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PREFACE

Into the fabric of modern American Education are woven the threads of many movements and theories. One of these is Child-study.

This dissertation deals with the development of Child-study in America over the forty year period--1880 to 1920. The research is historical in nature and presents a synthesis of the development of the Child-study movement. In planning the research the writer sought to do the following: systematically examine the literature dealing with Child-study during the years mentioned; review the status of Child-study in America and in foreign countries at the beginning of the study, 1880; analyze the European foundations for the development of this movement in America; become familiar with the main leaders; report the organization, growth, and decline of the movement; discover the main contributions made to American Education; and summarize the findings of the study and note the implications for modern education.

Data for the dissertation were secured from numerous sources. Personal interviews were held with two outstanding students of G. Stanley Hall--Dr. J. R. Jewell, Dean of the School of Education, University of Oregon; and Dr. H. D. Shelden, Professor Emeritus,
University of Oregon, and one of the best informed men in America on Child-study and on Hall's life. Letters were written to students who had studied at Clark University with Dr. Hall. The official publication of Child-study, Pedagogical Seminary, was thoroughly examined and used extensively. The Addresses and Proceedings of the National Education Association from 1895 to 1920 proved helpful and presented materials from the national point of view. The official publication of the Illinois Society for Child-study, Child Study Monthly, was the best state publication and offered an account of state activity. The yearly reports of the United States Commissioner of Education for 1880 and 1881 were the basic source used for the introductory chapter dealing with the status of education in America. Biographical studies of leaders in Child-study yielded some materials. A number of excellent books and periodicals dealing with Child-study when the movement was at its height were available.

The writer feels that the field has been systematically covered and the data embodied in this research presents a true picture of the development of Child-study in America. The materials should be helpful to students in education who are searching for a clearer perspective of the historical background, personalities, and events contributing to modern elementary education.
The writer wishes to express his appreciation to all who have helped so graciously in the preparation of this dissertation. Of real and lasting value have been the personal contacts and experiences with these individuals: Mr. Paul R. Hanna has been educational adviser, critic, and friend. The writer profitted by Dr. John C. Almack's keen interest in the topic and his valuable suggestions for organization and content. Dr. Walter Kaulfers has read the manuscript and his constructive criticisms resulted in many improvements in style and content. The writer gained much in the time spent with Dean J. R. Jewell, of the University of Oregon, discussing his early experiences at Clark University with G. Stanley Hall. Dr. H. D. Sheldon, University of Oregon, also one of Hall's students, spent many hours helping the writer gain a clearer perspective of the movement and suggesting new sources. The librarians of University of Oregon, Clark University, and Western Washington College of Education have been kind and helpful—without them this research would not have been possible. My wife has been a constant source of inspiration and encouragement.

W. H. Dutton

April, 1945
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CHAPTER I

INTRODUCTION

Along the road of educational advancement in the United States the year 1880 was a significant milepost. That year saw the beginning of the Child-study movement by G. Stanley Hall. Hall had just returned from Germany where he had studied with von Kries and Kronecker at Berlin, with Fechner at Leipzig, and with Wundt in his famous laboratory.\footnote{Edwin G. Boring, \textit{History of Experimental Psychology}, p. 506, Century Company, New York, 1929.} In September of this year he made a study of 200 Boston school children to determine the "contents of their minds" upon entering school. This study marked the beginning of a national trend to discover the much needed information about child life.

Following this trend Child-study emerged as a definite movement in American education. An educational movement may be defined as a series of related events which form a distinctive educational enterprise or activity. Characteristics of an educational movement would include: an origin in some educational need, the acceptance of the ideas by others if
results are good, the forming of an organization with constitution, rules for membership, and a medium of publicity such as a magazine. Child-study as a movement had all of these attributes and became the leading educational movement in America just before the turn of the nineteenth century and for over a decade thereafter.

Child-study may be defined as a method of collecting facts about children and interpreting these facts for practical purposes. Individuals approached the study of children with a variety of purposes: psychologists were interested in discovering facts pertinent to problems of method, learning, and motivation; sociologists wanted data on infantile morality, working conditions, and literacy; medical men were observing the process of physical growth and patterns of development; teachers awakened to the realization that understanding children must precede teaching them. In educational gatherings individual differences became an important issue. All of these approaches to Child-study developed simultaneously. Some groups moved ahead of others because of leadership and public recognition.

Status of American Education in 1880

In order to see this movement in its proper setting, it is well to consider the America of 1880—educationally. The storm clouds of the Civil War had passed leaving the South desolate and impoverished. Yet the nation was
determined to reconstruct a New South and to provide education for all. The prolonged struggle for the establishment of a series of state systems of free, publicly controlled, tax-supported, non-sectarian common schools had been won. Minor points of difference, particularly local in nature, were to be reconciled. The guide lines for future development in education were firmly established.

This young and independent American nation traveled little, worked hard, and developed its own ideas and resources. Schools were largely native in character and were adapted to the needs of a developing nation. Teachers and schoolmasters were of this same "homespun variety". Teachers were poorly trained, read little, and were provincial in their outlook.

The reports of the United States Commissioner of Education for the years 1880-1881 point out specifically the educational opportunities and limitations of these years.

Characteristics of Education in 1880

Elementary instruction comprises generally eight grades, each grade corresponding to one year. Four grades are classified as primary and four as grammar school.

The programmes of studies for these grades do not differ materially in the principal cities. They include reading, writing, English language, arithmetic, geography, history, constitution of the United States, grammar and composition, physics or physiology, music, drawing, and oral or object lessons. In rural schools music, gymnastics, and needlework have no place in the program. The objection was that such programmes include too much for the meagre term of school life.
Textbooks were not provided equally. No uniform plan prevails throughout the country. In some cities the matter is left to the parents, arrangements being made for supplying books to children whose parents are too poor to purchase them; in other cities textbooks are included in the expenditures covered by the school tax or income; and in others the school boards make contracts with publishers for the purchase of the books and they are sold to the children at a small profit. The estimated cost of minimal required textbooks for the District of Columbia for 1879-1880 was $15.47 for the eight year period. The average cost per annum was $1.68. The cost of copy books and drawing books is not included. These estimates give no margin for loss or wear and tear.

Discipline problems and truancy were pronounced. Great improvement had been made during the decade in the methods of discipline. It is generally admitted that corporal punishment is still too frequently administered. The habitual absence of scholars in nominal membership is so serious a hindrance to class work and ultimately so injurious to society that educators and legislators find a common cause in measures for the repression of the evil.

Periodical examinations were widely used. The excellent effects of the periodical examination of country schools by qualified officers cannot be questioned.

Classes were quite large. The average number of children (city schools) to one teacher is about sixty, but it is generally conceded that the number of children to one teacher should not exceed fifty. The Committee of Boston allow an assistant in the fifth and sixth classes whenever the number of pupils exceeds fifty-six, the intention being to have no more than fifty pupils to a teacher.\(^1\)

Qualifications for Teachers—Salaries

The qualifications for teachers and teachers' salaries were much lower than the standards of other countries in which provision was made for education of the masses. The countries having notably higher standards were England, France, Prussia, and Switzerland. America could not expect to obtain well trained teachers for the salaries being paid at this period. A few representative statements from the reports made by the Commissioner of Education in 1881 will substantiate this statement. Of importance also is the difference between salaries of men and women, differences in pay between North and South, and differences in wages between cities and counties.

Rhode Island Board of Education reported for the state that 4 per cent of the teachers in the state had college degrees; 32 per cent had either high school or an academic education; 21 per cent, normal school training; 15 per cent had common district school preparation. The average school teacher's salary in 1881 was $76.00 a month for men and $41.89 for women.

Michigan established a new school law providing for the examination of teachers by county boards. The average salaries in ungraded schools were $26.30 a month for men and $18.49 for women in 1881. This was a decrease of $1.22 for men and twenty-six cents for women per month over salaries for 1880. The average duration of schools was 7.4 months.

Pennsylvania makes excellent provision for examination of teachers, but experience proves that the system can have little effect against low salaries. For 1881, the average salaries in the state, excluding Philadelphia, were $52.64 a month for men; $26.04 for women. The average length of the school term was 6.28 months.
In Alabama the average pay of teachers in white schools is $22.98 a month; in colored schools, $23.15; the average paid to each teacher yearly is $25.30. The funds allowed the white schools to be maintained on an average of 84 days in 1881; the colored schools were open 76 days.

The average monthly salary in Mississippi, estimated for the entire state, was $30.00.

Averages given for the nation for counties based upon figures of 1880 were: white teachers (male) $54.00; white female teachers, $28.00. For cities men were paid $47.00 and women $37.00. Colored males in the counties received on the average $29.00; females $26.00. Colored men in cities received $33.00, and women $32.00.¹

The preceding statistics are self explanatory. The struggle for fixed minimum salaries in each state and increased funds for the payment of teachers was just beginning. The total number of teachers in the United States and territories at this date was 289,159.² Women teachers were in the majority in most states with the exception of the South where men predominated.

**Illiteracy in America in 1880**

Illiteracy, determined on the basis of ability to read simple content and to write, was quite marked for the nation and particularly high for the Southern states.

(see table 1, p.7)


²Ibid, p. XIV ff., 1881 (from census of 1880).
TABLE 1

ILLITERACY OF MINORS 10 - 20 YEARS OF AGE
COMPARSED BY RACE, AGE, SEX, AND LOCATION 1

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>Northern</th>
<th>Southern</th>
<th>Pacific</th>
<th>Nation</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Male</td>
<td>Female</td>
<td>Both</td>
<td>Male</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>M.F.</td>
<td>M.F.</td>
<td>M.F.</td>
<td>M.F.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>10</td>
<td>17.1</td>
<td>15.1</td>
<td>16.1</td>
<td>70.1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>17.2</td>
<td>15.2</td>
<td>16.2</td>
<td>70.2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>11</td>
<td>16.1</td>
<td>15.1</td>
<td>16.1</td>
<td>69.1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>16.2</td>
<td>15.2</td>
<td>16.2</td>
<td>69.2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>12</td>
<td>15.1</td>
<td>15.1</td>
<td>15.1</td>
<td>68.1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>15.2</td>
<td>15.2</td>
<td>15.2</td>
<td>68.2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>13</td>
<td>14.1</td>
<td>14.1</td>
<td>14.1</td>
<td>67.1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>14.2</td>
<td>14.2</td>
<td>14.2</td>
<td>67.2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>14</td>
<td>13.1</td>
<td>13.1</td>
<td>13.1</td>
<td>66.1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>13.2</td>
<td>13.2</td>
<td>13.2</td>
<td>66.2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>15</td>
<td>12.1</td>
<td>12.1</td>
<td>12.1</td>
<td>65.1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>12.2</td>
<td>12.2</td>
<td>12.2</td>
<td>65.2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>16</td>
<td>11.1</td>
<td>11.1</td>
<td>11.1</td>
<td>64.1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>11.2</td>
<td>11.2</td>
<td>11.2</td>
<td>64.2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>17</td>
<td>10.1</td>
<td>10.1</td>
<td>10.1</td>
<td>63.1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>10.2</td>
<td>10.2</td>
<td>10.2</td>
<td>63.2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>18</td>
<td>9.1</td>
<td>9.1</td>
<td>9.1</td>
<td>62.1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>9.2</td>
<td>9.2</td>
<td>9.2</td>
<td>62.2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>19</td>
<td>8.1</td>
<td>8.1</td>
<td>8.1</td>
<td>61.1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>8.2</td>
<td>8.2</td>
<td>8.2</td>
<td>61.2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>20</td>
<td>7.1</td>
<td>7.1</td>
<td>7.1</td>
<td>60.1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>7.2</td>
<td>7.2</td>
<td>7.2</td>
<td>60.2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>S...Surplus of colored</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>W...White</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

School Enrollment and Attendance

An amazing picture of the discrepancy between potential school population and public school enrollment from 1873 to 1880 is shown in Graph 1, page 9. School population increased from slightly over 15 million (1873) to a little over 15 million (1880). School enrollment increased from approximately 7 million (1873) to 9 million in 1880. Thus only 9 million out of 15 million children were in school in 1880. Average daily attendance was astonishingly low. In 1880, the average daily attendance was just under 6 million. The average attendance each day would be 6 million out of the potential school population of 15 million. Expressing this in percentage we would say that 40 per cent of the nation's children were in school each day in 1880. Obviously much work had to be done to get the children of our nation into schools.

Close of Public School Revival

Following this period of isolation and independence, the movement known as the "public school revival" attempted to arouse public interest in education. The leaders were interested in reforming the common schools and in establishing in each state a public educational system providing for free elementary, secondary, and higher education wherever possible. This revival was well started by 1840 and drawing to a close by 1880. New ideas from abroad were coming
to America and were to play an important part in the recasting of our educational methods.

GRAPH 1

SCHOOL POPULATION, ENROLMENT IN PUBLIC SCHOOLS, AND AVERAGE ATTENDANCE IN UNITED STATES, 1873-1880.
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SCHOOL POPULATION

PUBLIC SCHOOL ENROLMENT

AVERAGE DAILY ATTENDANCE

Type of Psychology of Education Being Used

Teachers of this period looked upon the child's mind as that part of the body which could be trained by uniform procedures. Teachers could drill the attention, will, memory, imagination, feelings, judgment, reasoning, ability in observation and sense discrimination, and other "powers of the mind". Children's minds were conceived of as water-tight compartments or faculties. Drilling of the mind was the job of education.

This type of psychology had a definite effect upon the courses of study prepared and used in our schools. Cubberley aptly describes the pattern established between 1870 and 1890 and found in limited degree in certain areas today.

Courses of instruction were much more minutely outlined than before; the work of each grade was quite definitely laid down; the kind, amount, and order of subject-matter to be learned, by all pupils in all parts of the city, and regardless of age, past experience, future prospects, or physical or mental condition, was uniformly prescribed for all; and the examination test at the end of the term became the almost uniform proof that what had been outlined had or had not been mastered.¹

Source of Educational Ideas

The chief source of our early educational ideas had been England. We were English in history, traditions, and social institutions.

The dame school, the tutor in the home, private and parochial pay schools, apprenticeship training, the pauper-school idea, the Latin Grammar school, and the college—all were typical English institutions brought over by the early colonists and established here. For a century and a half the textbooks, and many of the teachers, were also imported from England. After the coming of nationality, the creation of distinctly American textbooks, and the evolution of more American-type schools, we still continued to draw our new educational ideas and creations from the old mother land. The Sunday School, the Charity School, the Church Society came directly from England and were fitted into and onto the slowly evolving native American school."

Methods of Teaching

The next great emphasis in the development of American Education was upon methods of teaching, teacher training, and adoption of new agencies for increasing the efficiency of teachers. The public school revival had stressed organization of education and the establishment of free tax supported institutions. Little attention was given to methods of instruction and to the treatment of children in general. There were a few "bright lights" such as Horace Mann and Henry Barnard shining during this period of the revival stressing teaching methods. Horace Mann was able to secure astonishing reforms in schools of Massachusetts. These reforms included organizing of

\[\text{Op.Cit., p.257.}\]
normal schools, extension of the school year, establishment of high schools, increased compensation for teachers, and adoption of new agencies for teacher improvement. Other reforms included teacher institutes, establishment of libraries, and the promotion of new methods of teaching—especially Pestalozzian object lessons and emphasis upon a milder form of discipline. His seventh annual report was a "bombshell" thrown into the ranks of the conservatism that surrounded Boston and other cities in New England. Likewise Henry Barnard accomplished many brilliant reforms for the states of Connecticut and Rhode Island. He agitated for a federal agency for the collection and publication of educational information. In 1867 the Bureau of Education was established in Washington with Barnard as the first Commissioner. Barnard's *American Journal of Education* was one of his greatest contributions to American Education. The *Journal* is still a source of great worth to educational research workers. This publication was used to stimulate the introduction of new methods of teaching in our country. Pestalozzian methods, organization of the kindergarten, and reports of advancements made in Europe were carefully recorded.
General Summary of American Education in 1880

American Education in 1880 could be characterized as: successfully accomplishing the main goals in providing free, public, tax supported, non-sectarian schools; educational psychology was crude and based largely upon faculty psychology; courses of study were rigid and minutely outlined; examinations were used to measure mastery and achievement; methods of instruction were very inadequate; women teachers were gradually supplanting men; discipline was harsh; teachers were poorly prepared, poorly paid, poorly supervised; school attendance was miserable; certification of teachers had just started; illiteracy for the nation was quite marked; the stage was set for studying children and improving teaching methods.
THE EUROPEAN FOUNDATIONS FOR THE DEVELOPMENT OF CHILD-STUDY IN AMERICA—PERSONALITIES

The main emphasis in this study has been placed upon modern times because of the recognition given to understanding and studying children during this period. The large share of the seventeenth and part of the eighteenth centuries were characterized by the preponderance of tradition and authority in all walks of life. Instruction in the universities was retarded due to the fact that lectures were in Latin and the subjects discussed were theological and classical in nature. Political life was controlled by the sovereigns who believed in the "divine right of kings to rule". Superstitions and witchcraft were prevalent. Some strong force was needed to change this social pattern. Men needed to be stimulated to use their minds for critical thinking and for the improvement of social conditions.

John Locke and Rationalism

John Locke provided this force and started a movement known as "Enlightenment". Traditional theories and practices were to be tested by reason. Whatever could not stand this test was rejected. Locke refused to accept
the popular belief of innate ideas. He suggested that "human understanding" was to be developed from external experience of environment.¹ We often refer to his theory of the mind as a "tabula rasa". The mind was supposed to be like a blank piece of paper before receiving the impressions from without.

The aim of education, according to Locke, was virtue and could be achieved when the individual was willing to deny himself his own desires and follow the dictates of reason. Children had not developed the powers of reasoning and must be directed in the formation of good habits of reasoning. Locke was concerned with earliest infancy, with health, and with the physical welfare of children. He stressed the molding of character when the child was young and pliant. Discipline was to be used and authority well established. But harsh discipline was to be used only as a last resort and reasoning should be attempted first.²

Locke was very much concerned with the courses of study and methods being used during his time. He advocated learning and using the native language before attempting the study of Latin and Greek. He was even bold enough to suggest that many should never learn these languages because they would not have occasion to use them. Subjects advocated


by Locke were geography, arithmetic, astronomy, history, ethics, law, natural philosophy, and the Scriptures. John Locke's ideas for educating children influenced other educators—particularly Rousseau.

**Rousseau's Influence Upon Child-study**

Rousseau disagreed with Locke's idea of building character through authority and planned discipline. He insisted that the ideal way to rear children was to have them free from all unnatural restraint. The permissible restraints were to be those of nature and necessity.¹ To Rousseau the individual was supreme.

Rousseau's *Emile* was a proclamation of the rights of the child and the earliest significant treatise on Child-study.

*Emile* is really the first important treatise on Child-study. Hence when impressed by inconsistencies and paradoxes that may be found in it, one must remember its pioneer character and the need felt by Rousseau of startling people into a knowledge of the absurdities and outrages of the prevailing education by using all the devices of the rhetorician. . .²

Rousseau's main contribution was upon French social life, literature, and art. His educational views had no noticeable effect. Outside France, Basedow led in putting Rousseau's

---


teachings into practice. Rousseau did have a profound effect upon the total picture of education in the nineteenth century.

The main contributions of Rousseau have been very aptly stated by Cubberley.

Emile had a tremendous influence on Europe in laying bare the defects and abuses of the formal and ecclesiastical education of the time. Though Rousseau's enthusiasm took the form of theory run mad, and the educational plan he proposed was largely impossible, he nevertheless popularized education. He contributed much to changing the point of view in instruction from subject-matter to the child to be taught, and the nature of instruction from formal religious doctrine, preparatory for life hereafter, to the study of the life and universe amid which man lives here....

