is no national school system in Germany; each state has a system of its own. Since Prussia is by far the largest state, and since its school system largely dominates those of the other states, the Prussian system will be considered in this study. There are two distinct classes of schools in Prussia, the *Volkschulen*, or people's schools, and the higher schools. The people's schools are free and are adapted to the needs of the humbler classes. They admit pupils at the age of six, and offer an eight year course in such subjects as are supposed to fit for citizenship, and for the commoner occupations of life. The courses of study are prescribed by the state, as is also the preparation required of teachers. The higher schools charge tuition, and are intended for the higher social classes. They receive pupils at nine, after they have had a three year preparatory course, and offer either a six or nine year course. This course, if of the *Real* type fits for commercial life or for the higher technical schools, and, if of the *Gymnasium* type, fits for the university and professional life. Part of these higher schools are state, part city and part private institutions; but the curricula are outlined for all by the state, and all teachers must be certified by the state.

What, then, are the most important features of German schools which contribute indirectly to moral training?

1. Most of the boys and many of the girls in German schools never come under the influence of women teachers. Of those who do, many are under their influence for a relatively short time. In the higher schools for boys all teachers are men. In the higher schools for girls, of which there are hardly a fourth as many as for boys, the teaching force is about equally divided between the sexes, though the more important positions are occupied by men; the head teacher and one other must be men. The people's schools, wherever practicable, are organized for boys and girls separately. There are thus schools for boys only, schools for girls only, and mixed schools. In the country about seven-eighths of the schools are mixed, in the cities about one-third. Women are allowed to teach in girls' schools, in mixed schools, and in the first and second classes of boys' schools. In 1901 almost 85 per cent. of the teachers in the public schools of Prussia were men. It is thus seen that nearly all of the teachers in the boys' schools, most of them in the mixed schools and many of them in the girls' schools are men. (20.)

The significance of this situation for moral education must remain more or less an open question, even when much more shall have been ascertained than is now known concerning the psychology of sex. But there can be no question that it cultivates certain traits of character which we are in the habit of calling masculine, and represses others which we call feminine.

But what are the distinctively masculine and what the more distinctively feminine traits of character? According to Geddes and Thompson, who have referred the whole question of sex differences to a biological basis, "The more active males, with a consequently wider range of experience, may have bigger brains and more intelligence; but the females, especially as mothers, have indubitably a larger and more habitual share of the altruistic emotions. The males, being usually stronger, have greater independence and courage; the females excel in constancy of affection and in sympathy." (8, pp. 270-271.) Professor Patrick, in a brief summary of sex differences, concludes that in her moral qualities woman represents higher evolution than man. This is in harmony with the position taken by Havelock Ellis that woman represents the type of the future humanity better than man. "This is notably true," Patrick goes on to say, "in respect to her altruism, charity, sympathy and pity. Woman's greater humanity, philanthropy, conscientiousness, fidelity, self-sacrifice, modesty and patience, as well as her lesser disposition to crime, are qualities which separate her farther than man from the savage." He con-

cludes, on the other hand, that woman does not have as high a conception of truth as man, but looks more to the immediate good to be attained. (26, p. 219.) Havelock Ellis points out that woman is more dependent on the opinion of others, strives more to please, than man; also that self-sacrifice appeals to woman more strongly than the sublimity of truth. (6, pp. 185-187.) Dr. Helen B. Thompson concedes, from her experimental study of the mental traits of sex, that men are more frank than women. She also agrees with other writers that "The religious consciousness is more prominent among women than among men." (43, p. 168.)

Granting these sex-differences, upon which there is most general agreement, the predominance of male teachers in German schools stands for the cultivation of egoism rather than altruism, of selfishness rather than self-sacrifice. It lends support to stern and rigorous discipline. It tends to cultivate courage and regard for truth. It emphasizes law, authority, force, as motives of conduct rather than love and desire to please the one in authority. It stimulates independence and initiative rather than their opposites.

2. Militarism, which is so marked a feature of German character, exercises a profound influence on German schools. To quote Russell: "Germany is nothing if not military. The school system is pervaded by the military spirit; many of the teachers are reserve officers, most of the pupils hope to be, and all know that army service awaits them at the end of the school days." (39, p. 121.) Russell is speaking particularly of the higher schools, in which the influence of militarism is especially strong. Completion of a six year course in one of these schools carries with it the privilege of serving but one year in the army, the privilege of living outside the barracks during this year, special opportunities for promotion in the reserve force and marked social advantages. A German scholar said to me recently: "Boys go to the higher schools, not for an education, but for the sake of the military privileges which they hope to secure." It is in these schools, also, that the reserve officers mentioned by Russell—five or six thousand in number—are engaged in teaching.

But in the people's schools, too, the military spirit is strong. Until recently two years of military service, now reduced to one for graduates of normal schools, were required of able-bodied male teachers in these schools. Their military training gives these teachers the military attitude towards their work in the schoolroom. The fact that the fathers of the pupils have served two years in the army puts the home in sympathy with this attitude.

Under these influences a precise military air pervades the en-

tire school system and an exacting military discipline prevails. These require prompt, unquestioning obedience. They emphasize strict attention to the task in hand. They cultivate respect for authority. They magnify the office of the teacher and intensify his official influence. On the other hand they have little sympathy with the trivialities and weaknesses of child life. They emphasize a perfect organization more than individual differences. They repress rather than cultivate moral independence and initiative. They tend to prevent those amiable relations between teacher and pupil which sometimes have great moral value for the pupil. To quote Russell again: "Good masters have remarked to me—and I am inclined to credit the statement—that the average schoolboy considers an amiable teacher as a prodigy, fit only for a girl's school." (39, p. 211.)

3. German teachers receive most thorough professional training. Speaking of public school teachers, Hughes says: "The most thoroughly trained teacher in the world is admittedly the German. . . . The teacher's knowledge of the history and philosophy of education is very thorough and sound. . . . The doctrines of apperception and interest, together with the formal steps, are often to be observed. . . . In no country in the world is the teaching on so sound and philosophical a basis." (14, p. 179.) According to the same writer: "The secondary teachers of Germany have no peers. They are without doubt the finest body of teachers in the world." (14, p. 256.) Teaching is not a makeshift but a profession with the German teacher. He prepares for it and enters upon it as his life work. The state provides that this preparation shall be long and thorough. If one would teach in the higher schools he must first complete one of the nine year higher school courses. He then spends at least three years in university study, largely special work calculated to fit the candidate to teach a limited group of subjects. This is followed by the State examination. If the candidate passes this, he enters upon a two year pedagogical course—one year of it theoretical and one year practice work. He is then ready for appointment to a regular position in a higher school, which appointment comes to the average teacher in Germany after nearly six years of waiting, spent usually in assisting or tutoring. The teachers in the public schools are required to have had six years of training,—three years of it distinctively professional—after having completed the course which they aspire to teach.

This means that German higher schools give a more rigorous and exact intellectual training than any other schools in the world give to pupils of the same age. Herbart, and many others since him, have pointed out the value of the regular

work of the school in developing such moral qualities as accuracy, thoroughness, truthfulness, conscientiousness, persistence. It means, also, that because of superior professional training German teachers as a body make few mistakes, according to German pedagogical ideals and methods, in management, discipline and teaching—few of the common pedagogical blunders, some of which are positively immoral in their influence upon pupils.

4. The German teacher *instructs* his pupils. He does not conduct a recitation in which he calls upon the pupils to recite a previously assigned lesson. There are not alternate periods of preparation and recitation. There are consecutive periods of instruction, each an hour long, ranging from 22 to 32 per week. There is home work in certain subjects—little in the people's schools, very much in the higher schools—but this work is looked upon as a means of fixing in the minds of the pupils instruction already given, rather than as preparation for a recitation yet to come.

All this is important for moral training in that it emphasizes the office of the teacher. It brings the pupil into contact with the teacher more and the text-book less than the recitation method. It makes the pupil more ready to accept the teacher's statement without question. On the other hand it makes him less dependent on his own efforts. It tends to weaken the pupil's self-reliance and initiative, moral as well as intellectual, or at least to leave these undeveloped.

5. Games and play occupy a very insignificant place in German school life. Practically all foreign students of German education call attention to this. "Seldom are children allowed to run and play with freedom in the school yard," observes Seeley, speaking of the public schools (41, p. 81). In his chapter on secondary education in Germany, Hughes writes: "German lads rarely play. The playground is very small, and divided into little plots for each class. The games occasionally played are of a very mild character. German school-masters do not like to see their pupils perspiring. . . . The German lad has no school games. . . . The boys do not take kindly to them." (14, pp. 247-248.) According to Russell, what the Germans consider ample playground for the higher schools, is really little more than standing room. He adds: "I am told that there are field sports but I have seen none of them save a flimsy attempt at football, a recent importation from England. The fact is there is no time for sports as we know them. . . . There is as little time for in-door diversion as for sports." (39, pp 208-209.)

In the light of what is now known concerning the educative value of play, there can be no doubt that this lack of play in

German schools is of great significance. It is a failure to utilize one of the most potent forces for the cultivation of fundamental, social and personal virtues. The games of school children stimulate respect for the rights of others, co-operation, loyalty to the social group. On the other hand they may be used to develop courage, self-reliance, self-control, individual initiative and honesty. The real significance of play in developing character will appear more clearly when the contribution of English schools to moral training is considered. It is Germany's misfortune that she is only beginning to recognize the value of out-door games and to introduce them into her schools.

Other features of German schools, such as large classes in the people's schools and uniformity of discipline throughout the nine year course of the higher schools, exercise indirectly a strong influence on character.

It now remains to consider the religious instruction of German schools.

There is throughout Germany general sympathy with religious instruction in the schools. It has existed for centuries, first as an institution of church schools and later, when the government took upon itself the responsibility for education, in state and city schools. The people have come to look upon it as a matter of course.

The plan of instruction for Prussian higher schools, issued in 1901, states that the aim of religious instruction shall be "to develop, through education in God's word, strong Christian characters, which, because of their knowledge, their conduct, and especially their interest in the church life of their respective communities, shall exercise a strong Christian influence." (21.) This may be expressed in a word as Christian leadership. The aim of religious instruction in the people's schools may, on the other hand, be expressed as Christian citizenship. In both, however, faith and dogma are more emphasized than conduct; the religious rather than the ethical elements of Christianity are kept in the foreground, though the ethical are not omitted.

The fact that church and state are still closely connected in each of the German states, and the additional fact that there are only three religious sects, Lutherans, Catholics, and Jews, which have any considerable number of adherents, makes it comparatively easy to prevent sectarian prejudices from interfering with the teaching of religion in the schools. The state church is Lutheran in the northern and central states, including Prussia, and Catholic in the southern and eastern; and the official religious instruction corresponds. But if there are twenty-five or more pupils in a given community, whose parents

are adherents of another faith, special provision is made by the state for their instruction in that faith. If there are fewer than twenty-five such children, they must be provided by their parents with special instruction under a teacher who is acceptable to the state. The points are: (1) that every pupil is expected to receive instruction in religion, (2) respect must be had for the religious preferences of the parents, and (3) this instruction must be given by an approved teacher.

In the people's schools instruction in religion is given the first period in the morning, three days per week the first three years of the course and four days each of the succeeding five years. This means that a little more than 13% of the entire school time is given to religious instruction. This instruction is given by the regular teacher, who has had special training for it in his three year professional course in the teachers' seminary. Here he devoted four hours per week for two years and two hours per week for one year to the study of religion and methods of religious instruction, and to observation of religious teaching in the practice school. The most emphasized feature of the instruction is Bible study. The first two years this is given in the form of stories narrated by the teacher, then selected stories written in simple language are read by the children, and finally, during the last four or five years, the entire Bible or an expurgated edition of it is read in the class. Teachers favor the expurgated editions, but are generally opposed in this by the church. The Bible study aims to impress especially the "History of Redemption," but also to familiarize the pupil with Jewish and Apostolic history. The divisions of the Bible and the names and order of its books are learned. Many Bible verses are committed to memory. Luther's Shorter Catechism also occupies, from the first, a prominent place in the instruction. This consists of five parts, (1) the Ten Commandments, (2) the Apostles' Creed, (3) the Lord's Prayer, (4) the Sacrament of Baptism and (5) the Sacrament of the Lord's Supper. The pupil is required to learn by heart the first three parts, including Luther's comments, and the fourth and fifth parts without these comments.

