

Metaphysics in Educational Theory: Educational Philosophy and Teacher Training in England (1839-1944)

Abstract

Faculty of History
University of Oxford
Trinity, 2008
Ashley Rogers Berner

In 1839 the English Parliament first disbursed funds for the formal education of teachers. Between 1839 and the McNair Report in 1944 the institutional shape and the intellectual resources upon which teacher training rested changed profoundly. The centre of teacher training moved from theologically-based colleges to university departments of education; the primary source for understanding education shifted from theology to psychology. These changes altered the ways in which educators contemplated the nature of the child, the role of the teacher and the aim of education itself. This thesis probes such shifts within a variety of elite educational resources, but its major sources of material are ten training colleges of diverse types: Anglican, Nonconformist, Roman Catholic, and University.

The period covered by this thesis is divided into three broad blocks of time. During the first period (1839-1885) formal training occurred in religious colleges, and educators relied upon Biblical narratives to understand education. This first period also saw the birth of modern psychology, whose tools educators often deployed within a religious framework. The second period (1886-1920) witnessed the growth of university-based training colleges which were secular in nature and whose status surpassed that of the religious colleges. During this period, teacher training emphasized intellectual attainment over spiritual development. During the third period (1920-1944), teachers were taught to view education from the standpoint of psychological health. The teacher's goal was the well-developed personality of each child, and academic content served primarily not to impart knowledge but rather to inform the child's own creative drives. This educational project was construed in scientific and anti-metaphysical terms.

The replacement of a theological and metaphysical discourse by a psychological one amounts to a secular turn. However, this occurred neither mechanically nor inevitably. Colleges and theorists often seem to have been unaware of the implications of their emphases. This thesis contemplates explanatory models other than the secularisation thesis and raises important historical questions about institutional identity and the processes of secularisation.

Metaphysics in Educational Theory:
Educational Philosophy and Teacher Training in England (1839-1944)
Long Abstract
Ashley Rogers Berner

Introduction

In 1839 the English Parliament began to disburse funds for the formal education of teachers. Between this first grant and the McNair Report in 1944, both the institutional shape and the intellectual resources upon which formal teacher training rested changed profoundly. The centre of teacher training moved from residential, theologically-based colleges, to university departments of education. At the same time, the primary intellectual resources for understanding educational imperatives shifted from theology to psychology. This change altered the ways in which educators contemplated the primary concerns of educational philosophy: the nature of the child, the role of the teacher, the aim of education itself and the basis for authority in these matters. Emblematic of this change are two best-selling textbooks from opposite ends of our inquiry: John Gill's *Introductory Text Book to School Education, Method, and School Management*, which ran through 50,000 copies between 1857 and 1882, and Percy Nunn's *Education: Its Data and First Principles*, reprinted some twenty times between 1920 and 1945. Gill's work focused upon the spiritual, mental and physical nurture of the child who was located within the religious narrative of the New Testament; Nunn's attended to the psychological fulfilment of each individual school child, who appeared within a Darwinian narrative of instinct and survival.

This thesis probes evidences of the theoretical shift by examining elite educational resources such as major educational journals, prominent textbooks, and Board of Education

publications. Its major sources of material, however, are the training colleges themselves, whose archives present most clearly how teachers were trained to think about their craft. The records of ten training colleges of diverse type provided a wide theoretical window: Anglican Diocesan Training Colleges (Fishponds and Culham); an Anglican evangelical college (Cheltenham); three Nonconformist colleges (Westminster, Borough Road, and Stockwell); two Roman Catholic colleges (St. Mary's and La Sainte Union); and two University Day Training Colleges (Oxford and London). Lecture notes, syllabuses, examinations, the external writings of instructors, and recommended reading lists offer compelling insights into the educational theory into which teachers were initiated. The thesis focuses upon academic educational philosophy not because extra-mural theories of education did not exist (they did) nor because academic philosophy guided legislative policy single-handedly (it most certainly did not), but rather because academic philosophy represents the dominant model of education in which teachers were trained.

Despite ideological differentiations between colleges, their records reveal a remarkably symmetrical trajectory, which was towards biological and psychological categories and away from metaphysics altogether. By the Second World War, educators were taught to be more concerned about avoiding neuroses and sponsoring pupils' individuality (psychological well-being), than about imparting information (academic training) or transmitting wisdom (spiritual life).

These changes did not occur overnight, nor were they straightforward. It would be best to think of them as shifts in dominance or emphasis. Therefore, the period covered by the thesis is divided into three porous yet broadly coherent blocks of time which can be characterized as follows:

The First Period

The first period (1839-1885) traces the early development of the confessional training colleges, their funding by the State, and their reliance upon Biblical narratives to understand the child and the purpose of education. David Stow's work and that of his star pupil, John Gill, exemplify the period. An excellent statement of the prevailing ontology can be found in Gill's comment: 'In the child's mind there is the image of Deity defaced...and education...is to be employed to restore it. Hence [education] embraces both time and eternity.'

This first period also witnessed the birth pangs of modern psychology as it became a distinct intellectual specialism. Early English psychology had developed within competitive and often religious metaphysical systems. By the middle of the nineteenth century, it began to sever itself from metaphysical concepts. Prominent intellectual leaders such as logician Alexander Bain and sociologist Herbert Spencer insisted that education, too, shed its metaphysical trappings and become a 'true science'. Bain helped to found *The Journal of Education* in 1880, which mirrored his views as they became more prominent. The dominant educational philosophy of the training colleges, however, remained religious.

The Second Period

The second period (1886-1920) witnessed the growth of university-based training colleges which were secular in nature and which assumed greater intellectual authority than the religious colleges. At the same time, as the English school system expanded to embrace a wider spectrum of children, teacher training began to emphasize intellectual attainment over spiritual development. Schools were still infused with a religious spirit, but educational theory itself

became detached from theology and philosophy. A new specialist was born: the educational psychologist, who referenced the work of laboratories and talked about the conditions for intellectual growth. Although there continued to be some debate about the nature of the child, the focus of teacher training was on how best to educate him. The work of Continental philosophers and nascent psychological laboratories bolstered this endeavour. This emphasis was propagated by the country's most prominent educationalists: John Adams, Percy Nunn, and Cyril Burt, all from the London Day Training College, which was affiliated to the University of London and exerted a disproportionately large control over educational philosophy across the country.

The Third Period

Throughout the second period psychology was used to support intellectual attainment. During the third period (1920-1944), it was used to underwrite a different emphasis: that of developing individual personality. This tendency had been articulated by William McDougall and Sigmund Freud in the first decade of the twentieth century; it had been incubated in the University of London. In the publication of Percy Nunn's *Education* (1920) it found its voice. During the following decades educational philosophy came to reflect almost exclusively the psychological cast of mind propounded by Nunn and his colleagues. Religious training college curricula, dominant textbooks, prestigious journals, and Board of Education pamphlets addressed education from the standpoint of psychological health, not of academic achievement and certainly not of religious life. The chief concern of the teacher was to be the well-developed personality of each child, and academic content served not to impart valuable knowledge but rather to inform the individual child's own creative drives. This educational project and its

story-telling were constructed in scientific and anti-metaphysical terms. With the notable exception of Roman Catholic training colleges, there was no obvious difference in outlook between the religious and secular training colleges. For instance, a major textbook by J.S. Ross narrated the entire history of English education without reference to its theological backdrop. Though he presided over a Wesleyan College, Ross's anthropology was completely naturalistic: the child for him consisted of instinct and desire, and education's *telos* was the individual child's ability to integrate these drives into a social and distinct personality. Institutionally, the Board of Education ceded its administrative work to the universities, which reinforced the authority of the university *vis a vis* the less prestigious religious colleges. Although the Butler Act required religious education in local schools, the philosophy of education in centres of higher learning had completely abandoned religious concepts.

Analysis

The replacement of a theological and metaphysical discourse by a psychological one amounts to a secular turn, a process which was most striking within religious training colleges. One might have expected there to have been at least a re-framing of psychological theories, but only the Roman Catholic institutions gave evidence of engaging competing ontologies. At St Mary's Training College, for instance, McDougall's stance was framed by reference to Papal writings on education and seasoned with talk of 'the soul' and the spiritual mandate of the teacher. In other colleges students dutifully reiterated McDougall's stance, at times verbatim, in the 1930s and 1940s. The question is why this occurred.

This thesis suggests that, *pace* the secularisation thesis, the secular turn within educational philosophy occurred neither mechanically nor inevitably. Rather, it resulted from

the long-term agenda of anti-metaphysicians; the hard work and motivations of the close-knit educational psychologists (particularly those in London); and finally, and perhaps to a large degree unintentionally, from the search for status on the part of the religious training colleges. In affiliating with the universities intellectually and then administratively, the colleges sought relevance. In importing the thought-world of the University of London, however, the colleges risked losing their distinctive understanding of the human person, the teacher, and education itself. Although it is far from clear that the colleges saw this at the time, evidence suggests that the religious training colleges did in fact sacrifice their particularity. In the 1930s, when confessional colleges faced closure due to lack of government funds, they grounded their defence on their similarity with secular institutions, not upon their distinctiveness. In the 1940s and 1950s, one can peruse the syllabuses of Anglican, Wesleyan and secular institutions and find not one significant difference. Educational theory had become monochromatic.

This thesis offers, then, a rigorous examination of the dominant philosophy within teacher training institutions over a hundred-year period. In examining intellectual shifts within these colleges, the thesis raises important historical questions about institutional identity and the process of secularisation.

Metaphysics in Educational Theory:
Educational Philosophy and Teacher Training in England
(1839-1944)

Ashley Rogers Berner

Submitted to the University of Oxford
Faculty of History
D.Phil Thesis
Trinity Term, 2008



Table of Contents

| | |
|--|-----|
| Acknowledgements | i |
| Chapter I Introduction..... | 1 |
| 1.1 Core Thesis..... | 3 |
| 1.2 Interpretive Framework..... | 11 |
| 1.3 Organisation of Material..... | 24 |
| 1.4 The Development of Psychology..... | 31 |
| 1.5 The Vocabulary..... | 38 |
| 1.6 Primary Resources..... | 44 |
| Chapter II Institutional History..... | 48 |
| 2.1 Teacher Training: Overview..... | 50 |
| 2.2 Anglican Institutions..... | 59 |
| 2.3 Nonconformist Institutions..... | 69 |
| 2.4 Roman Catholic Institutions..... | 75 |
| 2.5 University Day Training Colleges..... | 83 |
| 2.6 Training Colleges: Summary..... | 94 |
| Chapter III First Period (1839-1885)..... | 96 |
| 3.1 Survey of Relevant Educational Events and Institutions..... | 96 |
| 3.2 Survey of Psychology: Majority and Minority Views..... | 101 |
| 3.3 Training Colleges and their Textbooks..... | 115 |
| 3.4 Training Colleges: Other Internal Documents and Data..... | 123 |
| 3.5 Board of Education Documents..... | 128 |
| 3.6 Prominent Journals..... | 132 |
| 3.7 Summary..... | 141 |
| Chapter IV Second Period (1886-1920)..... | 142 |
| 4.1 Survey of Institutional Atmosphere..... | 147 |
| 4.2 Survey of Relevant Educational Currents..... | 158 |
| 4.3 Religious Training Colleges: Books, Curriculum, Artifacts..... | 174 |
| 4.4 London and Oxford Day Training Colleges..... | 190 |
| 4.5 Board of Education Documents..... | 211 |
| 4.6 Prominent Journals..... | 215 |
| 4.7 Summary of Instrumentary Instruction..... | 224 |
| Chapter V Third Period (1921-1944)..... | 226 |
| 5.1 Institutional and Historical Factors..... | 227 |
| 5.2 Survey of Relevant Educational Currents..... | 234 |
| 5.3 University Training Departments..... | 236 |
| 5.4 Nonconformist Training Colleges..... | 249 |
| 5.5 Anglican Training Colleges..... | 263 |
| 5.6 Roman Catholic Training Colleges..... | 272 |
| 5.7 Influence of the Board of Education..... | 280 |

| | | |
|-------------------|---|------------|
| 5.8 | Prominent Journals..... | 285 |
| 5.9 | Summary of Psychological Education..... | 290 |
| Chapter VI | Post-War Trends and Final Conclusions..... | 291 |
| 6.1 | Post-War Direction..... | 291 |
| 6.2 | Academic and Public Educational Theory..... | 297 |
| 6.3 | Why?..... | 301 |
| 6.4 | The Question of Success..... | 314 |
| 6.5 | Conclusions..... | 317 |
| | Appendices..... | 319 |
| | Bibliography..... | 324 |

Acknowledgements

There are many people without whom this thesis would never have happened. From the beginning until the end, two scholars have stood beside me as friends and mentors: James Davison Hunter at the University of Virginia and Jane Garnett at the University of Oxford. Both had confidence in my work, encouraged me to undertake doctoral research and continued to guide my project. Dr. Hunter's Institute for Advanced Studies in Culture awarded me a dissertation fellowship without which the years in Oxford would have been substantially more difficult. Dr. Garnett, despite a strenuous schedule as Wadham College's Senior Tutor, spent precious hours meticulously critiquing my work. She provided not only academic but also personal support and encouragement, and my admiration for her in every respect could not be greater.