John Basedow Influenced By Rousseau

As indicated earlier, Johann Basedow was one of the first students of education to be influenced by Rousseau's Emile. He took advantage of the aroused public interest in Rousseau's writings and made appeals for money to publish proper textbooks and to organize schools for using these new ideas. He wrote the first reformed textbook issued since Comenius published his famous Orbis Pictus. Basedow stressed learning by experience, teaching languages in the vernacular, and using the conversational method to teach language.²


The Philanthropinum was established to put these ideas into practice. Basedow's temper, weak character, and poor management compelled him to give up his leadership of this institution. His work was carried on by very able associates. Christian Salzmann was the best advocate of Basedow's ideas and later opened his own school at Schnappfenthal. Salzmann anticipated many of the reforms later introduced into elementary education by Pestalozzi and others. The philanthropic movement had a profound effect upon children's books and literature. *Swiss Family Robinson* was one of the children's books written by the followers of Basedow.

**The Pestalozzian Movement**

The best contributions of Pestalozzi were the rejection of teaching of mere words and factual materials. He tried to organize and psychologize the educational process by harmonising it with child development. This required careful studying of children. His methods were developed experimentally and as a result of his observations. Pestalozzi used the motto "read nothing, discover everything, and prove all things".¹

In his schools, Pestalozzi stressed studying real objects, learning through sense impressions, the individual expressing his ideas, and child activity.

The most influential group to use Pestalozzian methods in America was the Oswego, New York, schools. Edward Sheldon was superintendent of schools and provided many expert teachers to spread Pestalozzian methods throughout the nation. By 1866 the National Education Association approved the methods and plan being used.

The stress placed upon studying children is important to this study. Also Pestalozzi greatly influenced other educators—particularly Froebel and Herbart.

**Herbartian Method of Teaching**

Herbartianism had a profound effect upon methods of teaching and upon the content of the school curriculum. The main end of education was character; this was to be secured by developing the many-sided interests of children. Herbart believed children must not only know about the world they live in but they must love it. The personal interests of the teacher and pupil must be interwoven. The teacher's enthusiasm should inspire the pupils to learn.

The mind of the pupil was shaped by the teacher and instruction was based upon the theory of apperception. Herbart stressed the formal steps of the recitation and conformity to the principle of correlation of subjects.

---

As a movement Herbartianism was just beginning when Child-
study was organised. The National Herbartian Society was 
established in 1892. Later this organization became the 
National Society for the Study of Education which issues 
studies on all leading educational advancements rather than 
to espouse any particular creed.

The Herbartian movement placed emphasis upon his-
tory and literature as the best subjects for the teaching 
of moral character. A much broader view was taken in the 
teaching of history. Ancient, European, and English histo-
ry received attention. Social life was stressed rather than 
the development of patriotism. Biographical and historical 
stories became popular. The principle of correlation, 
popularised by Ziller and Rein, influenced the organisation 
of the curriculum in American schools. The committee of 
fifteen of the National Education Association, 1895, began 
their search for a basis of unity in the curriculum. In 
1894 Colonel Parker used science as the central subject for 
correlation. The discussion centering around correlation, 
led to the controversy over "interest and effort" in education 
which held the center of the stage for many years. Clark 
University, like so many leading educational centers of that 
period, stressed the "Cultural Epoch" theory that had its 
origins in the teachings of Herbart. Hall used the "reapit-
ulation" theory in all of his writings.
Froebel and The Kindergarten

Froebel is responsible for many of the most important streams of thought in modern elementary education. The aim of education for Froebel, influenced by his early life and training, was the development of the inborn capacities and powers of the individual. Self-activity and participation were to be used to develop the child and direct him toward social participation. He attempted to achieve these new principles through the kindergarten and used the materials of play-songs, gifts, and occupations.

Kindergartens first appeared in America when cultured Germans immigrated to the United States after the German revolution of 1848 and opened private schools for the education of their children. Elizabeth Peabody was impressed by these schools and opened a kindergarten in Boston in 1860. In 1868 she was instrumental in starting a training school for kindergarten teachers. The movement was carried largely by the private schools during the seventies and eighties. William T. Harris introduced the movement into public school work. As superintendent of the St. Louis schools, Harris adopted the kindergarten in his schools and was ably assisted by Susan Blow.¹ Miss Blow wrote and spoke extensively about the kindergarten and established a training

school for teachers in St. Louis. Teachers went out from this training school to spread the work of the kindergarten throughout the nation.

Because of the interest taken by this organization in the study of children, the kindergarten movement had a direct bearing upon the Child-study movement. Some of the kindergarten leaders assisted Hall with his first studies.

**Experimental Psychology**

Experimental psychology originated in Germany and had a profound influence upon American educators and upon Child-study. Boring has placed Fechner as the real founder of this psychology.

It is true that without Fechner or a substitute which the times would almost inevitably have raised up, there might still have been an experimental psychology. There would still have been Wundt and Helmholtz. There would, however, have been little of the breath of science in the experimental body, for we hardly recognize a subject as scientific if measurement is not one of its tools. Fechner, because of what he did and the time at which he did it, set experimental psychology off upon the course which it has followed. One may call him the "founder" of experimental psychology, or one may assign that title to Wundt. It does not matter. Fechner had a fertile idea which grew and brought forth fruit most abundantly—and the end of that growth is not yet.¹

During the time Child-study was emerging as a major educational movement in America, experimental psychology was going through the stages of organization. These two

---

movements profited by and stimulated each others growth. Americans had been going to Germany and studying with Wundt. They came back determined to start experimentalism in our country. Titchner and Munsterberg were imported to America in 1892. William James recognized the significance of the new experimental physiological psychology of Germany and introduced experimentalism to America. G. Stanley Hall had borrowed money to study in Germany with the leaders of the new psychology. Upon returning he was ready to turn all of his energies toward the establishment of experimental work in psychology and toward the study of children. In 1879 Dr. K. Lange had studied 500 children entering the city schools of Plauen and 300 children entering twenty-one country schools in outlying districts.¹ The results of this study had a significant influence upon Hall. Hall was eager to make a similar study in America. In 1880 the Boston schools provided this opportunity. The data and experience obtained furnished both prestige and content for lectures and articles appearing in leading publications for the next few years. This, then, was the beginning of Child-study in America—the beginning of Hall's career as one of America's great educators.

Summary of European Influences

These were the contributions of European Educators to the Child-study movement. John Locke was the first. He was followed in succession by Rousseau, Basedow, Pestalozzi, Herbart, and Froebel. Fechner and Wundt made contributions to experimental psychology. Other Europeans were to make additions in methods for studying children.

The result of individualism started by Rousseau and rapidly advanced by other educators was an outgrowth of the psychological motive in all aspects of education. Schools began to organize their materials and instructional practices so that the powers and capacities of the individual child would be developed to the fullest. Normal schools took up this trend and trained teachers with the large part of the work devoted to method and individualistic psychology. The time was ripe for an educational movement that would capitalize upon this trend toward studying and understanding the individual child.
CHAPTER III

ORGANIZED EFFORT DIRECTED TO THE PROMOTION OF CHILD-STUDY

The Child-study movement had three well-defined periods of growth: (1) Establishment of Child-study, 1880-1895; (2) a period of rapid growth and climax, 1895-1910; (3) a final period in which there was a shading of interest into side paths and other movements, 1910-1920. It is well to follow the events and developments of the movement through these three stages.

Establishment of Child-study

Hall's study in the Boston Public Schools of the "Contents of Children's Minds" marks the beginning of Child-study. The investigation was carried on through the liberality of Mrs. Quincey A. Shaw who provided four teachers from her kindergartens to act as special questioners under Dr. Hall's direction. Miss Sara Wiltse was one of these four and later became an important leader in the movement. The following year (1881) Hall printed the first comprehensive syllabus for the study of children. In 1882 Hall published his Study of Children's Lies. This publication was translated into many languages.¹ The Story of a Sand-pile was the last publication

for a few years until he founded the *Journal of Psychology* in 1887. This was the first psychological journal in America and was open to all writers.

Systematic study of children began in the State Normal School at Worcester upon Hall's suggestion and under the direction of E. Harlow Russell in 1885. Mr. Russell collected 35,000 records, 180 articles spontaneously made by children, and many specimens of children's drawings. These studies formed the basis for the methods used in training teachers. The lectures in classrooms derived their content from these studies.

Child-study in Massachusetts and the whole nation received a great impetus by the founding of the new department of pedagogy at Clark University, 1890. For the next few years summer sessions were held at Clark with large groups of leading educators in attendance.

**Main Publication of Child-study**

The *Pedagogical Seminary* founded in 1891 by Hall became the official publication of Child-study. A brief statement made by Hall in one of the early volumes will give a clear picture of the purpose of the publication.

Child-study in this country has grown up, produced its results and achieved its organization for more systematic work under the auspices of the *Pedagogical Seminary*, which has been its chief organ and promoter, and prints, either in original or in the form of abstracts, about all that has ever been done in any land on the subject up to date. About 275 parents and teachers in all parts of the country have corresponded
with the Seminary during the year concerning active work on Child-study, not a few of whom have their work directed by members of the Pedagogical department of Clark University. Our program is to gradually center all study of psychology, philosophy, ethics and other cognate branches by teachers about Child-study.\footnote{1}

The Pedagogical Seminary was used to direct the advancement of the movement. Hall reported on the progress of this publication as follows:

The Seminary still spares no pains and no expense to secure all important new publications, not only in English but in other languages for brief mention and if space is permissible for digest. This is a unique feature of the Seminary, a single number of which sometimes contains reviews of 20,000 to 30,000 pages of carefully selected printed matter. In response to requests for suggestions for guidance in the work of Child-study, the Pedagogical department of Clark proposes to issue a series of topical syllabi for Child-study. Anger is included in this issue, Volume III.\footnote{2}

Period of Rapid Growth

Interest in Child-study spread rapidly. The movement made substantial growth after 1893 and played the role as the leading educational movement in the nation until 1910. Sectional meetings of Child-study attracted much interest at the Chicago meeting of the National Education Association, July, 1893, and their attendance was larger than any other section. In 1894 at Ashbury Park the Child-study section was organized

\footnote{1}{G. S. Hall, \textit{Pedagogical Seminary}, Vol. III, p.5, 1894.}
\footnote{2}{Ibid, p. 178.}
as a department of the National Education Association with Professor William L. Bryan as president of the section.

Division of Child-study—National Education Association

The first annual meeting of the Child-study division of the National Education Association was in Denver, 1895. Two department sessions were held and reports were given from various states and papers were read by leading educators: Dr. Edward R. Shaw, "Methods of Child-study and Comparative Value for Teachers"; V. O'Shea, "Method and Scope of Child-study for Teachers in Service"; Chas. De Garmo, "Child-study from the Herbartian Point of View"; Dr. C. C. Van Liew, "Child-study with the Cooperation of Parents". Officers for the next year were: President Earl Barnes, Stanford; Vice President Orville T. Bright, Illinois; Secretary, Dr. Edward R. Shaw, New York.¹

Reports of Progress

Reports from leading workers with the movement indicate that there was widespread interest in Child-study during this second period. William O. Krohn, Co-editor of Child Study Monthly, the official publication for Illinois, reported as follows on the state of Child-study at the Chicago meeting of the National Education Association, 1896:

It is highly gratifying to know that this new zest for Child-study, this eagerness to make the child's mind an open page, is taking precedence over all other discussions

at our educational meetings, as is shown in the
programs of the National Education Association, the
various state teachers' associations, and the smaller
assemblages of educators.¹

Sara Wiltsie, secretary for Child-study section of
the National Education Association from the first year
through 1895 states:

The literature on Child-study is quite comprehensive,
over 250 titles have been listed by the Illinois Society
of Child-study through May, 1895. Courses in Child-
study are now given either in the regular work or in the
summer at Clark, Yale, Harvard, Princeton, Pennsylvania,
and elsewhere. Specialists are now studying in this
country and in Europe hoping to become professors of
"Paidology"....no educational meeting is complete without
at least one paper on Child-study. Since the reports of
the committee of Ten and Fifteen have fully opened up the
programme question, it is clear that the next step in
educational progress must be to shape it to the needs of
individual children.²

Child-study in The States and Foreign Countries

By the year 1896 Sara Wiltsie reported active Child-
study groups in twenty-two states, Canada, four British
centers, and returns of work being done in France, Germany,
Australia, Japan, South Africa, China, South America, and
North Africa. Active Child-study centers were noted in the
following states and countries: (detail in appendix p.137)

Massachusetts; California; Illinois; New York; Iowa;
Pennsylvania; New Jersey; Connecticut; Michigan; Maine;

¹W. O. Krohn, Child Study Monthly, p. 24, Vol. 1,

²Sara E. Wiltsie, Pedagogical Seminary, Vol. III,
pp. 189 f., 1894.
Indiana; Minnesota; Wisconsin; South Carolina; Colorado; Ohio; Rhode Island; Nebraska; Missouri; Oregon; Alabama; The British centers in London, Dublin, Cheltenham, and Glasgow.¹

Widespread Use of Topical Syllabi

The great number of topical syllabi issued from Clark University is another indication of the extent of the movement during this period. Fifteen syllabi were issued in 1895 and formed the basis for lectures and summer school work at Clark; sixteen syllabi were prepared and issued in 1896-1897. The syllabi issued at Clark University since the beginning of the Child-study movement in 1894 was well over 125. Sixty-four publications had been based on these syllabi.² Between 1903-1905 there were twenty-nine topical syllabi issued and seventeen books and articles issued by Clark University on Child-study.³ The returns from these syllabi were astonishing from the standpoint of number and area covered. A few citations will help to show the extreme spread to states.

A questionnaire dealing with "Curiosity and Interest" was issued and 1,247 returned. (no indication of number issued)⁴

⁴G. S. Hall, *Aspects of Child Life*, p. 84, Ginn, 1907.
G. S. Hall printed a questionnaire on dolls and sent copies to 800 teachers and parents. The returns were: State Normal School, New Jersey, 205; St. George's High, Edinburgh, Scotland, 67; Jennie Merrill of New York, 55; New York at large, 105; Sara E. Wiltse, 26; Mary White, 18; miscellaneous 176.  

Sara E. Wiltse and Hall made a study of the collecting instinct in children. The data for the study (using questionnaires) were from 510 Santa Barbara children; 704 Santa Rosa children. In all 607 boys and 607 girls, a total of 1,214 were sampled.

Topical syllabi were distributed to teachers and students to obtain information on the "Psychology of Ownership." The returns included 520 answers, of which 148 were males and 176 females.

"I have seen over 10,000 questionnaire papers at one time at Clark University when I was working on my doctorate there. That's a lot of questionnaires and I am not underestimating the number I saw. Few educators today realize the extent of the Child-study movement centered at Clark under Dr. Hall."  

Hall collected facts concerning fears of children. He found 1,701 children had 6,456 fears.

Earl Barnes worked in many leading centers in California. Data were reported for Monterey, Santa Ana, San Mateo, Fresno, Madera, San Bernadino, Riverside, El Dorado Counties. Records of data collected show: 37,500 definitions (following Binet tests); 15,000 children's drawings; 7,000 papers on the historical sense; 3,000

1Ibid., p. 205.
2Ibid., p.206 f.
3Ibid., p. 240.
4J. R. Jewell, (personal interview), June, 1943.
papers on children's rights; 1,200 compositions on heaven and
evil; 4,000 papers describing punishment; 2,000 on observations;
3,000 comparisons of horse and cow; 5,000 papers on inference;
3,000 children's ambitions; 1,200 tests on poor spellers;
1,200 color tests; 2,000 compositions on fear.\footnote{Proceedings of National Education Association, p. 902, July 11, 1896.}
Mr. Barnes reported 75,000 children examined for physical defects and
health conditions in London in 1908.\footnote{Earl Barnes, Op. Cit., p. 955, 1908.}

Leadership of G. Stanley Hall

The data presented have shown that Hall did collect
enormous quantities of data from a wide variety of states and
countries. Students of Hall's report that the success of this questionnaire method used by Hall was due to the fact that so many students who had worked with him helped to collect data whenever necessary.\footnote{H. D. Sheldon, (personal interview), March, 1943.} Hall used these individuals frequently as well as the institutions they represented. Earl Barnes collected data in California; Kate Stevens reported and collected data in Great Britain; Herman T. Lukens collected data and reports from centers in Europe; Sara Wiltse was an industrious worker; the different state societies cooperated with Hall and his students; the Illinois Society aided with the Child Study Monthly. The data also prove quite conclusively that the Child-study movement was popular and wide-spread. Educators were interested in
studying children as will be shown in the remaining pages of this chapter.

Hall took a personal interest in the advancement of Child-study. He edited the Pedagogical Seminary; prepared topical syllabi; directed the students who worked under him on Child-study topics; and lectured from one end of the nation to the other. In 1894 Hall lectured daily at Clark and gave thirty-four public lectures. He toured as far West as Lincoln, Nebraska. Later tours took him to the West Coast, to the Inland Empire Educational meetings at Spokane, and to Child-study centers throughout the West.

Summer Sessions at Clark University

A report of the summer sessions will show a little of the enthusiasm for the movement.

The second session of summer school of Clark University was held during the last two weeks of July. The program was fuller and the attendance much in excess of the year before, nearly 800 members were enrolled from different states and countries. An advisory committee, composed of the most prominent ladies and gentlemen of Worcester, worked in planning the session and entertained many members at their homes, and provided charming evening receptions.

In 1895 fifteen syllabi were issued and formed the basis for one hour a week course given by Dr. Hall and this data were used as foundational materials for the summer schools. Four individuals were employed to work on the data and he used his students whenever possible. Nineteen syllabi were sent out in 1896 on such topics as study of dolls, suggestibility of children, youthful degeneracy, etc. 1

E. D. Sheldon reported that many educational leaders came to Clark in the summers to deal with all sorts of child problems. The two week period was most popular for several years. Gradually Hall found it difficult to gather new materials and attendance lagged. These sessions were used to popularize the movement.

Changes in Pedagogical Seminary and the Extension of Child-study

By 1900 the work at Clark had become so heavy that Hall decided to make some re-arrangements of the work. Changes had to be made in the editorial staff of the Pedagogical Seminary. T. W. Ballist, Superintendent of Springfield was to report findings on Child-study from Europe where he was going to study; Earl Barnes was in Great Britain and would send in materials; W. H. Burnham, head of the education department of Clark, was to make contributions; W. S. Monroe, Westfield Normal, had wide European acquaintances and was to obtain reports when possible from these sources; E. H. Russell was to report practical work he was doing on Child-study at Worcester Normal; Louis N. Wilson, Librarian at Clark, was to publish the Seminary.¹

The movement was still growing rapidly by 1903. In this year G. Stanley Hall presented a plan for extension of Child-study. He suggested that all institutions and individuals interested in Child-study in the United States and other

¹Ibid., Vol. VI, Introduction, 1899.
countries co-operate by collecting and sending materials to Clark. Over seventy promised co-operation, domestic and foreign. Some of the contributions were: Miss Chevallies, of England; Madame Grudzinska, Poland; Professor Notora, Japan, Imperial University of Tokyo; Professor Mastroini, Italy, and seventy Italian educators co-operating with the movement. Italy at this time was concerned primarily with the field of criminology and defectives. Paolo Lambroso was receiving much attention. Out of twenty-seven leading colleges and universities from which replies were received regarding Child-study in their curriculum, there were but two who did not include Child-study. The pattern was to offer either a separate course or include Child-study as a part of psychology. Some of the larger universities reported three or four separate courses. The publication of Dr. Hall's Adolescence gave the subject a fresh impetus. The recognition of Clark University as the leader in Child-study research was coming with ever increasing frequency from foreign countries.¹

At the St. Louis exhibit in 1904 the Child-study movement had a display of its work and its literature. W. S. Monroe reported data concerning the preparation and extent of these displays.

Child-study materials were sent from University of Texas, University of Washington, University of California,

¹Pedagogical Seminary, Vol. XII, pp. 93-96, 1905.
Yale, Iowa, and Teachers College Columbia. Forty-four American Normal schools replied concerning Child-study. Five reported investigations to reach general truths, 30 used Child-study to train teachers, 11 sent exhibits to St. Louis. The normal schools sending exhibits were: San Jose; Indiana, Pennsylvania; Bloomsburg, Pennsylvania; New Orleans; St. Cloud; Lowell, Massachusetts; Cheney, Washington; Duluth; Pittsburgh, Massachusetts; Westfield, Massachusetts; Worcester, Massachusetts. Twenty-one cities and towns replied that they were doing Child-study work.1

President Lancaster addressed the opening meeting of the national meeting of Child-study in 1905. He stressed the rapid growth and the wide influence of Child-study upon leading educational institutions in America.

