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CONCEPTIONS OF DISCIPLINE IN THE
PUBLIC SCHOOLS OF THE UNITED
STATES FOR THE PAST
SIXTY YEARS
CHAPTER I.

PURPOSE AND METHOD OF THE STUDY.

In attempting to determine the attitude of educators in the United States toward the problem of discipline during the past sixty years, it was necessary, at the very outset, to delimit the field of inquiry and to define the terms to be used.

The term discipline, as used in this paper, will be understood as being limited to that field which has as its objective the creation and the maintenance of proper order in the classroom and in the school. This study is not concerned with any other form of discipline, although at times the dividing line between this particular problem of control and mental and moral training becomes almost unrecognizable. Nor does the question of motivation, as such, enter the field of our inquiry. Rather, the limits of discipline will be understood to be the external, physical keeping of good order by the teacher.

The purpose of this research can be divided into two parts:

(a) What ideas, ideals, methods, and conceptions of discipline have been prevalent among the leading educators of the United States during the past sixty years?

(b) Have these ideas, ideals, methods, and conceptions of discipline been influenced by the leading educational movements of their particular period? If so, to what extent?

The historical method was, obviously, the only available means for the gathering of the necessary data. The field was fur-
ther limited by the choice of the source materials. The record of the speeches and addresses presented before the conventions of the National Education Association, collected and published annually, was examined. The dates were from 1870 to 1931, inclusive. The data collected from this source formed the basis for the conclusions, for it is taken for granted that the ideas expressed by the members of the National Education Association are indicative, at least, of the sentiment of the teaching profession of the country. While many of the speakers were obscure, and although the sincerity of some of the sentiments expressed might be open to question, there was a sufficient sprinkling of well known names to render the investigation of value.

While the investigation proper was limited to the record of the proceedings of the National Education Association, other books and publications were consulted for the necessary background. As an added source, the bulletins for the Department of Elementary School Principals, a publication of the National Education Association, were also consulted.

In treating a subject as important and as inclusive as discipline, a writer is faced with the question of just how much of material prior to the dates of investigation should be necessary for a complete comprehension of the problem. In this case, it would be futile to go too far back into history to trace the rise and fall of the different schools of discipline. The most outstanding phases are well known to the average reader. The Spartan method, for example, which aimed through repression of all outward manifestations of emotion, pain, or affection, to create an invincible warrior breed, is a method that needs no explana-
tion. The methods of discipline used in the early Roman and Greek schools, as well as the system of control practiced in the medieval schools, had little or no effect upon the American phase of education, and hence will be omitted.

The concept of discipline held by the early American educators is rather graphically depicted in the literature of the period. The chief objective was a complete subjugation of the pupil to the authority of the master, this subjugation having as its outward symbol what was termed "pin-point order." Messenger (33:269-270) sums up the features of early education in America.

The methods of teaching were simple and direct, though very inefficient. No one thought of anything but pure memory work, but the memory was aided by rhyme and meter. It was aided also by physical appliances cut from the branches of trees and applied vigorously and almost daily. The whipping post was the center of the most impressive school activities. These activities were not extra-curricular, either, they were intimately associated with class work. Some sweet spirited teachers offered positive rewards as an inducement to study in place of the gad. For example, pupils who had learned their lessons unusually well would be allowed to read two chapters in the bible.

During Colonial days, and even for the first quarter century after the establishment of the republic, such methods were the rule rather than the exception. Corporal punishment was looked upon as a necessary adjunct of learning, and although the ideas of Rousseau, as set forth in his Emile, and carried on by many educators, were slowly permeating through the various strata of society down to the inarticulate mass of parents, it was some time before any appreciable amount of reform in the admittedly bad school situation could be detected.

Many of the repressive and coercive tendencies in discipline
can be traced to the influence of the Puritans on the early school thought of the country.

Prior to 1840 (16:22), there is little in the literature that will point out any conception of any other relationship between pupil and teacher than that of inferior and superior. Since it was necessary, for the show of good control, to keep absolute silence and order in the classrooms, the discipline of the schools was wholly restrictive or negative (16:24). This restrictive nature of the control was due to the lack of elasticity of the code of discipline, which necessitated a constant emphasis upon the punishment for non-conformity with the set rules, rather than upon the constructive rewards that would follow conformity with the decrees of those in authority.

Leaving for later discussion the effects of such a system upon the minds and characters of the pupils, the question of teaching efficiency under this regime is discussed by Pickens Harris (16:25):

It seems a conservative estimate to conclude that the major portion of the teacher's time was given to keeping order and inflicting punishment. Indeed, books, articles, and school committee regulations concerning the management and discipline of the school specify that proper allowance and deduction from "hearing each lesson" must be made for "correcting faults" and "administering punishments." The actual work of instruction occupied only a secondary position in relation to the assumed importance of silence, order, physical posture, and the like.

Summarizing, we find that the "system was based on traditional practices and an existing morality which was identified with religious authority and which presumed to control, in the interest of heavenly sanction, the total range of the
child's responses" (16:41).

It is not to be inferred that prior to 1840 there were no educators who felt a dissatisfaction with the existing order of things. From time to time a voice would be raised in protest, but the lack of influence of the protesting individual, coupled with the limited nature of the facilities for the dissemination of his ideas, rendered his attempts at reform abortive, or at best, strictly local in character.

The example of Pestalozzi, carried forward by Samuel Hall, and made vivid by the writings of Horace Mann, led to a spirit of reform that found tangible expression in the establishment of the first American Normal schools. Their influence upon the thought of the American teaching profession, as expressed through the medium of the National Education Association, will be the material for the next chapter.
CHAPTER II.
THE INFLUENCE OF PESTALOZZI, FROEBEL, AND THE NORMAL SCHOOLS.

Attention was called as early as 1829 to the low grade of teacher preparation in the United States. The profession of the teacher was looked upon with disfavor, and drew to its ranks men who considered it a makeshift or a part time occupation. Worse still, the type of individual who attempted to teach was that represented by professional and business incompetence (37:393). Standards of fitness and training were completely absent.

The reports of Pestalozzi's work filtered slowly into the country. It is entirely possible that the movement for a real teacher training had its inception independent of foreign influence. In 1823 the first normal school was founded at Concord, Vermont, by Samuel R. Hall, as a distinctly American undertaking. Reisner (37:394) believes that the plan of James G. Carter for a teacher's seminary, as enunciated in his Essays upon Public Education, published in 1824-1825, was equally free from any German or other influence. On the other hand, Reisner feels that the reports of a favorable nature concerning the Prussian system of training made by Cousin, Stowe, Bache, Mann, and other commentators had a great deal to do with the sentiment that culminated in the establishment of the first normal schools in the United States and in the movement for state policies in the training of teachers.

The first Normal School in America was founded in 1838 at Lexington, Massachusetts, with Cyrus Peirce as its principal. In his lectures on teaching, quoted by Reisner (37:401), we find some enlightenment concerning the attitude toward dis-
cipline that was to find echo in later years in the proceedings of the National Education Association.

"Decide at the outset," he advised his charges, "whether you will govern by fear of punishment, by force of persuasion, or by both, but do not vary the system continually. A government conducted by caprice is no government at all." He found all appeals to fear objectionable because schools ruled by fear develop no self-control in the pupils. Perhaps, he said, the time had not arrived when the rod could be entirely abolished, but the occasions for its use were certainly rare and should be postponed as long as possible. When the rod was used the following rules should be applied: Be sure that you have the good of the pupil in view; punish with a feeling of reluctance; punish sparingly; be not in haste—review the case for mitigating circumstances; do not administer any kind of punishment in anger; be sure that it is deserved and if it is possible, convict the culprit of his guilt; never resort to physical punishment when an appeal to anything else will answer as well; and take care it is not too severe.

Horace Mann is looked upon by many as one of the chief driving forces in the movement toward a saner method of control. In 1844 he observed that the doctrines and practices of the seventeenth and eighteenth centuries should be modified, in regard to the training of children, for the nineteenth century. He attacked (31:132) the doctrine of absolute authority and unconditional subordination, especially in the use of force, fear, and pain, in securing them, as being particularly vicious in the disregard shown for individual differences. He was not the first to attack the use of corporal punishment, for it is evident from his writings that such a movement had attained considerable headway. One of his objections is to the cruelty of the substitutes in vogue in his day, substitutes that will repay the space necessary to quote them in full (31:120).

To imprison children in a dark and solitary place; to brace open the jaws with a piece of wood; to torture the muscles and bones by the strain of an unnatural position, or of holding an enormous weight; to inflict a wound upon the instinctive feelings of mod-
esty and delicacy, by making a girl sit with the boys, or go out with them at recess; to bring a whole class around a fellow pupil, to ridicule and shame him; to break down the spirit of self-respect, by enforcing some ignominious compliance; to give a nick-name—these, and such as these, are the gentle appliances by which some teachers, who profess to disregard corporeal punishment, maintain the empire of the school room; as though the muscles and bones were less corporeal than the skin; as though a wound of the spirit were of less moment than one in the flesh; and the body's blood more sacred than the soul's purity.

It might be asked at this time, why, if the scope of this paper is from 1870 to the present day, it is necessary to go back to Pestalozzi, to Peirce, and to Mann to find the school of thought that influenced the early part of the time under investigation. The answer is that the thoughts of these men, while accepted in many quarters, had little or no opportunity for general dissemination. Although the Normal School had its birth in 1838, it had a very slow growth. It was not until after the Civil War that they began to take a place of prominence in the educational scheme of the country. The nation had been growing rapidly, spreading its frontiers, both of territory and of education. The result was that the call for teachers was always insistent, while the supply was drawn from the same sources that had produced the teachers of preceding generations.