Many hymns are committed to memory, this work extending throughout the entire eight years of the course. Also simple prayers are learned and used in the opening and closing exercises of the school. The church calendar is studied, and church history in an elementary way, the chief attention being given to the Reformation. According to Schmidt's encyclopedia, the child leaves the people's school at the age of fourteen with a memory stock of at least 350 Bible texts, 35 Christian hymns, the five articles of the catechism, and the 73 responses of his confirmation book.

In the higher schools all pupils are required to study religion three hours per week, the first year, and two hours per week, each of the succeeding eight years. The period usually devoted to this subject is, as in the people's schools, the first in the morning. The religious instruction may be, usually is, given by two or more teachers, each of whom also instructs in other subjects. Russell cites the Friedrich's Gymnasium of Berlin as having 24 teachers, nine of whom teach religion. In every case the teacher of religion must have made a special study of this subject in his university course, and must have made it his major or minor in the examination which admitted him to the position of teacher. Many of these teachers prepared originally for the church and have had extended theological training.

In general outline the course of study used in Prussian higher schools does not differ materially from that required in the people's schools. It is, however, much more comprehensive in character. It includes far more advanced work in church history and dogma. It adds dogmatic theology and Christian ethics. It is more critical and scientific.

There is much in this course of study which possesses but little value for moral training. The names of the books of the Bible, many of the facts of Biblical and church history, much of the catechism, the church calendar, dogmatic theology, and church creeds belong to this class. There are also portions of the Bible which are positively immoral in their influence upon young people.

On the other hand, the course is enormously rich in ethical content. It brings before the pupil the moral teachings of the entire Bible—the stern commands of the decalogue, the fervid exhortations and denunciations of the prophets, the sublime moral principles of the Christ. It includes also numerous examples of moral heroism and moral cowardice, and frequent illustrations of rewarded virtue and punished wrong. Again, it brings under tribute the ethical content of church history. While this has its dark moral side, it presents many illustrations of forceful moral character, high ideals, self-sacrificing altruism, heroic devotion to the principles of Christian morality. And it is significant for this course in religion that one of the most striking examples of moral heroism is the German reformer Luther.

Moreover, aside from its ethical content, much of the purely religious training which this course affords is tremendously important for the moral life. Christianity is essentially an ethical religion. The beliefs that God knows the thoughts and motives of the human heart, that it is possible to draw upon the infinite resources of Heaven for help in moral crises,

that divine forgiveness of sin may be secured upon repentance, confession and faith, that a Heaven of reward or a hell of punishment awaits the soul at the close of this life, are powerful factors in determining human character and conduct. In fact religious instruction in German schools rests on the assumption that these doctrines are the basis of morality. As far as its content is concerned a course of study could hardly be conceived which would promise more for moral training.

But the value of a course of study is not determined wholly by its content. It depends, also, upon its relation to the life of him who pursues it, and upon the manner in which it is presented.

There are many indications that the course of study outlined above is not closely related to the lives of German pupils. A casual reading of it impresses one that it is calculated to give knowledge about the Christian religion rather than to implant a vital religious faith or to cultivate morality. Many of the clergy complain that religious instruction in the schools is lacking in vitality, fails to reach the lives of the pupils, and, without looking deep enough to find the real cause, blindly urge that more time be given to it. Teachers of the higher schools insist that there is too much pure memory grind, too much catechism and dogma, too much Jewish and church history; that these become a burden to the pupil and defeat the very purpose for which they are given. Professor Kirchner, of Berlin, expresses a feeling quite general among higher school teachers of Germany, when he refers to the religious instruction as a "surfeit of religious doctrines, maxims, hymns, forms, ceremonies." He further criticises the present course of study most severely, when, in looking towards the ideal, he says: "In the choice and treatment of subjects the standard must be genuine religious stimulation rather than dead knowledge, scholastic erudition, or barren forms." (18, p. 479.) A recent writer thinks it would not be far wrong to summarize German opinion thus: "Instruction in religion is absolutely indispensable, but the existing instruction is completely out of harmony with the best thought of the day and stands in need of radical reform." (42, p. 265.)

Perhaps this course was suited to German life when it was first adopted. Certainly it was more in harmony with educational practice in other subjects than it is to-day, though it has always had too little regard for the educational principle that instruction should be adapted to the needs of the different stages of child development. But Germany, like America, is passing through a period of religious reconstruction. What is to be the final outcome of this reconstruction cannot yet be determined. Already there has come from it a transfer of em-

phasis from the mystical to the ethical, from dogma to life. The German course of religious instruction, with the inertia so characteristic of education, has hardly begun to respond to this movement. The department of education is still trying to put the new wine of modern interpretations of Christianity into 18th century bottles; if, indeed, they have yet recognized that the wine is new. It is true, however, that this course is more closely related to the lives of the common people than it is to the lives of the professional classes, and so is better suited to the people's schools than to the higher schools. The common people have been less exposed than the professional classes to the influences of scientific progress. They are consequently nearer the religious ideals and life of the time when the course in religion was first prescribed by the state.

Nor can it be said that teachers generally present the religious instruction effectively. A large and growing class treats it intellectually, much as arithmetic or history. Another gradually diminishing class presents it in an extremely devotional manner; every passage of Scripture studied is inspired and has some special significance for the pupil. Many combine in varying proportions the intellectual and devotional treatments. A constantly increasing number of the best trained teachers, especially in the higher schools, are out of sympathy with the rigid orthodoxy of the course of study and disbelieve much that they are required to teach. Professor Paulsen is quoted as having said: "Many of the teachers of religion in these schools are men who have taken a theological course in the university, but finally have been unwilling to take orders in the church because of unsoundness of faith. They are even more dangerous in the schools, where they deal with plastic young life, than they possibly could be in the pulpit." (39.) A German scholar said to me recently: "Religion as taught in the Berlin Gymnasium which I attended had nothing to do with life. Its teaching killed the religious spirit and did not encourage morality." On the other hand many of the teachers in the people's schools are sufficiently in sympathy with the course of study and possess the necessary sense of responsibility for the moral and spiritual welfare of their pupils to make their religious teaching vital. But the vital element is the teacher's personality.

We have now sketched the main features of German school life which contribute to moral training. The following conclusions appear to be justified:

(1) The moral training of the German school has its aim in citizenship rather than in individual development. The problem is to make citizens who will fit existing political and social institutions, rather than to make men, who may later see fit to adjust institutions to their needs.

(2) Respect for authority is, therefore, cultivated at the expense of self-control, moral independence and initiative.

(3) The religious and moral instruction given is in harmony with school organization and management; both make for the same type of character.

(4) This instruction is out of harmony with the progressive thought of the times and on this account has lost much of its former efficiency. Its emphasis is too little on the immutable principles of Christianity and morals; too much on the unessential and the changing.

(5) The instruction is not adapted to the stages of child development. Some effort is made to adjust it to the child's vocabulary but not to its moral progress; the younger children are taught about the sacrifice of Isaac as well as about the youthful exploits of David and the early piety of Samuel.

(6) Where the religious teaching is really vital and stimulating, the force which makes it so is the teacher's personality.

(7) Whatever may be said in criticism of the moral influences of German schools, they stand pre-eminently for the inculcation of two fundamental virtues—obedience and reverence.

MORAL TRAINING IN FRENCH SCHOOLS.

Let us turn first to the indirect influences which count for moral training.

1. The great majority of French school children are taught by teachers of their own sex, and associate in school with pupils of their own sex. To be sure, in the maternal school, attended by children under six years of age, the sexes mingle and are taught exclusively by women. But this is only for a brief period in early childhood. At six the primary school is entered, and separation of the sexes begins. Every commune with a population of over 500 must have a primary school for boys and another for girls. In smaller communes both sexes may attend the same school. In the higher, or so-called secondary schools, the boys and girls are separate from the first. The boys' schools, both primary and secondary, are taught by men; the girls' schools by women, and the mixed schools mostly by women. Enough was said in the previous chapter concerning sex differences to indicate that this arrangement by which each sex associates only with its own members in the school life is significant for moral training.

2. Militarism exercises a strong influence over school life in France as truly as in Germany. Hughes tells us that: "In no country, perhaps, in the world are the schools so influenced, one might say controlled, by the military spirit as in France." Parsons speaks of the atmosphere of war by which the boys' schools are surrounded, referring to the military drill in which

they engage. (24.) Richard calls attention to the military exercises of the last three years of the primary school, these exercises being classed as a part of physical education. (36, p. 7.) 'Those teachers in the boys' primary schools who received a normal training were taught military exercises and use of the rifle in the normal school. They have also served one year in the army. Those who have not the normal training spent three years in military service. The fathers of primary schoolboys also gave three years to military service. The entire school system is centralized, officered and controlled much like a great army, with the minister of education as commander-in-chief. Official courses of study, sent out from the minister's office, fix the work to be accomplished. French educational writers speak of public education as a "war against ignorance." All this makes school discipline military in character. It makes the teacher a subordinate officer whose chief business is to carry out the orders of superiors. It crushes out originality and initiative in teacher and pupil alike and forbids development of moral self-hood. It subordinates the interest of the individual child to the perfect working of a great machine. It cultivates obedience to authority, but an obedience that is unreasoned and mechanical—an obedience that is unmoral if not positively immoral.

3. An almost entire absence of games and play from French schools has also an important bearing on the development of character in French children. Until recently the French teacher was legally responsible for all accidents to his pupils and on this account naturally discouraged games. "The playground is small, and the teacher's garden monopolizes half of it," says Hughes (14, p. 113), who considers the absence of games one of the most serious defects in the entire school system of France.

4. French teachers are less thoroughly trained professionally than German teachers. Nearly all French primary teachers have had a three year normal school course, but it is less professional in character than that of the German seminaries, and is not preceded by as extensive study. Teachers in the secondary schools receive practically no professional training. The French teacher, particularly in the secondary school, is, therefore, more liable than the German to pedagogical blunders of moral significance.

5. Many patriotic mottoes and moral maxims adorn the walls of French primary schools, exercising an unconscious influence in favor of patriotism and morality. There is also posted in a conspicuous place in each schoolroom a copy of the law prohibiting corporal punishment, the punishments which the teacher may inflict being limited to "bad marks, reprimands."

mands, partial deprivation of recess, detention after class, temporary suspension, not exceeding three days." One may reasonably question whether the influence of the notice does not more than offset that of the mottoes.

6. Competition and rivalry are greatly encouraged by the awarding of many prizes and medals. On the other hand, self-emulation is stimulated by the use of the *cahier*, an exercise book owned by each pupil and taken from grade to grade as he advances. In this book the pupil writes an exercise at regular intervals for the sake of comparison with earlier exercises.

France has made a more serious conscious effort than any other great nation to develop character through her schools. The means chosen is direct moral instruction on a secular basis.

In 1882 a law was passed making compulsory such moral instruction in all public elementary schools. A body of eminent educators formulated a model programme. Courses in morals were established in the normal schools. Text-books, following closely the official programme, were introduced into the schools. Within a few months, moral instruction was as truly a part of the regular school work as reading or arithmetic.

The time devoted to moral instruction in the primary school is, for the elementary and intermediate courses (7 to 11 years), one hour per week, and for the superior course (11 to 13 years), one and one-half hours per week. In general, this time is divided into three equal periods and apportioned to the first hour of alternate schooldays. In the higher primary schools, including not only those offering the general course but also the agricultural, commercial, and industrial, the time devoted to moral instruction is also one hour per week throughout the three year course. In the two year preparatory course of the Lycée and Communal College (ages 7 to 8 years), moral and civic instruction are given with French history and geography, all of which together occupy two and one half hours per week. The Lycée and College require one hour of ethics per week during the third and fourth years.

Since less than 150,000 pupils attend public higher schools of all classes, and about 4,000,000 attend public primary schools, and since conditions in the former both as to organization and instruction appear less favorable to moral training than in the latter, we shall fix our attention chiefly on the latter. It ought to be noted, however, that about one-fourth of the primary school children are in private schools, almost wholly Catholic, and are taught morality in connection with highly sectarian religious teaching. Moreover the percentage of school children in church schools has increased slightly since religious instruction was succeeded by secular moral instruction in the public schools.