I would also like to thank the archivists who made the research such a joy. From Caroline McIntosh who introduced me to the Cheltenham College archives, to Dr Peter Forsaith whose highly-organised collection at Westminster College proved so helpful, to the sisters at La Sainte Union who welcomed me into the family during my stay – the personal side has been a pleasure.

Besides the Institute for Advanced Studies in Culture at the University of Virginia, four other institutions supported my work and deserve great thanks. St Hilda's College granted me the Bielby Graduate Fellowship two years in a row, and the University of Oxford extended a Hardship Grant when it was most needed. The Culham Institute sponsored my research for two years, the St Luke's Foundation for one. The enthusiasm with which the directors of these centres engaged my work was gratifying and helped to sharpen my thinking as the work progressed.

Finally, words could never express the appreciation I owe my family. My mother and father, Angeline and Bill Eckbert, supported my daughters and me emotionally, financially, and spiritually, and at great cost to themselves, throughout the years we spent in Oxford. My brother and sister-in-law, Betsy and John Eckbert, flew across the Atlantic many times to be present with us in good times and in bad. My dear husband Mark, who came into our lives at the end of our stay, has provided immeasurable nurture, support, critique and inspiration. Finally, to my precious daughters, Abigail and Hopewell: being your mother is the greatest honor I could ever receive. Thank you all.

Metaphysics in Educational Theory: Educational Philosophy and Teacher Training in England (1839-1944)

Chapter I: Introduction

There are numerous motivations and justifications for the formal education of children, and there are equally numerous types of training into which children may be inducted. A society might think about education as a political palliative, a social equalizer or a religious imperative; the classroom's content might be classical, technological or scientific. At its heart, the form and content of what a society sanctions as its education rest upon certain assumptions, implicit or explicit, about the nature of the human person. Changes in how societies construe the human person, then, result in changed educational structures. At the same time, the very institutional structure of education bears upon its content; when the source of educational authority changes, educational expectations and ontological assumptions change as well.

This thesis explores such themes in the context of England's teacher training colleges in the nineteenth and early twentieth centuries. While dominant educational theories are found in newspapers, journals, parliamentary policies and the dictates of the Board of Education, it is teachers, not newspapers, which have quotidian contact with children and which carry educational theories into practice. Thus, the theoretical assumptions in their training need to be identified and analysed.

This thesis addresses areas which have not been fully explored. The history of educational thought has been well-surveyed, in particular by R.J.W. Selleck, whose *The New Education: 1870-1914* (1968) and *English Primary Education and the Progressives, 1914-1939* (1972) discussed the vast spectrum of pedagogical approaches which were debated during this period.¹ This thesis charts new territory, however, by analyzing the underlying trends within theoretical approaches to education as they were developed and propagated within the training colleges. It also challenges some of the emphases within Selleck's narrative, which reflected the assumptions of the period in which he was writing (see page 144). This thesis is also distinctive in relation to other more recent studies of twentieth-century psychology, such as those by Adrian Wooldridge and Mathew Thomson (see pages 145 and 146). Wooldridge's work is extremely helpful in charting the activities and influence of the professional psychologists who clustered around the University of London. However, because he limited his discussion to their professional and political aims, he did not consider the metaphysical aspects of their work, an omission which this thesis addresses.² It also draws upon Thomson's exploration of the popularity of a non-elite psychology in the early twentieth century to consider why training colleges and their students did not draw sharper lines between theological and psychological ontologies.³ However, Thomson, who otherwise emphasizes the (often implicit) ontological aspects of twentieth-century psychology, neglects to highlight normative concerns when it comes to education. This is partly because Thomson's narrative commences in the twentieth century and therefore omits psychology's important nineteenth-century developments, and also because

¹ R.J.W. Selleck, *The New Education: 1870-1914* (London: Sir Isaac Pitman and Sons, 1968), and R.J.W. Selleck, *English Primary Education and the Progressives, 1914-1939* (London: Routledge and Kegan Paul, 1972).

² Adrian Wooldridge, *Measuring the Mind: Education and Psychology in England, C. 1860-C.1990* (Cambridge: Cambridge University Press, 1994).

³ Mathew Thomson, *Psychological Subjects: Identity, Culture, and Health in Twentieth-Century Britain* (Oxford: Oxford University Press, 2006).

Thomson limits his discussion of educational psychology to mental testing and child guidance; the thesis attempts to expand the discussion on both fronts.

The introduction consists of six sections. The first four sections concern the research itself: the core arguments of the thesis, the vocabulary which it employs, the organisation of material, and the sources upon which it draws. The last two sections concern the analysis embedded within the thesis: historical frameworks and sociological theories, the scope which the thesis addresses, and areas in which further research stands to bear fruit.

1.1 The Core Thesis

This thesis argues that between the first parliamentary grant to teacher education (1839) and the McNair Report (1944) which advised placing the training of teachers under university control, educational leaders in England changed the way in which they viewed the project of education itself, the nature of the child, the purpose of the teacher, and the authoritative sources for their craft. Although these changes may be seen in many quadrants, this thesis examines those which occurred in institutions for teacher training. At its inception, formal teacher training employed religious justifications for education and Biblical understandings of the human person, and the institutions which trained teachers were confessional communities. By the Second World War, both the structures themselves and the expectations of educational elites had been re-configured. Education, for these elites, had ceased to be primarily a religious endeavour or indeed primarily an intellectual endeavour: it had become primarily a psychological endeavour which strove to sponsor each child's individual personality and individual pursuits. As such, it drew upon a psychological anthropology which told particular stories about human beings, their needs and their purposes. Many educational theorists and policy-makers attempted to locate this

work within an explicitly anti-metaphysical stance, which they associated with the natural sciences.

This turn towards a scientific psychology was transmitted by the new profession of educational psychologists, often associated with University Day Training Colleges and largely centred on the University of London, to teachers in training across the country. The vehicles for transmission included prominent textbooks, educational journals for both elite and popular consumption, lectures and examinations. The most direct transmission was personal: men and women who trained at elite institutions then became lecturers at the provincial, generally religious, training colleges, and brought with them cutting-edge educational psychology. The training colleges participated eagerly in this cycle, not only because they were hungry for the prestige associated with the universities, but because, by the mid-1920s, the universities had become the examining institutions for the colleges and as such dominated academic educational thought. One of the consequences of this administrative and social nexus was that the training colleges became less distinctive: the theological resources which had inspired their early years lay silent and unused in the face of William McDougall's views of moral development, Susan Isaacs' use of Freud to explain classroom behaviour, or Percy Nunn's exposition of pupil individuality. It was not merely that naturalistic and credal theories stood side-by-side, or that certain psychological tools were employed in an otherwise metaphysically rigorous regime, be it utilitarian or idealist; rather, with the notable exception of Roman Catholic colleges, teacher training colleges imported wholesale the agenda of educational psychologists. This new agenda did not merely give divergent answers to timeless questions; it asked entirely different questions and concerned itself with an entirely different educational product.

This change in the framing of educational theory might seem a straightforward process toward secularisation, a concept associated with the vacating of theological categories and the diminution of religious institutions. However, it was anything but straightforward, and should not be construed as necessarily or intentionally secular. Certainly, adamant advocates for a secular classroom existed at both the elite and the popular levels, and their work certainly made a difference in educational theory, as this thesis will explain. But these men and women formed a minority, nor were their projects always successful. In the majority of cases, the naturalistic framework came into education as the unintentional consequence of an appeal to science, which was the mantle with which psychology wrapped itself. Instructors at religious training colleges seemed to have believed that psychology offered both authoritative substance and professional status to the practice of education. With the exception of Roman Catholic college instructors, they seem not to have plumbed possible conflicts between confessional and psychological understandings of human nature and *telos*. Thus the history of the discourse and sanction of psychology is as important to this thesis as the history of educational institutions themselves, and theories about secularisation as important as careful chronology and historical accuracy.

The intellectual shifts in elite educational theory between periods become vivid when we examine prominent textbooks themselves. Chapters III, IV and V consider textbooks from consecutive periods in turn. However, two best-selling textbooks, one from each end of our time frame, clearly demonstrate the nature, extent, and location of theoretical change; to these two we turn by way of summary.

‘My thanks are tendered to professors of education in this country, the United States, the Dominions, Australia, New Zealand, Africa, and India for its use as a text book in colleges and

to school boards for its adoption for their pupil-teachers.’⁴ So reads the introduction to the 1882 edition of John Gill’s *Introductory Text Book to School Education, Method, and School Management*, first published in 1857. This training book for teachers ran through 50,000 copies between 1857 and 1882 and remained influential throughout that time period.⁵ According to one historian of education, Gill’s work was the ‘standard manual of method and of educational ideas which formed the professional reading of elementary school teachers, not only in Great Britain but in the colonies’,⁶ throughout the second half of the nineteenth century. Gill himself taught at the Cheltenham Training College, which was evangelical, Anglican, and funded by the State. Sir T. Percy Nunn’s *Education: Its Data and First Principles* (1920) enjoyed a similar presence in a later age. Between 1920 and 1945 the book was printed some twenty times and ‘was designed for teachers and students in training’⁷ It was, wrote R.J.W. Selleck, ‘certainly the book teachers were most likely to have read’.⁸ Nunn and his colleague John Adams were the leading theorists at the London Day Training College, which was an appendage of the University of London and the most influential teacher training college in the country. Together Nunn and his colleagues championed the shift from a theological to a psychological approach to education.⁹ When we compare John Gill and Percy Nunn we find we are entering two different worlds. In fact, it would be hard to imagine two more distinct views of human nature, destiny and purpose, and therefore of education.

⁴ John Gill, *Introductory Text Book to School Education, Method, and School Management: A Treatise on the Principles, Aims, and Instruments of Primary Education* (London: Longmans, Green & Co., 1882), p. vi.

⁵ Charles More, *The Training of Teachers, 1847-1947: A History of the Church Colleges at Cheltenham* (London: The Hambledon Press, 1992), p. 71.

⁶ John William Adamson, *English Education 1789-1902* (Cambridge: Cambridge University Press, 1930), p. 136.

⁷ George Z.F. Bereday and Joseph A. Lauwerys, *The Education and Training of Teachers* (The Year Book of Education; New York: Evans Brothers, 1963), p. 91.

⁸ Selleck, *English Primary Education and the Progressives, 1914-1939*, p. 121.

⁹ Adrian Wooldridge, ‘Child Study and Educational Psychology in England, 1880-1950’, (Oxford University D. Phil Thesis, 1985).

Gill's view of the child emanated from a Biblical anthropology. The child's body, mind, and will, were inextricably related, and 'there must be no vain attempt to separate them. As a matter of fact it cannot be done'.¹⁰ Education must nurture the *whole* child. Gill said that the child was 'a temple in ruins, which it is the aim of education to remodel in all its pristine beauty'.¹¹ 'In the child's mind', he wrote, 'there is the image of Deity defaced...and education...is to be employed to restore it. Hence [education] embraces both time and eternity.'¹² Gill's ontology was, again, informed by theological narrative: humans fell from grace, and educationalists participated in the divine plan of restoration. 'The mind,' he said, 'is not indifferent; it has a tendency to evil'¹³ But instruction alone could not provide the remedy: 'Instruction alone makes neither good nor bad'¹⁴ Although he considered the cultivation of moral intelligence to be 'the highest aim of the teacher', Gill stated that only the holy spirit could regenerate a human being.¹⁵ Thus, Gill's educational theory carried with it both an exhortation (education was potentially redemptive) and a limitation (education was inherently circumscribed by human nature and free will).