So slow had been the growth of the Normal School idea, that before its presence had been felt another philosophy of education impinged itself upon the consciousness of American school men. This was the system of thought of Friedrich Froebel, whose name is almost inextricably bound up with that of the kindergarten. The first kindergarten connected with the public school
system was opened in St. Louis in 1873. The ideas of Froebel must have reached America some time before that. It is interesting to see just what the principles were that underlay this movement. Froebel's was the philosophy of idealism. It is recognized (37:444) in human beings the emergence of the Absolute into self-conscious morality. Quoting Reisner (37:446) again:

In thinking of the individual child as a part of the universal onward movement of the Absolute toward self-realization and as constructively participating in this evolution, Froebel was led to several important positions. In the first place, he was bound to think of the child in a positive instead of a negative way. The child is good, being God in the small. Its original tendencies are sound. Its original nature, if not interfered with, will find its own way to a worthy maturity. The child also contains within itself irrepressible tendencies to grow, to expand, to develop, to master its environment, to enter into relationships with its fellows. These inner factors of growth are the essential factors in education. The child equipped as co-worker with the Absolute for the business of self-realization, is the central concern in the educative process.

It is now time to investigate the result of these ideas upon the part of American educators as expressed by them in their speeches and addresses before the National Education Association between the years 1870 and 1880. The total number of pages in the reports of the proceedings between 1870 and 1879, inclusive, is 2248. Of this number 44 are devoted in whole or in part to the question of discipline. The first indication of a changing conception of the nature of discipline, which we can possibly attribute to the growing influence of the Normal School, with its consequent increase of interest in thoughts akin to those of Froebel, comes in 1870. J. L. Pickard (34:145) was applauded when he stated that the will of the child should never be broken. In the same round
table discussion Emerson Elbridge White, the man who was to be president of Purdue University, state superintendent of public instruction in Ohio, superintendent of schools in Cincinnati, and president of the National Education Association before his death; the author of Elements of Pedagogy, School Management, and The Art of Teaching, brought up the question of punitive methods (48:146).

It seems to me that, in all these matters, there is danger of going to an extreme. This is true in the matter of corporal punishment. I think it true, that the teacher who tries to govern his school by relying upon the rod or physical power, is making a great mistake. In training children that means needs to be used very seldom. But I am far from saying that the teacher does wrong who at times falls back upon the rod to enforce his authority. I believe there are periods in the training of children when the best thing and the only thing that can be done to enforce authority, is by this very means.

Here is a problem expressed by Mr. White that agitated the minds of teachers for many years. It was felt that the new doctrines were to make of discipline a more humane and a less rigid function of the school. Corporal punishment had from time immemorial been considered the best means of securing control. As the various new schools of thought were tested in the laboratory of the classroom, from time to time the question was raised as to whether or not discipline could be adequately maintained without recourse to some form of physical sanction. Mr. White attempted to strike a happy medium between the forces of complete subjection, with the consequent reliance upon the rod, and the proponents of a greater freedom than the teachers of that day were ready to allow.

The influence of Froebel can be detected in the thoughts
of Hoose (21:147), expressed in the same round table discussion of 1870.

What is ordinarily called a good school is not necessarily a good place for good discipline. A school should be a place where pupils can live, and live well, cheerfully, handsomely, profitably; and until we make our schools such, we are not in the highest sense educators. We want a broader platform on which to work in our system of school discipline. I cannot see why a school can not be considered as a small society and governed upon the principles that obtain in society.

That the reform in disciplinary procedure was still in process of realization, and that there were still practices not in accord with the principles of the men whose work had been discussed for many years, is evident from the remarks of one teacher in 1873 (2:144), who warned that while education must remain forever a discipline, closer insight into the minds of youth was beginning to show that discipline is "of the nature of a nutritive rather than a curative process, and that the disgust felt by the recipient for the means employed is no measure of their disciplinary value."

The influence of the Normal Schools can be seen in the words of F. Louis Soldan in 1874 (43:247). He spoke with the voice of authority, for his life span, which extended from 1842 to 1908, included forty-four years in the public schools of St. Louis. At the time of this speech he was principal of the high and normal schools. Later, (1895-1903) he was to be superintendent of schools of St. Louis, while in 1885 he was president of the National Education Association. His published works include Landmarks in Education, and Culture and Facts. "Instruction," he said, "must furthermore rouse the powers of his mind according to its inherent laws and in obedience to its structure, which structure is to
be developed by a professional teacher who understands its silent working, and not injured or crushed by a rude or ignorant hand." The "rude and ignorant hand" seemed to be still in a prominent position, if the concern exhibited by the speaker is to be taken at its face value.

The tendency toward extremes that sometimes accompanies significant changes in method evidently ran its course in the matter of discipline. From the words of another speaker (1:32) it is evident that some teachers took the thought of relaxed discipline too literally, and in repressing harshness eliminated at the same time all evidences of strength of character in their dealings with their pupils. This speaker, while assailing weakness in the enforcement of discipline, advocated firmness, intrepidity, and impartiality in the infliction of punishment, which, he claimed, is the ultima ratio for certain natures.

That the study of individual differences is no new thing can be inferred from one of the speeches given in 1875. This speaker (35:176-178) asserted that all faulty boys are not in the same class. He pointed out the steps which would lead a ragged, dirty, neglected boy, possessed of a large amount of natural pride, to seek compensation for his outward inferiority to his fellows by a show of bravado and an asserted independence of the rules of decorum. We do not know how this address was received, for the proceedings of the National Education Association, at least after 1870, were printed without comment.

Mr. Pickard added another thought in the same address, one that by now has been accepted by many, that problem cases are
in many cases the result of physiological disorders, especially where this problem appears suddenly in a boy whose conduct prior to this time has been blameless.

The objective of older schools of discipline, that of breaking the will of the child, seemed to be one of the points that Mr. Pickard intended to break down through frequent denunciation. Earlier in this chapter he was quoted as of 1870. The thought was elaborated and put into logical form in 1875. The insistence of the speaker upon this one point may indicate that some thought on the problem was being given by the teaching body of the nation as a whole. Pickard divided faulty boys into two classes: the keenly sensitive and the naturally stubborn boys (35:178).

The former watch for slights and often provoke them; the latter seem to have been born against their will, and to have grown up with their feet and hands resolutely planted forward. Side approaches suit both best. Issues must be avoided. With the former the objective point must be the heart. The confidence and affection must be secured. With the latter the will stands most in the way. It needs not removal, but replacing. Instead of lying across the path of progress, it should be brought into the line with it. It needs curbing, directing, training—not repression, nor breaking.

Hoose in 1876 laid the problem of good citizenship on the shoulders of the school. He maintained that the school must establish and enforce that type of discipline which shall establish in the youth of the country the habits most needed by a good citizen, those of self-control and integrity. Carrying the idea to a logical conclusion, he said (22:186): "Any school which ignores, or which is too feeble to command proper loyalty from its attending learners—any such school is a public misfortune."
In the discussion thus far, much has been said of the pupil, and about the effect of discipline upon the pupil. Little has been said of the teacher as such, even though the question of his training was a very important one in the period under discussion. In 1877 one man's conception of an ideal teacher, a conception that might very well be attributed to the influence of Froebel, was given utterance (40:181-182).

The character of the teacher must be marked by gentleness. Gentleness attracts, violence repels; gentleness leads, violence drives. Gentleness is as charming and as soft as the kiss of a zephyr, violence is as terrible as the storm. Gentleness saves by tenderness, violence ruins by harshness. Gentleness in the school-room must take the place of the ferule, and words touching and tender must ever be characteristic of him in whose hands are placed the destinies of children. To this must be united firmness. Firmness is as essential as gentleness. So these two virtues acting in harmony should result in such culture as would be felt for generations to come. When patience is lost all self-control departs and with it good government. An impatient man actually invites disorder and produces insubordination. Unable to govern himself, he loses control over others, and anarchy with all its direful consequences is the result of his lack of this passive virtue.

It is probable that the idea of gentleness shown by Mr. Rivers in this address was at variance with the practices of many school men of that day. Perhaps the background of Mr. Rivers was responsible for the outlook upon discipline that he displayed in this speech. He had been president of Centenary College, Louisiana, from 1848- to 1854. From there he had gone to preside over La Grange College, Alabama, from 1854 to 1865. His published works include Mental Philosophy (1860), Moral Philosophy (1866), and Our Young People (1880). Since the great bulk of his experience had been with young people beyond and above the age when discipline is most vexing, the principles of Mr. Rivers might be called into question. How-
ever, his thoughts on discipline are worthy of quotation, if only for the sake of the ideal quality shown by the speaker (40:134).

When discipline is required and punishment must be inflicted it must be done with a steady but firm and gentle hand. In rare instances it may be attended to before the school. In most instances even a reproof should be administered privately. The culprit should be called to a private room, and there with all the influence of truth, gentleness, patience, and firmness, let the fault be corrected and the offender saved. Alone with a teacher whose character is respected, whose confidence he desires to enjoy, and whose feelings he would not wound on any account, an offending scholar cannot remain perverse for any length of time.