Child-study has advanced during the past year. Nearly every college, university, and normal school, beyond provincial New England, has a chair of pedagogy and Child-study. Excellent courses are being given in practically all of the great state universities of the West, and particularly in the normal schools. There has been an unprecedented call for teachers of child psychology and pedagogy during the past year. The following universities and colleges are giving regular instruction in Child-study: Washington; Oregon; California; Stanford; Texas; Colorado; Denver University; Illinois; Indiana; Wisconsin; Chicago; Olivet College; Cornell; Syracuse; Baltimore Woman's College; Columbia; University of Western Pennsylvania; Toronto, Canada; Smith; Mount Holyoke; Vassar; Wellesley; Wilson College.2

Louis N. Wilson reported the bibliography of Child-study up to 1910. He reported 5,487 articles written on the subject. The number of articles had remained steady for a decade: 1899, 441 articles; 1900, 351 titles; 1901, 307 items; 1902, 344 articles; 1903, 486 contributions. Totals for other years ran about the same with another high in

1 *Proceedings of National Education Association*, p.761f, 1904.
1908 when 448 items were noted by Wilson.¹

Organizing a Children's Institute

By 1909 the Child-study movement had reached the peak in its development. The future of the movement for Clark University and for Hall was now to be decided. It was the turning point in a movement and a great man's career. G. Stanley Hall presented a plan to the trustees of Clark University for the organization of a Children's Institute, the first of its kind in the world. The plan was accepted because of the personal enthusiasm of Hall. It could not be carried out because of the lack of funds and support for such an enormous program. Hall had the vision of an organisation which would have made a remarkable contribution to education the world over. But the plan was too visionary for his supporters and too large for Clark. The plan included the following provisions:

1. Collection of data for the Children's Institute library. Dr. Theodote Smith was given charge of this department. He was to gather all types of literature dealing with children and including recent legislation. In 1903-1905 there had been 753 school bills reported.

2. Establish a division on Natality, Mr. De Busk was to be director.

3. Provide for the study of subnormal children, Harry W. Chase in charge. (see Chase's letter chapter VI)

4. Health and disease was to be studied by W. H. Burnham.

¹Pedagogical Seminary, Vol's. V, XVI, XV.
5. Department of Crime. (no leader given)
6. Department of Vice. (no leader)
8. Anthropological and sociological division. (no leader indicated)
9. Experimental didactics, by Dr. A. E. Tanner.
10. Child labor and industrial education. (no leader)
11. Moral and religious education. (no leader)
12. Pedagogical museum

The purpose of the work in the Children's Institute was to: offer courses and provide for conferences on each of the above fields; coordinate scientific work of experimental and genetic psychology with the sources of child welfare agencies then at work; compile or outline the history of each class of society or institution; and to find in the voluminous results of Child-study data which would be helpful to workers in their research.

Beginning of the Decline of Child-study

Had the Children's Institute become a reality, the Child-study movement might have continued or would have at least developed into an organization that would have fostered the collecting and synthesizing of data about children. Its failure hastened the disintegration of the movement. So many

1Ibid. 1909, Introduction.
educational interests were developing that they gradually drained the life blood from the parental movement.

After 1910 the Child-study movement gradually declined. The center of the movement was certainly at Clark University with G. Stanley Hall as the leader and motivating force. We can liken the movement to a large wheel. The hub would be Clark University and the spokes would be reaching out in all directions to states, cities, and countries. The hub was the strongest part of the wheel, the power center driven and greased by Hall. The gradual weakening of the wheel started from the outside ring. As the Child-study movement traveled along there were new fields to explore. Many new educational developments grew out of Child-study and gradually worked to weaken the parental movement.

Final Period—A Shading of Interest Into Side Paths Of Other Educational Movements

There were three influences shaping the educational thought and activity in the United States after the turn of the twentieth century: the new psychology; Child-study; and Herbartianism. As the first two grew in membership and strength they were able to use the strengths of Herbartianism and to discredit the rest. After a few years Herbartianism became lost in the other two movements. Nina Vandewalker has made a careful observation relative to this discussion.

The Child-study movement was the natural outgrowth of the new psychology, attempted a task which would
have been of inestimable value had it been satisfactorily completed—the gathering of a body of facts concerning the nature and growth of children at different stages upon which a true science of education might ultimately be built. Much of value was accomplished, although the most important part of the work—sifting and organizing of collected data—has never been satisfactorily completed. The movement gave an added stimulus to the study of psychology as a basis for education, however, aided in the reorganization of many phases of educational procedure, destroyed the tendency toward the blind acceptance of educational doctrines whatever their source, and led to an appreciation of the new educational movements that would have been impossible before. To many it gave their first insight into the nature and purpose of the kindergarten; to others it reinterpreted the Froebelian doctrines and gave them a broader significance.¹

The study of adolescence was an obvious outgrowth of Child-study. Hall's two volume work in 1904 stimulated the general interest in Child-study but at the same time started another group to work on one phase of psychology that gradually weakened the fostering movement.

Weakening of State Organizations

The Child Study Monthly, official organ of the Illinois Society, changed its title to the Journal of Adolescence in March of 1901 and shortly after ceased publication.² The leaders in the study of adolescence left Child-study and moved on to higher ground. The society was heavily in debt incurred by printing and publishing the


transactions. No settled policy for action was accessible. A statement from the Illinois Society of this year (1901) presents a clear picture of their plight:

Measures were set on foot to awaken an interest in the old friends of the society and appeals were sent to its staunch members for the payment of arrears, with the gratifying result that in many cases a ready response was made. Publications of value were offered for sale to raise money to meet the debt.1

Hall's Influence Upon Leaders and Movements

The influence of G. Stanley Hall and Child-study in general is seen in many movements and institutions. J. Adams Puffer was a student with Hall and later established the Limon School for Boys. The Nature Study Movement and Dynamic Biology had their origin at Clark. C. F. Hodges worked in this field and his Nature Study and Life revolutionized this phase of the school curriculum. Over 100,000 copies of this book were sold. The playground movement began with Mr. Johnson of Pittsburg. He observed children on the playground and then this influence spread to the organization of a national movement. Hall took an active part in the early beginnings of this work.

Mental Hygiene came out of the genetic method—the beginning and cause of development. Adolph Meyer, psychiatrist, worked on the staff of Clark University. Hall was a leader in this field too. His protests against the insane hospitals had much to do with studies dealing with the insane. Swift's book The Mind That Found Itself was a pioneer work in this field.

1Pedagogical Seminary, Vol. VI, p. 71, 1901.
Arnold Gesell was one of Hall's students and a worker with Child-study. Later he developed his laboratory for studying children at Yale. He has made a wonderful contribution in the field of techniques for the study and observation of children from birth through the first few years of life.

Many leaders in experimental psychology and research with individual psychology were pupils of Hall's. A few of these were: H. H. Goddard; E. B. Rusey; H. D. Sheldon; L. M. Terman; E. S. Conklin; W. L. Bryan; J. A. Bergstrom; T. L. Bolton; E. H. Lindley.¹ These individuals started their work and gradually drew away from Child-study as a movement and devoted their efforts to individual or institutional work. Terman worked on gifted children and upon the revisions of the Stanford-Binet tests. Goddard worked with the feeble minded at Vineland.

E. D. Starbuck instigated the religious education movement. From his original studies and work there grew such organizations as Young Men's Christian Association. W. James obtained much of his original information in this field from Starbuck's Psychology of Religion.

---

The field of children's literature was explored and many fine contributions were made. Some of the most important writings dealing with children's literature were coming from William Allen White, Children's Literature; Ray Rolfe Wilson, In The Morning Glow; J. M. Berry, Sentimental Tommy; Rielley's Little Children; George N. Martin, Emmy Lou and The Broken Heart.

The Kindergarten Movement was aided and strengthened by Child-study and was made modern and flexible. A resolution was passed by the International Organization of Kindergartens that worked with Hall at Clark in connection with one of the summer sessions in 1896:

Feeling the imperative duty of having in our work as Kindergartners and normal teachers, not only a deep reverence and right understanding of Frebel's Philosophy, but recognizing also the present need of a clear view of a true psychology of children, we hereby tender our most sincere thanks to Dr. Hall for offering us the opportunity to co-operate with him in the Child-study movement through the syllabi and in the conferences of this session of the Clark University Summer School.1

Conclusion of Final Period

Each of the interests and movements mentioned drew heavily from the Child-study movement. The movement did not have the organization or leadership to hold together longer. On the horizon was appearing a new interest in education which was to develop into the Progressive Education Association. Child-study as a popular educational movement gradually faded out—as a scientific movement for experimental psychology and child psychology it has continued to the present.

1Pedagogical Seminary, p. 111, Vol.IV, 1897.
CHAPTER IV

IMPORTANT LEADERS IN CHILD-STUDY

The leader and organizer of the Child-study movement in America might well be called the "forgotten man" in education. Hall has been called the "father of Child-study";1 "greatest modern student of the child"; "the Darwin of psychology";2 "a great teacher (Hall's seminar was one of my most valuable educational experiences)";3 "the leader of the most significant movement in the whole history of American Education";4 "the founder of ideas--a continual series of educational eras";5 and "he influenced education more profoundly than any other thinkers except W. T. Harris and John Dewey".6 When one opens the leading books in the field of history of education and elementary education, little reference is given to this leader. With the exception of Boring's brief biography of C. Stanley Hall, there is scarcely enough space given to Hall and the Child-study movement to fill a dozen typewritten pages. At the beginning

3L. M. Terman, (correspondence of April 28, 1944).
4F. Bolton, (correspondence of April 28, 1944).
of this chapter dealing with leaders of the Child-study movement, we should examine the life of G. Stanley Hall to see why he has been called by such an array of titles—names any educator would be proud to have attached to himself.

G. Stanley Hall

Hall a most unusual man with excellent health led a life of service and action. One of his students has characterized him as: a lover of children; a brilliant lecturer; a man interested in many things (boasted of 70 different trades in which he was fairly skillful); an expert at billiards; an excellent skater (children called him "the old gink on de ice" because he wrote names in German and English with his skates); the man to whom educators turned when they wanted assistance with perplexing problems concerning individual psychology.¹

For thirty years Hall was the president of Clark University. In this position he was both an inside president and a teaching president and never really devoted much of his time to administrative duties. His life was full of organizing laboratories, journals, institutions, and Child-study centers in all parts of the world. Boring has called Hall the founder of ideas.

He would, under the influence of a conviction, bring together certain new ideas, that were not original with himself, add to them a supporting mass of other ideas from his omnivorous reading, and then drive the resultant mass home in a book, on the lecture platform, in his seminary, and on every other occasion that presented itself. Hall admitted that his intellectual life might be viewed as a series of "crames." Hall's torrential, fervid, vividness won him many ardent disciples.¹

Hall was born on a farm at Ashfield, Massachusetts, February 1, 1844. He led an isolated boyhood due to the fact that he was already beginning to develop intense interests in many things—he found little sympathy with his companions. He was able to enjoy all of the advantages of work, study, and play afforded by the best New England communities of the century. His father was a substantial farmer, a prominent citizen and a thrifty businessman; his mother was of Scotch descent and a graduate of Albany Female Seminary. Both parents were natives of Massachusetts and were Congregationalists.

School work for G. Stanley began at Sanderson Academy in Ashfield. At the age of sixteen he went to Williston Seminary at Easthampton to prepare for Williams College. He entered Williams, in 1863, and was graduated in 1867. Considerable recognition came to him while in college. Hall was the editor of the college magazine, was

class-orator and poet, and was a leader in his class. Mark Hopkins seems to have been one of his favorite friends and teachers during this period of his life. At a later date Hall dedicated one of his books to Hopkins. In this institution he developed his enthusiasm for philosophy and was an ardent student of the philosophy of John Stuart Mill.

The next educational adventure was at Union Theological Seminary in New York City. He had decided to become a minister. Hall was so much the philosopher and so little the theologian that his first attempts in this field were not too successful. Boring states:

After his trial sermon, the member of the faculty whose custom it was to criticize, despairing of more criticism, knelt and prayed for his soul. Henry Ward Beecher was more sympathetic; he advised Hall to go to Germany and study philosophy.

Hall went to Europe on borrowed money (1868-1871) and studied with the great Trendelenberg and Du Bois-Reymond. He then returned and completed his divinity degree and was a pastor for ten weeks in a country church.

College teaching started with Antioch College in Ohio (1872-1876). He was, at different times, professor of English, modern languages, and philosophy.

---

1Dedication was in *Aspects of German Culture*, 1881.

The next great longing of Hall was to study with Wundt in Germany. Wundt's "Physiologische Psychologie" had aroused Hall's interest in this field. For two years he was sidetracked with the offer of a tutorship in English at Harvard by President Eliot. During these years he worked with William James, studied philosophy, and received the first doctorate of philosophy in the new psychology to be granted in America. "Hall was a comet, caught for a moment by James's influence, but presently shooting off into space never to return".1

Hall then went to Germany (1876-1880) to work with von Kries, Kronecker, Fechner, and to become Wundt's first American student in the year of the founding of the Leipzig laboratory. He sampled everything he could in Germany and did some publishing with von Kries and Kronecker.

While in Berlin, 1876, Hall renewed his acquaintance with Miss Cornelia Fisher, whom he had first met at the home of President Hosmer at Yellow Springs, Ohio, and who had been studying in Berlin during the previous year. The young people saw a great deal of each other during the next year and were married in September, 1879.

His family consisted of two children, Robert Granville, born February 7, 1881, and now a practicing

physician in Portland, Oregon; and Julia Fisher born May 30, 1882. Mrs. Hall and Julia later were victims of a tragic death. They both died in 1890 as the result of suffocation from a gas leak in their home. Mr. Hall was away at the time.

Dr. Hall remained a widower for nine years, then married Miss Florence E. Smith of Newton, Massachusetts, who survives him.¹

Upon returning to America, Hall made the study with the Boston Public Schools. This study enabled him to collect data to use for lectures and for writing. He gave Saturday morning lectures on educational problems at Harvard. The lectures were successful and Hall became quite popular.

The following year he was given the opportunity to lecture at the new graduate university of Johns Hopkins. He was so successful that he received the title of lecturer in psychology in 1889 and a professorship in 1894. John Dewey, J. McKeen Cattell, H. H. Donaldson, E. C. Sanford, W. H. Burnham, Joseph Jastrow, and others were students under him at this institution. In 1885, he founded the first psychological laboratory in America.² Hall also

¹L. N. Wilson, G. S. Hall, (memorial issue) p.32, Clark University Publication, Worcester, Massachusetts, 1925.
founded the *American Journal of Psychology*, the first psychological journal in America and the first in English to which the few American psychologists could contribute their papers. While dealing with his contributions, we should list: The American Psychological Association started in Hall's study in 1882 (Hall was the first president and also president at the time of his death in 1924); founded the *Pedagogical Seminary*, 1891; founded the *Journal of Religious Psychology*, 1904; attempted the organization of the Children's Institute, 1909; founded the *Journal of Applied Psychology*, 1915.

Hall accepted the call to become president of the new Clark University at Worcester, Massachusetts (1888) and organized this institution along the lines of Johns Hopkins—a graduate school with its primary stress upon investigation. He traveled in Europe for several months gleaning new ideas for Clark. The university had five departments: Hall remained a professor of psychology while president; the laboratory was turned over to E. C. Sanford; W. H. Burnham headed the department of pedagogy. Hall had expected to obtain enough money for enlargement of Clark University. The founder of Clark was willing to give very little in the way of financial assistance. There was considerable strife

---

1Boring states that Hall "founded" whereas other laboratories at Harvard and elsewhere—were not founded.

2William James was the only other educator honored by two terms as president.
between Hall and Clark. The University of Chicago was just starting to build up their education department, so they helped Hall by taking many of his well trained staff members that could not be retained because of lack of funds. Hall had the united support of his board. He remained as the president of Clark, in spite of this dreadful curtailment of funds and limitation of scope, and made his many contributions.

G. Stanley Hall was a genetic psychologist—a psychological evolutionist concerned with animal and human development and all of the problems of adaptation and development. He drew freely from a wide field for his psychological data and called this the "Synthetic Psychology". We would call this the eclectic approach or view today. All of his work to establish journals and to found new organizations were but deposits of his restless mind. Boring has stated this thought clearly.

It seemed rather that he developed a new interest, carried it through the pioneer stage, and then, already caught by the next topic, tried to perpetuate the old by creating for it a new professorship, a journal, or an institution. ¹

The influence Hall exerted on the Child-study movement was spectacular and astounding. He lectured each year to the leading educational meetings all over the nation. He

wrote incessantly and made contributions to the Pedagogical Seminary practically every issue until the years just before his death. Time and time again the writer discovered mention of the work of G. Stanley Hall in the starting of a new society of Child-study.

The general influence of Hall upon psychology and education in general was great.

In 1890, just before the wave of laboratory-founding had reached its height, there were probably not more than ten psychological laboratories in America, and at least four of these besides Hopkins itself, had begun life under the direction, as a pupil or associate of Hall's at Hopkins. The laboratory in America is indebted to him as a promoter and a founder.¹

His most important educational writing was the two volume work on Adolescence. Play, growth, fears, dreams, sex, religion, collective habits, and many other topics were explored and written about by Hall. During his life he wrote over 328 articles and books that were published.² He used the questionnaire method of collecting data and is often thought of as the founder of this method in America.³ The natural climax for Hall's life and work should have been the establishment of an institution to synthesize and

³Galton was the originator of the questionnaire.
summarize all that had been written and discovered about children. His ideal, the children's institute, failed because of inadequate financial support and because Clark University was too small for such a huge yet so important an idea.

Hall met his retirement from the presidency of Clark with the same spirit of "here's a new experience to look into", that had characterized his whole life. He tried to understand old age psychologically and wrote his *Senescence*, 1922.

After his retirement he devoted himself to writing and conducting the Pedagogical Seminary. He sold the *American Journal of Psychology* in 1921, to a friend of Cornell University who wished to place the editorial succession in the hands of professor E. B. Titchener.

In the early part of March, 1924, he took a severe cold and was ordered to bed by his physician. It was hard to keep him at home, and in a few days he insisted upon going about his usual tasks. A week later he suffered a relapse and passed away, April 24, 1924, at a little over eighty years of age.¹

Before closing this brief biography of Hall we should include a statement of his enthusiasm for Child-study as late as 1918, six years before his death:

.....twenty-five years ago Child-study was in its
lush and lusty childhood. European writers Lasarus,
Pless, Prayor, and Perez were making contributions.
American students like Earl Barnes were using the
questionnaire. Miss Shinn was studying the individual
child. Baldwin was construing geneticism philosophically.
E. H. Russell was using his unique method of spontaneous
observations and was teaching psychology in Normal
Schools with these data as texts. Chrisman had develop-
ed the term "Paidology".

The questionnaire method was everywhere and called
for information on every subject....language and
vocabulary, height and weight, specializing of
different parts and functions. Hygiene, feelings,
sentiments, emotions, laughing, crying, fear, anger,
pity, sense of self, love, religion; feelings toward
blue sky, stars, clouds, sun, moon, storms, wind, fire,
stones, trees, flowers, animals were being studied.
Biographical studies of childhood, copious literature
on play—resulted in the playground movement.....study
of games and puzzles and dolls and toys were other
topics of research. We were collecting literature on
creeping, walking, running away, teething, puberty
and adolescence, mental age. The motor abilities were
being studied.

Normal and abnormal (Lombroso and criminals), juve-
nile and infantile criminals were important. The Binet
test was being developed. The field of eugenics and
Carnegie Institution at Cold Spring Harbor was slowly
laying the foundations for improvement in our mating
practices.....

The study of childhood has often been called a
Copernican Revolution since before it the child was
adjusted to the school—whereas now everything in the
entire educational system is conditioned by the nature
and needs of the child.....

According to the Smith classification now over 100
types of Child Welfare Organizations are working.....