Second, Gill's theory reflected a universally-applicable vision of 'the good life' Education was not merely instrumental but substantive: it aimed at training young people for a particular kind of life. In perhaps the most important passage in his textbook, Gill wrote:

As its special work, [the school] has to furnish those instruments of culture, that intellectual discipline, and those habits of strenuous labour, necessary to the pupil's advancement in intelligence, which will open to him higher sources of enjoyment than such as are merely animal and which will fit him for a faithful and intelligent discharge of the duties which will await him in the future.¹⁶

¹⁰ Gill, *Introductory Text Book to School Education, Method, and School Management: A Treatise on the Principles, Aims, and Instruments of Primary Education*, p. 8.

¹¹ *Ibid.*, p. 1.

¹² *Ibid.*

¹³ *Ibid.*, p. 12.

¹⁴ *Ibid.*, p. 32.

¹⁵ *Ibid.*, p. 33, p. 290.

¹⁶ *Ibid.*, p. 19.

Gill talked openly about the non-negotiable aims of the classroom: ‘the mind must be preoccupied with thoughts and principles that are true, beautiful, and good’¹⁷ His notions of the true, beautiful, and good, came from the Bible, ‘a book,’ he wrote, ‘whose aim is to bring man back to God; it exhibits a plan whereby he might be saved; it points him to a Saviour’¹⁸

Third, the teacher’s job was to lead the child into rightly-ordered pleasures, socially-negotiated duty, and moral behaviour. This he should achieve by personal example, and by a classroom filled with wonder, not drudgery. Gill wanted his teachers to captivate the children’s imagination. Time after time, as he commented upon subject after subject, he urged against rote, against ‘dry facts,’ against abstractions, and towards imagination. With mathematics: ‘Mere rote and rule methods require no mental effort from the teacher. They will be fruitless with the learner.’¹⁹ With grammar: Use whole sentences, but not rote repetition. With geography: stimulate imagination with ‘scenery, costumes, natural objects...not words’.²⁰ And more strongly: ‘The teacher...will be tempted to resort to the plan of giving dry facts. But he must resist this temptation.’²¹ With English history: Do not require long lists of dates but rather,

Select topics which appeal to his sympathies. These will not be found in a history of kings and their deeds, but in a history of the people. How they lived, in what houses, on what food, by what employments. How they dressed, indoor and outdoor life, and popular games. The relations between the classes of the community, modes of salutations, relations of employers and employed, trade guilds and clubs.²²

Gill wanted his teachers to stimulate curiosity that each pupil might in turn become ‘a self-educationalist’²³ He had all kinds of instructions for the teacher, but the final goal of pedagogy

¹⁷ Ibid., pp. 11-12.

¹⁸ Ibid., p. 290.

¹⁹ Ibid., p. 249.

²⁰ Ibid., p. 269.

²¹ Ibid., p. 273.

²² Ibid., p. 279.

²³ Ibid., p. 18.

was to direct the child into the right kind of life and the right approach to the ongoing process of learning.

Percy Nunn wrote after the First World War. In reading his textbook one is forcefully struck by three things, each in its own way and all three together signifying a departure from the self-consciously metaphysically-ordered world of Gill. First, Nunn renounced the concept of an explicit *telos* to which education was to be directed. 'There can be no universal aim of education if that aim is to include the assertion of any particular ideal of life...Educational efforts must...be limited to securing for everyone the conditions under which Individuality is most completely developed.'²⁴ That is, the classroom must not aim at something universal, such as ethics or character or learning or citizenship or godliness. It must only permit each individual the maximum opportunity to develop as he or she chose.

Second, Nunn resisted the idea that it was the role of the teacher to give moral guidance between competing claims about the good life. While he wanted education to urge the individual towards 'loves', he was unwilling to state which loves ought to be encouraged. Rather, human morality might only be judged by the degree to which it welcomed individual 'expressiveness' He wanted an individual's definition of 'good' to be in accordance with 'universal good',²⁵ but he had conveniently denied access to any universal principles save for individual self-discovery. Even appealing to an amorphous 'social good' would not do:

We have to recognize the absolute impossibility of assessing the social consequences of our most momentous decisions...we find it impossible to judge conduct, in general, by any external criterion, and have to fall back upon the principle that human lives, like works of art, must be judged by their expressiveness.²⁶

²⁴ T. Percy Nunn, *Education: Its Data and First Principles* (London: Edward Arnold, 1920), p. 5.

²⁵ *Ibid.*, p. 191.

²⁶ *Ibid.*, p. 197.

These words continued to appear through the editions of the 1940s. Education existed, he thought, to sponsor individuality. But what was the individual? Unlike Gill's classical understanding of the human being as an inseparable body-mind-spirit organism, Nunn's 'self' was a post-Freudian mystery of mellifluous drives, racial recapitulation, conations, and complexes, sometimes impenetrable except in dreams.

As Freud has shown, there is one region of the mental life of everyone where the symbolic activity of buried complexes is not an exceptional incident but an essential and universal gesture – namely, the region occupied by dreams.²⁷

For Nunn, the self was neither universal nor given but made. Children at play were 'experimenting in self-building', which was 'a process in which the impulses that have their roots in instinct and appetite become organised into a permanent hormic [conative] system, wielding imperial authority within the organism'.²⁸ The self was made, not given, in a constant process of change, which had some predictability (all children were driven by instinct, for example), but took shape only in the context of mysterious and unfathomable experiences and choices; the 'self' which resulted could neither be predicted nor judged. For Nunn, then, not only did questions of ultimate meaning remain impenetrable, but in like manner even interior life remained veiled.

Third, Nunn reconceptualised the authority of the teacher in the classroom. A teacher must not claim to be wiser than his pupils but must, rather, foster a 'community of feeling' between himself and them. Certainly a teacher would be powerful in shaping classroom discussions. However, rather than controlling or prescribing, a teacher must seek to 'put his own experiences into the common stock'²⁹ Nunn did not reject the contents of the traditional curriculum, but rather re-framed them. Whereas Gill's model conceived of the classroom as

²⁷ *Ibid.*, p. 50.

²⁸ *Ibid.*, p. 142.

²⁹ *Ibid.*, p. 128.

providing experiences and insights into ‘the good life’, in Nunn’s the same ‘solid tissue of civilisation’ (science, art, literature, maths) bestowed examples of individual creativity and different ways of configuring human life.³⁰ Intellectual content itself served to sponsor individual expression. Whereas Gill elaborated on classroom management and the problem of the bored or recalcitrant scholar, Nunn did not anticipate any such difficulties. Because ‘a normal child’s appetite is as varied as it is vigorous’, he wrote, ‘he can rarely resist the impulse to emulate another’s exploits. Thus it is not often difficult to make him take his intellectual meals, provided the fare is properly chosen and attractively set out.’³¹ According to Nunn, apathy or misbehaviour simply need not exist.

A brief comparison of these two textbooks indicates that the most prominent educationalist of 1857-1882 configured theory around traditional theological concepts, whereas the most prominent educationalist of 1920-1945 putatively eschewed metaphysics altogether. These radically different starting points led to very different expectations about the classroom, the teacher, and the child. The truly arresting aspect of Nunn’s approach is that from the 1920s it dominated the landscape of teacher training programmes, even those with religious foundations. His books, along with those of his friends and companions (J.S. Ross, John Adams, John Adamson, all associated with the University of London), formed the core curriculum of teacher training. How and why this happened will be explored in Chapter VI.

1.2 Interpretive Framework

It is one thing to be able to chart changes in educational theory, but how are we to understand those changes? What is the relationship between the educational theories surveyed

³⁰ *Ibid.*, p. 211.

³¹ *Ibid.*, p. 217.

here, and general social patterns of religiosity and secularisation? How are we to understand the importance of institutional identity within social change? What significance does the analysis of the training colleges and their educational theories have for twenty-first century historiography? This thesis submits that, as the analytical strategies of the twentieth century are being re-considered, a careful study of English training colleges stands to make a significant contribution towards the newer models of social change which are even now being developed.

Until the late twentieth century, educational history displayed three tendencies, all of which are now contested: a progressivist approach which focused in congratulatory fashion on administrative rationalization; a class-based understanding of social change which interpreted educational change in light of ruling class interest; and a conceptual framework which assumed the constant and inevitable move of society towards secularisation ('the secularisation thesis'). These three positions were distinct but nevertheless worked together to reinforce the anti-metaphysical stance which happened to be characteristic of progressive educational philosophy itself. In the first instance, prominent historians – often themselves educationalists - trumpeted changes in educational theory as the inevitable and beneficial consequence of the march of science and technology.³² As educational theory shed its dependence upon metaphysics and leaned ever more heavily upon a form of psychological scientism, only one prominent writer objected to the neglect of teleology.³³ When educational histories examined administrative development they tended to portray the centralization of authority as universally beneficial and did not contemplate what might have been lost in the process. John Hurt's *Education as Evolution* (1972), for instance, portrayed the Board of Education's civil servants as the real

³² John Adams, *Modern Developments in Educational Practice* (London: University of London Press, 1922), R.W. Rich, *The Training of Teachers in England and Wales During the 19th Century* (London: Cambridge University Press, 1933).

³³ Adamson, *English Education 1789-1902*.

heroes of education for rationalizing an otherwise 'chaotic' system, as did E.J.R. Eaglesham's *Foundations of Twentieth-Century Education in England* (1967).³⁴

In the second instance, educational histories adopted class-based theories which ranged from simplistic notions of 'social control' to the more sophisticated 'segmentation and social reproduction' of French sociologist Pierre Bourdieu. Bourdieu postulated that social change occurred at the behest of the elite classes for their own behalf, and in a way which mirrored, or reproduced, existing social and power structures. This hermeneutic informed the educational histories of Detlef Mueller, Fritz Ringer, and Brian Simon, whose work is drawn together in *The Rise of the Modern Educational System: Structural Change and Social Reproduction 1870-1920* (1987). Mueller wrote in the introduction that despite dissimilarities in 'specific institutional forms', the educational systems in England, France, and Germany produced 'similar social effects: in all three nations the processes...resulted in hierarchical systems of education that tended to reproduce and to fortify the class and status structures of society'³⁵ Mueller saw in the divergence of educational curricula 'segmentation, or a division of educational systems into parallel...tracks, which differ both in their curricula and in the social origins of their pupils'.³⁶ He called the entire process 'a conflict-ridden exercise in social demarcation'³⁷ Mueller's analysis assumed that across Europe elites chose a classical education for their sons and a vocational one for underlings.

Phillip McCann, at the social control end of the spectrum (whose arguments in the English context commentators such as Brian Simon were attempting to nuance), believed that the

³⁴ E.J.R. Eaglesham, *The Foundations of Twentieth-Century Education in England* (Students Library of Education; London: Routledge and Kegan Paul, 1967), John Hurt, *Education in Evolution* (second edn.: London: Paladin, 1972).

³⁵ Detlef K. Mueller, 'Introduction', in Franz Ringer Detlef K. Mueller, Brian Simon (ed.), *The Rise of the Modern Educational System: Structural Change and Social Reproduction 1870-1920* (Cambridge: Cambridge University Press, 1987), p. xiii.

³⁶ *Ibid.*, p. 7.

³⁷ *Ibid.*, p. 6.

negotiators of English education aimed simply at the quietude of the masses. ‘The close connection between education and charity in Spitalfields had one unfortunate result’, he wrote: ‘it led to the engrafting on popular education, from the very beginning, of the strong element of social control inherent in the operations of private charity’.³⁸ To make the point more explicit, he argued that ‘the Anglican catechism, the product of a patriarchal age, extended the child’s consciousness of filial authority in the home to the political and social order’.³⁹ In the same volume, Simon Frith, a sociologist at the University of Warwick, began by stating that he would ‘take for granted educational ideologies, the role of elementary education in the economy, its social control function’.⁴⁰ As such, Frith interpreted as oppressive the requirements of the Leeds schools that parents bathe their children regularly, discipline them at home, prevent their carousing, forbid their begging, and expect them to read their Bibles. Donald Jones, at the School of Education at the University of Leicester, located educational social control within political economy and its liberal advocates. ‘Given that elementary education during the nineteenth century was mainly a matter of social control, it filled the heads of its pupils with inert knowledge, much of it carefully calculated to justify the social and economic status quo’, he wrote.⁴¹ Jones focused on the ‘brain-washing techniques employed by exponents of political economy’, citing the prevalence of classical economics in mid-century readers and an essay on ‘The Iron Law of Wages’ written by a nine year-old.⁴²

In the third instance, many educational histories rested upon the meta-narrative of secularisation. Put simply, secularisation theory anticipated a necessary and mechanistic decline

³⁸ Phillip Mccann, ‘Popular Education, Socialization, and Social Control: Spitalfields 1812-1824’, in Phillip Mccann (ed.), *Popular Education and Socialization in the Nineteenth Century* (London: Methuen, 1977), p. 276.