This chapter has been dealing with the thoughts of American educators for the period under discussion, and attempting to show some nexus between these thoughts and the new trend in education. It was not until the latter part of the decade that the National Education Association took up the question of these new movements as such. One of the first interpretations of Froebel's method of instruction came from William T. Harris in 1879. It is not out of place here to digress for a moment at the mention of the name Harris, for he was one of the early giants of American education. Born in 1835, from 1867 to 1880 he was superintendent of schools of St. Louis. In 1889 he was appointed United States Commissioner of Education by President Harrison, and filled that office until 1906, when he voluntarily retired. He was editor-in-chief of Webster's New International Dictionary. He is looked upon as America's first great educational philosopher. A bibliography of his works, compiled after his death in 1908, contains 479 separate titles. This array of titles covers all the important questions that have been discussed in the educational world during the past half-
century. His interpretation of Froebel's method (18:156) was for this reason the final word for his day.

It is the preservation of the form of play and at the same time the induction of the substance of prescription that constitutes what is new and wonderful in Froebel's method of instruction. There is a gentle insinuation of habits of attention, of self-control, of concert of action, of considerateness towards others, of desire to participate in the common result of the school, that succeeds in accomplishing this necessary change of heart in the child, from selfishness to self-renunciation—without sacrificing his spontaneity as is done in the old fashioned primary school.

The words of Harris were the last ones uttered in this decade on the problem of discipline in the National Education Association. A rapid recapitulation will show that, while much was said concerning discipline, much that was undoubtedly influenced by the movements that were going on in the educational field as a whole, very little of a constructive nature was accomplished. Discipline did not get much further than the discussion stage. No rules were formulated for the furtherance of control, or, if they were, they were not as yet put before the convention of the leading educators for their consideration.

An analysis of the speeches and addresses for the decade will show the following results:

Objectives: The objectives of discipline, formulated by three different speakers, were declared to be: Purifying the will from the sway of caprice; the inculcating of right habits without the sacrifice of spontaneity; to have the school considered as a small society and governed by the principles that obtain in society; the establishing in the youth of the country those habits of self-control and of integrity that
are needed by the wise citizen.

Methods attacked: The methods under fire were not as numerous as in succeeding decades. Four authors were responsible for attacks on: going to an extreme in the use of corporal punishment; repression and breaking; coaxing and entertaining; and the lack of strength in the official sanction of the school.

Means suggested: The means suggested for the keeping and the improvement of discipline were put forward by seven speakers. They included: pleasanter schoolrooms, smaller schools, and more teachers (39:185); individual handling of problem cases through an analysis of individual differences, social and physical; the non-avoidance of issues; gentleness, firmness, patience, and self-control; private reproofs; developing an affection in the child for the teacher; the use of discipline by a competent, professional teacher; a transition from family nurture to primary school that is not too abrupt.

It will be seen, then, that the question of discipline, while calling for comment and suggestion, was still far from a complete solution. While the problem was presented before the assembled members of the National Education Association in the decade beginning with the year 1870, it remained for the following ten years to find a practical way out of the dilemma. While it is not to be inferred that the problem was settled forever, still it must be conceded that an honest attempt was made during the 1880's to put the problem of discipline on a scientific footing. How this was done is the material for the following chapter.
CHAPTER III.
CONCRETE RESULTS OF FROEBEL'S PRINCIPLES.

The discussion of discipline in the meetings of the National Education Association reached a high point of interest in 1888 when, out of 794 pages in the complete report of the proceedings of the association, no less than thirty-eight were devoted to this problem. Three of the years of this decade, 1881, 1882, and 1887, failed to bring out a single discussion on the subject as such. The speeches that were reported, however, for the years in which discipline was under discussion, furnish the investigator with some interesting data. There were nine separate speeches in which discipline was the dominant note, and a study of them tends to show an attempt to put the doctrines of Froebel into a workable form for the use of American schools. This can be observed in the words of a speaker of the early part of this period (24:214-215).

This reign of authority in our schools is, I believe, the great hindrance there to the development of character. Authority is a grand and necessary element in human society, but its forte, surely, is not education. Authority deals with what is purely external; it can oblige to certain forms of physical activity, and so led to form habits, which constitute character, only by motives addressed to reason, sensibility, and conscience;... The atmosphere of our schools, even today, (with a few beautiful exceptions), is an atmosphere of authority. The child as he enters the door is met by rules—"you must not whisper"—"you must not turn your head"... This is not an exaggerated picture of the antiquated and abominable system which reigns in (I believe) the majority of our schools, and those schools are most admired in which it is most complete and most automatic. But this government by authority not only fails to do what is desired, it seems to me to have positively vicious results... And since to enforce these arbitrary rules, punishment is often necessary as for moral wrong, the tendency of them is to obscure the child's moral sense.
Miss Hyde's chief complaint was the deification of authority in the schools. The first constructive suggestion that she made is reminiscent of the words of J. H. Hoose (op. cit.) in 1870 (24:215).

It is not licence which I desire, but liberty. Let the children be subject in school to the same law, (and no other) which should govern them, and every one, out of school—the law of right and courtesy... Let us not meet them at the threshold with arbitrary restrictions, but, when there is need for it, explain to them that where there are so many together any unnecessary noise or disorder is an interference with the rights of others, and therefore wrong. Let us substitute for the dictum of command the question "Is it right?" Let us be patient with the childish thoughtlessness, and careful to punish only moral wrong. The teacher's office in school government, as I understand it, is not that of a dictator, but a guide. In place of command let the child hear: "This course which you want to pursue is unwise and wrong, it seems attractive now, but you will be sorry for it by and by." If such a presentation is not enough, and we see that the inclination is going to conquer conscience, there is the next appeal to the approbation of those he loves and desires to please; and as a final resort the sorrowful statement of fact—not a threat—"If you do what is wrong it will be my duty to punish you;" and punishment, when deserved, must be as certain as the law of gravitation.

Thus one speaker attempted to work out a rational system of pupil control. She also warned her listeners concerning an attitude that seemed to be prevalent in the schools of treating all pupils from the outset as being guilty until proved innocent. She felt that if this attitude were continued, it would be a miracle if some of the pupils did not speedily become guilty of some fault of greater or less degree.

The effects of the new order of things in school discipline, especially when handled by teachers who had difficult classes to contend with, is illustrated in a speech given in 1884 (28:134). Miss Kellogg complained that a teacher entered the classroom expecting to meet resistance, and that this re-
istance was caused by "irreverent self-assertion". This caused the teacher to be in a state of high tension, watchfully waiting and attempting to quell any incipient disturbance. She said that actual teaching does not wear out a teacher; "it is the expenditure of nerve and will-power to hold the pupil in a necessary condition to be taught, that saps the teacher's strength."

The healthy passion for play that rules the life of the child is not antagonistic to the proper setting for effective teaching, for that can be utilized by the ingenious teacher. Rather, ---and this seems distressingly modern for 1884---"...there is a natural defiance of controlling authority in American children that presents an intangible barrier to the teacher's approach--a kind of 'annex' to the total depravity one is prepared to meet." She maintains that the great feat to be accomplished by American teachers was to teach over and in spite of the obstruction of "bristling self-assertion" that the children constructed against teaching authority. If a teacher could not do this, he or she was dropped from the rolls of that particular school system with the remark "want of executive ability."

This speech of Miss Kellogg, if it can be taken as representative of any considerable percentage of American teachers, seems to indicate that there was a considerable gulf between the ideal conception of discipline, such as the followers of Froebel advocated, and the attempt to put it into universal practice. Whether this was due to a faulty understanding by the teachers of the method of procedure, or whether the fault could be traced to poor supervisory work, there is no present indication.
The utilization of school discipline for social value was advocated by William T. Harris in 1894. The applications that he laid down were, he asserted, valid under all conditions of society. They are (19:12):

a- Obedience towards parents.

b- Obedience towards employers, overseers, and supervisors as regards the details of work.

c- Obedience toward the government in its legally constituted authority, civil or military.

d- Obedience toward the divine will, however revealed.

The ideas of Harris seemed to find sympathizers, for in 1895 one speaker (46:35) attacked the theory that outward conformity with the rules was the highest aim of discipline. Stearns stressed the necessity of trying to lift the pupil to a higher plane of thought and action, and to enlist his better nature in the effort to overcome wrong tendencies. That kind of management which would bring the pupil's nature into glad conformity with what is right, giving him a conscious feeling that he chooses to do the right thing because it is right, and finding increased strength and self-respect in so acting, was the only right and just mode of control. He quoted Locke to emphasize the bad effects of the other kind of discipline, that "slavish discipline makes a slavish temper", and elaborated on the words of the philosopher to interpret a slavish temper as one that is cunning, deceitful, eye-serving, and cowardly. Stearns strongly advocated sympathy as a necessary concomitant to discipline. His words on this particular phase of
Helpfulness gains confidence and cooperation, and is founded upon that sympathy which understands and appreciates both the weaknesses and the better impulses of childhood. Thus discipline becomes but an incident to helpfulness. It is neither retributive nor for the sake of an example; there is no place in school for either of these sorts. It is purely personal, designed to add the strong will of the teacher to the weak will of the child, and thus help forward on the road of self-control. In all cases the less severe it is the better, provided it be effective, since the natural sensitiveness of the child is less impaired by it. To destroy this is to brutalize him; and to respect and conserve it is the aim of rational management. We need teachers, not dominies; leaders, not drivers; those who inspire new life instead of new fear. Frank relations are possible only under such conditions, and frank relations are indispensable to right moral growth.