It has been said that this moral instruction rests on a secular basis. Duty and conscience are the key words. The sanctions of morality are to be found in duty, not in religion. Duties towards God are included in the official programme but nothing concerning the attributes or nature of God, and of course no church creeds or catechisms, are to be taught. As a matter of fact, duties to God are given but little space in the text-books and are passed over lightly if taught at all. Yet the official regulation says expressly: "Lay moral instruction differs from religious instruction without opposing it. The teacher does not become a substitute either for the priest or for the father of the family; he joins his efforts to theirs in order to make of each child an honest man. He should insist on the duties which unite men, not on the dogmas which divide them. . . . He ought to avoid as evil everything in his language or attitude which would wound the religious beliefs of the children confided to his care, everything which would trouble their souls."

A large majority of primary teachers have received a normal school training, given by professors who have been specially prepared for it in the higher normal schools. It includes two hours per week in psychology, morals, and pedagogy. The teacher at work is provided with elaborate instructions and suggestions concerning the task of moral instruction. He is given a carefully outlined course of study, or "official programme," and his pupils are, in general, provided with text-books prepared according to this official programme. There are in reality three such programmes, one for each division of the primary school.

The elementary programme (ages 7 to 9) is chiefly suggestive. The teacher is to engage in familiar conversations with the pupils and to read to them moral examples, precepts, parables, and fables; also to direct practical exercises tending to put morality into action in the class itself: (1) by individual observation of the pupils' characters, (2) by intelligent application of school discipline, (3) by incessant appeal to the feelings and the moral judgment of the child, (4) by correcting false notions, superstitions, prejudices, etc., (5) by having children present, from their own observation, illustrations of such vices as drunkenness, idleness, and cruelty, (6) by having them contemplate grand scenes of nature in order to arouse the religious feeling and the feeling of admiration for the universal order.

The programme for the intermediate classes (ages 9 to 11),—the heart of the entire course—is more definite. It treats of: (1) The child in the family—duties towards the parents, grandparents, brothers, sisters and servants. (2) The child in the school—docility, assiduity, work, duties towards teacher and

fellow pupils. (3) *La Patrie*—duties towards *la patrie* and society. (4) Self—duties towards the body: sobriety, cleanliness, and temperance; duties towards exterior goods: economy, avoidance of debt, work; duties towards the soul: veracity, sincerity, personal dignity, self-respect, modesty. (5) Duties towards other men: justice, charity, kindness, fraternity. (6) Duties towards God: reverence, obedience to God's laws as revealed in conscience and reason.

The superior programme (ages 11 to 13), presents a more comprehensive treatment of duties towards the family, society, and *la patrie*.

This programme of moral instruction as a whole is, perhaps, as comprehensive and rich as can be found anywhere. Moreover, it contains little that is not important for the moral life. It is a careful and complete outline of moral duties.

It should be noted, however, that it is an outline of moral duties rather than a course of study suited to children of public school age. The men who arranged the programme seem to have been thinking of moral citizens, not of moral children at each stage of their development. It is as if, knowing from their own experience and observation what qualities are desirable in adults, they had said: "Go to; let us arrange a programme in moral instruction which emphasizes all these qualities, and, when our children are grown, we shall have noble citizens." Whether the thing to be taught is related to the life of the child is of little consequence; so long as it is likely to be important to the man.

Again, there is lack of harmony between the most fundamental parts of this course of study—those dealing with duties to self—and the organization and management of French primary schools. France affords the anomaly of a programme of moral instruction suited to a republic, and a school organization adapted to an absolute monarchy. The teacher is expected to instruct his pupils in initiative and self-reliance, but the strongly centralized school system forbids him to exercise either of these admirable qualities. And the discipline generally maintained prevents pupils from putting this teaching into practice. Personal dignity and self-respect are to be taught, but neither is possible in any high degree to the teacher, whose duties are so minutely prescribed that the Minister of Education at Paris can tell exactly what is being done at any given instant in every school in France. Both are hostile to the dominant spirit of French life—militarism.

The text-books on morals for the most part, follow the official programme very closely. Their chief differences are in method of presentation, one using many quotations from literature by way of illustration, another emphasizing clear cut

definitions, another giving frequent résumés, etc. Some authors grade their books according to the divisions of the primary school. Others combine in one book and with the same treatment lessons for the elementary and intermediate, and still others for the intermediate and higher divisions. One writer has different books for teacher and pupil, the teacher's book including what is contained in the pupil's, and, in addition, two brief plans for handling the lesson (one plan for the intermediate, the other for the superior course), and subjects for written exercises. Since the elementary and higher programmes do not furnish as definite outlines or as rich fields for writers of text-books as the intermediate, there are more text-books for the intermediate course, and many of those for the other courses follow the intermediate outline.

But let us examine some of these books more carefully. One of the most extensively used bears the title: "The First Year of Moral and Civic Instruction." This reached its 48th edition in 1904, 25 editions having appeared since 1890. In 1889 it was mentioned first in the list of text-books most in use—a rank which it appears still to hold. It is intended for children of intermediate grade, *i. e.*, from 9 to 11 years old. The book is divided into thirteen chapters as follows:

(1) Duties of the child in the family, in the school and in apprenticeship.

- (2) Duties towards self.
- (3) Duties towards society.
- (4) Work, order, association, etc.
- (5) Employers, and employed.
- (6) The farmer.
- (7) The merchant.
- (8) Service of the state.
- (9) The head of the family.
- (10) Civil rights.
- (11) The state.
- (12) The administration.
- (13) Rights and duties of citizens.

Each chapter consists of a number of moral, hygienic, or business precepts and definitions, a résumé, a group of references to the supplement, which will be described more fully later, a few subjects for pupils' compositions and several pages of little stories, apparently written by the author, illustrating the teachings of the chapter. There are also questions at the bottom of the page, numbered to correspond with the various duties emphasized on that page. An occasional quotation from the laws of France appears among the precepts. Specimen pages and sections will show the character of the book better than any description of it. Here is the first page, which treats of duties in the family:

(1) "You ought to love your parents, who love you, nurture you, and educate you.

(2) "You ought to respect them. Do not be familiar with them, as you are with your companions.

(3) "You ought to obey them. Do not dispute with them. One disputes with equals, not with his father and mother.

(4) "The law makes sacred the authority of parents in giving them the right to punish. (Here follows a quotation from the laws of the Republic, bearing on the authority of parents over their children.)

(5) "You ought to be grateful to your parents for all the care which they give you."

At the bottom of this page are the following questions:

(1), (2), (3), "State the principal duties of children towards their parents.

(4) "How does the law make sacred the authority of parents over their children?

(5) "Why ought you to be grateful to your parents?"

At the close of the first chapter is the following résumé which the pupil is expected to commit to memory:

(1) "I shall love my father and mother; I shall respect and obey them.

(2) "I shall be grateful to them; I shall render to them in old age the care they have given me.

(3) "I shall love all the members of my family.

(4) "I shall do honor to the name I bear.

(5) "At school, I shall work with all my might; I shall put all my attention and all my intelligence into everything that I do.

(6) "I shall love my teacher; I shall obey him, respect him, and be grateful to him.

(7) "I shall form good habits, and shall choose well my friends. I shall avoid evil companions.

(8) "During my period of apprenticeship, I shall work hard, and be teachable and honest. I shall carefully guard the good habits of my childhood."

Notice that this résumé, as are also some of the others, is cast in the form of a series of resolutions or pledges.

The chapter on "The Merchant" treats of book-keeping, bankruptcy, notes, drafts, checks, protesting of notes, failure, liquidation, and gives the 9 to 11-year-old prospective merchant such indefinite advice as "Do not make hazardous investments," and "Do not buy too much merchandise." In the chapter on "The Head of the Family" we find the question "What is marriage?" answered by the enlightening statement "Marriage is the most serious act of one's life."

Thirty pages of the book are occupied by a supplement

which gives additional information concerning terms used in the lessons, usually with quotations from the laws. A few such terms are: "commercial associations," "code," "municipal council," "general council," "contracts of marriage," "desertion," "schools," "expropriation," "electoral list," "pensions," "posts," "military service," "vagabondage." At the end of each chapter are given a few references to this supplement, which the pupil is expected to look up and copy.

What shall be said concerning this text-book as a whole? It contains a large number of valuable moral precepts and definitions, which the pupils are required to commit to memory. There can be no question that it fixes in the child's mind, temporarily at least, many statements of moral duties, distinctions and resolutions. The composition exercises and especially the abundant illustrative material must serve to give this memory stock greater permanence and meaning. But the mere memorizing of precepts, definitions, and resolutions does not constitute moral training. These give at best only knowledge about morality. Unless they actually reach the understanding of the child, they do not even give this. And knowledge about duty and about moral distinctions does not necessarily result in moral life and conduct. The entire book has a mechanical, precept, question-and-answer air about it which robs it of vitality. Many of its teachings are far beyond children 9 to 11 years old; as, *e. g.*, those about the head of the family and marriage. Many others have no moral significance whatever, as some of those in the chapter on the merchant; others never will have interest, except for the few who engage in particular occupations. Much of its illustrative material is fanciful, inaccurate, trivial. No attention is paid to the stages of child development. The author appears to have looked over society and picked out those moral qualities in children and adults which seemed to him desirable, and, without asking whence they came or how they are most naturally developed, to have included them in his book to be taught in the school.

Such is one of the most widely used French text-books on morals—a book which has gone through more editions than any other of the score or so examined. The same author published also a book for the elementary course which follows the intermediate rather than the elementary programme. It has not been so well received, only six editions having appeared in 1902.

Another book of a somewhat different type bears the name "*Le Livre de morale des écoles primaires*" (47) and is intended for intermediate and higher classes. There is a separate book for the teacher. Each lesson contains (1) two brief résumés, one for the intermediate course and one for the superior and

(2) one or more selections from standard authors, chiefly French. The résumés are to be committed to memory. They consist chiefly of moral precepts or definitions concisely but dogmatically and dryly stated. Much of the work is far beyond the primary school pupil. For example, the pupil is asked to express in writing his opinion of a being sensible only to bodily pains and pleasures, and to tell in what moral sensibility consists. He is also asked to tell the difference between desire and will, between anger and will, between physical force and will, and to cite examples supporting his distinctions. The most valuable feature of the book is its illustrative material gathered from the best literature. The arrangement, by which duties of the child are presented in one section and duties of the man in another, is unfortunate, especially since the latter includes most of the fundamental virtues and occupies more than half the book. It tends to emphasize the remoteness of what he is studying from the immediate life of the child.

A set of three books, one for children under 10 and one for boys (53) and another for girls (54) from 10 to 13, bears the title "Moral Maxims." These books are what their names indicate and little more. There is a brief résumé and a list of questions at the end of each lesson, both numbered to correspond with the maxims of the lesson. There are no quotations from literature, no stories, only an occasional crude picture to relieve the monotony of dry moralizing.

A book notably different from any yet described is entitled "*L'enseignement morale à l'écoles primaires*" (62), and is intended for intermediate classes. Its contents are divided into sections according to the months of the year. Thus in October children study duties in the family, in November duties in the school, etc. In each lesson there is a group of moral precepts or definitions, two or three choice sayings of well known writers, selections from good literature to be read, a few questions and a few subjects for compositions. It is one of the best books yet issued, but appears not to have been favorably received.

Other text-books might be mentioned, but these suffice for the purposes of this study. Altogether they are an unsatisfactory lot, of which the best appear to be little used and the worst much used. Probably the most valuable feature of them is the use of illustrative selections from standard literature. But this feature is not used at all in some, and only in a limited and imperfect way in any of them. The one thing common to all is an abundance of moral precepts and definitions.

But how do teachers actually use the programme and text-books? How are the lessons presented? This, of course,

varies greatly with different teachers. M. Pierre, Director of the Normal School at St. Cloud, outlines the method usually followed: "The plan of the lesson is written in advance on the board. The lesson is developed and explained. A résumé is dictated. A selection illustrating the résumé is read. A maxim is given in conclusion." But these are only formal steps, untouched by the personality of the teacher. Is the teaching perfunctory and mechanical, or is it vital and stimulating?

A large number of primary inspectors' reports quoted by Lichtenberger (22), in 1889, indicate that at that time the great majority of the moral teaching was perfunctory and mechanical. Said one inspector: "The teachers lack capacity and conviction." Said another: "The lessons too much resemble ordinary lessons; they lack the emphasis of conviction and sincerity which belongs to true moral instruction." One inspector made the statement that moral instruction did not exist in the schools under his inspection, and then added significantly that he heard a teacher trying to explain to seven or eight year old girls the distinction between soul and body. According to most reports, however, a few teachers under each inspector were able to give the moral instruction in an efficient manner.