³⁹ *Ibid.*, p. 276.

⁴⁰ Simon Frith, ‘Socialization and Rational Schooling: Elementary Education in Leeds before 1870’, *Ibid.*, p. 67.

⁴¹ Donald K. Jones, ‘Socialization and Social Science: Manchester Model Secular School 1854-1861’, *Ibid.*, p. 34.

⁴² *Ibid.*, p. 129.

in religious belief as science explained, and enabled human control of, natural phenomena. This theory captivated the academic world for much of the twentieth century and enabled educational historians either to ignore or to denigrate the role of religion within education. Even astute scholars, such as David Owen (1965), remarked of a philanthropist that ‘*in spite of the Puritan spectacles through which he viewed the life around him, [he] canvassed the social needs of his time*’.⁴³ James Murphy’s *Church, State and Schools in Britain 1800-1970* (1971) depicted denominational scruples as having sadly delayed the march of progressive education. He referred to one democratically-driven process as a ‘logjam’ because it involved religious differences.⁴⁴ Catering to denominational sensibilities and a local variety created ‘an administrative muddle’⁴⁵ At last, he wrote with relief, a ‘decline in dogmatic religious belief’ cleared the way for the Education Acts of the mid twentieth century.⁴⁶ H.C. Dent (University of Sheffield) managed to write an otherwise thorough account of English educational history without acknowledging the ongoing role of religion.⁴⁷

These three approaches worked to reinforce an anti-religious and anti-metaphysical bias within twentieth-century historiography. Thus, even otherwise helpful narratives tended to miss the ontological or metaphysical claims being made by their subjects. A perfect example of this omission is the otherwise helpful contribution made by Adrian Wooldridge in his analysis of the psychologists grouped around the University of London.⁴⁸ Wooldridge’s history depicted the scope of their work and their effect upon English education; it skilfully considered questions of professional status and disciplinary demarcation. However, he emphasized exclusively the

⁴³ David Owen, *English Philanthropy 1660-1960* (London: Oxford University Press, 1965), p. 25.

⁴⁴ James Murphy, *Church, State and Schools in Britain, 1800-1970* (Students Library of Education; London: Routledge & Kegan Paul, 1971), p. xv, 152.

⁴⁵ *Ibid.*, p. 84.

⁴⁶ *Ibid.*, p. 121.

⁴⁷ H.C. Dent, *The Training of Teachers in England and Wales, 1800-1975* (London: Hodder and Soughton, 1977).

⁴⁸ Wooldridge, ‘Child Study and Educational Psychology in England, 1880-1950’, and Wooldridge, *Measuring the Mind: Education and Psychology in England, C. 1860-C.1990*.

psychologists' commitment to national fitness and educational efficiency, without probing their underlying metaphysical commitments and agenda. In such works the line connecting beliefs about the human person, and specific educational protocols, is too thinly drawn. This thesis, in contrast, attempts to shed light on the connection between metaphysical claims (however implicit) and educational theory (however scientific).

The late twentieth century brought a challenge to all three models of social change and thus to educational history. The progressivist stance has been questioned by postmodernist philosophy which rejected meta-narratives of ascension and cleared the way for local scenarios to be examined on their own terms. Educational historian Wendy Robinson has sharply criticized the 'heroic' portrayal of the Board of Education, citing instead the damaging effects of its policies which crushed local initiatives and parochial variety.⁴⁹ Robinson took issue with the received view that the Board rationalized and improved education by standardizing teacher training and by shutting down pupil-teacher centres in the early twentieth century. Rather, her close study of these centres, and Meriel Vlaeminke's work on the higher grade schools, convinced both scholars that the dominant narrative had been wrong, and that in the demise of the local and particular, important opportunities for working-class children simply disappeared.

In the second instance, social theorists themselves have moved away from class-based strictures and have opened the way for more nuanced educational histories. James Albisetti articulated two objections to class-based models within educational historiography: inherent condescension and lack of real evidence. 'The role of human intentions in this process is particularly important because of the general tone of indictment that underlies most discussions

⁴⁹ Wendy Robinson, 'Expert and Novice in the Pupil Teacher System of the Latter Nineteenth Century', *Journal of Educational Administration and History*, 28/2 (July 1996), 129-41, Wendy Robinson, 'In Search of a 'Plain Tale': Rediscovering the Champions of the Pupil-Teacher Centres, 1900-1910', *History of Education*, 28/1 (March 1999), 53-72, Wendy Robinson, 'Historiographical Reflections on the 1902 Education Act', *Oxford Review of Education*, 28/2/3 (June-Sept 2002), 159-72.

of systematisation and social reproduction', he wrote.⁵⁰ Brian Simon had suggested, for instance, that the Royal Commissions of the 1860s laid the basis for class-based stratification in the schools. Albisetti countered that the Commissions did not create difference but rather reported upon them. Further, whereas Mueller and Simon interpreted debates about classical and modern curricula as an indication that elites wanted to keep the poor down, Albisetti noted disputes within and not just between class lines.⁵¹ So did historian W.B. Stephens, who recognized local and national complexity in his analysis of educational shifts.⁵² Change was not uni-directional: the red brick universities initially aimed at a technological education broadened into liberal arts facilities by the 1880s and 1890s; Oxford and Cambridge simultaneously broadened in the opposite direction by including the physical sciences.⁵³ David Rubenstein nuanced class issues by discussing working-class resistance to compulsory education. Working-class Londoners clashed with the London School Board because the LSB often appropriated their property for schools, because children's wages were badly needed for sustenance, and because educational achievement seemed to threaten parent-child relationships.⁵⁴ Indeed, debates on education often made strange bedfellows on the LSB itself, with Tories and Socialists arguing for the abolition of truancy fines against Liberals, who insisted that they be maintained.⁵⁵ No longer do historians automatically assume a working-class antipathy to religion: S.J.D. Green argued that, far from being a hindrance, religion provided a powerful resource for all kinds of

⁵⁰ James Albisetti, 'Systemization: A Critique', in Franz Ringer Detlef K. Mueller, Brian Simon (ed.), *The Rise of the Modern Educational System: Structural Change and Social Reproduction 1870-1920* (Cambridge: Cambridge University Press, 1987), p. 211.

⁵¹ James Albisetti, 'The Debate on Secondary School Reform in France and Germany', in Franz Ringer Detlef K. Mueller, Brian Simon (ed.), *The Rise of the Modern Educational System: Structural Change and Social Reproduction 1870-1920* (Cambridge: Cambridge University Press, 1987), p. 181.

⁵² W. B. Stephens, *Education in Britain, 1750-1914* (Social History in Perspective; Basingstoke: Macmillan, 1998).

⁵³ *Ibid.*, p. 124.

⁵⁴ David Rubenstein, 'Socialisation and the London School Board 1870-1904: Aims, Methods and Public Opinion', in Phillip McCann (ed.), *Popular Education and Socialization in the Nineteenth Century* (London: Methuen, 1977), pp. 236, 237.

⁵⁵ *Ibid.*, p. 249.

working-class creativity. Green's study of mutual improvement societies, religious associations, and popular education in three late-nineteenth century working-class communities suggested that religious life educated and inspired men and women to self-improvement and often to political activism.⁵⁶

That the working classes refused to fall into monolithic predictability poses an acute problem for class-based theorists, unless they resort to notions of mysterious, unacknowledged agency. It is just such a resort which sociologist Anthony Giddens attacked in his *Profiles and Critiques in Social Theory* (1982). Of course, he said, 'the knowledgeability of human agents...is always bounded: by the unacknowledged conditions of action on one side, and its unintended consequences on the other'⁵⁷ Nevertheless, this 'boundedness' is neither complete nor inherently sinister. Indeed,

Institutions do not just work 'behind the backs' of the social actors...Every competent member of every society knows a great deal about the institutions of that society; such knowledge is not incidental to the operation of society but is necessarily involved in it. To discount agents' reasons...implies a derogation of the lay actor.⁵⁸

Giddens' objection to the language of purpose embedded in systems theories makes for sound historiography. That social systems 'reproduce themselves' makes no sense, because 'social systems have no needs, and to suppose that they do is to apply an illegitimate teleology to them'⁵⁹ Doctoral theses such as Robin Freathy's at the University of Exeter (2005) have taken wider views on board: Freathy's historical work displays a non-ideological view of human

⁵⁶ S.J.D. Green, 'Religion and the Rise of the Common Man: Mutual Improvement Societies, Religious Associations and Popular Education', in Derek Fraser (ed.), *Cities, Class and Communication: Essays in Honour of Asa Briggs* (London, 1990).

⁵⁷ Anthony Giddens, *Profiles and Critiques in Social Theory* (London, 1982).

⁵⁸ *Ibid.*, pp. 37-8.

⁵⁹ *Ibid.*, p. 10.

behaviour and reveals none of the strictures and terminologies of social reproduction.⁶⁰ Gregory Dochuk's doctoral thesis at the University of Oxford, although not yet deposited in the Bodleian Library and therefore not consulted for this thesis, stands to offer another view of the ongoing cultural role of religion in the educational debates of 1936-1951 from which is absent the mechanisms of earlier debate.

In the third case, the secularisation thesis has come under sustained suspicion even from its former adherents. Sociologist Peter Berger wrote recently:

If we are to acquire a valid picture of the global situation of religion today, one of the conventional ideas we must give up is the idea that our age is one of secularisation. Put differently, we must give up the idea that modernity and a decline of religion are inexorably linked phenomena. I shared this idea in my earlier work as a sociologist of religion. Along with most people in the field, I had to give it up under the sheer pressure of empirical data.⁶¹

Other sociologists and many historians have followed Berger's eye for data. Sociologist Grace Davie has published numerous accounts of the persistent religious tenor of European life, and her colleague David Martin, once an advocate of the secularisation thesis, now tracks religious momentum worldwide.⁶² Sarah C. Williams suggested a flexible methodology which probes both 'the structural and the symbolic dimensions of particular communities', and her own work on the borough of Southwark is one such example.⁶³ A rejection of mechanism has opened up the field of educational history, as displayed in *History of Education for the Twenty-First*

⁶⁰ Robin James Kenneth Freathy, 'Religious Education and Education for Citizenship in English Schools, 1934-44', (University of Exeter D. Phil, 2005).

⁶¹ Peter Berger, 'Globalization and Religion', *The Hedgehog Review*, 4/22002), 7-20.

⁶² Grace Davie, *Religion in Britain since 1945: Believing without Belonging* (Oxford: Blackwell, 1994). Grace Davie, *Religion in Modern Europe: A Memory Mutates* (Oxford: Oxford University Press, 2000). David Martin, *Pentecostalism: The World Their Parish* (Oxford: Blackwell, 2002).

⁶³ Sarah Williams, 'Victorian Religion: Class or Culture?' *Nineteenth Century Studies*, 172003), 13-19; Sarah Williams, 'Religious Belief and Popular Culture: A Study of the South London Borough of Southwark, C. 1880-1939', (Oxford University D. Phil, 1993). Williams' work details the amount of religious observance and belief amongst Southwark residences in the late 19th and early 20th century.

Century (2000), which shows historians arguing for the legitimacy of ‘private, public and official’ styles of educational history.⁶⁴

Additionally, recent general and educational histories have taken interest in religious belief itself as a persistent, motivating concern, constitutive of human identity, which moves not in one direction but in several. Matthew Grimley’s *Citizenship, Community, and the Church of England: Liberal Anglican Theories of the State between the Wars* (2004) explored ways in which the religious thought-world of the nineteenth century played a central constitutive role in national life through the Second World War. In particular, Liberal Anglicanism provided its own rationale for an ‘organic national community presided over by a comprehensive church and an active state’, the development of which they perceived as ‘part of a providential plan’.⁶⁵ In this project, Liberal Anglicans crafted a unique social theory which not only undercut the appeal of Marxist ‘community’ but maintained an important space for the Church. Another recently-published volume, *Redefining Christian Britain: Post 1945 Perspectives* (2007), is also illustrative of this new approach. Taken together, these essays proffer the view that, throughout the twentieth century, religion in Britain did not dissipate but was rather transformed.⁶⁶ Within educational histories, Robin Freathy’s 2005 doctoral dissertation demonstrated that religious denominations enjoyed increased vigour and relevance during the 1930s and early 1940s, *particularly* in the realm of education. Whereas secularists argued vehemently that English citizenship education must avoid a theological framework, their position lost ground throughout the 1930s as Anglican activists, in particular, persuaded the country that only Christianity could

⁶⁴ *History of Education for the Twenty-First Century*.

