

A STUDY OF VARIOUS VIEWPOINTS
EXPRESSED CONCERNING THE ESTABLISHMENT
OF UNIVERSITY SCHOOLS OF EDUCATION
DURING THEIR FORMATIVE YEARS 1850-1905

Thesis for the Degree of Ph. D.
MICHIGAN STATE UNIVERSITY

Edward Rutkowski
1963

This is to certify that the

thesis entitled

A Study of Various Viewpoints
Expressed Concerning the Establishment
of University Schools of Education
During Their Formative Years 1850-1905

presented by

Edward Rutkowski

has been accepted towards fulfillment
of the requirements for

PhD degree in Education



Major professor

Date November 15, 1963

O-169



ABSTRACT

A STUDY OF VARIOUS VIEWPOINTS EXPRESSED CONCERNING THE ESTABLISHMENT OF UNIVERSITY SCHOOLS OF EDUCATION DURING THEIR FORMATIVE YEARS 1890-1905

by Edward Rutkowski

This is a historical study of the various views that were expressed concerning the establishment of the first university schools of education. These views were expressed by educators, critics, and educational reformers. Schools of education are an important part of university programs and their value as institutions has been discussed and debated. The problem of this study was to investigate the original reasons presented for the establishment of these schools and also the criticism offered against them. This study serves as a comparison to ascertain whether the present institutional goals of these schools are in harmony with their original purposes.

The primary data of the study were gathered from professional and popular periodicals, minutes of meetings, and private and public records of the period. The material was related to the major field of educational interest of the critic or reformer. There were four general categories: normal school officials, psychologists and philosophers, advocates of liberal arts, and university presidents. All four groups expressed negative and affirmative opinions on this question.

The results of the study revealed the following general

conclusions:

1. Schools of education were established on an independent institutional basis with disagreement about their value expressed both within and outside the university.

2. The establishment of these schools came as part of the general movement to place all professional education in the university.

3. These schools were established as a separate professional school with a commitment to a prerequisite general or liberal arts education required before professional training.

4. The purposes and aims of these schools were in general agreement with the other professional schools of the university, to upgrade the profession and to train a more competent professional person.

5. Schools of education shared in the same cultural pattern of incorporation into the university as did the other professional schools and were not a radical innovation in the American university.

The university was the most adaptable institution to meet the educational needs of an urban industrial society, and university schools of education were their response to meet the needs of an increasingly complex educational system.

A STUDY OF VARIOUS VIEWPOINTS EXPRESSED
CONCERNING THE ESTABLISHMENT OF UNIVERSITY
SCHOOLS OF EDUCATION DURING THEIR
FORMATIVE YEARS 1890-1905

By

Edward Rutkowski

A THESIS

Submitted to
Michigan State University
in partial fulfillment of the requirements
for the degree of

DOCTOR OF PHILOSOPHY

College of Education

1963

ACKNOWLEDGMENTS

Few words exist which could describe my years of graduate study at Michigan State University. More importantly, my doctoral committee did exemplify for me the idea of a university. To these words I can only add my gratitude for such substantial and formative help. To Dr. Carl Gross, my chairman and advisor, who worked with me and gave me wise direction, to Dr. John F.A. Taylor, Dr. Gilman Ostrander, and Dr. Herbert C. Rudman, who contributed equally in this regard, I wish to offer my thanks. I am also indebted to Dr. Guy Hill and Dr. George S. Counts, in particular, and all of the members of the university community who sustained me with wise counsel and help. My special thanks to Dr. Carlton Washbourne for the use of the manuscript of his mother's diary in this thesis.

My wife, Helen, contributed greatly to my graduate study by her understanding and devotion. To both our parents, Mrs. Florence Oswald and Mr. and Mrs. George Hass, who gave us substantial help, I wish to acknowledge a debt of gratitude. Finally, to all the friends we have made because of our years spent here at the university, our thanks. They, in numerous ways, made contributions toward the achievement of this goal.

TABLE OF CONTENTS

CHAPTER		PAGE
I.	INTRODUCTION TO THE STUDY	1
	Need for the Study	2
	Purpose of the Study	7
	Method of Study	7
II.	THE AMERICAN SOCIAL SCENE:1890-1905	9
III.	AMERICAN EDUCATION AND THE TEACHING PROFESSION:1890-1905	30
	The School Population	30
	Teachers and Teacher Training Agencies	31
	Professional Status of Teaching Compared with Other Professions	34
	Teacher Organizations	35
	Organizational Policies and Leadership	35
	The New Administrators	37
	Urban School Problems	39
	Rural School Problems	41
	Higher Education	42
	Influence of German Universities	46
	Universities and Teaching Profession	47
	Normal Schools and Teaching Profession	49
	Summary and Conclusions	50
IV.	THE ROLE OF THE NORMAL SCHOOL AS THE PROFESSIONAL TRAINING INSTITUTION	54
	Crisis in Education:1890-1905	54
	The Conflict Among Teacher Education Groups	55
	In Defense of the Normal Schools	60
	Variations in Quality of Normal Schools	61
	John R. Kirk	62
	Homer Seerly	63
	Nathan C. Schaeffer	66
	The Detractors of the Normal Schools	69
	John Lancaster Spalding	69
	Daniel Fulcomer	72
	Oscar H. Cooper	72
	Francis W. Parker	72

CHAPTER	PAGE
The Views Expressed by the Conciliators . . .	73
William T. Harris	73
Fredrick Burk	74
Nathan C. Schaeffer	74
William H. Maxwell	76
Charles C. Van Leiw	77
Grant Karr	79
Guy E. Maxwell	80
Z.X. Snyder	81
Summary and Conclusions	81
V. SCIENCE, PSYCHOLOGY AND UNIVERSITY SCHOOLS OF EDUCATION	83
Impact of Science	83
Psychology as the New Discipline	84
Child Study Movement	84
Psychology and Education	85
Views Expressed by the Critics of a Science of Pedagogy	85
Josiah Royce	85
Hugo Munsterberg	86
James Mark Baldwin	88
Nicholas Murray Butler	89
The Science and Psychology of Education Expressed as the Key to Educational Reform	90
William James	90
Child Study at Clark University	91
Experimental Work in Education at University of Chicago	91
Edward L. Thorndike	92
Micheal V. O'Shea	92
G. Stanley Hall	93
Thomas M. Balliet	94
John Dewey	95
The Views Expressed by Those Who Believed Education and Psychology Compatible	99
Munsterberg's Charges Refuted	99
Charles B. Bliss	100
Science Will Benefit Education	101
Edward L. Thorndike	101
James M. Cattell	102
William James	103
Summary and Conclusions	105

CHAPTER	PAGE
VI. THE ROLE OF LIBERAL EDUCATION AND UNIVERSITY SCHOOLS OF EDUCATION	107
The Demands For Professional Training at Universities	107
James Bryce, American University	107
Liberal Education is Higher Education	109
Timothy Dwight	109
James Russell Lowell	109
Harry Thurston Peck	110
Barrett Wendell	110
Conservative Reactions	112
University Schools of Education and Their Compatibility with Liberal Education	114
John Lancaster Spalding	114
James E. Russell	116
Albert Ross Hill	121
Liberal Education and Professional Training	123
Woodrow Wilson	124
William DeWitt Hyde	125
Arthur T. Hadley	126
W.M. Sloane	127
George Trumball Ladd	127
Summary and Conclusions	128
VII. THE STUDY OF EDUCATION AS EXPRESSED BY THE VIEWS OF THE NEW UNIVERSITY PRESIDENTS	131
The Views Expressed by Those Opposed to the University Study of Education	133
Charles W. Eliot	133
Daniel Coit Gilman	136
The Views Expressed by New University Presidents for Schools of Education	137
William R. Harper	137
Nicholas M. Butler	139
Jacob G. Schurman	142
The New Education and University Presidents	147
Seth Low	147
David Starr Jordan	148
Summary and Conclusions	152

CHAPTER	PAGE
VIII. THE BEGINNING OF UNIVERSITY SCHOOLS OF EDUCATION	153
American Education for American Democracy .	153
John T. Pierce's Educational Plan for Michigan	153
Attempts to Unify American Education . . .	155
The American University and Professional Schools	157
Antecedents to University Schools of Education	165
School of Pedagogy, New York University .	166
School of Pedagogy, Clark University . .	170
IX. FIRST UNIVERSITY SCHOOLS OF EDUCATION	173
Teachers College, Columbia University	173
New York College of Teachers	174
Walter L. Hervey	178
Nicholas M. Butler	181
Dean James Russell	183
School of Education, University of Chicago .	188
Education at University of Chicago in the 1890's	188
Chicago Educational Circle	190
William R. Harper's Ideas on Teacher Education	190
Col. Francis Parker, Cook County Normal School Dispute	192
Amalgamation of School of Education, University of Chicago	195
These First Schools Spread Their Fame and Influence	197
Michael E. Sadler, Praise From the English	198
University Schools of Education Declared the Finest for Teacher Training	199
Reports of Mosely Commission	200
Influence on Other Universities	201
Summary and Conclusions	205
X. SUMMARY AND CONCLUSIONS	207
BIBLIOGRAPHY	215

CHAPTER ONE

INTRODUCTION TO THE STUDY

The growth and development of university schools of education has paralleled the growth of higher education in the United States. In 1959, one hundred and forty-seven schools of education were affiliated with colleges and universities. The period of greatest growth in the number of these schools was in the first thirty years of this century. During this period eighty-one schools of education were established.¹

American higher education has experienced phenomenal growth in the last fifty years. This is the result of the expansion of knowledge and the increasing enrollments. In a democratic society and in higher education where man's pursuits are essentially intellectual there will always exist a difference of opinion regarding the role of these institutions. The years 1890-1905 are important to the study of higher education. This was the period of transition in American society. The United States, which was a frontier agricultural country, became an industrial and urban society. The development of the present pattern of higher education was part of this movement.

¹ Mary Irwin, American Universities and Colleges, American Council on Education, (Washington D.C., 1960). The figures stated above were derived by a numerical study made of the university and college descriptions which are catalogued in this directory. The information is supplied by the institution itself.

The professional training of teachers and its incorporation into university work were a concern. Influential men expressed their views in this question. These men held the key positions in higher education. Their views and ideas were the basis on which schools of education would be established. They expressed their ideas in public and their views were recorded in the literature of this period.

These years are significant in any discussion of the rationale for schools of education. The establishment of a separate school of education with a dean, faculty, and independent structure was a major commitment on the part of a college or university. An undertaking of this size was to be discussed or debated.

The first two major schools of education were Columbia Teachers College (1898) and The School of Education, University of Chicago (1901). The two universities which established these schools were recognized as American examples of the university ideal borrowed from Germany. Their schools of education were regarded as models for university work in education. These first schools established the pattern which other American universities adopted. The ideas and views expressed for the establishment of a school of education at these first two universities served as the basis of argumentation for the adoption of these schools by other universities.

Historians and educators have neglected the study of the relationship between schools of education and

universities.² The majority of past studies have been of a particular school of education, or the study of a number of schools preselected by geographical location. There are studies of the goals and functions of schools of education but they relate to the years following the establishment of these schools. Other studies deal with the historical development of teacher education in such a broad manner that it gives one little insight into the views that were held concerning the establishment of these schools.³

There is a great deal of discussion about the value of schools of education. Some critics charge that these schools are a major source of the ills in higher education. Robert I. Gannon, S.J., a former president of Fordham, in a recent book states that Columbia Teachers College has created the chaotic condition that exists in higher education.⁴ He

² Fredrich Rudolph, The American College and University (New York: Alfred A. Knopf, 1962), p. 514.

³ For examples see Edwin A. Lee, The Development of Professional Programs in Education, (unpublished Ph.D. dissertation, Teachers College Columbia University, 1925). Timothy F. O'Leary, An Inquiry Into The General Purposes, Functions, and Organizations of Selected University Schools of Education, (unpublished Ph.D. dissertation, Dept. of Education, Catholic University, 1941). Arthur Ray Partridge, The Rise of the University School of Education as A Professional Institution, (unpublished D.Ed. dissertation, School of Education, Stanford University, 1958.) Allen Session Whitney, The History of the Professional Training of Teachers at the University of Michigan (Ann Arbor: George Wahr, 1930.)

⁴ Robert I. Gannon, The Poor Old Liberal Arts (New York: Farrar, Straus, and Cudahy, 1961), p. 34. See Chapter II, "In A Coonskin Coat," pp. 29-52.

cites two men, John Dewey and William H. Kilpatrick, as two of the "Four Horsemen of the Apocalypse" in education.⁵

Gannon charges that the last thing these liberal professors desired was order. Their theory that the schools should reflect the society would lead to the conclusion that as the society becomes more chaotic, the schools should also become more chaotic.⁶ This educational philosophy was spread by the Columbia Teachers College faculty in the 1920's and 1930's and is responsible for the present conditions of our schools.⁷

Critics are expressing concern over the quality of academic work done in graduate programs of schools of education. A former graduate student of Columbia Teachers College in a recent issue of Harper's charges that Teachers College has run its course as an academic institution. In the past the school was the leader in education. Now the faculty has deteriorated and only a few of its professors⁸ have any academic prestige among their colleagues.

There is also criticism of the low quality of work being done in teachers' colleges. Evan Hill in a Saturday Evening Post article, "Have Our Teacher's Colleges Failed?"

⁵Ibid., p. 38.

⁶Ibid., pp. 40-1.

⁷Ibid., p. 40.

⁸Miriam Borgenicht, "Teachers College: An Extinct Volcano?" Harper's, CCXXIII (July, 1961), p. 82.

states that the biggest problem of education is the low quality of work done at these schools. Low entrance requirements, inbreeding of faculty, and easy grading practices have influenced the academic standards and created a bad situation. Hill believes that reforms must be made by putting more stress on a strong liberal arts program. The teaching profession will then enjoy the prestige it deserves. The independent teachers' college must develop the characteristics of a university. These schools should emphasize broad cultural education and high academic standards. Only the most vigorous and academically capable students should be allowed to continue professional graduate study in a school of education.⁹

There is continued concern expressed within the academic profession over the relationship between subject matter and teacher training. It was reported in the press that a committee of the Wisconsin Historical Association had studied this problem in the area of secondary social studies. This group recommended a course of studies for secondary social studies teachers. The schedule included forty-two semester hours of social studies. The professional courses required were a course in educational psychology, social foundations of education, teaching methods, and practice teaching. The association passed a resolution

⁹Evan Hill, "Have Our Teacher's Colleges Failed?" Saturday Evening Post, CCXXXIV (November 11, 1961), p. 30.

to work for adoption of the program in the state.¹⁰

Not all recent criticism of professional teacher training and schools of education is of a derogatory nature. Paul Woodring in an article in the Saturday Review cites the university school of education as the future leader in the upgrading of teacher training. He describes three stages in the history of teacher preparation. The normal school of the nineteenth century provided training for students with an elementary school background. In the early years of the twentieth century the teachers' college offered to the high school graduate teacher training combined with a modest amount of liberal education. The university school of education will provide the teachers of the future with professional training after the completion of a considerable amount of liberal education. For many this would mean a liberal arts degree. Teacher education has developed to a stage where it is an integral part of higher education. Universities have accepted this responsibility and an increasing number of teachers' colleges are expanding into university work as a result of this progressive development.¹¹

These criticisms of the scope and nature of the work in schools of education illustrate the fact that teacher

¹⁰Milwaukee Sentinel, December 27, 1962

¹¹Paul Woodring, "Short Happy Life of the Teacher's College," Saturday Review, XLIV (June 17, 1961), p. 60.

training is an important aspect of higher education. A study of the relationship of the first schools of education with the university will reveal to us the role that these schools were assigned. The functional purpose of this study is to gain this historical insight. The views expressed on the subject of schools of education received attention in professional journals, meetings, public records, and literature. These sources served as the primary material for this study. The chronological period of 1890-1905 was selected because this was the period when the first schools of education were established. The various viewpoints that were expressed would focus on schools of education which were the pioneers. University people would be concerned about the worthiness of such a new venture. A final argument favoring the chronological approach is that it provides a broader base for study than a study based on consideration of area or location. Furthermore, the chronological approach permits the examination of a greater diversity of viewpoints.

The thesis follows a pattern of ten chapters including the introduction to the study. The second chapter deals with a review of the social and economic forces that changed the character of American society between 1890-1905. A description of American education and its relation to the society is handled in chapter three. The four following chapters, four through seven, deal with the subject of the thesis, the various viewpoints that were expressed. In each

U
C
A
P
C
C
C
C
C
C

chapter, the viewpoints that were expressed are organized according to the position with which each educational leader was generally identified. For example, chapter four deals with the views expressed by leaders associated with the normal schools. Chapter five deals with views of men connected with the movement for a psychology and science of education. Chapter six discusses the views of the educators who were identified with the traditional liberal arts program. Chapter seven treats of the views of educators who were committed to the "New Education" and the university ideal of public and social service. These men, despite the similarity of occupational and educational backgrounds, demonstrate that the educational leaders of this period had varied viewpoints regarding the value of schools of education. The last two chapters deal with the growth and development of the first schools. They show that men of varied backgrounds associated together in advocating or opposing these new schools. Indeed, the various arguments and viewpoints have continued to serve as a basis for the acceptance or rejection of university schools of education.

.

CHAPTER TWO

THE AMERICAN SOCIAL SCENE: 1890-1905

The closing years of the nineteenth century and the opening ones of the twentieth were very significant for the course of American history. The American nation which largely had been indifferent to international politics was pushed by men and events into the position of becoming a world power. The people were compelled to examine their own institutions to see whether they squared with the democratic ideal. They also had to defend democracy as a viable and a practical way of life. The American system of free enterprise was to be questioned as to its value and its contributions toward social progress. This generation of Americans of the 1890's was to argue that the production of wealth was not enough. The socially just system must produce security for all citizens as well.¹

The emergence of the United States as a world power was the result of its astounding growth. In 1790 the new nation had four million people living on nine hundred thousand square miles of territory. By contrast, the census of 1900 indicated that there were seventy-six million people living on an area of nearly four million square miles. Although by European standards the United States was still thinly

¹Oscar T. Barck and Nelson M. Blake, Since 1900 (New York, Macmillian Company, 1959), pp. 1-2

settled in 1900, the rate of growth between 1790-1900 was still extraordinary.

Until 1900 America had been a rural society. The biggest reason for this increased population was the large scale immigration. Americans of the 1900's were an immigrant people. Over one-third of the population were immigrants. The rest of the population, almost without exception, was descended from earlier immigrant generations. The 76 million inhabitants of the nation included 66.8 million of white European stock, some 8.8 million Negroes, and approximately 115,000 of Oriental extraction. American Indians numbered 237,000 and lived for the most part on reservations.²

The tide of immigration had been flowing toward the new continent for almost three hundred years. It had reached peak proportions by the middle of the nineteenth century. Until 1880 about 80 percent of the foreign-born Americans came from Germany, Ireland, England, and Canada. However, the number of immigrants from these sources declined during the 1890's and a greater proportion of newcomers came from Italy, Russia, and Austria-Hungary.³ A characteristic of the earlier immigrations had been the movement of the population from section to section. The great frontier movement which populated the West had been

²Eric F. Goldman, Rendezvous with Destiny (New York: Vintage Books, 1960), pp. 29-30.

³Ibid., p. 30.

completed by 1890. The frontier line disappeared from the census map. By 1900 the roster of 48 states was almost complete. Still, the closing of the frontier in the 1890's was more theoretical than real. The West was still sparsely settled and millions of acres of land were still to be opened up.

The nation was being transformed from predominantly a rural country into an urban one. In 1860, 83 percent of the people lived in communities of less than 2,500 inhabitants. This percentage had declined to 60 by 1900. The urban population increased by 16 million between 1880 and 1900, but the rural population had increased by only 10 million. This disparity of growth was the outcome of various causes. The most prominent one was the tendency of immigrants and farm youth to seek employment in the city. States on the East coast became largely urban, but the states of the Middle and Far West remained rural in character. These environmental differences were reflected in the educational interests of the people.⁴

One of the most significant events in American social history between the Civil War and World War I was the industrial growth of the nation. Among the industrial nations of the world, the United States rose from fourth place in 1860 to first place in 1894. The value of products manufactured in American factories rose from less than 2

⁴ Lawrence A. Cremin, The Transformation of the School (New York: Alfred A. Knopf, 1961), pp. 66-67.

billion dollars annually to more than 11 billion between 1860 and 1899. Industries that hardly existed in 1860 became industrial giants by the end of the century. The introduction of mass production methods in the steel industry made possible a less expensive product that opened up hundreds of new uses for steel. Railroads, armor plated naval vessels, steel building girders, barbed wire, and tin cans were all benefits of advanced methods of producing steel that were transforming American life. American steel production had expanded from less than 67 thousand tons in 1870 to over 10 million tons in 1899.⁵

The growth of the oil industry was just as remarkable. After the discovery that the distillation of petroleum would make possible the manufacture of cheap fuel for lamps and lanterns, there was nothing that could hinder the growth of this industry. The development of better methods of drilling brought abundant supplies of this cheap source of fuel to the surface. Drillers and speculators swarmed into the oil districts and thousands of oil wells were soon in production. Kerosene lamps soon replaced candles and whale oil lamps in millions of American homes. By the end of the century, American kerosene was being exported to foreign markets as far away as China. Oil became increasingly valuable for its by-products and as a lubricant.⁶

⁵Barck, op. cit., pp. 4-5

⁶Ibid., p. 5.

A new industry of the 1890's was associated with the production of electric power. The variety of uses of electricity was exploited giving birth to a vast number of new industries. Edison's invention of the electric light bulb in 1880 was followed within two years by the introduction of electric lighting into the homes and offices of downtown New York City. Later in the 1880's the electric street car was introduced. This form of transportation was so adaptable to the needs of the growing cities that there were 850 local street car lines in the country in 1895. The multiplicity of uses of electricity created manufacturers of generators, motors, and other types of electrical equipment and also power companies to supply the current.⁷

The rise of the industrial supremacy of the United States resulted from the fortunate merger of many different factors. America had an abundance of natural resources, political and economic freedom, widespread educational opportunities, a common acceptance of the value of thrift and honesty, and an accumulation of investment capital. A manufacturer could buy his raw materials and sell his products on a great national market. Europe was a divided continent, separated by national boundaries, tariff walls, and legal barriers. In contrast, America was a vast market protected from outside competition by tariff barriers.

⁷Allan Nevins and Henry Steele Commager, A Short History of the United States (New York: Modern Library, 1942), pp. 264-65.

The nation depended on the railroads to move the products of its new industries. The railroad age began in 1850 when the regional trunk lines were linked into a national system. After the Civil War the process of expansion and consolidation of these short lines into great systems went steadily forward. In the Far West the railroads preceded rather than followed the settlement. The policy of the Federal government to grant loans and land subsidies encouraged the building of the transcontinental systems from the start. In 1865 the United States had only 35,000 miles of track and by 1900 it had 193,000. Technological progress was impressive. Steel equipment, coupling devices, air brakes, and automatic signals made railroads safe. Travel was made comfortable by the introduction of the sleeping, dining, and parlor cars. The railroads gave the advantage of a continental economy.

Yet as the producers became dependent upon the railroads, they began to fear the economic power of the corporations. At first railroads were arbitrary in their rate policies. They discriminated against entire communities, impoverishing farmers and other economic groups.⁸ Out of this fear arose the demand for federal and state regulation of the railroads that swept the Middle West during the 1870's and 1880's. This agitation led to the enactment of numerous state laws and the first federal regulatory measure, the

⁸Ibid., pp. 311-14.

Interstate Commerce Act of 1887. Despite these various statutes, abuses in railroad management continued, and the problem of devising effective government regulation was still urgent during the 1890's.⁹

The growth of big business which first occurred in the railroad field had parallels in many other areas of the American economy. The telegraph business, as an example, had a natural tendency toward monopoly. Building competing lines between cities resulted in a wasteful duplication of service. The weaker companies had to go out of business or sell out to larger rivals. Western Union forged ahead because it enjoyed a mutually profitable contract with the railroads which allowed the telegraph company the use of the railroad right of way and stations in exchange for free telegraph service for the railroad. As Western Union came closer to becoming a monopoly, many farm organizations and labor unions demanded that the Federal government enter the telegraph business. Before 1900, seventy-five bills were introduced into Congress for the establishment of a government telegraph service. The telephone business followed a similar evolution. The American Telephone and Telegraph Company, a large holding company, finally emerged from various individual Bell systems in 1900.⁹

In the field of manufacturing, the same degree of monopoly was not possible, but the tendency toward consolidation

⁹Barck, op. cit., pp. 7-8.

was strong. In 1860 industry was managed through partnerships and small corporations with moderate capital. They were largely local in influence. By the opening of the twentieth century a major portion of the national economy had come under the control of a relatively small group of powerful men. As late as 1914, 88 percent of the manufacturing was done in factories and shops with an annual output worth less than 100,000 dollars. The remaining 12 percent of the factories employed three-quarters of the workers and produced four-fifths of the nation's manufactures.¹⁰

One of the most famous examples of this tendency for consolidation was the work of John D. Rockefeller in the oil industry. He was an organizing genius and by 1882 he controlled 90 percent of the oil refining industry. Andrew Carnegie pieced together the Carnegie Steel Company during the 1890's. Although Carnegie's share in the nation's steel production was only about two-fifths of the total, it made this man one of the wealthiest and most powerful in the nation. It was of great significance that a large portion of the fortunes of these men were used to promote educational and humanitarian ventures after their fortunes were acquired in ruthless financial dealings.

Big business and financial capitalism was regarded as good or bad depending on one's point of view. These large corporations were usually able to produce more efficiently.

¹⁰Goldman, op. cit., pp. 5-6.

The standardization of products and the lowering of prices raised the standard of living of the whole population. Despite all this, millions of Americans were uneasy because so much power rested in so few hands. Farmers, workers, consumers, and small businessmen showed this fear and looked to the government to bring these giants under control.

By comparison with Europe, America was the land of good wages and advantageous working conditions for the worker. Opportunities for employment in American mines and factories had drawn the immigrants from Europe and the rural farm youth into the cities. The worker's share of America's industrial prosperity was a modest one. Hours were long and wages were low. One estimate indicated that the average yearly wage paid a worker in 1900 was 490 dollars.¹¹ Throughout the nineteenth century the wage earners made efforts to improve their position by forming unions and attempting strikes and boycotts. Every period of economic boom brought a new group of local unions, and every depression killed off all but the hardest of their number. The labor unions suffered from a lack of unity. It was not until the organizing genius of Samuel Gompers was brought to bear on labor's difficulties that the union movement gained support. Gompers's first attempts to federate the many local craft unions into one national organization failed in 1881. He persisted however, and in 1886 the American Federation

¹¹Barck, op. cit., p. 12.

of Labor was established. Thereafter, Gompers was president of the AFL every year except one until his death in 1924. His leadership in some respects was conservative. Although holding to labor's right to strike, Gompers advocated craft unions and opposed the formation of an independent labor party. Labor unions were strong advocates of improved free public education. They continued this support throughout the period of the 1890's. The leadership of Gompers and the AFL was not accepted in all quarters. The railroad brotherhoods maintained their independence. There were also numerous groups of small radical labor organizations.¹²

Despite the movement toward labor unions, these organizations were weak in comparison with their European counterparts. In the great mass production industries like steel or textiles the great number of employees were unskilled or semi-skilled. The unions were either non-existent or unimportant. Other factors handicapped the American labor movement. The American-born workers were fresh from the farms and rural villages. The more ambitious were likely to work themselves up to the rank of foreman or superintendent. The less successful would drift back to their rural homes. With their mobility, these American workers rarely thought of themselves as permanent members of the working class. The foreign-born worker was likely

¹²William E. Drake, The American School in Transition (Englewood Cliffs: Prentice-Hall Inc., 1955), p. 181.

to accept meekly the conditions of employment offered him. He was indifferent to the unions. Many employers deliberately preferred the newcomers as they were less likely to make trouble. Any American factory in 1900 contained a miscellaneous collection of employees, each feeling more kinship with his own nationality group than with the working class as a whole.

Another obstacle to the growth of labor unions was the dominant American ideal of rugged individualism. The prevailing faith in this ideal assured the employer that most middle-class Americans would share his prejudice against unionism. During the 1890's the government's intervention in labor disputes was invariably on the side of management. When President Cleveland helped to break the Pullman Strike of 1894 with use of the injunction and troops, he won praise from the general public for his intervention. Unions were not accepted as respectable institutions.¹³

The changes in agriculture between 1861 and 1900 were just as revolutionary. The farmer thought no longer in terms of his farm as an independent subsistence unit. Agriculture was becoming increasingly commercial. The farmer devoted his energy to the production of cash crops. This kind of agriculture demanded horse-drawn harvesters, other machines, and a large amount of land. During and after

¹³ Nevins, op. cit., pp. 292-300.

the Civil War, Middle Western farmers went heavily into debt in order to buy land and equipment. The Southern cotton farmer also struggled with the problem of debt because of the post-war conditions. Thousands regularly mortgaged their crops to the country bankers and merchants in order to buy seeds and provisions. The large agricultural debt made the American farmers particularly resentful of falling prices. The general trend of farm prices during the second half of the century was downward, with especially serious declines during the periods of 1872-1878 and 1887-1896. Many factors contributed to the situation. Increased acreage and mechanization expanded the supply of agricultural commodities more rapidly than the demand. Competition on the world market was keen, with Russia, Argentina, and Australia as the chief rivals.¹⁴

The American farmers, by their own analysis, placed the principal blame for their problems on the businessmen with whom they dealt. They accused the railroads of charging unfair rates, manufacturers of maintaining high prices, middlemen of levying excessively high handling charges, land speculators of controlling the best acreage, and bankers of bolstering high interest rates. Thousands of farmers joined the Grange during the 1870's. They organized cooperatives and business ventures to meet their needs. These attempts at self-help were not successful as business

¹⁴ Nevins, op. cit., pp. 341-52.

enterprises. They did scare businessmen into treating their farmer customers better. Grange political parties succeeded in obtaining temporary regulatory laws over railroads and banks.

Although the better times of the early 1880's quieted agrarian agitation, the agricultural depression of 1887-1896 created new movements of protest. The Farmer's Alliance established cooperatives and agitated for a broad program of governmental intervention. The farmers' organizations entered politics and won numerous local victories, although their attempts at the national level, both under the Populist banner in 1892 and the Democratic Party in 1896, failed. The chief factors which caused this were that business conditions improved and attention was diverted from domestic issues to the war with Spain. The money demands of the farmers were partly met by the new discoveries of gold. By 1900 agriculture was entering a period of good crops and gradually rising prices.¹⁵

For three decades there had been rising discontent with certain aspects of American political and economic life. The Granger, Greenbackers, Single-Taxers, Bellamyites, Populists, and socialists all challenged the conservative character of the government. Despite their vigor these groups were regarded as visionary and dangerous. Progressivism would be distinguished from these earlier movements

¹⁵ Ibid., pp. 353-76.

of protest by its broad appeal and respectability in the eyes of the majority of people. Everywhere the Progressives placed great importance in the adoption of new devices of democratic government. The direct primary, initiative, and referendum were introduced in all states in varying forms. The recall was adopted in eleven states.¹⁶

Women's suffrage became a part of the Progressive program. By 1914 the monopoly of the male in the voting booth had been broken in eleven states west of the Mississippi River. This agitation also had an effect on changing the attitude toward co-education. The education of women became an important consideration in universities and colleges.

This was also a period of significant progress in social legislation. Much of the impetus for new legislation came from professional social workers. Jane Addams and Florence Kelly in Chicago and Francis Perkins and Lillian Wald of New York were examples. Able leaders forsook well-to-do homes to live and work in settlement houses and the city slums. They prodded state legislatures into action to deal with the abuses of child labor and the exploitation of workers, through long hours, sweat-shop wages, and uncompensated industrial accidents. Humanitarians were particularly disturbed by child labor, an evil that seemed to be on the increase. In 1900 more than 1.7 million children, almost one out of five in the ten to fifteen age bracket,

¹⁶

Ibid., p. 376.

were gainfully employed. During the next ten years a great deal was accomplished. States set minimum ages for employment and maximum working hours for youthful employees. In many states compulsory education laws were established.¹⁷

The major political bosses maintained themselves through their control of state and city government. The campaign against these bosses was best exemplified by the career of Robert M. LaFollette of Wisconsin. All during the 1890's he worked to build up a bloc within the Republican party. LaFollette's triumph finally came in 1900 when he was elected governor by the largest majority in Wisconsin history. He was reelected in 1902 and 1904. Later he moved into national politics as a United States Senator. The program that LaFollette instituted in his state received wide attention. The privileged position of the railroads and other corporations was attacked in legislation that required the corporations to pay a larger share in taxes. Other laws exposed inheritance to a progressive tax, provided workmen's compensation in case of industrial accidents, and aimed at the conservation of forests and water power.¹⁸

Muckracking was both a cause and symptom of the growing demand for municipal reform. When James Bryce wrote his famous study The American Commonwealth in 1889, he expressed the opinion that the most conspicuous American failure had

¹⁷Drake, op. cit., p. 238.

¹⁸Barck, op. cit., pp. 34-36.

been in the field of municipal government. The writings of Lincoln Steffens indicated that conditions had not improved by 1902. Tammany Hall was the most notorious political machine in the country.¹⁹

One of the weaknesses of the municipal reform movement was that the crusaders limited their indignation to the crooked politicians. They shut their eyes to the fact that many of their most powerful enemies were the respected businessmen who manipulated city councilmen, tax assessors, and judges. They also failed to give serious consideration to the structure of municipal government. Its machinery in many cases was so worn and outmoded that the temptation to grease the machinery with bribes was understandable.