In 1888 Gilbert (13:530) attacked the conception of demanding discipline for its own sake. He did not deny its usefulness or even its necessity, but stated that society must exact it and schools must have it, not because of any virtue inherent in it, but solely because of its expediency. He advocated dethroning it from its lofty position in the schools, as it already had been in the social and political systems. He felt that too much worry and attention was given to discipline in the schools, for experience had shown that it could usually take care of itself, with nothing said, and very little thought about it. The natural analytic powers of the children soon tear the structure of control apart, finding out for themselves all that is of importance in it. If necessity arises, it should be enforced, but this necessity, he felt, should arise but rarely. He assured teachers that if obedience should be relegated to a secondary position in the scheme of school discipline, the teacher would not be robbed of authority, nor
would the immediate result be anarchy. On the contrary, order, and an increased obedience, obedience of a more willing sort, would follow. "Ordinarily the boy or girl in school, as much as his elder in society, has a perfect right to know the reason for commands to which he must submit; and the wise teacher, while not brooking insolence, will yet recognize the right, and will not provoke to wrath for the sake of proving authority."

Gilbert's substitutes for the measures he attacked were a fostering of self-control and an emphasis upon self-sacrifice.

The last speaker of this decade whose speech is the concern of this paper, Duncan Brown, deserves the final word, for he was the first speaker during the twenty years that have been treated so far to systematize discipline through the medium of rules and laws. It might be said that his viewpoint put into workable form the thoughts and theories that had been expressed prior to this time by the leaders of educational thought. The philosophy underlying his work can be traced to the influence of Pestalozzi, of Froebel, of Mann, of Peirce, and of William Harris. He stressed the fact (5:104) that true discipline is concerned with the training of the eye, the ear, the hand, and the mind, to obey the will, with the will dependent upon the conscientious dictates of the judgment, and all these under the control of proper authority. He felt that discipline is not something to be achieved immediately, but is a training that takes time, often many years, to bring to maturity. The cardinal points of success in discipline for the teacher, while subject to variance because of circumstances, are a genuine love for the pupil, patient persistence in training, a true
example, and the will to be obeyed.

He laid down four main points that he would insist upon in all school discipline (5:109):

1- Absolute and immediate obedience to all lawful commands.

2- Self-sacrifice for the general good; with the corollary that in the end this will prove best, even for self.

3- Self-sacrifice now, for the sake of increased power hereafter. This includes training in good habits, the subordination of desire to duty, and the following out of some definite lines to a definite end, with a definite purpose.

4- Self-control now, including, perhaps, training through suffering for greater power and usefulness hereafter.

Brown took up the question as to just when should discipline first reach the child. He was a strong advocate of the practice of beginning with the very first days of the child at school. This should be brought about through training the child to obey some distinct regulation, whether pleasant or unpleasant. As to the continuation of the period of discipline in point of time, he felt that some form of discipline or of regulation is of value to men and women of any age, and as long as they are under tutelage in any form.

He seemed to have little faith in the efficacy of the new forms of punishment, for he felt that students' courts, jury
trials, self-punishment, and other artifices, while they had been tried, in some cases successfully, in the long run they would not pay. His conviction was that the teachers in a given school should know better than the pupils what regulations and penalties are best, both from the standpoint of justice as well as from the question of their advisability. His stand was that the teachers should prescribe the penalties, allowing the students the opportunity to ask questions and to present petitions at any reasonable time.

Brown's seven laws of discipline (5:110) conclude the contribution of the Proceedings of the National Education Association to this period.

1- Every school of any grade, from the kindergarten to the university, should have some definite laws, which must be obeyed, under penalty of some form of punishment.

2- The penalty should have some proportionate relation to the offense.

3- The penalty should be sure rather than severe, although it should always be severe enough to count.

4- The punishment should not be such as to permanently degrade the student in his own estimation or in that of the school, if he makes reparation as far as possible.

5- So far as possible it should avoid subjecting either teacher or student to ridicule.

6- Its object should be only to reform the of-
fender, or to prevent other offenses in the school, never to take revenge in any form.

7- Opportunity should always be given (in private, or before the faculty), for the pupil to plead his own cause, and any known injustice should be promptly acknowledged and repaired as far as possible.

The analysis of the speeches and addresses of the decade comprising the years 1880 to 1889 inclusive, yields the following data:

Methods attacked: Purely external authority, "must not" and "shall not" authority; the automatic and complete submission; obscuring the child's moral sense by making the punishment of ceremonial offenses equal in stringency to that inflicted for moral offenses; arbitrary restrictions; treating pupils as guilty until proved innocent; slavish discipline; retributive discipline, for the sake of an example; driving; fear; that diligence in study and outward obedience that is secured by means that divorce conduct and right motive; authoritative restraints and artificial incitements; order alone, to compel attention; the display of needless authority, or the appeal to wrong motives; too constant watchfulness, too much constraint, and too unyielding a control (10:491).

Means suggested: The careful teaching of right principles of conduct, reinforced and vitalized by the personal power and life of the conscientious teacher, and intensified by the well-regulated association with his mates; the cultivation of the closest possible fellowship with the children, by an
ever ready sympathy in whatever is glad and joyous in their childish experiences, entering into their small griefs as well, and taking a hearty and generous part in their studies and their sports, yet leaving them in all these interests much to their own resources; to make the work assigned meet the learner's need (10:487-493). Brown's rules for discipline; his keeping the supremacy of the teacher in the infliction of penalties; enlisting the better nature of the pupil in the effort to overcome wrong tendencies; subjecting the children to the law of right and courtesy; explaining to the children the necessity of discipline; patience, allied with firmness.

Objectives of discipline: the carrying over of the school discipline into the daily life of the pupil; the use of authority in such a way as, by obliging to certain forms of physical activity, to lead to habit formation, and hence character, by means of motives addressed to reason, sensibility, and conscience; to bring the pupil's nature into conformity with what is right; to respect and conserve the natural sensitiveness of the child; to produce a self-governing body, one whose moral consciousness has not been blunted; to put the pupil most surely in command of himself, of his best powers of accomplishment and of service, in whatever line of work he may decide to engage.
CHAPTER IV.

THE INFLUENCE OF THE HERBARTIAN MOVEMENT.

The system of education of John Frederick Herbart (1776-1841), while it covered the entire field of instruction, is summarized here only in regard to those particular aspects that relate to the question of discipline. He held that instruction in knowledge, even the apparently non-moral in kind, performs an important function in the development of moral character. He made a sharp distinction between mere governmental or police regulation of a repressive character, by means of which the child was held in check without regard to any specific moral effort, and the more serious, far-reaching efforts that involve the formation of moral habits. Government he defined as the immediate maintenance of outward order through enforced authority, the holding in check of the youth, partly that education might succeed, partly to secure the safety of the child, and in addition to protect society against the natural tendency of the child toward destruction and mischief. He defined training as moral education itself in so far as it works directly upon the mind. The cardinal principle of Herbart was the development of instruction that makes for character. While Pestalozzi held that the end of education was the harmonious natural development of all the powers of the human being for the sake of his true moral nature, Herbart attempted to show how the daily activity of the school might bring about this desired result.

After Herbart's death his theories were carried on and
and developed by Tuiskon Ziller, Karl Volkmar Stoy, Karl Lange, and others, among whom was Wilhelm Rein, head of the department of pedagogy at the University of Vienna. It was not until fifty years after his death that his educational theories had any effect upon the thought of America. A number of American students were attracted to Rein's seminar at Jena (37:464), among whom were Edmund James, Charles De Garmo, and Charles and Frank McMurry. Returning to this country, fired with enthusiasm for the Herbartian theories and practices, they began to move, by pen and by example, for the adoption of the Herbartian system in the public schools of America.

The most acceptable part of the Herbartian psychology, from the point of view of American educators, was the new light it shed upon the process of character development. The Herbartian movement enjoyed its greatest vogue between the years 1892 and 1902. The result of the impact of these ideas upon the education of this country, as shown by the proceedings of the National Education Association between the years 1890 and 1899, inclusive, will now be observed.

That the ideas of Herbart concerning character development were a cause of concern to educators in the beginning of the decade, and that the methods by which these results could be obtained were still a matter of discussion, can be inferred from a group of prefatory remarks to a paper read in 1890 (50:99):

When I say discipline, I do not mean the discipline which serves as a curb but not as a stimulus. Such discipline would produce stagnation, and stagnation is death. To teachers I would say, "Preserve discipline even if all else be sacrificed," and yet what can be sacrificed if discipline be maintained? A study of the/
leading institutions of the world will show fluctuations in numbers in proportion as the discipline is good or bad.

Coming right down to the question of the Herbartian principles (50:100):

Evidently then it is with the discipline of the school that we need be most concerned. The habits there formed, moral, intellectual, and physical, can with difficulty be eradicated. While perfect discipline in a class or school must ever be regarded as an indispensable condition of successful teaching, its results are now more far-reaching. When we consider, then, that the great object of a teacher is to determine the best ways of managing a boy and of developing his character and power, it seems that we should be duly impressed with the importance of having teachers who are mental and who are trained for the work. Teach obedience first. Without obedience nothing is possible. It is the foundation stone of all law and order, the basis of all civil government and civilization. Perfect obedience would mean perfect discipline, but not every teacher commands it, neither can we prescribe any law by which it may be secured. One exercises personal influence, another force, but in some way or other it must be had if the relation of teacher to pupil is to be preserved. Pupils should be made at a very early date to subordinate their will and practice self-control and denial.

Wiggins condemned (50:102) any mechanically administered system of discipline, on the grounds that it will defeat its own purpose by becoming ineffective, and that the individual development of the student will be frustrated. Firmness, kindness, justice, and the sympathy of those to be governed, are necessary for the establishment of the authority of the teacher. Above all, trust in the pupils is necessary, even when it seems that the trust is misplaced. But besides the objectives of obedience and truth, the pupil must be given a high conception of duty, and be made to realize that his natural endowments can be developed only through industry. To bring this about it is essential that no opportunity be given
for the formation of habits of idleness.