⁶⁵ Matthew Grimley, *Citizenship, Community and the Church of England: Liberal Anglican Theories of the State between the Wars* (*Oxford Historical Monographs*) (Oxford: Clarendon Press, 2004), p. 7 and also p. 22 and the entirety of Chapter 1.

⁶⁶ Jane Garnett, Matthew Grimley, Alana Harris, William Whyte, Sarah Williams (ed.), *Redefining Christian Britain: Post 1945 Perspectives* (London: SCM, 2007).

offer strong foundations. Whereas in the 1920s the prospects of a public Christianity looked dire, wrote Freathy, the 1930s brought a ‘revival of the Christian foundations of British national identity and citizenship’ which found expression not only in The Butler Act of 1944 but in specific, government-sponsored literature for schools.⁶⁷

A further consequence of the loosening hold of the secularisation thesis is that, in contrast to the anti-metaphysical bias so common in the twentieth century, recent scholarship considers comfortably the implicit metaphysical claims of various social projects. Rick Rylance provided an excellent example of this in his exhaustive history of nineteenth-century psychology (*Victorian Psychology and British Culture*, 2000); he noted repeatedly that, however ‘scientific’ it became, psychology dealt in profound ontological claims and ethical assumptions. Because the transformation of educational philosophy had much to do with the development and deployment of the discipline of psychology, this thesis refers to Rylance’s work and relates his observations to the study of teacher training colleges.

Questioning the assumptions of the secularisation thesis has thus made space for meticulous research on particular localities as well as for the inclusion of religious belief on its own terms, rather than on economic or political ones. It has also necessitated new theorizing about how and why secularisation occurs. Sociologist Christian Smith has offered a stimulating alternative model in his work on the secularisation of American public life. He rejected secularisation theory’s narrative of inevitability, principally because it did not take into account the variability of human agency. Instead, he suggested, we might view secularisation as akin to a political revolution. In summary:

The historical secularisation of the institutions of American public life was not a natural, inevitable, and abstract by-product of modernization; rather it was the

⁶⁷ Freathy, ‘Religious Education and Education for Citizenship in English Schools, 1934-44’, p. 2 and chapter V in particular.

outcome of a struggle between contending groups with conflicting interests seeking to control social knowledge and institutions. My intent is to move agency, interests, power, resources, mobilization, strategy, and conflict to the foreground in our understanding of macrosocial secularisation—a topic until now largely framed by abstract and agentless terms like differentiation and rationalization. By suggesting revolution as the central analytical image, I mean to highlight issues of power and authority, mobilization, and cultural and institutional transformation.⁶⁸

Smith suggested, then, that we examine the intentionality of historical actors, their networks, their institutions, and their aims. His book explored this model in reference to a host of American institutions: to journalism, to the field of sociology, to religion itself, to public education, and to legal institutions.

Smith's ideas certainly resonate with the observable changes within English educational theory and institutions. The advocates of a psychologized educational theory were aggrieved and disenfranchised; they were well-organized and well-networked; they were able to create new institutions and transform old ones; their vocabulary effected a change in notions of the self and of the self in society. His model missed one aspect of secularisation, however, which might be supplied by turning to Julie Reuben's *The Making of the Modern University* (1996). In describing the decline of the moral urgency which American universities had originally sponsored, Reuben noted that secularisation may be the unintended consequence of another type of advocacy. In her study, while there were certainly those who desired a university shorn of religious or metaphysical foundations, the most important secularisers had ironically intended, rather, to craft a scientifically-oriented theological foundation. While their project failed, their intentions had not been to destroy religion but rather to renovate it.⁶⁹ Her theory, too, makes sense in the context of English educational theory. There were certainly those (such as

⁶⁸ Christian Smith, *The Secular Revolution: Power, Interests, and Conflict in the Secularisation of American Public Life* (Berkeley: University of California Press, 2003), p. vii.

⁶⁹ Julie A. Reuben, *The Making of the Modern University: Intellectual Transformation and the Marginalization of Morality* (Chicago: University of Chicago Press, 1996). In particular, pages 3, 13, and her chapter on "The Reconstruction of Religion".

Alexander Bain) who championed an educational science devoid of all transcendence, but there were others who had no such wish and who nevertheless participated in transformations which were tantamount to secularisation. Certainly instructors at the (evangelical) Cheltenham Training College did not intend to secularise educational theory when they imported McDougall, Nunn and Isaacs into their classrooms: rather, they were attempting to be scientific and academically reputable. The secularising effect was unintended and secondary. Likewise, the colleges' deferential approach to the universities had everything to do with prestige and little to do with secularisation on the face of it. Nevertheless, in affiliating with the universities (institutionally) and in adhering to psychological paradigms (intellectually) they came to sacrifice their own distinctive contribution to educational theory. Both Smith's and Reuben's work illustrate the creative work going on within social theory and its relevance to educational history; this thesis draws upon both.

In summary, this thesis situates itself within the newer scholarship described above, and over and against progressivist, class-based, or mechanistic secularisation theories. It acknowledges the constraints of culture upon historical agents (including upon the historian); it affirms the role of human agency; it denies absolute predictability to intellectual and cultural change. It concludes that while the secularisation of academic educational theory was of complex and varied origin, there are several causes to which we may point by way of explanation: the result of the specialization within academic professions; the effect of a deliberate, ongoing lobby to strip education of metaphysics; a close network of individuals within university Departments of Education who disseminated their views widely and effectively; the uncritical adaptation of these views by training colleges, who sought affiliation with the prestige of the universities and who therefore did not examine ontological shifts in

thinking; a general public inured to ontological conflict between religion and psychology. The thesis also considers the importance of narrative: it pays attention to the stories that educational leaders told about the history of psychology, about the history of education, and about the history of humankind, as clues to understanding the metaphysical assumptions which inhere in their projects. In contrast to twentieth-century educational histories which neglected to probe implicit metaphysical claims, this thesis places in relief the relationship between ontological assumptions and educational goals.

1.3 The Organisation of Material

The chief contention of this thesis is that definite shifts in thinking occurred among educationalists between the 1840s and the Second World War. These shifts were not universal, but they were pronounced. It is helpful to think in terms of dominance: in any given time frame, one particular framework held sway, but at the same time, in the background, we can often discern countervailing thoughts which began to gain traction and, themselves, moved towards dominance in the next period. This process was not mechanistic, nor was there any guarantee of intellectual success to minority views; indeed, educational history is strewn with ideas which never gained sufficient appeal. This thesis maps out the survivors within their intellectual contexts.

Of course, it would be false to speak of rigid periods of intellectual demarcation, as if at one point educationalists emphasized 'the teacher' and at another 'the child,' or 'intellect' at one point and 'emotion' at another. Teachers seem to have been dealing from a similar deck of concerns during the entire time covered by this discussion. The question, rather, is one of

emphasis and resources: of the spectrum of concerns, which captivated their attention? Of the variety of intellectual resources, which informed them most consistently?

Despite the limitations of any categorization, it seems reasonable to divide this study into ‘periods of influence’, portions of time in which particular ways of thinking dominated the field. These are segregated by important dates in the development of English academic educational theory as it was embodied in the training colleges, such as the establishment of the first, publicly-funded training colleges (1839), the announcement of an important report (1888) or the publication of significant books (Nunn’s *Education*, 1920). Such markers suggest that there were many important facets to the development of English educational theory, from institutional formation to government initiatives to literature itself. In each period, we will be mindful of administrative and institutional structures, salient ideas within educational philosophy, new psychologies, government policies and particular changes within society which had a bearing upon educational philosophy. It would be vain, for instance, to consider educational theory in the 1870s without adverting to the Board of Education’s narrowing of the elementary school curriculum in 1862, or to the growing fascination with quantitative measurements without reference to the Boer War (1899-1902), which revealed a shockingly low fitness level among British soldiers. All of the chosen dates, however, relate to the work of the training colleges, because it is in these colleges that one may glimpse most clearly the theories of education into which England’s teachers were initiated.

1.3.1 The First Period: From the Foundations to the Cross Commission (1839-1885)

English education became a focus for philanthropists in the late eighteenth century, and early education centred on religious communities. Churches provided networks of ‘Sunday

schools' which taught the basic tools of learning to working-class children, framed by Biblical narratives and with religious motivations. They carried this principle into the creation of weekday schools and founded societies for this specific task: Nonconformists opened the British and Foreign School Society in 1808, and in 1811 the Anglicans followed suit with the National Society.

By the 1830s a consensus developed which championed government assistance to the voluntary effort. Parliament passed its first grant for elementary education in 1834, which was followed immediately by jockeying among religious denominationalists for control of local schools.⁷⁰ Largely out of the failure of the denominations to work together on an agreed curriculum, Parliament never granted money outright to schools. Rather, it channelled the money through the two religious societies. Grants had to be matched by voluntary subscriptions and accompanied by the Crown's Inspectorate which evaluated schoolmasters, schools, and individual students' performance in key subjects. Thus at the same time Parliament both honoured religious differences and expected religious participation: in 1840 the Committee of Council which handled education wrote that 'no plan of education ought to be encouraged in which intellectual instruction is not subordinate to the regulation of the thoughts and habits of the children by the doctrines and precepts of revealed religion'.⁷¹ At the same time, the Government enforced respect for religious differences: in 1847 Parliament removed the requirement that the Anglican Authorized version of scripture be read in state-aided schools, permitted Roman

⁷⁰ James Murphy, *The Religious Problem in English Education The Crucial Experiment* (Liverpool: Liverpool University Press, 1959).

⁷¹ Minutes of the Committee of Council, 1839-40, in Murphy, *Church, State and Schools in Britain, 1800-1970*, p. 29.

Catholic schools to apply for grants, and allowed laity to inspect the religious training of non-Anglican schools. The first state-funded Jewish school opened in Manchester in 1853.⁷²

In 1834 Parliament approved the first funding for training colleges for elementary teachers, although none of it was used for five years. As with the schools themselves, denominational control was the rule, and by 1850 there were thirty colleges, all but five Church of England.⁷³ These training colleges varied in many ways: the (Methodist) Westminster College in London was practically-oriented; St. Mark's, Chelsea, run by Derwent Coleridge, oriented itself towards high church aesthetics and a highly cultured curriculum; a Catholic religious order ran St Mary's College, Hammersmith; Cheltenham Training College evidenced the most pronounced Evangelical tone; Bishops and Lords sponsored the Diocesan Training College at Culham. But it was the original standard established by Battersea Park, founded in 1839 by the Secretary to the Committee of Council on Education, Dr. Kay-Shuttleworth, which '[was] the most significant event in the history of the development of the English training college, for it was the type to which all subsequently founded training colleges conformed until the advent of the Day Training College'⁷⁴ What did this model look like?

Kay-Shuttleworth believed that he was training Christian missionaries and emphasized moral development: chapel services framed the day's work at beginning and end, and admissions turned upon testimonials from a candidate's local priest. The entire community, tutors as well as students, worked the land to ensure self-support; there was constant supervision; the time-table ensured 'constant activity,' and there was no leisure time. The lone servant was a cook. What historian R.W. Rich called a 'semi-monastic' existence became the norm for teacher training

⁷² Helena Miller, 'Meeting the Challenge: The Jewish Schooling Problem in the UK', *Oxford Review of Education*, 27/4 (December 2001), 501-13.

⁷³ Dent, *The Training of Teachers in England and Wales, 1800-1975*, p. 14

⁷⁴ Rich, *The Training of Teachers in England and Wales During the 19th Century*, p. 75.

colleges.⁷⁵ The curriculum consisted of academic training in elementary subjects as well as in ‘School Management,’ or, the principles and practice of teaching, and the two-year course led to the Board of Education’s examinations and certification. These residential communities came in for brisk ridicule in the late nineteenth century (see, for instance, James Runciman’s *Schools and Scholars*, 1887, which pilloried his time at the Borough Road Training College⁷⁶), but until Parliament authorized the creation of Day Training Colleges following the Cross Commission (1886-8), all formally-trained teachers passed through their gates. Thus, the founding of the early training college marks the beginning of our first period.