For a decade or two this country led the world in
the special studies of childhood. With the work of

10. S. Hall, Pedagogical Seminary, Vol. LVI, pp332 ff,
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Stern, Meumann, and others Germany took it up and has
done contributions of great value in improving our
techniques and adding to our methods. Call this THE
CENTURY OF THE CHILD.

Child-study seeks to trace human nature to its
beginnings, to detect and mold character in the
gristle... . It is inseparably allied with evolution--
and with primitive man. We should do more with anthro-
pology. This movement marks the advent of a humanistic
wave into our educational system that was more or less
inimical to the life and spontaneity which all great
educators have supremely stressed....

The field of psychoanalysis has gathered a vast
amount from Child-study... the mainspring of every
disturbance of sanity or virtue is found in the
first quadrennium of life.....

At last we have found a number of fundamental
mechanisms which go distinctly beyond the old doctrine
of the four temperaments........

1. The active--aggressive man and the passive
receptive type shed light upon fear and anger and
human drives.

2. "Erethism", the power to draw upon reserve energies
in emergencies.

3. Distinction between the egoist and the altruist

4. In the first triennium or quadrennium of life the
fundamental attitude of the individual toward authority
is pretty well established.

5. Principle of compensation--the blind compensates
for the loss of sight by over-developing touch and
bearing. Ugly men compensate by being intellectual--
Socrates.

6. Maintenance of psychic unity. The soul, as a
genetic psychology conceives it, is a congeries of very
different and often diametrically opposite activities.
Thus there is need for synthesis. Thus education is
to organize the soul...........

We may well rejoice today that it is our good fortune
to live in a period of renaissance of the naive and the
unconscious such as the world has never seen, in which,
besides other great manifestations of this trend,
childhood is more loved, studied, than it ever was in the world before. IT IS PRECISELY THIS WORK THAT PLACES IN OUR FORTUNATE HANDS THE GOLDEN PASS KEY TO EVERY ROOM IN THE SPLENDID MANSION OF MANSOUL.¹

The psychological theories advanced by Dr. Hall in the above article are not, of course, acceptable today. We can say that Hall’s greatest contributions were in the organizing, promoting, motivating, and exploring of a wide variety of educational fields and problems. He was not one of our greatest psychologists and should not be interpreted as such.

More Ardent Supporters of Child-study

There were many teachers, professors, parents, and professional workers interested in Child-study. The writer could not attempt to enumerate all of them. He has prepared a list of those who were most prominent in the movement and who made consistent contributions to Child-study meetings and activities.

Sara E. Wiltsie was an enthusiastic worker for Child-study. She assisted G. Stanley Hall with his first study made in the Boston Public Schools in 1880. She was active with the kindergarten organization and helped to direct this organization to utilize much that was constructive and sound in Child-study. She was the first secretary of the National

¹G. S. Hall, Pedagogical Seminary, Vol. LVI, pp. 332 ff, 1918.
Education Association's department of Child-study. For several years she made brief reports on the history and progress of Child-study--1896 on. Gradually the task became too large for her as the movement expanded.

Dr. William Lowe Bryan was president of the Child-study department of the National Education Association, 1894-1895. He attended Clark, October, 1891 to January, 1893 and made special study of voluntary motor abilities of children. This work became the main content for his doctor's dissertation. He was identified with Child-study from the very beginning. He was widely known as a lecturer and writer on various phases of this new movement. He was active as secretary-treasurer of the National Child-study society. When he resigned, due to the pressure of other duties, the organization was so crippled that it never became very effective again. The state societies took the place of this national organization. Dr. Bryan was an active member of the Illinois Society for Child-study and a member of its original executive committee. He was responsible for the success of the first Indiana Child-study conference.

Dr. Oscar Chrisman was very active in presenting Child-study to the various teachers' associations. He was secretary-treasurer of the Kansas Child-study Society. He maintained the study of the child should be scientific and called this new study "Paidology". He had very close
association with Professor Freyer of Germany. Chrisman contributed many articles to leading educational magazines.

Dr. W. S. Christopher was one of the few medical men who took a profound interest in methods employed in the education of children and in children themselves. He was on the board of education of the Chicago Public Schools and was responsible for the establishment of a department of Child-study in the Chicago Schools. "Men of his broadmindedness, his genial spirit of helpfulness, his devotion to the worthy cause of alleviating physical suffering that leads to the physical, mental, and moral deterioration of the children of today, who are to become the men and women of tomorrow are too rare in all countries". ¹

Col. F. W. Parker took an active part in the first meetings of Child-study in Illinois and was on the board of directors. He did considerable speaking and writing on the subject. The Chicago Tribune carried a number of his articles on Child-study.²

Edwin D. Starbuck broke the ground in a new field and made a weighty contribution to the psychological and sociological studies of the period. He believed that

²Chicago Tribune, February issues, 1901.
religious education should be adapted to the needs and condition of each person and that the stages of growth from childhood to maturity must be given much consideration in the educational process. Starbuck worked with Hall at Clark, 1895-1897, and later assisted James with his work in the field of religious education. He went to Stanford and was responsible for the establishment, by David Starr Jordan, of the first religious center for University students.¹

Dr. Charles C. Van Liew was one of the most vigorous, most ripely experienced, best seasoned and most rationally grounded of the Child-study leaders. He was a potent factor at the laying of the corner-stone of the Illinois Society for Child-study. He went to Los Angeles State Normal School. He was one of the best exponents of the Reim School of Jena in America. He was an industrious writer and contributed a series of articles to the 1898 issues of Child-study.²

M. V. O'Shea held the position of professor of psychology and Child-study and director of practice teaching in the University of Buffalo. Later he went to the University of Wisconsin. He wrote extensively upon psychology and Child-study. His articles appeared in Atlantic Monthly, North American Review, Popular Science Monthly, Chautauquan, and Outlook.

Louis N. Wilson, Librarian at Clark, reported the bibliography of Child-study from its beginning to 1910. He was an ardent worker for the movement and through his library work and writings on C. Stanley Hall has made one of the finest contributions.

Earl Barnes lectured in nearly every city in California. He wrote several volumes on Child-study topics investigated in California and elsewhere. He made some outstanding contributions while in the education faculty at Stanford University. Later he lectured all over the United States and finally went to England as a lecturer and helped to stimulate and organize Child-study groups there.

William Krohn, editor of the Child Study Monthly, was one of the most ardent workers for the movement. He contributed to the magazine and traveled widely and lectured throughout the Great Lake Region and the West. After five years of outstanding service, he resigned as editor of the monthly to return to the University of Illinois.

Louis H. Calbreath, Winona Normal School, was secretary of the Minnesota Society for Child-study. He was active as a writer and speaker on the movement.

H. K. Wolfe was responsible for the movement in Nebraska.

Edwin A. Kirkpatrick was an active worker in the movement. His most recent book dealing with Child-study was Fundamentals of Child-study, 1905, written at Fitchburg.
Normal School. This book went through four different revisions, 1907, 1916, 1929.

John Dewey participated in the early meetings of Child-study in Illinois. He was particularly active at the National meetings of Child-study in connection with the National Education Association.

William H. Burnham, head of the education department of Clark and former student of Hall's at Johns Hopkins, contributed regularly to the Pedagogical Seminary and was active in working with Child-study societies. He had a large following in educational circles.

E. H. Russell, principal of the State Normal School, Worcester, Massachusetts, was noted for his methods of informal observation. He used the results of these observations for the content in his methods classes.

G. W. A. Lucey (George Washington Andrew), taught Child-study for twenty-one years in the University of Nebraska. He worked with H. K. Wolfe and contributed many articles on Child-study. His best book was the Essentials of Child Study, 1917.

This brief review of the leaders of Child-study in America has not been exhaustive. The movement was popular and drew all of the important educational leaders into its fold just as the later Progressive Education Association meetings have been well attended by the leading thinkers and workers in education. The individuals listed above might
be called the more ardent workers in Child-study.

A list of the presidents of the division of
Child-study of the National Education Association by years
will be interesting and revealing.

1895 Wm. L. Bryan, Bloomington, Indiana
1896 Karl Barnes, Stanford, California
1897 Francis W. Parker, Chicago, Illinois
1898 M. V. O' Shea, Madison, Wisconsin
1899 Will S. Monroe, Westfield, Massachusetts
1900 F. L. Burk, Santa Barbara (Later president San Francisco State College)
1901 T. P. Bailey Jr., Chicago, Illinois
1902 H. E. Kratz, Sioux City, Iowa
1903 G. W. A. Luckey, Lincoln, Nebraska
1904 E. A. Kirkpatrick, Pittsburg, Massachusetts
1905 E. G. Lancaster, Olivet, Michigan
1906 No meeting
1907 Edwin G. Dexter, Urban, Illinois
1908 George L. Leslie, (acting president) Los Angeles
1909 George E. Johnson, Superintendent Playground Association
1910 Will Grant Chambers, Dean Education, University of Pittsburg
1911 Lewis M. Terman (acting president) Stanford University
1912 Wm. H. Burnham, Clark University
1913 W. A. Jessup, Dean Education, State University Iowa
1914 W. C. Bagley, Professor Education, University of Illinois
1915 L. N. Hines, Superintendent Crawfordsville, Indiana
1916 L. N. Hines
1917 L. N. Hines
1918 E. A. Peterson, Head Department School Hygiene, Cleveland
1919 Lewis M. Terman, Stanford University
1920 E. G. Gowans, State Director Health, Salt Lake City
1921 C. B. Nesbit, Director Medical Improvement, Gary, Indiana
1922 C. B. Nesbit
1923 Dr. W. A. Howe, State Medical Inspector, Albany, New York
1924 Dr. W. A. Howe

The department was known as Child-study from 1895
to July 13, 1911; Child Hygiene 1911 to 1924; and then
merged with Physical Education and Health Department of
the National Education Association. In 1937 this
department merged with the Association of Health, Physical Education, and Recreation. After 1911 the division slowly shed into the particular interests of Physical Education, Mental Hygiene, and Health. (Other leaders and graduates of Clark University who became important workers in education will be found in the appendix)
CHAPTER V

CONCEPTS, LITERATURE, AND METHODS OF CHILD-STUDY

Educators, parents, teachers and physicians had discovered that there was a very real need for more information about children. Many were struck with the practical usefulness of the movement. Some saw the contribution that could be made by a more scientific approach to the study of children. There was agreement, then, upon the general purpose of Child-study—to gather more information about children. Studying them would reveal new information so that all could do a better job in educating, rearing and inducting children into society. How this information was to be secured was a matter of method not decided. Each was urged to collect data of any kind that would make a contribution to this movement.

Individuals studying children usually prepared materials directing their progress. The most popular individual to direct workers in Child-study was G. Stanley Hall. Hall was a dynamic speaker and traveled widely throughout the United States espousing the cause of this new movement. His topical syllabi and questionnaire methods will be discussed later in this chapter.

Concepts of Child-study

Two typical examples of the literature prevalent at this period were written by John Dewey and L. H. Galbreath.
Dewey was making a name for himself with the work he was doing in Child-study. He made most of his contributions before the Illinois Society of Child-study and at the National Education Association meetings. L. H. Galbreath, secretary for the Minnesota Child-study Society was one of the best writers on this subject. He discussed the origin and objectives of Child-study before many of the leading educational groups in the state of Minnesota and elsewhere.

John Dewey listed three main sources of the remarkable development in child life: political, aesthetic, and scientific.

The **political** began with the contact of the oriental and western systems of civilization with Plato and Aristotle. Social life could be directed. The foundation of any system is the child. The child, however, was a predestined unit of an ideal society. Before the present emphasis on Child-study we were looking at childhood from a fixed standpoint.

The **aesthetic** came also at a period of great awakening—the Renaissance. The child had prophetic value—the dream of a social life men and women could not formulate. The child had also a retrospective value—men found consolation in the child for their lost promises and faded ideals. We failed—our children will not. From this point of view the child became a symbol of what the adult wanted to be, rather than a sign of what the child should become. Children were playthings for the home—something to make life more happy for the adult.

The **scientific** interest also comes at a time of great expansion of life. It fixes itself on the child as a phase—the most important phase of the general interest in growth—the beginnings of things. Personal and aesthetic interest is the ground and motive of the scientific method. We ought to go to the child and see him as he is—not as we would have him be. The scientific is not superimposed upon the political interest. With a fixed social life the child was not treated necessarily in a fixed way. Today society is complicated and changing. Education is to help the child master himself.
Education must be given in conformity to the laws within the child. The discovery of these laws is the purpose of Child-study. "Come, let us live with our children," means the co-operation of the scientific with the practical and aesthetic methods.¹

Galbreath asked three leading questions about Child-study and answered them in a way that was helpful to teachers working with children.

Out of what educational conditions did Child-study arise? A theory of instruction based upon a philosophy of the ends of education, rather than upon the nature, needs and possibilities of children.

A psychology based upon a knowledge of the adult mind, rather than upon a knowledge of the child mind; one that substituted a phantom of an "Average Child" for the concrete, real, and mechanical conception of mind for a warm, live spirit as a guide for the teacher.

A certain philosophy of the origin of knowledge and of the relations of mind and body that led parents and teachers to neglect the senses, and consequently to overlook the great sources of individual weaknesses and differences in children.

Knowledge of the child was left to the accidental achievements of instinct and common sense. In the school-room could be found teachers with minds full of preconceived notions about what ought to be found in the child, but with eyes closed to its real capacities and needs. Children were classified as if they were of the same type and strength of nervous structure and mental aptitude to beat the same time. Should a teacher recognize the need of testing a child, he had few, if any, well-chosen devices for doing so. Care and the development of the body were left to nature and the physicians.

What is there that is distinctly new in Child-study? It is new in recognizing and emphasizing the inter-dependence of mind and body, and in the more

rational use of the causal principle in the study of physical and mental phenomena as they appear in the home and school life of children.

It is new in impulse to methodize and popularize close and careful study into all phases of child life.

The Child-study movement is therefore somewhat new in assumptions and aims, in problems and plans, and in efforts of individuals and institutions to further, through systematic means a new spirit and impulse.

What are the general objectives of Child-study? To acquire, through careful observation, experimentation, and statistical inquiry, exact and reliable knowledge of the development of children, of the factors that influence their growth, and of the relation this knowledge to the home and school life of the children.1

**Literature on Child-study**

Leaders in Child-study wrote and spoke on the subject regularly. Many were professors in leading normal schools, colleges, and universities. Still others came from the ranks of the public schools, the medical profession, and parent groups. In general the literature was expressive of the particular interest of the writer. Dr. W. S. Christopher wrote and spoke on those aspects of Child-study dealing with physical examinations, handicapped, and problems of nutrition. Starbuck contributed articles on religious questions. So we would have to run the gamut of almost every current topic in American Education of that time to cover the individual contributions. There was this common desire on the part of all interested in the movement for

gathering information for more enlightened action that characterized each.

Child-study and Parental Education

Harriet A. Marsh of Detroit, principal of the Hancock School, was one of the early leaders who prepared materials for parent groups. Her comments were typical of the enthusiasm being expressed in many cities and reported regularly in the Child-study publications. This parent education was the forerunner of the Parent Teachers Association movement. Miss Marsh reported:

Our school is commencing its fourth year, and we are anxious to do for the children all in our power. This cannot be accomplished without an individual knowledge of each child, and this cannot be gained until parents and teachers work together, as members of one family toward one common end; will you not, therefore try to become well acquainted with your child's teacher during the coming year, so that you can talk freely to her concerning your child's needs? The next mothers' meeting will be Tuesday, September 24, 1894, at a quarter to four; the following topics will be discussed:
What should the public school do for the child? The duty of each parent to the truant law. The amount of money each child should spend for supplies and other topics of interest.

Dr. Hall's syllabi suggested the feasibility of mothers' meetings. I have found these meetings the most helpful and inspiring ever undertaken in connection with our school work. 1

Round tables were organized and directed by most of the state associations for Child-study. Parents were urged

1Harriet A. Marsh, Pedagogical Seminary, Vol. IV, p. 139 ff.
to form groups (five formed a group for a charter) for the discussion of child problems. These round tables were used also as centers for the collection of information about children. The Illinois Association for Child-study did more to organize a system of round tables than any other state. There seemed to be no well established pattern for organization. The local group prepared its own constitution and plan of organization.

Leading Child-study Publications

The two most widely accepted publications for the dissemination of Child-study literature were the Pedagogical Seminary and the Child Study Monthly. Both had large circulations during the years that the movement was at its height. The Illinois publication, Child Study Monthly, was published for a brief period, 1895-1901. The Pedagogical Seminary has been an active periodical since 1895 to the present. The latter was accepted as the national publication for the movement. Materials from these publications have been used throughout this dissertation. The topics discussed were as numerous and as broad as the whole span of educational thinking. The common elements of collecting information about children, reports on recent activities of the movement, and requests for cooperation with additional syllabi were found in both publications.
State Departments of Education Advance Child-study

State departments of education were often quite sympathetic with Child-study and printed materials on this subject for teacher use. New York State incorporated the work of Child-study within their department of education. Iowa reported support from the state department of education. Michigan acknowledged "the department of public instruction stands ready to print and distribute the reports of the Child-study committee without charge". Illinois state department of education was very co-operative. Along with the publication and distribution of literature on Child-study, the state departments of education arranged for the various educational institutes and conventions. Leading speakers at most of these educational assemblies spoke on Child-study topics and reported studies and investigations they had been making.

Teacher Training

Teacher training institutions prepared Child-study materials for use in their classes. Examples of this type of literature will be found in the next chapter dealing with methods. This institutional emphasis was far reaching. Many instructors published books to use in their psychology classes dealing with Child-study.

This was a popular educational movement that helped in the collection of vast amounts of data about children—a movement that carried on an enormously large piece of research that might be called "exploratative research".

Methods Used in Child-study

There were no well accepted methods for the studying of children at the beginning of the movement. New methods had to be developed. This hewing out and discovering of new methods was to become one of the main contributions of the movement. Educators, scientists, physicians were urged to study children, to develop new techniques, and to free themselves from the straight-jacket of tradition and authority that surrounded the social institutions of this period. G. Stanley Hall believed that Clark University would be able to synthesize the materials collected concerning children and to eventually prepare materials for the entire nation.

Wilhelm Freyer and The Biographical Method

Wilhelm Freyer was one of the first to make substantial contributions to child psychology. He produced a monograph on the Determination of the Limits of Hearing, 1876, and his companion work dealing with perception of overtones and aspects of hearing, 1879. Freyer published his Child Psychology, the first to be written, in 1882. He made a notable advance in methods of studying children by the use of
the "biographical method"—the day-by-day recording of the
events of a child.¹ This method was used in America by
Miss Shinn. G. Stanley Hall came under the influence of
Preyer while studying in Germany. William Stern substantiates
the emphasis placed upon the work of Preyer.

In 1882 Wilhelm Preyer's book, Soul of the Child,
was the real foundation of modern child psychology.²

Early Medical Records

Antedating Preyer and the biographical method for
studying children, medical men had made notes and descrip-
tions of cases of defectives, abnormals, and unusual or
diseased children. Investigations also involved the study-
ing of children in the first stages of life. Among the most
important of these medical men were: Tiedeman, Development
of Psychic Qualities in Children, 1787; B. Sigismund, The
Child and the World, 1856; and Kussmaul, Enquiry into the
Psychic Life of the New-born Child, 1859. These notes made
by medical men are the forerunners of the more current
social case history developed by agencies concerned with
the practical problems of handling children.

¹W. Preyer, Mental Development in The Child, D.
Appleton-Century, New York, 1903.

²W. Stern, Psychology of Early Childhood, Unwin,
London, 1924.
The Questionnaire Method

The questionnaire method was first used in America by G. Stanley Hall. This was a duplication of methods used by Dr. K. Lange in his study of school children in Flauen. Hall inaugurated the topical syllabi—a variation of the first questionnaires used. As many as 19 different syllabi were used by Hall in one year. A sample of the syllabi is given below.

I. Peculiar and exceptional childhood. You are invited:
   1. To think over your own childhood and consider if you were a striking illustration of any of the following types, and describe your case.
   2. To consider if you have any friends who come into any of the classes below, and ask them to describe their own case.
   3. To describe your own children or pupils who are strikingly exceptional.
   4. To get students (for college professors) to write essays on peculiar or exceptional children they know.