Charles De Garmo himself, whose book, Herbart and the Herbartians, is considered an authoritative source, and who climaxed a long life with the presidency of Swathmore College, spoke in 1890 (7:123), and reminded the assembled educators that "whatever may be true of will-training through the exercise of authority, the teacher must never forget that instruction can reach the will only over the bridge of interest, for only through interest can instruction set up ends for which the mind is willing to struggle."

The factor of interestingness was also brought forward by Wiggins (op. cit.), who suggested that in nine cases out of ten when the class becomes restless and yawn and lounge during the recitation, the teacher should blame himself, not the pupils. He informed his listeners that new methods of imparting knowledge in an interesting fashion had been perfected in the preceding few years, and bluntly suggested that the rank and file of the teaching profession should give a little time to the study of them.

The question of punishment must inevitably obtrude itself in any discussion of discipline, and Wiggins' paper shows that the sharp division between the old school of rigorous punishment and the new school of freedom was still in effect. He said that the most important principle to observe in school discipline is a distinction at all times between ceremonial offenses and moral offenses, and that there should be determined, with careful equity, scrupulously graduated punishments to meet the several offenses. The importance of the pupil
respecting the law from a recognition of its justice was stressed. Regarding corporal punishment, although personally opposed to it, he felt that there was a great deal of unnecessary sentimentalism involved in the whole question. While not unconscious of the ill effects and dangers that attend its abuse, he urged that "such punishment be inflicted under the most careful restrictions, and only where the degradation of the offense overshadows any degradation that may be supposed to attend its use." It might be inserted here, parenthetically, that the idea of corporal punishment for extreme cases was not incompatible with the ideals of the Herbartians.

One of the best examples of the Herbartian influence appeared in the meeting of 1892. Here was advanced the thought of character development through spontaneity (23:188-189).

We should control children because the wise and definite control by a superior will develops the will power of the child, and qualifies him to direct his own life when he reaches maturity. Uncontrolled forces lead inevitably to ruin and disaster. But while control by a superior will is essential and natural, it should never prevent the full development of spontaneity of character. It is not necessary to dwarf a soul by controlling it. The child's individuality cannot be weakened without fatal consequences.

The speaker, James L. Hughes, formulated nine laws for the establishment of the relationship between control and spontaneity. They are:

1- Control by external agencies should last for the shortest possible time. Self-direction should be the aim for the pupils from the first.

2- Control should never degenerate into coercion.
3- The child should not be conscious of the restraint of external control through the personality of the teacher.

4- Human control, like Divine control, should be prompted by love, based on love, and executed by love.

5- It is utterly degrading to give the pupils the idea that they are naturally expected to do wrong, and that the teacher's constant duty is to check their natural tendencies.

6- All control is wrong that attempts to fetter the child with a man's thoughts, motives, or creed.

7- Growth cannot be forced, and the attempt to force it checks spontaneity and weakens individuality.

8- In the training of self-expression, self must not be sacrificed to expression, or spontaneity will be lost.

9- Spontaneity may be restricted by school programs.

Another speaker, this time in 1898 (15:357), gave evidence of the mounting tide of favor that the Herbartians were enjoying in the field of discipline. Halleck pointed out that rational child observation, coupled with the study of physiological psychology, had emphasized the fact that activity is one of the special characteristics of the child, and that because of this he should have far more motor training than was ac-
corded him at that time. His chief complaint was that the teacher repressed the natural bent for activity of the child with the constant admonition to be still.

The growing sentiment concerning the importance of the individual pupil and his reaction to the means used for the attainment of discipline, which was the direct result of the influences studied in this chapter, is illustrated by Earl Barnes in 1895. He reported an experiment that he had conducted through the medium of pupils' themes to determine their attitude toward punishment. His material was gathered from 4,000 pupils of the California schools. His conclusions were that with the children studied, the common form or type of punishment, whether just or unjust, that lingers longest in their minds is some form of bodily pain; that children do not object to severe penalties as such; that checks and extra work had ceased to be much used as punishment, or else had made such a slight impression on the minds of the pupils questioned as to be overlooked in their themes; that boys were treated more severely than were girls; and that what he terms the most civilized penalty of all, correcting the harm, is hardly connected in the minds of the children at all with misdemeanors. Barnes came to the conclusion that penalties were kept before the minds of the children rather as fear-inspiring agencies than as remedial measures, or else that children are in that state of their development when they naturally look upon punishment from this point of view.

The opening words of Barnes's paper might serve as a fitting conclusion to the study of the sentiments expressed dur-
ing this decade, for they epitomize the ideals of discipline, especially that phase of discipline that has its sanction in punishment of any nature, that were advanced by the Herbartians. He said that all punishment should be remedial in its nature (4:914); hence, any punishment which leaves the child in a worse frame of mind than it found him is wrong, and from the point of view of the intelligent teacher has been a failure.

"What a child ought to feel has nothing to do with the case. Our problem is the same as that of the physician: How has the remedy which we have applied actually affected the patient? Has it left him better or worse than he was before?"

In spite of the great interest engendered in the minds of educators in America by the spread of the doctrines of Herbart, there was a paucity of material directly relating to discipline in the proceedings of the National Education Association in the period 1890-1899. Of a total of 10,454 pages in the volumes containing the reports of the proceedings, just 116 were devoted in whole or in part to the discussion of disciplinary problems. The sentiments expressed were, however, easier to classify and account for than were those of the preceding twenty years. All speakers showed a pronounced leaning in the direction of the Herbartian school, and the summarizing analysis will show even more clearly just how close the bond was.

Methods attacked: control by physical force only (45:766); discipline which serves as a curb; discipline mechanically administered; the multiplication of rules and punishments; any punishment that leaves a child in a worse state of mind than
when it found him; control that degenerates into coercion; giving the pupils the idea that they are naturally expected to do wrong, and that the teacher's duty is to check their natural tendencies; the attempt to fetter a child with the thoughts, motives, or creed of a man.

**Means suggested:** interest; love of the pupil; unconsciousness of restraint; trained mentteachers for boys; teaching obedience as a foundation; early subordination of the will of the pupil, and teaching the practice of self-control and self-denial; firmness, kindness, justice, and the sympathy of the governed; trust; graduated punishments, depending for their severity upon the importance of the offense; corporal punishment under careful supervision for extreme cases; motor training to utilize excess activity.

**Objectives of discipline:** to determine the best way of managing a pupil and of developing his character; a respect for the law through a recognition of its justice; the ability to direct one's own life when one reaches maturity, as a result of the wise and definite control by a superior will.
CHAPTER V.

THE EARLY INFLUENCE OF JAMES, PARKER, AND DEWEY.

While the 1890's were almost wholly Herbartian in their expression of their conception of discipline, the first decade of the twentieth century presents so many names that have made educational history that no paper of the limited scope of this thesis could hope to do more than merely indicate the most important trends.

As was indicated in a previous chapter, the rapid expansion and systematization of city and rural schools, with the introduction of many new subjects, resulted in a hasty preparation of the materials of instruction, and a consequent diversity and confusion among schools. School policies tended toward stabilization in the 1890's, and by the time the new century dawned the teaching body of the country was ready to listen to any constructive ideas that might be brought forth.

The early 1900's might be called the era of school reform, for the three great names of the period, those of William James, Colonel Francis W. Parker, and John Dewey, are synonymous with reform. The basis for their reform ideas was growth—physical, mental, and cultural development. "They were the creative analysts who cut straight through the superficial details of administration and visualized the school in a totally new orientation" (41:21).

The first of these men, first at least in point of time, was William James, whose highly regarded Psychology, which appeared in 1890, and his Talks to Teachers, which was published two years later, developed the thought that education
is for behavior, and habits are the stuff of which behavior consists. The James psychology constantly stresses the words behavior, growth, and activity. James saw education in terms of growth--physical, intellectual, moral,--all-round growth. "The total child was envisaged. The aims of education increasingly centered on the development of his individuality. Children were regarded as unique individuals with personal rights" (41:37).

New scientific procedures had been developed in psychology by Wundt, Cattell, and others, and new procedures in the field of statistics had been evolved by Galton, Pearson, and the English school of biometricians during the latter part of the nineteenth century. These developments had been taken over into the field of education, and had as their American protagonists Thorndike and Judd. An increased understanding of child learning was the result of the impact of this group of educational scientists on the conventional school.

Colonel Francis W. Parker, the first head of the department of education at the University of Chicago, former head of the Cook County Normal School, and prior to that intimately bound up with the reforms in the schools of Quincy, Massachusetts, that caught the educational eye of America, broke with the traditional idea of a school with the establishment of his child-centered school in Chicago. It was John Dewey, however, head of the department of education at the University of Chicago from 1894, when Parker resigned, to 1904, and professor of philosophy at the same school, whose voluminous work is well known to every student of education, and who at present is able, from his point of vantage at Columbia Unive-
ersity, to look back upon a life of achievement, who ignited the first flame of the current educational revolution. One book (41:39) puts the matter succinctly. "In striving to cut through the crust of the disciplinary conception he seized upon the doctrine of growth and activity." Thus, it can be seen, Dewey was but following the ideas of James, but putting them into practical form.

One of the earliest indications that the ideas of James were being carried on to their ultimate bounds of application appeared in the proceedings of the National Education Association for 1901, when G. Stanley Hall (14:474-488), who was to earn in subsequent years the reputation for being the foremost authority on adolescent psychology, made his first address before this body. His paper gave a searching analysis of the psychology of childhood, with special emphasis on the period of adolescence.