The Cross Commission marks the period’s end. After commissioning the study of working-class education (the Newcastle Commission, 1858), the nine public schools (the Clarendon Commission, 1864), and the other endowed schools (the Taunton Commission, 1868), Parliament turned its attention to the workings of the classroom and the training of teachers themselves. This investigation yielded a tentative (on the part of the Majority) and emphatic (on the part of the Minority) affirmation of a new, non-residential training course, in affiliation with universities and leading to a B.A. or B.S.C. as well as to a certificate of training. The possibility of a new model of teacher training opened up new worlds to the intending teacher, and thus this report marks the end of our first period. Chapter III explores this period in detail.

1.3.2 The Second Period: From the Founding of Day Colleges to Nunn’s *Education* (1886-1920)

As soon as Parliament sanctioned the opening of non-residential colleges, universities raced to establish three-and four-year teacher training departments, many of which offered a B.A. or B.Sc. in conjunction with professional certification. Six opened in 1890 and four each in

⁷⁵ *Ibid.*, pp. 65-73.

⁷⁶ James Runciman, *Schools and Scholars* (London: Chatto and Windus, 1887).

1891 and 1892. Many of these new institutions formed not only elementary but secondary school courses as well. By 1900, nearly a quarter of the total number of students in training (1150) were enrolled at the sixteen University Day Training Colleges (UTDs).⁷⁷ Advocates of the UDTs from the nineteenth to the mid-twentieth century praised these new institutions for increasing the supply of trained teachers, ending ‘the religious monopoly of the colleges’, giving the study of education ‘academic status’, ‘raising the prestige of the elementary school teacher’, and pressuring the residential colleges into improvements.⁷⁸

The new colleges presaged shifts in administrative authority, as the universities supplanted the Board of Education in the certification process, and in intellectual authority, as the universities took the lead over the residential training colleges in framing educational philosophy. Thus, the establishment of University Day Training Colleges marks the beginning of our second period.

In 1920, Percy Nunn of the London Day Training College published *Education: Its Data and First Principles*, referred to briefly above. This book burst upon the scene and captured the imaginations of its generation. Nunn did not write *ex nihilo*. Rather, his book summed up the insights of innovatory psychology, sociology and biology in coherent, readable text. Wrote Selleck: ‘The product of an optimistic age...the book has now dated, but whatever its defects it put many of the educational practices and ideas of the reformers in a theoretical framework...a framework derived, in large part, from biology and psychology. He gave the progressives a textbook.’⁷⁹ London County Council educationalist and psychologist P.B. Ballard, a friend of Nunn’s and participant in his school of thought, simply called it ‘the individualist’s Bible’⁸⁰

⁷⁷ Dent, *The Training of Teachers in England and Wales, 1800-1975*, p. 33.

⁷⁸ *Ibid.*, p. 33.

⁷⁹ Selleck, *English Primary Education and the Progressives, 1914-1939*, p. 46.

⁸⁰ *Ibid.*, p. 53.

Nunn's book drew upon currents already flowing in the 1910s, but it was a landmark because it channelled these forces and thrust educational theory forward to the coming decades. As such, it marks the end of our second period and is discussed thoroughly in Chapter IV

1.3.3 The Third Period: from the Joint Boards to the McNair Report (1926-1944)

In 1926 the Board of Education issued Circular 1372, which stated that it would no longer validate training college courses or certify students. That duty devolved upon the universities under the 'Joint Board Scheme,' in which the training colleges grouped in clusters under the *aegis* of a full-fledged university. Rather than inaugurating an 'Era of the University', the Joint Boards went only halfway towards the close affiliation which some educationalists had wanted. Some colleges had spent the early 1920s anticipating this scheme and jockeying for positions with prestigious universities.

The transition from Board of Education to university oversight was uneven. Some colleges rejoiced, others complained; some Joint Boards tolerated a wide range of syllabuses and curricula, while others appeared more domineering. That the universities supervised curricula and examinations but related only superficially to the colleges otherwise, was an endemic problem for those who wished to identify more closely with universities. The Joint Board scheme ended up being an intermediate step to a more tightly-bound relationship with the universities. Ultimately, this thesis argues in Chapters V and VI that the universities expected the colleges to import their brand(s) of educational psychology and thus profoundly affected the content of education courses offered in the training colleges.

With the McNair Report comes the end of this period, the end of the span of the thesis, and, in many cases, the beginning of the end of the training colleges. The Report urged a clean

solution to the administrative difficulties of the Joint Boards. One of the options it articulated was to create ‘Institutes of Education’ at university centres, to which each training college would affiliate, share its professors, and overlap its courses; this option won the day. Although initially the colleges remained intact, throughout the rest of the century the once-independent training colleges, one by one, closed their doors or were wholly subsumed into larger universities. The thesis suggests in Chapter VI that although such moves were not without benefit, they nevertheless constituted an irretrievable loss for English education.

1.4 The Development of Psychology

Because English educational theory drew increasingly from psychology across the time span of this thesis, it requires an introduction to psychology against which developments described in Chapters III, IV and V become clear.

English psychology began as a metaphysical consideration. It wrestled with questions of human freedom and human learning. In the early nineteenth century, much of the debate within psychology occurred between those who considered morality to be generated by association (the *a posteriori* school), and those who considered morality to be innate (the *a priori* school).⁸¹ The key issue was the ‘constitution of mind’, or, the nature of Man. Are humans made in God’s image, albeit vitiated by original sin? Do humans possess an innate conscience (the *a priori* school)? Or, on the other hand, are humans a *tabula rasa*, all of whose moral and intellectual furniture is acquired by association (the *a posteriori* school)? Both sides referred this question to larger frameworks of meaning.

⁸¹ For a more nuanced, accurate understanding of these two positions, see Alan P. F. Sell, *John Locke and the Eighteenth-Century Divines* (Cardiff: University of Wales Press, 1997).

For instance, the prime mover of *a posteriori*, or associationist psychology, was John Locke (1632-1704). Locke believed that the world was created by God and was filled with moral laws.⁸² Humans did not possess an innate knowledge of these laws, however; they learned right and wrong from the association of pain and pleasure with ideas and experiences.⁸³ He wrote that

Things then are good and evil, only in reference to pleasure or pain. That which we call good, is apt to cause or increase pleasure, or diminish pain in us...we name that evil, which is apt to produce or increase any pain, or diminish any pleasure in us...of body or of mind.⁸⁴

All sense of right and wrong stemmed, then, from early experiences with pain and pleasure; ‘conscience’ was merely the result of ‘education, company, and customs’⁸⁵ Might any behaviour be considered categorically ‘wrong’? Yes, wrote Locke, for moral truth exists, and we may act against it. But we act against truth not because of original sin, but because of false associations which then bestow upon us ‘a degree of madness’.⁸⁶ Locke was therefore not a relativist. While he denied innate moral principles, he did not deny natural laws.

A follower of Locke, and the first to use the term ‘psychology’, was David Hartley (1705-1757). With Locke, Hartley suggested that the moral sense developed mechanically, by association. As Locke, Hartley wrote that although morality was factitious it was nevertheless authoritative:

All the pleasures and pains of sensation, imagination, ambition, self-interest, sympathy and theopathy, as far as they are consistent with one another, with the frame of our natures, and with the course of the world, beget in us a moral sense, and

⁸² John Locke, *An Essay Concerning Humane Understanding* (The second edition, with large additions. edn.; London: printed for Thomas Dring at the Harrow over-against the Inner-Temple Gate in Fleet-street; and Samuel Manship at the Ship in Cornhill near the Royal Exchange, 1694). p. 274.

⁸³ *Ibid.*, p. 76.

⁸⁴ *Ibid.*, p. 216.

⁸⁵ *Ibid.*, p. 78.

⁸⁶ *Ibid.*, pp. 354-355.

lead us to the love and approbation of virtue, and to the fear, hatred and abhorrence of vice. This moral sense therefore carries its own authority with it.⁸⁷

How could something mechanically-derived be authoritative? Because, wrote Hartley, it emanated originally from God, who, functioning as Aristotle's Prime Mover, had arranged the world so that goodness was ultimately more pleasurable.⁸⁸ Having identified virtue and pleasure, Hartley then allowed that self-interest would lead to the good which is God.⁸⁹ Over time, associationist psychology was used to bolster utilitarian thinking. Hartley's more heterodox followers, such as Joseph Priestley (1733-1804) and James Mill (1773-1836), jettisoned his theistic overtones but retained his sense of moral urgency.

In contrast to the associationist psychology, the *a priori* school argued that intellect and morality were given, not produced. Consequently, they attacked the contingency inherent in associationist morality. James Oswald of the Scottish Common Sense philosophers wrote that 'if all our knowledge of religion and virtue is gathered from [produced] abstractions...such knowledge is precarious indeed.'⁹⁰ Many divines followed suit. William Sherlocke, Dean of St. Paul's, rebuked Locke from the pulpit:

Is it reasonable to suppose that God has implanted in us natural passions, which have good and evil for their objects, but has implanted no natural ideas in us of good and evil?⁹¹

Yet although these two schools disagreed vehemently about how the human mind developed, they agreed that how human beings construed who they were, mattered to how they lived.

Intuitionists worried, for example, that associationist psychology would underwrite antinomian practices. Such questions as how the human mind functioned, whether there were a knowable

⁸⁷ David Hartley, *Observations on Man, His Frame, His Duty, and His Expectations*. (London: S. Richardson, 1749), Part I, Chapter III, Section VI.

⁸⁸ *Ibid.*, Part I, Chapter I, Section III, proposition xxii.

⁸⁹ *Ibid.*, Part I, Chapter IV, Section III.

⁹⁰ Sell, *John Locke and the Eighteenth-Century Divines*, p. 69.

⁹¹ *Ibid.*, p. 22.

Reality beyond the mind, whether God's existence could be divined, and how humans constructed society, were seen as inextricably intertwined. Metaphysics was a taken-for-granted component of early 'psychology'.

Indeed, the term 'psychology' means 'soul discourse' in Greek. The *British Cyclopaedia* stated in 1838 that psychology,

the science of the soul, or the spiritual principle in man...may be defined to be the scientifically conducted observations of the operations and changes of the human soul...it takes for granted the distinction of spiritual substance from the body.⁹²

When the *Encyclopaedia Britannica* posted its first entry under 'Psychology' in the eighth edition of 1853-60, it simply referred readers to 'Metaphysics', the section of which had been written by H.L. Mansel, Dean of St. Paul's.⁹³

The 'new psychology' of the late nineteenth century sought to change this outlook in two respects. First, it sought to sever psychology from metaphysical concerns and to place it within the realm of 'science.' Second, it sought to create a separate disciplinary field which would result in a new profession and new academic departments.

Rick Rylance's *Victorian Psychology and British Culture 1850-1880* (2000) described the growth of psychology as a separate sphere of inquiry and its role as a locus 'for Victorian culture['s] reflecting upon the formation of its own mind as it loosed itself from the traditions of the past'.⁹⁴ These traditions were, specifically, Christian theological concern and its secular substrates (such as Priestley's):

Whatever headway was made by the new physiologically oriented psychology during the nineteenth century was made against a Christian conception of humanity that

⁹² Rick Rylance, *Victorian Psychology and British Culture 1850-1880* (Oxford: Oxford University Press, 2000), p. 23.

⁹³ *Ibid.*, p. 24.

⁹⁴ *Ibid.*, p. 4.

stressed exclusive spiritual determinations, and the spiritual status of humans judged in relation to animals.⁹⁵

As stated, English psychology had initially developed at the bosom of theology and philosophy and was properly bound up with questions of meaning and purpose and often with theological language. This was precisely the point of conflict with emerging psychology, as Rylance charted carefully in his book. The new psychologists were suspicious of metaphysical categories and wanted them excised from the new field. Chapter III gives greater space to Alexander Bain, but for now it suffices to state that his outline of psychology insisted upon a scientific approach without reference to what he called ‘the perverted views on matters of common business, the superstructure of fable that envelopes the narration of the past, the incubus of superstition and blind faith, [which] have their foundation and source in the power of emotion to bar out the impressions of reality...The cloud of legend and fable...has only just begun to be dispersed’⁹⁶ So successful was Bain’s project, that a French experimental psychologist, Theodule Ribot, wrote in *English Psychology* (1873) that Bain had effectively shattered all metaphysical associations:

The conditions of independence are simply the constant study of facts and separation from metaphysics...*Psychology will be based on metaphysics but then severed. This no doubt makes it incomplete, but that is the cost of progress. If psychology desires to be both psychology and metaphysics at the same time, it will be neither* [italics mine].⁹⁷

In this project, the move away from metaphysics was seen as a necessary step in the pursuit of scientific, independent truth.