II. Types of information called for
   1. Physical—exceptional beauty or ugliness; largeness or smallness
   2. Psychical—courage or timidity; cleanliness or dirtiness; obedience or disobedience
   3. Moral defects and perversions
   4. Beginnings of reading and writing.

1 Child Study Monthly, Introduction, 1897.
Local and state groups used the syllabi method for collecting data too. William Krohn, editor for the Illinois Society Publication, used syllabi for Hall and for the Illinois group. Foot-notes were attached thus: "kindly send your answers to G. Stanley Hall of Clark University, Worcester, Massachusetts". Then for his own syllabi he would give additional illustrations and instructions:

Observations should be made with the greatest accuracy. Your data will then in all probability be of some scientific value in the endeavor to settle some of the pressing questions now upon us.

Materials needed for making tests may be secured from Mr. Krohn at the University of Illinois. The writer will edit results and publish conclusions in the Monthly.1

Individual Intelligence Tests

After the turn of the twentieth century, Alfred Binet forged ahead with a new method for testing intelligence. This new instrument and new techniques made tremendous advancement in the studying of children.

Miscellaneous Contributions to Methods

Sanford Bell, Indiana Normal School, Valparaiso, Indiana, suggested methods to help teachers and parents study children more adequately. Bell suggested four methods:

1. The psycho-physical record. The observer is

---

expected to seek out and record all of the details that in any way throw light upon the physical and mental make-up of the child. Note conditions of eye, ear, nose, throat, etc. Observe facts relative to temperament, self-control, associations, etc.

2. The Cross-section method. The observer seizes a single event or happening in the child's life and endeavors to find the mentality corresponding to it. The method is characteristically inductive, as it takes particular facts in the child's life and seeks the laws underlying them.

3. The topical method. Different subjects are taken up, with partial knowledge representing generalizations (from 2 above) and studied in light of additional facts. The generalizations are thereby much enriched, defined, and when faulty, corrected. This method is deductive and must be used in conjunction with the former to assure trustworthiness.

4. The Longitudinal-section method. This method requires the child to be observed during 20, 30, 40, or 60 minutes, or even longer, and a record made of every thing he does and says during the time of the observation. The observer attempts to seize every minute detail that in any way indicates the mental life of the child.¹

J. P. Gordy believed the Child-study included what was then called the Genetic Psychology. The question as to how much the student could be required to do, in what order we should take up particular subjects, and how long we should pursue them could all be answered by Genetic Psychology.²

Oscar Chrisman coined the term "Paidology" which referred to Child-study as a pure science—the collection of data for the sake of the knowledge alone.

¹Sanford Bell, Child Study Monthly, pp. 581 ff, Vol. III.
E. J. Swift stated that education was too much concerned with its history. He urged less straining of their eyes looking over their shoulders at Pestalozzi, Froebel, and Herbart and more looking forward to new methods and to the new achievements that could be made. He was interested in the experimental aspects of Child-study and had made a fine contribution with his book, *Mind In The Making.*

Arnold Gesell was interested in the scientific aspects of Child-study. He defined the movement as the science or an inductive synthesis of all of the sciences dealing with the nature of childhood. His work at Clark was the beginning of an interest in a Child-study laboratory which finally had its culmination in the widely recognized Yale Clinic of Child Development.

General observation was stressed as a good method by Hall in 1892. At that date he felt this method was the only method for Child-study:

It is in a sense introductory and should be extended as a first stage as widely as possible, and no more special or expert observer should fail to keep an eye toward all parts of the field, and not everything of interest.

I suggest that the beginners write to the publisher, Mr. Orpha, to get in touch with a leader in the field interested in. Then details of method for inquiry can be prepared.

Some cautions for observations are:
1. Do not try to carry much machinery of local organization.

---


2. Promoters or propagandists of a cause are not wanted—but effective scientific work.

3. Go quietly to work yourself; lead, not point the way. Allow interest and curiosity a chance to develop.

4. The few best teachers and parents, those who really love children, will respond first.

5. Do not attempt to do this study unless you are sure you have good health, strength and time enough without neglect of present duties, and unless you love the work.

6. No hack or routine teacher will ever undertake this work, but all of them are sure to discourage it.

7. Do not take a subject on which you do no reading. ¹

Russell's Method

E. Harlow Russell, principal of the Normal School of Worcester, Massachusetts, used and popularized the "Russell Method". Russell gives credit to Hall for the first suggestions of desirability and feasibility of the method and for helpful and stimulating criticism throughout the entire program of developing his method.

We begin by calling attention of new teachers to the fact that children are in full activity about them, and to the fact that their own childhood stretches back continuously to infantile unconsciousness and parts of it may be recalled and brought into view and studied.

Teachers are then carefully directed to observe children. They are to report everything they can get hold of that goes to make up the manifold activities of children's lives; and they are to reject nothing because it seems remote or trivial for they can never tell at the moment what significance may lurk unperceived.

in the most ordinary or the most extraordinary word or act or gesture. Accordingly, they cast as large a net as possible and of as close a mesh, to gather of every kind, the haul can be sorted by competent hands afterwards.....The value of the method seems to be:

a. Brings prospective teachers into the right attitude of mind towards children.

b. Helps to discover living facts which alone can nourish child psychology into a science.

c. Wholesome influence upon all who engage.

d. There is an awakening of intelligence and of new interest and zeal in the higher and finer parts of teaching.

Russell's method was extensively used and formed the basis for teaching at his institution. In 1892 (19,000) studies were reported and were increasing at the rate of 3,000 a year.1

Earl Barnes--Discussion of Methods

An excellent statement of methods of Child-study was made by Earl Barnes in his Studies in Education.

Child-study as we understand it is not a pure science at all. We are trying to use some of the tools of pure science. Child-study is an applied science; it is prosecuted for the most part by parents and teachers who want knowledge that can be used in the development of the children for whose future happiness and usefulness they are immediately responsible.2

---


The great bulk of the contribution to methods came from America. Comments of two travelers in Europe substantiate this:

The professors of Pedagogy in Germany, with perhaps the exception of Rein, seem to have no interest in the study of educational problems, and nowhere did I find them doing anything themselves along the newer lines. Several, while lamenting it, admitted frankly that Pedagogy was a dead subject at the universities, and that they looked to America for new inspiration.¹

Thomas Balliet, reported that European educationists were looking to this country both for inspiration and for light on the general subject of child psychology.²

Conclusion on Literature

We can safely conclude that Child-study literature was issued by a large number of different individuals and institutions. Teachers colleges, state departments of education, parent round tables, teacher's institutes, and individual contributions made by lectures and writings in the leading publications of the time were the most important. There was no set pattern for preparing or issuing this literature. The Illinois Society of Child-study had a significant influence upon the organization of similar groups in other states. Constitutions, rules and


regulations, and statements of guiding objectives were not in widespread use throughout the different Child-study groups.

Conclusion on Methods

Regarding the methods used, we can state that the explorative type of research done by the Child-study movement was of tremendous value to education. The methods used and developed were: the topical syllabi and questionnaire used to collect data and conduct statistical studies; undirected observations in home and school used by Russell and others to collect materials for lectures and methods in teacher training institutions and to gain a clearer understanding of the way children lived and behaved; miscellaneous collections of children's writings, drawings, sayings, and feelings; introspective methods and personal reminiscences of students and adults; personal journals and letters of children; attempts to interpret artistic contributions of children; direct study of children along more scientific lines such as the work done by Arnold Gesell; biographies of individual children conducted along the lines of Shinn and Preyer; physical examinations and studies to discover defects; more direct observation of children under specific environmental conditions such as playground, factory work, and farming; and variations of several of these methods listed above such as the studies carried on by Earl Barnes in California cities. This hewing out and discovering of new methods, then, was truly a significant contribution.
CHAPTER VI

THE STATUS OF CHILD-STUDY IN AMERICAN EDUCATION
AND THE CONTRIBUTIONS MADE BY THE MOVEMENT

The data collected on Child-study in America point out the striking contributions made by this popular educational movement. Before the movement is appraised in terms of education today, data will be presented to show the consensus of opinion of leading educators concerning the contributions of Child-study during the time the movement was at its height.

Opinion of Educators Regarding Child-study

G. W. A. Luckey, Professor of Pedagogy at the University of Nebraska, stated his views on Child-study and collected statements from all of the leading educators who were recognized as the most prominent workers in Child-study. Mr. Luckey asked three questions of each:

1. In your experience what seems to be the chief value of Child-study?

2. What do you consider the most helpful line of advance?

3. What do you think to be the principal value of Child-study to the teacher?

Replies were received from nearly every one to whom letters were sent, showing the interest existing in this subject. Luckey was well accepted in educational circles.
This made a difference in the promptness and the quality of the responses. His comments on Child-study have merit for this study. He enthusiastically declares:

If the history of Child-study were written up, it would read like a romance or a fairy tale. The attention of fathers, mothers, teachers, scientists, has been turned to the child with an interest that seems almost divine. The child is becoming a real living, active being, trembling in the balance of right and wrong; and the possibilities of humanity have enlarged with this view. Truly is coming to pass that saying—"a little child shall lead them".

One weakness of our profession is that teachers accept one or another educational theory because of the language in which it is written and apply it for years without knowing it is false, and children are warped through their whole after life, for the want of proper knowledge in the teacher and parent at the right time.

If we are ever to have a science of education, its basis must be found in the development of the child.

So long as education meant to us the mere accumulation of knowledge, and the mind was a sort of receptacle to be filled with facts, it did not matter whether we knew the child or not, for the man was to be fitted to the education and not the education to the man.

The present idea of education which physiological psychology has forced us to accept, puts a very different phase upon the subject. Education is now considered to be simply a growth of body, mind and soul—a united growth, and by laws that are very similar. A defect in one is felt in all. The same food which nourishes the tissues of the body supplies the food for the nerve cells from which thought is possible.

Man needs development, and the best culture of man is not restraining of his weakness but the bringing into play of his strength.

If Child-study does nothing more than rejuvenate the teachers, which it will surely do, it will have accomplished more than all its cost."

Replies Received By Mr. Luckey

Dr. Nicholas Murray Butler, professor of philosophy, Columbia College, New York.

1. It arouses the teacher to examine the study of mental status of children. It will furnish us with a series of conclusions that will be practical in guiding the development of courses of study, methods of instruction, hygienic and sanitary surroundings of the school, etc.

2. Leads to the scientific examination of children’s interests and knowledge.

3. It causes her to become a naturalist in so far as she scientifically observes and records the phenomena of child life and growth.


1. A contribution to anthropology and a powerful agent in enlarging the sympathies of those who have to deal with children.

2. Physical observations of children—and the phenomena of psycho-genesis (of Freyer type)

3. Knowledge of children as individuals and sympathy with children as human beings.

Dr. Jennie B. Merrill, Normal College, New York.

1. Interest aroused in Children. This interest in the child seems to awaken a greater interest in teaching and leads to more consideration in discipline.

2. Practical results in pedagogy

3. Answered in (1)

Dr. G. Stanley Hall, President of Clark University.

1. Brings teacher into closer rapport with the pupil and establishes that personal bond which brings out the power of the teacher. Teaching is a work of love.

2. Determine more accurately culture epochs; a study of
religious ideas—and law of nature; even power of
mind and body needs to be studied.

3. Expressed in my syllabi—study of children more
adequately.

Dr. G. T. W. Patrick, professor of philosophy, State
University, Iowa City, Iowa.

1. In psychology in increasing our knowledge of
mental evolution and in pedagogy in helping to
put education on a scientific basis.

2. Along physiological lines, sight, hearing, fatigue,
motor ability, physical training.

3. The teachers ought to post themselves on what has
been accomplished in these researches and make
practical applications and reforms.

Professor Karl Barnes, education department, Stanford
University.

1. Need to build up a body of facts as a pure science.
   For majority of us child-study must mean a study of
   practical pedagogy.

2. Along the lines of careful reminiscent study of one's
   own childhood, with a view to quickening sensibility
   and sympathy. Also along the lines of schoolroom
   studies of children's points of view and children's
   interests.

3. The quickening of the teachers sympathy, the massing
   of general truths concerning children, and the
   creation of a student spirit.

Dr. Charles A. Mc Murray, secretary National
Herbartian Society, Normal, Illinois.

1. Child-study is a more practical form of psychology.
   It brings people into sympathy with childhood and
   with the growing, changing, developing minds of
   children.

2. Study of individual children, leading to deeper
   appreciation of disposition and temper and mental
   character; physical measurements of children; study
   of fatigue; study of school diseases; study of school
   hygiene.
3. Greatest benefit is in bringing the teacher into closer sympathy and appreciation of childhood.

Sara E. Wiltse, corresponding secretary, International Kindergarten Union, West Roxbury, Massachusetts.

1. Breaking down all walls that somehow seemed built around the children by study of methods, methods, methods in normal training.

2. Combination of Hall’s syllabi, Russell’s “Still Hunt”, and Barnes drawings and compositions.

3. Greater enthusiasm it inspires.

Dr. E. W. Scripture, Instructor Psychology, Yale.

1. It is an integral part of scientific psychology.

2. Accurate scientific experiments and measurements of the psychological processes of children.

3. Work of this kind has no direct value for the teacher till it has been elaborated by the psychologist.

Dr. H. K. Wolfe, Professor Philosophy, University of Nebraska.

1. More incentive to the original investigator.

2. In areas of general biology, physiology, embryology, anthropometry, and experimental psychology.

3. Teacher now looks out from the child’s standpoint—a complete reversal of her line of vision.

Dr. E. E. Brown, Professor Pedagogy, University of California.

1. Better understanding of psychology of development.

2. Tracing the successive stages of child development.

3. More sympathetic relation between teacher and pupil and a more minute and thorough understanding by teachers of the character of each child.
Col. Francis W. Parker, Principal Cook County Normal.

1. Enable the teacher to diagnose the personality of the child, to know something of the child's body, mind, and soul.

2. Combined efforts of parents, teachers, and others to study children.

3. Same as first.

Professor M. V. O' Shea, School Pedagogy, Buffalo

1. Enables us to understand the average normal child better. Also statistical studies of Hall, Barnes, Bowditch, Gilbert and others may bring out laws of childhood development.

2. Enables teacher to understand the child and to shape her work according to individual needs.

3. Included in (1).

Dr. F. Mc Murray, Dean School of Pedagogy, Buffalo

1. Child-study is forcing us toward individualism.

2. Get teachers into the habit of observing children.

3. Regard child as first factor in the school--attitude of physician toward his patient. We feel obliged to diagnose the case each time.

Dr. William H. Burnham, Head Department of Pedagogy, Clark University.

1. To arouse an interest in the teacher--interested in developing children.

2. Studies of physiology, psychology, and hygiene seem of promise.

3. Interest in childhood aroused for teacher.

Dr. C. C. Van Liew, Secretary Illinois Society for Child-study, Normal, Illinois.

2. Along the line of child’s physical development.

3. Teacher undertaking work according to methods of Child-study is first brought to realize certain limitations to her work in the physical, intellectual, and moral constitution of the child. This brings more sympathetic understanding too.

Charles H. Thurber, Dean Morgan Park Academy, University of Chicago, and Editor of School Review.

1 & 3. Attitude of teacher toward child and child nature.

2. Broadens the horizon and widens the life of a teacher to feel that she is connected with something outside of the four walls of her little room.

There was general agreement among leading educators that Child-study was bringing teachers, parents, and professors into a closer relationship with children. There were widespread attempts to study children and to understand them.

**Lines of Development For The Future of Child-study**

The need for still more data about all phases of child life was recognized as important. The consensus of opinion seemed to indicate that there was need for more research and for continued effort to collect scientific evidence about children. The lines of development for the future were not clearly indicated. It is natural to expect that each individual reporting would predict that future development would follow lines that he was primarily interested namely: the professor of pedagogy expected more practical results in his field; the philosopher was interested in scientific examination of children and the application of
the findings to education; the psychologist wanted to elaborate on the findings of research to make them practical; the kindergarten teacher wanted more emphasis upon the practical side and less upon rigid method. This last trend is noticed throughout the movement and is certainly a healthy trend--enabling the whole field of education and child life to be explored by numerous individuals according to the methods they are willing to develop and popularize.

**Child-study in Illinois**

The Illinois Child-study organization was unique. It had the best organization and the only official state publication for Child-study, the *Child-Study Monthly*. In 1897 the editor of this monthly publication attempted to get some indication of the acceptance and use of Child-study in the counties throughout the state. A Questionnaire was sent to the county superintendents asking them what they thought Child-study meant and how it was being accepted by teachers in their counties. The replies were not too accurate and the editor concluded that, "the county superintendents are a sturdy lot, honest and practical almost to a man, and their opinions are interesting and instructive".1

---

Some of the typical replies were:

I think the effect has been to awaken interest in the teachers and to deepen the interest felt in the welfare of the child, as well as to further correct methods of teaching. . . Superintendent Bartlett, Brown County.

Child-study has been given quite a good deal of attention and while it has not been systematized so that the application of discoveries made can be readily applied in school work, yet from the investigations certain deductions have been made which have been of great value in the practical work of teaching. Superintendent Whisman, Coles County.

The effect of Child-study has been to inspire my teachers with new life and zeal for work. Superintendent Beerman, Crawford County.

Forty counties ignored the circular; thirty-seven county superintendents answered with statements like those above—favorable; fifteen county superintendents answered in a negative way such as these:

So far we have escaped with a few mild, sporadic cases of "Child-study fever". A large number of our teachers are unmarried, and the salaries paid in this county are so small that our married teachers cannot afford to go to Switzerland to have their children born, and the duties of life are so urgent that they find it very difficult to stop every morning and weigh and measure their babies and children. I doubt not they think they have as fine children as Mr. and Mrs. Hall, and would like just as well to be advertised in the Child Study Monthly. Superintendent Greenlaw, Clay County.

The teachers of my county have not given very much attention to the subject. Superintendent Sarah Whittenberg, Johnson County.

The teachers and schools of this county have been influenced but little by the Child-study movement. Superintendent Piper, Ogle County.

The above data indicate that Child-study was being received by a fair number of counties (37 favorable to 15
that were non-receptive). Since the movement was so new and since this was the first real educational movement of any size to really attempt entrance into the tradition and conservatism surrounding American Education, the effects should be considered hopeful and forward looking.

**Child-study and Educational Meetings**

Careful scrutiny of the literature of this period showed that there was considerable recognition given to Child-study by state educational meetings, by national meetings, by parents, by administrators, by the newspapers and periodicals. Additional data to substantiate this point will include the following:

William Burnham reported on important contributions of Child-study, 1905, before the national meeting of the department of Child-study.

The study of children is revolutionizing pedagogy. Attention is shifting from methods of teaching to methods of learning. The work has already passed from the stage of mere observation and crude speculation to the stage of analysis and experimentation. Mayer has studied individuals work as against group work; Schmidt has studied children's work at home and at school; Neumann has studied learning by heart.¹

Circulars of the Illinois Society of Child-study were being published and distributed by the Illinois State Superintendent of Public Instruction.²

¹W. H. Burnham, "Education From the Genetic Point of View", *Proceedings of National Education Association*, pp. 727f., 1905.

A. S. Whitney, Superintendent Saginaw Michigan, reported to the National Association of City School Superintendents. I would say that Child-study has a very marked beneficial effect upon the child in that it has led to a better understanding of his growing powers and necessities; upon the teacher by acquainting her with the complexity of a child's physical and mental constitution, and by magnifying her concept of the child's individuality.¹

The Chicago Tribune carried an article on G. Stanley Hall and the Child-study movement. (1900)

Thousands of mothers and ordinary teachers have been helped in understanding children. The movement has helped several sciences by dealing with humans and because reports are made of child life. Often child minds are not considered at all--too much emphasis has been placed upon the adult point of view.²

The American High School and Child-study

Child-study did not penetrate the tough hide of the secondary school. Few accounts were found in the literature dealing with these schools. The greatest amount of study was given to students in grades seven through nine after Hall published his work on Adolescence. From the standpoint of this study the writer could not find substantial evidence to indicate continuous or intensive work with Child-study in American High Schools.