Fletcher B. Dreslar (9:912), in his address in 1907 showed the unmistakable imprint of the work that had been started by Parker and Dewey.

We have learned through study of the native interests of children that much of the school work we have insisted upon has had no vital effect upon their childish lives and has aroused no active participation therein. As a result of this point of view, school men have been forced to more careful consideration of the curricula, to question carefully the needs and reactions of children. Interest is one of the most significant words in our educational vocabulary. It has made the work of the teacher more joyous, more endurable, and has helped to establish relations between pupil and parent previously impossible.

This factor of interestingness has previously been cited as a means for the improvement of discipline, Charles De Gar-
no having advocated its use in the convention of 1890 (op.cit.), and B. L. Wiggins recommending it the same year (op.cit.).

At the same meeting in which Hall made his first public contribution to educational psychology, William E. F. Faunce, who is considered one of the outstanding presidents of Brown University (12:630), sounded a warning that seemed to come from a realization of the truth of James's psychology. He warned that "the spirit of pettiness and fussiness in school administration, the exaltation of the trivial, and the nagging or pupils by martinets dressed in a little brief authority, may produce serious nervous disorders in children, and must produce a narrowing of howizon and a contraction of spirit.

John Dewey himself, appearing before the meeting of 1903, pointed out the difficulties in the way of those who would make the school something that would contribute to the welfare of society (8:377-378):

We may feel sure that in time independent judgment, with the individual freedom and responsibility that go with it, will more than make good the temporary losses. But meantime there is a temporary loss. Parental authority has much less influence in controlling the conduct of children. Reverence seems to decay on every side, and boisterousness and hoodlumism to increase. Flippancy toward parental and other forms of constituted authority waxes, while obedient orderliness wanes. The domestic ties themselves, as between husband and wife as well as in relation to children, lose something of their permanence and sanctity. The church, with its supernatural sanctions, its means of shaping the daily life of its adherents, finds its grasp slowly slipping away from it. We might as well frankly recognize that many of the old agencies for moralizing mankind, and of keeping them living decent, respectable, and orderly lives, are losing in efficiency—particularly, those agencies which rested for their force upon custom, tradition, and unquestioning acceptance.
The first year of the century saw a paper read (11:123) that furnished many points and observations of interest for an investigator. This speaker maintained that the best discipline is that which produces the natural moral development of the ideal within the nature of the child. This development is dependent primarily upon the personality of the teacher and the influence exerted through the power of suggestion. As teachers, she said, "our problem is to retain the immense vitality of the children, to purify it by admixture of higher life-qualities, and, above all, to keep it in continuous expression." The fundamental factors of successful discipline that she lay down were:

1- Natural aptitude to control and govern.
2- Personal magnetism.
3- The power to express the beautiful impulses and noble emotions of a strong, steadfast character.

The principles of James and Dewey seem to be expressed in Miss Edmund's paper, although it was too early in the century to ascribe any influence to Dewey. Rather, it could be said that the speaker was probably an adherent of James. Her ideas on the objectives of discipline are illuminating (11:125):

To my mind, discipline is the very essence of the teacher's individuality and should be allowed to follow the outlines of one's own peculiar powers; it should furnish an outlet of expression for the teacher's spirit. The stronger the teacher, the more spontaneity will she allow, the more will she encourage self-direction; for if self-government be the whole object of political freedom, then self-control is the legitimate primary object of a child's instruction. Discipline should in no way repress activity, but should direct it by means of regulated re-
Activity we must have, for without it there would be nothing to discipline.

It is evident from her paper that even at that early date there were teachers who looked upon the new methods of measuring the effect of instruction as ends in themselves, rather than as the means for the attainment of definite objectives. She observes that good order, while a necessity in every school room, is but the merest incident in the series of steps by which the child should learn self-government. The most that can be hoped for in the earliest years of training is to develop a habit of right obedience by applying true moral stimuli and requiring regular obedience to them. "This basis of habit is what we have to work with when the development of reason proceeds, and the child learns that above him is the law, and that the law is for his good and the good of his fellows, and that obedience to the law must be absolute. To bring him into a right attitude toward this law, he must first be taught its purpose and operation, and then led voluntarily to adopt it as a rule of his life."

An even greater and more bluntly expressed complaint concerning the practice of some schools, with some thoughtful suggestions for a method of procedure, was presented in 1903 (44:763).

We are becoming convinced that our problem is not the teaching of so much arithmetic, reading, and spelling; much less is it the recording of endless measurements, the tabulation and comparison of extensive observations and experiments, with the purpose of making some scientific generalization. Our problems are living problems demanding living solutions. Each one is presented in the shape of a living child, who, we quickly find, is the focus of endless subordinate problems, whose conditions are changing from day to day.
Our primary duty as teachers is to solve each of these child-problems, not with paper of text-books, not on paper of a thesis, but in the broader, richer, nobler, healthier lives which we can enable and inspire these children to live.

Character building through the inculcation of right habits is one of the salient characteristics of the James doctrine. The application of this principle to the problem of discipline was the concern of a paper read in 1908 (47:248). This individual believed that school discipline, because it tends to form right habits, is a potent factor in character building. These habits are necessary for the proper organization and management of a school. Even the necessary law of prompt and regular attendance at school is in itself a valuable training. Added to this, the school requirements of system, industry, obedience, self-reliance, and regard for the rights of others make for a mine of moral training.

An attitude of the teacher toward the problem of discipline that seems to point toward an increasing consciousness of training the pupil for his later social life was recorded in 1908 (42:244-245).

Much of the so-called discipline in school could be avoided if boys and girls were impressed with a sense of responsibility toward their schoolmates. For instance, the boy who disturbs his class by foolish pranks, who will not settle down to serious work, because it is more interesting to act the clown while the class applauds, will be greatly benefited, and the characters of the class greatly strengthened, if they, realizing their responsibility for their neighbor's conduct, refuse to be amused by his silly or even witty tricks. If now they refuse to be influenced they may be the means of winning back into the ranks of good citizenship a fellow-being who otherwise may be forever an outcast from society.

The last speaker of this decade, last at least for the
consideration of this chapter, advocated in 1909 (38:230-231) an investigation of the worst problem cases to see whether or not the problem child were suffering from heart hunger. In her own words:

There is not a teacher in all our broad land who would knowingly let a child's body starve to death for want of physical food. Why should any child's heart or soul be allowed to starve to death for want of a little sympathy and affection? Bodily starvation, at its worst, can only end in death; soul starvation, at its worst, ends in a hateful, ugly, defiant, lawless attitude toward authority, which not only ruins the starved one but brings disaster to the social order... Child-rescue is our duty; child-ruin is our shame. The best way to keep a child from doing something bad is to set him to work doing something good. It is our duty to find the something good. It is our shame if the child chooses something bad.

While it would be inaccurate to judge the influence of the so-called educational reformers by the words of their immediate contemporaries, and although the first ten years of the century, taken by themselves, would give a very incomplete picture of the effect of these doctrines on discipline, still it is evident that the speakers at the conventions of the National Education Association were at least sympathetically inclined. Of the 9295 pages embracing all the reports of the decade (no meeting of the association was held in 1906), 106 were devoted to a discussion of discipline, and throughout each of the speeches on discipline could be discerned the influence of the leading educational minds of the day.

A summary of the main points from the standpoint of the subject of this paper, as reported in the proceedings of the National Education Association, follows:

Objectives of discipline: Three speakers contributed the following: winning back to the ranks of good citizenship by the
proper disciplinary procedure those problem children who would otherwise become outcasts; the natural development of the ideal within the nature of the child; self-control; to direct activity by means of regulated restraint; to retain the vitality of children, and to purify it by an admixture of higher life-qualities, and to keep it in continuous expression; to awaken gradually in the child the knowledge that law is for his good and for the good of all, and that obedience to the law must be absolute; to establish right habits.

Methods attacked. This period was singularly free from any great volume of attack. Three speakers attacked: the use of educational tests and measurements as ends in themselves rather than as means toward ends; a repression of activity; methods of pettiness and fussiness; the exaltation of the trivial; the nagging of pupils.

Means suggested. Six speakers suggested ways and means for getting and improving discipline. Among the suggestions were: sympathy, affection, and a lessening of soul-starvation in children; to set the child to work doing something that is good; inculcating a sense of responsibility toward his school mates, made effective by the cooperation of the student body as a whole; solving each problem individually, not by a text book, but in relation to life; the personality of the teacher and her influence through the power of suggestion, aided by personal magnetism and the power to express the beautiful and the noble; to teach the child the purpose and operation of the law, and then lead him to adopt it voluntarily as a rule.
of life; the creation of interest in the subject matter.

**Warnings and fears.** Three speakers presented material that should fall logically into this category. The most important thoughts were: parental influence, by its decay, was causing a rise of flippancy, boisterousness, hoodlumism, and decay of reverence. Obedience is waning. The old agencies for moralizing mankind and of keeping him decent are losing their efficiency; wrong methods in teaching may cause serious nervous disorders in children, and must cause a narrowing of horizon and a contraction of spirit; soul-starvation ends in a hateful, ugly, defiant, lawless attitude toward authority, which not only ruins the victim, but also brings disaster to the social order.
CHAPTER VI.

LATER EFFECTS OF THE EDUCATIONAL REFORMERS.