M. Pelisson (27), writing of the situation in 1900, quotes much more favorably from several inspectors. One says: "Of all the different subjects taught in the schools *la morale* has, in the past ten years, made more serious progress and given better results than any other." Undoubtedly there has been great improvement since the very unfavorable reports of 1889. But an American professor of education, after a recent careful inspection of French primary schools, characterized their moral instruction as "absolutely wooden."

It is impossible to determine and difficult to estimate the results of such a course of instruction as the one we have been considering. One can say without hesitation, however, that it has not accomplished what its friends expected of it. This expectation is well expressed in the words of the official programme. Speaking of the teacher it says: "He is to strengthen, to root into the minds of his pupils, for all their lives, through daily practice, those essential notions of morality common to all civilized men. He should aim to make all the children serve an effective apprenticeship to a moral life. Later in life they will, perhaps, become separated by dogmatic opinion but they will be in accord in having the aim of life as high as possible; in having the same horror for what is base and vile, the same delicacy in the appreciation of duty, in aspiring to moral perfection, whatever effort it may cost, in feeling united to that fealty to the good, the beautiful, the true,

which is also a form, and not the least pure, of the religious sentiment."

Buisson, in 1898, after years of service as director of primary education, writes almost passionately of the limitations of the school in the work of moral training (33, 1901, p. 1121), Cloudesley Brereton, of England, vice-president of the international jury on primary education, Paris Exposition, after having made extended personal observation of primary education in France, speaks of "a considerable gain" having resulted from the change of education from a Catholic to an ethical foundation. He says, also: "During my visit in the provinces I was present at a certain number of *morale* lessons, and was agreeably surprised by the interest the children generally took in them. Whenever the teaching was practical, and bore on the daily life and ways of the school, or treated of some subject well within the ken of the children, it was easy to see that the teacher had the ear of his audience. But if an abstruse *cas du conscience* was posed which required some subtlety to disentangle, or the teacher was too anxious to give a philosophic or dogmatic air to his teaching by entrenching himself behind a barbed wire fence of maxims and formulas, it was evident that even those children who attempted to follow him, painfully repeated by rote what he laid down, but their hearts were far from him." (33.) Bracq quotes several school inspectors and other French writers as speaking of the results favorably. Their statements, however, are all in general terms such as "manifest progress," "results more and more satisfactory," "admirable results," etc. While Bracq himself thinks that these and other similar investigations show tangible results, he admits that: "Honest teachers on both sides have not failed to express their disappointment at the results of their work." (1.)

To be sure the international jury on primary education, of the Paris Exposition, awarded France, by unanimous vote, a grand prize for her system of moral instruction. But it must be acknowledged that the award was made on the appearance of the machine, rather than on its product—because France was making an extensive direct effort for moral training, not because there was evidence of the effort's success.

Some light is shed on the question of results by an investigation recently made. More than 3,000 primary school children were asked to describe the "most beautiful act they had ever seen." (37.) About half recounted not an act which they had actually seen, but one of which they had read in the illustrative material of their moral instruction books. For the most part they reported acts of heroism and self-sacrifice, and the heroes and heroines were those of the books. The test indicates that at least the most striking and dramatic parts of

the stories become so identified with the child's own experiences that he does not know the one from the other. The assumption is likely to follow that the child's appreciation of all moral acts has been intensified in like manner by his moral instruction. But it must be remembered that the common every day duties are less dramatic, less impressive than the heroism and self-sacrifice of the stories.

The "Book of Gold of the Schools" is cited by some writers as evidence of the good results of moral instruction. (28.) This is an immense manuscript volume containing brief accounts of acts of justice, honesty, and heroism observed in French school children. The book formed a part of the educational exhibit in 1900. But one is hardly justified in assuming that these acts are the result of the school study of morality.

When all is said, one must acknowledge disappointment that the results of so great an effort are not more obvious. It must also be borne in mind that since 1882, when moral instruction was introduced into the schools, there has been marked educational progress in many directions, such as better preparation of teachers, introduction of manual training, etc., which have no doubt contributed much to moral improvement through the school.

From the foregoing study the following conclusions seem to be justified concerning moral instruction in French public primary schools.

(1) That the official programme comprises an admirably comprehensive list of moral duties.

(2) That this programme fails to take account of the stages of child development.

(3) That it is out of harmony with the organization and management of the schools.

(4) That it is poorly interpreted and applied by the text-books most in use.

(5) That most teachers lack the sympathy and conviction which alone make moral instruction vital.

(6) That the whole effort places too great emphasis on the school as an educational factor.

(7) That it tends to treat morality as a veneer to be put on rather than as a life to be developed. (One text-book defines *la morale* as the science of good manners.)

(8) That the results, so far as they can be estimated, appear pitifully insignificant when compared with the magnitude of machinery and effort which produce them.

But however severely one may criticise the French method of giving moral instruction in the school, he must give France the credit for having made a beginning in the face of tremen-

dous obstacles. What it meant to take the schools by force out of the hands of a church which had controlled their teaching for centuries, in a country where there was comparatively little middle ground between Catholicism on the one hand and atheism on the other, and to substitute in these schools moral instruction based on duty and conscience for the religious instruction of the Catholic church, cannot be appreciated by a foreigner. Moreover, one must acknowledge that much light has been shed on the problem of moral instruction. Thousands of French teachers have been forced to think more or less seriously about it. Their thought and their experience are gradually making clear the weaknesses of the methods employed and focusing attention upon the teacher as the fundamental factor in the task before them.

MORAL TRAINING IN ENGLISH SCHOOLS.

Passing from a study of the French to a study of the English school system, one is impressed with the complexity of the problem which confronts him. A striking feature of English education is its lack of uniformity. This makes general statements extremely hazardous, and the task of finding common features of moral significance peculiarly difficult. The difficulty will be lessened somewhat, though still great, by treating of elementary education and secondary education separately. And first let us give attention to elementary education.

It is necessary to distinguish between the two types of English public elementary schools. Prior to the law of 1902, these were known as "board" schools and "voluntary" schools, and since this law was enacted as "provided" and "non-provided" schools. The chief difference between provided and non-provided schools is that the former are entirely free from denominational control while the latter are not. Both are, by the new code, under the control of the county council, but not equally so. Board Schools, or provided schools were established by the government in 1870 and have been supported from the first by special grants, and by local taxes. Since 1903 the county council appoints their local boards of managers. The Voluntary Schools, or the non-provided schools were founded by religious denominations or by the British and Foreign School Society and have been supported partly by denominational funds and partly by Government grants; but since the new code went into effect their support has been the same as that of the provided schools. The law provides for the appointment of four out of six of the board of local managers in accordance with the original deed of foundation of the school, the other two being appointed by the county council. The appointment of teachers is in the hands of the

board of managers, thus making it practically certain that religious tests will continue to be imposed on teachers in non-provided schools. In 1902, 48% of English public elementary pupils were in provided and 52% in non-provided schools.

The main difference between the two classes of schools, as far as they concern this study, are: (1) differences in preparation and efficiency of teachers, (2) differences in the religious instruction given. Before 1902 the Board Schools were better supported financially than the Voluntary Schools and on this account were able to secure a larger percentage of teachers who had received a professional training. Though their attendance was at this time a little less than that of the voluntary schools, they employed over 30% more certificated teachers, or teachers of the highest class. The religious instruction of the non-provided schools is denominational in character, that of the provided schools undenominational.

With these differences in mind it will be possible for us to speak of the English public elementary schools as a whole in relation to moral training.

Turning first to those features of the elementary school which influence moral life indirectly, one finds that while the majority of German elementary school teachers have had a very thorough three year course of professional training, and while nearly all French primary teachers have pursued a three year professional course not greatly inferior to the German, only about 25% of English elementary school teachers have had a two year training course, which is really more largely secondary than professional. Moreover, 12% of the English elementary teachers—the so-called additional teachers—were admitted to the profession without examination even as to scholarship, and about 20% belong to the class of pupil teachers—"young apprentices of from fifteen to eighteen years of age, engaged by the managers on condition of teaching under the superintendence of the head teacher and of receiving suitable instruction during their engagement." (14, p. 52.)

Separation of the sexes in elementary schools is common in England but much less so than in Germany or France, there being about twice as many mixed departments, aside from those for infants, as there are separate departments for the sexes. Besides, less attention is paid to placing boys' departments in charge of men than on the continent. Feminine influence is becoming predominant in English public elementary education, and is necessarily bringing with it greater emphasis on feminine than on masculine moral qualities.

Games, play, and athletic contests occupy a much more prominent place in the life of English school children than in that of the German or French child. According to Philpott,

the spirit of the Eton playing fields is invading the elementary school playgrounds of London. (59, p. 314.) Teachers generally are in sympathy and frequently take part with the pupils in their games. Says Greenough, "In the elementary schools, the teachers feel that the vigorous use of the play hours is of primal importance in developing manhood." (10, p. 265.)

The influence of militarism and of extreme centralization in educational management are absent from the English school. The head-teacher enjoys a great deal of freedom and initiative in the organization of his school and the arrangement of his programme. The government code requires that certain subjects be taught, but does not specify how extensively or in what manner. Moreover, it provides another list of optional subjects, from which the head-teacher may select what shall be taught in his school. Provision is thus made for the needs of the local community, and respect is shown to the teacher's individuality and sense of responsibility. The teacher is more a partner and less a servant of the government in its educational work than is either the French or German teacher. A school atmosphere is thus created which stimulates a feeling of responsibility and initiative in the children. Punishments are sometimes severe, but order and obedience are not of a military, mechanical character. To quote Greenough again: "Germans who visit English schools have often said that they would like to transfer to German schools the force and the enthusiasm of the English student in out-of-door sports, his self-reliance, and the relations of the teachers and pupils." (10, p. 173.) The report of the Moseley Educational Commission, however, indicates that the relations between teacher and pupils are much less intimate and friendly in England than in America, one commissioner referring to the British tendency of teacher and pupil "to regard each other as natural enemies."

Judging by reports of official inspectors, but little importance is attached to reading lessons as forces for moral training. (30.) One inspector points out that reading books are lacking in both literary and ethical merit, and another complains that historical, geographical, and scientific supplementary readers are crowding out those of real literary value. Still others refer to efforts being made by teachers to get pupils into the habit of reading public library books and to direct this reading along right lines. But most of the reports deal only with such topics as enunciation, fluency, understanding of subject matter, oral reading, silent reading, etc., with little appreciation of the moral possibilities of the reading lessons.

The same reports show that pupils are required to memorize many literary selections, mostly poetical, and give them as

recitations. Several inspectors complain that these recitations are chosen with too little regard for their literary value. Nothing is said concerning their moral value, but no doubt many of them exercise considerable influence on the lives of those who memorize them.

The act of 1870, establishing a system of elementary education in England, made important provisions concerning religious instruction. For the Voluntary Schools it provided: (1) that no religious test should be required of any pupil, (2) that religious instruction should be given at such an hour that parents who chose to do so might withdraw their children without forfeiting any of the other benefits of the school, and (3) that this instruction should not be subject to inspection by her Majesty's inspectors. For the Board Schools it provided that the question of religious instruction should rest with the local board, with the reservations that it should not be denominational and that it might be possible for parents to withdraw their children from it as in the case of the voluntary schools.

In accordance with this act, almost all school boards introduced scripture lessons into the schools under their management. The London board provided that "the Bible shall be read, and there shall be given such explanations and such instruction therefrom in the principles of morality and religion as are suited to the capacities of the children." The same board also issued annually a syllabus of Bible instruction, which was adopted by 101 other boards, including those of several large cities. In 1895 there were only 9 school boards in England and 48 in Wales, out of a total of 2,390, which made no provision for religious teaching. More recent legislation, though prompted by religious controversies, has had no effect on the practical working of the arrangements made under the act of 1870. Speaking for London, Webb says: "From this standpoint of administration, it is a merit of the acts of 1902-3 that, so far as religious teaching is concerned, they simply maintain the existing arrangements. They make no change whatever, and they require no change, in the religious instruction given in any London school." (44, p. 200.)

As has already been indicated, the subject-matter of religious teaching in the board schools differs little from that of the voluntary schools, except that the latter includes the catechism and other denominational features. It will suffice, therefore, to consider here the character of this teaching in the board schools with only mention of differences of method in the two classes of schools, where these differences seem important. And since London includes by far the largest number of schools under one local management, and since, also, many other cities have adopted the London syllabus of Scripture lessons, it will

suffice to present this teaching only as given in the London schools. It must be borne in mind, however, that differences between board school conditions and voluntary school conditions are greater in London than in England as a whole.