Strongly entrenched as the philosophy of rugged individualism seemed to be, it was under attack during the 1890's on both the popular and intellectual fronts. Sumner's hard Social Darwinism was countered with the soft liberal Darwinism of Lester Ward. Ward repudiated the "Survival of the Fittest" dogma and argued for a program of bold government action to promote the general welfare.²⁰ William James in his first persuasive statements of the philosophy of pragmatism was destined to upset conservative Social Darwinist and other laizze-faire social theories. Pragmatism

¹⁹ Ibid., p. 28.

²⁰ Richard Hofstadter, Social Darwinism In American Thought (Beacon Hill: Beacon Press, 1955), pp. 67-84.

rejected absolute truth for practical results. At first a philosophy of extreme individualism, pragmatism became an instrument of social criticism and experiment in the hands of John Dewey.²¹

Two writers were important in the late nineteenth century in the provoking of Americans to consider flaws in the existing social system. In Progress and Poverty, Henry George dealt with the paradox of increasing want accompanied by increasing wealth. He found the cause in the private ownership of land. All men had an equal right to land as they had a right to air and sunshine. He advocated the so-called "single tax", a levy to take from the landlord for the benefit of society the increased value that was created by no labor but came through the growth of cities, nearness to markets, and discovery of mineral resources. It was hoped that the "single tax" would destroy monopoly, speculation, inflation, and depressions. Even if the reading public believed that George's remedy was impractical, it found his description of the inequalities of American life revealing.²² Edward Bellamy's Looking Backward, 2000-1887 had a similar effect. Bellamy made socialism acceptable to many middle-class idealists.²³

²¹Ibid., pp. 123-42.

²²Ibid., pp. 110-13.

²³Ibid., pp. 113-15.

Certain religious leaders were taking an increasingly serious interest in social issues. During the 1880's Washington Gadden, pastor of the Congregational church in Columbus, Ohio, began to attract attention by defending labor's right to organize and strike and by characterizing John D. Rockefeller's fortune as "tainted" money. Reverend W.D.P. Bliss, an Episcopalian, founded a Society of Christian Socialists in 1889. Bishop F. D. Huntington of the Episcopal Church became the president of the Christian Social Union in 1892. In the same year Walter Rauschbusch organized the Brotherhood of the Kingdom. This group was committed to the belief that the Kingdom of God was to be achieved in this world rather than the next. The Social Gospel movement was only in its beginning stages but the demands for a more Christian social order had great significance for the future. Within the Catholic Church a somewhat similar reorientation was taking place. Cardinal Gibbons, Bishop John Ireland, and Bishop John Lancaster Spalding were Catholic churchmen who were combating the influence of the more conservative churchmen on social issues. The famous encyclical Rerum Novarum, issued by Pope Leo XIII in 1891, balanced its condemnation of socialism with criticism of the evils of unregulated capitalism. The Pope appealed for an acceptance of a Christian social order and a living wage for all workers.²⁴

²⁴ Barck, op. cit., p. 20.

On the eve of the twentieth century the United States was a rapidly expanding nation with a proud record of growth and bright prospects for the future. The conclusion of the Spanish-American War marked the end of comparative isolation and the emergence of the nation as a world power.

America faced a comparable shift in its internal structure. The reform of the basic social institutions of the nation would be necessary. Foremost among these institutions was education. Industrial growth of the nation created capital which was used to finance an expanding educational program. Better means of transportation and communication were bringing people close together and making schools more readily available. Cheaper books and more of them coming from the printing presses along with newspapers and magazines made formal education more desirable and necessary. The bitter struggles between labor and capital pointed to the need for more social education.

American education would adapt to the new needs of the society. The increased knowledge in science and technology brought about by the industrial revolution was further expanded by educational research. In higher education the institution most adaptable to the conservation and expansion of this new knowledge was the university. These institutions accelerated the process of industrialization and urbanization by educating increasing numbers of scientists, technicians, and skilled professionals.

The movement for consolidation in the economic sphere

of society had its counterpart in education. The greater numbers of people living in the cities created the need for larger and more diverse educational institutions. This growth and consolidation appeared at all levels of education. Its most important manifestation was in the organizational pattern of the new large multi-purpose urban university. The urban universities of Chicago and Columbia were representatives of the practical realization of these concerns. The incorporation of university schools of education were only adaptations of the university pattern of professional education in America. The increasing number of professions developed by the needs of this growing complex society found the university pattern the one most adaptable to their needs for trained personnel.

The urban way of life in the 1890's also created a number of new complex problems. The sprawling disorganized metropolis was one of the major concerns. Cities had been poorly planned and hastily erected to meet the new economic and industrial demands. The rapid growth of cities was further complicated by the inability of the new inhabitants from rural environments to adapt to urban living. Americans had a traditional faith that education could solve these problems. A new kind of education had to be constructed to meet the social and economic needs of the city dweller. The education of an earlier America was largely fundamental, elementary, and academic. In the 1890's education was expanded to include social, economic, and industrial

training. A more broadly educated teacher had to be trained to bring this new education to the people.

The great expansion in industry and the corresponding shift in American agriculture created an increasingly complex society. This gave rise to the need for the training of professional experts in all fields. The university became the center where the new academic disciplines of sociology, economics, education, political science, and social science were developed. These experts focused their critical attention on the society of the 1890's. Their criticisms and projected solutions to social issues were well received by the public.

The political corruption of the cities was viewed by educated Americans as a blight on the nation's progress. The group from which Americans believed they could receive help were the university people. In the programs proposed by these men, the earliest forms of Progressivism were manifested. University presidents like Seth Low and William R. Harper viewed the social role of the university as the agency of change toward a better urban society. The chief theoretical concern of men like Dewey, Parker, and Butler was to create a socially meaningful education in order to raise the standards of American society.

The new social and economic conditions of America was interpreted by these educational leaders to mean that if American education was to fulfill its social role it had to expand to meet these new social needs.

CHAPTER THREE

AMERICAN EDUCATION AND THE TEACHING PROFESSION: 1890-1905

Public education in America had achieved, by 1890, recognition and acceptance, after a long struggle. In certain areas it was not a dominant force, but generally the need and value of public education was regarded as a necessary element to the national progress.¹ The national school population was about 16 million in 1894. Elementary school enrollment was 15 1/2 million. Secondary enrollment numbered only 408,000, and higher education had only 176,000 students enrolled. Private schools and colleges had 11% of the total school enrollment. The elementary schools were 90% public and 10% private. In secondary education 40% of the schools were private, and in higher education 70% of the institutions were considered private. Out of every 1,000 students, 964 were in primary grades, 26 were in secondary schools, and 10 had entered college or professional studies. City schools operated up to 200 days per year. The operation time for rural schools was considerably lower. Rural schools were open from a high average of 150 days down to a low of 70 days.²

The total number of teachers employed in the nation

¹ Duane Doty, "Our American Schools--Their Progress, Condition, and Prospects," Scientific American Supplement, XXXVIII (July 21, 1894), p. 15472.

² Ibid., p. 15472.

was around 444,000. Private education employed about 60,000 of the total. One-third of all teachers were male. The average monthly wage paid teachers in 1891 was 45 dollars for men and 37 dollars for women. By the middle of the decade this had increased only 2 dollars for men and 1 dollar for women.³ In terms of real wages it was comparable to that of an unskilled worker.⁴

The primary institution for the training of teachers was the normal school. The 132 public normal schools had an enrollment of 31,792 students, and the 47 private normal schools enrolled 10,515 students. The combined number of yearly graduates was around 6,000. Colleges and universities were conducting training classes for about 4,000 students.⁵

The normal schools were turning out proportionately fewer trained teachers in relation to the needs of the society than were the other professional schools of the day. In 1894, 54 law schools had an enrollment of around 6,000 and 2,000 yearly graduates. There were 143 schools of theology with an enrollment of 7,328 and graduating yearly 1,324. Colleges and departments of medicine, dentistry, and pharmacy had 26,186 students enrolled and

³Ibid., p. 15472.

⁴Henry G. Williams, "Discussion, How To Increase Normal School Scholarship," Proceedings and Addresses of the NEA (Boston, Mass., 1903), p. 587.

⁵Doty, op. cit., p. 15472.

7,379 yearly graduates. Schools of business numbered 250. They enrolled 58,839 male and 23,059 female students. Of this total 14,000 were in evening classes. The total national population was about 68 million of whom 20 million were of school age, 6 to 18 years old. This would be around 29 1/2% of the total population.⁶ One can see that the ratio of trained teachers was low in proportion to the potential school population.

It was estimated that less than 15% of the elementary and secondary school teachers had any professional training at all.⁷ Small in numbers, this professionally trained group and its leaders were a force for the improvement of teacher training.

The greatest number of employed teachers was at the elementary level which constituted over 96% of the school population. These teachers were recruited mainly from the ranks of high school or upper elementary school graduates. The latter was especially true in the rural areas.

Many states, counties, and cities had established normal schools to meet the demand for more and better trained teachers. Those schools that were established at the state level were considered to be the more outstanding in quality. There was very little state control and supervision and as a result these schools varied greatly in size

⁶ Ibid., p.15472.

⁷ J. G. Shurman, "Teaching, A Trade or Profession," The Forum, XXI (March, 1896), p. 179.

and quality. Some schools were only a room in an elementary or secondary school. Other schools, in contrast, had national and international reputations of excellence with substantial facilities, faculty, and finances. The entrance requirements were as variable as the quality and size of the schools. Some schools accepted candidates with as little as a fourth grade education. The better schools required a high school education as a minimum.⁸

If a teacher was interested in improving professional competence he or she usually sought help through the many in-service training programs. The county teacher's institute, the various local, state, and national professional meetings were sources of teacher improvement. This was the hey-day of the Chautauqua and many teachers took advantage of this cultural medium.⁹ Many colleges and universities were expanding into the field of extension and correspondence work and many of their enrollees were teachers.¹⁰ Another source of improvement was the rapidly developing field of professional literature. There was a general

⁸"Report of the Committee on Normal Education," Proceedings and Addresses of the NEA (Saratoga Springs, N.Y., 1892), pp. 781-87.

⁹"Round Tables of State and County Superintendents," Proceedings and Addresses of the NEA (St. Louis, Mo., 1904), pp. 306-309.

¹⁰R.H. Halsey, "University Extension," Proceedings and Addresses of the NEA (St. Louis, Mo., 1904), pp. 294-95.

increase in both the quality and quantity of professional journals as the century drew to a close. The subject matter was increasingly being directed toward the developing specializations in education.¹¹

Normal school effort was basically at the elementary level. As the century drew to a close, the question of teacher training, its character and emphasis in the preparation of secondary school teachers, was to become an issue. The public acceptance of tax supported high schools was creating a demand for trained teachers at this level too.

The teaching profession, as other professions, did not require college work as a condition for entrance into professional training. For example, in 1880, seven and nine-tenths percent of the medical students, twenty-six and four-tenths percent of the theology students, and twenty-four and one-tenth percent of the law students possessed prior college degrees. These were the professions traditionally allied with college and university work. In this last decade of the century pressure was being exerted to have a college background required before professional training. This same pressure was exerted on teacher education and played a major role in the establishment of the first university schools of education.¹²

¹¹"Literature of Education," Educational Review, XIX (May, 1900), pp. 490-91.

¹²Charles A. Blansard, "What the People Have a Right To Ask From the Colleges," Proceedings and Addresses of the NEA (St. Paul, Minn., 1890), p. 662.

In the period that followed the Civil War the local and state educational organizations extended to a regional and national basis. The closing years of the nineteenth century saw the emergence of the National Educational Association as the national organization and the spokesman for the profession. It had grown out of the active state organizations for teachers, and was founded in 1857 at Philadelphia as the National Teacher's Association. Its earliest national objectives were to elevate the character of the profession of teaching and to promote the cause of popular education in the United States. One of its early achievements was agitation for a United States Office of Education which was established by Congress in 1867.¹³

A merger with two educational organizations, the National Association of School Superintendents, and the American Normal School Association, in 1870, created the National Education Association. The two merging groups became the first departments of the NEA.¹⁴ The membership as late as 1900 was only 4,641.¹⁵ The significance and

¹³William T. Harris, "National Education Association: Its Organization and Functions," Proceedings and Addresses of the NEA (Toronto, Canada, 1891).

¹⁴Ibid., p. 448.

¹⁵Classified Membership by States," Proceedings and Addresses of the NEA (Charleston, S.C., 1900), p. 800.

influence of the NEA in establishing policy in education far outweighed its numbers. For example, such NEA committees as the National Council of Education, Committee of Ten, Committee of Fifteen, and the National Society for Scientific Study of Education made influential studies of educational questions.¹⁶

The membership included most of the distinguished educators, administrators, and educational theorists of the day. Important educational and social figures were invited to use the platform of its conventions as a forum for expression and discussion of their ideas. The national conventions drew from 12,000 to 20,000 participants which insured a wide audience for the various views that were expressed. The activities of the convention were extensively recorded in annual volumes of The Proceedings and Addresses of the National Educational Association.

Among its departments, the Department of Superintendence was held to be the most powerful and influential educational policy making body in the nation.¹⁷

This was the period when the leading university presidents were also the active leaders in the NEA. Charles W. Eliot and Nicholas Murray Butler served terms as presidents.

¹⁶"The New Movement in Education," Century, XL (May, 1890), pp. 151-52.

¹⁷"Four Educational Meetings," The Nation, July 17, 1890, p. 47.

Many others served on important committees, as elected officers, and as keynote speakers. William R. Harper, G. Stanley Hall, Daniel Coit Gilman, David Starr Jordan, Woodrow Wilson, and Andrew S. Draper are only a few of these important men.¹⁸ The NEA Convention was a forum for ideas and its published annual record was used by the teaching profession as a source of ideas, procedures, and theory.

The administrative function in American education had developed greatly after the Civil War. The expanding enrollments and curricula necessitated the employment of full-time administrators. This new professional person as a result of his duties and responsibilities became a locus of power. This made the administrator the focal point of educational policy.¹⁹ The expansion of this group gave rise to a new powerful force in educational matters that served to unite or divide the profession depending on how one felt on the issue.

In higher education these new administrators were the new college and university presidents. They were scholars and professional educators, not the ministers of earlier

¹⁸
"NEA Meeting in Asbury Park," The Nation, July 19, 1894, p. 48.

¹⁹
Charles F. Thwing, "A New Profession," Educational Review, XV (January, 1898), pp. 26-33.

days. They were experts in secular and educational concerns.²⁰

This was becoming increasingly true of administrators in public school administration. The Kalamazoo case not only settled the issue of public tax supported high schools but decided the legality of hiring a full-time superintendent.²¹ The administration of public elementary and secondary schools was becoming a complex problem.²² The larger school systems turned to the colleges and universities for their administrators. A report of the Michigan superintendent of public instruction stated that in twenty-seven Michigan high schools employing fifteen or more teachers, sixteen of the superintendents were University of Michigan graduates, six were from outstate colleges and five were graduates of normal schools.²³ It is evident that the university would influence this important segment and the leadership role that they played would be shown by subsequent

²⁰Charles W. Eliot, "Address at the Installation of President Butler of Columbia University," Report of the Commissioner of Education: 1902, II (Washington, D.C., U.S. Government Printing Office, 1903), pp. 622-23.

²¹Michigan Supreme Court Decisions, Stuart vs. School District of Kalamazoo, (30 Michigan 69, 1874),

²²"Business Side of City School Administration," Review of Reviews, XXIIX (November, 1903), pp. 607-608.

²³William Harold Payne, Contributions to the Science of Education, (New York: Harper Brothers, 1887), pp. 335-37.

historical events.

The pressure for more education brought with it new problems that needed attention and solution. The need for more teachers was sharpened by the booming population. Population and immigration were two of the major problems of the city schools.²⁴ The problem of the support of education, either by public taxation,²⁵ or private philanthropy,²⁶ was one of the continual struggles at all levels of education. Another factor that would contribute to the splintering of the educational process was the democratic character of its policy making process. Any change of major importance would have to win the approval of the constituency, or its representatives, whether board of trustees, school board, legislature, or commission. Action needed majority approval in some form and this meant that those who were advocating change would have to persuade a number of others. The seeds of educational diversity were inherent in America's educational process.²⁷

²⁴"Von Holst's Convocation Oration," The Nation, March 9, 1893, p. 180.

²⁵William H. Maxwell, "Present Problems of the School," Educational Review, XXVIII (November, 1904), pp. 394-95.

²⁶"Private Aid to Education," Educational Review, XIX (May, 1900), p. 400.

²⁷John Dewey, "Are the Schools Doing What the People Want Them to Do?" Educational Review, XXI (May, 1901), pp. 459-74.

The influx of the urban settling immigrants meant that the city school system would have to make citizens out of these newcomers.²⁸ The native born rural American was turning away from the rugged life of the farm to the weekly wages of the factories and sweat shops of the city. Our nation was in the midst of its conversion from an agricultural economy into an industrial society.²⁹ These people who lacked the background to live in the city were creating a host of problems. The conditions that were created became the theme of literature of the period. The state of the city schools reflected these conditions also. Dr. Joseph M. Rice was one of the many who reported the situation to the reading public. Rice made a survey for the editor of The Forum magazine and his findings were published in a series of articles that ran from 1891-1899. The theme of these articles was the lack of trained teachers and administrators, the wretched classroom conditions, poor sanitary facilities, over-crowding of students, lock-step memorization methods of instruction, and the harsh discipline that was the order of the day. The schools of New York, Buffalo, Cincinnati, Baltimore, St. Louis, Boston, and Philadelphia were all regarded as below standard by the German-educated

²⁸Maxwell, op. cit., p. 392.

²⁹"The Farmer's Crisis," Popular Science Monthly, XXXIX (October, 1891), pp. 856-57.

Rice. Only in Indianapolis were the teachers and methods comparable to those in German schools. Here he praised the strong in-service training program for the teachers and a school system that was based on the child's needs. These reports received a great deal of attention in educational meetings. Rice approached the NEA leadership with a proposal for reform to be based on the investigation of a study commission under their sponsorship.³⁰

Rural schools were also under criticism. Weather, short school terms, apathy of the farmers, and unqualified teachers were the subjects of the discussions of professional meetings. The rural school teacher was personified as the still existing example of Ichabod Crane. His fictional embodiment had changed little after almost a century.³¹

Higher education was in the midst of revolutionary

³⁰J. M. Rice, "Need the School Blight the Child's Life," The Forum, XII (December, 1891), pp. 529-35.; "Our Public School Systems of Buffalo and Cincinnati," The Forum, XIV (November, 1892), pp. 293-309.; "The Public School System of St. Louis and Indianapolis," The Forum, XIV (December, 1892), pp. 429-44.; "The Primary School System of New York," The Forum, XIV (January, 1893), pp. 616-30.; "The Public Schools of Boston," The Forum, XIV (February, 1893), pp. 753-67.; "The Public Schools of Philadelphia," The Forum, XV (March, 1893), pp. 31-42.; "The Substitution of the Teacher for the Textbook," The Forum, XIX (June, 1895), pp. 681-88.; "Why Teachers Have No Professional Standing," The Forum, XXVII (June, 1899), pp. 452-63.

³¹Henry Raab, "Rural School Problems," Proceedings and Addresses of the NEA (Saratoga Springs, N.Y., 1892), pp. 577-84.

change. It had been almost twenty years since the publication of the articles on the "New Education," by Charles W. Eliot in the Atlantic Monthly. This plea for the inclusion of science and technology in curriculum, university and college work based on social service, and the elective system based on student needs and preferences, marked the direction that movement of reform would take in higher education. The patterns of this reform movement became realized in the schemes of the emerging universities. The last quarter of the 19th century saw great institutions like Stanford, Chicago, Clark, and Cornell founded on concepts that were in harmony with those expressed by Eliot. Other universities following the lead of Harvard reconstructed their curricula. Examples were Columbia and the University of Pennsylvania. Other schools modified their programs with systems of majors, minors, electives, required subjects, and new offerings to supplement the traditional offerings.³²

The Morrill Land Grant Act was of major importance to curriculum reform. This act was dedicated to the practical arts and sciences and committed the schools that accepted its assistance to a philosophy of public service and broad

³² Charles W. Eliot, "The New Education, Its Organization," Atlantic Monthly, XXIII (February, 1869), p. 216.

practical curricula.³³

The most influential voices in education were the university presidents. Charles W. Eliot of Harvard, William R. Harper of Chicago, David Starr Jordan of Stanford, Seth Low and Nicholas Murray Butler of Columbia were not only reformers in higher education but took an active role in all phases of educational and social reform.

This wave of reform in higher education was generally opposed by those who believed in the traditional American liberal arts college. This tradition had a long history of servicing the intellectual needs of the American people. They would not placidly accept the expansion and reorganization that was dictated by the "New Education." Many institutions had the core and essence of their programs based on the philosophy of the liberal arts. Some of these institutions could see the need for the inclusion of science in their curriculum. This was the age of invention, and science seemed to hold the promise of real breakthroughs for the betterment of mankind.³⁴ They were willing to allow some modifications to new knowledge but had serious reservations about the free-wheeling elective curricula that the

³³ David Starr Jordan, "Science and the Colleges," Popular Science Monthly, XLII (April, 1893), pp. 730-31.

³⁴ Ibid., pp. 721-34.

"New Education" seemed to imply. Friends, teachers, and professional people who had received their education in the traditional colleges protested the excesses of the "New Education." Not the least among their number were members of the teaching profession who questioned that the scientific, utilitarian, and practical were the proper goals of higher education.³⁵

The core of protest came from the great traditional colleges of New England and the East. Important educators like Andrew F. West and Woodrow Wilson of Princeton, Arthur T. Hadley of Yale, Homer Keyes of Dartmouth, and John Lancaster Spalding, founder of Catholic University of America, were prominent men who opposed the basic concepts of the "New Education." They saw the elimination of classical languages and modification of traditional subjects as a threat to the very foundations of higher education.

Overriding these curriculum issues was the desire of the American people for more education. By the turn of the century the attendance in American colleges and universities was proportionately double that of England. The amount of private endowment given by Americans to higher education was eight times that of England from 1871-1901. The amount of federal and state aid was six times that of Great Britain.

³⁵ Andrew F. West, "Greek for the Bachelor of Arts," Proceedings and Addresses of the NEA (Chicago, Ill., 1893), pp. 117-19.

This figure did not include the indeterminate value of state and federal land grants. The value of endowments of the State of New York exceeded the total value of those of England for the same thirty year period. The total number of faculty in American higher education was around 17,000 instructors and professors. This figure was nearly as great as the total number of students in English higher education, which was around 20,500. Germany was almost as far behind as England with 7.87 students per 10,000 population compared with 12.76 in the United States.³⁶

American colleges and universities actively recruited students as a matter of policy. This was another factor that contributed to the growth of higher education. Charles W. Eliot in one of his addresses to the NEA on the problem of the lack of qualified college students stated that it was necessary that five-sixths of the colleges and universities maintain academies or offer high school level courses to obtain students who would qualify for college level work.³⁷

Another stimulus to the growth of higher education was

³⁶"Universities in the United States and Great Britain," Scientific American, July 4, 1903, p. 4.

³⁷Charles W. Eliot, "The Gap Between the Elementary School and the Colleges," Proceedings and Addresses of the NEA (St. Paul, Minn., 1890), p. 522.

the adoption of graduate study. The connection between the German university graduate system and American scholars and educators had begun early in the century. George Bancroft, Edward Everett, George Ticknor, and Joseph Caldwell were among those scholars who started the movement toward German graduate study. The American colleges, by the turn of the century, began to offer graduate study on a tutorial basis because of increasing student demand. This demand led to the organization of the graduate school in the department of philosophy and arts at Yale in 1858. The first Ph.D. was conferred as early as 1861. This degree was exclusively professional and granted largely for teaching. By 1880 it was in general use. Johns Hopkins opened its doors in 1876 with the express purpose of becoming a graduate university on the German model. The German university ideal of graduate study spread throughout the United States and the earlier trend of graduate study in Germany was checked by the growing ability of American institutions to meet the needs of its advanced students.³⁸

Further expansion and enrollments in higher education came from the acceptance of women on the campus. Co-education had found support in the state universities of the

Middle West. Slowly they were being admitted into colleges and universities in increasing numbers. The profession that was most open to them was teaching. The Chicago School Board reported in 1892 that of the 3,000 teachers in its system, 190 were men.³⁹ In the East private women's colleges became the pattern because of the resistance to co-education. The decade of the 1890's saw this issue reluctantly resolved.

An innovation that attracted many teachers to college and university campuses was the summer school. The plan for the year round operation of the University of Chicago received national attention when it was announced. Other schools followed with various plans of summer study, and teachers took advantage of these opportunities.⁴⁰

The universities and colleges had always possessed a vested interest in the preparation of teachers, and primarily those teachers who would be employed in higher and secondary education. Many of the state universities of the Middle West and West began as normal schools or teachers' seminaries. The universities of Indiana and Missouri are examples. Many critics expressed concern over the low standard of

³⁹"Sexes as Pupils and Teachers," The Nation, August 18, 1892, p. 125.

⁴⁰"Innovations at the University of Chicago," The Nation, October 6, 1892, pp. 255-56.

teacher training. They held that it was the place of universities and colleges to remedy the situation. As early as 1855 a normal department had been established as part of the University of Iowa. Its educational level was that of a high school. Pressure from normal school groups in 1873 forced the dropping of the department by the university.

The board of trustees established a chair of didactics and appointed Stephen Fellows, a Methodist minister, to the post. Fellows had been one of the leaders of the normal school opposition. He served in this position for six years with a dual appointment in political science. The department, by 1888, was abandoned again and its professor, G.T.W. Patrick, was transferred to philosophy.⁴¹

The University of Michigan also manifested an early interest in teacher training. The classical language teachers in 1858-9 launched a course for the teaching of classical languages in high schools. J.M. Gregory, State Superintendent of Public Instruction, gave a course of free lectures for a few weeks in 1861-3 in the philosophy of education, proper organization of schools, and methods of teaching various subjects. These early attempts led to more concrete steps. President James B. Angell was concerned that when he was required to write a letter of recom-

⁴¹

Allen S. Whitney, "The First Chair of Education in an American University," School and Society, LIII (March 1, 1941), pp. 257-61.

mendation on the teaching ability of a graduate he could not answer the question. President Angell with the approval of the faculty of the department of science and arts recommended to the board of regents that a chair for the science and art of teaching be established. The board of regents appointed William H. Payne as the first full-time professor of education in an American university in 1879. He served the post for nine years and was succeeded by Burke A. Hinsdale. As the number of students increased, the department grew. The department did not become a school of education until 1927 because of opposition from within and outside the university.⁴²

Other universities followed the lead of Michigan. Some institutions opposed the establishment of a chair on the grounds that it was not properly part of the university curriculum, but generally the scope of these institutions was defined broadly enough by the turn of the century that the idea of a chair of education was accepted.

It had been sixty years since the first normal schools had been established. The number of schools increased, but they still were unable to provide the necessary number of teachers. There were many critics of the movement. Normal schools suffered from lack of prestige because they were

⁴² Allen S. Whitney, History of Professional Training of Teachers at the University of Michigan (Ann Arbor, Mich., George Wahr, 1930).

considered part of the elementary and secondary school system. The general low status of the teaching profession and the lower academic requirements of normal training did much to continue this image. Fewer normal school graduates were in positions of administrative authority and their numbers were gradually decreasing as the century drew to a close.⁴³

The NEA Conventions engaged in a great deal of discussion and debate over low status of the normal school. The facts were that the growing population and the commitment of the nation to public education created demands for more teachers than the teacher training institutions could properly prepare. The demands for broadly trained administrators to handle the increasingly complex educational problems of a changing society were being filled by college and university trained people.⁴⁴

Many of the normal school instructors were college and university trained people. A study of forty state normal schools chosen geographically for a national sampling revealed that of 639 teachers on their faculties, 301 or

⁴³ Nicholas Murray Butler, "Some Pressing Problems," Proceedings and Addresses of the NEA (Minneapolis, Minn., 1902), pp. 68-69.

⁴⁴ "Sexes as Pupils and Teachers," op. cit., p. 125.

slightly less than fifty percent had college or university degrees. If the critic teachers and department heads were included the percentage would be sixty percent. The schools had 45 teachers with Ph.D. degrees. The study concluded that there had been great changes over the last 35 years when the best normal schools had principals in charge who were not college graduates.⁴⁵

Normal school people were sensitive to these criticisms. They were also aware of their own inadequacy to deal with these problems. The lack of normal school scholarship, staff, finances, standards, and facilities was deplored. Charges that the normal school made too much of pedagogical dogma and too little of subject matter was one frequently heard.⁴⁶

The normal schools had their defenders. These schools had done pioneer work in the upgrading of the teaching profession. They had a host of accomplishments and many felt that normal schools alone should be the professional training institutions. The pioneer work of Dr. Edward Sheldon at Oswego had received much acclaim, and his students were

⁴⁵
A.P. Hollis, "Heads of Departments and Training Schools," Proceedings and Addresses of the NEA (Minneapolis, Minn., 1902), pp. 534-35.

⁴⁶
Homer H. Seerly, "Defects in the Normal Schools," Proceedings and Addresses of the NEA (Minneapolis, Minn., 1902), pp. 539-48.

sought after as teachers.⁴⁷ Another example of normal school leadership and educational accomplishment was the work of Col. Francis Parker. His reforms of the Quincy, Massachusetts, school system and subsequent pioneer experimental work at Cook County Normal in Chicago gave him an international reputation.⁴⁸ This brought fame and pride to the normal schools.

The issue of the establishment of university schools of education was a question that would splinter the teaching profession. Teachers with their different academic backgrounds, training, professional positions, and interests were to be divided on the question of the proper course for the professional training of teachers. This question was buried in a host of educational issues that were competing with one another for attention and solution. The problem of the professional needs of an industrialized society and the role that the college or university should play in meeting these needs was the broad issue of which teacher training was only a part. The length of study and

⁴⁷Francis W. Parker, "School of the Future," Proceedings and Addresses of the NEA (Toronto, Canada, 1891), pp. 82-89.

⁴⁸"Addresses Delivered at the Services Held in the Memory of Col. Parker at the University of Chicago, March 6, 1902," "Addresses Delivered at the Memorial Exercises Given by the Public School Teachers of Chicago and Cook County, April 19, 1902," Report of the Commissioner of Education (Washington, D.C., 1902), pp. 264-276.

its proper division between broad cultural training and specialized professional training was a derivative issue. Another problem concerned the professions to be included in university work. These demands created by the conversion of the traditional colleges into multi-purpose universities produced a climate that would affect many points of view on the establishment of university schools of education.

These major problems of higher education were to occupy the greatest share of debate and discussion. If the question of the status of the professional training of teachers was an issue of lesser significance it was still the subject of much comment and lively debate, debate that has continued in American higher education in varying forms up to the present day.

CHAPTER FOUR

THE ROLE OF THE NORMAL SCHOOL AS THE PROFESSIONAL TRAINING INSTITUTION

The time for decision was approaching for those educational leaders who were concerned with teacher education. An editorial that appeared in the summer of 1890 in The Nation summarized the pressing problems that were being considered by the national and regional educational conventions of that year. The summary indicated a pooling of these opinions. Secondary education in New England was falling behind the West and Middle West because of the greater age, complacency, and unprofessional qualifications of city and state superintendents. Reports from all the meetings emphasized the necessity of reform in normal school training and improvement in qualifications of teachers. It was noted that college and university presidents, who had rarely attended these meetings before, were present including the presidents of nearly all the foremost institutions in the country. The Nation article predicted that the presence of these men was bound to influence the course of education. The editors commented that never before had there been so much discussion about educational issues, and great changes were coming in American education.¹

¹
"Four Educational Meetings," The Nation, July 17, 1890, pp. 47-48.

The normal school seemed to be fulfilling its role as the primary source for trained teachers. There had been substantial increase in the enrollment of normal schools in the two decades preceding the turn of the century. Enrollments of about 12,000 in 1880 had risen to 67,380 in 1897. In 1880, there were about 240 normal students per million population. The figure rose to 936 students per million population in 1897.² Despite their growth and expansion, normal schools and other teacher preparation agencies could not keep up with the demand for teachers.³ The desire of the American people for more and better education was outstripping facilities.⁴

William T. Harris, U.S. Commissioner of Education was concerned over this state of affairs. He was considered the intellectual and educational leader of the nation.⁵ Harris believed that the yearly NEA convention could be used as a forum where educational problems could be settled. Many

²William T. Harris, "The Future of the Normal School," Educational Review, XVII (January, 1899), pp. 7-8.

³"Training For Teachers," The Outlook, October 15, 1898, p. 414.

⁴William T. Harris, "Public Faith in American Education," Proceedings and Addresses of the NEA (Saratoga Springs, N.Y., 1892), pp. 56-61.

⁵"Introduction of William T. Harris," Ibid., p. 54.

times he addressed the convention for the purpose of focusing attention on educational issues or to make pleas for the settlement of differences.