Child-study and The Elementary School Curriculum

The influence of the Child-study movement upon the curriculum of the elementary schools was quite pronounced.

G. Stanley Hall was opposed to the standardizing of the school curriculum. He clashed with Eliot of Harvard over the famous committee of ten. Hall strove to reform and modernize the kindergarten and was successful in tearing Froebel to pieces in great style and seemingly with much delight. Several works on methods had appeared just before the turn of the twentieth century. John Dewey was writing and speaking regularly on methods of teaching and upon the Child and the Curriculum.\(^1\) The committee of fifteen of the National Education Association in 1895 was searching for a basis for unity in the school curriculum. But the main force of the Child-study movement was not to culminate in the improvement of the elementary school curriculum—the power that had been generated was to be used by a new popular educational movement that was showing the first signs of growth near the close of the Child-study movement. This new movement was Progressive Education.

F. E. Dresslar, of the University of California, reported on the application of Child-study to grammar grades:

1. Careful observation of growth of children shows girls of 12 have reached maturity comparable with boys about 14.

2. Studies dealing with motor abilities have emphasized anew and enlarged in detail the peculiar abilities and inabilities of the children in muscular adjustments.

---

3. Various investigations have shown many children to be slow and stupid because of physical defects.

4. One of the best ways to get at moral nature of the child is through good health and proper environment.

5. Games and plays fill natural needs of Child-life.

6. Studies of child interest have shown that much school work has had no effect upon children’s life and has not aroused active child participation.

7. Out of general studies of rudimentary society—have come all sorts of organizations for self-government and self-control such as George Junior Republic, Columbia Park Boy's Club, the School City, etc.

8. Meanings put into common words by children are far more varied and far less exact when compared with adult standards than the world had previously supposed.

9. Studies have revealed interesting facts regarding the emotional and intellectual conditions of early adolescence.¹

---

**Influence of Child-study Upon Other Movements and Fields of Study**

A report should be made of the influence of Child-study upon other movements and fields of study—thus a direct effect upon the improvement of education as a whole. The best authority the writer could locate was G. Stanley Hall. He delivered an address before the department of Child-study of the National Education Association in Cleveland, 1908. The materials were well prepared and

---

¹F. B. Dresslar, (Department of Education University of California), "Contributions of Twenty-five years of Organized Child-study In America to Educational Theory and Practice, as Applied to Grammar Grades", Proceedings of National Education Association, pp. 910-914, 1907.
were representative of Hall's great enthusiasm for the movement. This was his chance to really speak about the movement at its height.

Child-study in its larger ranges occupies today the very centre of the stage in both the theory and the practice of education. It is not too much to say that now he or she who commands its resources commands the chief attention when they speak or write, and usually says the decisive word when most great vital problems are discussed. From the first it has been largely an American project. It has spread to every civilized country.

Only a very few of the older leaders and some who manage this greatest of all associations of teachers in the world hold aloof and strive to maintain an attitude of detachment from it. But it has won at least the good-will of all the younger and progressive minds in the pedagogical fields; so that the future is now secure and we can see already the signs of new dangers, i.e., that the results of Child-study will be accepted prematurely and uncritically. The scope of Child-study has been wide and vast. The influence of the movement has been profound:

1. Medical profession—contagious diseases, adolescent perversion, and in developing the school physicians.

2. Religious training—revolutionized methods of training in various Sunday Schools.

3. Juvenile crime—became a specialty, literature has increased.


5. Genetic knowledge concept—most perfect type of knowledge—the best and only scientific definition of anything is a full description of its stages of growth.

6. Students of education—demanding Child-study knowledge as the best investment of time and money, to equip themselves for educational leadership.

7. Careful laboratory work developed—type of text book, line space for eyes; Lay, Maumann, Dewey, and Phillips work on elementary curriculum.
8. Only science that teachers have furnished the data for and helped to create and advance.

9. Field of adolescents has been opened and explored.

10. Grading of children—Crampton’s norms.

11. Measurement of mental ability has been assisted.

12. Normal school education has been greatly influenced.

13. Nature study has been started and advanced—Hodge.


15. Teachers texts have been improved—Tanner, Kirkpatrick, Swift, O’Shea.

16. Dancing movement

17. Playground movement

18. Dramatics and children’s theatres

19. Story telling leagues (5,000 members in many cities)

20. Society for moral prophylaxis—sought to prevent vice among the young.

21. Child labor laws and organisations

22. Parent Teachers Association

23. Young Men’s Christian Association and Young Women’s Christian Association had their origins in Child-study.

Child-study is vaster than all these applications to pedagogy. We are working out the answer to the great question—What is a child?

Also Child-study teaches that it is the duty of every healthful man and woman to marry and bear children. This is a duty that we owe to the world and society, which is quite as imperative upon all those who are fit as it is to vote, pay taxes, or fight if our country is in danger.¹

F. W. Parker Stressed Contributions of Child-study

Parker stressed the many influences of Child-study in an article published in the Chicago Tribune, February, 1901.

Child-study has brought the knowledge that dullness, backwardness, and stupidity in children have their causes in defects of the body, in nerve affections, defective eyesight, with countless resulting maladies, impaired hearing, etc.

Another lesson of Child-study is that there are stages of mental growth co-ordinate with stages of physical growth, each stage demanding special conditions to arouse the needed activities.

Child-study has brought into home and school a better understanding of the nature and destiny of the child, and is resulting in the creation of the right home and school environment.

The formation of Child-study clubs, parent's meetings, mother's congresses, all over the land, is the direct outcome of Child-study.¹

Graduates of Clark University Aid Child-study

Between 1884-1914 there were 117 Doctors of Philosophy degrees granted at Clark University in the Psychology and Education departments. There were 98 masters of Arts degrees for the same period. The great influence of the men graduating from Clark University with the Child-study point of view can be recognized by the place these men have taken in American Education. (see appendix for list of graduates)

¹Col. F. W. Parker, Chicago Tribune, February, 1901, "What Child-study has Brought to Children"
A Backward Glance at Child-study By Leading Educators of Today

The writer was able to obtain letters from a few leading educators who had worked with G. Stanley Hall at Clark University during the years when Child-study was at its height. These men are still active in educational circles. Their statements are helpful to bridge the gap between the reports on the influence of Child-study in the early nineteen hundreds and the present.

Dr. H. D. Sheldon

Dr. Sheldon, Professor Emeritus at the University of Oregon, carefully pointed out the use he made of Child-study in his teaching. His evaluation of the entire movement is significant.

As to the influence of the Child-study movement on my teaching, it would be difficult to say, and perhaps it would be more useful if I were to tell you what I have done with it. During my first eleven years (1900-1911) at the University of Oregon in charge of the School of education, I gave courses in Child Psychology at the University to small classes and frequently spoke at various county institutes throughout the state, dealing with such topics as discipline, certain aspects of the curriculum like history and nature study from the child study point of view, also adolescence, and frequently recommended books and articles on the subject. From 1912 to 1914 at the University of Pittsburgh, I was connected with an institution the head of which, Will Grant Chambers, had spent one year at Clark and had established a school of childhood there, a sort of modernized kindergarten, that in the main represented Hall's ideas. Returning to Oregon in 1914, I continued in my outside work especially to emphasize this point of view, particularly along social and sociological lines. However, Dr. E. G. Conklin, who was head of the Department of Psychology here from 1911 to 1935, was a more thoroughgoing disciple of President Hall than I, and his course on Adolescence made quite an impression on the students.
here. Also, Dean J. R. Jewell, the present dean, took
his degree at Clark under Hall, and his underlying
philosophy of education represents, I think, the point
of view of Clark rather more strongly than I ever did.

The main significance of the entire Child-study
movement, in my opinion, was its preparation for progres-
sive education, for the child-centered school. Child-
study emphasized the individual, differences between
individuals, the voluntary activities of individuals.
It is very unfortunate that Harold Rugg in his book on
the child-centered school entirely omitted any refer-
ence to this beginning. John Dewey, a former student of
Hall's, was profoundly influenced by Hall and the Child-
study movement. In addition to its laying the foundation
of the child-centered school, its other contributions
are as follows: (1) emphasis on voluntary activity,
particularly play, stimulating the playground movement;
(2) a reform of the kindergarten from a somewhat ossi-
fied institution to its more modern and elastic form;
(3) emphasis on children's art work, writing, poetry,
etc.; (4) emphasis on adolescence and the peculiar prob-
lems of the high school period; (5) providing a psycho-
logical basis for moral and religious education; (6)
treating curricular problems from the point of view of
their psychological roots such as C. F. Hodges' Nature
Study and Life, of which a hundred thousand copies were
sold in this country, which for the time being put this
study on a new basis in American schools.

March 27, 1944
H. D. Sheldon

John Dewey

John Dewey replied to a letter asking about the
influence of Child-study upon the writing of his monograph,
"The Child and the Curriculum", in 1902.

I am glad to know of your work. The theme of Child-
study is one that needed study and public report. I
think the connection of my monograph with the Child-
study movement is genuine but very round-about, not
direct nor exactly conscious. There is a direct connec-
tion with another monograph I wrote, published I think
in the old Herbart Society publications. Col. Parker
was very active in the Illinois Child-study Society.
March 30, 1944
John Dewey
Lewis Terman

Lewis M. Terman expressed his feelings about the influence of G. Stanley Hall.

I can say that Hall's seminar was one of the most valuable educational experiences I ever had. In fact, I think his weekly seminars did more for me than all the lectures I listened to at Clark University.

April 28, 1944
Lewis M. Terman

H. W. Chase

Harry Woodburn Chase, Chancellor, New York University, studied at Clark, 1908-1910, and reports some of the most interesting recollections of the work with Dr. Hall. Of special interest is his reference to the work with Sub-normal Children which was a part of Hall's proposed Children's Institute.

During the last year that I was working for my Ph. D. degree there Dr. Hall asked me, together with a local physician, to undertake the direction of what he called an "Institute for Sub-normal Children". He sent me over the country to see what other people were doing. It was just about the time that the Binet tests were beginning to be known in this country and I went to the University of Pennsylvania which was doing a comparable piece of work in those days, to the Institute for the Feebleminded at which Dr. Goddard was working and to half a dozen other places which were beginning that approach. We set up the machinery of the institute in one of the rooms in the University equipped with testing material of the usual type and examined, as I recall, quite a number of the public school children in Worcester and some who came from outside. I left the University after receiving my degree that Spring and I believe the work continued only sporadically for a time after that. It was only significant in that it was the recognition of the newly developing methods of testing the intelligence of children. But about that time
Dr. Hall began to be interested in psychoanalysis and brought Freud over for a series of lectures and gave his mind to that for some time.

May 2, 1944
Harry Woodburn Chase

Frederick Bolton

Frederick E. Bolton, Research Professor in Education for University of Washington, commented upon many of the influences of G. Stanley Hall and Child-study.

It seems to me that the movement initiated by Dr. Hall was one of the most significant in the whole history of education in America. I feel sure that in time to come Dr. Hall will be recognized as one of the great men of all times in the field of education and psychology.

Dr. Hall was one of the first to go abroad for study with Wilhelm Wundt at Leipzig where Wundt had started the first laboratory in the world for the experimental study of psychology. Hall returned to America and after a brief period of teaching at Harvard he was called to Johns Hopkins where he established the first laboratory for the experimental study of psychology in America—the second in the world. Both James and Hall were considered for that position. Hall was appointed. Among the men trained under Hall at Johns Hopkins were John Dewey, Joseph Jastrow, George T. W. Patrick, and James McKeen Cattell.

While those students of Hall came to represent varied fields in education and psychology, they all received the initial stimulus under Hall’s teaching. Dr. Hall started the publication of the Pedagogical Seminary............

You ask how the work at Clark influenced my own educational work. I have one book on adolescence which is a direct outgrowth of Hall, and all of my writings have been very greatly colored by Hall, James, and Dewey.

May 9, 1944
Frederick E. Bolton.
Arnold Gesell

Arnold Gesell, Director of the Clinic of Child Development Yale University, responded to the writer's request and sent several recent articles written by him and where reference had been made to G. Stanley Hall.

Hall became a powerful exponent of Darwinism in America. With fertile suggestiveness and comprehensiveness, Hall applied the concepts of evolution to the mind of the child and of the race. Hall also became the father of a nation-wide Child-study movement which liberalized elementary education and led to scientific advances in the study of child development. This movement in its mixture of empirical fact-finding and zeal for social welfare was characteristically American.

October 3, 1944
Arnold Gesell

Progressive Education and Child-study

The year before his death, G. Stanley Hall made a statement relative to the newer schools and curriculum organizations being developed in the United States. "The Gary System, The Project Method, the Batavia Plan, the new appeals to the play instinct, Montessori, the new student movements of many kinds, and even psychanalysis are phases of this great VOLTE FACE MOVEMENT. ¹ Careful examination of the data will be necessary to establish the true status of Child-study and its relationship to the next main educational movement--Progressive Education.

Child-study Leaders and Progressive Education

Some leaders of progressive schools received their training at Clark, were active in Child-study, and then moved toward Progressive Education and influenced this movement profoundly. Maximilian F. E. Grossmann, formerly superintendent of Ethical Culture Schools, established a school for exceptional children requiring expert individual treatment. Notices of M. Grossmann's school appeared in the Child Study Monthly. He was active in national meetings of the movement.¹

An ardent worker in Child-study was Frederick Burk (Ph. D. Clark, 1898). His educational influence was felt most directly in California. As president of San Francisco State College he greatly influenced a few of the leading innovators in American Education. Carleton Washburn and Helen Parkhurst were teachers at this institution. We can recognize the direct connection between Burk's educational ideas and the school organizations at Winnetka and Dalton by these teachers.

Repeated reference will be made to John Dewey, the leading philosopher of our nation, whose theories were accepted by the Progressive Education Association. Dewey had numerous contacts with Child-study and with Dr. Hall.

Child-study Literature and Progressive Education

Leading educators were thoroughly familiar with some 8,034 articles on Child-study written up to 1903. For the next ten or twelve years there were numerous other articles written. There was so much being written that educators, if they were at all conscious of the educational trends, could not neglect Child-study--they were filled with the discoveries of this movement.¹

The official publication of Progressive Education carried articles and studies which were a continuation of the general trend and work in Child-study. Stanwood Cobb, the founder of the Progressive Education Association and its first president, believed that the movement was to reflect the newer trends in education. Here was the opportunity to put into practice many of the findings of Child-study. At the sixth annual convention of the association he stated:

In a movement so spontaneous, so freely expressive of diverse personalities and viewpoints, it is hardly possible to understand the essence of the thing by reading separate books and articles about it. One must visit progressive schools, see progressive education at work, and then the multitudes assembled at this convention in the name of progressive education, sense the underlying unity of the movement. It is not a particularistic movement. If it seems to be represented preponderantly in private schools, it is not so from choice but from the happy accident that private schools can more easily experiment and take on the new. One of the most notable achievements of the convention (1907) was the honor paid John Dewey who consented to become honorary president of the association. His philosophy is universally recognised as the foundation and inspiration of the new education

¹E. E. Spaulding, (adapted from), Proceedings of National Education Association, 1903.
which seeks to make education a process as natural and as real as life itself. All progressive teachers acknowledge his leadership.\(^1\)

Three important points were emphasized by the founder of Progressive Education: (1) Progressive Education was not defined and destined to follow a pattern well established by the founders—it was spontaneous and freely expressive of diverse personalities and viewpoints; (2) the movement was not particularistic and yet was early confined largely to private schools; (3) John Dewey was universally accepted as the one who stated a philosophy of education for the new education.

The first issues of *Progressive Education*, the official publication for the movement, carried these article titles: "A Plea for The Conservation of Childhood"; "Parent Education"; "And The Child Grew"; "Child-study in Preschool"; "Mental Hygiene In Elementary Schools"; "School Methods of Studying Children"; "Creative Experiences"; "Rhythmics"; "Music Education Abroad"; "A Child's Size World"; "New Schools For Old"; and comments on schools making progress.

The above data would indicate that the trend in educational writings was to continue the work started and advanced by Child-study and then to go beyond this into the field of implementation and discovery. Child-study had lost its great founder and motivator; the movement had not been conceived as one to deal primarily with the curriculum even though it did effect the curriculum of the elementary schools.

---

in general; finally the movement had not been organized and had not been prepared so that new strides could be taken in the direction of the organization of experimental schools. The time was ripe for progressive education—the data were collected and the leading educators had been stimulated to activity.

Early Statements of Purpose

John Dewey was one of the first to state the common elements in the Progressive Schools:

The common elements in the progressive schools seem to be respect for individual capacities, interests, and experience; enough external freedom and informality at least to enable teachers to become acquainted with children as they really are; respect for self-initiated and self-conducted learning; respect for activity as the stimulus and centre of learning; and perhaps above all the belief in social contact, communication, and cooperation upon a normal human plane as all-enveloping medium.¹

The principles of Progressive Education were listed on the inside of the cover sheets of their official magazine from 1924 to 1928.

1. Freedom to develop naturally
2. Interest, the motive of all work
3. The teacher a guide, not a taskmaker
4. Scientific study of pupil development
5. Greater attention to all that affects the child's physical development

6. Co-operation between school and home to meet the needs of child life

7. The progressive school a leader in educational movements

Practically all of the above principles were a direct outgrowth of Child-study. The first, freedom to develop naturally, had been advanced by the early psychologists. The kindergarten movement strengthened this principle. The doctrine of interest grew out of the Herbartian movement. The direct influence of Child-study is easily recognized however.

These early statements of philosophy for the Progressive Education Movement were by no means accepted by the total membership. They represented an attempt of a few to bring the basic principles before the membership of the association. Individual schools had worked out statements of the principles that were to guide them in their new developments. The movement as a whole had no common statement. This likely was a good thing in that a variety of statements were in the process of development just as the Child-study movement had to develop a set of new techniques and methods for the studying of children. Burton P. Fowler, President after Cobb in 1930 stated:

Although our association has never promulgated or approved anything like a program either of principles or procedure, we do endorse, by common consent, the obvious hypothesis that the child rather than what he

---

studies, should be the centre of all educational effort and that a scientific attitude toward new educational ideas is the best guarantee of progress.\(^1\)

Later he stated, "Progressive Education is not a cult or a system of pedagogy; it aims rather to give expression to a new spirit in education". \(^2\)

Boyd Bode believed that the education of the time must reflect social change. The Progressive Education Association moved in this direction.

A shift of emphasis is necessary if progressive education is to remain faithful to its basic principles and ideals. Whether progressive education is to be continuously progressive or keep forever rotating on the axis of pupil interest depends on its readiness to make such a shift. I believe that our best hope in American Education lies in the progressive movement. I believe that its doctrine of interest is fundamentally sound. But I also believe that the time has come for progressive education to acquire a new sense of social responsibility for conserving the achievements of our past and for shaping the future character of the American people.\(^3\)

Kilpatrick struck the same note a year later, 1935.

The interest we as progressive educators have had in developing individuality and in fostering creative intelligence on an experimental basis will stay with us forever as fundamental aims and methods in life and in education. The new condition of economic interdependence seems to demand drastic changes in our economic system, not in violation of human freedom but to preserve and extend it. When we in education see that social-economic system thwarts and hampers us in the pursuit of our

---


highest ethical and educational aims for those under our care, it becomes our duty to join hands with others to change that system to something better.¹

Alexander Neiklejohn voiced a plea that was to direct the movement a few years later. He stated that teachers should know what they were teaching for, should have a clear and lucid understanding of the end which they are trying to achieve. Teaching is justified, according to Neiklejohn, only as it drives straight and true toward human growth and freedom.² Paul R. Hanna and his committee, of 1938, made the first significant restatement of principles and philosophy for the Progressive Education Association. They recommended that all Progressive Education Association members study and accept the committee report.³ This was a recommendation to get the total membership to work in the development of a common philosophy. This recommendation was carried out and by 1941 the most effective statement of philosophy of the Association was accepted by the members.⁴

Progressive Education, then, did not begin with a well defined pattern and statement of purpose—it is more logical to say that it started with the predominant trends

of the time and these were the continuation of the emphasis upon the child and Child-study.