It is almost a universal custom to open the school with a hymn and prayer, either the Lord's Prayer or one or more short prayers from the book of common prayer. The Scripture lessons are given immediately after the opening of the morning session, and occupy about a half hour. "Teachers are instructed to make the lessons as practical as possible, and not to give attention to unnecessary details." Examinations are held at regular intervals and reviews are frequent. Numerous prizes, provided by private individuals, are distributed annually among those pupils making the best showing in the examinations.

All lessons are based on the syllabus furnished by the local educational authority. How they shall be taught is left to the individual teacher. The syllabus provides a different programme for each of the seven standards or classes, but each standard reviews much that has been learned in the earlier standards. (See 10, pp. 53-56.) The Lord's Prayer, the Ten Commandments, Proverbs, many of the Psalms, and selections from the Gospels and the Prophets are committed to memory. The child is made familiar with the lives of Old Testament heroes, "with the practical lessons therefrom, together with the teaching of the law of Moses with reference to the poor, stranger, fatherless, widow, parents and children." The life and teachings of Christ are studied with care, special attention being given to the parables of the Sower, the Lost Sheep, the Laborers in the Vineyard, The Talents, the Good Samaritan, The Lost Piece of Money, The Prodigal Son, The Pharisee and the Publican. The learning of texts illustrating the duties of truthfulness and temperance is emphasized.

It is obvious that the syllabus was arranged with special emphasis on the moral teachings of the Bible. Nearly all of the most objectionable part of the religious instruction of the German schools is omitted. It is also arranged with considerable regard for the age of the child, the simpler stories and easier selections coming first, though too little attention is given to selecting stories suited to the child's stage of moral development.

In regard to the manner in which the Scripture lessons are taught it may be said, (1) That a reverent spirit is almost always manifest in both teacher and pupils. American observers have repeatedly called attention to this. Board inspectors have reported that they find the spirit of reverence as marked in the board as in the voluntary schools. (2) That Scripture

lessons are, on the whole, taught with as great care and thoroughness as any other lessons. The opposition of the Anglican Church to the board schools on the ground that their religious teaching would be colorless and comparatively valueless without denominational sanctions, has incited the managers of the board schools to put forth extra efforts to make the religious teaching at least as good as any other. Sir John Gorst maintained in the House of Commons in 1898 that, as far as the historical facts of the Bible are concerned, they were taught far better in the board schools of London than in the voluntary schools of the same city. He attributed this to the better training of the board teachers, and to the fact that in the board schools the Scripture lessons are taught in the regular classes, while in voluntary schools they are taught to the school as a whole, in open session.

Rev. Bernard Reynolds, Prebendary of St. Paul's and Diocesan Inspector of schools, London, after severely criticising the principle of board school religious teaching admits that, "In board schools the religious teaching is far better than is usually believed. The syllabus of the London school board is quite excellent, both for pupil teachers and children, and in many of the schools the teaching is quite as good as in any church schools. . . . Under some boards the religious teaching is worth nothing; the same may be said of some of the voluntary schools." (34, p. 53.)

The effectiveness of religious and moral instruction is always difficult if not impossible of measurement. Nevertheless, a few words may profitably be said concerning the results of this instruction in English elementary schools. An official report of inspection of religious teaching in the board schools in 1893 stated that: "the Fatherhood of God and the brotherhood of man are the key notes of it. So far as the examination can test it, the upshot of the lessons may be said to be the acquisition of a very fair knowledge of the Bible story and the committal to memory, and perhaps to heart, of a considerable amount of the Bible text." The eminent English educator, Sir Joshua Fitch, believes that: "a successful effort is made in the board schools to bring up the children in the fear of God, with a reverence for his Word, a considerable knowledge of the history and poetry of the Bible and its plainer moral lessons, and especially of the life and teaching of our Lord." He adds: "No one who knows the schools can well doubt that . . . religious and moral teaching of a very precious kind is imparted in the schools, and that the influence of this instruction on the conduct and character of the children, and on the religious life of the nation, has been profoundly felt." (10, p. 61.) The last president of the London School Board, in an address

delivered when, by the Act of 1902, this board ceased to exist, said: "The excellent results of this teaching, due to the discrimination of the teachers, have been admitted by all impartial critics. Hundreds of thousands of children have reaped the benefit of the illuminating pages of Holy Writ and in after life will have realized, amidst the vicissitudes of their existence, how much they owe to the teachers who, through this teaching, created an atmosphere which permeated the day's work." (31, p. xix.) Dr. Greenough, from an American point of view, maintains that "The literary, moral and religious value of these lessons can hardly be overestimated." The fact that whether or not religion shall be taught is decided by the local board, the freedom of the individual teacher and the absence of church dogma all tend to make the religious teaching of English board schools more vital than that of the German people's schools.

Turning to secondary education we find that not until the passage of the Educational Act of 1902 was provision made for a secondary school system connecting with the elementary system. But generations ago the great "public school," of which Eton, Rugby, Harrow and Winchester are the most notable examples, became the typical secondary school, after which scores of lesser institutions have been modeled. The public schools are boarding institutions, each independent of the other. They admit boys at from 11 to 14 years of age and offer six year courses. The school is divided into "houses" of 40 or 50 boys each with a master over each house. The expenses are so great as to make them distinctively class institutions. Their courses of study are extremely classical, some schools devoting two-thirds of their time to Greek and Latin.

Perhaps no one feature of English public school life contributes more to moral training than school games. No other schools in the world have so fully recognized their culture value. Out-door sports are graded and made a regular part of the curriculum. Boys are excused from them only upon medical advice. Any absence from the playing field is treated as an absence from the classroom. Masters not only direct the games, but often join in them. On the average, nearly two hours each afternoon are devoted to sports.

Mr. Paton, Head Master of Manchester Grammar School, after discussing the physical advantages of these public school games, speaks of their moral value as follows: "But there are other effects, less obvious and less conscious, but more important and quite as real. Indirectly, but none the less effectively, games develop promptness of action and promptness of decision, prompt command on the part of the captain, prompt obedience on the part of the team. They teach self-restraint, how to

keep one's temper under trying circumstances, and respect for an adversary even in the hottest conflict. They teach straightforwardness and a sense of honor, rudimentary but real. They teach unselfishness, and what English people specially lack—the habit of co-operating with each other. And they teach all this in the line of the boy's own natural taste and natural activities. His native combativeness, which, if neglected, would make him a hooligan, and if repressed makes him a coward, is thus utilized to make him a man." (25, p. 10.)

The curriculum of most English secondary schools is extremely classical, cultivating conservatism, respect for authority, imitation of the ancient—in a word the spirit of scholasticism. The "public school" devotes twice as much time to Greek and Latin as does the German Gymnasium or the French Lycée. Science, which stands for individual observation, independence, self reliance, self expression, has hardly begun to find a place. The classical influence is, however, largely offset by that of the "playing field."

On the other hand, many public schoolmasters and others complain of the evils of too great athleticism, growing largely out of contests between schools. An anonymous writer, Kappa, while finding no fault whatever with the time spent in games, deplors the fact that "by far the greater part of boys' leisure moments is taken up with reading athletic reports, discussing records, and brooding over athletic distinctions." (16, p. 173.) The author of the Upton Letters, himself a public schoolmaster, speaks of the boys basing their ideas of social success entirely on athletics. Another writer insists that "the interest in these games is often too absorbing, lasting in a full measure throughout the whole day, and distorting the ideals of life; often making boys admire skill in them more than they admire usefulness and virtue." The same writer refers to the "ruinous publicity" given these games by the newspapers. Mr. Moseley, patron of the educational commission which bore his name, calls attention to the fact that sports do not form anything like so important a part of the everyday life of the schoolboy in America as in England. He adds: "The absolute devotion to sports to the exclusion of almost all other interests, which of late years has crept into all classes of English schools, forms I think, one of the weakest points in our educational system." (32, p. 13.)

Another feature of the public school which is important for moral training is the intimate relations of the master with his boys. We have seen that he is with them in their games. He is also with them on long tramps. He lives in the same house with them, and dines at the same table, daily sharing their experiences. Says Sadler: "The English secondary school-

master, teaching in a school of the corresponding grade, is much more the personal friend of his pupils, much more in sympathy with their out of school interests . . . than the German." Paton also speaks of the closeness and the freedom of personal intercourse between master and pupils as one of the distinguishing characteristics of an English public school. This greatly intensifies the influence of the master's personality. But it does more. It contributes greatly to the cultivation of that school loyalty which is so marked a feature of every public school. Besides, the whole situation contributes to the same end. The school is more than school to its boys; it is home, also, for most of the year; and it calls forth much of the home-feeling, and the home-loyalty, along with the loyalty ordinarily developed by the school. No other schools in the world succeed so well in rousing the life-long devotion of their students as the great public schools of England.

Discipline, in the more important matters of conduct, is strict though much less so than in the French Lycée. Mr. Gray, a member of the Moseley Commission, and himself a head-master, "speaks of the uncompromising, unquestioning discipline which marks the well governed English public school." On the other hand, reliance is generally placed "on inward trustworthiness and a sound, enlightened, wisely directed public opinion" rather than on close supervision. And public opinion is almost always the opinion of the leading spirits in the sixth, or highest, "form." Recognizing this, Dr. Arnold instituted his system of sixth-form government, which is now in quite general use. Paton describes it as follows: "The boys of the highest form are invested with certain powers of supervision and government, in return for which they receive certain special privileges. . . . They are responsible for orderly conduct at meals, in the corridors, the studies, and dormitories. . . . They are responsible under the masters for punctuality and good form at games. They are expected themselves to show the highest example in industry, good conduct and public spirit." (25, p. 26.) There can be no question that this responsibility for the conduct of others is of great value to sixth-form boys, and, under a wise head-master, who keeps constantly in touch with his older boys, to the school as a whole. But experience has shown that the system has serious faults.

A complete lack of professional training on the part of English public school teachers has an important bearing on their efficiency in moral training as well as in intellectual training. The notion that a man needs only to know his subject or subjects in order to become a secondary teacher still holds sway in England as it does in America.

Cramming for university, professional, Joint Board and other examinations is a distinctive feature of the secondary school. Each school is judged by the success of its candidates in competitive examinations. Therefore every boy who shows special ability is crammed to the limit of his capacity, at the expense of his fellow students and of his own highest interests. A member of the Moseley Commission speaks of the cramming system as one of the most serious difficulties which English secondary schools have to face.

Another feature of the public school which has significance for moral training is its distinctively class character. It is a school for the sons of wealth only. The boys have almost no contact with the lower classes of society during their school life. Says Paton, who is a strong supporter of the public school: "Too often the boy learns to despise the great body of his species with a contempt bred not by familiarity but the lack of it." (25, p. 40.) Keen competition between the different classes of society rather than co-operation lies at the basis of English life, and the public school fosters, rather than discourages, this unhealthy condition.

Again, it must not be overlooked that English public school-boys not only are taught exclusively by men, and associate only with pupils of their own sex during school hours, but that they have no other associations at any other time during the day. They are almost entirely removed from the influences of the opposite sex. Only during vacations are they permitted to breathe the home atmosphere, sweetened and refined by a mother's, and perhaps a sister's presence. We have already seen in our study of French and German schools that the association of boys during school hours exclusively with men and boys tends to intensify their masculine qualities; how much more does this. Personal courage, sense of honor, hardiness, self-assertiveness are stimulated in a high degree, while sympathy, kindness, self-sacrifice, thoughtfulness for others—the higher altruistic virtues—are repressed, or at least not encouraged. It would be interesting to speculate on the outcome of this double system of education which puts the sons of wealth entirely under male instruction, and the sons of the common people almost wholly under the tutelage of women.

Religion occupies an important though unobtrusive place in public school life. Paton says: "the public school spirit is based on religion, though there is not much demonstrative religion among the boys." (25, p. 37.) Scripture is taught about two and one half hours per week in each form, much as it is taught in the voluntary schools. The chapel is the most expensive and beautiful part of the school premises. A brief chapel exercise is held in the morning. Prayers are read in

each house in the evening just before retiring. "Even when there was the great rebellion at Rugby, and the head-master was barred out of his own house, the sixth-form fellows held their regular prayers evening by evening!" At the Sunday services the head-master gives much advice and endeavors to inculcate the ideals for which the school stands.