The years between 1910 and 1931 are grouped together in this chapter more for the sake of unity than for any other reason. These twenty-two years bear the impression of the forces that were set in motion in the early years of the century, and the material investigated seems to bear out the assumption that the chief educational thought of the period, especially that relating to discipline, traces its origin to the work done in the preceding ten or fifteen years. Much has been accomplished in fields outside the scope of this paper, particularly in the realm of psychological research and in the refinement of methods of teaching, but a careful study of the literature of the period tends to bear out the impression that the movement for character education through discipline, which reached its height after 1910, as well as the other trends in discipline, can be traced back to the work of James, Parker, and Dewey. This can be illustrated by a passage from a book that appeared in 1925 (25:130-148). The principles of discipline that the author advocates might be exhibited as an example of the progress in the conception of discipline that the teaching body of America as a whole has achieved since 1870.

1- Discipline should be built upon a recognition of the rights and responsibilities of the members of the school as a social group.

2- Good discipline aims to secure the conditions
most favorable for carrying on the learning process.

3- Discipline should develop in the pupil the social ideals, attitudes, and habits which are desirable in mature life, to the end that he may become capable of self-direction.

Undesirable or Doubtful Methods:

1- Any punishment inflicted in anger.
2- Corporal punishment.
3- The use of threats.
4- Detention.
5- Sarcasm or ridicule.
6- Forced apology.
7- The assignment of extra tasks.
8- Deprivation of marks.
9- Demerits.
10- Penalties without consideration of individual differences.

Desirable Methods:

1- The use of group judgment.
2- Deprivation of privileges.
3- Suspension and expulsion.
4- Reports to parents.

Corporal punishment, which Johnson entirely excludes as a sanction for authority, is given a slightly different treatment by Bagley in his book of 1923 (3:117):

Corporal punishment is at best only a tentative measure, designed to teach the child the initial lessons of decency and order. It is an extremely effective agency
for fulfilling this function if it is used temperately and with good sense. Its possibilities of evil are incalculable if it is used in any other way.

It has been found that no innovation is an unmixed blessing. So it was with the newer mode of enforcing discipline. Olive M. Jones, an elementary school principal in the New York City school system, reported in the Bulletin of the Department of Elementary School Principals (26:10) that, while a teacher need no longer fear to seek aid in disposing of her problem cases, the situation has merely changed rather than improved.

If the discipline of twenty-five years ago was too severe, unreasonable, and unjust to both teacher and pupil, it was followed by a laxity in the name of self-expression and individual initiative which is just as injurious to teaching, to group action, to character, and to making young men and women willing and good teachers as the former condition was. Worse still, if permitted to continue, its inevitable result is the destruction of respect for law in the child and the development of insincerity in the teacher.

Another writer in the Bulletin of the Department of Elementary School Principals (30:73) said that the modern teacher has escaped to a large extent from the professional notion of preceding generations that misbehavior on the part of the child is a manifestation of original sin. She asserted, and this seems to point to the influence of James, that misbehavior is rather an urgent response to irritations—mental, social, or physical—or to wrong habit formations both of which must be localized, analyzed, and treated by the teacher.

"No teacher who has been touched by educational literature or professional training in the last decade can escape the utilization of this principle at least within the limitations of our present schoolroom organization. The case of our present ed-
ucational philosophy is a clear one for both teacher and child: the only justification for knowing the good, the desirable, is doing the good."

This author was more optimistic than some who have been quoted, for she felt that not only have we derived from the present day social philosophers the instrument of a pragmatic education al philosophy, but we have also learned the thought from the philosophy of a reverence for the personality of a child, this being expressed in a schoolroom program that gives evidence not only of the faith but also of the practice of that reverence.

During this period there was a slight let-down in the amount of material on discipline in the proceedings of the National Education Association. This might be accounted for by the larger implications of the philosophy that was so generally accepted by educators. Whereas in preceding generations the teachers had been content to discuss discipline as a problem in itself, it now became so completely identified with other problems, such as that of character education, that it was an extremely difficult task to keep the investigation centered on the original problem. From the evidence of the few speakers who treated the problem, though, it is safe to say that it had not as yet ceased to be a problem. In fact, the difficulties experienced were not different in the main from those already reported upon in these pages.

The same Olive Jones referred to above was made chairman of a committee to investigate and report on behavior problems in America. In the preliminary report of her committee—"the present writer was unable to find evidence that the committee
has as yet brought in its final report— the behavior problem
child was defined as "those who stand out or who differ from others
of their group because of certain undesirable habits, personality traits, or behavior in the home, school, or community; whose
conduct interferes, or is likely to interfere, with the individual's—or the group's—fullest development and usefulness socially, educationally, or hygienically, and whose behavior may result in more serious handicaps of one sort or another in later life" (27:244).

One of the speakers in the 1915 convention (20:658-659)
advocated the following of the principles of modern psychology in the treatment of disciplinary cases. He recommended
the use of the social instincts, chief among which are:
1- gregariousness, or the liking to be with our own kind. The
use of this instinct should afford daily opportunities for
making social adjustments and should discipline the pupil into
becoming gradually a member of a group; 2- mastery and submis-
sion, which develop the necessary leaders and followers; 3-
love of approval. This instinct is used for the most part in
too shallow and superficial a way, giving approval rather to
the veneers of life, the external symbols of clothes and man-
ners, rather than upon the more solid virtues which make daily
life livable: kindliness, consideration for others, and du-
ties done which contribute to the welfare of the home, the
school, and the community.

The most significant work contributed to the ends of this
paper in the National Education Association for the period un-
der investigation was read by Walter F. Lewis in 1910 (29:174-78).
He said that the discipline of the school is growing less autocratic as time goes on, and that as it grows less autocratic it becomes more attractive to the pupils. Echoing the thought of the period, he said that the great problem of school government is to train the boy and girl so that when they leave the school and take their places in the world they go forth as honest, upright, decent citizens. For this reason he said that the question of school discipline must be considered as a moral one.

Discipline to be successful, he said, and work for the best interests of the child, must be based upon a respect for the teacher, and come involuntarily, almost spontaneously. A spirit of hearty cooperation must obtain between both parties in the school—the teacher and the pupil. This being accomplished, the work of the school should be largely pleasure, and the discipline of the school a relatively easy task.

The great importance of discipline from the point of view of the teacher's professional success is made clear.

The discipline of the school is a large part of the success of the teacher. Broad scholarship is no guarantee of this success. The teacher may have many excellent qualities, but through her power as a disciplinarian she is rated either a success or a failure. We expect all normal pupils to respond to sensible discipline, a discipline that is steady, firm, based on thorough understanding between teacher and pupil. Such a scheme of discipline will take into consideration the varied but rational interests of the children. There must be a strong public opinion in the school in favor of discipline of the right sort. With a close sympathy between pupil and teacher, and plenty of steady, honest work, the question of discipline is solved for the great majority of pupils.

Mr. Lewis, who was superintendent of schools of Port Huron, Michigan, at the time he read this paper, handled the problem of punishment in a thoughtful manner. He called to the at-
tention of his hearers the existence every now and then in the classes of nearly all teachers, a pupil of so defiant an attitude that the fear of punishment, and that alone, will keep him in line until the teacher can attempt to develop a better spirit in him. Sometimes these boys cannot be won over, and when this is the case the problem child should not be allowed to disrupt the school and its discipline. Lewis was unqualifiedly against corporal punishment, or any other "form of discipline through assault and battery," He felt it to be a mistake, however, to make the use of corporal punishment impossible, for then there would be nothing in reserve to cope with the most serious cases of disobedience, stubbornness and defiance. However, if it were necessary to choose between corporal punishment and suspending a boy from school, it seemed to the speaker that the former is less injurious than the latter to the future life of the boy.

No one questions that the highest motives should be employed, and in well-disciplined schools, with teachers of broad common-sense and large understanding, it is seldom resorted to. Probably in ninety-nine cases out of a hundred even in these extreme cases mentioned above there is some better way that will touch these pupils. But a little spanking is preferable to disorder and lawlessness, better for the boy and better for the school. In a very, very few cases it acts favorably toward discipline. For the most part kindness, firmness, and self-control will produce good discipline. In general terms a teacher may be unfit who must use the rod. But after other means have been tried to the utmost, rather than the truant school or expulsion a little corporal punishment is less injurious.

The methods and objectives of discipline enunciated by Lewis bear the impression of the influence of James and those who carried his doctrines to their logical conclusions, that
a resume of them will be worth the space consumed. Ordinarily, he said, the child respects the right and the good, and the true conception of discipline is based upon such a feeling of the child. While an orderly school, subject to the will of the teacher, is presumed, the scheme of discipline must have the pupil in mind. The objectives are the direction of virtue, the development of moral strength in the child, not through talking or preaching, but through the child seeing and feeling the presence of good conduct all around him in the school life.

This is to be brought about through daily and yearly training.

Or does this training avail nothing? Has it no value in the general training of the schoolroom? Is it useless to insist upon obedience, or fruitless to form habits of honesty and integrity? If this is true our discipline would become useless. If these habits formed in school do not become part of the individual and make for law and citizenship, then discipline counts for nothing in developing obedience and self-control. Honesty, uprightness, self-control are taught by example until a habit is formed. Every scheme of discipline stands for these virtues through a continual respect for authority.

In line with the sentiments expressed by other writers of the period concerning the social aspects of discipline, Mr. Lewis maintained that the discipline of the school for all classes should impress upon the children the realization that they share in the responsibilities of their fellows, as well as in the duties. This realization should be brought about through emphasis upon their own rights and upon the privileges of others. He suggested the device of self-government in the upper grades for making the whole control easier, as well as to create a feeling of responsibility in the pupil. If the pupil, who ordinarily is conscious of the violations of rules going on about him daily, but who takes these violations as a
matter of no concern to himself because it is not his province to interfere in matters of government, should be shown that he is part of the government, discipline could be maintained by and through the efforts of all. Among the forms of self-government Mr. Lewis mentioned the device of the school city, which had been attempted with success in several of the large cities of the country. However, in 1910 the idea seemed slow to spread. Mr. Lewis was highly in favor of the school city method of discipline, for in it he saw new and important elements brought into school discipline, for pupils instead of blindly obeying the commands of others are led to think for themselves. In addition, and this was stressed as an item of major importance, the children are trained in the practice of citizenship.