Philosophy of Progressive Education

The philosophy of John Dewey was whole-heartedly accepted by the Progressive Education Association. The important question at this point seems to be: How much was John Dewey influenced by Child-study? In a searching study of the Activity Movement in American Education, a statement was made by the authors of the thirty-third yearbook dealing with this topic. "Dewey's educational philosophy is the outcome of his psychology and philosophy, reinforced by certain elements of strength which he beheld in certain of his predecessors," Reference has been made to the European influences of Child-study and upon American Education in general. The most revealing data that the writer has found to substantiate the belief that John Dewey's philosophy was directly influenced by Child-study were his own statements made in 1902.

I would emphasize first, the chief thing that Child-study has done is that it has regenerated the peculiar thing named "Pedagogy" and psychology for teachers. Child-study has led us to base methods on the actual characteristics of the actual concrete being under instruction.

Child-study has put into proper perspective the sort of training which the teacher needs, and has brought a vitalizing element into the work.

Child-study has brought about a different conception of education itself. One of the late advances in education was the doctrine of drawing out instead of pouring it in.

\[1\text{National Society for Study of Education, Activity Movement, Part II, P.111, Bloomington, 1934.}\]
Child-study makes prominent the activities of the child and tries to find the line along which these activities can direct themselves.

Child-study brings out the significance of development in education. To ridicule Child-study, which has its excesses, is to say that the mind has no laws which can be discovered. The time will come when one of the two or three important facts which educational history will mention about this period will be its recognition that the embodied mind of boys and girls has laws which can be discovered, and the laws discovered give a basis for directing growth which will give the richest and the best results.¹

The philosophy of John Dewey was obviously influenced by Child-study in America—he considered himself a part of the movement. The data collected by this movement served as the basis for much that is so important in his philosophy. We can say this without belittling the great educator. After all, could his contributions have been possible without his accepting and utilizing the best in educational thinking of his period and the past? The best in American Education in the first two decades of the twentieth century was certainly the summations of the many important findings of Child-study. People will say, "we have had Child-study for twenty years. What has it done for our schools?" The answer is: It has contributed much to give elementary schools (1) an improved curriculum; (2) a better method; and most of all (3) a new goal.²


Conclusions on Progressive Education and Child-study

Progressive Education took the findings of Child-study and worked to implement them in our schools. Thus a new popular education movement gradually replaced Child-study as a movement. G. Stanley Hall had been the motivating force in a movement that boldly sought to study children. John Dewey accepted the important task of the educational philosopher—applying the facts discovered about children to the school curriculum and to the methods of teaching. Hall's influence ceased at his death in 1924; Dewey's has continued to direct educational thinking for two more decades.
CHAPTER VII

OPPOSITION TO THE CHILD-STUDY MOVEMENT

Any evaluation of Child-study would be incomplete without an examination of the criticism of and opposition to the movement. Child-study was not under attack for any length of time. The leading educational literature of the years 1880 to 1920 has surprisingly few articles opposing Child-study. There were some individuals and groups that did criticize particular aspects of the movement. There was so little known about children that most people were happy for the opportunity to study and learn more about them. Another factor leading to the popular acceptance of Child-study was the fact that the movement followed in the wake of the humanistic trend in education to help children. The national tendencies in education stressed the need for educating and providing for youth if our country was to realize its greatest potentialities.

The commonly accepted arch-demagog of the period was Dr. Munsterberg of Harvard. His scathing attacks were published in the leading educational periodicals. Replies to Munsterberg were received from far and near. W. James Sully, of London, wrote one such reply and brought out the main controversial issues:

1. The movement has been popular, therefore unscientific.
2. Has suffered most from its best friends

3. Work of Child-study has been largely done by amateurs

Measured by results, the work of several atomizers would compare favorably with the practical help given teachers by the Harvard man. While a considerable body of knowledge, original and assimilated from the sciences, has been accumulated, the great good of the Child-study movement is in its effect upon the school-work of today. Professor Munsterberg's attack still indicates that Harvard is out of sympathy with education of common people.1

During the early years at Clark University the town of Worcester was very much disturbed over vivisection carried on in biology. These difficulties grew out of the dissention between Dr. Hall and Mr. Clark, the local business man who was to endow the University. After Clark's death these local problems were removed.

Reference has been made to the opposition voiced by county superintendents and teachers in rural areas. This opposition was due to the backwardness of many county superintendents who opposed anything that was new or progressive. Many teachers were so poorly trained, poorly paid, and poorly supervised that they were not interested in professional improvement and new research in education.

John Dewey spoke at the national meeting of the Child-study section of the National Education Association.

in 1897, on "Criticisms—Wise and Otherwise on Modern Child-
study". The main criticisms of Child-study were openly
discussed and answered.

The features of Child-study against which criticisms
have been justly directed are the results partly of the
exaggeration incident to all large movements in their
inception, partly of the misdirected gyrations of those
camp-followers who, hanging about education as about all
other progressive forces, attempt to use Child-study for
their own advertising and aggrandizement, and partly of
the unwise zeal of those who, lacking in stability, are
blown about by every new wind of doctrine and lose the
just perspective.

Many of the criticisms which have justification are
caused by the premature assertion on the part of some
that the Child-study movement was to afford a new,
certain, positive, and scientific basis for education,
replacing supposedly all of the tentative and speculative
foundations heretofore built upon. When the proposed revo-
lution failed to materialize, and teachers found that,
as hitherto, they had to rely upon good judgment, personal
experience, and a knowledge of the ideas and practices of
others, many felt that they had been fooled, and turned
from an indiscriminate worship at the shrine of Child-
study to a condemnation equally indiscriminate.

Other criticisms proceed from a failure to draw the
lines carefully between those aspects of Child-study which
belong to the providence of the scientific investigator
and those which interest the educator. It takes time to
develop scientific method, to collect and sift facts,
to derive theoretic conclusions.

Another source of criticism has been the undue iso-
lation of Child-study from the sciences upon which it
is dependent. The only excuse for making Child-study
a thing by itself and attributing to it a unity of its
own is not that the child is a unique fact separate
from others, but simply because it presents a focus to
which principles of physiology and psychology may be
directed. When those ignorant of or disregarding larger
sciences plunge directly into Child-study and expect to
get valuable results, the method is quackery, and the
outcome is confusion. The mere collection of facts,
uncontrolled by working hypothesis, unenlightened by
generalization, never made a science and never will.1

1John Dewey, Proceedings of National Education
Association, p. 825 ff., 1897.
The criticisms of Child-study were not too widespread. They centered around exaggeration of the benefits of Child-study, the expectation that the movement would care for all of the evils of education, and the discussions over the absence of scientific approaches to Child-study. Obviously many mistakes were made. The movement had a long, healthy life and then died from lack of nourishment—other organizations and movements gradually sapped its life blood.
CHAPTER VIII

SUMMARY AND CONCLUSIONS

Concerning the Status of Education in 1880

1. Free, public supported, non-sectarian schools had been firmly established.

2. Educational psychology was crude, was dependent upon the concepts of earlier European education, and stressed faculty psychology. Teachers could drill the attention, will, memory, imagination, feelings, and other "powers of the mind".

3. Courses of study were rigid and minutely outlined. The kind, amount, and order of subject matter to be learned by all students was prescribed.

4. Examinations were used to evaluate the results of teachers—the proof that the outlines had been mastered.

5. The subjects given in the first eight grades included reading, writing, English Language, arithmetic, geography, history, constitution of United States, grammar, composition, physics or physiology, music, drawing, and oral object lessons.

6. Children were harshly treated, truancy was prevalent, and school attendance was low. On the average 40 per cent of the nation's children were in school each day.
7. Most of our educational organization and methods had come from England. During the period following 1880 new innovations came from Continental Europe and we gradually started developing our own methods and materials.

8. Qualifications for teachers, teacher training, and teachers' salaries were very inadequate.

9. Women teachers were gradually replacing men and were bringing with them an understanding of children and a more sympathetic attitude toward children in general.

10. Illiteracy, determined by ability to write, was quite marked for the nation and particularly high for the Southern states.

11. The nation was ready for new developments in methods and techniques of teaching. Emphasis had been placed on organization of the public school. Now there was a definite need to work on the school curriculum and upon methods of teaching. The time was "ripe for Child-study".

Regarding European Foundations of Child-study

1. Only in modern times has the individual received any marked degree of recognition.

2. John Locke started the movement of "Enlightenment". His influence is important because of the restatement of his ideas by Rousseau.

3. Rousseau directed the thinking of educators to the "child" and inspired the work of Pestalozzi, Herbart, and Froebel.
4. Basedow and his associates anticipated many of the reforms in elementary education introduced by Pestalozzi. They had a profound effect upon children's books and literature. Their acceptance of children, their emphasis upon work experiences, and their milder forms of punishment are noteworthy.

5. The more formalized type of Pestalozzianism influenced elementary education in America. There was a continued emphasis upon children, upon milder forms of discipline, and upon improved methods of teaching.

6. Herbartianism, restated by Ziller and Rein, directed educational thinking for some time. They emphasized history and literature as the best subjects for teaching moral character. A broader view was taken toward teaching these subjects. Social life was stressed. Correlation of social subjects and the doctrine of interest were important outgrowths of the movement. The "cultural epoch" theory and "recapitulation" were accepted by G. Stanley Hall and others that played an important part in Child-study.

7. Froebel is responsible for many important streams of thought in modern elementary education. Developing inborn capacities, self-activity, social participation, plays, songs, and gifts were the most accepted contributions. The kindergarten had its origin with Froebel and has made continuous contributions to elementary education.
8. Experimental psychology started in Germany with Fechner and Wundt. G. Stanley Hall studied with these men, was inspired by them, and later transplanted the best of their ideas into similar experimental laboratories in America. This enthusiasm and acceptance of the scientific led later to the development of scientific Child-study and Child Psychology.

9. There was an accumulation of conditions that led to the beginning of Child-study in America. G. Stanley Hall was the type of individual who would respond to the needs of the time—launching a program to collect information about children.

Pertaining to Organizing and Promoting Child-study

1. The beginning of Child-study was in 1880 when G. Stanley Hall studied children in Boston Public Schools. The results of this study were published, lectures were given by Dr. Hall, and there was keen interest aroused.

2. G. Stanley Hall worked diligently on Child-study from the very beginning. His influence was continuous until his death in 1924.

3. The founding of the Pedagogical Seminary and the establishment of a department of pedagogy at Clark University were highly significant in the development of Child-study. The Seminary became the official publication and the department of pedagogy began to train prospective leaders in Child-study.
4. The movement spread rapidly after 1893 due to popular acceptance.

5. National and state organizations were started with rather loose and inadequate types of organization.

6. Clark University and G. Stanley Hall provided the main motivation for many national Child-study meetings and helped state organizations when called upon.

7. The Pedagogical Seminary was well accepted and had a wide circulation. Results of Child-study were published regularly.

8. Popular methods used to extend the organization were summer sessions at Clark, lecture tours, use of the topical syllabi, and educational meetings—both state and national.

9. The state of Illinois provided a pattern for other states interested in starting Child-study associations.

10. The large following of important educators helped to advance the movement. The popular trend was to talk and work with Child-study.

11. The St. Louis exhibit helped to advance Child-study through the large displays of Child-study materials and plans for future development. Many individuals from foreign countries had their first introduction to the movement in this way.

12. The Children’s Institute was an ideal of Hall’s that should have been carried out. This organization
could have played a very important part in extending the usefulness of Child-study and in advancing education in general.

13. Gradually there was a shading of interest into the side paths of other movements and Child-study declined. Leading educators devoted their time and energy to another movement—Progressive Education.

Regarding The Leaders of Child-study

1. G. Stanley Hall was the "father of Child-study". He remained the leading force in the movement until his death. His most active participation was between 1880-1918.

2. Hall's greatest contributions were in the organizing, promoting, motivating, and exploring of a wide variety of educational fields and problems. He was not one of our greatest psychologists—but one of our great educational leaders.

3. Some of the nation's best educators were leaders in Child-study. The most noted were: John Dewey, Col. F. W. Parker, Earl Barnes, William Burnham, William Krohn, Sara Wiltse, and W. V. O' Shea.

4. The National Education Association had a department of Child-study from 1895 to 1911. The leaders of this organization included another group of important men. In addition to those listed above, there were W. L. Bryan, Will S. Monroe, F. L. Burk, G. W. A. Luckey, L. M. Terman, and others.

5. Graduates from Clark University were prepared in
the field of Child-study. A list of the most important graduates has been placed in the appendix.

With Respect to Literature, Concepts, and Methods

1. There was agreement upon the general purpose of Child-study—to gather more information about children.

2. How to obtain information about children was not well defined. New methods had to be developed.

3. This hunting out and discovering of new methods was one of the significant contributions of the movement.

4. Different groups and individuals were urged to study children, to develop new techniques, and to free themselves from the straight-jacket of tradition and authority that surrounded the social institutions of this period.

5. The synthesis of the vast array of data collected on children should have been accomplished by Hall’s proposed "Children’s Institute". This was an anticipation of the Collaboration Center On Human Development and Education of the University of Chicago which has been so timely developed in the last few years. We can not estimate the amount of advancement that would have been made in Child-study, Child Psychology, and experimental research had Hall’s plans been fulfilled.

6. The pattern for preparation and dissemination of Child-study literature was: individual contributions through writings and lectures with G. Stanley Hall the outstanding personage; state organizations—Illinois was the prototype for
other states; state departments of education that issued circulars on Child-study—New York the best example; the national organization and department of Child-study of the National Education Association; parent round-tables—Illinois leading these; teacher training institutions using Child-study for courses and training—E. H. Russell and the Normal School of Worcester was the most noted; literature written by leaders in Europe and other countries; public schools using Child-study materials—Chicago Public Schools the main contributor; official publications—Child Study Monthly and Pedagogical Seminary.

7. Methods and techniques developed and used by Child-study included:

- Questionnaires and topical syllabi
- Undirected observations
- Collection of Children's writings, drawings, sayings
- Personal reminiscences—introspection
- Interpretation of Children's drawings
- Directed studies on children—Gesell
- Biographies of young children
- Statistical studies of large numbers
- Experimental studies with children
- Beginning of studies on learning and motivation
- Physical examinations
- Methods employed by a City School System—Chicago
Relating to The Status of Child-study
In American Education

1. Child-study made a significant contribution to American Education. The data show that the movement has not been adequately reported in educational literature and in modern histories of education.

2. It seems clear to the writer that G. Stanley Hall and the Child-study movement have been interpreted in terms of modern advancements. The evaluation of Child-study must be made in terms of the total movement and its effect upon the total educational pattern.

3. Child-study was the leading and dominant educational movement between 1880-1920. The area covered was so great that gradually other movements and groups branched out from Child-study and started their own organizations.

4. One of the most important factors in the consideration of Child-study is that this movement was the motivating force for nearly forty years in the study of children. Up to 1910 there were over 5,000 different titles concerning Child-study. This data radically changed educational methods, educational psychology, and educational philosophy.

5. In growth we accept the principle—that movements are at first diffuse and unorganized. So it was with Child-study. These movements were part and parcel of a growth pattern in American Education. The development was not premature and certainly it must not and cannot be skipped in any discussion of American Education.
6. The contributions of Child-study to American Education include the following:

Awakening of a keen interest in children by parents teachers, physicians, and social groups
Advancements made in school health, physical examinations, and mental hygiene
Study and improvement of juvenile delinquency
Better understanding of adolescents
Reorganization of the kindergarten
Developing of departments of pedagogy in leading institutions

Study of growth and development from birth
Careful laboratory work with children
Teachers contributed to the movement
Grading of children
Measurement of mental ability
Work with feeble minded
Methods used in teacher-training schools
Textbooks for use in teachers colleges
Nature study
Juvenile agriculture
Improvement of children's literature
Dancing movement
Playground movement
Story telling leagues
Discussion of child labor
Religious education and religious groups for children
Parent groups and round tables for studying children
Beginnings of Parent Teachers Association
Home-school-community relationships stressed

7. Child-study prepared the way for Progressive Education. The movement collected data about children. Many of the important aims of progressive education grew out of a better understanding of children. Many leaders of the Progressive Education Association were Child-study workers and had this background to influence their thinking. John Dewey, who provided the basic philosophy for Progressive Education, was greatly influenced by Child-study and was one of the active leaders in the movement.

8. The data in this study have directed the writer toward a point of view: that the need in future development of American Education is to show the continuity, to single out the common contributions of various educational movements, and to direct and channel our efforts and energies toward the improvement of the total educational program in the United States.

9. American Education has been significantly influenced by numerous popular educational movements. Child-study was unique in that it covered such a wide spread of subjects and activities. This was an explorative type of development. It seems to the writer that there is a definite need for a well organized, well planned, and democratically controlled educational organization or movement of the entire educational profession with its many diversified groups.
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APPENDIX

There were numerous states and foreign countries that contributed to the Child-study movement. By treating each state separately, an opportunity will be provided for an examination of the type of organization, the extent of the movement, and a glimpse of the leaders and their activities.

Massachusetts

This was the pioneer state in the Child-study movement so far as effective work and productivity were concerned. This state produced more valuable results than all the other states combined. As for organization the state failed.

It is possible that the same conservative spirit that opposed Horace Mann is now being expressed in the hearty applause given by the Boston Schoolmasters' Club upon hearing the disbelief statements of Professor Münsterberg.¹

The writer's own opinion, looking at the movement in 1944, leads him to the belief that the Child-study movement in Massachusetts was dominated by G. Stanley Hall and Clark University. Hall did not want a strong organization in Massachusetts because of the possibility of drawing the "baby" away from its home--Clark University.

¹Sara Wiltse, "History of Child-study", Pedagogical Seminary, pp. 189-218, Vol. III.
Child-study in Massachusetts was centralized at Clark University. Numerous studies and meetings were conducted by G. Stanley Hall and students working under his direction.

**California**

This state ranks next to Massachusetts in the amount and value of research in the field of Child-study. This was due to the cooperation of the schools and universities in the state and because of the dynamic leadership. The two most able leaders were Millicent W. Shinn and Earl Barnes. Shinn followed Freyer's work and studied, with copious notes, one child. She also published a number of interesting articles on various aspects of Child-study. Earl Barnes wrote on "Theological Life of California Children and Children's Drawings". He organized teachers' classes under the direction of boards of education in San Francisco, San Jose, Oakland, Stockton, Alameda, Santa Cruz, and Santa Rosa.

The Oakland Public School report of 1892-1893 shows that teachers were actively engaged in this work. During these years professor Barnes lectured in nearly every city in California. His plan was to outline a subject in a general meeting, and distribute syllabi. During the next few days the teachers collected papers, worked out their conclusions, and sent the papers to the superintendent's office. Barnes and his students worked over the material,
met with the teachers again, and discussed the results.

Other workers in California were Dr. Dresslar, Los Angeles, and professor Bailey, University of California.

**Illinois**

Child-study was very strong in this state and the organization resulting helped strengthen the movement in other states. The influence of Colonel F. W. Parker, head of Cook County Normal, was quite noted. He had a sympathetic and educational spirit and love of childhood. G. Stanley Hall's lectures in Springfield and Chicago gave the movement much momentum. Several of Hall's pupils worked diligently on the organization. Superintendent O. T. Bright organized the State Child-study Society and incorporated it under the laws of the state. Later the society was highly endorsed by the state superintendent of public instruction.

The Illinois society became a model for other state organizations. C. C. Van Liew, secretary of the Illinois Society, and Dr. Krohn, editor of the Child Study Monthly, were courageous and enthusiastic workers.

Prominent features of the Illinois society included local Child-study round tables in all parts of the state; visitations of schools and kindergartens by experts, such as Adolph Meyer; and the development of relations with physicians and parents. Both Kindergartens and Herbartians cooperated with the movement in Illinois.
John Dewey, Head of the department of Philosophy, University of Chicago, addressed a meeting of Child-study at Cook County Normal, May 13, 1896, on "The Interpretation Side of Child Study". He was active for several years in the Illinois movement.

Dr. Van Liew, secretary for the Illinois Society of Child-study reported over 1,500 members when the movement was at its height. This membership included forty to fifty members from Indiana, Michigan, New York, and practically all states in the United States, Canada, Scotland, South Africa, Japan, and India. In each of these states or countries the main leaders had membership in the Illinois society.