⁹⁵ Ibid. p. 24.

⁹⁶ Ibid., pp. 21-22.

⁹⁷ Theodule A. Ribot, *Modern English Psychology* (London: Henry S. King and Company, 1873), p. 24.

Second, the ‘new psychology’ sought its own place within academic study. In this it was not unique. Part of the nineteenth century’s story is the move from general to specific knowledge, from liberal departments to specialized fields of inquiry. This affected the broader public as well as the Academy. The generalist nature of Victorian intellectual life is well-attested. Jane Garnett chartered the ‘diffuse’ nature of ‘intellectual vitality’ in Victorian Britain, which was ‘seen as a way of shaping one’s own world and establishing a position morally, socially, and politically’.⁹⁸ She provided numerous examples, including mechanical engineers’ facility with Greek and Latin.⁹⁹ Natural sciences, too, could sponsor excellent drawing-room conversation, wrote James Secord, in his analysis of Victorian ‘geographies of reading’. Books on phrenology and evolutionary theory were wildly popular, their reviews ubiquitous; one instructional book told women that ‘astronomy was a surefire way to attract the opposite sex’.¹⁰⁰ Of psychological discourse, Rylance wrote, ‘the high-Victorian psychology of the years 1850-80 was a more open discourse, more spaciouly framed in its address to common issues’.¹⁰¹

By 1900 the landscape had changed. The universities had established chairs in nearly all of the newer sciences. Edward Wheeler Scripture’s *The New Psychology* (1897) ‘sever[ed] psychology from its origins in the philosophy of mind’.¹⁰² Cambridge and University College London established the first experimental psychology labs in Britain in 1897; in 1901 the British Psychological Association was founded.¹⁰³ By the end of the nineteenth century psychology had emerged as a distinct professional specialism which focused deliberately not on metaphysical

⁹⁸ Jane Garnett, ‘Religious and Intellectual Life’, in Colin Matthew (ed.), *The British Isles: 1851-1901* (Oxford: Oxford University Press, 2000), p. 200.

⁹⁹ *Ibid.*, p. 214.

¹⁰⁰ James A. Secord, *Victorian Sensation: The Extraordinary Publication, Reception, and Secret Authorship of Vestiges of the Natural History of Creation* (Chicago, Ill. ; London: University of Chicago Press, 2000), p. 163.

¹⁰¹ Rylance, *Victorian Psychology and British Culture 1850-1880*, p. 7.

¹⁰² *Ibid.*, p. 6.

¹⁰³ *Ibid.*, p. 5.

questions but upon laboratory experiments.¹⁰⁴ Edwin G. Boring's 'hugely influential' *History of Experimental Psychology* (1927) 'show[ed] no patience with pre-experimental work'¹⁰⁵ At the same time popular psychology, which often superimposed the new ideas upon existing religious values and beliefs, proliferated through clubs, journals, and lectures.¹⁰⁶

What did these changes have to do with education? Everything. Whether one looks from the top down (from universities to the training colleges to the classroom) or from the bottom up (from the general public which produced educators in the first place), psychology changed the way in which teachers viewed the child, the classroom, and their vocation. Many emerging psychologists found in education an open playing field for their theories. Chapters III, IV and V highlight the passion with which psychologists Alexander Bain, William McDougall, and Susan Isaacs, regarded the seemingly limitless sphere of education. Educators, at the same time, hungered for credibility as a profession which the scientific terminologies of psychology seemed to offer. As psychology increasingly employed the terminologies of natural science, and as it developed its own rules of experiment and narrative of progress, so grew its appeal to educators hungry for credibility, and to a Government hungry for data about the increasingly varied population of children whose education it funded. At the same time, the 'reenchantment' of scientific psychology in some sectors of the general public may have made accommodation to a more stringent scientific psychology plausible for teachers in training.¹⁰⁷

So great was the effect of these changes upon teacher training that in 1936, the *British Journal of Educational Psychology* published a paper which had been read at the Education and Psychology sections of the British Association. In his paper, training college lecturer Mr. Lloyd-

¹⁰⁴ Ibid., p. 6.

¹⁰⁵ Ibid.

¹⁰⁶ Thomson, *Psychological Subjects: Identity, Culture, and Health in Twentieth-Century Britain*, pp. 3, 5, 32-39.

¹⁰⁷ Ibid., pp. 42-43.

Evans positioned psychology as the primary intellectual resource of the training college.

Whereas thirty years ago, ‘the ideal was the acquisition of knowledge of, first, a certain closed body of information and, secondly, a certain fixed way of imparting it’,¹⁰⁸ for intending teachers now, ‘there exists no fixed body of knowledge or one stereotyped method’¹⁰⁹ Whereas the goal of yesterday was to create ‘a finished article – a trained teacher’,¹¹⁰ contemporary training emphasized child development. Said Lloyd-Evans,

The change at bottom is a change in relationships...thirty years ago the centre point of importance in any place of education was the teacher; now it is the child.¹¹¹

This shift he attributed to the emphases particular to psychology. ‘Psychology has come to permeate the atmosphere of a training college. It is true now to say that without psychology there would be no reason for our existence.’¹¹² It is the contention of this thesis that Lloyd-Evans was right.

1.5 The Vocabulary

As Gill’s and Nunn’s writings illustrate, educational philosophy, implicitly or explicitly, has attempted to answer a particular set of questions. During the earliest period, clearly the discourse and concepts of theology and philosophy featured prominently; during the last, psychological language dominated the conversation. It cannot be too strenuously emphasized that many educationalists of the last period believed themselves to have avoided some of these questions altogether by referencing physiology rather than transcendence. This thesis considers

¹⁰⁸ A. Lloyd-Evans, ‘The Place of Psychology in the Training of Teachers’, *British Journal of Education*, V(1936), 257-65, p. 257.

¹⁰⁹ A. Lloyd-Evans, ‘The Place of Psychology in the Training of Teachers’, *The British Journal of Educational Psychology (Incorporating ‘The Forum’)*, V/3 (November 1935), 257-63, p. 260.

¹¹⁰ *Ibid.*, p. 257.

¹¹¹ *Ibid.*, p. 264.

¹¹² *Ibid.*, p. 263.

the implicit metaphysic behind the psycho-analysis of Susan Isaacs, for instance, and the Darwinian narrative of James Sully. Additionally, Chapters III, IV and V probe changing emphases within discourses, such as the many differences between associationist psychology (in the middle period) and experimental psychology (in the last).

Whether educationalists employed the language of Biblical theology, utilitarian philosophy, Freudian analysis or psycho-genetics, whether they were comfortable discussing teleology or not, their work must be seen in light of the following questions.

1.5.1 What is the aim of education?

Particularly during the first and second periods, those who taught 'Education' or 'Classroom Management' to young teachers wrestled with the question of purpose. What, after all, did teachers hope to accomplish when they educated the young? In these two periods, education might aim towards goodness, towards holiness, towards professional success, towards well-chosen pleasure, or towards a scientific posture towards the world. For instance, John Locke, in *Some Thoughts Concerning Education* (1693) wrote that 'education' aimed at four things: virtue, wisdom, breeding, and learning, and in this order.¹¹³ Virtue, as 'the first and most necessary of these endowments', focused on the idea of God (not the Being, but the Idea), reverence for Him and aversion to vice. Wisdom, or 'managing business [ably], and with foresight in this world', emanated from 'time, experience and observation, and an acquaintance with Men, their Tempers, and Designs'¹¹⁴ Good breeding added sociability to the virtue and wisdom acquired. The intellectual content of learning stood firmly in last place. Two hundred years later, a famous Professor of Logic at Aberdeen, Alexander Bain, disagreed vehemently. Education

¹¹³ John Locke, *Some Thoughts Concerning Education*, ed. John W. And Jean W. Yolton (Oxford University Press, 1693, 1989), p. 195.

¹¹⁴ *Ibid.*, p. 198.

must distance itself from any sort of theological or philosophical rumination; it must concern itself with building up the acquired powers of human beings.¹¹⁵ It must draw upon physiology and psychology and most emphatically not upon religion.¹¹⁶ (Chapters III and IV specifically address Bain's theories as they emerged from minority to majority status.) Throughout this thesis, key participants in educational theory addressed this question through lectures, textbooks and journals.

1.5.2 What is the nature of the child?

Educationalists constructed their work around their view of the child. Across the hundred-year span of this thesis, the child was represented variously as a fallen creature which could, to some extent, be helped towards regeneration by the educative process (Stow and Gill); as a reasoning machine which needed specific intellectual stimulation (Cowham); as an animal driven by instinct (McDougall); and as an explosive and unpredictable carrier of parentally-inspired neuroses (Isaacs). Educational mandates changed according to foundational assumptions. This thesis therefore tracks the development of ontological assumptions. Parliamentary debates and the educational policies set by the Board of Education were rooted in sharply contrasting ontologies. There was a world of difference between the Biblical view of the child held by David Stow and the evolutionary views of Herbert Spencer, the utilitarian sociologist popular in the late nineteenth century, for whom the child had emerged from a long history of survival. Whereas Stow's child needed adult authority, intellectual stimulation, and a good dose of Holy Scripture, Spencer's child needed an education which mirrored the stages of evolution; his education needed to help him survive in the world as it was, not as it should be.

¹¹⁵ Alexander Bain, *Education as a Science* (Internat. Sci. Ser. Vol.25; Lond., 1879), p. 9.

¹¹⁶ *Ibid.*, p. 423.

Spencer's child should be 'fit for life', by which was meant for 'deliberate self-preservation, indirect self-preservation, protection of offspring, social and political relations, and leisure'.¹¹⁷ Neither of these ontologies made sense to A.S. Neill, radical educationalist in the first three decades of the twentieth century, for whom the child's nature was best described by recourse to Freudian categories: 'Before psychology discovered the importance of the unconscious a child was considered a reasonable being, with the power to will good or evil...now we understand that there is nothing static about a child; he is one dynamic urge'.¹¹⁸ Neill consequently eschewed punishments of any kind in the classroom and urged educationalists to focus, instead, upon the unconscious, which inevitably possessed a 'diseased attitude to sexuality and to bodily functions'.¹¹⁹ His job as Headmaster of Summerhill, the progressive boarding school which he founded, was to 'cure' the maladaptations which the students had inherited from their 'problem parents'. In summary, then, different beliefs about the child inspired different educational priorities and strategies which were filtered through teacher training institutions.

1.5.3 What is the role of the teacher?

Given that they posited different views of the child and of educational aims, it is no surprise that the educationalists surveyed in this thesis articulated different understandings of the teacher. Gill's generation and previous ones portrayed the teacher as a role model who imparted a canon of information as well as a way of being in the world. Education was prescriptive, hence the teacher's authority. Henry Dunn's 1837 classic, *Popular Education, or the Normal School Manual*, wrote about the teacher's burden to help children associate good behaviour with pleasure, immoral behaviour with distress, and to train children in 'cleanliness, self-denial,

¹¹⁷ Herbert Spencer, *Education: Intellectual, Moral, and Physical* (London: Watts and Company, 1929. 1859), p. 8.

¹¹⁸ A.S. Neill, *The Problem Child* (London: Herbert Jenkins, Ltd., 1926), p. 61.

¹¹⁹ *Ibid.*, p. 29.

gentleness, humility, kindness and regard for the feelings of playmates'; his last chapter dwelt upon the teacher's embodiment of these virtues himself.¹²⁰ In the middle period, under the influence of Froebel and Pestalozzi and the Child Study movement, James Sully wrote that the teacher's task was twofold: to draw out from the child what was naturally present, and to train the senses and the capacity of the brain, that the child might grow 'according to nature', that is, according to the stages through which the race had passed (so-called 'racial recapitulation').¹²¹ The teacher's authority persisted, but it had become less prescriptive. By the 1930s, however, fewer educationalists subscribed to the view of the teacher as role model and authority: the teacher had become a counsellor whose primary goal was to lead the children towards mental health and personal happiness. Susan Isaacs, for instance, subscribed to the view that while a teacher must establish routine, maintain discipline and help children control anti-social impulses, he or she could not lead. Rather, most of the time 'he must be passive and merely supporting. His active functions lie in maintaining the stable framework of ordered routine, and in the control of aggressive, destructive impulses in their crude forms'¹²² Isaacs believed that teachers had very little influence upon the child's maturation, and that to attempt to influence would merely create neuroses:

The psycho-analytic study of young children, and especially of the early phantasies and anxieties, thus altogether re-emphasises the importance of respecting the child's individuality, even at an early age. The personality of the child, and of the adult that he is to be, rests in the last resort upon the inner flux of forces within his own mind, which it is beyond our power to affect and control by any deliberate act.¹²³

¹²⁰ Henry Dunn, *Popular Education: the Normal School Manual* (London: The Sunday-School Union, 1837), p. 165.