This concludes the material gathered from the proceedings of the National Education Association. It is thought best, however, to go outside this source for an effective summary of the most modern conception of discipline and its functions. This is taken from a book published in 1931 (6:174).

... the methods of pupil control which so long prevailed have no place in the schools of a modern democracy. Progressive educators now think of the schools as a miniature community, a segment of the life outside, where teachers and pupils combine to form a social group. The members of this group are motivated by common purposes and are striving together to attain goals which they as a group accept as desirable. Though the teachers still reserve certain authority which can be called upon if necessary, the major emphasis is placed upon their functions as leaders. Discipline is no longer an end in itself; it is no longer enforced through external authority in the form of arbitrary rules and regulations; instead, it has now become a means to an end. Control is exercised almost entirely through standards of conduct which the group accepts as conducive to its own best interests.

In the analytical summary of the thoughts brought forward
in the addresses and papers of the National Education Association for the period 1910-1931, it will be noticed that the trend of thought seemed to be in the same direction as that of the first decade of the century. It is quite evident that the problem of discipline had ceased to be a pressing one, or that the methods in vogue were for the most part considered satisfactory, for of a total of 23,781 pages in the reports of the proceedings of the National Education Association for this period, but 43 were devoted to discipline as such. While it is true that much was said and done about character education and motivation, these aspects of the teaching problem, as was stated in Chapter I, were outside the scope of this paper.

Still, it cannot be inferred that the problem had been settled satisfactorily to all, for a book published in 1928 (16:6) gives the impression that such is not the case. The author speaks of discipline as

... a very real problem now existing in educational thought and practice. On the one hand, it is held that the control or discipline of pupils is prerequisite to their proper educational growth or guidance. It is at present urged by some... that recourse must be made to the rather old-fashioned discipline of authority, with its prompt and unquestioned obedience to commands, not merely as providing conditions basic to proper educational procedure, but also as a means of improving the general social situation.

Objectives of discipline: the following objectives were announced during this period by speakers in the National Education Association conventions: to train the child so that when he leaves school and goes out into the world he goes forth as an honest, upright, decent citizen; the direction of virtue, and the development of moral strength; the develop-
ment of social responsibilities; the teaching of honesty, uprightness, self-control, through the medium of example, and for the objective of forming right habits.

Means suggested: Among the means put forward during this period are included the following: authority with obedience behind it; authority both from within and from without; to base discipline upon a respect for the teacher and to cause it to come involuntarily, almost spontaneously; a spirit of kindly cooperation between the teacher and the pupil, creating pleasure in the school work, and thereby removing the difficulty and the onerous aspects of discipline; the use of the social instincts as revealed by modern psychological discoveries; a steady, firm discipline, based upon a thorough understanding between teacher and pupil, taking into consideration the varied but rational interests of the children; a strong public opinion in the school for discipline of the right sort, plus plenty of steady, honest work; the holding in reserve of the possibility of corporal punishment for extreme cases, since corporal punishment is preferable to the deleterious effects consequent upon expulsion from school; kindness, firmness, and self-control; a discipline based upon a respect for the right and the good that is inherent in the child; keeping the pupil in mind; emphasis placed upon the rights of the pupils and the privileges of others; self-government in the upper grades; the Brownlee word-a-month plan in the lower grades; the school city; reverence for the personality of the child; utilizing the knowledge that misbehavior is an urgent response to irritations—mental, social, or physical,—or
to wrong habit formations, both of which must be localized, analyzed, and treated by the teacher.

Methods attacked. Very little was found in the investigation of this period that could be catalogued under this heading. In one paper (51:57), the inference was that the author was opposed to "pin-drop" order and irksome restrictions, while the other attack, that upon unthinking use of corporal punishment, has already been mentioned at some length.

Observations. Among the observations that may be considered of value were the following: the discipline of a school is growing less autocratic year by year; it is more attractive to the pupils. The question of school discipline must be considered as a moral one. Many teachers are autocrats in their plan of discipline; this is noticeable in every exercise of the school. The discipline of the school is a large part of the success of the teacher. Broad scholarship is no guarantee of this success; the teacher may have many excellent qualities, but through her power as a disciplinarian she is rated as either a success or a failure. We expect all normal persons to respond to a sensible discipline. Talking will not produce good conduct; the pupil must see and feel it in the school life; it must be brought about through daily and yearly training.
CHAPTER VII.
CONCLUSIONS FROM THIS STUDY.

The sixty years under investigation furnished evidence of growth and progress in the attitude of the educators of America toward the problem of discipline. From the comparisons made in the preceding chapters of the thoughts advanced by the members of the National Education Association with the ideas promulgated by the leading educational minds of the past few generations, it is evident that the school men of the country were eager and willing to put into actual classroom practice any devices that would tend to utilize discipline for worthy ends. Pestalozzi, Froebel, Mann, Hall, Peirce, James, Parker, Dewey, and many other lesser names, led the way toward reform, and the majority of teachers followed.

In 1870 the teachers of the country were divided upon two main points. The first one was the extent to which authority should be used in the enforcement of discipline. That it was used and abused to a large extent is evident from the numerous attacks made upon it. The other was the proper use of corporal punishment.

Corporal punishment, its use and its abuse, was a point upon which was expended much thought and controversy. In the 1870's and 1880's the question was not whether or not to use it, but just what constituted abuse of the means of control. The idea of its use is old, and was rather firmly implanted in the minds of the teaching profession, and the advocacy of its use, although in a very mild way, is discernible as late as 1910. An interest-
ing explanation for this was advanced by a speaker in 1894 (45:765-766). He laid it to the evolutionary process that is followed by education in all countries. The first, or primitive stage, is represented by the question that determines the fitness of applicants for teaching positions, "Can he lick all the big boys? Is he a good disciplinarian?" This stage is not only satisfied with the use of corporal punishment, but actually implies its desirability. Discipline meant only bodily pain, and bodily pain flavored with a few facts constituted education.

The second stage, the faith of the people as a whole in the efficacy of the rod is shaken. They no longer look upon it as the sole means of keeping discipline, for the question now is, not "can he" but "does he"—not wield the rod— but keep good order?

In this second stage, they are conceding to the teacher a great deal—the mode of punishment. Even when school discipline has reached its second stage, the battle is still a hard one. Many of the people of this age have seen such beneficial results from milder means that they dare not openly question its efficiency, yet they fondly cling to the memory of "those good old days of yore." The majority of the people of this age, however, were ready to concede to the teacher the manner of maintaining order. But they still clung to the necessity for good order and to their theories of what constituted good order.

Thus can be seen part of the reason for some of the seeming back-tracking in some of the ideas expressed from time to time. The early speakers and writers were strong in their denunciations of the use of authority, the exaction of unquestioning obedience, and the use of repressive measures in the handling of pupils. For many years the attempt was made to have educators treat discipline from the point of individual differences, the realization of the individuality of the child, and the utilization of dis-
cipline for the formation of right habits. While the early days thought of order and decorum in the classroom as an indispensable element of the teaching process, later writers strove to make the methods of control means for the improvement of the social life of the child, both during the school period, and in after life.

That the ideas promulgated in the meetings of the National Education Association had some influence in the matter of discipline, that the methods and means suggested in the early days of the period under investigation bore fruit, can be inferred from a comparison of the sentiments expressed in 1870 and 1880 with those of the later 1900's. Those ideas upon which there seemed to be a unanimity of opinion gradually took root, and in the twentieth century were followed as a matter of course. To give some concrete illustrations, it is only necessary to refer back to the thoughts of Hoose in 1870 (op.cit.). The ideal of a school, which he inferred was non-existent in his day, must have been realized to the fullest extent in 1931, if it is possible to take at face value the observations of Carpenter and Rupi (op.cit.), and there is no immediate reason why personal investigation cannot seek the truth of their statements.

It will be noted that, in spite of variance of opinion along other lines, for the past sixty years three things have received almost unanimous support as requisites of good discipline: firmness, kindness, and self-control.

Since 1870 fear, bodily pain, coercive measures, and the rule of incompetent teachers have been outlawed in the schools
of the United States. Absolute authority, with the relationship of inferior and superior between pupil and teacher, has lost favor. Instead, the child-centered school, with a consciousness of the individual rights of the pupil, and an attempt to allow the fullest self-expression in those under instruction, has made considerable headway. Experiments have been made, for the purpose of developing self-government and spontaneity in the child, with the devices of the school city and student government. The evidence of the proceedings of the National Education Association is not sufficiently spread over any considerable cross-section of the educators of the country to draw any conclusions concerning the efficacy of these means of control. However, since during the preceding years the methods of discipline that seemed to the speakers to be wrong or vicious were attacked in the meetings, and since no concerted complaint concerning the new methods of control has been recorded, it is to be inferred that the people of the country as a whole are satisfied that with the changes that have been wrought, and are willing to continue for the time being with things as they now are.

What the discipline of the future will be is difficult to forecast. From the evidence at hand, it would seem that the pattern of thought along this line is rather well stabilized at the present writing, and since the prevailing ideas are strongly fixed in the minds of educators, it is probable that no strong movement for change is to be looked for within the near future.
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