Such are some of the features of English schools which are most significant for moral training. One is impressed especially by the facts that these schools recognize and use a considerable number of forces for character-building, that they place much emphasis on the personality of the teacher, that, on the whole, they stand for the cultivation of individuality, self-expression, initiative and self-reliance, though there are strong influences in the opposite direction, that they afford a solution, under peculiar conditions, of the vexing problem of religious instruction.

On the other hand it must be acknowledged that the English teacher has but meagre professional preparation for his work; that the separation of the social classes in school life interferes with the cultivation of the broadest altruism; that probably neither the exclusively masculine environment of the boarding schools nor the largely feminine environment of the elementary schools affords ideal conditions for the moral development of the English boy; that even so valuable a moral discipline as that of games is often vitiated by misplaced emphasis.

MORAL TRAINING IN AMERICAN SCHOOLS.

Lack of uniformity is the first thing which impresses one who attempts to consider the contribution of American schools to moral training. American public education is fundamentally a local matter.

Several states, among them Massachusetts, Rhode Island, North Carolina, West Virginia, Minnesota, North Dakota and Washington, have made legal provisions concerning moral training in their schools. These provisions vary from that of North Carolina which aims merely at requiring teachers to "encourage morality" to that of West Virginia which charges "all teachers, boards of education and all other school officers with the duty of providing that moral training for the youth of this state which will contribute to securing good behavior and manners, and furnish the state with exemplary citizens." Minnesota provides that all school officers may introduce . . . instruction in the elements of social and moral science." North Dakota prescribes specifically that "moral instruction shall be given by each teacher in the public schools," but fails to provide for the enforcement of the prescription. It is hardly necessary to say that these laws are commentaries on

the art of law making rather than actual forces for moral training in the schools.

Several of the states have also passed laws or rendered judicial decisions concerning Bible reading in the school: nine states prescribing it, twelve giving it a legal status, and five forbidding it. Because of their relation to religious beliefs these regulations, particularly those forbidding Bible reading, have aroused more discussion and are more generally enforced than those concerning moral training.

All of the states affect, in a slight degree, the efficiency of their schools for moral training (except the schools of those cities which examine their own teachers), through the standard of attainment required of teachers in order to secure the teaching certificate. The state provisions for the removal of immoral teachers by local authority, and for the prevention of saloons and immoral houses locating near school buildings, also have some bearing on the moral efficiency of the school.

Aside from these very general limitations each city, town or rural school district is a law unto itself as far as the moral influences of its schools are concerned.

In a few cities, the school board and superintendent provide as at Anderson, Indiana (3), for an extended, systematic course in moral instruction. In other cities the board, in its printed regulations, calls the attention of the teacher to the importance of making each part of school life count for moral training and provides him with a syllabus on ethics suggesting how this may be done. New York city is an illustration, providing a syllabus which emphasizes the personality of the teacher, reverence, the spirit of the classroom, the development of self-control, the moral value of school subjects, etc. The syllabus also includes a list of topics for practical lessons in morality and lays down the following principles for the guidance of the teacher in moral education: "(1) The course of moral training is a development, in which the child is first led to practice and afterward to work from principle. . . . The child also develops from egoism to altruism. . . . (2) The culture of the imagination is a powerful aid in moral instruction. . . . (3) In using literature and similar material for purposes of moral education, the teacher should not violate the law of self-activity. . . . (4) The most effective method in moral education is positive rather than negative. A mind filled with good interests, high ideals, and helpful activities, has no room for evil. Love is a stronger and better motive than fear." (13.)

Other city boards leave their teachers without printed regulations or suggestions of any kind, the superintendent bringing the question before them from time to time in teachers' meetings or by circular letter. In still other city schools and in nearly

all village and rural schools the matter is entirely in the hands of the individual teacher, and whatever is done for moral training must be done on his initiative.

Consequently, the direct moral instruction actually given in the schools varies greatly. Nearly all teachers devote the first few minutes of the day to "opening exercises." Most of them—about 75%—use Bible readings, or the Lord's Prayer, or both, along with religious or patriotic songs, for these exercises. Some give short ethical talks or read stories containing moral lessons. Many have their pupils learn proverbs, mottoes, precepts, or short selections from literature which have a moral import. Some take advantage of every opportunity which the regular lessons afford to point a moral. Others give a few earnest words of moral instruction whenever an incident of school life offers a favorable opportunity. Most teachers use several of these means for giving direct instruction in morals. Few if any schools are entirely without such instruction, although a formal course of study is rarely followed. In a word, direct moral instruction is nearly always incidental and unsystematic.

But American educators rely chiefly on *indirect* means for moral training. Let us examine some features of the public school which are indirectly significant as regards moral training.

Prominent among these is lack of professionally trained teachers. Hughes calls this the weakest point in the American school system. Even in Massachusetts, which heads the list, less than half the public school teachers have had a normal school course. Taking the United States as a whole, not one city teacher in four has received such training, while in many states, where the population is chiefly rural, less than half have received any education whatever beyond the grammar grades. Very few high school teachers, even in the larger cities, have had any professional training. Besides this, many teachers who graduated from so-called normal courses attended institutions whose chief aim was to prepare for teachers' examinations rather than for teaching. Teachers' associations and institutes, summer schools, reading circles, etc., have done much to supplement the work of normal schools, but are by no means a substitute for it. Moreover, the brief professional life of the American teacher, said to be five years, indeed for the rural teacher only two years, shows that schools are largely in the hands of those who lack the training of experience as well as that of the normal school. The relation of professional training of teachers to moral education has been discussed at some length in the earlier sections of this study. It need not be considered again here. However, it must be borne in mind,

as will appear more clearly later, that much depends on the educational aim emphasized in this training. If the aim be merely to give the prospective teacher methods of school work and knowledge of the subjects to be taught, the result must be much less important as far as the moral efficiency of the teacher is concerned than if it be chiefly to put him into sympathetic touch with child life by giving him the genetic point of view.

A second feature of the American school having an important bearing on moral training is the predominance of female teachers. Statistics of the bureau of education show that nearly three-fourths of the public school teachers are women. In many states the percentage is much larger, Massachusetts having ten female teachers to one male. The Moseley Educational Commission expressed alarm at "the growing preponderance of women teachers," one member lamenting that "the boy in America is not being brought up to punch another boy's head or to stand having his own punched in a healthy and proper manner." (32, p. 13.) German critics maintain that our schools are training a race of effeminate men, lacking in virile, aggressive qualities. Prominent American educators take the same view, and plead for more male principals and teachers in the higher grades, especially in the high school. But the significance of the sex of teachers for moral training has been considered in the section devoted to German schools. Suffice it to say here that we Americans, on account of a commercialism which is driving men out of the teaching profession, are throwing the influence of our schools toward the cultivation of a feminine type of morality.

The organization and management of the American school have an important bearing on moral education. In the main, the organization is such as to give the individual teacher a good degree of independence and to encourage initiative and a feeling of responsibility. In some city systems, however, nearly everything is prescribed and outlined by the board or superintendent, making the teacher's work lifeless and mechanical. In most rural schools the teacher is his own master. Wherever the teacher has a fair degree of freedom his management generally, though by no means always, provides an atmosphere favorable to free and natural development of the moral nature. The relations between teacher and pupil are more intimate and friendly than in the schools of any other great nation. The children have greater freedom in asking questions and in expressing their opinions. Discipline, too, is more incidental and is based on interest in the work of the hour. The teacher seeks not so much to keep order as to keep the pupils interested in the work they are doing. Some prin-

cipals and teachers establish a system of co-operative management and discipline, sharing with the pupils the responsibility for the general good order of the school. A few principals have gone so far as to organize their schools into municipalities, called "school cities," with mayor, council, police, board of health, judge and other officers elected by the pupils. Practically all members of the Moseley Educational Commission report that they were greatly impressed by the cordial relations existing between American teachers and pupils and by the dependence of discipline on interest. (32, p. xxiii.) Both of these give free play to the personality of the teacher, on which is placed, according to H. Thistleton Mark, the chief reliance for moral training in American schools. This eminent English educator reached the above conclusion after extensive study. He quotes with approval: "When a boy is going into a classroom he thinks more of the man he is going to meet than of the subject of the lesson," and confesses that in search of something concerning moral training that could be written down in a report, he felt a momentary impatience at times when greeted with the formula "the personality of the teacher." (23, p. 90.) It must be confessed that both Mark and the Moseley commission visited only our better schools but they unquestionably hit upon characteristic though by no means universal features.

American methods of teaching place much responsibility on the pupil, leave a great deal for him to work out for himself, thus serving to develop self-reliance and initiative. Says Mark: "Comparing elementary school teachers in England and in America, English teachers, as a rule, take a far greater proportion of the work into their own hands; leave much less, that is, to the spontaneous efforts of the children." (23, p. 64.) This is true even in a greater degree of the elementary teachers of Germany and France. It must be admitted that the American method often has the disadvantage of merely substituting one authority for another—that of books for that of the teacher—thus lessening the personal influence of the teacher. But even in cases where books come to be looked upon as almost sacred authorities the pupil learns to rely on his own efforts to find out what these authorities say.

The regular studies of the curriculum, especially reading, history, literature, manual training and nature study, are generally recognized as having an important bearing on moral training. In the main, however, the subjects taught in the American school are not different from those taught in Germany, France, and England, though a German writer, Gizicki, has pointed out that American school readers are richer than those of Germany in moral incidents from current life. The

hero of the American reader is more apt to belong to the present generation and to have risen from the ranks of the common people, while the hero of the German reader is more often of royal blood and of a generation or more ago. It needs to be noted, however, that the curriculum of the American school affords far richer material for character building in the elementary grades than in the higher grammar grades. In the former the work is nearly all new to the child; in the latter, he must work over more thoroughly much that he has already learned. In the former, moreover, nature study and manual training have been given a more prominent place largely because something was needed to bridge over the gap that had formed between the kindergarten and the primary school. And the new education has devoted itself chiefly to the child under ten, and to the adolescent. The upper grades have come to be known as the "barren years" of the school curriculum. The amount of work which each child is expected to do is blocked off much as labor unions would mark off a standard day's work and require all to conform to it. The amount of moral injury which results from constantly demanding less of children than they are capable of doing, and from keeping them on work that has grown stale to them cannot be estimated. The enrichment of the curriculum in the upper grades has fortunately begun, but little more than a beginning has yet been made on this very important problem.

The value of games and play as factors in moral education is much less generally recognized in America than in England. In the cities, school playgrounds are usually small, if there are any; the intermissions between classes are brief and pupils are expected to go directly home at the close of the school sessions. The opportunities for spontaneous exercise are thus very limited, and little is done by the teachers to encourage it. A few cities, however, among them Washington, Brooklyn and Cleveland, have begun to teach playground games in the schools because of their effect on the out-of-school lives of the pupils. In the high schools much more attention is generally given to games, nearly every high school having its regular athletic teams and inter-scholastic contests. But even here principals and teachers little appreciate the opportunities afforded by these games for character building, and, with their pupils, are usually more interested in the success of the school team than in the moral effects of the game. The results are often demoralizing because the rewards of success are exalted rather than a clean, honest, straightforward game. And unlike the games of the English public schools, these are participated in by only a small part of the boys of the school, the rest, or as many of them as can pay the price of admission,

with also a part of the girls, merely looking on when contests with other schools occur. In a word, outdoor games in American high schools are occasional and incidental factors in the moral lives of a few pupils, whereas they might be daily and wisely directed factors in the lives of nearly all. The instinct of activity gives them an open sesame to the life of every healthy boy.

In the village and country schools games occupy a far more prominent place in the pupil's life than in city schools. Playgrounds are large. School affords almost the only opportunity which the children have for group games. Most pupils spend the greater part of the noon period as well as the forenoon and afternoon intermissions in spontaneous outdoor play. Teachers do much to encourage games by participating in them, though with little or no appreciation of the moral value which we have seen them to possess.

The fact that American schools are not class institutions, as are those of Europe, but institutions in which the children of rich and poor alike mingle, has long been recognized as significant for the development of social and democratic virtues. Social distinctions are eradicated in the public school. Children of the rich learn to appreciate and to understand the children of the poor and *vice versa*. The school is a centre for the dissemination of the broadest altruism.

There are also many features of American schools, less common than the above, which have a place in character building. Among these may be mentioned schoolroom decorations, pupil organizations in the higher grades and the high school, physical training, efforts to influence the out-of-school reading of pupils, and school gardens. It must be remembered, however, that none of these is exclusively American, though some are more highly developed here than elsewhere.