Education was, for Harris, the key to the betterment and advancement of American civilization. In his view, the two major weaknesses of society were crime and pauperism. Education could overcome these weaknesses by eradicating illiteracy.⁶ Another struggle education faced was in the heart of the educational process itself. It was a clash between education as an ideal of culture and education as fitting one for a trade or profession. Harris challenged the NEA to display its leadership by reconciling these two ideals and placing them in their proper order.⁷

If the NEA Convention was not to become a court of reconciliation, it was to become an arena for debate and discussion of these issues. The floor of its convention and department meetings were to bear the brunt of open debate on teacher training. The people who were in favor of universities and colleges providing teacher training created a split between themselves and the normal school people.

The establishment of the first chair of education at

⁶ William T. Harris, "Addresses of Welcome," Proceedings and Addresses of the NEA (Saratoga Springs, N.Y., 1892), p. 54.

⁷ Ibid., p. 54.

University of Iowa was the result of the activities of normal school groups who forced university authorities to abandon the normal department.⁸ One of the early schools of education attached to a university was the School of Pedagogy (1898) of the University of Washington. It was closed in 1901 by President Frank P. Graves, a classical scholar who favored a liberal arts curriculum. University and normal school people negotiated an agreement whereby the university agreed to close the school and offer extension work in liberal arts to normal school students. The normal school authorities agreed to use their influence to back university officials in their proposals for legislative appropriations.⁹ Charles W. Payne, the first full-time professor of education, had been well received at the University of Michigan. Teacher training, because of the interest and demand, was expanded into a department by the turn of the century. The professional school of education was not established until 1927. One of the major reasons offered for this long delay was that strong normal school groups in the state opposed the establishment of a school

⁸Timothy O'Leary, "An Inquiry Into General Purposes, Functions and Organization of Selected University Schools of Education," (unpublished Ph.D. dissertation, Dept. of Education, Catholic University), pp. 248-49.

⁹Charles M. Gates, The First Century at University of Washington (Seattle, Wash.: University of Washington Press, 1961), pp. 54-56.

of education. They believed that the model school, which was being constructed on campus, would really be used to train elementary teachers. Normal school people saw this as a threat in the one area in which they still had a monopoly in the state.¹⁰

The strong resentment that normal school people expressed toward universities entering teacher education was long in abating. Charges were hurled back and forth. Normal schools charged that their students never received fair treatment at the hands of the university.¹¹ University and college people rebuked the normal schools for the low quality of their programs.¹²

An illustration of the extent of this cleavage was a survey made by G.W.A. Luckey for his book on the professional training of secondary teachers. The training of secondary teachers had been traditionally carried on in the universities and colleges. The demand for an increased number of secondary teachers raised the question of whether normal

¹⁰Allen S. Whitney, History of the Professional Training of Teachers at University of Michigan, (Ann Arbor, Mich., George Wahr, 1930), p. 161.

¹¹G. Stanley Hall, "Means Available for the Preparation of Teachers," Proceedings and Addresses of the NEA (Toronto, Canada, 1891), p. 504.

¹²G. Stanley Hall, "Normal Schools Especially in Massachusetts," Pedagogical Seminary, IX (January, 1902), pp. 180-92.

schools should become secondary teacher training institutions. The question that Luckey asked one hundred normal school principals and fifty university professors of education was, "Is there any distinction between teacher training for elementary and secondary teachers?" Of the normal school principals, 66% expressed the opinion that no distinction existed, but 82% of university professors of education thought there was a distinction. Luckey concluded from these results that the conflict between the two groups was still continuing.¹³

It was not until after World War II that this opposition subsided. As normal schools raised their standards they choose to emulate college and university standards, facilities, and curricula. Educational progress and time changed this situation. In the 1890's, the opposition of these two groups was a serious breach that divided educators.

Many friends of the normal school rose to defend this institution as the primary source for teacher training. They were willing to admit that normal schools had weaknesses. The course of action should be to strengthen the normal schools, not experiment with new agencies. The defenders of the normal school held that the principles of

¹³ Edward F. Buchner, Review of The Professional Training of Secondary Teachers in the United States, by G.W.A. Luckey, Educational Review, XXVII (September, 1904), pp.193-96.

normal school training were sound and all that was needed was modification and upgrading of training to meet the demands for better teachers. The first part of this chapter will deal with the views expressed by those who defended the normal schools as the institution for the training of teachers.

The second part of the chapter will deal with the viewpoints expressed by the detractors of the normal schools. They believed that the normal school had outlived its usefulness. Only by the establishment of university schools of education could the educators meet the demand for better qualified teachers. This new teacher training institution should replace or supersede the normal schools.

The third and final part of the chapter will deal with the views expressed by the conciliatory groups. They believed that the problem of providing enough qualified teachers was so huge a task that all educational institutions could share in the work. Harmony was their keynote and all people in education should work together to improve teacher training.

In Defense of the Normal Schools

The Normal School Association was one of the founding groups of the NEA and a department of the organization. Its yearly meeting at the convention was a roundtable for discussion of normal school problems. All of the important

normal school leaders participated in these meetings. The most discussed issue of the 1890-1905 period was the capability of the normal schools to meet the demands of the society for more qualified teachers.¹⁴ These discussions revealed the hostility of many normal people to the developing interest of university and college people in teacher education.

Many of the speakers and committees of the normal department defended their schools. They declared that the normal school alone was the professional school for the training of teachers of the public schools. It was not a school of general education or for the training for culture for its own sake.¹⁵ The normal school was established to prepare elementary and secondary teachers and was committed to a doctrine of professional education.¹⁶ The course of study was related to the child and required the careful study of subject matter in its relation to actual teaching. The normal school had to remain an independent professional

14

National Council of Education, "Report of the Committee on Normal Education: Discussion," Proceedings and Addresses of the NEA (Saratoga Springs, N.Y., 1892), p.788.

15

William W. Parsons, "Normal School Curriculum," Proceedings and Addresses of the NEA (St. Paul, Minn., 1890), pp. 718-24.

16

National Council of Education, op. cit., p. 786.

school which recruited its own students from high schools.¹⁷

The defenders admitted that the normal schools had variable standards. The normal schools were still a new experiment and no overall plan or effort existed. Nevertheless, the special function of the normal school was to give its graduates the proper spirit and correct attitude. This institution alone could give superior training and education to secondary and elementary teachers, and there was no need to extend the work to other agencies. If normal schools were correctly organized and equipped, they could contain more elaborate apparatus and libraries for individual work and training than a college or university because the preparation of teachers was more involved.¹⁸ John R. Kirk, president of the State Normal of Kirksville, Missouri, and one of the important leaders, confirmed this as a fact. He declared that in the state of Missouri the normal schools had better facilities and faculty than the typical colleges of the Mississippi Valley.¹⁹

¹⁷Ibid., p. 786.

¹⁸Homer H. Seerley, "Relative Advantages and Limitations of Universities and Normal Schools in Preparing of Secondary Teachers," The Education and Training of Secondary Teachers, Fourth Yearbook of the National Society for the Scientific Study of Education, Part I (Chicago, Ill.: University of Chicago Press, 1905), pp. 84-89.

¹⁹John R. Kirk, "How to Increase Normal School Scholarship: Discussion," Proceedings and Addresses of the NEA (Boston, Mass., 1903), p. 591.

Another argument was the prior right of the normal school in teacher education because it had its origin in law as a teacher training institution. The only reason university and college people were showing interest in teacher training was because the normal school was doing excellent work and receiving public attention. Universities had been compelled to establish chairs of education to meet public demand, and had gone on to establish schools of education, teachers' colleges, and normal colleges.²⁰ Still, the normal school was the institution where all teachers should be prepared. Therefore, the university and college had no right to claim this higher work of the public schools. Universities and colleges may have prepared teachers in the past, but the good normal school could better prepare teachers in secondary school subjects if scholarship in those subjects was recognized as part of normal school work. The instruction received would be better than that received at any college or university, as proper training would have much to do with the attitude of the future teacher.

Homer Seerley, president of the Iowa State Normal School and another strong defender of these schools, believed that the opposition to these schools was the fault

²⁰ Seerley, op. cit., pp. 84-89.

of the colleges and universities.²¹ He charged that no educational movement had suffered more ridicule and contempt than the normal school. These conditions retarded its progress and development. The major opposition to the normal school movement came from the leadership of higher education because they considered themselves the best and sole agency for bettering the public schools. These leaders belittled normal school training as too elementary. They discouraged the normal school graduate from attending the university by not accepting his normal school course work. Normal school graduates were also considered innovators and reformers. They had a difficult time putting their training into practice under supervisors, who adhered to the older and more accepted training of the college and university.²²

John R. Kirk attacked the increasing size of universities. He declared that universities had extended themselves beyond their scope. Several universities had already grown too large to offer efficient service. For an example he cited a university not far from Boston in which the

²¹

Homer H. Seerley, "Defects in the Normal Schools that are Responsible for Opposition and Criticism Urged Against Them in Many Parts of the United States," Proceedings and Addresses of the NEA (Minneapolis, Minn., 1902), p. 548.

²²

Ibid., p. 536.

president did not know half of the members of the senior class. This president was merely the managing agent of a vast commercial enterprise involving the investment of millions. He may have been a great businessman who knew the value of buildings, grounds, and securities, but he was not concerned about the teaching skill of his faculty. Universities had become abnormally large and many colleges were as large as they ought to be. There was no reason why the normal school could not expand into college work. This action was necessary, Kirk declared, in order to divide the "vast masses" of students and bring them into contact with mature men who were teachers as well as investigators. Kirk charged that the university men were after the normal schools with a paring knife. As "incipient monopolies," the universities apparently sought to form an educational trust for control of all educational institutions.²³

Normal school people asserted that the university was not a fit place to train teachers. They charged that the worst teaching in America was done in the universities. The university faculty was an investigating body and not a teaching faculty, and this was why its teaching was so poor.²⁴ These institutions produced a teacher who was untrained, unskilled, and highstrung. He would be unsympa-

²³Kirk, op. cit., pp. 590-92.

²⁴Ibid., p. 92.

thetic to adolescent school children. As a university student, he reflected the methods and specializations of his university professors. The tendencies of universities for more specialization would only increase the distortion in the university graduate's teaching methods. The university trained teacher confined his students to small areas of broad subjects rather than leading them to larger views and conceptions.²⁵ During the discussions there were always many examples cited of poorly trained university and college teachers who in some manner failed in their performance.²⁶ The methods and curriculum of the university were attacked. Textbook teaching, memorization methods, and the lecture system were all considered harmful.²⁷

Even the university education courses were attacked by professional educators who were in sympathy with the normal school. Nathan C. Schaeffer, state superintendent of schools of Pennsylvania, declared that education professors in universities dealt only with principles. Teaching was

²⁵

Seerley, op. cit., pp. 100-101.

²⁶

A.B. Poland, "College Graduates in Elementary Schools, Discussion," Proceedings and Addresses of the NEA (Minneapolis, Minn., 1902), pp. 279-83.

²⁷

A.B. Poland, "College Graduates in Elementary Schools, Discussion," Proceedings and Addresses of the NEA (Minneapolis, Minn., 1902), p. 283.

an art that required practice and application.²⁸ The instruction was a failure because the department heads themselves did not know how to teach children. They just talked about the subject. The high school graduate with normal school training was much better equipped than the average university teacher education graduate who was a product of the impractical atmosphere of the college classroom.²⁹

In conclusion these defenders argued that the normal school was the professional school for the education of teachers. Universities and colleges conducting experiments in teacher preparation were usurping the right of the normal school as the established institution charged with this responsibility. The normal school must find solutions to its problems and overcome its defects. It was the primary agency for teacher training, and universities and colleges should remain in their own sphere of activity and not interfere.³⁰

28

Nathan C. Schaeffer, "Report of Committee on Normal Education, Discussion," Proceedings and Addresses of the NEA (Saratoga Springs, N.Y., 1892), p.784.

29

Greenwood, "Report of the Committee on Normal Education," Proceedings and Addresses of the NEA (Saratoga Springs, N.Y., 1892), p. 786.

30

Kirk, op. cit., pp. 590-92.

The Detractors of the Normal School

Many important educators associated with the normal school movement believed its usefulness was coming to an end. They saw weaknesses which they thought could only be reconciled by the creation of university schools of education. Outstanding normal school leaders expressed doubts that even the best of the normal schools were turning out good teachers. Col. Francis Parker, a normal school administrator of great prestige,³¹ and Bishop John Lancaster Spaulding, one of the pioneer promoters for the establishment of Catholic normal schools,³² argued that the normal schools were no longer adequate. Others voiced criticisms also. They argued that normal schools, with a few exceptions, were not leaders in education. Normal school instructors were not scholarly and had written few books of merit. Their courses were based too much on method and too little on content. The instruction was mechanical and pedantic, and the instructors themselves lacked teaching experience. The principals of these schools were devoid of culture

³¹ John P. Gordy, Rise and Growth of the Normal School Idea in the United States, Circular of Information No. 8, U.S. Bureau of Education, (Washington, D.C.: U.S. Government Printing Office, 1891), p. 105.

³² John Lancaster Spaulding, "Progress in Education," Proceedings and Addresses of the NEA (Detroit, Mich., 1901), pp. 82-83.

despite the opportunities for advanced education in colleges and universities.³³

Other critics charged that in academic instruction, normal schools only repeated high school instruction. The normal schools were asked to demand a higher standard of scholarship from their applicants. The administrators and faculty of normal schools in the past had refused to set up any standards and judge their students for their scholarly or teaching aptitudes. As a result, the administrators of the best schools were turning to university schools of education for their teachers.³⁴ The critics described the typical normal school graduate as "crude and unbalanced,--the heterogeneous product of district schools, village academies and necessitous homes."³⁵ There was a lack of broadening cultural influence and a lack of strong basic elementary training.³⁶ These conditions lowered the level of scholarship at the normal schools. This state of affairs was especially true of those normal schools which granted degrees at the completion of one or two years of

³³Charles C. Ramsey, "Normal Schools in the United States," Education, XVIII (December, 1896), pp. 232-240.

³⁴Ramsay, op. cit., p. 235.

³⁵Fred C. Foster, "The Normal School and the School of Pedagogy," Educational Review, VII (March, 1894), pp. 383-84.

³⁶Ibid., p. 384.

study.³⁷

These normal school critics also expressed doubt that university departments of pedagogy or education could provide the proper work. They charged that the departments of pedagogy were strictly theoretical.³⁸ The lectures of mediocre professors of pedagogy only hurt teaching as a profession.³⁹ If a university was to establish a teacher training program, it must be in a separate school. They argued that without this separate school there was little justification for teaching theory without allowing the students to set the theory to practice.⁴⁰ The school of education which was autonomous would provide a "model" school where observation and practice could take place under close supervision. A university school of education would be a school of high rank in its admissions, academic work, and teaching.⁴¹

³⁷Mrs. Daniel Fulcomer, "The Ideal in Professional Teaching," Education, XVI (April, 1896), pp. 473-81.

³⁸Andrew S. Draper, "The New York Secondary School System," Reports of the Commissioner of Education, II (Washington, D.C.: U.S. Government Printing Office, 1905), pp. 152-53.

³⁹Henry Sabin, "What Present Means Are Available For the Preparation of Teachers for their Work," Proceedings and Addresses of the NEA (Toronto, Canada, 1891), p. 505.

⁴⁰Draper, op. cit., pp. 152-53.

⁴¹Clark, op. cit., p. 134.

Many normal school critics viewed the university as the educational leader of the nation and the hope for improvement of its schools. Not only was university scholarship far superior but this institution had the ability to apply its power to solving the problems of the day.⁴² These institutions had influenced the nation since its earliest beginnings. The highest political and social ideals of the nation were cherished in these schools. Their democratic character and influence made them the natural leaders of educational progress.⁴³ The establishment of university schools of education would improve the character of teacher education. The whole question of the reform of education and its progress was a question of good teachers. The university was the home of great teachers or it was not a university at all.⁴⁴

The detractors who criticized the value of normal schools also expressed views on the status that schools of education should have in the university. Col. Francis Parker held that normal schools were only half measures. The great need was to establish purely professional training

⁴² Draper, op. cit., p. 153

⁴³ Oscar H. Cooper, "Universities and Schools," Proceedings and Addresses of the NEA (Toronto, Canada, 1891), pp. 493-98.

⁴⁴ Spalding, op. cit., p. 634.

schools that would rank with the best law and medical schools.⁴⁵ Parker declared that teaching was man's most noble profession. If universities prepared people for law, medicine, ministry, and many other professions, they should devote some energy to bolster the profession which is the basis of the university and all educational pursuits.⁴⁶

The entrance requirements these critics suggested for university schools of education were varied. A suggestion by President Daniel Fulcomer, of the Michigan State Normal, Grand Rapids, was that the best courses in general education for teacher training were psychology, physiology, social science, moral science, at least one modern language, elements of religion, philosophy, and anthropology.⁴⁷ Despite many different views, it was predicted that university faculties would form a new race of professional teachers "who would walk in the ideals of human perfection."⁴⁸

The normal school critics defended education as a discipline worthy of attention in a university. Only through a combination of the practical work of the normal school

⁴⁵ Parker, op. cit., p. 105.

⁴⁶ Cooper, op. cit., p. 498.

⁴⁷ Daniel Fulcomer, "A Sociological Ideal View of Normal Schools," Proceedings and Addresses of the NEA (Chicago, Ill., 1893), pp. 423-27.

⁴⁸ Spalding, op. cit., p. 82.

and the spirit of the university could the perfection of the art of teaching be reached.⁴⁹ The critics expressing dissatisfaction with the system of normal training believed the future of teacher training lay in the establishment of university schools of education.

The Views Expressed by the Conciliators

The views expressed by educational leaders who were conciliators have historical interest as they tried to bring harmony and order to diverse interests and points of view. The course of the history of teacher education has shown that their attempts to bring order to a diverse educational system was to fail. The spirit that they expressed in their attempt to mollify contending viewpoints was an important facet of the climate of opinion that prevailed during this time.

William T. Harris was concerned about the future of the normal school and teacher education. In an article for the Educational Review, he presented a scheme for the unification of American education.⁵⁰ The basis of his analysis was philosophical, but he hoped that its theoretical conceptions would evolve into actual practice. The university and its

⁴⁹

Mrs. Daniel Fulcomer, op. cit., p. 480

⁵⁰

William T. Harris, "The Future of the Normal School," Educational Review, XVII (January, 1899), pp. 1-15.

teachers would be the crown of the education system. Harris argued that the college education for broad culture was grounded in the history of civilization.⁵¹ Comparative history or philosophy of history furnished the ultimate principle which would solve the deepest questions in education.⁵² Each school was to be part of the whole system of education and contribute to it. The kindergarten, elementary, secondary, normal, and university education were each to deal with a phase.⁵³

The normal school, in his scheme, would prepare elementary teachers. The essential part of their course would be a review of elementary curriculum: reading, writing, arithmetic, geography, history, and grammar.⁵⁴ The normal school had raised the level of the elementary education. This was its traditional role and it should continue this work.⁵⁵

The secondary schools, Harris reasoned, should be staffed with teachers who have had deeper studies in a college or university. It was the task of these teachers to

⁵¹ Ibid., p. 15.

⁵² Ibid., p. 15.

⁵³ Ibid., p. 1.

⁵⁴ Ibid., p. 4.

⁵⁵ Ibid., p. 4.

synthesize the facts learned in elementary schools.⁵⁶

The university was to be the final stage. One would deal with all the preceding stages of education and synthesize them into a unified whole, "a world view", or a unified theory of nature.⁵⁷ After a student achieved this synthesis of culture he could proceed to post-graduate education with a view to becoming an expert.⁵⁸ Harris concluded that the teaching of teachers could not be limited to one method, that of the elementary school.⁵⁹ The method of the college and university was the apex of the system and should lead the way.⁶⁰ In his final words Harris admitted that this view would create controversy between the heads of normal schools and university professors of education, but the normal school would gradually adopt this "world view."⁶¹

The strongest argument for the survival of normal schools was the fact that if all the institutions of higher education had teacher training there would still be a short-

⁵⁶ Ibid., p. 11.

⁵⁷ Ibid., pp. 12-13.

⁵⁸ Ibid., p. 13.

⁵⁹ Ibid., p. 14.

⁶⁰ Ibid., p. 14.

⁶¹ Ibid., p. 15.

age of teachers. In New York State alone, there were nearly twelve thousand elementary and secondary schools. If the graduate of every liberal arts college in the state went into teaching, and an estimated 50% did not, they would still need twice the number of colleges to supply the yearly demand.⁶² A solution suggested by an editorial in Journal of Pedagogy was to have the high schools absorb the academic preparation given in the normal schools and the normal school become strictly a training institution.⁶³

The NEA Convention in the summer of 1905 at Asbury Park, N.J. saw teacher education as one of the convention's major topics of concern. William H. Maxwell, Superintendent of New York public schools, established the mood of the convention in an address entitled, "Education for Efficiency," which was delivered before the general session. Maxwell brought up the issue of the teacher training when he stated:

"The born teacher--that is, the man or woman who has a genius for teaching will teach well, in spite of any curriculum, however bad. Unfortunately, genius is as rare in the profession of teaching as it is in law, medicine, or any other profession. The great majority of us, as it needs must be, are very common place persons, who are seeking for the light and doing the best we can. Hence, the supreme importance of training. And yet there is no part of our work to which so little thought and investigation has been given.

⁶²"The Future of the Normal School," Journal of Pedagogy, XV (June, 1903), pp. 273-78.

⁶³Ibid., p. 274.

Normal schools in this country are still very young--only a little over a half of a century old. The first normal schools were high schools with a little pedagogy thrown in. The majority of them remain the same to this day. There is a strong movement, however, toward purely professional schools to which no student who has not had a reasonably liberal education is admitted, and in which he shall devote his entire time to learning how to teach--how to observe, understand, and exercise children both mentally and physically. Welcome and necessary as this movement is, if all teachers are to train for efficiency, we are still far from precise scientific notions as to the best methods of training teachers. I commend this subject to the National Council of Education as one of the next investigations."⁶⁴

This subject did not wait for investigation. Charles Van Leiw, president of Chico State Normal School and the NEA Normal Department, in his statement of critical issues that faced the normal schools, took up the question of teacher education. Van Leiw asserted that the strength of the normal school lay in the fact that it had exploited a distinct and legitimate field, the professional training of teachers. The future of the normal school lay in the emphasis on this primary function.

The most serious problem, Van Leiw argued, was the training of an increasing number of secondary teachers either by the normal school or university. The two institutions had mutual interests in teacher education. Van Leiw

⁶⁴ William H. Maxwell, "Education For Efficiency," Proceedings and Addresses of the NEA (Asbury Park, N.J., 1905), p. 65.

stated that though universities trained for other lines of work few of them had expressed any desire to grapple with the problem of teacher training. One of the reasons was that even in universities favorably disposed there was a lack of financial support for facilities. The demands for mechanical, engineering, mining, commercial, and agricultural education were so great that there was a lack of funds for teacher training facilities.⁶⁵

Van Leiw believed university departments of education were inadequate because they covered too broad a field and were concerned with theory which did little to help the secondary teacher in his practical needs. Teacher education in a university had low status. The university professor was not a teacher, but a lecturer, experimenter, and reader of dictation.

Van Leiw presented a proposal for a program of cooperation between the normal schools and universities. In the discussion of this question, normal school men and university professors expressed their opinions. David Felmley, president of Illinois State Normal University, asserted the high school as sufficiently strong enough to provide the academic preparation needed by the normal school student. He argued that normal schools should demand that high schools provide

⁶⁵

Charles C. Van Leiw, "A Statement of the Issues Before the Department," Proceedings and Addresses of the NEA (Asbury Park, N.J., 1905), pp. 519-23.

this training. Any defects in the high schools were the result of their adoption of the Report of the Committee of Ten in 1893. He believed this "undue influence" of college and university people was turning the high schools into "fitting academies."⁶⁶

Grant Karr, superintendent of the Training Department of the Oswego Normal School, defended the ability of the normal school to provide the best elementary teacher training. In his discussion of the relation of theory to practice he assented to the superiority of the university as the source for educational theory. Still, it was the province of the normal school to harmonize this theory and practice.⁶⁷

In the second session of the normal department, Guy E. Maxwell, president of the State Normal School at Winona, Minnesota, predicted that a cooperation would evolve between the university and normal school. He believed normal schools should continually raise their standards and train secondary teachers. The university should be the research institution

⁶⁶David Felmley, "The Modern High School Curriculum As Preparation For a Two-Year Normal Course," Proceedings and Addresses of the NEA (Asbury Park, N.J., 1905), pp. 525-533.

⁶⁷Grant Karr, "How Can the Normal School Best Produce Efficient Teachers of the Elementary Branches as Regards the Control of Both Subject Matter and Methods?" Proceedings and Addresses of the NEA (Asbury Park, N.J., 1905), pp. 533-540.

and dispense its findings to the normal schools. The normal school would send its graduates to the professional school of education at the university. Education would become a unified system from the kindergarten to the university. Indeed, more men would enter the profession if they could see their future in an educational career that could lead them up the ladder to higher positions. Maxwell pleaded for a coordinated system in which the university and normal school cooperated in training elementary teachers.⁶⁸

The last normal school educator to speak on this issue was President Z.X. Snyder of the State Normal at Greeley, Colorado. His plea also was for a unified educational system embracing all grades up to the university. He argued that the teacher should be well prepared. The minimum professional and academic training should be at least one school higher in grade than the school in which the prospective teacher was to teach. Snyder believed that the academic preparation should be broad. Professional training should include the study of both human beings and the educational system. Any institution that prepared teachers should be equipped with a training school, and normal schools and universities could both share in secondary teacher training.

⁶⁸Guy E. Maxwell, "The Cooperation of Universities and Normal Schools in the Training of Elementary Teachers," Proceedings and Addresses of the NEA (Asbury Park, N.J., 1905), pp. 542-45.

He admitted normal schools had deficiencies of equipment and faculty which would have to be improved, but universities and colleges needed to establish practice schools. Their faculties, also, would have to undergo a change in attitude before a complete system of professional training could be established.⁶⁹

The university, with varied reservations, had been accepted by normal men in the professional training of teachers. It was realized by all concerned that the university was the educational leader. By 1905 normal schools had come to accept the leadership role of the universities and would adopt or emulate the university spirit. The normal schools, in many cases, would grudgingly give ground, but this would be only a matter of time not of principle.

Those who would defend the exclusive right of the normal school in professional teacher training had already lost their argument. The normal school dominance of teacher training was broken. The university had been accepted as the apex of our educational system. The scholarship and quality of education this new institution represented had been accepted by the teaching profession.

Those who believed that there could exist a division of labor in teacher training were mistaken also. Not only

⁶⁹Z.X. Snyder, "The Cooperation of Universities and Normal Schools in Training of Secondary Teachers," Proceedings and Addresses of the NEA (Asbury Park, N.J., 1905), pp. 551-55.

teachers but all Americans were concerned with quality in education. These normal school administrators saw that the solution was to raise the quality of their schools. The unification of education was defeated by the race of institutions to improve their educational status.

The new universities were producing men in the disciplines of science, psychology, and philosophy who were interested in educational problems. These university people would unite with the critics of the normal schools in the cause to establish university schools of education. The next chapter will take up the views expressed by these people.

CHAPTER FIVE

SCIENCE, PSYCHOLOGY, AND UNIVERSITY SCHOOLS OF EDUCATION

Among the new disciplines that were developed in the universities, none was of greater importance to the establishment of schools of education than psychology. The study of psychology began at Johns Hopkins in 1881 with G. Stanley Hall. Within a decade the interest in psychology had grown to such an extent that America could boast of a score of¹ psychophysical laboratories.

The most influential movement within the profession of teaching was child study. Clark University was its center, and Dr. G. Stanley Hall, lately appointed president of Clark, was its leader and popularizer. The Pedagogical Seminary, edited by Hall, dealt with all phases of child study and other educational subjects. Child study associations were formed and the subject became an important topic of discussion at local, state, and national meetings. The movement grew so rapidly that by 1893 a separate section of the NEA was set up for its study. This section developed a² large enthusiastic membership.

¹G. Stanley Hall, "Psychology in Universities," Report of the Commissioner of Education, 1893-4, I (U.S. Government Printing Office: Washington, D.C.), p. 445.

²E.A. Kirkpatrick, "Child Study in the Training of Teachers," Review of Reviews, XIV (December, 1896), pp. 687-88.

The child study movement became recognized as an integral part of the study of education, and as the decade progressed it was recognized as a legitimate study in all universities which had departments or sub-departments of pedagogy. Chicago, Stanford, and the University of California, following the lead of Clark, inaugurated psychological and child study work. Normal schools enthusiastically³ entered into the movement.

The interest in science and psychology was not only confined to education. There was interest in the notions of a scientific study of anthropology, sociology, ethics, philology, and even theology. Many scholars expressed the hope that proper experimentation, controlled laboratory conditions, and the high level of theorizing available only at a university could succeed in providing future mankind with the scientific key to the good life.

There were three basic differences of opinion expressed about the relationship of science to education and the need for the establishment of schools of education. The first group of critics expressed a negative attitude toward the possibility of a science of education and psychology. In fact, they felt that the study of education deserved no attention in a university. The second group held the view that there was a science of education. These views were

³
Ibid., p. 688.

expressed by scholars who were actively engaged in its study. Their scholarly leadership pointed the way to the establishment of schools of education. The third group of views were expressed by scholars who believed that psychology and science had much to offer society. These views created a favorable climate of opinion toward scientific study of education. They contributed indirectly to the establishment of schools of education by motivating the teaching profession toward psychological and scientific studies.

The Views Expressed by Critics of a Science of Pedagogy

In 1890 Charles W. Eliot, president of Harvard, appointed a faculty committee under the chairmanship of Josiah Royce to investigate the possibilities of establishing a course of pedagogy for teacher training. Royce's report recommended that a course should not be instituted. The reasons Royce offered for this action were later published in a two part article in the first two issues of Nicholas M. Butler's new journal, Educational Review.

Royce argued that there was no such thing as a science of education as there was no science of the business life, marriage, domestic economy, or life in general. He believed that the study of psychology could be best handled in the department of philosophy. Education could never be an exact science and teaching was an art. Although there was a

wealth of psychological material that an educator might study, the best the university could do was to follow its past procedure of scheduling a course of lectures by various experts telling what they had learned through their experience about the art of teaching. The only way to acquire this art was through practice. The skilled teacher had practiced and achieved the art in its fullness. Royce made it clear he was unwilling to apply "a pretentious and comforting name of science to the laborious and problematical art of education."⁴

Hugo Munsterberg, a German psychologist who had been appointed to replace William James as head of Harvard's experimental psychological laboratory, was a popular writer and critic of American education. In contrast to his work in experimental psychology, Munsterberg advocated the traditional liberal arts curriculum. In a series of articles for the Atlantic Monthly, which had grown out of an address Munsterberg had delivered before the Boston Schoolmaster's Club in 1895, he presented his views in opposition to the development of a science of education.

Munsterberg's basic argument was that his own teachers had never heard of a theory of education, history of pedagogy, or psychology. German teachers received their

⁴Josiah Royce, "Is There A Science of Education," Educational Review, I (January, 1891), p. 15.

enthusiasm for teaching directly from their subject matter. There was never any question in their mind whether the subject would be useful to the student. The excellence of German education stemmed from the fact that beyond a student's ninth year of school he did not have a teacher who had less than three years of university graduate study. A university trained teacher reinforced the desire for scholarship on the part of students placed under his care. Also, the home of the child played a paramount role in his scholarly development. A teacher received his good name from the respect the home instilled in the child.

Munsterberg argued that psychology had nothing to offer the teacher when it came to a question of what to do in the practical life. He decried the whole tendency of American teacher training toward science, psychology, and child study. The only area in which a science of pedagogy or psychology might be of value would be in the development of planning for school organizers, superintendents, and city officials. Psychology would be of no help to the teacher in dealing with individual cases. Munsterberg further charged that the psychological movement had done serious damage because it⁵ turned teacher training away from true reform.

⁵ Hugo Munsterberg, "School Reform," Atlantic Monthly, XXCV (April, 1900), pp. 656-69.

As a twin evil to psychology, Munsterberg denounced the elective system. It was a perversion of the liberal arts curriculum and retarded reform. If Americans established and maintained a strong liberal arts program, the university spirit would filter down and strengthen the total school system. Now with the elective system, it was the kindergarten spirit that dominated the school system. These tendencies were disrupting the educational system.

Munsterberg concluded that elementary teachers should be better educated in normal schools and colleges, and high school teachers should have at least two years of graduate preparation after college. No pedagogical technique was a substitute for scholarship, and American teachers lacked this training because only two per cent had college degrees. The only solution was to emulate the German system of teacher education.⁶ Munsterberg continued to express his criticisms during his years at Harvard. He argued that you could not measure psychical facts, and there was no application of experimental psychology to teacher training and child study.⁷

James Mark Baldwin, Princeton psychologist and co-editor of Psychological Review, also criticized the child

⁶ Ibid., pp. 666-69.

⁷ Hugo Munsterberg, "Danger From Experimental Psychology," Atlantic Monthly, XXCI (January, 1898), pp. 159-67; "The Germans and Americans," Atlantic Monthly, XXCIV (July, 1899), pp. 396-407.

study movement. He regarded child study as a harmless fad. Baldwin stated that Hall's Pedagogical Seminary contained poor material. The experiments reported in it lacked scientific method and control. Rather than predict the evil consequences that Munsterberg declared happening, Baldwin saw these efforts as beneficial to those teachers who lacked sympathy toward their students. Still, he believed it was a sad commentary on the teaching profession that it needed this cultivation. In harmony with Munsterberg, Baldwin stressed the fact that psychological tables, curves, and findings could not speak for themselves. He doubted that teachers received any benefit from purchasing these find-⁸ings. Nicholas M. Butler saw merit in Munsterberg's charges and expressed views of caution about the possibility of a science of education.⁹ Munsterberg's views began a heated exchange between scholars and educators which continued in professional and popular journals well into the first decade of the new century.