The first meeting of the Illinois Child-study Society was held at the Laboratory School of the University of Illinois, Champaign. Frances W. Parker was chosen president of the society. Three vice-presidents were chosen: Orville T. Bright; John W. Cook; and H. W. Everest. The executive committee included Dr. William Krohn; Professor H. H. Donaldson; professor C. A. Mc Murray; professor W. L. Bryan; Dr. Adolf Meyer; superintendent A. V. Greenman; Dr. Bayard Holmes. Later Haris Hallin, John Dewey, and Dr. Cornelia B. De Bey were added. C. H. Thurber, of Colgate University and editor of School Review, was the official representative of Child-study in New York state.¹

¹Child Study Monthly, pp. 29 ff., Vol. I.
William Krohn, editor of Child Study Monthly was a real supporter of the movement. Several of his reports are revealing:

......since July last the editor has given lectures on Child-study to over 10,000 teachers.1

......copies of Child Study Monthly are being sent to non-subscribers to see whether it is not just what they want. We want 10,000 new subscribers before the new year opens.......circulars of the Illinois Society of Child-study by C. C. Van Liey, secretary, have been published and the State Superintendent of Public Instruction has consented to distribute them.....the monthly has a clubbing list of twenty-three magazines. The list of magazines that can be secured at reduced cost by taking Child Study Monthly include: Atlantic Monthly, Education, Education Review, Forum, and others.2

Child-study Department of Chicago Schools

The plan and organisation for formulating a Child-study department in Chicago Public Schools was instituted by a board member Dr. W. S. Christopher. The board also established a laboratory for the study of children at the offices of the board in the Schiller Building. F. W. Smedley was placed in charge of the Child-study department.

The department carried on investigations in Chicago Schools collecting data relating to size, strength, endurance, motor ability, sight, hearing, and noted the abnormalities and


defective attitudes and movements of the pupils. The laboratory was established for the purpose of having a place where demonstrations could be given and the teachers and principals could study and work on Child-study.

During the year of 1900, 5,600 examinations were given in the Chicago Schools to children six to sixteen years of age. Seven tests were used: comparison of sexes—endurance; comparison of sexes for physical and intellectual capacity; physical factor in grading; small bright pupils; backward pupils; defects and classification; remedial defects and truants. W. S. Christopher, M.D., member of the board of education, recommended that all observations made be along the lines to lead quickly to results which could be applied to pedagogical work. He stressed the importance of continuing this work and making it a permanent feature of school work.1 Dr. Christopher read a paper on "Medical Inspection of Schools" at the National Education Association meeting, March, 1901, which received considerable attention and discussion.

The Chicago innovation received international attention. Director Emanuel Bahr of Vienna, in April 27, 1900, called attention to the Chicago report in his statement to Vienna officials:

......similar studies of children have been prosecuted in many places, but never before under the auspices of a board of a city or state as part of the system of education.2

1Ibid., p. 140.

2Ibid., p. 141.
Federation of Women's Clubs of Child-study

This organization began to work industriously in 1896. They issued circulars dealing with social problems as related to Child-study. Some of the problems they dealt with were: working children; pauper children; neglected and truant children; delinquent children; and the insane.

New York

In addition to the individual groups and the work of the state department, there was an official organization of Child-study in New York state. The society was organized in 1897 at a meeting of the New York State Teachers Association. The society organized as a bureau under President Dr. Griffith, superintendent of Utica and professor O'Shea of Buffalo University. Their purposes were to unite the scattered local agencies, to promote Child-study by establishing and fostering round-tables for parents and teachers, to distribute helpful literature, and to direct scientific studies relating to the national treatment of childhood from maturity to birth.

Reports for later meetings show substantial growth. In 1900 the third annual meeting was held at Thousand Island Park, New York. Three main points were stressed:

1. Membership. President John Nicholson had worked on membership and had extended it to the South Gulf of Mexico. Some members were registered beyond the Mississippi.
2. Holding general and local meetings to discuss the work of the society. Speakers used included Charles H. Judd, Edward L. Thorndike, Edward R. Shaw, and Walter L. Herney.

3. Leaflets and articles pertaining to Child-study were published.

Mrs. Harry Hastings and Mrs. Felix Adler (1889) had an organization for Child-study. This group followed Freyer's topics and met as a reading circle.

An Associate Alumnae of Normal College (1893) had a committee on Child-study. They collected data according to Hall's syllabi. Miss Jennie B. Merrill had been the chairman. Dr. Grozmann of Workingman's school was quite active.

The School of Pedagogy and Principal E. R. Shaw collected over 3,000 illustrations of children's handwriting.

In Brooklyn the Froebel Society, Progressive Education Club, the Mother's Class of Pratt Institute, the Reading Circle for the Study of Children's Literature, and two or three other associations did Child-study work.

New York was the only state where Child-study became a distinct department of the State Department of Education.

Charles R. Skinner reported:

...every well-considered state school system will give its attention to all influences which tend to the welfare of the individual as part of the state. It is not a fad or a chimera, but a well-grounded and intensely practical method of work.¹

¹Ibid., Vol.2, pp. 104 f.
Iowa

The Iowa Society for Child-study was organized in December, 1894. The state department of education gave its support. About sixty members were enrolled at this date. The work centered around three aspects of Child-study: testing eye and ear-mindedness; determining height and weight of children and studying temperament education.

Dr. Krohn, of the State University of Illinois and editor of Child Study Monthly, addressed the Iowa association in 1895. Over 1,000 were present. The following resolutions were passed:

1. The State Superintendent requested the County Superintendents to have the subject of Child-study taught in normal institutes.

2. Circular letters were to be addressed to the County Superintendents setting forth the need and importance of Child-study.

3. The society gave full authority to executive committee to publish the proceedings.

4. Secure the presentation of Child-study society, its work, scope, and merits, in the several sectional meetings of State Teachers Associations.

5. The executive committee was to provide a larger room for next year's meetings. Many were turned away.

6. Recognize the Child Study Monthly as a magazine worthy of hearty and loyal support.
Pennsylvania

The work centered around several educators. The most active were Dr. Lightner Witmer, lecturer on experimental psychology and Child-study; Sydney T. Skidmore; Dr. John M. Taylor; Samuel D. Risley; and Miss Mary S. Marot.

New Jersey

J. M. Baldwin made contributions to the Psychological Review on mental development in the child and race. Miss Lillie A. Williams, of Trenton Normal School, collected a great deal of data on Child-study. She reported 5,000 reports sent to Hall on his syllabi of 1896.1

Connecticut

Dr. E. W. Scripture, head of Yale Psycho-physical Laboratory, a former pupil of Hall's lectured widely in California, Maine, Massachusetts, and Connecticut on Child-study. He contributed many periodical articles. His pupil, J. A. Gilbert, worked on musical sensitiveness of children.

Michigan

H. R. Pattengill, Superintend of Public Instruction, supported the movement and established a committee to prepare a pamphlet of the "History of Child-study".

....."the department of publication of the state department of education stands ready to print and distribute the reports of the Child-study committee without charge"....2

Minnesota

Louis H. Galbreath, Winona Normal School and
secretary of the Minnesota Society of Child-study made
an interesting report for his state:

...charity is the word characterizing the work of
Child-study in our state. The work received its main
impetus from professor O'Shea. He left us and we have
tried to keep the work going in the spirit that he
started it. From the scientific point of view a few
individuals are making progress. Dr. Kiehle, head of
Pedagogy at State University, has undertaken to dem-
onstrate that teachers can, through examinations, learn
helpful things about the eye. Dr. Harlow Gale is
studying two of his own children. Mr. Kirkpatrick is
making some studies at Winona Normal. Miss Isabell
Low studies at Mankato Normal School on eye and ear
mindedness. Some principals and one county super-
intendent have been promoting Child-study in a system-
atic way—getting acquainted with the schools under
their own supervision. Three mother's clubs have been
organized at St. Paul; 2 in Minneapolis; 2 in Duluth; a
few others in the state at large.¹

Maine

In Farmington Normal School the playground was the
chief place of observation. Imitation and self-assertion
instinct received the greatest attention.

Indiana

W. L. Bryan, president of Child-study of the
National Education Association, 1894-95, of the Univer-
sity of Indiana and a pupil of Hall's has been one of the
main leaders. A. H. Yoder has collected several thousand
papers on children's vocabularies. John A. Bergstrom and

¹Ibid., p. 106-108.
E. E. Starbuck, Hall’s pupils also, have made important studies. Starbuck specialized on "Conversion and Psychology of Religion".

The state organization of Child-study began in 1896. W. L. Bryan indicated that:

Child-study was organized amid much enthusiasm and with energetic support. The main platform was inter-state cooperation.¹

**Missouri**

In 1881 Kansas City Schools repeated Hall’s Boston Questionnaire. Dr. W. T. Porter of St. Louis was quite active in the movement.

**Wisconsin**

Professor Jastrow of State University, a pupil of Hall’s, had worked on the "Blind" and had made many contributions. In 1881 G. W. Peckham had studied growth of Milwaukee children.

**South Carolina**

An association of Child-study was organized in 1894. Dr. Thomas P. Bailey, of Clark, was chairman of the association and had syllabi prepared for use by this organization.

**Colorado**

Child-study was organized as a part of the state teachers association and syllabi were issued in 1896. J. A. Hancock, superintendent of Durango, studied children’s drawings.

Ohio

Dr. Aikins, of Clark University, had studied moral ideas of children. Dr. Dowling collected over 1,000 cases on the eyesight of children.

Rhode Island

The training school for teachers, Pawtucket, Rhode Island, made some contributions to Child-study. Mary L. P. Shattuck of this institution was interested in the observation of pupils.

Nebraska

The organization for Child-study was completed in 1895 and was largely the work of Dr. H. K. Wolfe. The plans and purposes of the organization were quite similar to those of the Illinois Society. The Northwestern Journal of Education was adopted as the organ of the society. During the meeting of the Nebraska Teachers Association of this year over 500 persons found their greatest interest in the Child-study Round Table. This was double the attendance of other groups. Women's clubs were organized all over the state.

H. K. Wolfe, in 1890, published the returns of 23,000 papers on color vocabularies of children. The University of Nebraska offered two courses in Child-study each year. Professor Luckey was chairman of Pedagogy at Nebraska University.
Kansas

In 1896 the State Teachers Association devoted considerable time to Child-study. Superintendent George Kendrick of Junction City, President of the general meetings stated:

...among educators President G. Stanley Hall is justly entitled to the honor of being the leading spirit in America, and largely through the influence of his example and the contagion of his enthusiasm, the scientific study of childhood is receiving attention in nearly every state in the Union.¹

Oregon

Miss Agnes Stowell, Eastern State Normal, was doing Child-study work. The University of Oregon had a new journal that carried Child-study materials. Several important educators interested in the movement were: J. R. Jewell, H. D. Sheldon, Miss De Busk, and E. G. Conklin.

Alabama

Birmingham and Mobile reported some work in observing and recording of children's activities. Three papers were given in 1896 at the state association meeting: Mrs. Cunningham, arithmetic; Mr. Gilbert, discipline cases; Professor Van Wie, pupil observations.

Iowa

The Iowa Society of Child-study met in 1896 with over 200 members present at Des Moines. H. D. Kratz of Sioux City was president. Other leaders and workers included O. C. Scott, Askalooza; A. D. Cromwell, Humboldt; H. E. Seeley, of State Normal at Cedar Falls; Julia Hallam, Sioux City; and J. J. McCornell.

The meeting of 1897 was well attended and there was a pronounced interest shown in all of the papers and discussions as indicated by the reports:

......a noticeable feature of the meeting was the prominence given to the subject of parent meetings. All seem to realize the importance of bringing about closer relations between teachers and parents. Systematic instruction in Child-study was given in twenty counties during Normal Institute season on 1897. 1

Texas

Oscar Chrisman was notified by the president of the Texas State Teachers' Association that he was wanted to start a Child-study section for them in 1897. He reported:

There was quite a large attendance. A committee was appointed to work on organization and reported favorably to the general assembly. Thus Child-study started as a division of the Texas State Teachers' Association. 2

---

Child-study in Canada, Europe, and Great Britain

Reports on the development of Child-study for these countries are not complete or consecutive in their appearance. The best data the writer was able to secure were the reports of students traveling in Europe. Enough data have been collected to show the extent of the movement in Europe and to point out the main activities and leaders.

Canada

G. Stanley Hall visited Ontario in 1893 and addressed the educational association there. In 1892 Dr. A. F. Chamberlain studied at Clark University and made studies in Toronto. The Dominion and Ontario Associations met together in 1894 and papers on Child-study were read by Dr. Tracy of the University of Toronto and S. B. Sinclair of Ottawa Normal. Child-study section of Ontario Association was formed with Dr. Tracy as chairman.

Great Britain

The movement in Great Britain owes its inception and much of its progress to America. The inspiration which led to the founding of the British Child-study Association was given by G. Stanley Hall. Earl Barnes aided the movement considerably too.

In connection with the International Congress of Education held at the World's Fair at Chicago, in 1893, Great Britain sent eight women teachers representing various phases of education. During the congress Miss Clapperton and Miss Crees attended the Child-study section and came under the inspiring and enlightening
influence of Dr. G. Stanley Hall. Miss Louch also heard an address of Hall's and was inspired to attend his summer sessions at Clark. All three were so inspired with the need of Child-study and so enthusiastic in regard to it that they called a meeting, gained the sympathy and help of several prominent educators and, as a result of this meeting, the British Child-study Association was formed in Edinburgh, August, 1894.

The official organ of the British Child-study Association is the Psalmodist, founded in 1899 with Miss Louch as editor. Other editors were Dr. Fletcher Beach, T. G. Tibbey, and Sarah Young.

Leading educators who were presidents of the association were: James Sully, Henry Holman, H. M. Inspector, Dr. George Shuttleworth, Dr. Langdon Downe, Rev. J. C. Bevan, Dr. Fletcher Beach, Hon. Sir John Cockburn.

The method is to present each year a course of lectures by men and women recognized as authorities in the various phases of child life. These lectures are free to members and open to others interested on payment of a small fee (5d). Earl Barnes and Dr. Hall directed many individual studies published in England.

Circles or round tables were also instituted as a part of the work. Branches of Child-study were in London, Cheltenham, Newcastle, Derby, Manchester, Birmingham, Liverpool, West Kent.

Germany

Four or five centers of interest and activity in Child-study were reported just after 1900 by Will S. Monroe who was traveling in Europe and took careful notes on Child-study for the Pedagogical Seminary. He reported:

Jena has summer sessions devoted to Child-study. The students number between forty and fifty. Director Johann Truper outside of Jena stands for much that is best in the study of defective children.

Zeitschrift fur Kinderforchung, Organ of German Child-study Union, has 160 members and holds annual meetings at Jena.

---

1Kate Stevens, Pedagogical Seminary, Vol. 15, p.245, 1906.
Berlin has some work conducted by Karl Stumpf and Dr. Ferdinand Kemies. Their official organ for publication is the Zeitschrift fur Pädagogische Psychologie and Pathologie. There is a Berlin Union for child psychology.

Professor Hermann Schiller at Leipzig lectures every year on the psychology of childhood to a limited number of university students. Mr. Spitsmen, also at Leipzig, is doing considerable to arouse an interest in the study of children on the part of teachers and parents.¹

France

The movement in France was represented by a national society and several independent centers. The national society had its headquarters at Paris and was led by Ferdinand Buissou, professor of Pedagogy in the University of Paris. The work of Alfred Binet was noted at this time.

Switzerland

The department of psychology at Zurich did some work with Child-study. Flournoy at Geneva and Karl Groos at Basal made contributions to pathology and psychology.

Russia

Dr. Alex Netshaeff at St. Petersburg attracted national attention. He believed in the value of experimental psychology. He stressed the application of the results of psychology to the work of teaching.

Antwerp

A pedagogical laboratory was established with Dr. M. C. Schuyten, a trained psychologist, in charge.

¹Will S. Monroe, Pedagogical Seminary, Vol. 8, p. 244, 1901.
Danmark

Kristine Friedriksen represented Denmark at Chicago in 1893 and took the initiative to form a national society of Child-study in Denmark.

Norway

Thomas Parr of Bergen and Dr. Kristian Aars were the main leaders.

Bohemia

The summaries of American Studies by G. Stanley Hall, E. Harlow Russell, Frederick Burk and others were being translated into Czech for the use of Bohemian teachers. Later reports showed that the Bohemian movement grew rapidly. An Austrian Congress for the protection of children was held in Vienna in 1907. A Bohemian council was organized shortly after this and in the first few years of work supplied for 3,000 needy children. Membership was given as 324 and 120 of these were teachers.¹

Poland

The government forbade formation of any new associations in Poland up to 1906. The new constitution enabled new societies to form and the Polish Child-study Association was legalized and started. There was a membership of over

²Pedagogical Seminary, Vol. 20, p. 296, 1913.
eighty from Warsaw and the adjacent country. Their activities included: starting a reading room of periodicals for those interested in psychology and Child-study; printing questionnaires; organizing scientific meetings; collecting funds for an experimental laboratory. Hall's works were being translated.

In 1907-1908 seven meetings were held. The following year ten meetings were reported. Three studies were started in this year on Children's drawings, language, and mathematical concepts of children.

Reports in 1911 indicated that the society had grown to 300 members, consisting of teachers and psychologists, and its work was vigorous and hopeful. Gratitude was expressed to G. Stanley Hall, Theodate L. Smith, and Louis Wilson for assistance given.¹

Miscellaneous Reports

The writer was able to find a few scattered reports indicating that considerable correspondence was being carried on by G. Stanley Hall with students who had worked at Clark and with friends all over the world. Sara Wiltse reported that in 1897 replies were coming from Australia, Japan, South Africa, China, South America, North Africa, and elsewhere.²

¹Anna Grudzinska, Pedagogical Seminary, Vol's. 12, 19, pp. 97 ff.; pp.; 295ff.
Degrees Granted at Clark University

Many degrees were granted to individuals at Clark University who were workers in Child-study. The following are Doctors of Philosophy:

William L. Bryan, 1891-1893, Development of Voluntary Motor Ability

John A. Bergstrom, 1891-1894, An Experimental Study of Some of the Conditions of Mental Activity

Fletcher B. Dresslar, 1891-1892, Studies in The Psychology of Touch

Edwin D. Starbuck, 1895-1897, Some Aspects of Religious Growth

Frederic Burk, 1896-1898, From Fundamental to Accessory in the Development of the Nervous System and of Movements

Frederick E. Bolton, 1897-1898, Hydro-psychoses

Henry H. Goddard, 1898-1899, The Effects of Mind on Body as Evidenced By Faith Cures

Edmund B. Rusey, 1897-1899, The Psychology and Physiology of Reading

Henry Davidson Sheldon, 1897-1900, The History and Pedagogy of American Student Societies

Frederick Hby, 1898-1900, The Reconstruction of the Kindergarten

Edgar James Swift, Studies in the Psychology and Physiology of Learning, 1901-1903
Fred Kuhlmann, 1901-1905, Experimental Studies in Mental Deficiency

Lewis Madison Terman, 1905-1906, Genius and Stupidity: A Study of Some of the Intellectual Processes of Seven "Bright" and Seven "Stupid" Boys

Arnold Lucius Gesell, 1904-1905, Jealousy

James Ralph Jewell, 1905-1906, Agricultural Education, Including Nature Study and School Gardens

George Ordahl, 1906-1908, Rivalry; Its Genetic Development and Pedagogy

Howard W. Odum, 1908-1909, Religious Folk Songs of the Southern Negroes

Harry Woodburn Chase, 1909-1910, Psychoanalysis and the Unconscious


Edmund Smith Conklin, 1908-1911, The Pedagogy of College Ethics

Doctor Of Laws--Honoris Causa

The degree of Doctor of Laws, Honoris Causa, was conferred upon Henry Cabot Lodge; Sigmund Freud; Carl G. Jung; Adolf Meyer; William F. Osgood; William Stern; Edward Bradford Titchener; and Robert Williams Wood. These degrees were conferred from 1899-1909.