If one were asked to characterize the moral training of American schools in a single word, that word would be *incidental*. It must not be assumed, however, that incidental moral training is of little value. It is suggestive rather than didactic in character and on this account is more effective than formal and direct training. Moreover, it gives freer reign to the personality of the teacher. But in practice many of the forces which ought to make for character are overlooked and unused.

We have now reviewed briefly the principal forces which make for character in the school systems of four great nations.

We have found in Germany the best trained body of teachers in the world, nearly all men, giving dogmatic religious instruction of the type common three centuries ago, and managing their schools with almost military exactness and

rigor. We have found in France, teachers second in training only to those of Germany, about equally divided as to sex, giving moral lessons prescribed and carefully outlined by the state, and conducting their schools largely in accordance with the directions of the minister of education at Paris. We have found in England teachers on the whole poorly trained, three-fourths of them women, giving, in half the elementary schools, sectarian and in half, non-sectarian religious instruction, enjoying a considerable degree of freedom in the management of their schools, and depending to a considerable extent upon indirect means for moral training. We have found in America teachers trained and divided, as to sex, much the same as in England, giving moral instruction only incidentally, and relying chiefly on the indirect means of school life for moral training.

Here is diversity indeed. In all this diversity, however, a few things have stood out clearly, compelling attention.

The personality of the teacher has forced itself persistently to the front throughout this study as the ultimate source of power in the school. This force alone gives vitality to the sectarian religious teaching of the German school, and the non-religious moral instruction of the French school. The same force puts life into the English non-sectarian Scripture lessons, and into the incidental, moral and religious teachings of the American school.

The personality of the teacher is also the vital factor in most of the indirect moral influences of the school. Much emphasis is often placed on the moral value of school subjects, especially history, literature, nature study, manual training and the like; and there can be no question that these are rich in moral culture material. But their significance for character depends chiefly on the teacher. We hear it said sometimes that the public opinion of the pupils has far more influence on character than anything the teacher may say. The statement contains a profound truth. Public opinion, in the school or out of it, has immense weight in determining the ideals and conduct of the individual. But public opinion in the school is, or ought to be, in great measure, the teacher's opinion—the expression of his personality—crystallized in the minds of the pupils. We hear much of the importance of the moral atmosphere of the school, and this is tremendously important. The child should literally breathe a moral atmosphere at home and at school if he is to attain the best moral character. It may be added that he must not be more conscious of this atmosphere than he is of the natural atmosphere which carries life-giving oxygen to every fibre of his body. But the moral atmosphere of the school is essentially its routine and discipline permeated by the teacher's personality.

If you ask why the personality of the teacher is the vital factor in the moral training of the school, we can do no better than answer in the words of Professor Coe, and in the spirit of Pestalozzi: "The essential method of education is the sharing of life." (4, p. 146.)

The practical bearing of this is seen in the training, selection and retention of teachers. Concerning their training more will be said later. As to the selection and retention of teachers, it must be confessed that if only ideal teachers were employed most of our schools would be teacherless. On the other hand, it is one of the saddest facts of educational management that the moral personality of a candidate for an educational position frequently counts for less than the amount of "influence" which he is able to bring to bear on the board. Moreover, it is often the case that teachers, principals or superintendents are retained, long after it is known that their moral influence over their pupils is bad. A prominent American educational writer has well said: "School boards that fail to enquire minutely into the past conduct, character and moral reputation of a candidate for an educational position—superintendent, principal or teacher—are guilty of criminal neglect." (19, p. 356.) He might have added that they are far more guilty when they retain a teacher whose moral influence has become persistently bad.

Our study also serves to show that the genetic point of view is fundamental in efficient moral training. Attention must be given to the different stages of child development. The religious instruction of the German schools, and the moral instruction of the French schools were planned with adult life in view, not to meet the needs and conditions of child life. True, in the German Bible stories, in many of the French textbook lessons on morals, in much of the English and American incidental teaching of morals and religion, simple language is used in order that the ideas conveyed may be grasped by the child mind; but it is not considered whether these ideas are suited to the child's stage of moral development. The rigorous discipline of the military type, less common in America than in any of the other countries but still far from extinct here, is based on the theological conception of total depravity instead of on a scientific study of the child's moral nature.

The genetic point of view is significant for moral training, in the first place, because it seeks to relate all of the regular work of the school to the life of the child. It seeks to determine the spontaneous interests at each stage of child development and to correlate school work with these interests. The recent overhauling of school curricula, with extensive revision and enrichment, is a step in this direction.

But the genetic point of view is significant for moral training in more direct ways. It brings out with greater clearness the importance of suggestion and imitation in child training, revealing their variations with advancing age. It shows that every pupil is learning by suggestion constantly whether the teacher would have it so or not. It intensifies and gives a scientific basis to the emphasis placed on individual differences in children—differences in physical health which often mean much for the intellectual and moral life, initial differences in temperament, emotional range, mental and moral initiative, sympathy, tact, etc., differences in home training before entering school, and in the entire out-of-school environment. It shows that the child's standards of morality differ from those of the adult. It furnishes information concerning the development of the moral nature—sense of law, sense of truth, attitude towards authority, conscience, selfishness, self-sacrifice, moral ideals, etc. To be sure, comparatively little has yet been done in the study of the moral development of the child, but this little suffices, notwithstanding individual differences, to show that the field is rich in suggestions for moral training.

It is not enough, however, that the teacher should profit by the results of others inspired by this point of view. The most important advantage of the genetic point of view is its effect upon the teacher himself, once he really gets it. He looks upon the same school equipment, the same daily routine, the same boys and girls as before, but his attitude towards them is as different as was the astronomer's attitude towards the heavens when he passed from the geocentric to the heliocentric conception of the solar system. No longer ability to pass examinations, nor discipline, nor athletic standing, but the child himself becomes the central object of the school. The full meaning of the obvious principle "the child is not made for the school but the school for the child" is recognized.

Again, our study emphasizes the immense number of means available for moral training.

The advocate of a particular means, such as direct moral instruction, usually overlooks or underestimates the many other forces of the school which make for character. This was a fault of the framers of the French course of study. Judging by their statements, they expected moral instruction to be the panacea for the moral ills of French life. But the differences in individual children, and in the same children at different times, make necessary many ways of approach, and demand that all be kept open.

The organization of the school throws open to the alert teacher a great number and variety of such ways of approach. Moral instruction, including the use of proverbs, mottoes,

injunctions, exhortations and precepts, has a place in the school, and perhaps no school is entirely without it. But it does not follow that such instruction should be given at stated times as fixed lessons, and least of all from text-books. A brief word now and then, called out by some incident of school life and earnestly uttered, is worth more than a score of ordinary text-book lessons. Moral instruction has value according to its opportuneness, and the tact, sincerity, and moral earnestness of the teacher. It must be sympathetic, individual, related to experience, and based on an intimate knowledge of the one instructed. "The inculcation of moral rules," says professor Dewey, "is no more likely to make character than is that of astronomical formulæ." (5, p. 314.) Professor Roark tells of a high-school boy who, on being expelled from school exclaimed: "I got fired, but I got 98% in ethics."

In the lower grades stories and fables, in the higher, reading lessons, history and literature furnish rich stores for cultivating the moral judgment and for fostering high ideals. But the teacher must, for the most part, allow the moral of the lesson to find its own way into the lives of his pupils. He may, however, see to it, particularly in the lower grades, that it is suited to his pupils' needs, just as a gardener surrounds the roots of a plant with soil rich in those elements which the plant can incorporate into its life.

Among other school subjects, manual training, nature study, and school gardens are most important for moral training. An eminent educator has said: "The chief value of nature study in character building is that like life itself it deals with realities: Nature study, if it be genuine, is essentially doing. This is the basis of its effectiveness as a moral agent." (15.) The same may be said of manual training and of school gardening. All three of these subjects serve to furnish the pupil with pleasant occupation for leisure moments out of school, and thus to remove him from the bane of idleness. They teach respect for property rights. A lad of 14 in the Lyman School for delinquent boys said to the principal one day: "Mr. P., I've learned not to steal. Some fellow stole my finest musk-melons, and I know now how it feels." Patience is inculcated by them, since the pupil must wait for results till his labor, or that of nature is completed. In so far as they contribute to muscle and nerve they help to build the foundation of positive moral character. It is noteworthy that experience has shown manual training and gardening to be two of the most potent forces for reclaiming delinquent boys.

We have seen that games and play may be very important factors in developing self-control, initiative, co-operation, respect for the rights of others, loyalty to the social group. They

are also of great value to the observing teacher in revealing the characters, temperaments and dispositions of his pupils.

It has already been intimated that physical training is significant for character. Herbart said long ago: "Sickly natures feel themselves dependent, robust ones dare to *will*. Therefore the care of health is essentially a part of the formation of character." Evolutionally the development of the human muscular system leads that of the intellectual and moral life. Recent studies, notable among them Mr. Puffer's study of the physical, social, intellectual, and moral qualities of 100 delinquent boys, show a close relation between perfect physical development and positive morality. In boys' camps and summer schools this is recognized. Dr. Talbot, at his boys' camp at Lake Asquam, New Hampshire, produces almost marvellous improvement in the mental and moral lives of backward boys, by simply giving them an abundance of sleep and out-door exercise. Physical training suited to the needs of the individual pupil will some day be generally recognized as one of the first essentials to character-building.

Even the arrangements of the building as to light, heat, ventilation and sanitation contribute to or detract from the general orderliness of the school. Every teacher knows that many a case of discipline with far reaching consequences, has arisen from poor ventilation, and many another from narrow halls.

Discipline and management are immensely rich in possibilities for character-building. The aim, however, must not be merely good order and absence of friction, but the development of moral self-hood through co-operation. "Breaking the will," has no place in the school. Military discipline may "hold down" even vigorous, healthy boys, but it utterly fails to build up character. The child should early be made to feel a co-partnership in and a responsibility for the government of the school. This is done admirably in a well managed "school city," and may also be done equally well without such elaborate machinery.

Self-emulation, encouraged by comparison of the pupil's work of one month or year with his own work of an earlier date, such as is possible in French schools by means of the *cahier*, may well supersede much of the vicious competition promoted by examinations and prizes. Col. Parker never tired of condemning "the systematic cultivation of selfishness by bribery—percents, material rewards and prizes."

The routine of a well managed school, as Dr. Harris has so ably pointed out, cultivates habits of punctuality, regularity, and system—marks of character often too little recognized. (11.)

Pupil organizations, such as clubs, Legions of Honor, and

the like in the upper grades, and in the high schools literary and debating societies, athletic associations, fraternities, and musical clubs, particularly if spontaneous organizations, are important moral factors in the school life.

Even the school janitor is a moral factor of no little consequence; his character and reputation, his attitude towards the pupils, as well as the thoroughness with which he does his work, are legitimate and necessary subjects of inquiry on the part of the board employing him.

It is vital that there be such an assignment of school work that every pupil, not merely the brightest, nor yet all but the dullest, *but all* may be conscious of progress, may feel the satisfaction, the power, and the will for further effort, which come only from doing, from overcoming obstacles. It is the glory of manual training and nature study that they consist essentially in doing. They furnish to many a pupil, who would otherwise seldom experience it, the consciousness of progress.

Enough has been said to indicate the great number and variety of means afforded by the school for moral training, though the catalogue is by no means complete. It needs to be added that all forces must harmonize, must work together, not only for character, but for the same kind of character—and that, democratic manhood—if the best results are to be realized. It has been seen that a chief fault of French moral education is that the organization and management of the school repress the type of character which instruction seeks to develop. Many an American teacher encourages moral-selfhood by every means save the essential one—giving his pupils an opportunity to practice it. Many another urges his pupils to honesty and truthfulness, and then encourages their opposites by watching for them.

Our study leads also to the conclusion that the school can do much more for the moral training of its pupils in their out-of-school lives. "The end of the school is its effects upon the home," writes a Swedish educator. (17.) Henderson's book is permeated with the idea that the pedagogy of the future will concern itself far more with the child out of school than with the child in the school. (12.)

Sociologists lament the decline of the home, owing to changing industrial and economic conditions. It is unquestionably true that the average home occupies a far less prominent place in the life of the child to-day than it did a generation ago. The social environment has become a more powerful factor. The home, whether wisely or not, has delegated a larger share of its responsibility to the school. The school has been obliged to concern itself more and more with the health, the nourishment, the environment, and the activities of its pupils during

the many hours of the day when it does not have direct supervision over them.