Josiah Royce had continued his interest in psychology during the 1890's. Many times he expressed humility at his lack of psychological knowledge. Despite this, he became a

⁸James Mark Baldwin, "Child Study," Psychological Review, V (January, 1898), pp. 218-20.

⁹Nicholas M. Butler, "Editorial," Educational Review, IX (February, 1898), pp. 196-99.

member of American Psychological Association and gave many addresses on this subject to both psychologists and other scholarly groups. Munsterberg's charges created such a fervor that it was believed that Josiah Royce's speech to the NEA Convention of 1898 was a move to placate those who held¹⁰ opposing views. In his NEA address, Royce proposed that every school system should employ a consulting psychologist to work with teachers in their educational problems. "This would be a much better arrangement than having teachers¹¹ trained in poor courses of educational psychology."

The Science and Psychology of Education
Expressed as The Key to Educational Reform

The critics of a science of education in this last decade of the 19th century were a small minority. The full force of new pragmatists, experimentalists, and empiricists were on the threshold of winning their day in American education. The experimental methods and techniques employed by Col. Francis Parker at Cook County Normal received wide educational and popular press coverage. These results were¹² reported as advances in the science of education. G.

¹⁰"NEA Convention," Outlook, LVIV (July, 1898), p. 707.

¹¹Josiah Royce, "The New Psychology and the Consulting Psychologist," The Forum, XXVI (September, 1898), pp. 80-96.

¹²Francis W. Parker, Talks on Pedagogics, (New York: E. L. Kellogg and Co., 1894), p. 435.

Stanley Hall's work in child study popularized the conception of a science of education. Bold, aggressive, and forceful in both manner and speech, he optimistically predicted that the day was not far off when that which was morally correct would also be psychologically correct and education would be an exact science.¹³ The work of John and Alice Dewey in their laboratory school at the University of Chicago was extensively reported in educational publications. This work was reported as scientific in nature, and of the work of the school Dewey stated:

The conception underlying the school is that of a laboratory; it bears the same relation to work in pedagogy that a laboratory bears to biology, physics, or chemistry. Like any such laboratory, it has two main purposes: (1) to exhibit, test, verify, and criticize theoretical statements and principles; (2) to add to the sum of facts and principles in its special line.¹⁴

During this same period, Herbartianism was in vogue in the United States. Charles A. McMurray and Charles DeGarmo had studied Herbartian psychology at Jena and did much to spread the knowledge of this psychology.¹⁵

¹³William Edward, Clark University, 1889-1899, (Worcester, Mass.: Norwich Press, 1899), pp. 131-143.

¹⁴Fredrick Starr, "Science at University of Chicago," Popular Science Monthly, LI (October, 1897), pp. 799-800.

¹⁵Charles A. McMurray, The Elements of General Method Based on the Principles of Herbart. (New York: Macmillian Co., 1906); Charles DeGarmo, Herbart and Herbartians, (New York: Scribners, 1896).

At the turn of the century, the work of Edward Thorndike at Columbia Teachers College heralded an almost unqualified acceptance of psychology in education. In his work, Educational Psychology published in 1903, he predicted, "The science of education when it develops will be like other sciences, resting upon direct observations of, and experiments on the influence of educational institutions and methods, and may be reported with quantitative precision."¹⁶

These examples illustrate the force that psychology and science exerted on education. The perfection of science of education was to be the major task of university schools of education.

Many normal schools had developed experimental programs in education and psychology and criticism was being raised about their work in this area. Critics charged these schools were inadequate for experimentation. Their emphasis on mechanical methods and details obscured scientific foundations on which a science of education could be based. Michael V. O'Shea, professor of education at University of Wisconsin, in a speech before the NEA Convention of 1898 stated that only in a university could education take advantage of the research in biological science. A future teacher could only

16

Edward L. Thorndike, Educational Psychology (New York: Lemcke and Buechner, 1903), p. 164.

study human development properly in a university.¹⁷ Frank M. McMurray, psychologist and professor during the early years of Columbia Teachers College, expressed the view that it was the university properly equipped with practice schools which would vigorously apply the scientific method and show the way to the professional departments of normal schools. Only then could education hope to solve its pressing problems.¹⁸

G. Stanley Hall was continually stressing his lack of faith in normal schools for the preparation of teachers. He believed only the university could teach the expert scientific knowledge needed.¹⁹ Hall predicted that normal schools would attach themselves to universities. The consolidation of Col. Parker's institute with the University of Chicago and Teachers College with Columbia were examples of a coming trend.²⁰

¹⁷Michael V. O'Shea, "The Training of the High School Teacher," Proceedings and Addresses of the NEA (Washington, D.C., 1898), pp. 714-16.

¹⁸Frank M. McMurray, "Method of Solution of Educational Problems," Columbia Teachers College Record, V (May, 1904), p. 5.

¹⁹G. Stanley Hall, "Normal Schools Especially in Massachusetts," Pedagogical Seminary, IX (March, 1902), pp. 180-92.

²⁰G. Stanley Hall, "Relative Advantages and Limitations of Universities and Normal Schools in Preparing Secondary Teachers," The Education and Training of Secondary Teachers, Fourth Yearbook of the National Society for Scientific Study of Education, Part I, (Chicago, Ill.: University of Chicago Press, 1905), p.84.

The notion that a university school of education was to be a research laboratory was primary in the views of those who believed in the advancement of education as a scientific study. The articles and speeches stressed this point. In an article, "The Study of Pedagogics," Thomas M. Balliet, superintendent of Springfield, Massachusetts schools, later dean of the School of Pedagogy, New York University, stressed the need of a study of education as a science based on the new psychology. Second in importance was the empirical and experimental study of children. The studies themselves, Balliet advocated, must be carried out in model or practice schools attached to university schools of pedagogy.²¹

Nicholas Murray Butler repeated the same view in his Educational Review. The editorial stated that the incorporation of Teachers College with Columbia was of the highest importance to the cause of education in America. This incorporation was recognition of the fact that classroom instruction in the history and theory of education was inadequate to train successful teachers. The Teachers College with its school of observation and practice made it possible to study education from kindergarten to college level. The laboratories and libraries of both institutions could be utilized. In summary, Columbia was to provide the scholarly instruction

²¹ Thomas M. Balliet, "Study of Pedagogics," Education XIV (October, 1893), pp. 65-68.

and principles of education, and Teachers College the more technical courses and clinical instruction. It was predicted that this plan would be widely influential in this country and Europe.²²

John Dewey, in April, 1899, delivered a series of lectures in the home of Mrs. Emmons Blaine. Friends and interested persons had gathered to hear about the purposes of the Chicago Laboratory School. In this series of three lectures, later published as the first three chapters of School and Society, Dewey focused his attention on the work that the school wanted to do in the future.²³ The first two lectures were devoted to the work that had been accomplished in the school. In the final lecture, entitled "Waste in Education," Dewey presented his views on reform in teacher training. He believed the basis of reform must be the university. In the Middle Ages universities were essentially a cluster of professional schools. The universities, Dewey declared, had

²²

Butler, op. cit., p. 196-99.

²³

Unpublished diary of Mrs. Carlton Washbourne, April, 1899, pp. 159-61. This diary relates a personal view of the history of the reform movement in teacher training in Chicago of the 1890's. Mrs. Washbourne was a teacher in Col. Francis W. Parker's Cook County Normal. Parker left Cook County Normal in a disagreement with Chicago School Board over his teacher training methods. Carlton Washbourne, her son, and later a distinguished educator in his own right was a student at this school. Mrs. Washbourne and her family were an intimate part of Chicago educational circles.

not outlived all of their medieval traditions.²⁴ The technical and normal schools were products of the conditions of the 19th century. Technical schools were developed because of the needs of business, and normal schools were established because the society needed trained teachers.²⁵ Dewey argued that normal schools were in an anomalous position between the high schools and colleges. They required high school preparation for entrance and in their courses covered some college work. The normal schools were isolated from higher scholarship.

On the other hand, the colleges emphasized scholarship in isolation and contempt for methods of teaching. The college was isolated from the schools and children. College students became teachers with a great deal of subject matter at their command but with little knowledge on how it would be related to the children they were teaching. As a result of this cleavage each suffered.²⁶ The parts of the school system were separated, and the ideals differed. Moral development, practical utility, general culture, discipline, and professional training all represented some distinct part

²⁴ John Dewey, School and Society, (Chicago, Ill.: Chicago University Press, 1956), p. 67. Publishers' note on page 4 refers to first three chapters that were delivered as lectures at the home of Mrs. Blaine, in April, 1899.

²⁵ Ibid., pp. 69-70.

²⁶ Ibid., pp. 70-71.

of the system of education. As these parts interacted, each was supposed to offer a certain amount of culture, discipline, and utility. Lack of unity in education had splintered these aims until one study was considered good for discipline, and another for culture. The unity of education was dissipated. The different studies were used to secure different ends and the whole system was a patchwork and compromise.

The great problem in education was to secure unity.²⁷

Dewey's proposal was to unite each school to life. The total school system was to be related to the life of the home, natural environment, business life, industry, and to the university with its various resources of libraries, museums, and professional schools. The university spirit of inquiry²⁸ was to pervade the whole system of education.

He believed that the university school of education should be a model to work out unification. Its work was to extend from the most elementary, the four-year old child, to the most advanced, the graduate student. The university library and museum was the resource which would break down²⁹ the barriers.

Dewey criticized the work in teacher education at the

²⁷ Ibid., p. 72.

²⁸ Ibid., p. 79.

²⁹ Ibid., p. 92.

University of Michigan. He stated that it was a failure because it did not make a connection between theory and practice. At Michigan they taught by theory and lecture, referring to books rather than going through the actual work of teaching itself. Dewey argued that he desired a more intimate union between the professional school and the university when he stated:

The university putting all its resources at the disposition of the elementary schools contributing to the evolution of valuable subject matter, and right method while the school will be a laboratory in which the student of education sees theories and ideas demonstrated, tested, criticized, enforced, and the evolution of new truths. We want the school in relation to the university to be a working model of unified education. 30

In his final remarks Dewey outlined the functional purpose of the school. It would be experimental so that other schools would not have to experiment. The schools would have results that were tested, definitive, and positive to go by if they would care to use them. Experiment required favorable conditions in order to arrive at good results. The laboratory was the base of all great business enterprise. A working model, such as this school, was to demonstrate feasibility of an educational principle and the methods used to attain it.

30

Ibid., p. 93.

31

Ibid., p. 94.

By 1902 the importance of the new schools of education at Columbia and Chicago was recognized. In an address to the NEA Convention of that year, G. Stanley Hall called for model schools to be maintained at universities under trained experts such as John Dewey. Secondary teachers should be educated from a scientific standpoint and Columbia and Chicago were³² setting precedents in this regard. Other educators followed with high praises for the work of these schools. Their influence was to be felt in the establishment of schools of education at other universities.

The Views Expressed by Those Who Believed
Education and Psychology Compatible

The great romance of the 1890's was with the notion of science and its possibilities.³³ The educational reforms called for by The Forum editor Joseph M. Rice were based on the application of science to educational problems, and he hoped that science would make education a profession with the same status as medicine.³⁴ Munsterberg's public charges of

³² Hall, op. cit., p. 190-92.

³³ Clarence King, "Education of the Future," The Forum, XIII (March, 1892), pp. 20-33; G. Stanley Hall, "Child Study: The Basis of Exact Education," The Forum, XVI (December, 1893), pp. 429-41

³⁴ Joseph M. Rice, "Why Teachers Have No Professional Standing," The Forum, XXVII (June, 1899), pp. 452-63.

opposition only served to rally and focus attention on this question.

Dr. Charles Bliss, professor of psychology of the School of Pedagogy, New York University and a Yale graduate, answered Munsterberg's charges in a Forum article. He defended the notion that psychology was a matured discipline because it had now reached the textbook stage. The early experimental work was completed and the teaching profession was justified in expecting great things from this new science. Bliss defended his own work at New York University. This psychological training gave teachers a better insight into scientific and laboratory methods. With this knowledge, they understood the literature and the problems of psychology. Bliss argued that a psychology based on genetic lines needed to be developed, and child growth and development were a practical concern of the teaching profession.³⁵

Others protested Munsterberg's views. Wilbur Jackman, a member of the staff of Parker's new Chicago Institute, expressed doubt that the German aristocratic ideal of education was compatible with the American democratic ideal.³⁶

³⁵ Charles B. Bliss, "Munsterberg's Attack on Experimental Psychology," The Forum, XXV (March, 1898), pp. 214-23.

³⁶ Wilbur S. Jackman, "Discussion," Educational Review, XX (June, 1900), pp. 85-89.

Joseph Lee, in a later issue of the Educational Review, also defended the worth of the kindergarten against Munsterberg's charges of its destructive influence.³⁷

Among Munsterberg's fellow psychologists there were objections to his remarks. James McKeen Cattell stated that he believed that Munsterberg overstated his case when he claimed that psychical facts were not measurable and psychology was of no use to the teaching profession.³⁸ Edward L. Thorndike joined in the protest by stating that he resented being told a thing was incommunicable. In contrast, Thorndike encouraged teachers, normal schools, and child study societies to conduct psychological experiments.³⁹

Charles DeGarmo would not agree with Munsterberg's contention that education could not be a science. Experimental psychology may be of little value to the half-educated teacher but to say it is of no value at all was an extravagant claim according to DeGarmo.⁴⁰ These protests and Royce's

³⁷ Joseph Lee, "Munsterberg on the New Education," Educational Review, XX (September, 1900), pp. 123-40.

³⁸ James M. Cattell, "Munsterberg's Danger From Experimental Psychology," Psychological Review, V (July, 1898), pp. 411-13.

³⁹ Edward L. Thorndike, "What is a Psychical Fact?" Psychological Review, V (September, 1898), pp. 668-71.

⁴⁰ Charles DeGarmo, "Psychology and Education," Psychological Review, V (September, 1898), pp. 668-71.

speech before the 1898 NEA Convention proposing the staffing of schools with consulting psychologists brought reactions⁴¹ from educational and psychological circles.

As a member of the department of philosophy and psychology at Columbia, James McKeen Cattell wrote extensively. Cattell was a co-editor of the Psychological Review and later editor of the important Popular Science Monthly. In one of his articles, "The Progress of Psychology," Cattell presented his views on education. His central idea was that⁴² the progress of man was a result of the progress of science. On the relation of psychology to education he declared:

Our methods of education have been greatly altered in the past few years, and more changes will follow. But we go forward blindly, not seeing the way, often retracing our steps. The poor children contribute to the progress of educational methods somewhat as the frog contributes to the progress of physiology. But we can hope to replace vague surmises with exact knowledge. In our laboratories of psychology we can test the senses and faculties of children. We can determine whether the course of study is developing or stimulating fundamental characteristics such as accuracy of perception, quickness of thought, memory, reasoning, etc. We can learn what methods best strengthen each of these faculties without injuring others. ⁴³

⁴¹"Correspondence," Popular Science Monthly, LVII (May, 1900), pp. 210-12.

⁴²James M. Cattell, "The Progress of Psychology," Popular Science Monthly, XLIII (October, 1893), pp. 779-85.

⁴³Ibid., p. 783.

In Cattell's view psychology would be the key to solve all human problems. He stated:

Ultimately we shall be able to determine what distribution of labor, wealth, and power is best. Indeed, the measurements and statistics of psychology, which at the first sight may seem remote from common interests, may in the end become the most important factor in the progress of society. The whole course of life will move forward in straighter and broader channels when we no longer depend on instincts developed by the beast and savage, but on knowledge and reason guiding to an end. ⁴⁴

William James contributed to the notion of the values of university teacher training and psychology for teachers when he gave a series of lectures at Harvard beginning in 1892. These lectures were repeated many times to interested teachers at summer schools and institutes. Eventually, they were published in the Atlantic Monthly, and as a book entitled Talks to Teachers.

In the introduction to his first lecture James stressed the importance of psychology to American education. He believed that if reform was to take place it would come from the university where the "more reflective" members of the state resided. The movement then would spread outward and downward. American teachers had the future in their hands and American education in its organization was the best in the world. The state school systems gave education flexibility, diversity, opportunity to experiment, and competition

which was found nowhere else. The independence of colleges and universities, the give and take between students and instructors, were all cited by James to be better than the pure lecture systems of Germany and Scotland. Unlike many of his colleagues, James believed that the presence of both sexes in American higher education was a great benefit. James predicted that in a generation or two Americans would lead the world in education. These events would have a direct effect on the work of the psychologists. James declared, "The desire of the school teachers for complete professional training and their aspirations toward the profession spirit in their work have led them more and more to turn to us for light on fundamental principles."⁴⁵

James's lectures and writings did much to strengthen the cause for the professional training of teachers. Benjamin Gruenberg estimated that nine-tenths of the teachers who studied psychology read James's Principles of Psychology.⁴⁶ His Talks to Teachers ran through many printings. It was because of James's influence that Thorndike, as a student at Harvard, dropped literature in favor of psychology.⁴⁷

⁴⁵William James, "Talks to Teachers on Psychology," Atlantic Monthly, LXXIII (January, 1899), pp. 152-62.

⁴⁶Benjamin Gruenberg, "William James," Scientific American, CIII (September, 1910), p. 198.

⁴⁷Edward L. Thorndike, Selected Writings From A Connectionist's Psychology, (New York: Appelton-Century-Crofts, 1949), pp. 1-2.

Dewey also gave credit to James for transforming his thinking from the idealism of Kant and Hegel to his own philosophy.⁴⁸

By the turn of the century a tangible event, the establishment of the American Society for the Scientific Study of Education bore witness to the fact that science was expected to play a major role in solving educational problems. The society was founded in 1902 as part of the Department of Superintendence of the NEA. John Dewey was elected chairman, and Micheal V. O'Shea of the University of Wisconsin was elected secretary.⁴⁹

These views of Hall, DeGarmo, O'Shea, Dewey, James, Cattell, Thorndike, and others pointed to a wedding of education with science. If education was to be accepted as a university study for teacher training, it was to be accepted on its scientific basis. The university schools of education in their early years met this challenge.

The university spirit was dedicated to pushing back the frontiers of all knowledge. The psychology and science of education had evolved from the university discipline of philosophy. If a science of education was discoverable it

⁴⁸ Jane M. Dewey, ed., "Biography of John Dewey," in Paul A. Schilpp: The Philosophy of John Dewey (New York: Tudor Publishing Co., 1951), pp. 3-45.

⁴⁹ "Societies for Scientific Study of Education," Popular Science Monthly, LXI (May, 1902), p. 92.

would be discovered in the university laboratories and research facilities. The only institution which could adapt new knowledge and conduct research in the process of education was a school of education. These first schools of education were products of this university spirit and were staffed by men who exemplified this spirit of research.

The American university had absorbed the liberal arts tradition of the American college. This humanistic tradition was modified and fused with professional education. The struggle and eventual wedding of the two forms of education had an effect on university schools of education. This is the subject of the next chapter.

CHAPTER SIX

THE ROLE OF LIBERAL EDUCATION AND UNIVERSITY SCHOOLS OF EDUCATION

University schools of education would have to work out an acceptable arrangement between the established university curriculum and its offerings. The oldest curriculum was that of liberal arts based on the traditional English university and college programs. In its adaptation to American culture it had undergone change all during the 19th century.

The demands of scientific technical education resulting from America's conversion into an industrial society created great pressures which reshaped the liberal arts program. As a result, many people attached to liberal education came to its defense. Some of the debate centered around university schools of education and the professional training of teachers.¹

This transition in American higher education was observed by James Bryce in his study American Commonwealth. He classified three major types of American universities: first,

¹Charles Kendall Adams, "The Next Step in Education," The Forum, X (February, 1891), pp. 618-32. Daniel C. Gilman, "The Shortening of the College Curriculum," Educational Review, I (March, 1891), pp. 1-7. Nicholas Murray Butler, "Professional Schools and American College," Educational Review, XXIV (December, 1902), pp. 503-17. Department of Higher Education, "The Length of the Baccalaureate Course and the Preparation for Professional Schools," Proceedings and Addresses of the NEA (Boston, Mass., 1903), pp. 487-516.

the English university typified by the great traditional schools of New England; second, the newly established German model universities such as Johns Hopkins, Clark, and Chicago; third, the developing hybrid type which grafted the German model to the English such as Harvard and Columbia. In Bryce's opinion this transition was the major problem of American higher education.²

Among the educators who supported liberal education there were divergent views on the relationship between teacher education and liberal education. The first part of the chapter will deal with the views of those critics who thought that teacher education had no place in the college and university curriculum. The second part of the chapter will deal with the views of educators who believed that schools of education should be established at universities to take advantage of the liberal education offered by these institutions. The views expressed by the third group of educators will demonstrate that important men of the period believed in the value of a liberal education as a prerequisite to professional education. Their views gave support to educators who wanted university schools of education.

² James Bryce, American Commonwealth, (London: MacMillan and Co., 1889), II, pp. 542-44.

Liberal Education is Higher Education

Charles W. Eliot's curriculum reforms at Harvard were not readily accepted by the other great New England colleges. There was opposition and Yale was typical. As late as 1897, Timothy Dwight, president of Yale, stated opposing views for a series of articles in the Cosmopolitan magazine called "Modern Education." He argued that college education was a four-year course, not vocational or professional training. The college was a society of scholars who trained youth in mental discipline to produce thinking men. Liberal education was the only way to accomplish this task. There was no need for professional schools in the university, but the real need of the nation was for broadly trained men.³

This liberally educated man was described by James Russell Lowell in an address given at Harvard celebrating its first two hundred and fifty years as a school. He stated:

I had rather the college should turn out one of Aristotle's four-square men, capable of holding his own in whatever field he may cast, than a score of lop-sided ones developed abnormally in one direction. Our scheme should be adapted to the wants of the majority of undergraduates, to objects that draw them hither, and to such training as they will make the most of them after they come. Special aptitudes are sure to take care of themselves, but the latent possibilities of the average mind can

3

Timothy Dwight, "Modern College Education," Cosmopolitan, XXIII (August, 1897), pp. 437-45.

only be discovered by experiment in many directions. ⁴

The editors of The Nation endorsed Lowell's ideas. They stated that the university may produce the specialist scholar, but the nation needed good citizens and "four-square" men to grapple with the problems of the 20th century. ⁵

Harry Thurston Peck of Columbia expressed the view that the German influence in education had been good in so far as teaching Americans the practical and scientific value of thoroughness, but the Germans had also given us the "cult of the formula," which reduced education to logarithm tables. The elective system was a dumping ground. The old college was superior in its lofty conception of liberal education. Scholarship had now become degraded. Education was not meant for all, but only the intellectual aristocracy. ⁶

If the arguments of some of the liberal arts advocates indicated that liberal education was superior to professional and vocational education, Barrett Wendell, professor of English at Harvard, left no doubt in this regard. In a colorful article in the North American Review he expressed his views about the trends toward science and university

⁴"The Yale Bicentenary," The Nation, (October 24, 1901), pp. 317-19.

⁵Ibid., p. 319.

⁶Harry Thurston Peck, "Modern Education," Cosmopolitan, XXIII, (July, 1897), pp. 263-71.

professional schools.⁷ He argued that in our culture the word education was undefined and very indefinite. Still, Americans looked to education as the cure-all of all national ills. It had become our national superstition.

Looking at American history, Wendell argued since we were an experiment in democracy we gave most of our political power to lawyers in the early days. The lawyers, as a result, availed themselves of every educational opportunity and became the intellectual aristocracy. The secret of the lawyer's success lay in their thorough education. Their education was based on traditions of the Renaissance and the acquisition of Latin, Greek, and mathematics. These lawyers did not become experts in their studies. At the end of their courses they could only reproduce what they had studied for examinations. Because this reproduction of memory was preposterous to many people, there was educational⁸ reform.

The educators replaced Latin grammar with English and mathematics with nature study. As a result, education from the elementary school to the university was based on the principle of the kindergarten. The elective system based on letting the student do what he liked produced "paper

⁷Barrett Wendell, "Our National Superstition," North American Review, CLXXIX, (July, 1904), p. 388.

⁸Ibid., p. 394.

cutters." These educators with their new methods and subjects did not produce higher standards. Now, students only knew English as well as they used to know their Latin. The new college student was becoming "flabbier and flabbier" in the mind.

Wendell admitted that he never ceased to resent the fact that after ten years of work with Latin and six years with Greek he could not read a page of either language. He claimed his friends were in the same circumstances, but if he was ill-educated, today's youth were not educated at all.⁹ Education, for Wendell, became a matter of information and training. The practical aim of a general education was to have a student devote his faculties to matters, which of themselves had no interest to him. The faculty of voluntary attention had distinguished the American lawyer of the 19th century, and the student of thirty years ago at Harvard. This method was superior to today's kindergarten principles. The classics and mathematics were tyrannical. Worship of the classics may have been an educational superstition, but the newer educational superstition "that bowed at the knee of pedagogics was more mischievously idolatrous."¹⁰

These notions of faculty psychology were common. The

⁹ Ibid., pp. 396-97.

¹⁰ Ibid., p. 401.

charge was frequently made that the country was suffering from educational psychology. An editorial in The Century on the teaching of English commented that this new education was moonshine. Natural born teachers did not need elaborate apparatus. The two things that made a successful teacher were knowledge of subject matter and common sense. The only reform needed in secondary schools was English teachers of real culture, then the problems of English composition would be solved.¹¹ Another example of the conservative reaction to these new reform movements in teacher education was the reception of the announcement that a school of pedagogy was included in the plans of the new University of Chicago if money was available. An editorial of The Nation declared that even though there might be some precedent for such a school, it was unnecessary. A teacher could never be taught how to teach. A student received all of the education necessary from the regular university curriculum and a few theory courses in education.¹² Many critics looked on schools of education as interlopers in higher education. They expressed their resistance to them. The real issue these friends of liberal education had to face was not the inclusion of professional schools, but how to make these

¹¹"Two Ways of Teaching English," Century, LI (November, 1895), p. 739.

¹²"Innovations at University of Chicago," The Nation, October 6, 1892, p. 255.

two concepts of education compatible.

University School of Education and Its
Compatibility to Liberal Education

There were many friends of liberal education who believed that schools of education should be established at universities. One of these was Bishop John Lancaster Spalding of Peoria, the most outstanding church educator of the 1890's. He was one of the leading educational reformers in the NEA. Along with Bishop John Ireland, he tried to make Catholic education compatible with public education.¹³ In 1889 he organized and raised the money to establish the first Catholic graduate school, Catholic University of America.¹⁴ Spalding also established the first Catholic normal schools and was interested in the upgrading of teacher education by bringing it into the university setting. He was involved with all phases of educational and social reform.

Bishop Spalding's views of teacher education mirrored his own religiously centered viewpoint. The discoveries in science, new knowledge, and evolution, in Spalding's view,

¹³ John Ireland, "State Schools and Parish Schools--
Is Union Between Them Impossible," Proceedings and Addresses
of the NEA (St. Paul, Minn., 1890), pp. 179-99.

¹⁴ "Commencement Day 1902," Columbia University Quarterly,
IV (September, 1902), pp. 365-66.

meant that life was in the process of a progressing organic unity. These new findings gave us the law of progress. All things were interdependent and God had revealed himself in these new findings. The new insights in truth, Spalding declared, had shown that ignorance was slavery and the ignorant were the subjects of tryanny and oppression.¹⁵ Man's genuine progress was spiritual and piety was indispensable for this life and the next.¹⁶ The American people's love of liberty and religion was preserved by those principles from which it had sprung. These principles had to be implanted in generation after generation. This was to be done through universal education. The great importance of the school and universal education pointed to an appreciation of the teacher's office.¹⁷

The teacher, in Spalding's view, was not a pedagog, but a co-operator with God to regenerate the world. Teaching was a learned profession, and if a learned profession was performed in the right manner there would be little law breaking, disease, sin, or ignorance. Thus, a teacher needed

¹⁵John Lancaster Spalding, "The Development of Educational Ideas in the Nineteenth Century," Educational Review, XVIII (November, 1904), p. 335.

¹⁶John Lancaster Spalding, "Progress in Education," Proceedings and Addresses of the NEA (Detroit, Michigan, 1901), p. 85.

¹⁷Spalding, "The Development of Educational Ideas in the Nineteenth Century," p. 341.

a liberal education which gave the highest faith, the truest knowledge, and the greatest love. He also had to be familiar with the practical and theoretical considerations of his work. Teachers who were exemplars of manhood would have¹⁸ children learn by their imitation of the teacher. Teachers received their best education in a university. The whole question of reform and progress in education was simply the employment of good teachers and the removal of poor teachers. The university was the home of great teachers or it was not a university at all. Buildings, endowments, libraries, laboratories, and students were all symbols of this "luxur-¹⁹ iant climate" where the "spirit of man was divine." Spalding declared that the normal schools rendered great service, but at best were insufficient. The affiliation of teachers' colleges with universities on a par with faculties of law, medicine, or theology would create a new race of²⁰ professional teachers.

James E. Russell, first dean of Teachers College, Columbia University, (1898-1927) was also a strong advocate of liberal education for teachers. Russell's college

18

Ibid., p. 341.

19 John Lancaster Spalding, "The University and the Teacher," Reports of the Commissioner of Education, I (Washington, D.C.: U.S. Government Printing Office, 1899), p. 634.

20

Spalding, "Progress in Education," p. 82.

education was received at Cornell. The two teachers that impressed him the most were Jacob G. Schurman in philosophy and Benjamin Ide Wheeler in Greek. After college, Russell taught Greek and later managed a boy's preparatory school. Russell stated that the ideals of teaching he had acquired at Cornell crumbled when he became a teacher. The only concern the parents of his students seemed to have was to have their sons pass the college entrance examinations. Russell's classes became drill exercises for the preparation of these examinations. He was so concerned he resigned his position and traveled to Europe to study their schools to see if there were any educational methods they used that would be adaptable to American schools. Some critics were saying that the German school system should be adopted in this country, but Russell found German education unsatisfactory. He believed they had not harmonized theory and practice as they had claimed. The university had little effect on the lower school system which was dominated and controlled by an autocratic government. Russell concluded that German ideals were foreign to American ideals and there would be very little that could be adopted.

Upon his return to the United States, Russell took a

²¹
 York: James E. Russell, Founding Teachers College, (New
 14-18. Teachers College, Columbia University, 1937), pp.

position with the new University of Colorado. Soon after, he was summoned to New York by his old Greek professor Benjamin Wheeler to become a member of the faculty of Teachers College. Wheeler had consented to become its new president. When Russell arrived he discovered that Wheeler had changed his mind. Russell was asked to be the new head, and he accepted on condition that the school would be consolidated with Columbia University. President Low and the trustees agreed to the affiliation if Russell would be the dean for at least one year. He agreed and Teachers College was affiliated with Columbia in 1898.

The summer of 1899, Russell addressed the Department of Superintendence of the NEA on the subject of teacher training.²² Russell noted that these were rapidly changing times in educational practice. The high school not long ago was a preparatory academy for the college. At one time all a high school teacher needed to know was what the college required for entrance. The teacher knew this from his own college experience. The only demand was usually a good knowledge of Greek and Latin and a college graduate with classical training could supply it.

Now, the high school curriculum had expanded to such a degree that the present day college was an inadequate

²²James E. Russell, "The Training of Teachers for Secondary Schools," Proceedings and Addresses of the NEA, (Columbus, Ohio, 1899), p. 285.

training source for teachers. Even a normal school graduate was preferred to the college graduate who had taken a "maze of electives."²³ Russell argued that both the college graduate and normal school graduate were inadequate. The only hope lay in the introduction of a professionally trained teacher especially educated for the secondary schools. Only university schools of education and departments of pedagogy²⁴ could make this possible.

Russell had four criteria for the ideal preparation of teachers: (1) general knowledge, (2) professional knowledge, (3) special knowledge, and (4) skill in teaching. General knowledge was a liberal education of at least four years in advance of the grades to be taught. Professional knowledge was the teacher's ability in his own particular subject and the courses of professional instruction. The minimum of professional knowledge consisted of psychology of education, history of education, and philosophy of education.²⁵

Special knowledge, Russell argued, would be the scholarship that was required by a teacher in his special field. Russell denounced textbooks as crutches for dull routine

²³Ibid., p. 286.

²⁴Ibid., p. 286.

²⁵Ibid., pp. 288-89.

teaching. He cited the case of a high school principal who undertook the teaching of Latin in his school after a six-weeks' summer course. Russell exclaimed, "What a travesty on classical instruction!"²⁶

The final point was teaching skill. Russell warned that much of the judgment of a teacher's skill was based on non-essentials such as classroom order, satisfaction of parents or examiners, neat rooms, and records. A teacher's real capability was an interdependence of his liberal education, professional training, scholarship, and the ability to impart knowledge in such a way as to broaden the horizon of his pupils, extend their interests, strengthen character, and arouse them to lead a "pure, noble, and unselfish life." Russell stated he acquired these ideas in Germany where university teacher training was established. The teachers in Germany had superior training. In America there were no specific requirements, and the weaker schools had unqualified teachers.²⁷

Russell predicted schools of education would be established at universities in America. He outlined his program for such schools. The school must have degree-granting status. Its teachers would be college graduates and certified to teach only in those subjects in which they were

²⁶Ibid., pp. 288-89.

²⁷Ibid., p. 290.

qualified. Russell concluded that this plan was no utopian dream but was being realized at Columbia University and it could work anywhere. His statement became one of fact. The work at Teachers College influenced the establishment of²⁸ other schools of education.

By 1905 it was recognized that there were four university schools of education: Teachers College, Columbia; School of Education, University of Chicago; Teachers College, University of Missouri; and College of Education, University of Texas.²⁹ In the NEA Convention of the same year, while normal school people and professors of education debated the subject of teacher training in the Normal Department, the Department of Higher Education was the scene of an address by the new dean of Teachers College, University of Missouri, Albert Ross Hill. The subject of his address was, "Should Chairs of Pedagogy Attached to College Departments of Universities be Developed into Professional Colleges for the Training of Teachers, Co-ordinate with Those of Law, Medi-

²⁸

Ibid., pp. 295-96.

²⁹

"Provision for Education of Secondary Teachers," The Education and Training of Secondary Teachers, Fourth Year-book of National Society for Scientific Study of Education, Part I (Chicago, Ill.: University of Chicago Press, 1905), p. 65. The article expressed doubt as to status of College of Education, University of Texas as a professional school.

cine, and Engineering, or Should They be Abolished?"³⁰

Hill, of course, urged the abolition of chairs of education in favor of separate schools. He argued that educational problems were the most important social problems and they demanded the consideration of every citizen. Courses in philosophy of education and educational psychology established educational aims and values which gave meaning to education and to the history of social progress. These subjects had the same right to be included in a scheme of liberal education as courses in general philosophy, ethics, and sociology.

Hill believed that a teacher needed a liberal education and the technical training of his profession. The technical aspects of instruction, theory of teaching, special methods, organization, management of schools, observation, and practice teaching called for a distinct professional school. This school would give teachers the same professional spirit as the graduates of the schools of medicine,³¹ law, and engineering.

In his concluding remarks Hill urged that the school of

³⁰Albert Ross Hill, "Should Chairs of Pedagogy Be Attached to College Departments of Universities Be Developed Into Professional Colleges for the Training of Teachers, Coordinate With Those of Law, Medicine, and Engineering, Or Should They be Abolished?" Proceedings and Addresses of the NEA (Asbury Park, N.J., 1905), p. 514.

³¹Ibid., p. 514.

education should be a professional school beginning in a student's junior year. He thought it advisable to begin courses in the teachers' college at the same level as courses in the other professions. The college would have the same relationship to the college of liberal arts as the other professional schools. The school was to train for all grades of school work and give attention to graduate study in education with the aim of producing leaders in educational thought and practice.³² Hill's remarks were prophetic. As public universities established schools of education, they developed in the pattern predicted by Dean Hill.

Liberal Education and Professional Training

The structure of the new American university was well established by the 1890's. In the last quarter of the century there had been a concerted movement by the administrations of these universities to bring professional schools into closer harmony with the university program. The momentum of this movement continued through the 1890's. One of the demands that had an effect on the establishment of schools of education was the argument that a professional school should require a prerequisite liberal education from its students. These views would give weight to the notion that teacher training was incomplete without liberal educa-

³²Ibid., p. 515.

tion and the university was the institution to harmonize the two programs.

In 1893 a World Congress of Education was held in conjunction with the Columbian Exposition at Chicago. Woodrow Wilson, then professor of law at Princeton, addressed the assembly on the issue of liberal education as a prerequisite to professional education.³³ He stated it was a disgrace that at Harvard, America's oldest and richest university, only the theological school required a prerequisite of liberal arts study. He also believed that if the same was required of Harvard medical students they would leave. The people were now demanding more education and the professional man needed a liberal education. The universities or professional schools could not exist without the support of the society, but they were independent and the people lacked the power to consolidate them. He proposed that the prominent universities establish their own professional schools, with high standards of liberal education required before professional training would be permitted.

In conclusion Wilson declared that this separation of general and special training was the disease of education.

³³ Woodrow Wilson, "Should Antecedent Liberal Education be Required of Students in Law, Medicine, and Theology?" Proceedings and Addresses of the NEA (Chicago, Ill. 1893), p. 115.

The professional man was being hampered by partial knowledge. Knowledge was trustworthy only when it was balanced and complete. Knowledge must be kept together,³⁴ and our professional schools must be university schools. In a later session of this same convention, Daniel Fulcomer president of Michigan College addressed the assembly predicting that the ideal normal school of the future would be a university school requiring at least three years of liberal education³⁵ as a prerequisite.

College presidents made the same general appeal during the 1890's. William DeWitt Hyde of Bowdoin College expressed the view that what the country needed was not greater numbers of teachers, but scholars who carried on their studies far ahead of the students they wished to teach. No pedagogical theory or method could save a teacher from failure if he did not possess broad scholarship. The college should be the institution to provide this work and send its graduates on to the university for advanced study. The university people should not allow students in professional schools without college training. Without a broad liberal education

³⁴
Ibid., p. 117.

³⁵
Daniel E. Fulcomer, "A Sociological Ideal View of Normal Schools," Proceedings and Addresses of the NEA (Chicago, Ill., 1893), pp. 423-27.

the professions would deteriorate into trades.³⁶

Yale had been considered the most conservative of the great New England colleges. By the turn of the century with a new president, Arthur T. Hadley, Yale was modifying its organizational pattern to accept professional schools. Yale became a university with the addition of schools of science, law, medicine, music, fine arts, and forestry.³⁷ Hadley argued for liberal education as a prerequisite for professional training. He believed that modern studies came easier to the student who had a good background in the classics. Latin and Greek were no longer necessary, but³⁸ man needed the primary fundamentals of a liberal education. The individual should have a liberal education as this was the sum total of the world's experience. Classical education and mathematics had the advantage of offering permanent standards of excellence. The English universities, Hadley argued, did not spend enough time on professional education. Germany and France crowded the liberal arts into the secondary schools by their emphasis of technical education in

³⁶William DeWitt Hyde, "The Organization of American Education," Proceedings and Addresses of the NEA (Saratoga Springs, N.Y., 1892), pp. 228-29.

³⁷"Yale Bicentenary," The Nation, October 14, 1901, pp. 318-19.

³⁸Arthur T. Hadley, "The Meaning and Purpose of Secondary Education," School Review, X (December, 1902), pp. 729-41.

higher institutions.

Hadley observed that Americans tended to tack the two together making education both long and expensive. All the great universities were experimenting, and Hadley optimistically predicted that the proper combination would evolve.³⁹

There were other professors of the New England colleges who were in substantial agreement with their presidents. Professor Sloane of Princeton stated that his institution had achieved the mean between the conservatism of Yale and the radical elective curriculum of Harvard. The aim of Princeton was an aristocracy of broadly trained scholars. Science and engineering students at Princeton received a liberal arts education. The students participated in a liberal education by living together. As a result, there was no dichotomy between the professional and liberal.⁴⁰

George Trumball Ladd, professor at Yale, observed that the content of the liberal arts was growing, changing, and developing with the times. As the high schools were improving, Ladd argued, the liberal education in college should shift its emphasis to modern languages and natural science.

³⁹ Arthur T. Hadley, "Modern Education," Cosmopolitan, XXVIII, (November, 1899), pp. 104-13.

⁴⁰ W.M. Sloane, "Princeton University," Harper's, XXCI (November, 1890), pp. 886-900.

This was a necessary adjustment to a "modern liberal education."⁴¹ Ladd stressed that the most modern equipment and methods should be incorporated into liberal arts studies. Much of the objection to classical studies was based on obsolete methods which made them repugnant. He suggested three groups of new essentials: language and literature, mathematics and natural science, and psychology and philosophy. Instructors should have the knowledge of specialists and the widest intellectual interests and sympathies.⁴² The superior man, in Ladd's view, was the liberally educated specialist who possessed the fundamentals of a liberal education and had given special attention toward the mastery of one of them. Ladd warned that the national destiny was based on universal education.⁴³

The end of the 19th century witnessed the triple impact of expanding knowledge, scientific research, and philosophical speculation, which affected liberal education, institutions, and scholars. The prestige of the Ph.D. degree, American preference for German scholarship, educational devices such as the laboratory, seminar, thesis, and lecture

⁴¹ George Trumball Ladd, "The Essentials of a Modern Liberal Education," Educational Review, X (October, 1895), p. 234.

⁴² Ibid., pp. 235-36.

⁴³ Ibid., p. 238.

system led to great changes. The traditional curriculum, ill-defined and indefinite, crumbled or shifted its foundations.

Liberal education, even with differences in definition of content and purpose, had many friends both scholarly and professional. They saw merit in a man being aware of the great thoughts of the ages, making effective use of language, possessing the faculty to think critically, and judging intelligently the world and his relation to it. Liberal education had a historical tradition, heritage, and high purpose. It was logical that it would continue to find a place in higher education.

Many educators who argued for university schools of education also were products of its culture and wanted teachers to enjoy its benefits. They believed that a teacher would be a better professional person with a liberal education. The problem of reconciling professional teacher preparation with liberal education was a question of degree, not of principle. Those who desired professional schools of education at universities believed both forms of education would be beneficial. The school of education was part of the general movement to incorporate professional training into the university.

If universities were to establish schools of education, they would have to be in harmony with the goals of the parent institution. The American university was a new

institution. The presidents of these institutions expressed their views publicly on the role of the university and schools of education. The views they expressed is the subject of the next chapter. The ideas of these educators shaped the character of the new American university.

CHAPTER SEVEN

THE STUDY OF EDUCATION AS EXPRESSED BY THE VIEWS OF THE NEW UNIVERSITY PRESIDENTS

The period following the Civil War heralded the beginning of the American university. It was copied from the German university which American scholars greatly admired. The American university builders made trips to Europe before launching their own American ventures. Daniel Coit Gilman, G. Stanley Hall, Charles W. Eliot, and William R. Harper were examples of those organizers who went abroad. It is interesting to note, however, that the university they envisioned was not a direct transplant of the German model. They admired the Germans, sought the wisdom of their experience, and adopted their university methods and procedures. They were also aware that the people, government, geography, and culture were different and that the German model needed¹ modification to exist in America. They realized that this institution should have an American character. By the turn of the century, although there was a variation in American universities because of their historical antecedents, the basic criteria of a university were established.² There were three essentials: (1) service to the society, (2)

¹Nicholas M. Butler, "President Gilman's Administration at the Johns Hopkins University," Review of Reviews, XXIII (January, 1901), p. 49.

²Ibid., p. 49.

research of high excellence in general and professional fields to both conserve and advance knowledge, and (3) dissemination of this knowledge for social progress.³

Generally, it was the views held by these university presidents that decided the fate of teacher education at these institutions. Their views were varied but the role of a university was so broadly defined that schools of education were easily incorporated. Among the university presidents, views of opposition were not as intense as were the views expressed by normal school people or advocates of the traditional liberal arts program. German universities trained teachers and this fact did much to temper the feeling toward teacher education. American university schools of education would be a cultural modification. In a German university, teacher education was conducted under the faculty of philosophy which included both pedagogy and psychology. Nevertheless, a school of education was not a radical modification in the American university. In this same period, universities established traditional schools of law, medicine, and theology, and many other new schools in economics,

³"Addresses at the Installation of President Butler of Columbia," Report of Commissioner of Education, I (Washington, D.C.: U.S. Government Printing Office, 1902), pp. 623-31. An excellent consensus of the definition of a university is available from these addresses at Butler's inauguration. Butler of Columbia, Eliot of Harvard, Patton of Princeton, Harper of Chicago, and W.T. Harris all spoke on the nature of American universities.

agriculture, engineering, dentistry, music, library science, and pharmacy plus some to meet even local situations.⁴

As with the other groups, the university presidents expressed three basic differences of opinion on these schools. The first group opposed education as part of the proper curriculum of the university. The views expressed by the second group endorsed and promoted the idea of a university school of education. The third group expressed views that would allow for the establishment of schools of education because of the broad definition they gave to the role of an American university.

The Views Expressed By Presidents Opposed to University Study of Education

In 1890 Charles W. Eliot opposed the inclusion of teacher education in the curriculum at Harvard. As a result of the negative report of Royce's committee, Eliot announced that in his opinion and the opinion of his faculty there was only a slight interest and confidence in pedagogy. Furthermore, most of the teachers in the United States and England agreed with this view.⁵ Nevertheless, by the summer of

⁴Edmund J. James, "What the New President is Planning For the University of Illinois," Review of Reviews, XXXII (October, 1905), pp. 441-43. This article shows the diversity and variety of professional schools at a state university at the turn of the century.

⁵"Slight Confidence in Pedagogy," Report of the Commissioner of Education 1890-91 (Washington, D.C., 1891), p.1076.

1891 it was announced that Dr. Paul Hanus had been retained to teach the history, theory, and art of teaching.⁶

Hanus believed he was appointed because of the possibility that a new normal college was going to be established in Boston. The establishment of such a school was proposed to the state superintendent a year before at an educators' meeting. The purpose of the school was to train college graduates for teaching. Hanus thought Eliot organized this new department to counter such a move.⁷ The Nation magazine also reported that this was Eliot's motive.⁸ Although these might have been the reasons, they did not take into account Eliot's growing interest in educational problems at all levels. His work on the Committee of Ten and the National Council of Education contributed to an awareness of the importance of teacher education.⁹

In an address entitled, "The Unity of Educational Reform," Eliot defended the right of university and college people to actively enter in reform of secondary education.

⁶"Announcement of Courses of Instruction at Harvard," The Nation, July 25, 1891, p. 519.

⁷Paul Hanus, Adventuring in Education (Cambridge, Harvard University Press, 1937), pp. 108-9.

⁸"Announcement of Courses of Instruction at Harvard," op. cit., p. 519.

⁹"National Council of Education," Proceedings and Addresses of the NEA (Saratoga Springs, N.Y., 1892), p. 749.

Eliot argued that all education from the kindergarten to the university was in principle the same. Education was a matter of training the senses in observation, memory, expression, and thinking. The elective system would work better in lower grades than at the university. Specialization in teaching was becoming more a part of education at all levels, and to improve teaching, normal schools had to be upgraded and departments of education created or strengthened in all colleges and universities.¹⁰ At the inauguration of Nicholas M. Butler as president of Columbia in 1902, Eliot in his address of response endorsed the establishment of schools of education. He believed Butler was becoming president at a fortunate time because he could be instrumental in making Columbia a true university. The professional schools, Eliot predicted, would be based on departments that offer liberal arts and the sciences. When all leading universities required a liberal arts degree as a prerequisite for entrance to the professional schools of law, medicine, divinity, teaching, architecture, and applied science the liberal arts would get the support they needed from the university, and the professions would gain members who had strong professional training and a broad cultural

10

Charles W. Eliot, "The Unity of Educational Reform," Report of the Commissioner of Education, 1892-93 (Washington, D.C., 1894), pp. 1465-73.

background.¹¹ Eliot was an example of a university president who changed his point of view toward teacher education. He was considered the most powerful university president in the nation by his colleagues and a leader in educational reform.¹²

Daniel Coit Gilman, first president of Johns Hopkins, expressed a lack of faith in teacher training despite the fact that he had a outstanding career as a teacher and administrator. Gilman stated that school teachers were born and not made. Educational methods would produce scholars, pedants, and specialists who could patiently produce minute research, but no process had been discovered to make teachers. Gilman believed in faculty psychology and education as a character training. He claimed the sciences of psychology and physiology were not advanced enough to help teachers. The teacher, for Gilman, was the "all around man" whose manners, morals, and intellectual ways were exemplary. He would know and could teach the classics. Specialists trained only in mathematics, physics, or as linguists were incomplete men. Only specialists with a broad education should be allowed to teach.¹³

¹¹"Addresses at the Installation of President Butler of Columbia University," op. cit., pp. 622-23.

¹²Nicholas M. Butler, Across Busy Years, I (New York: Scribners and Sons, 1939), pp. 204-206.

¹³Daniel Coit Gilman, "A Discourse on Boys and Boy's Schools," Cosmopolitan, XII (April, 1891), pp. 461-70.

Gilman proposed a revised liberal arts curriculum based on the study of science and modern foreign languages.¹⁴ He also argued for a strong liberal education before training in the professional schools to lift law and medicine above the status of trade schools.¹⁵ Electives, to Gilman, were an evil, but he also believed that there was no absolute formula for the best education. He expressed the hope that in the next fifty years a solution would evolve to relieve the present defects of an unprepared college graduate because he had taken too many electives.¹⁶ Gilman, an important figure in the university movement, was considered a conservative in educational reform.

The Views Expressed by New University
Presidents for Schools of Education

The same month, April, 1899, that John Dewey delivered his influential lectures on The School and Society at Mrs. Blaine's home, the Cosmopolitan magazine published an article by William R. Harper entitled, "The University and Democracy." As president of the University of Chicago, Harper presented his views on a university. The role of a univer-

¹⁴Ibid., 469.

¹⁵Daniel C. Gilman, "Modern Education," Cosmopolitan, XXIII (May, 1897), p. 36.

¹⁶Ibid., p. 37.

sity was the same as that of the government, a service to uplift and advance humanity. Harper argued that the university had its birth in the democratic ideal and throughout its history it was a self-governing association of men for the purpose of study. As an institution it was chartered by the state for the guidance of the people, and was an agency for resolving the problems of civilization. The university furnished guidance to the public in decision-making and leaders in the different callings of life.¹⁷

If the university was the seat of the highest educational work, Harper argued, it was the highest function of the university to prepare teachers. The university should have included all educational work from the college to the kindergarten. The true university should have brought its power to bear on educational problems of every grade. This would have made the university an integral part of the public school system. University ideals controlled the development of all the schools under it. Therefore, the university could not be aloof, nor could schools and colleges shut out the university influence because they shared in the same important task. Harper concluded that education was the basis of all democratic progress. Its problems were the

¹⁷ William R. Harper, "The University and Democracy," Cosmopolitan, XXVI (April, 1899), pp.681-91.

problems of democracy.¹⁸

These were the views of a university president committed to a multi-purpose institution of higher education. The work of Harper in the establishment of the University of Chicago was the embodiment of these broad educational aims.

Nicholas Murray Butler was a product of the educational transition of the 1890's. As a young lad from Patterson, New Jersey, he entered Columbia at the age of sixteen. He spent the rest of his life at this institution, receiving his undergraduate degree at twenty, master's at twenty-one, and his Ph.D. in philosophy at twenty-two. He was first an assistant and tutor in philosophy, later a professor and dean of the faculty of philosophy from 1890-1901, and finally president from 1902 to 1945.¹⁹

Columbia was Butler's life work, but his other educational interests were varied. In 1886 he helped establish and was the first president of the New York College for the Training of Teachers (Teachers College), during the first five years of its operation. He was a member of the New Jersey State Board of Education from 1887-95, and president of the Patterson, New Jersey, school board in 1892-3. In 1895 he was president of the NEA. He was editor of the

¹⁸ Ibid., p. 690.

¹⁹ Samuel E. Moffett, "Nicholas Murray Butler," Cosmopolitan, XXXIV (November, 1902), p. 177-79.

Educational Review, wrote many other monographs, and edited various series on education. Butler was tremendously energetic and active in educational reform movements at all levels.²⁰

The New York College for the Training of Teachers had grown out of the aims of the Industrial Education Association to promote industrial arts and to provide manual training teachers for the schools. It was the creation of young Butler as president of the association. Butler believed that teachers who were prepared only for manual training were vocational-trade teachers. He sought more. The education of these teachers was to include a more general education "to produce artists rather than artisans."²¹ Dr. Butler's proposal was accepted and the college started in September, 1887. The school had a mission and considered itself unique. Dr. Butler declared:

It (the college) is not a normal school and is not intended to be such....They (the normal schools of the country) are academies or high schools with a slight infusion of pedagogic instruction. They certainly are not to the profession they represent what the law school, the medical school, and the theological seminary are to their respective professions.
22

²⁰Ibid., p. 178.

²¹John P. Gordy, "The New York College for the Training of Teachers," U.S. Circulars of Information, V (Washington, D.C.: U.S. Government Printing Office, 1892), p. 104.

²²Ibid., p. 105.

Because of a lack of funds the college did not receive a charter until 1889.²³ The charter allowed the granting of a bachelor of pedagogy degree and advanced degrees at both master and doctoral level. The school hoped to admit only students who had completed college, but in practice it admitted high school graduates. The reasons given for this action were that public opinion was not demanding college trained teachers and that it would be absurd to insist on the prerequisite of a college education when universities such as Yale, Harvard, and Princeton made no provision for the study of pedagogy.²⁴

Nicholas Murray Butler took his ideas to the floor of the NEA convention. In the 1891 convention he presented his views. Butler argued that the university had a duty to the teaching profession because it was the original purpose of a university to train teachers. Chairs of pedagogy had been established, but Butler thought this important movement was being hindered by the lack of properly trained men. Butler declared:

We need men to devote themselves to the study of education in order to represent it in the universities and make its development complete. When this is done, the university will not only be the apex and crown of the American educational system, but it will be

²³Ibid., p. 106.

²⁴Ibid., p. 110.

its life and heart. 25

A decade later in his inaugural address as president of Columbia, Butler stressed the same theme. The university was a place of scholarship and service. One could not be a specialist without a broad liberal education. It was the duty of the university to provide for every legitimate demand for guidance, leadership, and expert knowledge. It was the business of the university to foster the advancement of all fields of knowledge and support all professional education including the newer fields of architecture, engineering, and teaching.²⁶

Another promoter of schools of education in the 1890's was Jacob Gould Schurman. He had come to Cornell as its first full-time professor of philosophy and first head of Sage School.²⁷ Schurman became president of Cornell in 1892, and in this capacity he addressed the Department of Superintendence of the NEA on February 18, 1896 at Jacksonville, Florida. In a speech that combined both philosophical reflection and practical concerns, he argued the case for university schools of education.²⁸

²⁵Nicholas M. Butler, "Universities and Schools Discussion," Proceedings and Addresses of the NEA (Toronto, Canada, 1891), p. 504.

²⁶Nicholas M. Butler, "Scholarship and Service," Educational Review, XXIV (June, 1902), pp. 1-9.

²⁷Twenty-Eighth Annual Report by President Schurman, 1919-1920, (Ithaca, N.Y.: Cornell University, 1920), pp. 29-34.

²⁸Jacob G. Schurman, "Teaching--A Trade or a Profession." The Forum, XXI (March, 1896), pp. 171-85.

Schurman believed that teaching was not a profession but a potential one. As a vocation it had serious drawbacks unlike the other learned professions. More often than not, teaching was used as a stepping stone to something else. Schurman argued that the statistics revealed a yearly turnover of 15% of the teachers leaving the profession. He calculated that this would mean an average time of service of seven to eight years. In New Jersey, Schurman claimed that the published figures showed only seven to eight months average length of service compared with Prussia in the "Volksschulen" where 55.4% of the teachers had ten years of service and 20.4% had twenty-five years or more.²⁹

The second factor was the overwhelming number of women teachers. Women teachers made up two-thirds of the national force. The number of male teachers had decreased over the last decade and female teachers had increased 70 per cent. When women married, they quit teaching which contributed to the fluctuating of the profession.³⁰

The only hope of the profession, Schurman believed, was to insist on high standards of qualification. He believed that the condition for admittance to any profession was general education and special training. Even the learned professions in this country were far away from this desirable

²⁹Ibid., p. 174.

³⁰Ibid., p. 175.

standard. Medical schools only required a year or six months of general education. Theology school requirements varied with the variety of different denominations. The establishment of law schools was just beginning with this generation. Schurman thought some of the newer professions were more entitled to the designation of learned than the traditional professions.³¹ The standard, Schurman proposed, was that in every grade the teacher must be a graduate of an institution of a higher grade.³² Schurman was concerned that only one-sixth of the teachers were normal school graduates. He claimed the normal schools themselves left much to be desired. They stressed methods with an absence of real literary and scientific culture. This meager scholarship became dangerous soil for pedagogical doctrines.³³ Schurman stated that a school of pedagogy affiliated with a university was needed so the future teacher or administrator could receive his technical training. He believed that no school of pedagogy attached to a university existed.³⁴

³¹Ibid., p. 177.

³²Ibid., p. 179.

³³Ibid., p. 180.

³⁴Walter L. Hervey, who replaced Nicholas M. Butler as president of the New York College of Teachers, was very upset by this statement and wrote an article in The Nation defending his school as a professional school of university grade. In substance, Schurman was correct because his proposal was a university attached professional school for teachers. Two years later, New York College for Teachers would affiliate with Columbia. See Walter L. Hervey, "A College for Teachers," The Nation, April 9, 1896, p. 287.

Nevertheless, its place should be among the professional schools of the university because it needed the support of the university and apart from it no professional school of high standing could exist. In the past universities had attempted to meet this need by establishing chairs. Law had the same history but the time was ripe for a corresponding transformation of teaching into a professional school.³⁵

Schurman's proposed curriculum for this school was a two-year course of study which would be open to juniors and seniors in the liberal arts and sciences. The electives could not accumulate to more than one year of professional work. The shortest length of time would be five years of combined liberal arts and professional education. As with the school of medicine, the work would be both theoretical and practical. The practical work would be observation and practice teaching in a school connected with the college or by arrangement with nearby schools. The theoretical work would consist of psychology as the basic science of education. The other three subjects of fundamental importance would be history and philosophy of education, and school economy (administration and organization) with two-thirds to three-fourths of the student's time to be devoted to theoretical study.³⁶

³⁵Schurman, op. cit., p. 182.

³⁶Ibid., p. 183.

In his concluding remarks Schurman stated that some may think his proposal novel. This proposal had been made three hundred years ago by Richard Mulcaster.³⁷ The British Royal Commission on Secondary Education was proposing these post-graduate institutions for Oxford and Cambridge.³⁸ A German educator told Schurman that the weakest point in the American school system was the lack of professionally trained teachers.³⁹ Reform must begin in the highest sphere which is the quickest way of reaching "the entire crop." Schurman concluded, "For the rest I hold, with Plato, that the business of reforming education is the chief work of every man."⁴⁰

Cornell did not follow President Schurman's recommendations although he made numerous proposals for a school of education.⁴¹ Harper, Butler, and Schurman were among those presidents who expressed views directly concerned with university schools of education. Harper was directly involved in establishing one of the pioneer institutions at University of Chicago.

³⁷Ibid., p. 184.

³⁸Ibid., p. 182.

³⁹Ibid., p. 185.

⁴⁰Ibid., p. 185.

⁴¹Twenty-Seventh Annual Report by President Schurman, 1918-19, (Ithaca, N.Y.: Cornell University, 1919), pp. 34-35.

New Education and University Presidents

The presidents of many of the new universities did not speak publicly on the subject of university schools of education. Nevertheless, they defined the role of their institutions so broadly that it would not prevent the adoption of these schools.

One of these men was Seth Low, who became president of Columbia in 1890. He believed the university was a new institution that was devoted to specialist scholarship. Johns Hopkins and Harvard had contributed to specialization through graduate study and the elective system. Indeed, Low thought that both of these tendencies had uplifted the academic climate of the nation.⁴² The liberal arts curriculum produced good citizens because it stressed training. The best program combined both the college and elective programs.⁴³ He argued that the emerging university with its professional schools was the answer to a liberal education and preparation in a profession. Low predicted that he would see the day when a college education would be required of all students who entered a professional school. The university would realize its obligation to the nation when it

⁴²Seth Low, "Higher Education in the United States," Educational Review, V (January, 1893), p. 11.

⁴³Ibid., p. 13

would send these thoroughly prepared professionals into the society.⁴⁴

The editors of The Nation endorsed Low's ideas for professional education. Low actively supported the plan to affiliate Teachers College with Columbia, although he did not reveal it in his NEA Convention address or The Nation article.⁴⁵ The character of Low's administration at Columbia was one of consolidation, incorporation, and growth. It was because of Low's intervention that Teachers College was affiliated with Columbia in 1898.⁴⁶

Another spokesman for the university and "New Education" was David Starr Jordan. He had been president of the University of Indiana and was picked by Leland Stanford to establish his new university.⁴⁷ In his speeches, Jordan was a man with a mission. A natural scientist who taught for many years in colleges, Jordan resented the type of education that colleges gave students. He also resented the fact that as a teacher he had to be a jack-of-all-trades

⁴⁴"President Low on University Education," The Nation, January 5, 1893, pp. 6-7.

⁴⁵Nicholas M. Butler, Across Busy Years, I (New York: Schribners and Sons, 1939), p. 187.

⁴⁶James E. Russell, Founding Teachers College (New York: Columbia Teachers College, 1937), p. 29.

⁴⁷"The Opening of Leland Stanford University," Scientific American, October 1, 1891, p. 225.

rather than being able to concentrate on his speciality.⁴⁸

Jordan believed that progress in American higher education came from science and the extension of human knowledge that had resulted from it. One of its benefits had been the development of the university in America. Growth, in Jordan's view, was not an evil in the university. If one area of knowledge developed more rapidly than another, symmetry in the university could be attained by stimulating the work in other departments. The university was to be the refuge on the "ultimate boundaries" of knowledge. Individualism in the form of the elective system held no evils for Jordan. He saw it as a gift from Harvard which stimulated the study of science. There was no knowledge that was not a science, and no applied science without the basis of pure science on which to rest. Schools of applied knowledge could not be separated from schools of knowledge. Jordan believed institutions were wasting money if they separated professional schools from the university.⁴⁹

As a man of science, Jordan declared that he had no interest in depreciating literary or classical training. The revolution in higher education was not a revolt against the classics but against the assumption that the classics

⁴⁸David Starr Jordan, "Science and the Colleges," Popular Science, XLII (April, 1893), pp. 724-25.

⁴⁹Ibid., p. 730.

furnished the only way to culture. The greatest change that came to higher education was the extension of the scientific method to subjects that were formerly deemed as essentially unscientific. He argued that in the best schools psychology was split from philosophy and treated as an experimental science. Ethics, pedagogics, and the study of children used scientific methods.⁵⁰

By the end of the decade Jordan had expanded his view. In an article for Popular Science Monthly entitled "University-Building" Jordan presented his ideas on the structure of a university. The American university was to perform three functions, the college, professional school, and that which was characteristic of the university.⁵¹ The college was a school of general culture, but the list of subjects along with Latin, Greek, and mathematics must be expanded. A university had a large number of students but at the college level the teacher should be known by name and each student should receive attention. The college function of a university was not to be despised or belittled. Despite the excellence of the German system, Jordan held that the gymnasium was an inadequate substitute for the American

⁵⁰Ibid., p. 733.

⁵¹David Starr Jordan, "University-Building," Popular Science Monthly, LXI (August, 1902), p. 331.

college.⁵²

The second university function Jordan believed was to provide professional training. It was a task that universities had taken up slowly. Law and medicine were exploited by private enterprise with poor schools. As a result American professional education could not be compared with German professional education. Jordan argued that only in a university did a professional school have a right to exist. The Morrill Act had paved the way for engineering, but law, medicine, theology, and education were following on a university basis. These few professional schools affiliated with the university were ranked with the best in their class in the world.⁵³

Jordan believed the crowning function of a university was original research to advance civilization. This was the real university spirit. The university was neither a collection of colleges nor a college fringed by professional schools. It was the institution that was dedicated to original research. A great university would be judged on the character of its advanced work. Publication was necessary but it must be of quality. Even in Germany, Jordan argued, much of the research was unworthy of the name science. "Of a thousand doctor's theses written each year scarcely a dozen

⁵²Ibid., p. 331-32.

⁵³Ibid., p. 332.

contain a real addition to knowledge."⁵⁴

The idea that a university was an instrument of social utility for the city, state, or nation was primary.⁵⁵ All knowledge was its province, and the education of specialists to push back the frontiers of knowledge was one of its teaching functions. The university would become the primary institution for advancing the progress of the people that supported it. The acceptance of this broad purpose for the American university contributed to the idea that schools of education should be established in universities.

Schools of education were a major concern of the new university presidents. They believed that the institutions they headed would not be fulfilling their role if they did not include such schools in a university along with the other professional schools. These schools of education were a realization of the university commitment to social service. The quality of the teaching profession could only be raised by its inclusion in university work. Schools of education would be only one of the means that would be employed in the attempt to unify American education. The next chapter will discuss the historical implications of this issue for American education and schools of education.

⁵⁴Ibid., p. 335

⁵⁵James, op. cit., p. 441.

CHAPTER EIGHT

THE BEGINNING OF UNIVERSITY SCHOOLS OF EDUCATION

The dominant ideal of this period was an American education for American democracy. The educational leaders desired the unification of the educational system. The commitment of these men to America and her ideals demanded the wedding of two principles, the political ideal that each citizen was part of the democratic process, and the intellectual ideal that a person should be allowed to develop to his fullest capacity. Only a school system that combined both of these elements could develop these democratic ideals. This idea of a unified school system was not new in American education. In various ways it appeared as part of the educational work of Jefferson, Rush, Franklin, and Mann in other periods. Michigan, at the time it was made a state out of the Northwest Territory, was a fine example of this continuing educational concern.