The means for making the school more effective in the home lives of its pupils are chiefly two. One of these is mothers' meetings. These are held in the schools of many of our cities. They are specially valuable in the poor and foreign sections since they bring the school and home into mutual sympathy, teach the mothers how to care for the physical and moral needs of their children, and implant in the homes some of the school's ideals.

The second and by all odds the most important means of influencing the out-of-school lives of pupils is the sheer momentum of school activity. The school can, and frequently does, start in its brief five hours of the day, activities possessing such inherent force that they *must* work themselves out in the child's leisure and recreation. Only such activities, as appeal strongly to the pupil and connect readily with home interests can ever acquire this momentum. Manual training, nature study, and school gardens possess these qualities in a marked degree, though the opportunities for their practical application in and around the home are often pitifully meagre. Only a few days ago a little fellow accosted me on the street with: "Say, Mister, do you know birds?" He then gave a description of a new bird he had just seen, and wanted to know its name. Nature study had given that boy something to think about when out of school. Games also may be taught, as they are in some of the schools of New York City, expressly for the purpose of providing the children with suitable recreation when away from the school. Teachers in the higher grades are beginning to make serious efforts to influence the home reading of their pupils and to give them permanent interests in good reading. Rapid increase in public library facilities has made this an important, though extremely difficult problem. A grammar school principal told me recently that, after several years of carefully directed efforts by herself and her teachers to influence the home reading of her pupils, she found by actual investigation that almost nothing had been accomplished.

Finally this study forces one to the conclusion that special preparation of teachers for their work of moral training in the school is the first and chief prerequisite of increased efficiency. "School reform is always schoolmaster reform."

When all has been said, the fact remains that the moral training of the school to-day is haphazard, unsystematic, unscientific. Part of it is directed in a chaotic sort of way by the teacher, whose methods are chiefly the result of accident. The greater part is left to chance; it may be good, it may be

bad; it may be in harmony with that directed by the teacher and it may not. And yet practically all educators are agreed that the fundamental aim of education is character.

Teachers' training schools are doing little to improve the situation. True, the German teacher is specially trained for his religious teaching. It is true also that the French teacher devotes considerable time in the Normal school to preparation for teaching *la morale*. And many, though by no means a majority of English teachers are prepared to some extent for teaching Scripture lessons. Besides, nearly all of the teachers of Germany and France and an increasing percentage of those of England and America, have a general pedagogical training. These facts must not be overlooked. It has already been pointed out how general pedagogical training of teachers is related to the moral influences of the school. Few will question that any country does wisely in demanding special training in religion and morals of the teachers of these subjects.

However, neither general professional training as it is given to-day, nor such special training as that given by the German, French or English normal schools is sufficient. The former gives almost no attention to moral training either direct or indirect. The latter concerns itself only with direct instruction, and seeks to give a comprehensive knowledge of what is to be taught rather than of the best methods of teaching it. Either separately or together they fail to give a teacher anything like adequate preparation for the great task of moral training in the school.

But how shall such preparation be given, and what shall be its nature? It should be given in every normal school as a separate subject, and by an expert. It should also be made a regular part of the work of teachers' institutes, and of the training given to teachers already employed in city systems. It should become the heart of all professional training of teachers.

The direction which special preparation of teachers for moral training should take has been intimated in the preceding paragraphs. Much attention should be given to the place of the teacher's personality. Child study should be pursued with special reference to the development of spontaneous interests and of the moral nature, and also to individual differences. The teacher must acquire the genetic point of view which recognizes the child as the centre of the school's life and effort. He should be led to appreciate the physiological basis of character. He should consider the place of the school in moral training, in relation to the home, the church, and the social environment of out-of-school life—this in order that in actual teaching he may be led to study the moral environment of his

school and of his individual pupils. He should be made familiar with the great variety of means which the ordinary school affords for moral training, both within the school and outside, giving attention to the possible contribution of each and to their relative values. He should be led to recognize the necessity of harmonizing all of the moral forces at work in the school. Special methods of moral training made use of in particular schools such as Abbotsholme, the Ethical Culture School of New York City, the Elmira Reformatory, etc., should be studied carefully. The practice school should be utilized for illustrative and experimental purposes. All this should be additional to a general pedagogical training, or better, an essential part of it.

Thus equipped, the teacher in his classroom and the principal in his building, each having been selected only after his personal character has been carefully investigated, should be given absolute freedom to work out his own method of moral training, and his own plan of organization and management. Both may be given suggestions by higher authority, but neither should be required to maintain a certain kind of discipline or organization, or to teach a given course, or in fact any course, in religion or morals. Nor should they be forbidden to teach either, so long as they avoid offense to the consciences and religious beliefs of pupils and parents. Moral personality is the most precious possession of any teacher; let him share it with his pupils in whatever way he finds best, so long as he offends none.

Such are the suggestions resulting from this comparative study of moral training in the schools of Germany, France, England and America. They would not, if carried out, make the school a perfect institution for moral training—the millennium is not yet due. They probably would not implant, though they would intensify, moral earnestness in the teacher. But they would give unity, definiteness and system to the teacher's most important work—a work now left largely to chance. They would tend to do for moral training what modern pedagogy is trying to do too exclusively for physical and intellectual training—give it a scientific basis.

BIBLIOGRAPHY.

1. BRACQ, JEAN CHARLEMAGNE. *Moral and Religious Instruction in France*. Ed. Rev., Apr., 1902.
2. BRERETON, CLOUDESLEY. *The Rural Schools of Northwest France*. Ed. Dept., Great Britain, Special Reports, Vol. VII, pp. 1-244.
3. CARR, J. W. *Moral Instruction in the Anderson Public Schools*. Proc. Relig. Ed. Assoc., 1904, pp. 302-310.

4. COE, G. A. *Education in Religion and Morals*. New York, 1904, pp. 434.
5. DEWEY, JOHN. *Teaching Ethics in the High School*. Ed. Rev., Nov., 1893.
6. ELLIS, HAVELOCK. *Man and Woman*. London, 1904, pp. 488.
7. GALTON, FRANCIS. *Inquiry into Human Faculty*. London, 1883, pp. 387.
8. GEDDES, PATRICK AND THOMPSON, J. A. *The Evolution of Sex*. New York, 1889, pp. 322.
9. GIZICKI, P. *Wie urteilen Schulkinder über Funddiebstahl? Kinderfehler*, 1903, pp. 14-26.
10. GREENOUGH, J. C. *The Evolution of the Elementary Schools of Great Britain*. New York, 1903, pp. 265.
11. HARRIS, W. T. *Moral Education in the Public Schools*. New York, 1877, pp. 20.
12. HENDERSON, C. H. *Education and the Larger Life*. New York, 1902, pp. 380.
13. HERVEY, W. L. *Religious and Moral Teaching in the Public Elementary School*. Proc. Relig. Ed. Assoc., 1904, pp. 311-321.
14. HUGHES, R. E. *The Making of Citizens*. London, 1902, pp. 405.
15. JORDAN, DAVID STARR. *Nature Study and Moral Culture*. Proc. N. E. A., 1896, pp. 130-139.
16. KAPPA (pseudonym). *Let Youth but Know*. London, 1905, pp. 256.
17. KEY, ELLEN. *Das Jahrhundert des Kindes*. Studien, tr. by F. Mars. Berlin, 1902, pp. 391.
18. KIRSCHNER, FRIEDRICH. *Contemporary Educational Thought in Prussia*. Ed. Rev., May, 1891, pp. 474-483.
19. LANG, OSSIAN H. *Educational Outlook*. Forum, Jan., 1906.
20. LEXIS, W. *Das Unterrichtswesen im Deutschen Reich*. Berlin, 1904, Vols. II and III.
21. *LEHRPLÄNE UND LEHRAUFGABE für höheren Schulen in Preussen*. Berlin, 1901, pp. 76.
22. LICHTENBERGER, M. F. *L'éducation morale dans les écoles primaires*. Recueil des Monographies Pédagogiques, Paris, 1889. Vol. IV, pp. 77-202.
23. MARK, H. THISTLETON. *Moral Education in American Schools*. Ed. Dept., Great Britain, Special Reports, Vol. X, pp. 11-254.
24. PARSONS. *French Schools through American Eyes*. Syracuse, N. Y., 1892, pp. 136.
25. PATON, J. L. *English Public Schools*. London, 1905, pp. 44.
26. PATRICK, G. T. W. *The Psychology of Woman*. Pop. Sci. Mo., Vol. XLVII.
27. PELLISSON, M. *Le situation de l'enseignement primaire en 1900*. Rev. Pédagogique, Apr., 1902.
28. PELLISSON, M. *Le livre d'or des écoles*. Rev. Pédagogique, Aug., 1901.
29. PHILPOTT, H. B. *London at School*. London, 1904, pp. 314.
30. REPORTS, GENERAL, of H. M. Inspectors on Elementary Schools and Training Colleges. London, 1902.
31. REPORT of the London School Board. London, 1904.
32. REPORT of the Moseley Educational Commission. London, 1904.
33. REPORTS of U. S. Commissioner of Education. Sections on German, French and English Education.
34. REYNOLDS, REV. BERNARD. *Church Schools and Religious Education in National Education (a symposium)*. London, 1901, pp. 36-56.

35. RIBOT, A. F. *La réforme de l'enseignement secondaire*. Paris, 1900, pp. 308.
36. RICHARD, E. *The School System of France*. New York, 1893, pp. 20.
37. ROUSSEL. *Rapport sur la plus belle action*. Bull. de la Société libre pour l'étude psychologique de l'enfant. Jan., 1903.
38. ROUVIER, G. *L'enseignement public en France au début du XX siècle*. Paris, 1905, pp. 129.
39. RUSSELL, J. E. *German Higher Schools*. New York, 1899, pp. 455.
40. SCHMIDT, K. A. *Encyklopädie des gesammten Erziehungs- und Unterrichtswesens*.
41. SEELEY, LEVI. *The Common School System of Germany*. New York, 1896, pp. 243.
42. SISSON, E. O. "Religionsunterricht" and its Results. Proc. Relig. Ed. Assoc., 1905, pp. 261-266.
43. THOMPSON, HELEN B. *The Mental Traits of Sex*. Chicago, 1903, pp. 188.
44. WEBB, S. *London Education*. London, 1904, pp. 219.

FRENCH TEXT BOOKS EXAMINED.

45. BAYET, ALBERT. *Morale et instruction civique (cours élémentaire)*. Paris, 1904, pp. 128.
46. BAYET, ALBERT. *Leçons de morale (cours moyen)*. Paris, 1903, pp. 182.
47. BOYER, LOUIS. *Le livre de morale des écoles primaires (partie de l'élève)*. Paris, 1905, pp. 252.
48. BOYER, LOUIS. *Le livre de morale des écoles primaires (partie du maître)*. Paris, 1903, pp. 342.
49. CAZES, E. *Morale*. Paris, pp. 272.
50. CHABRAND, D. *La morale à l'école primaire*. Aix-Les-Bains, 1903, pp. 179.
51. CHATEL, G. *Lectures Morales*. Paris, 1905, pp. 485.
52. CURÉ, J. et HOUZELLE, F. *Sommaires de leçons de morale à l'école primaire*. Paris, 1905, pp. 182.
53. GÉRARD, J. *Maximes morales de l'écolier Français*. Paris, pp. 308.
54. GÉRARD, J. *Maximes morales de l'écolière Française*. Paris, pp. 260.
55. GUIGON, PIERRE. *Petites leçons de morale*. Paris, 1904, pp. 56.
56. LALOI, PIERRE. *L'année préparatoire d'instruction morale*. Paris, 1902, pp. 136.
57. LALOI, PIERRE. *La première année d'instruction morale et civique*. Paris, 1904, pp. 211.
58. MABILLEAU, LÉOPOLD. *Cours de morale (cours supérieur)*. Paris, 1902, pp. 192.
59. MABILLEAU, LÉOPOLD. *Cours de morale. (Cours élémentaire et moyen.)* Paris, 1895, pp. 96.
60. PAVETTE, O. *La morale mise à la portée des enfants*. Paris, 1905, pp. 120.
61. THOMAS, P. FELIX. *Elements de morale*. Paris, 1904, pp. 192.
62. VIALA, F. *L'enseignement morale à l'école primaire*. Paris, 1896, pp. 272.