In 1837 John T. Pierce, the first superintendent of public instruction, worked out a complete system of public education for the state. He was familiar with European education and especially admired the Prussian system. His plan called for a unified educational system from the primary grades to the university, with the latter institution providing and training the teachers for the lower branches. The teacher training was to take place in university branch extension centers scattered throughout the state. These

branch extension centers would also act as intermediate preparatory schools for students who planned to enter the university.¹

This plan was never realized. There is no record that these branches ever offered teacher training. The board of regents of the university and the public viewed these branches as preparatory schools for the university. Also, the university teacher training requirements were much higher than the state requirements for teacher certification and this greatly limited the number of teacher candidates. The plan was not in harmony with the stage of educational development of a frontier state. As a result, despite the agitation of subsequent state superintendents, these branch centers after being operated for a short time were eventually closed. Teacher training waited until later in the century when separate normal schools were established, and when the university became interested in training secondary teachers for the increasing number of high schools in the state. This illustration shows that despite early attempts to install a state-wide educational system, it failed on two counts, because of the social conditions of the time and because of the democratic character of the

¹ Allen S. Whitney, Training of Teachers University of Michigan 1879-1929 (Ann Arbor, Michigan: George Wahr, 1931), pp. 10-14.

educational process which allowed local control.² The political freedom which allowed an educational institution to control the nature and character of its own social role caused dislocation in the educational process. Our system of education not only reflects democratic ideals but also its foibles.

The American scholars who returned from Europe as converts to the German university created another problem, the absorption of the German system into the American pattern of higher education. This adaptation of the German university was a mixed blessing. The new professional university president saw the German university ideal as a hand-maiden to democratic progress. The German educational system was highly organized and oriented toward university study.³ American university presidents of this period never seemed to fear this dilemma, the reconciliation of quality selective education with democratic equalitarian education. The directions that their work and interests took indicated an attitude of confidence that they could succeed in placing American education abreast of the times and its house in order. The whole panorama of educational activities of the period of 1890-1905 point in this direction. The new

²Ibid., pp. 14-15.

³Ephraim Emerton, "Gentleman and Scholar," Atlantic Monthly, LXXXV (May, 1900), p. 776.

national importance of the NEA, the activities of its leaders, the Committee of Ten,⁴ the development of accreditation machinery and associations,⁵ the revival of the old idea of a national university,⁶ the concern with Negro and Indian education,⁷ the reconstruction of post Civil War Southern education,⁸ and the incorporation of new national associations for advancement of different phases of education were all manifestations of this general attitude.⁹ These educational leaders conceived of their role as heralds of a great new culture that was destined to exhibit to the world through

⁴James H. Baker, "Review of the Report of the Committee of Ten," Proceedings and Addresses of the NEA (Asbury Park, N.J., 1894), pp. 645-69.

⁵Albert S. Cook, "Teaching of English," Atlantic Monthly, LXXXVII (May, 1901), pp. 716-17.

⁶Daniel C. Gilman, "Opening Address," Proceedings and Addresses of the NEA (Chicago, Illinois, 1893), pp. 94-104.

⁷Booker T. Washington, "The Influence of the Negroes' Citizenship," Proceedings and Addresses of the NEA (Buffalo, N.Y., 1896), pp. 208-17.

W.N. Hailman, "The Next Step in the Education of the Indian," Proceedings and Addresses of the NEA (Denver, Colo., 1895), pp. 80-86.

⁸William E. Boggs, "The Advancement of the South," Proceedings and Addresses of the NEA (Denver, Colo., 1895), pp. 966-69.

⁹"National Council of Education," Proceedings and Addresses of the NEA (Saratoga Springs, N.Y., 1892), pp. 747-50.

superior material, intellectual, and social progress that American democracy was the salvation of humanity.

The university was to act as the leader in this role. Teacher education was a phase in this concern. The other phases, the reconciliation of liberal education with professional education, the limits and scope of each curriculum, and the character of the social role of American universities, had yet to be solved. The adoption of the German university ideal was piece-meal because of the different social systems, and because of the freedom of institutions to adopt or change their own institutional patterns. As a result the American university escapes precise definition, although it has similar broad characteristics analogous to the characteristics of our democratic society. Nevertheless, one of the good results of these early attempts to unify the diverse educational system was the establishment of university schools of education.

The American University and Professional Schools

The idea of professional education was as old as higher education in America. At first limited generally to theology, colleges later included law, medicine, and other professions. Still, in the America of the 1890's the majority of these professions did not demand college preparation before professional training. The laissez-faire control of both public and private education allowed for the establish-

ment of many specialized training institutions for professional training. This decade of the 1890's was a period when attempts were made to consolidate and upgrade these professions by requiring a prerequisite liberal education before professional work, and by the instituting of administrative control over the independent professional schools which were part of the university. Eliot's demands for the reform of medical education at Harvard were typical of this trend.¹⁰

The argument that the preparation for teachers had no place in an American university had little substance by the 1890's. This charge was made, but in the light of the times there could be little basis other than bias or self-interest to exclude schools of education and have professional schools of architecture, dentistry,¹¹ engineering,¹² fine arts,¹³ agriculture, music, library science, pharmacy,¹⁴ and

¹⁰ Samuel Eliot Morison, "President Eliot's Inaugural Address," The Development of Harvard University, (Cambridge, Mass.: Harvard University Press, 1930), pp. lxx-lxxvii.

¹¹ Ibid., pp. xiv-xviii.

¹² "The Faculty of Applied Science," Columbia University Quarterly, I (June, 1899), pp. 241-59.

¹³ William R. Harper, The Presidents Report (Chicago, Ill.: University of Chicago Press, 1903), pp. xi-cxliii.

¹⁴ Franklin W. Scott, "Historical Sketch of University of Illinois," The Alumni Record of University of Illinois (Chicago, Ill.: Lakeside Press, 1918), pp. vii-xxx.

homoeopathic medicine.¹⁵ The variety was endless. Some have since passed away but already the unlimited definition of knowledge in university work allowed only interest and circumstance to define professional education.

There was also agitation from other professions during the 1890's for the inclusion of their specialities in university work. The year Teachers College was fully affiliated with Columbia, Eliot wrote an article arguing for the establishment of a professional school of commerce and industry at Harvard using the same basic arguments that were used for the establishment of schools of education. Eliot believed that the study of commerce and industry in the "higher ranges" were intellectual pursuits of eminent character. He knew of no other profession for which a professional school was not provided. The study of medicine and law were historically by apprenticeship but with the establishment of professional schools the intending physician or lawyer who did not go to such a school condemned himself to "hopeless inferiority."¹⁶

Generally, the same type of arguments were presented

¹⁵ "Homoeopathic Medical College," General Catalogue of the University of Michigan, 1837-1911 (Ann Arbor, Mich.: Published by University, 1912), p. 550.

¹⁶ Charles W. Eliot, "Commercial Education," Educational Review, XVIII (December, 1899), pp. 423-24.

for schools of journalism,¹⁷ economics,¹⁸ agriculture,¹⁹ and business.²⁰ These demands for the inclusion of other professions in university work also affected the views expressed by people who wanted schools of education. Scholars who were in favor of other university professional schools appealed to the educational profession for help through the NEA. Woodrow Wilson,²¹ Seth Low,²² and Nicholas Murray Butler²³ are examples.

Other professional people also made appeals to the teaching profession for aid in establishing their profes-

¹⁷"School of Journalism of Columbia University," Popular Science Monthly, LXIII (October, 1903), pp. 569-71.

¹⁸"Education in Business and Economics," The Outlook, October 15, 1898, p. 414.

¹⁹Lewis M'Louth, "The Place and Function of the Agricultural College," Proceedings and Addresses of the NEA (St. Paul, Minn., 1900), pp. 219-25.

²⁰S.S. Packard, "Business Education: Its Place in the American Curriculum," Proceedings and Addresses of the NEA (Saratoga Springs, N.Y., 1892), pp. 461-70.

²¹Woodrow Wilson, "Should Liberal Education be Required for Admission to Professional Schools?" Proceedings and Addresses of the NEA (Chicago, Ill., 1893), pp. 112-17.

²²Seth Low, "Relation of Professional Schools to the University," Ibid., pp. 146-49.

²³Nicholas M. Butler, "Professional and Technical Instruction in the University," Proceedings and Addresses of the NEA (Asbury Park, N.J., 1894), pp. 619-23.

sional training in universities. William Pepper, M.D. in a forceful speech before the 1892 NEA Convention described the state of professional education, and its relationship to the university.²⁴ He argued that as the nation needed political federation, so it needed educational federation. The only solution to democratic problems was an education that was thorough, free, and universal.²⁵ He declared that only 20.8% of the theology students, 21.2% of the law students, and 9.8% of the medical students had previous college training before professional education. There was no scholarship or grant available for those students who wanted college work before their professional education. Pepper charged that there were no laws or regulations on the qualifications for medical doctors or teachers. Until each state passed such legislation to protect the lives and minds of its citizens from malpractice, there would always be plenty of incompetent physicians and teachers.²⁶ Pepper proposed that since students could not pay their way through a long costly program of both college and professional training, the public or state should set up fellowships in schools of

²⁴William Pepper, "The Relation of Undergraduate and Post-Graduate Curricula," Proceedings and Addresses of the NEA (Saratoga Springs, N.Y., 1892), pp. 70-81.

²⁵Ibid., p. 81.

²⁶Ibid., p. 71.

medicine, pedagogy, and law. Pepper believed it was necessary to have university training in all professions: pedagogy, art, social and political science, journalism, chemistry, engineering, architecture, and literature. This training would be a two or three year post-graduate course in the areas related to their field.²⁷ These graduate schools would offer courses leading to the Ph.D. degree. In conclusion Pepper argued that America was developing a great national system of college and university education. It was too early to predict what its future would be, but because of the absence of governmental control, frequent and full discussion would be necessary on all the important issues. The system should be an adaptation of the European system, but not an imitation. For Pepper, the German system had shown brilliant results and presented more features which could be adapted to American conditions.²⁸

Dr. Pepper's address before the 1892 NEA Convention was one of the most perceptive on this subject, but there were also many others who expressed the same general concerns. The literature of the period, both professional and general, was filled with demands for professional education. These proposals came both from the university community and from

²⁷ Ibid., p. 74.

²⁸ Ibid., p. 76.

individuals and groups outside the university.

This movement grew during the 1890's. By the turn of the century the position of the American university became more solidified and professional education was one of the prime questions in higher education. The American college had lost its leadership position or had been converted into a university. Those colleges that did not adapt to the new university ideal were forced into a secondary role. This secondary role was to structure a program that would lead to university graduate work. Many advocates of liberal arts tried to hold on to the four-year college program. Many critics regarded the four year program as too much time to spend as a prerequisite to professional education. The economic considerations and the lengthy number of years of a combined curriculum created a burden argued those who favored a shortened college course.

The length of the baccalaureate course was the major problem discussed in the Department of Higher Education meeting of the 1903 NEA Convention. Many educational leaders demanded the shortening of the college course, but they wanted its basic ideals and purpose to be preserved. Butler and Harper stressed the need for the shortening of college courses because the professions were becoming more involved, and more time was needed to educate for them. High schools had also improved and more demands could be made on the

entering students.²⁹ Harper argued that the required studies in the first year of a professional school whether law, medicine, divinity, or education had the same liberal cultural value to a young man or woman as those studies offered in the final years of the college course.³⁰

Andrew F. West, Greek scholar and dean of graduate studies at Princeton, argued for the continuation of the four-year prescribed course as the core of American higher education. He charged that it was in institutions that favored elective studies where there was the most agitation for a shorter course.³¹

In the discussion that followed there was no recorded consensus on either proposal. The different university presidents expressed many varied points of view. G. Stanley Hall conceded that as civilization advanced so did the period of apprenticeship and a man was not mature till the age of twenty-five or six. Hall, in conclusion, argued that there was no actual need for uniformity in American higher education, but what was needed was variety. He declared, "Let

²⁹ William R. Harper, "Length of the Baccalaureate Course," Proceedings and Addresses of the NEA (Boston, Mass., 1903), p. 506.

³⁰ Ibid., p. 507.

³¹ Andrew F. West, "Length of the Baccalaureate Course," Proceedings and Addresses of the NEA (Boston, Mass., 1903), pp. 509-15.

different institutions follow different models."³² History would prove the worth of his remarks. In the first decades of the twentieth century each institution generally created its own patterns of curriculum. Schools of education were involved in these controversies.

Antecedents to University Schools of Education

In 1891 William T. Harris, in a letter of introduction to Professor John P. Gordy's study Rise and Growth of the Normal-School Idea noted that education was receiving more attention as a university discipline. The school of pedagogy at Clark, the reorganization of Albany Normal School, and a new department at Harvard were signs of the times.³³ Harris hoped that these events would be indicative of the time "when an untrained teacher will be considered a greater absurdity than an untrained doctor or lawyer."³⁴ Harris agreed with author Gordy's idea that a normal school was a technical school of university grade.³⁵ The conclusion both

³²G. Stanley Hall, "Discussion," Proceedings and Addresses of the NEA (Boston, Mass., 1903), p. 515.

³³William T. Harris, "Letter of Transmittal," U.S. Circular of Information, V (Washington, D.C.: U.S. Government Printing Office, 1891), pp. 5-6.

³⁴Ibid., pp. 5-6.

³⁵John P. Gordy, Rise and Growth of the Normal-School Idea, U.S. Circular of Information, V (Washington, D.C.: U.S. Government Printing Office, 1891), p. 94.

men drew was that the New York College for the Training of Teachers was a more perfect realization of the ideal of professional teacher training because university students were now taking advantage of its facilities.³⁶

During the 1890's a number of schools were established in universities which created a favorable attitude toward schools of education. Although these schools lacked the organizational patterns to be classified as schools of education, they established a precedent for a more structured university school. The School of Pedagogy, New York University was established by a vote of the University Council in March, 1890. In the resolution for its adoption, it was given equal rank with the law and medical schools of the university. The first dean, Dr. Jerome Allen, was a graduate of Amherst College and a former president of a normal school in Minnesota. He served as dean until 1894 when he was succeeded by Dr. Edward R. Shaw, who previously was an instructor on the staff. Some of the prominent early faculty, were Nicholas M. Butler, Charles H. Judd, and Edward F. Buchner. The enrollment of students was small between 1893 and 1901, fluctuating from 74 to 338 and down to 206 in 1901. The large number of 338 was in response to a ruling of the New York City school board that required, for a time, that

³⁶Harris, op. cit., p. 6

teachers must attend lectures as a condition for promotion.³⁷

The title, school of pedagogy, was misleading. It had to depend largely upon tuition fees for its financial support. Its budget, as late as 1911, was only \$20,000.³⁸ The school limited its work to graduate study for administrators and normal school instructors. The faculty could not agree on the course of studies, and as a result there existed indeterminate standards. Many teachers in the New York area wanted more instruction but were normal school graduates and could not qualify because they lacked a college education. They were admitted as auditors but could not obtain a degree. The university made no provision for these normal school people to make up their academic deficiencies. Those graduate students who took work in the school preferred the Ph.D. conferred by the graduate school rather than the Doctor of Pedagogy. This controversy coupled with a general lack of qualified candidates caused such bitterness that by 1901 the entire faculty resigned. The school went into a period of stagnation for three years with greatly reduced fees and student enrollments. The university was finally able to obtain a dean in Thomas A. Balliet, former school superinten-

³⁷Theodore F. Jones, New York University 1832: 1932 (New York: New York University Press, 1933), pp. 341-42.

³⁸Thomas M. Balliet, "Report of the Dean of the School of Pedagogy," Annual Reports of New York University 1910-1911 (New York, 1912), p. 81.

dent of Springfield, Massachusetts, and a graduate student of Yale and Leipzig. The school did not have psychological laboratories and practice school facilities.³⁹ During a discussion about the requirements for the degrees of Master and Doctor of Pedagogy at the NEA Convention in 1893, Dr. Jerome Allen referred to his school as a department.⁴⁰ Nevertheless, the school received much acclaim for its work. At the 1891 NEA Convention in Toronto, Canada, G. Stanley Hall, in response to Superintendent Oscar Cooper's address on schools of education, declared that the one hopeful sign for American education was that the schools were drawing closer. He had seen three hundred school teachers of New York City receiving instruction in a school of pedagogy. Hall stressed that the members of the NEA should try to understand the great difficulty that university authorities had in trying to establish such facilities, as he himself did in trying to interest capable young men in this study when he was at Johns Hopkins.⁴¹

In A.B. Poland's review of Gordy's, Rise and Growth of

³⁹Ibid., pp. 76-81.

⁴⁰Jerome Allen, "What Should be Required of and Upon Whom is to be Conferred the Degree of Doctor of Pedagogy?" Proceedings and Addresses of the NEA (Chicago, Ill., 1893), p. 434.

⁴¹G. Stanley Hall, "Discussion," Proceedings and Addresses of the NEA (Toronto, Canada, 1891), p. 504.

the Normal School Idea, he expressed regret that Gordy had not considered the work of the School of Pedagogy, New York University, as Poland considered its work unique and represented "the highest point yet reached in this high tide of teacher training."⁴²

Dean Shaw, in the 1895 NEA Convention, made an extensive report to the Child Study Department about the experiments that his school was conducting in children's handwriting. He reported the school had acquired an interest in the Hersinger Day School so it could continue such experimentation.⁴³

The Journal of Pedagogy reported in its issue of June, 1900 that the school had won a silver medal for its exhibit at the Paris Exposition. The article praised the school for its steady growth and excellence and that its department of education had some of the ablest men in the country in the field of psychology and philosophy.⁴⁴ In the 1900's during the hardship period of the school, John P. Gordy, now professor of history of education, addressed a group of its friends. His subject was "The Function of a University

⁴²A.B. Poland, Review of Rise and Growth of Normal School Idea by John P. Gordy, Educational Review, III (May, 1892), pp. 505-506.

⁴³Edward B. Shaw, "Child Study in New York," Proceedings and Addresses of the NEA (Denver, Colo., 1895), p. 901.

⁴⁴"Notes and News," Journal of Pedagogy, XIII (June, 1900), p. 270.

School of Education."⁴⁵ The editors of the Journal of Pedagogy believed the address was so significant that their readers would find it a source of "suggestive pedagogical literature." "A more lucid and forceful outline of the scope of an institution whose function it is to prepare teachers for their work has never been made."⁴⁶ When the appointment of Dr. Balliet was made the hopes of the editors of the Journal of Pedagogy were lifted as they declared that this would not only result in saving the school, but "this event is of unusual significance....to the course of university work in education throughout the United States."⁴⁷

The educational work of Clark University was well recorded by the educational journals of the period. The school had limited facilities and never achieved the rank of a university professional school. In 1892 a meeting of the National Council of Education considered the educational work in the universities. Clark was cited for its work when Charles DeGarmo stated:

Now whatever we may think of the value of physiological psychology as a method for examining educational questions, I think it undeniably true that the organic

⁴⁵John P. Gordy, "The Functions of a University School of Education," Journal of Pedagogy, XIV (March, 1902), pp. 190-95.

⁴⁶Ibid., p. 190.

⁴⁷"Dr. Balliet for the School of Pedagogy," Journal of Pedagogy, XVI (June, 1904), p. 276.

connection between the educational and the psychological department,....is better illustrated in Clark University than elsewhere. Admirable as this is, I regard it as a happy accident, not likely to be found in any other university in the land. ⁴⁸

Friends of the educational work at Clark also made appeals to the teaching profession to support Hall's work by purchasing the Pedagogical Seminary. A book review in the Educational Review regarded this magazine as one of the best in the world as "they are doing more for the systematic study of educational theory and improvement of educational practice than any of their European contemporaries."⁴⁹

The school was cited in the literature of the day as a school of pedagogy affiliated with Clark University. It lacked the organizational structure to be considered a school of education, but the educational work at Clark stimulated interest in the desirability of establishing these schools.⁵⁰

The same could be said of such early attempts as the school of pedagogy at the University of Buffalo which opened in 1895 and seemed to flourish at first, but later closed when its head Frank McMurry moved to Teachers College,

⁴⁸ Charles DeGarmo, "The Scope of Pedagogical Work in Universities," Proceedings and Addresses of the NEA (Saratoga Springs, N.Y., 1892), p. 777.

⁴⁹ Nicholas M. Butler, Review of Pedagogical Seminary, edited by G. Stanley Hall, Educational Review, VII (February, 1894), p. 196.

⁵⁰ Harris, "Letter of Transmittal," p. 6.

Columbia.⁵¹ The School of Education, University of Texas was a school in name, but in form a department. The school at the University of Wisconsin received some attention when it opened in 1897, but actually it was a summer school extension program for upgrading normal school teachers. It was closed after a time.⁵² These limited programs were direct predecessors to university schools of education.

⁵¹"Teachers College," Columbia University Quarterly, XIX (March, 1898), pp. 140-41.

⁵²George C. Sellery, Some Ferments at Wisconsin 1901-1947 (Madison, Wisc.: University of Wisconsin Press, 1960), pp. 45-50.

CHAPTER NINE

FIRST UNIVERSITY SCHOOLS OF EDUCATION

Teachers College, Columbia University

As early as 1882, President Fredrick A. P. Barnard of Columbia proposed the study of education at the university because teachers had no adequate knowledge of their task or proper preparation for it. In his annual report to the trustees, he proposed that a chair or a school be established to prepare teachers.¹ Nicholas M. Butler stated that these discussions by President Barnard opened a new field of reflection and study. This was the first expression of the idea for a college for teachers as an integral part of Columbia University.² In 1886 Nicholas M. Butler, with approval of President Barnard, gave a series of lectures on teacher training and its possibilities as a systematic course of instruction. These lectures were well attended and over a thousand teachers were refused admission because of the limited seating facilities. The enthusiastic response to the lectures prompted Butler to present a plan for the introduction of a course in pedagogy at Columbia. The plan was rejected as not being expedient.³

¹Nicholas M. Butler, Across Busy Years, I (New York: Charles Scribner's and Sons, 1939), p. 176.

²Ibid., pp. 177-79.

³Ibid., p. 179.

Although these early attempts by Columbia scholars for the cause of education were frustrated, a philanthropic movement was beginning which was to have great significance for the introduction of university schools of education.⁴ In 1880 the Kitchen Garden Association was formed to promote domestic and industrial arts among the laboring classes. In the next four years the movement had phenomenal growth. Thousands of young girls received training in ordinary household duties. It was reorganized in 1884 as the Industrial Education Association and added an industrial arts program for boys. Many of the most prominent and influential men in the city including President Barnard and his successor Seth Low had membership on the board of directors.⁵ The association took over and equipped a building which had been formerly occupied by Union Theological Seminary at No. 9 University Place. The school was an immediate success, as the demand for its teachers exceeded the number of graduates. It was at this time that Dr. Butler's proposal for education courses at Columbia was rejected. The association reorganized and because of this young man's ability and interest in teacher training, they elected him president in 1887.⁶

⁴James Earl Russell, Founding Teachers College (New York: Teachers College Bureau of Publications, 1937), p. 4.

⁵Ibid., p. 5.

⁶Ibid., p. 6.

Under the leadership of young Butler, the association reorganized the school in harmony with the academic views of its new president.⁷ This marked the turning point of the school. It changed its course from a philanthropic enterprise to one for educational advancement and reform.⁸ The Horace Mann model school was opened in 1888 with sixty-four pupils for student observation and practice teaching. The number of enrolled students in the two-year course increased from eighteen the first year to fifty the second, and eighty-nine the third year.⁹

On January 12, 1889 the board of regents of the University of the State of New York incorporated the institution under the name New York College for the Training of Teachers.¹⁰ Butler believed that his institution was unique and a real advance in teacher training. In an article for The Century of that same year, Butler presented his case for teacher training and its relation to the university. He argued that normal school training suffered from serious defects. The normal school started student training at too

⁷ John P. Gordy, "The New York College For The Training of Teachers," U.S. Circular of Information VIII, (Washington, D.C.: U.S. Government Printing Office, 1891), p. 104.

⁸ Russell, op. cit., p. 8.

⁹ Ibid., p. 7.

¹⁰ Ibid., p. 7.

early an age. They were only glorified high schools and as a consequence they had to concentrate on academic areas and offered only a smattering of pedagogy at the last year. The students graduated too early and the first classes they taught suffered the consequences. The universities were not providing teacher training and this had retarded the profession. There were only nine German, two Scotch, and six American universities which provided this work. The German universities were superior to our universities because their courses included practice teaching. Butler declared that a degree in pedagogy to the teacher should be the same as the medical degree was to the physician.¹¹

As early as 1890 an arrangement was effected by which students enrolled in either Teachers College or Columbia could elect certain courses in either school and receive credit in their own institution. Between 1892 and 1898 there was always a number of Columbia students attending some of the regular courses at Teachers College. The engineering students used the industrial arts shops of Teachers College for their laboratory and practical training courses.¹² In 1892 a proposal that the Teachers College

¹¹ Nicholas M. Butler, "The Training of the Teacher," The Century, XXXVIII (September, 1889), pp. 915-20.

¹² "University Notes," Columbia University Bulletin, XVIII (December, 1897), p. 45.

be affiliated with Columbia by stages over a five-year period, was presented to the trustees of the university. It was rejected on the grounds that the observation and practice teaching school of Teachers College was not a proper form of university work. Also, this affiliation would introduce co-education into Columbia on too large a scale.¹³

In its early days, Teachers College was supported by philanthropic gifts. It was to be the pattern of this school to receive a large part of its endowment from these sources during the 1890's. Miss Grace Dodge, secretary of the Industrial Education Association, was a large donor and a prime mover in this venture. Its expenses rose from a modest \$7,400 in 1886 to \$62,000 in 1891. It outgrew its original quarters at Old Union Theological Seminary. George W. Vanderbilt contributed \$100,000 and other pledges secured a new site at 120th Street.¹⁴

Butler resigned his post in 1891. It was said that not all of the members of the Industrial Education Association were in harmony with the broad educational aims of their enthusiastic young president. Also, the rapid growth of the school exceeded its financial returns. Many of its classes were offered free to public school children. The

¹³Butler, Across Busy Years, I, p. 182.

¹⁴Russell, op. cit., p. 9.

cost of this service made it necessary for the membership of the association to make door to door canvasses. These solicitations dampened some of the initial enthusiasm.¹⁵ Walter L. Hervey took over in these crucial years of both the moving and expansion of the college.

At the 1891 NEA Convention at Toronto, a major portion of the addresses and discussions were on the relation of the university to the schools. Dr. Hervey contributed to the discussion as "head of the most advanced institution for teacher training in the country."¹⁶ He presented his views on the function of a training college. Hervey predicted a close harmonious relationship between the university, the teachers' college and the total educational system. He stressed five major points about the unique character, purpose, and importance of a teacher training college. (1) The students at such a school should possess prerequisite maturity in scholarship or teaching experience. (2) The teachers' college must offer a complete curriculum in which all subjects taught in schools are represented. It must be characterized by an interest in all phases of education. (3) The teachers' college must wed theory with practice

¹⁵Ibid., p. 9.

¹⁶Walter L. Hervey, "The Function of a Teachers' Training College," Proceedings and Addresses of the NEA (Toronto, Canada, 1891), pp. 736-37.

through the establishment of an observation and practice school to serve as an experimental station for the college faculty and a model school and clinic for the student teachers. (4) The independence of subject matter must be maintained from both the professional and academic standpoints. (5) The training college was differentiated from the university, college, normal school, or city training school. The central purpose of the teachers' college, unlike the university, was not the development of knowledge by research, or as a college, the mastery of liberal studies and gaining of a disciplined power. Also, the teachers' college would not supply trained teachers to meet local demands as a city training school.

Hervey stressed that the function of the teachers' college was to train specialists, supervisors, or general teachers. It had the same relation to the college of liberal arts as the traditional professional schools. He believed that the relationship between the teachers' college and the university was the most vital of all. He stated:

....for it is to the university that the training college looks for its teachers trained under the influence of the university spirit, and for the periodicals and textbooks that record the results of its scholarly research--the Pedagogical Seminary, and the Educational Review, Boone's Education in the United States, and James's Principles of Psychology, are typical instances of this series--and, lastly, for that constructive guidance and that inspiration which it is the distinctive office of the university to render to the teaching profession.¹⁷

¹⁷Ibid., p. 738.

Hervey's concluding remarks repeated the view that our society needed more trained teachers than ever before. The training college stood for the concept that the state owed it to itself to educate its citizens. Education held the only solution to national problems and well trained teachers "were the surest, most economical, and most enlightened means to this end."¹⁸ The affiliation between Teachers College and Columbia would wait for another six years, but already the seminal notions for such an alliance were appearing.

The next few years the work and accomplishments of Teachers College received favorable notice in both educational and popular periodicals. In an illustrated Cosmopolitan article of March, 1894, Rosa Belle Holt described the work of Teachers College in glowing terms. The school had 42 professors and instructors, 12 departments, and 75 courses. There were 237 students enrolled from half of the states of the nation and many from foreign countries. The school had an alumni of over 900 teachers and this indicated to the author of the article that there was a need for such an institution. The laboratory methods employed demonstrated that education was both a science and an art. The college embodied the three leading tendencies in modern education, scientific spirit, practical spirit, and the spirit of art that aimed to implant

¹⁸Ibid., p. 738.

in every student love of the beautiful in art, nature, books, and work. This institution would upgrade the teaching profession and no movement in modern times demonstrated more promise for the betterment of its city population.¹⁹

These years of expansion at the school were looked upon with pride by educators. When the Teachers College moved to its new buildings it was reported in the Educational Review that this construction represented "a greater outlay than the endowment of many an American university."²⁰

Nicholas M. Butler chided G. Stanley Hall for his plea for funds to build a "model school" and "educational experiment station" at Clark University on the grounds that nowhere such an institution existed. Butler declared that the citizens of New York city invested nearly a million dollars in Teachers College and it was the most modern educational institution.²¹

The Scientific American praised the advanced system of education fostered by the college and its introduction of manual training and child study. This new system of education taught children to use hands as well as head. This

¹⁹Rosa Belle Holt, "The Teachers College," Cosmopolitan, XVI (March, 1894), pp. 579-88.

²⁰Nicholas M. Butler, Review of The Pedagogical Seminary, by G. Stanley Hall, Educational Review, VII (February, 1894), pp. 196-98.

²¹Ibid., p. 198.

education based on the concrete rather than the abstract replaced teaching methods of drill and memorization. In the opinion of the Scientific American, manual training was the greatest advance in education.²² The early years of this institution, although suffering from growing pains, presented to the public a bright new image of educational progress.

On February 1, 1893 an agreement was reached between the two institutions. The Teachers College was brought into the university system on a limited basis. The board of trustees still objected to Teachers College on the grounds that this would burden the university with a series of lower schools for children. Teachers College could give certificates to students who were not candidates for a degree. Male students of both colleges could take instruction at both institutions and women students would register in Barnard College. The Teachers College still maintained its own governing board and separate financial structure. President Hervey was allowed to sit on the Columbia University Council but without a vote.²³

In the next four years the university and Teachers

²² "The Advanced System of Education," Scientific American, May 4, 1895, p. 274.

²³ Butler, Across Busy Years, I, pp. 182-87.

College drew closer together through various working agreements and arrangements. Teachers College enjoyed great success in student enrollment, growth, and national attention, but there was continued conflict in the college over finances. The reluctance of many backers to continue financial help to the school was a factor. Dean Russell stated that when he came to Teachers College there was a debt of \$80,000. It seemed to him an insurmountable obstacle and this amount was sufficient to run the University of Colorado. President Hervey along with two other staff members resigned as of July 1, 1897, and the lady principal died later that summer.²⁴

The internal situation was not reported in the Columbia University Bulletin of that June. The bulletin announced that this next year would witness for the first time the unhampered working of the agreement between the two schools. The Teachers College had new buildings and land valued at a million dollars, a well-organized teaching staff, and was ready to serve Columbia and Barnard students. The announcement stated that the new affiliation was good for both institutions. The presence of the university would mean a liberalizing influence and would give higher training to the teacher. The Teachers College would bring to the university opportunities to observe, apply, and test educational

²⁴Russell, op. cit., pp. 23-25.

theory. The Teachers College faculty was being recruited largely from university men and women. They were coming from graduate work at Johns Hopkins, Princeton, Chicago, and Columbia. The budget was considered large at \$125,000 for the coming year. This money was partly supplied by a private endowment of \$1,500,000 which gave the school \$60,000 a year. The importance of the new affiliation was further stressed when the bulletin stated:

It is interesting to remember, also, that Teachers College always had a distinctive character. Its liberal studies and practical bent make it something more than a school of pedagogy, in the sense in which that term is sometimes used, its professional studies, method, and purpose differentiate it sharply from a college of liberal arts, while in point of spirit, staff, and material equipment it is naturally allied with a university.

The time is ripe for the kind of work for public education which it is the province of the university to do. During the next few years Greater New York will be the scene of a momentous educational development. In this development, the interests of public education throughout the country are at stake, for Greater New York is a type of country at large; and affiliation of these institutions, both of which have been identified with the movement from its inception will be one more factor in the culmination now at hand. 25

Nevertheless, Dean Russell was pessimistic when he came to the fall opening of Teachers College and found that he would be replacing Dr. Wheeler. His pessimism was not shared by the fall issue of the same Columbia Bulletin which described in glowing terms Russell's educational attainments

²⁵"Editorials," Columbia University Bulletin, XVII (June, 1897), pp. 177-78.

and the fact that the school was free of debt. Eighty thousand dollars had been received in pledges and the faculty was complete.²⁶ Russell reported that both Miss Dodge and William T. Harris met him at the front door. Harris was teaching in Russell's place until he arrived. The trend of events indicated that the affiliation was close at hand. Dean Russell stated that he desired a professional school of university rank. He said that he proposed it to Miss Dodge and Mr. Macy, another prominent benefactor of the school. Russell, at their request, put the plan for affiliation in writing and sent it on to Miss Dodge. Russell in mid-November was called from class late in the afternoon. Spencer Trask, Chairman of the Board of Teachers College, and President Low of Columbia were waiting on the steps. They informed Russell that the trustees were willing to adopt Russell's plan if he would be dean. Russell accepted the position as a temporary arrangement until a suitable person might be found. The arrangement was not what Russell wanted because it was restrictive and the school was still responsible for its own financial support. The complete unification would not come for another eighteen years, but for all intents and purposes, Teachers College became a part

²⁶
"University Notes," Columbia University Bulletin,
XVII (December, 1897), pp. 63-65.

of Columbia on January 3, 1898.²⁷

In the commencement address of 1898, President Low announced that "the university had accepted Teachers College as its professional school for teachers and has given to it the university rank of its law school and school of medicine."²⁸ An editorial of the Columbia University Bulletin announced that this educational union placed Columbia easily at the head of the universities of the world in education and teacher training. This event was an effective illustration of what President Eliot had termed "the unity of educational reform." It was predicted that Columbia would attract scores of experienced teachers.²⁹ The same bulletin announced the dual appointments of Butler, Hutton, and Cattell to the Teachers College faculty. Also, several other new important appointments were attributed to the incorporation. The most important was that of Frank M. McMurray, the dean of School of Pedagogy, University of Buffalo. This meant closing the school and transferring McMurray's graduate students to Teachers College. The statistics of the Teachers College, a few months after this union, revealed

²⁷Russell, op. cit., pp. 28-29.

²⁸Ibid., p. 47.

²⁹"Editorial," Columbia University Bulletin, XIX (March, 1898), pp. 120-22.

already an institution of considerable size with an enrollment of 968 students.³⁰

In the years that followed, Teachers College enjoyed great success. The physical organization of the school continued to grow. The Horace Mann school was reorganized, an experimental school was established, the summer session started, the Teachers College Record began publication, and the extension service was expanded into a department. By 1900 the total yearly budget was a quarter of a million dollars. Paul Monroe was persuaded to leave sociology and history for education. Edward L. Thorndike, whom Russell termed his "young Daniel," was added to the faculty. Russell even tried to persuade Professor Gildersleeve of Johns Hopkins to join Teachers College as a professor of the methods of teaching Latin and Greek. Russell claimed that Gildersleeve said he would have accepted if he was forty years younger.³¹

Dean Russell, after his appointment, "began to advertise his wares even though it meant rebuffs at every turn."³² He went to the Department of Superintendence meeting of the NEA in February, 1898 and began a continuing crusade for

³⁰ Ibid., pp. 140-142.

³¹ Russell, op. cit., pp. 48-54.

³² Ibid., p. 36.

university schools of education. The continuing success of the school and a world-wide recognition of that success was forthcoming in the first years of the twentieth century.³³

School of Education
University of Chicago

The establishment of the school of education at the University of Chicago was the result of an amalgamation of a number of experiments in education and teacher training. The seminal notions for such a project were stated in the articles of incorporation of this new university. The university was to be an advanced institution. It appeared that these articles wanted to make certain that there would be no facet of educational endeavor that the university could not attempt. The university was to furnish higher education to both sexes, establish and maintain academies, preparatory schools, manual training schools and all branches of higher learning including literature, law, medicine, music, technology, and the various branches of science both abstract and applied.³⁴

This institution was the work of William R. Harper with

³³ Ibid., p. 36.

³⁴ William R. Harper, Presidents Report July, 1897-July, 1898 With Summaries For 1891-1897, (Chicago, Ill.: University of Chicago Press, 1899), p. 7.

John D. Rockefeller's financial support. The articles of organization included along with schools of law, medicine, engineering, fine arts, and music, the provision for a school of pedagogy as soon as funds would permit these schools to be established.³⁵ The university opened its doors in 1892 and statistics show the first courses in pedagogy were offered in 1895 in the philosophy department. In the first year that such courses were offered, there were 81 students, and by 1897 the number rose to 205 compared to 731 in philosophy.³⁶ John Dewey, Wilbur Jackman, Charles McMurray, and Charles DeGarmo were some of the important educational figures who were instructors.³⁷ When the sub-department of pedagogy was established, within its scheme of organization was a plan for a laboratory school. The school was to take the children from 4 years of age and offer them work through the university level. The school was started in January, 1896, with a university appropriation of \$1,000, 2 women teachers and 12 students, 6 to 9 years old.³⁸ By autumn of 1898 the school enrollment had grown

³⁵ Ibid., p. 14

³⁶ Ibid., p. 89.

³⁷ Ibid., p. 48.

³⁸ Ibid., p. 232.

to 95 students and the school moved to a more spacious home at 5412 Elli Avenue. The school was able to maintain itself through the financial support of Mrs. William R. Linn. Dewey reported to President Harper that the purpose of the school was to demonstrate the unity and continuity of education from kindergarten to the university.³⁹

William R. Harper was also interested in the problem of school reform. A group of socially minded people gathered informally Sunday evenings at Mrs. Washbourne's home to talk over their current problems and activities. Mrs. Washbourne taught at Cook County Normal for Col. Francis Parker. Her good friend Francis Crane Lillie was a teacher in Dewey's laboratory school. These Sunday gatherings included President Harper, Professor Chamberlain from the University of Chicago, Mr. Bamberger, principal of Jewish Manual Training School, Jane Addams, Florence Kelley, and Julia Lathrop from Hull House, Colonel Parker and some of his faculty.⁴⁰

Chicago educational circles were in turmoil during these years. Harper was in the midst of these movements. By 1898 in a January convocation address he proposed a plan for the reform of teaching training. Harper charged that although he admired the teachers in Chicago as conscientious

³⁹ Ibid., pp. 232-34.

⁴⁰ Unpublished Diary of Mrs. Carlton Washbourne, pp. 105-106.

workers, of the five thousand teachers only about 10% had received a college education. He proposed that the university should establish degree-granting courses to improve this situation. The courses would be administered by a separate faculty with its own dean and full university privileges. These classes would be held on Saturdays and in the afternoons. The teachers of the city schools could take courses without entrance examinations. Harper believed that the smallest possible fee should be charged, and for six or eight thousand dollars a year more than a thousand teachers could get university instruction. Professor Edmund J. James was made the head of the school. Harper was enthusiastic about the project and stressed that this college for teachers was not a normal school but an arrangement of instruction for college training. Harper predicted, "It is quite certain that no money thus far employed by the university has accomplished larger results than the \$5,000 a year furnished by Mrs. Emmons Blaine for the work of the college."⁴¹

This was the month following Dewey's lectures on The School and Society. Harper recognized that Dewey's experimental school was arousing public interest. He declared

⁴¹

William R. Harper, The President's Report July, 1898-July, 1899, (Chicago, Ill.: University of Chicago Press, 1900), pp. xi-xiii.

that it was not a practice school for training teachers but a laboratory. Dewey was making genuine progress, and this school was doing true university work. It was work of the highest purpose to be able to study the growth and development of the mind of a child and to adapt educational theories to such growth. Harper thanked all the friends of this school who had contributed their financial support. He also asked them to be patient. The Laboratory School was as important as any laboratory in the university. He hoped some friends of the university would continue to endow this work as a contribution to the public school system of the nation.⁴² As these events pointing toward the future development of a school of education were taking place within the university, there were outside events which would contribute to the eventual amalgamation of the school.

Col. Francis Parker was having trouble at Cook County Normal School in the early 1890's. There were public charges and objections to Parker's advanced educational ideas. Charles Thornton, a member of the Cook County Board of Education, was Parker's most persistent and outspoken foe. When the Cook County Normal School was built, the site was comparatively worthless land which had been deeded to the school by the Beck family. It was a seventeen acre tract

⁴²

Ibid., p. xiii.

with the school in the center. The land had been landscaped as a park and used for nature study and other school activities. Parker charged that Thorton's public attacks on his methods were not the real reason for his wanting Parker to resign. Thorton was the Beck family attorney and he was trying to get hold of the land because the city had built up around the school and the land had become increasingly valuable. It seemed that the grant to the normal school had been made on the condition that a school would be established. If the school ceased operation the land would revert to the original donors. Parker claimed that it was Thorton's and the surviving heirs' intention to regain possession of the land and resell it at a profit. The stenographer who typed the agreement and witnessed the signing of it was supposed to have visited Parker and told him of the conspiracy. The story was never confirmed, and Thorton continued to attack Parker in the suburban papers and soon the story was written up in the metropolitan papers. Sides were taken with the P.T.A. of suburban Englewood, where the school was located, backing Thorton and the P.T.A. of the normal school defending Parker.⁴³ Parker charged that Thorton was engaged in a conspiracy to induce the Cook County

⁴³
Unpublished Diary of Mrs. Carlton Washbourne, pp. 99-103.

Board

Chicago

his fa

closed

the Ch

Thorto

in der

that h

closed

he wou

dent,

the T

in the

quite

passee

ly, P

Count

with

the C

made

"Addr
Publi
um,
Educa
Offi

Board to offer the Normal School property to the City of Chicago. This plot would lead to the firing of Parker and his faculty in the interim period and when the school was closed Thorton and the heirs would seize the property.

At this time Mrs. Washbourne was school reporter for the Chicago Evening Post. In her diary she recorded how Thorton came into the editor's office to protest her stories in defense of Parker. Thorton, in her words, threatened that he would ruin her reputation. The editor, Sam Clover, closed the interview by opening the door and telling Thorton he would kick him out if he didn't leave. After this incident, Mrs. Washbourne stated that the other major papers, the Tribune and the Daily News, swung over to Parker's side in the dispute. Apparently the whole question developed into quite a scandal. Mass meetings were held, resolutions passed, and members of the school board badgered. Eventually, Parker and his friends won their fight and the Cook County Normal School became the Chicago City Normal School with Parker and his faculty intact. Thorton was elected to the Chicago School Board when the transfer of the school was made on January 1, 1896.⁴⁴ Within two years Parker and the

⁴⁴Ibid., pp. 108-118, Also see Orville T. Bright, "Addresses Delivered at the Memorial Exercises Given by the Public School Teachers of Chicago and Cook County Auditorium, April 19, 1902," Reports of the Commissioner of Education, I (Washington, D.C.: U.S. Government Printing Office, 1902), p. 274.

Chicago B

was again

intereste

securing

in this s

Parker th

Parker an

Blaine's

Mrs. Bla

The

friends t

dren to s

not offe

this lad

Blaine p

bring hi

school,

In

instruct

Within a

transfe

Chicago

was cho

Chicago Board of Education were at odds. Their relationship was again becoming strained when Mrs. Emmons Blaine became interested in Col. Parker's work. She was interested in securing the best possible education for her son. It was in this search and from her admiration for both Dewey and Parker that she patronized both men and the university. Parker and Dewey were invited to her home to talk to Mrs. Blaine's friends to try to interest them in the project. Mrs. Blaine published Dewey's talks as The School and Society.

These meetings stimulated the interest of Mrs. Blaine's friends to the extent that they offered to send their children to such a school. Mrs. Washbourne stated they would not offer any financial help but depended on the wealth of this lady who was the daughter of Cyrus H. McCormick. Mrs. Blaine persuaded Parker to leave Chicago Normal School and bring his best faculty members with him to organize a new school, which was subsequently called the Chicago Institute.⁴⁵

In 1900 the Chicago Institute was opened and offered instruction from the kindergarten through the normal school. Within a year, President Harper induced Mrs. Blaine to transfer her endowment in the school to the University of Chicago and establish a school of education. Colonel Parker was chosen to head the new school.⁴⁶ The value of the land

⁴⁵Ibid., pp. 160-61.

⁴⁶Ibid., p. 161.

and prop
ferred t
attached
John Dew
of educa
the facu
Academy,
tory Sch
lishment
triumphs

The
two year
of Emmon
brated o
was appe
School a
other co
the dedi
versity
universi
that in

47
Ill.: Ur
48
Ill.: Ur

and property was one million dollars. The school was transferred to the university and reorganized as an organic unit attached to it. Col. Parker died within a few months, and John Dewey was appointed the director. His sub-department of education was absorbed into the school. On May, 1902 the faculty of the School of Education, the South Side Academy, the Chicago Manual Training School, and the Laboratory School were organized into a single unit.⁴⁷ The establishment of this school was hailed as one of the great triumphs of President Harper's administration.⁴⁸

The period of organization of the school took another two years. Many changes occurred by the time the dedication of Emmons Blaine Hall of the School of Education was celebrated on May 14, 1904. In the Presidents Report of 1902 it was apparent that there was friction over the Laboratory School and its operation. This question eventually led to other conflicts between Dewey and the administration. Before the dedication of Blaine Hall, Dewey resigned from the university and went to Columbia. It was a loss that both the university and Dewey keenly felt. Carlton Washbourne stated that in a personal conversation with Dewey, at the age of

⁴⁷ William R. Harper, The Presidents Report, I (Chicago, Ill.: University of Chicago Press, 1903), pp. lxxxiii-lxxxiv.

⁴⁸ Thomas W. Goodspeed, William Rainey Harper (Chicago, Ill.: University of Chicago Press, 1928), pp. 183-84.

ninety, he still expressed bitterness over the friction at the university which forced him to leave the Laboratory School.⁴⁹

The celebration was deemed a moment of triumph for the cause of schools of education. The University of Chicago was praised for establishing a professional school with the rank of other professional schools of law and medicine. It was predicted that both Teachers College, Columbia and School of Education, University of Chicago would lead the way for similar schools. Dr. Nicholas M. Butler, now president of Columbia, gave the dedication oration. Harper, Wilbur Jackman the new dean, Mrs. Blaine, and Dewey also gave addresses. Harper and Jackman gave the credit for establishment of the school to Col. Parker, Mrs. Blaine, and John Dewey.⁵⁰

These First Schools of Education Spread Their Fame and Influence

In the first five years of this century the fame and influence of these first two university schools of education spread throughout the nation and the world. At the 1901 meeting of the National Council of Education, Elmer Brown's

⁴⁹ Personal interview with Dr. Carlton Washbourne, September 30, 1962.

⁵⁰ "The Chicago School of Education," Popular Science Monthly, LXV (June, 1904), pp. 285-87.

report "On the Educational Progress of the Year," declared that although in the past year important steps had been taken in state universities toward strengthening pedagogical instruction, the most important steps were those taken at Columbia and Chicago universities. The work at Teachers College, Columbia, the establishment of the school of education at Chicago, and the work of John Dewey were all praised as accomplishments that were of the greatest importance to American education. It was predicted that other universities would follow and also gain this fame and honor.⁵¹

The 1902 NEA Convention was the occasion for an address by Micheal E. Sadler, Director of Inquiries and Reports of the British Education Office. He spoke on the subject, "The English Ideal of Education and Its Debt to America." Sadler argued for an exchange of ideas by exchanging teachers and graduate students. He declared that English education owed a great debt to American education. It had influenced the English to make education more democratic and to eliminate social prejudice in both schools and professions. England was also influenced by many of our great writers and students of education. He stated:

New England has had a profound influence on English

51

Elmer E. Brown, "Educational Progress of the Years," Proceedings and Addresses of the NEA (Detroit, Mich., 1901), pp. 372-73.

thinking, and of all the New England writers, Emerson has meant the most to us. We students of education are constantly drawing suggestions and inspiration from the work of a multitude of American educators, but perhaps I may be allowed to say that we are especially indebted to the writings of Dr. Harris, of President Butler, of Dr. G. Stanley Hall, of President Eliot, of John Dewey; to the work of Teachers College and of the Chicago University School of Education, and to the periodicals and other publications of your educational press. 52

Sadler concluded that America and England shared three things, language, practical idealism, and belief that the ideal of national life was to be met not in the mechanical uniformity of state regulation but in unity through diversity.⁵³

The National Society for the Study of Education at its fourth annual meeting in 1904 classified the different training institutions. Teachers' colleges, or their equivalent, at universities were placed in class one. Teachers College, Columbia was the oldest and most advanced, followed by School of Education, Chicago, and the Teachers College at the University of Missouri. The College of Education at University of Texas was considered doubtful, as a question mark appeared along side of the name of the school. The comment the year-book printed was most important. It praised the movement

52
Micheal E. Sadler, "The English Ideal of Education and Its Debt to America," Proceedings and Addresses of the NEA (Minneapolis, Minn., 1902), pp. 82-83.

53
Ibid., p. 83.

for school

dignity as

teachers."

colleges w

Edmund J.

declared:

I am

fundam

in co

of th

is se

gogie

and u

I am

I hav

sense

subje

the t

serio

ous a

Anot

education

This Eng

system.

cals and

favorabl

first un

54.

The Edu

Yearbook

of Educ

Press,

55

for schools of education as "rising into great meaning and dignity as a national factor in education and training of teachers."⁵⁴ The report further predicted that all teachers' colleges would follow the same trend. At this meeting Edmund J. James, president of the University of Illinois, declared:

I am decidedly of the opinion that, aside from those fundamental qualities which a secondary teacher needs in common with all other teachers, the greatest need of the secondary teacher in the United States today is scholarship....I have stood for professional pedagogical training for secondary teachers in our colleges and universities now for more than twenty years, and I am in favor of it today more than ever before; but I have never thought for an instant that this in any sense is a substitute for scholarly training in the subject matter which one is teaching; and I think of the two that the lack of knowledge is far the more serious difficulty today than lack of method, serious as the latter is. 55

Another important international compliment to American education was the 1905 report of the Mosely Commission. This English commission came to investigate our educational system. Its report received extensive coverage in periodicals and the educational journals. Several members recorded favorable impressions on the training of teachers in these first university schools, and that American teachers, at

⁵⁴"Provisions for the Training of Secondary Teachers," The Education and Training of Secondary Teachers, Fourth Yearbook of the National Society for the Scientific Study of Education, Part I (Chicago, Ill.: University of Chicago Press, 1905), p. 69.

⁵⁵
Ibid., p. 93.

least in the larger cities, were better trained than their English counterparts. Mr. Foster, a member of the commission, stated:

The important fact brought home to one by all this is that very large numbers of those in authority in America have recognized the need for the professional training of teachers of all grades, and that active steps are being taken to provide the training that is deemed necessary. In this way and in others already alluded to, it will be seen that the teaching profession in America is rapidly acquiring a dignity and force that will make it a great national power. 56

Another example of the importance of the establishment of these first schools of education was the effect these schools had in crystalizing various viewpoints toward the establishment of these schools at other universities. When the editorial staff on the Journal of Pedagogy began a campaign to have more schools of education established at universities, they cited the schools at Columbia and Chicago as the ideal models. As early as 1902, an editorial commented that this movement was recognition of the fact that normal schools and professors of education in colleges could not efficiently prepare teachers for secondary schools. Schools of education were not rivals of the normal schools. They had to do work that no normal school could satisfactorily accomplish, namely, training secondary teachers,

⁵⁶"Reports of the Mosely Commission," Reports of the Commissioner of Education, I (Washington, D.C.: U.S. Government Printing Office, 1905), pp. 22-23. R.M. Wenley, "Report of the Mosely Commission," Journal of Pedagogy, XVII (December, 1904), pp. 132-59.

specialist
schools of
demands for
and superior
their primary
editorial
ferent approach
In America
pedagogy by
methods we
"efficient
had proven
established
a teacher
lawyer, and

The J
for the es
by a contr
his position
made such
President
University

57"3
(December
58 It
59 H.
The Ohio
Education

specialists, expert supervisors, and superintendents. These schools of education were a product of the times and the demands for professionally trained high school instructors and superintendents. Normal schools must be satisfied with their primary function of preparing elementary teachers. The editorial stressed that other European countries used different approaches that seemed to fit their particular needs. In America university chairs of education had popularized pedagogy by establishing its cultural value, but their methods were not satisfactory when it came to producing "efficient workmen."⁵⁷ The faculties of schools of education had proven their worth, and that these schools should be established at all leading universities. The preparation of a teacher would then be as thorough as that of the clergy, lawyer, and doctor.⁵⁸

The Journal of Pedagogy published other articles asking for the establishment of schools of education. An article by a contributor who wanted to remain anonymous because of his position at an important Ohio educational institution made such a demand. H.G. Good believed this author was President William O. Thompson (1899-1925) of Ohio State University and a strong advocate of schools of education.⁵⁹

⁵⁷"Schools of Education," Journal of Pedagogy, XV (December, 1902), pp. 85-86.

⁵⁸Ibid., p. 86.

⁵⁹H.G. Good, The Rise of the College of Education of The Ohio State University (Columbus, Ohio: College of Education, 1960), pp. 32-34.

The article
was unique
normal sch
for Ohio

A tea
long
but t
for e
great
assem
ize a
unive
indee
indio
that
of th

Pres

universit

1902, an

tions fo

on April

enabling

school.

later or

people v

appoint

preside

60

Pedagog

61

The article stated the problem of teacher training in Ohio was unique as there were no state supported independent normal schools. The author proposed a "teachers' college" for Ohio State. He stated:

A teachers' college modeled on that at Columbia has long been an ideal with progressive Ohio school men, but they did not think of asking for it until schools for elementary teachers were established. In fact, a great many superintendents have urged the General Assembly to authorize Ohio State University to organize a high grade teachers' college but, thus far, the university has not seemed to favor the plan and, indeed, has blocked any movement which seemed to indicate such an outcome. It is likely, however, that the establishment of such an institution is one of the possibilities of the future. ⁶⁰

President Thompson made official recommendations to the university board in favor of a school of education in 1901, 1902, and 1905. The third of the president's recommendations for such a school was accepted on January, 1906, and on April 2, 1906, the Ohio General Assembly passed an enabling act permitting the university to establish the school. ⁶¹ The school opened its doors seventeen months later on September 17, 1907. The faculty numbered six people with the appointment of W.W. Boyd as dean. Another appointee was Professor Frank Pierrpont Graves, formerly president of the University of Washington, who in alliance

⁶⁰"An Educational Policy for Ohio," Journal of Pedagogy, XVII (December, 1905), pp. 113-22.

⁶¹ Good, op. cit., pp. 32-34.

with norm

pedagogy

the fact

professor

was made

at Ohio

Greek an

professor

The

editorial

1905 wh

philoso

Manus 1

editors

tion w

They a

progra

versity

but th

broade

of edu

afford

upgra

with normal school people closed its university school of pedagogy in 1898. A bit of historical irony is reflected in the fact that after Graves had left Washington he became professor of education at Missouri and now at the age of 37 was made professor of history and philosophy of education at Ohio State. H.G. Good thought Graves's training in Greek and classical philology an unusual preparation for a professor of education.⁶²

The editors of the Journal of Pedagogy continued their editorial policy of promotion for schools of education. In 1905 when Harvard took its department of education out of philosophy, an editorial praised the fine work of Professor Hanus in helping to bring this about. The demand of the editors was that Harvard should establish a school of education with equal rank to its other professional schools. They argued that Columbia offered the most comprehensive program in education. The School of Education at the University of Chicago had not reached its full expectations, but the University of Missouri seemed to be laying "the broadest and firmest foundations of a school for the study of education" among the state universities. Harvard could afford to invest one or two million dollars in a school to upgrade methods of teaching in the university and public

62

Ibid., pp. 46-51.

schools.

ment unt

lished.

Pro

on the v

of the c

be cons

to his

schools

Harper,

influen

Th

1905 w

Across

period

by Will

that t

not al

admini

suffer

deter

natio

Journ

schools.⁶³ Harvard was not to yield to this kind of argument until 1921, when its school of education was established.⁶⁴

Probably of more importance to the spread of the ideas on the value of schools of education was the mobile character of the educational profession itself. Frank P. Graves must be considered a typical case. Edmund James carried with him to his presidency at Illinois sentiments in favor of these schools. The educational leadership exerted by Butler, Harper, Eliot, Hall, Low, and Harris did a great deal to influence the establishment of schools of education.

The most cogent statements describing this era of 1890-1905 were made by Nicholas M. Butler in his autobiography, Across Busy Years. Butler believed this was the finest period of his lifetime in education. The era was dominated by William T. Harris and Charles W. Eliot. Butler stated that these men were a most extraordinary group. They were not all philosophers, but they were scholars, admirable administrators, and powerful personalities. Men who had suffered through the Civil War, and because of it, they were determined to make education an instrument to improve the nation. This group was open-minded, serious, and willing

⁶³"A Department of Education at Harvard-Editorial," Journal of Pedagogy, XVIII (June, 1906), pp. 244-45.

⁶⁴Morison, op. cit., pp. xiv-xviii.

to negot
views in
was a gr
too. It
of its m
tance of
of educa
of these
retired
slowing
in 1909
1906.
in 1904
Francis
Colt G
first
his exp
import
educat
educat

to negotiate differences. They would not let their diverse views interfere with their personal relationships. The NEA was a great force in the intellectual life of the profession too. It was small, but more powerful because of the quality of its membership. The year 1905 marked not only the acceptance of schools of education, but also the end of this period of educational ferment. The reasons for this was the passing of these personalities from the educational scene.⁶⁵ Harris retired as U.S. Commissioner of Education in 1906. Eliot, slowing down considerably at the turn of the century, retired in 1909. William R. Harper became sick in 1904 and died in 1906. John Lancaster Spalding suffered a series of strokes in 1904, which forced him to limit his active life. Col. Francis Parker died in 1902. G. Stanley Hall and Daniel Coit Gilman both left their respective universities in the first decades of the century. John Dewey left Chicago and his experiments in the Laboratory School. One of the most important tangible improvements that resulted from their educational leadership was the establishment of schools of education.

⁶⁵
206. Nicholas M. Butler, Across Busy Years, I, pp. 188-

The

schools

attributed

groups and

education

on the

into the

held the

tional

argued

tives

school

needs

who had

normal

argued

curric

They

educati

The

a conc

educati

educati

They

CHAPTER TEN

SUMMARY AND CONCLUSIONS

The various views that were expressed about university schools of education reveal that this movement cannot be attributed to a formal group or organization. Such diverse groups as normal school people, psychologists, philosophers, educational reformers, and university people were divided on the question. The normal school people could be divided into three categories on this issue. (1) The group who held that the normal school was by precedent and institutional right the primary teacher training agency. They argued that the university would be usurping their prerogatives if they established schools of education. The normal school needed only minor changes to meet the educational needs of the society. (2) A second group of normal people who had been active in this movement now believed that normal schools had outlived their usefulness. They also argued that education courses taught as part of the general curriculum of the university and college were inadequate. They strongly supported the establishment of schools of education as the solution to obtaining better teachers. (3) The third group of supporters of the normal schools expressed a conciliatory view. They believed that the reform of education was so great a task that there was room for all educational agencies in the professional training of teachers. They tried to establish harmony among the factions. They

were unse

education

education

in this

Dur

tion wer

new expe

with sci

also div

groups t

(1) Ther

ested in

could be

was no

versity

which an

for edu

establi

to this

not ha

fessio

The th

mental

the pr

profes

leme.

were unsuccessful because the trend was toward quality education. The normal schools lacked the prestige and educational opportunities which the university could offer in this regard.

During this period experimental psychology and education were accepted as disciplines in the universities. The new experimental psychologists and others who were concerned with science and its adaptation to educational problems were also divided on the issue of schools of education. These groups too could be divided into three main categories.

(1) There was a group of university scholars who were interested in experimental psychology but did not believe that it could be applied to educational problems. Hence, there was no need for teacher education in the college and university curriculum. (2) The second group expressed views which argued that science and psychology held great promise for education. University schools of education should be established with laboratory and research facilities devoted to this study. Departments and professors of education did not have the facilities for such research and only a professional school could supply the proper environment. (3) The third group were psychologists who believed that experimental psychology would be able to eventually solve all of the problems of mankind. These people motivated the teaching profession toward the scientific study of educational problems. Their views stimulated the movement for the scientific

study of

The

of education

liberal

were the

The first

sional

was the

place in

school

teacher

teacher

(3) The

before

should

education

group

their

reformation

tion.

T

questi

could

group

They

from

study of education to be carried on in schools of education.

The third major group who expressed views on schools of education were the university people who believed in liberal education or education for general culture. There were three groups that expressed views in this regard. (1) The first group opposed professional education or professional training of teachers. They believed that liberal arts was the basic curriculum and professional education had no place in the university. (2) The second group favored the school of education as a professional school. A better teacher would be created by a broad liberal education and teacher training that could best be obtained at a university. (3) The third group stressed the need for liberal education before professional training. They argued that universities should absorb the professional schools and require liberal education as a prerequisite to professional training. This group presented their views to the teaching profession and their arguments bolstered the views of those educational reformers who desired the establishment of schools of education.

The fourth main group who expressed views on this question were the new university presidents. Their views could also be divided into three categories. (1) The first group was the presidents of the first new universities. They believed that teachers best acquired their training from the disciplinary character of their subject, and there

was no
level.
school
toward
the es
univer
about w
of a u
of scho
educat
work be

Th
a resul
profes
their
educat
were 1
made n
on a n
school
exhibi
major
of te
this

was no need for the study of education on the university level. (2) The second group of university presidents favored schools of education as a real contribution of the university toward educational reform. This group worked actively for the establishment of these schools. (3) The last group of university presidents did not publicly express opinions about university schools of education. They defined the role of a university in such broad terms as to make the adoption of schools of education possible and desirable. Schools of education were accepted as a legitimate part of university work because of the views they presented.

The first schools of education came into existence as a result of the common concern of many people, both lay and professional alike, who were attracted to each other by their common concern over the reform of teacher training and education. They were a small informal militant group who were in a position to bring about these new schools. They made no concerted efforts to establish their reform programs on a national basis, but rather set out to establish model schools of education which would be showplaces that would exhibit what should be done to improve education.

By 1905 university schools of education became the major prestige institutions for the professional training of teachers. Teachers College, Columbia was the leader in this movement in the first decades of this century.

The normal school people, despite expressed opposition

to this
of colle
into te
purpose
of thes
program
as a re

So
research
and Sch
pioneer
themsel
a medic
the res

Th
establi
a unive
scholar
profess
tion, p
foundin
the lis
tion of
tinuain

T
affili

to this movement, slowly began to adopt the academic features of colleges and universities. They converted their schools into teachers' colleges and later into more complex multi-purpose institutions. By the midpoint of this century, many of these original normal schools had developed academic programs as large as those of many universities. They became, as a result, universities in both name and spirit.

Schools of education became leaders in educational research and scientific study. Teachers College, Columbia and School of Education, University of Chicago were the pioneers. The schools of education that followed committed themselves to this same scientific spirit. They also became a medium by which the university was linked more closely to the rest of the educational system.

The early educational reformers who worked for the establishment of schools of education believed that only in a university could the teaching profession obtain the scholarly training which was an essential prerequisite to professional education. The need for both forms of education, professional and liberal, had been stressed from the founding of these universities. The problem of reconciling the limits and scope of each form of education was a question of degree and not of principle. This would be a continuing problem in higher education.

These first schools of education were absorbed by affiliation and amalgamation into the university. Their

original

ments.

were ab

a better

the vie

schools

Th

these

all pr

curric

tion e

own de

tion

educat

views

on an

that

Ameri

why t

of co

were

grad

teach

scho

original roles were as humanitarian and educational experiments. These first schools were successful because they were able to attract large numbers of teachers who desired a better education. This success played a major role in the views of those reformers who wished to have similar schools of education established.

The study of these various views also points out that these demands were part of a general movement to incorporate all professional education into the scope of the university curriculum. The reformers interested in professional education exchanged similar views which in turn bolstered their own demands.

A general commitment to the ideal of an American education for American democracy may have been held by these educational reformers. Nevertheless, the diversity of the views presented indicated that there was little agreement on an actual plan to realize this goal. One must conclude that there was no actual agreement on the essentials of an American education. This lack of agreement would explain why these educational leaders failed to institute a program of concerted action to bring about reform.

Despite these drawbacks, the first schools of education were successful as model institutions. These schools upgraded both the academic and professional training of teachers. Many of the desired benefits that it was hoped schools of education would bring to education have not been

achiev

the sa

A scie

human

to li

ing o

educa

of th

1890

teach

cult

in o

the

ties

coul

The

this

este

most

of

est

tea

Am

me

achieved. The desire that these schools would give teaching the same status as other professions has not been realized. A science of education or the development of compatible human sciences have not yet been achieved.

The whole area of the relation of professional education to liberal education needs further study. This study dealing only with the establishment of the first schools of education was limited in scope. A study of the development of the ideas for these schools in the period before the 1890's would be fruitful. A comparative study of European teacher training institutions and methods with their cross-cultural relationship to American institutions might be in order. Another area of investigation should focus upon the introduction of schools of education into the universities in the early decades of this century. More studies could be made in depth of individual educational institutions. The educational reform leaders and their activities during this period would make a profitable study. If one is interested in the educational process, this period is one of the most important because this was the era in which the pattern of modern higher education was established.

In its historical perspective, a school of education established at a university was a unique institution for teacher education. It was as culturally unique as the American university. An institution that was created to meet the demands of the American society. The early schools

of edu

of pro

could

Educat

the un

dissem

people

of ed

pursu

right

of education were part of the movement for the incorporation of professions into the university. The university spirit could only add to the professional training of teachers. Education, as a profession among professions, could add to the university spirit in research, pursuit of truth, and the dissemination of that truth to the service of the American people. It was on this foundation that university schools of education were established, and it is only in the continued pursuit of those ends that these schools have a legitimate right to exist.

1. Fr

Bryce

Butle

DeGar

Dewe

Ferr

Edwa

Gar

Goo

Manu

Irr

McM

Pay

Rus

Tho

BIBLIOGRAPHY

I. Primary Sources

a. Books

- Bryce, James, American Commonwealth (London: Macmillan and Co., 1889), II.
- Butler, Nicholas M., Across Busy Years, I (New York: Charles Scribners and Sons, 1939).
- DeGarmo, Charles, Herbert and Hebartians, (New York: Scribners and Sons, 1896).
- Dewey, Jane M., ed., "Biography of John Dewey," in Paul Arthur Schilpp: The Philosophy of John Dewey, (N.Y.: Tudor Publishing Co., 1951), pp. 3-45.
- Dewey, John, School and Society, (Chicago, Ill.: University of Chicago Press, 1956).
- Edwards, William, Clark University 1889-1899 (Worcester, Mass.: Norwich Press, 1899).
- Gannon, Robert I., The Poor Old Liberal Arts (N.Y.: Farrar, Straus, and Cudahy, 1961).
- Goodspeed, Thomas W., William Rainey Harper, (Chicago, Ill.: University of Chicago Press, 1928).
- Manus, Paul, Adventuring in Education (Cambridge, Mass.: Harvard University Press, 1937).
- Irwin, Mary, American Universities and Colleges, (Washington, D.C.: American Council on Education, 1960).
- McMurray, Charles A., The Elements of General Method Based on Hebart, (New York: Macmillan Co., 1906).
- Payne, William Harold, Contributions to the Science of Education, (New York: Harper Brothers, 1887).
- Russell, James E., Founding Teachers College (New York: Teachers College, Columbia University, 1937).
- Thorndike, Edward L., Educational Psychology (New York: Lemcke and Buechner, 1903).
- _____, Selected Writings From a Connectionist's Psychology, (New York: Appleton Century Crofts, 1949).

Adams,

"Addre

"Addr

"Add:

"A I

All

"Ar

"A

Be

B

E

b. Articles

Adams, Charles Kendall, "The Next Step in Education," The Forum, X (February, 1891), pp. 618-32.

"Addresses at the Installation of President Butler of Columbia," Report of the Commissioner of Education, I (Washington, D.C.: U.S. Government Printing Office, 1902), pp. 623-31.

"Addresses Delivered at the Services Held in the Memory of Col. Parker at the University of Chicago, March 6, 1902," Report of the Commissioner of Education, (Washington, D.C.: U.S. Government Printing Office, 1902), pp. 264-65.

"Addresses Delivered at the Memorial Exercise Given by the Public School Teachers of Chicago and Cook County, April 19, 1902," Report of the Commissioner of Education, (Washington, D.C.: U.S. Government Printing Office, 1902), pp. 273-76.

"A Department of Education at Harvard--Editorial," Journal of Pedagogy, XVIII (June, 1906), pp. 244-45.

Allen, Jerome, "What Should Be Required of and Upon Whom is to be Conferred the Degree of Doctor of Pedagogy?" Proceedings and Addresses of the NEA (Chicago, Ill., 1893), pp. 434-37.

"An Educational Policy for Ohio," Journal of Pedagogy, XVII (December, 1905), pp. 113-22.

"Announcement of Courses of Instruction at Harvard," The Nation, July 25, 1891, p. 519.

Baker, James H., "Review of the Report of the Committee of Ten," Proceedings and Addresses of the NEA (Asbury Park, N.J., 1894), pp. 645-69.

Baldwin, James Mark, "Child Study," Psychological Review, V (January, 1898), pp. 218-20.

Balliet, Thomas M., "Report of the School of Pedagogy," Annual Reports of New York University, 1910-11 (New York, 1912), p. 81.

_____, "Study of Pedagogics," Education, XIV (October, 1893), pp. 65-68.

Blas

Blis

Bog

Bol

Bor

Bri

Bro

Bu

Bu

Bu

-

"E

E

- Blansard, Charles A., "What the People Have A Right to Ask From the Colleges," Proceedings and Addresses of the NEA (St. Paul, Minn., 1890), pp. 662-67.
- Bliss, Charles B., "Munsterberg's Attack on Experimental Psychology," The Forum, XXV (March, 1898), pp. 214-23.
- Boggs, William E., "The Advancement of the South," Proceedings and Addresses of the NEA (Denver, Colo., 1895), pp. 966-69.
- Bolton, Fredrick E., "What May the Secondary Schools of the United States Learn from a Study of German Secondary Education," Proceedings and Addresses of the NEA (St. Louis, Mo., 1904), pp. 478-81.
- Borgenicht, Miriam, "Teachers' College: An Extinct Volcano?" Harper's, CCXXIII (July, 1961), pp. 82-87.
- Bright, Orville T., "Addresses Delivered at the Memorial Exercise Given by the Public School Teachers of Chicago and Cook County, Auditorium, April 19, 1902," Reports of the Commissioner of Education, I (Washington, D.C.: U.S. Government Printing Office, 1902), pp. 273-76.
- Brown, Elmer E., "Educational Progress of the Year," Proceedings and Addresses of the NEA (Detroit, Mich., 1901), pp. 372-73.
- Buchner, Edward F., "Review of The Professional Training of Secondary Teachers in the United States," by G.W.A. Luckey, Educational Review, XXVII (September, 1904), pp. 193-96.
- Burk, Frederic, "Normal Schools and Training of Teachers," Atlantic Monthly, XXCI (May, 1898), pp. 769-79.
- Burnham, William H., "Education as a University Subject," Educational Review, XXVII (October, 1903), pp. 236-45.
- _____, "Some Aspects of the Teaching Profession," The Forum, XXV (June, 1898), pp. 481-95.
- "Business Side of City School Administration," Review of Reviews, November, 1903, pp. 607-8.
- Butler, Nicholas M. "Editorial," Educational Review, IX (February, 1898), pp. 196-99.

Butle

Cat

.

Cl

"C

"C

Co

Co

Butler, Nicholas M., "President Gilman's Administration at the Johns Hopkin's University," Review of Reviews, XXIII (January, 1901), pp. 49-53.

_____, "Professional and Technical Instruction in the University," Proceedings and Addresses of the NEA (Asbury Park, N.J., 1894), pp. 619-23.

_____, "Professional Schools and American College," Education Review, XXIV (December, 1902), pp. 503-17.

_____, Review of Pedagogical Seminary, edited by G. Stanley Hall, Educational Review, VII (February, 1894), pp. 196-97.

_____, "Scholarship and Service," Educational Review, XXIV (June, 1902), pp. 1-9.

_____, "Some Pressing Problems," Proceedings and Addresses of the NEA (Minneapolis, Minn., 1902), pp. 68-69.

_____, "The Length of the Baccalaureate Course," Proceedings and Addresses of the NEA (Boston, Mass., 1903), pp. 500-504.

_____, "The Training of the Teacher," The Century, XXXVIII (September, 1899), pp. 915-20.

_____, "Universities and Schools Discussion," Proceedings and Addresses of the NEA (Toronto, Canada, 1891), p. 502.

Cattell, James M., "Munsterberg's Danger from Experimental Psychology," Psychological Review, V (July, 1898), pp. 411-13.

_____, "The Progress of Psychology," Popular Science Monthly, XLIII (October, 1893), pp. 779-85.

Clark, W.A., "Training of Teachers for Secondary Schools," Journal of Pedagogy, XVI (December, 1903), pp. 131-35.

"Classified Membership by States," Proceedings and Addresses of the NEA (Charleston, S.C., 1900), p. 800.

"Commencement Day 1902," Columbia University Quarterly, IV (September, 1902), pp. 365-66.

Cook, Albert S., "Teaching of English," Atlantic Monthly, LXXXVII (May, 1901), pp. 716-17.

Cooper, Oscar H., "Universities and Schools," Proceedings and Addresses of the NEA (Toronto, Canada, 1891), pp. 493-98.

"Co

"Co

Dep

Dew

Dol

Dot

Dre

"D

Dw

"E

"E

El

—

"Correspondence," Popular Science Monthly, LVII (May, 1900), pp. 210-12.

DeGarmo, Charles, "Psychology and Education," Psychological Review, V (September, 1898), pp. 668-71.

_____, "The Scope of Pedagogical Work in Universities," Proceedings and Addresses of the NEA (Saratoga Springs, N.Y., 1892), pp. 774-80.

Department of Higher Education, "The Length of the Baccalaureate Course and the Preparation for Professional Schools," Proceedings and Addresses of the NEA (Boston, Mass., 1903), pp. 487-516.

Dewey, John, "Are the Schools Doing What the People Want Them to Do?" XXI, Educational Review (May, 1901), pp. 459-474.

Dolbear, A.E., "Metamorphosis in Education," Popular Science Monthly, XXXIX (October, 1891), pp. 750-61.

Doty, Duane, "Our American Schools--Their Progress, Condition, and Prospects," Scientific American Supplement, XXXVIII (July 21, 1894), p. 15472.

Draper, Andrew S., "The New York Secondary School System," Reports of the Commissioner of Education, II (Washington, D.C.: U.S. Government Printing Office, 1905), pp. 152-53.

"Dr. Balliet for the School of Pedagogy," Journal of Pedagogy, XVI (June, 1904), p. 276.

Dwight, Timothy, "Modern College Education," Cosmopolitan, XXIII (August, 1897), pp. 437-45.

"Editorial," Columbia University Bulletin, XIX (March, 1898), pp. 120-22.

"Editorial," Columbia University Bulletin, XVII (June, 1897), pp. 177-78.

"Education in Business and Economics," The Outlook, October 15, 1898), p. 414.

Eliot, Charles W., "Address at Installation of President Butler of Columbia University," Report of Commissioner of Education, 1902, II (Washington, D.C.: U.S. Government Printing Office, 1903), pp. 622-23.

_____, "Commercial Education," Educational Review, XVIII (December, 1899), pp. 417-24.

_____, "The Gap Between the Elementary School and the Colleges," Proceedings and Addresses of the NEA (St. Paul, Minn., 1890), pp. 522-33.

_____, "The New Education, Its Organization," Atlantic Monthly, XXIII (February, 1869), pp. 203-220, 358-67.

_____, "The Unity of Educational Reform," Report of the Commissioner of Education, 1892-3 (Washington, D.C.: U.S. Government Printing Office, 1894), pp. 1465-73.

Emerton, Ephraim, "Gentleman and Scholar," Atlantic Monthly, LXXV (May, 1900), pp. 773-78.

Felmley, David, "The Modern High School Curriculum as Preparation for a Two-Year Normal Course," Proceedings and Addresses of the NEA (Asbury Park, N.J., 1905), pp. 525-33.

Foster, Fred C., "The Normal School and The School of Pedagogy," Educational Review, VII (March, 1894), pp. 383-84.

"Four Educational Meetings," The Nation (July 17, 1890), pp. 47-48.

Fulcomer, Daniel, "A Sociological Ideal View of the Normal Schools," Proceedings and Addresses of the NEA (Chicago, Ill., 1893), pp. 423-27.

_____, "Professional Work in a Normal School: Discussion," Proceedings and Addresses of the NEA (Toronto, Canada, 1891), p. 726.

Fulcomer, Mrs. Daniel, "The Ideal in Professional Training," Education, XVI (April, 1896), pp. 473-81.

Gilman, Daniel Coit, "A Discourse on Boys and Boy's Schools," Cosmopolitan, XII (April, 1891), pp. 461-70.

_____, "Modern Education," Cosmopolitan, XXIII (May, 1897), pp. 33-39.

_____, "Opening Address," Proceedings and Addresses of the NEA (Chicago, Ill., 1893), pp. 94-104.

_____, "The Shortening of the College Curriculum," Educational Review, I (March, 1891), pp. 1-7.

Gordy

Green

Gruen

Hadle

Hadl

Hail

Hall

Gordy, John P., Rise and Growth of the Normal School Idea in the United States, Curricular of Information No. 8, (U.S. Bureau of Education, Washington D.C.: U.S. Government Printing Office, 1891).

_____, "The Functions of a University School of Education," Journal of Pedagogy, XIV (March, 1902), pp. 190-95.

Greenwood, J.M., "Report of the Committee on Normal Education," Proceedings and Addresses of the NEA (Saratoga Springs, N.Y., 1892), pp. 785-86.

Gruenberg, Benjamin, "William James," Scientific American, CIII (September, 1910), p. 198.

Hadley, Arthur T., "End of Education," The Outlook, August 3, 1901, pp. 761-63.

_____, "Modern Education," Cosmopolitan, XXVIII (November, 1899), pp. 104-13.

Hadley, Arthur T., "The Meaning and Purpose of Secondary Education," School Review, X (December, 1902), pp. 729-41.

Hailman, W.N., "The Next Step in Education of the Indian," Proceedings and Addresses of the NEA (Denver, Colo., 1895), pp. 80-86.

Hall, G. Stanley, "Child Study: The Basis of Exact Education," The Forum, XVI (December, 1893), pp. 429-41.

_____, "Daniel Coit Gilman," The Outlook, August 3, 1901, pp. 818-21.

_____, "Discussion," Proceedings and Addresses of the NEA (Boston, Mass., 1903), p. 515.

_____, "Discussion," Proceedings and Addresses of the NEA (Toronto, Canada, 1891), p. 504.

_____, "Editorial," Pedagogical Seminary, I, 1891, p. 326.

_____, "Means Available for the Preparation of Teachers," Proceedings and Addresses of the NEA (Toronto, Canada, 1891), p. 504.

_____, "Normal Schools Especially in Massachusetts," Pedagogical Seminary, IX (December, 1902), pp. 180-92.

_____, "Psychology in Universities," Report of the Commissioner of Education, 1893-4, I, (Washington, D.C.: U.S. Government Printing Office, 1894), pp. 445-49.

Helps

Halsey

Harper

Harper

Harr

Her-

- _____, "Relative Advantages and Limitations of Universities and Normal Schools in Preparing Secondary Teachers," The Education and Training of Secondary Teachers, Fourth Yearbook of the National Society for Scientific Study of Education, Part I (Chicago, Ill.: University of Chicago Press, 1905), p. 84.
- _____, "The Training of Teachers," The Forum, X (September, 1890), pp. 11-22.
- Halsey, R.M., "University Extension," Proceedings and Addresses of the NEA (St. Louis, Mo., 1904), pp. 294-8.
- Harper, William R., "Length of the Baccalaureate Course," Proceedings and Addresses of the NEA (Boston, Mass., 1903), pp. 506-509.
- Harper, William R., Presidents Report July, 1897-July, 1898 with Summaries for 1891-1897, (Chicago, Ill.: University of Chicago Press, 1899).
- _____, The Presidents Report, (Chicago, Ill.: University of Chicago Press, 1903).
- _____, The Presidents Report July, 1898-July, 1899, (Chicago, Ill.: University of Chicago Press, 1900).
- _____, "The University and Democracy," Cosmopolitan, XXVI (April, 1899), pp. 681-91.
- Harris, William T., "Address of Welcome," Proceedings and Addresses of the NEA (Saratoga Springs, N.Y., 1892), p. 54.
- _____, "Letter of Transmittal," U.S. Circular of Information, V (Washington, D.C.: U.S. Government Printing Office, 1891), pp. 5-6.
- _____, "National Education Association: Its Organization and Functions," Proceedings and Addresses of the NEA (Toronto, Canada, 1891), pp. 443-56.
- _____, "Public Faith in American Education," Proceedings and Addresses of the NEA (Saratoga Springs, N.Y., 1892), pp. 56-61.
- _____, "The Future of the Normal School," Educational Review, XVII (January, 1899), pp. 1-15.
- Hervey, Walter L., "A College For Teachers," The Nation, April 9, 1896, p. 287.
- _____, "The Function of a Teachers' Training College," Proceedings and Addresses of the NEA (Toronto, Canada, 1891), pp. 733-39.

Hill,

Mill,

Hollis

Holmes

Holt,

"Homes

Ryde

"Inn

"Int.

Irel

Jack

Jame

- Hill, Albert Ross, "Should Chairs of Pedagogy Attached to College Departments of Universities be Developed into Professional Colleges for the Training of Teachers, Co-ordinate With Those of Law, Medicine, and Engineering, Or Should They be Abolished?" Proceedings and Addresses of the NEA (Asbury Park, N.J., 1905), pp. 512-15.
- Mill, Evan, "Have Our Teachers Colleges Failed?" Saturday Evening Post, CCXXXIV (November 11, 1961), pp. 30-31.
- Hollis, A.P., "Heads of Departments and Training Schools," Proceedings and Addresses of the NEA (Minneapolis, Minn., 1902), pp. 534-35.
- Holmes, Manfred J., "Provision for Education of Secondary Teachers," The Education and Training of Secondary Teachers, Fourth Yearbook of National Society for the Scientific Study of Education, Part I (Chicago, Ill.: University of Chicago Press, 1905), pp. 63-82.
- Holt, Rosa Belle, "The Teachers College," Cosmopolitan, XVI (March, 1894), pp. 579-88.
- "Homoeopathic Medical College," General Catalogue of the University of Michigan 1837-1911 (Ann Arbor, Mich.: Published by University, 1912), p. 550.
- Hyde, William DeWitt, "The College," Educational Review, XVII (December, 1904), pp. 476-77.
- _____, "The Organization of American Education," Proceedings and Addresses of the NEA (Saratoga Springs, N.Y., 1892), pp. 217-29.
- "Innovations at the University of Chicago," The Nation, October 6, 1892, pp. 255-56.
- "Introduction of William T. Harris," Proceedings and Addresses of the NEA (Saratoga Springs, N.Y., 1892), p. 54.
- Ireland, John, "State Schools and Parish Schools--Is Union Between Them Impossible," Proceedings and Addresses of the NEA (St. Paul, Minn., 1890), pp. 179-99.
- Jackman, Wilber S., "Discussion," Educational Review, XX (June, 1900), pp. 85-89.
- James, Edmund J., "What the New President is Planning for the University of Illinois," Review of Reviews, XXXII (October, 1905), pp. 441-43.

James

Jewel

Jordan

Karr

King

Kirk

Kirk

Ladd

Lee,

Lee,

"Lit

"Low

McN

Max

Max

- James, William, "Talks to Teachers on Psychology," Atlantic Monthly, XXCIII (January, 1899), pp. 155-62.
- Jewett, George F., "A Shorter College Course," Journal of Pedagogy, XIII (June, 1901), pp. 216-26.
- Jordan, David Starr, "Science and the Colleges," Popular Science Monthly, XLII (April, 1893), pp. 721-34.
- _____, "University Building," Popular Science Monthly, LXI (August, 1902), pp. 330-38.
- Karr, Grant, "How Can the Normal School Best Produce Efficient Teachers of the Elementary Branches as Regards the Control of Both Subject Matter and Methods?" Proceedings and Addresses of the NEA (Asbury Park, N.J., 1905), pp. 533-40.
- King, Clarence, "Education of the Future," The Forum, XIII (March, 1892), pp. 20-33.
- Kirk, John R., "How To Increase Normal School Scholarship: Discussion," Proceedings and Addresses of the NEA (Boston, Mass., 1903), p. 591.
- Kirkpatrick, E.A., "Child Study in the Training of Teachers," Review of Reviews, XIV (December, 1896), pp. 687-89.
- Ladd, George Trumbell, "The Essentials of a Modern Liberal Education," Educational Review, X (October, 1895), pp. 234-38.
- Lee, Edwin A., "The Development of Professional Programs in Education," Unpublished Ph.D. Dissertation, Teachers College, Columbia University, 1925.
- Lee, Joseph, "Munsterberg on the New Education," Educational Review, XX (September, 1900), pp. 123-40.
- "Literature of Education," Educational Review, May, 1900, pp. 490-91.
- "Low, Seth, "Higher Education in the United States," Educational Review, V (January, 1893), p. 11.
- _____, "Relation of Professional Schools to the University," Proceedings and Addresses of the NEA (Chicago, Ill., 1893), pp. 146-49.
- McMurray, Frank M., "Method of Solution of Educational Problems," Columbia Teachers College Record, V (May, 1904), pp. 1-6.
- Maxwell, Guy E., "The Cooperation of Universities and Normal Schools in the Training of Elementary Teachers," Proceedings and Addresses of the NEA (Asbury Park, N.J., 1905), pp. 542-45.
- Maxwell, William H., "Education for Efficiency," Proceedings and Addresses of the NEA (Asbury Park, N.J., 1905), pp. 59-65.

Micha

Milwa

M'Lov

Moff

Mori

Muns

"Na

"NE

"NE

"Not

O'Le

O'Sh

Pack

_____, "Present Problems of the School," Educational Review, XXVIII (November, 1904), pp. 378-95.

Michigan Supreme Court Decisions, Stuart vs. School District of Kalamazoo, 30 Michigan 69, 1874.

Milwaukee Sentinel, December 27, 1962.

M'Louth, Lewis M., "The Place and Function of the Agricultural College," Proceedings and Addresses of the NEA (St. Paul, Minn., 1900), pp. 219-25.

Moffett, Samuel E., "Nicholas Murray Butler," Cosmopolitan, XXXIV (November, 1902), pp. 177-79.

Morison, Samuel Eliot, The Development of Harvard University, (Cambridge, Mass.: Harvard University Press, 1930).

Munsterberg, Hugo, "Danger From Experimental Psychology," Atlantic Monthly, XXCI (January, 1898), 159-67.

_____, "School Reform," Atlantic Monthly, XXCV (April, 1900), pp. 656-69.

_____, "The Germans and Americans," Atlantic Monthly, XXCIV (July, 1899), pp. 396-407.

"National Council of Education," "Report of the Committee on Normal Education," Proceedings and Addresses of the NEA (Saratoga Springs, N.Y., 1892), pp. 747-488.

"NEA Convention," Outlook, LVIV (July, 1898), p. 707.

"NEA Meeting in Asbury Park," The Nation, July 19, 1894, p. 48.

"Notes and News," Journal of Pedagogy, XIII (June, 1900), p. 270.

O'Leary, Timothy, "An Inquiry Into General Purposes, Functions, and Organization of Selected University Schools of Education." Unpublished Ph.D. dissertation, Dept. of Education, Catholic University, 1941.

O'Shea, Micheal V., "The Training of the High School Teacher," Proceedings and Addresses of the NEA (Washington, D.C., 1898), pp. 709-17.

Packard, S.S., "Business Education: Its Place in the American Curriculum," Proceedings and Addresses of the NEA (Saratoga Springs, N.Y., 1892), pp. 461-70.

Parke

Parso

Parti

Peck

Pepp

Pola

"Pre

"Pr

Raak

Ram

"Re

Parker, Francis W., "Application of Child Study in the Schools," Proceedings and Addresses of the NEA (Denver, Colo., 1895), pp. 418-29.

_____, "School of the Future," Proceedings and Addresses of the NEA (Toronto, Canada, 1891), pp. 82-89.

_____, Talks on Pedagogics (New York: E.L. Kellogg and Co., 1894).

Parsons, William W., "Normal School Curriculum," Proceedings and Addresses of the NEA (St. Paul, Minn., 1890), pp. 718-24.

Partridge, Arthur Ray, "The Rise of the University School of Education as a Professional Institute," Unpublished D.Ed. dissertation, School of Education, Stanford University, 1958.

Peck, Harry Thurston, "Modern Education," Cosmopolitan, XXIII (July, 1897), pp. 263-71.

Pepper, William, "The Relation of Undergraduate and Post-Graduate Curricula," Proceedings and Addresses of the NEA (Saratoga Springs, N.Y., 1892), pp. 70-81.

Poland, A.B., "College Graduates in Elementary Schools, Discussion," Proceedings and Addresses of the NEA (Minneapolis, Minn., 1902), pp. 279-83.

_____, Review of Rise and Growth of Normal School Idea, by John P. Gordy, Educational Review, III (May, 1892), pp. 505-506.

"President Low on University Education," The Nation, January 5, 1893, pp. 6-7.

"Private Aid to Education," Educational Review, XIX (May, 1900), p. 491.

Raab, Henry, "Rural School Problems," Proceedings and Addresses of the NEA (Saratoga Springs, N.Y., 1892), pp. 577-84.

Ramsey, Charles C., "Normal Schools in the United States," Education, XVIII (December, 1896), pp. 232-40.

"Report of the Committee on Normal Education," Proceedings and Addresses of the NEA (Saratoga Springs, N.Y., 1892), pp. 781-88.

"Re

Ric

"Re

"Re

Em

Sab

Sad

"Reports of the Mosely Commission," Reports of the Commission of Education, I (Washington, D.C.: U.S. Government Printing Office, 1905), pp. 22-23.

Rice, Joseph Mayer, "Need the School Blight the Child's Life," The Forum, XII (November, 1892), pp. 529-535.

_____, "Our Public School Systems of Buffalo and Cincinnati," The Forum, XIV (November, 1892), pp. 293-309.

_____, "The Primary School System of New York," The Forum, XIV (January, 1893), pp. 616-630.

_____, "The Public Schools of Boston," The Forum, XIV (February, 1893), pp. 753-767.

_____, "The Public Schools of Philadelphia," The Forum, XV (March, 1893), pp. 31-42.

_____, "The Public School System of St. Louis and Indianapolis," The Forum, XIV (December, 1892), pp. 429-444.

_____, "The Substitution of the Teacher for the Textbook," The Forum, XIX (June, 1895), pp. 681-688.

_____, "Why Teachers Have No Professional Standing," The Forum, XXVII (June, 1899), pp. 452-463.

"Round Tables of State and County Superintendents," Proceedings and Addresses of the NEA (St. Louis, Mo., 1904), pp. 306-9.

"Royce, Josiah, "Is There a Science of Education," Educational Review, I (January, 1891), pp. 15-25, 121-32.

_____, "The New Psychology and Consulting Psychologist," The Forum, XXVI (September, 1898), pp. 80-96.

Russell, James E., "The Training of Teachers For Secondary Schools," Proceedings and Addresses of the NEA (Columbus, Ohio, 1899), pp. 285-96.

Sabin, Henry, "What Present Means Are Available For the Preparation of Teachers for Their Work," Proceedings and Addresses of the NEA (Toronto, Canada, 1891), pp. 505-18.

Sadler, Micheal E., "The English Ideal of Education and Its Debt to America," Proceedings and Addresses of the NEA (Minneapolis, Minn., 1902), pp. 75-83.

Schaeffer, Nathan C., "One Sided Training of Teachers," The Forum, XXXII (December, 1901), pp. 456-59.

_____, "Report of Committee on Normal Education: Discussion," Proceedings and Addresses of the NEA (Saratoga Springs, N.Y., 1892), pp. 784-88.

"School of Journalism of Columbia University," Popular Science Monthly, LXIII (October, 1903), pp. 569-71.

"Schools of Education," Journal of Pedagogy, XV (December, 1902), pp. 85-86.

Schurman, J.G., "Teaching, A Trade or Profession," The Forum, XXI (March, 1896), pp. 171-85.

_____, Twenty-Eighth Annual Report by President Schurman 1919-1920 (Ithaca, N.Y.: Cornell University, 1920).

_____, Twenty-Seventh Annual Report by President Schurman 1918-1919 (Ithaca, N.Y.: Cornell University, 1919).

Seerly, Homer H., "Defects in the Normal Schools," Proceedings and Addresses of the NEA (Minneapolis, Minn., 1902), pp. 539-48.

_____, "Relative Advantages and Limitations of Universities and Normal Schools in Preparing of Secondary Teachers," The Education and Training of Secondary Teachers, Fourth Yearbook of the National Society for the Scientific Study of Education, Part I (Chicago, Ill.: University of Chicago Press, 1905), pp. 84-89.

Sellery, George C., Some Ferments at Wisconsin 1901-1947, (Madison, Wisc.: University of Wisconsin Press, 1960).

"Sexes as Pupils and Teachers," The Nation, August 18, 1892, p. 125.

Shaw, Edward B., "Child Study in New York," Proceedings and Addresses of the NEA (Denver, Colo., 1895), pp. 900-901.

"Slight Confidence in Pedagogy," Report of the Commissioner of Education 1890-91 (Washington, D.C.: U.S. Government Printing Office, 1891), p. 1076.

Sloane, W.M., "Princeton University," Harper's, XXCI (November, 1890), pp. 886-900.

Snyder, Z.X., "The Cooperation of Universities and Normal Schools in Training of Secondary Teachers," Proceedings and Addresses of the NEA (Asbury Park, N.J., 1905), pp. 551-55.

- "Societies for the Scientific Study of Education," Popular Science Monthly, LXI (May, 1902), p. 92.
- Spalding, John Lancaster, "Progress in Education," Proceedings and Addresses of the NEA (Detroit, Mich., 1901), pp. 66-85.
- _____, "The Development of Educational Ideas in Nineteenth Century," Educational Review, XVIII (November, 1904), pp. 335-60.
- _____, "The University and the Teacher," Reports of the Commissioner of Education, I (Washington, D.C.: U.S. Government Printing Office, 1899), pp. 624-34.
- Starr, Fredrick, "Science at University of Chicago," Popular Science Monthly, LI (October, 1897), pp. 784-805.
- "Teachers College," Columbia University Quarterly, XIX (March, 1898), pp. 140-41.
- "The Advanced System of Education," Scientific American, May 4, 1895, p. 274.
- "The Chicago School of Education," Popular Science Monthly, LXV (June, 1904), pp. 285-87.
- "The Faculty of Applied Science," Columbia University Quarterly, I (June, 1899), pp. 241-59.
- "The Farmer's Crisis," Popular Science Monthly, October, 1891, pp. 856-57.
- "The Future of the Normal School," Journal of Pedagogy, XV (June, 1903), pp. 273-78.
- "The Opening of Leland Stanford University," Scientific American, October, 1891, p. 225.
- "The Yale Bicentenary," The Nation, October 24, 1901, pp. 317-19.
- Thorndike, Edward L., "What is a Psychical Fact?" Psychological Review, V (November, 1898), pp. 645-50.
- Thwing, Charles F., "A New Profession," Educational Review, January, 1898, pp. 26-33.
- "Training for Teachers," The Outlook, October 15, 1898, p. 414.
- "Two Ways of Teaching English," Century, LI (November, 1895), p. 739.

"U

"U

Va

"

W

Wa

We

We

We

W

W

W

W

W

W

W

W

W

"Universities in the United States and Great Britain,"
Scientific American, July 4, 1903, p. 4.

"University Notes," Columbia University Bulletin, XVIII
(December, 1897), p. 45.

Van Leiw, Charles C., "A Statement of Issues Before the
Department," Proceedings and Addresses of the NEA
(Asbury Park, N.J., 1905), pp. 519-24.

"Von Holst's Convocation Oration," The Nation, March 9, 1893,
p. 180.

Walker, John B., "Modern College Education," Cosmopolitan,
XXII (April, 1896), pp. 887-88.

Washington, Booker T., "The Influence of the Negroes's
Citizenship," Proceedings and Addresses of the NEA
(Buffalo, N.Y., 1896), pp. 208-17.

Wendell, Barrett, "Our National Superstition," North
American Review, CLXXIX (July, 1904), pp. 388-401.

Wenley, R.M., "Report of the Mosely Commission," Journal
of Pedagogy, XVII (December, 1904), pp. 132-59.

West, Andrew F., "Greek for the Bachelor of Arts,"
Proceedings and Addresses of the NEA (Chicago, Ill.,
1893), pp. 118-42.

_____, "Length of the Baccalaureate Course,"
Proceedings and Addresses of the NEA (Boston, Mass.,
1903), pp. 509-15.

Whitney, Allen S., History of Professional Training of
Teachers at the University of Michigan (Ann Arbor,
Michigan: George Wahr, 1930).

_____, "The First Chair of Education in an
American University," School and Society, LIII
(March 1, 1941), pp. 257-61.

Williams, Henry G., "Discussion, How to Increase Normal
School Scholarship," Proceedings and Addresses of the
NEA (Boston, Mass., 1903), p. 587.

Wilson, Woodrow, "Should Antecedent Liberal Education Be
Required of Students in Law, Medicine, and Theology?"
Proceedings and Addresses of the NEA (Chicago, Ill.,
1893), pp. 112-19.

Woodring, Paul, "Short Happy Life of the Teacher's College,"
Saturday Review, XLIV (June 17, 1961), pp. 60-62.

d. Miscellaneous

Washbourne, Carlton W., Personal interview on September 30, 1962.

Washbourne, Mrs. Carlton, Unpublished diary.

II. Secondary Sources

a. Books

Barck, Oscar T. and Nelson M. Blake, Since 1900 (New York: Macmillan Company, 1959).

Cremin, Lawrence A., The Transformation of the School (New York: Alfred A. Knopf, 1961).

Drake, William E., The American School in Transition (Englewood Cliffs: Prentice-Hall Inc., 1955).

Gates, Charles M., The First Century at University of Washington (Seattle, Wash.: University of Washington Press, 1961).

Goldman, Eric F., Bandwagons with Destiny (New York: Vintage Books, 1967).

Good, H.G., The Rise of the College of Education of the Ohio State University (Columbus, Ohio: College of Education, 1960).

Hofstadter, Richard, Social Darwinism in American Thought, (Beacon Hill: Beacon Press, 1955).

Jones, Theodore F., New York University 1832-1932, (N.Y.: New York University Press, 1933),

Nevins, Allan and Henry Steele Commager, A Short History of the United States (New York: Modern Library, 1942).

Rudolph, Fredrick, The American College and University, (New York: Alfred A. Knopf, 1962).

Scott, Franklin W., "Historical Sketch of the University of Illinois," The Alumni Record of the University of Illinois (Chicago, Ill.: Lakeside Press, 1918), pp. vii-xxx.

ROOM USE ONLY

MICHIGAN STATE UNIVERSITY LIBRARIES



3 1293 03169 1508