¹²¹ James Sully, *The Teacher's Handbook of Psychology* (London: Longmans, Green and Co., 1909), p. 86.

¹²² Susan Isaacs, *Social Development in Young Children: A Study of Beginnings* (London: George Routledge and Sons, Ltd., 1933), p. 426.

¹²³ *Ibid.*

While a teacher might stabilize the child's environment or strengthen his ego 'through the special work of analysis', the teacher could not 'determine the lines upon which his individuality shall develop'.¹²⁴ The training colleges themselves initiated their teachers into each of these interpretations of the teacher's parameters, as Chapters III, IV and V illustrate.

1.5.4 What is the basis for authority in these matters?

Ultimately, the educational theories surveyed in the thesis referenced some kind of authority, whether the Bible, the priest, the counsellor, the statistician, the scientist, or the psychologist. The authority in early training colleges was the Bible and the creedal communities which ran the colleges. During the late 1800s, educationalists attempted to model their craft on the natural sciences, whose method and specialisms (biology in particular) became authoritative. Alexander Bain, for instance, whose *Education as a Science* (1879) played a prominent role in the severing of education and metaphysics, believed that physiology and (associationist) psychology provided the solid ground upon which to build; the American G. Stanley Hall, whose writings were popularized in England by James Sully in the 1880s and '90s, turned to evolutionary biology to understand human behaviour and thus educational requisites. In the early twentieth century psychology operated within its own 'scientific' sphere: Robert Rusk's popular *Introduction to Experimental Education* (1912), recommended by training colleges throughout the 1910s and 1920s, suggested that qualitative data should provide the framework for education. While Rusk did not dismiss the contribution which the social sciences might make towards education, he believed that, over time, the psychological laboratory would provide sufficient information with which to understand who children are and what they need.¹²⁵ By the

¹²⁴ Ibid., p. 427.

¹²⁵ Robert R. Rusk, *Introduction to Experimental Education* (London: Longmans, Green & Co., 1912).

1930s Freudian categories had made their way into educational discourse, and educationalists such as Susan Isaacs believed that psycho-analysis offered the ultimate source of authority with which to construct an appropriate education. Institutional structures provided location and community around these varying notions of authority. In the early years, the training colleges themselves generated a literature and praxis which mirrored their foundational commitments. By the Second World War, university departments of education played the central role.

All educationalists surveyed drew upon some kind of normative theorizing about the nature of human beings. Such theorizing was not always explicit; indeed, many advocates within education believed that they had managed to evade metaphysical concepts altogether. Nevertheless, as dominant views about the human person ebbed and flowed, so did the priorities within teacher training programmes.

1.6 Primary Resources

The chief aim of this thesis is to examine shifts in academic educational theory. Since the most important *locus* of transmission was the training college, ten diverse training colleges provided the richest resources. Extant examinations yielded keen insights into what the instructors emphasized, as did, to a lesser extent, the syllabuses from their classes. Student lecture notes, in particular those from the Cheltenham and St Mary's College archives, offered verbatim accounts of conversations between instructors and their students. Some colleges, such as Borough Road, retained exhaustive files of instructors' lectures which grant instant access to college classrooms. The recommended reading lists found at the University of London, St Mary's, and Cheltenham, plumb the instructors' own preferences and resources, and as such demonstrate shifting priorities and sources of authority. Letters between college administrators

and regulatory bodies, such as the Board of Education or the Institutes of Education, sometimes produced straightforward comments upon intellectual content. The reports of Her (and later His) Majesty's Inspectors, for instance, illustrated both the growing control which the State exercised over college staff appointments, as well as a steady trend towards psychological as opposed to religious (or even intellectual) requisites. So did testimonials about students, written to future employers, and students' own practice books. The practice books, which displayed students' first attempts at lesson plans, illuminated predominant theories and emphases. Professors at certain colleges (John Gill at Cheltenham; J.S. Ross at Westminster; Percy Nunn, John Adams and Cyril Burt at the University of London; M.W. Keatinge at Oxford, for example) published widely in the field of educational theory, and through their work the development of a psychological view of education may be seen clearly.

The archives possessed uneven records of these sources. Westminster College's archives provided a treasure trove of syllabuses but few lecture notes; the Culham archives possessed neither lists of textbooks nor student lecture notes but an abundance of practice school registers and notebooks and syllabus notices; the Cheltenham archives offered every single one of the desirable categories of information. Yet despite the sources' variety and independence, there was remarkable concurrence across the training colleges as to which authors were important and why. Taken together, it became possible to re-construct the normative educational theory common to all the colleges as well as to mark divergences particular to each one.

There were, additionally, numerous journals which had something to say about education. *The Schoolmaster*, for instance, was the mouth of the National Teachers' Union, *Child Life* the journal of the progressive Froebel Society. All of these journals are fascinating in their own right, and certainly they provide specific insights into the type of educational theory favoured by

their editors and, presumably, readership. However, this thesis focuses on three journals which, more than any others, illustrate shifts in the philosophy of education, not in the politics of education. Furthermore, these three journals addressed different but important audiences and therefore alert us to the nuances present in educational philosophy: *The Journal of Education* (1867-1958) was at the forefront of elite, intellectual change; *The Practical Teacher* (1881-1911) was orientated towards pupil-teachers and practising teachers, not training colleges, but it nevertheless illustrated the penetration of educational psychology into the teaching profession; *The Journal of Experimental Psychology* (1908-current), began as *The Training College Record* and as such demonstrates the colleges' embrace of, and eventual preference for, the agenda of educational psychologists. These journals will be discussed more fully throughout the remaining chapters.

Because educational theory drew increasingly from psychology, it became important to study these psychological works in their own right. Very few teachers in training probably read William James's *The Principles of Psychology* (1890) or William McDougall's *Social Psychology* (1908), but because works such as these influenced educational theory profoundly, and were filtered through respected educationalists such as Percy Nunn, Susan Isaacs and J.S. Ross, they became important primary sources for this thesis.

The primary materials surveyed indicate the scope and delimitations of the thesis, as well as suggesting some opportunities for further research. Due to time, financial and geographical restrictions, the archives of only ten training colleges, all in the south of England, were examined. The records of two additional universities, several more geographically-diverse religious training colleges, and a few colleges sponsored by Local Educational Authorities, would make the map more complete. Another area which demands exploration is the

relationship between what teachers learnt in college and how they ran their classrooms. There may well have been limitations to the impact of formal educational theory. There is some evidence for this: training college faculty complained occasionally that ‘students don’t care about theory’.¹²⁶ This research project focused upon academic educational philosophy, and not practised philosophy; a study of individual teachers’ practice would make a genuine contribution to the work begun here. None the less, the emphases of training colleges, reinforced as they were by educational periodicals read by practising teachers (including pupil-teachers), remain an important factor in the shaping of teachers’ assumptions. Finally, a more detailed consideration of the pupil-teacher system would be useful. The fact is that, up until the First World War, the majority of teachers trained not in training colleges but in the apprenticeship program (‘the pupil-teacher system’) founded by Kay-Shuttleworth in 1846 (see pages 51-57). The Education Act of 1902 itself raised the leaving age and shortened the apprenticeship. Starting in 1903 pupil-teachers were forced into secondary schools, and under regulations between 1904 and 1907, ‘the majority of pupil-teacher centres in England and Wales had been swallowed up by new municipal secondary schools’¹²⁷ So, the training college belonged to the future, and this thesis offers an historical study against which work on the pupil-teacher system might be measured.

¹²⁶ G.E. Lance-Jones refers to the common opinion that the theory taught in training colleges makes little impact upon teachers in training G.E. Jones Lance, *The Training of Teachers in England and Wales: A Critical Survey* (London: Oxford University Press, 1924), p. 138. Staff at the University of London stated simply that ‘to teachers, theory is valuable, interesting and stimulating; to students it is boring and unintelligible’ le.Acb.A.2, ‘Staff Meetings/Academic Boards 1909-1939’, (1909-1939), 23 March 1938.

¹²⁷ Robinson, ‘In Search of a ‘Plain Tale’: Rediscovering the Champions of the Pupil-Teacher Centres, 1900-1910’, p. 53.

Chapter II

Institutional History

Chapter I provided a brief history of the mechanism through which Parliament supported new schools. Throughout the nineteenth and early twentieth centuries, the scope and dimension of education increased. With each succeeding Act of Parliament, the numbers of children to be educated and the State's funding and oversight, grew. So, too, did the nation's sense of the complexity of the task. How should England educate children from widely different backgrounds and abilities? Should the State provide technical education? Should there be a base-level of knowledge required for everyone? Should education be scaled for different 'intelligence levels'? On a practical level, how should teachers determine which children fitted into which category? In the long term, how might the State address the material differences (nutrition, medicine, home life) which seemed to affect children's performance? Such questions were recognized as important, and the strategies suggested in response had great influence upon teacher training and upon the expectations of the teacher in the classroom. Chapters III, IV and V take up the most relevant practical issues relating to the expansion of education and discuss their bearing upon educational philosophy.

While educators scrutinized the above problems, the number of needy children in the educational system increased. The Newcastle Report, published in 1861, estimated that only a quarter of the poorest children received a sufficient education.¹²⁸ In 1870, the Vice President of the Education Department, W.E. Forster, steered through Parliament an Education Act which

¹²⁸ *The Newcastle Report*, Volume I, 1861, in J. Stuart Maclure, *Educational Documents: England and Wales - 1816-1963* (London: Chapman & Hall, 1965), p. 74.

established school boards to 'fill in the gaps' in the voluntary section and established compulsory education (with exceptions) from age 5 to 13. In the opening lines of his speech before the House of Commons, Forster stated that the 1,500,000 children on the registers of Government-assisted schools represented 'only two-fifths of the children of the working classes between the ages of six and ten years...and only one-third of those between the ages of ten and twelve'¹²⁹ His Act effected such a change that by 1902 the Board Schools educated 2,600,000 children and the voluntary schools over 3,000,000.¹³⁰ The 1902 Education Act legalized funding for secondary schools, which hitherto had been the *ad hoc* property of local authorities under the guise of higher-grade elementary schools or pupil-teacher centres and deemed illegal by the Cockerton Judgement of 1901. The Act of 1918 raised the leaving age to 14; the Act of 1944 raised it to 15 (enforced in 1947). As the educational mandate increased, as the types of children under the Governmental purview expanded, as the academic abilities of these children appeared to differ widely, and as the needs of these children (medical and nutritional) were seen more clearly, so grew the demand for more, and better trained, classroom teachers.

This chapter consists of seven sections which set out the landscape of teacher training in England. The first provides a brief overview of elementary and secondary education in England during our period, the second a more detailed look at the development of teacher training institutions. The third, fourth, fifth and sixth sections present general and particular histories of the following types of training colleges: Anglican, Nonconformist, Roman Catholic, and University; the seventh summarizes all of them.

¹²⁹ W.E. Forster, *The Elementary Education Bill, in the House of Commons, February 17th, 1870*, in *Ibid.*, p. 99.

¹³⁰ P.M. Arthur Balfour, *Education Bill, House of Commons, March 24th, 1902*, in *Ibid.*, p. 151.

2.1 Teacher Training: Overview

Until the mid-nineteenth century few teachers received formal training. One notable exception was the charitable Society for the Propagation of Christian Knowledge, which required some training for its Sunday School teachers. Some particularly rigorous vicars also provided training in their parishes as early as 1707.¹³¹ The first proper training institution was built in 1808 in London by Joseph Lancaster, a Quaker whose system of running a large classroom by using student ‘monitors’ (the ‘monitorial system’) became wildly popular across England. Lancaster built a hostel for teachers next to his school in Borough Road, Southwark. Although Lancaster’s mismanagement caused the institution to be transferred to the British and Foreign School Society, his methods of training influenced English schools for decades.¹³² Dr. Andrew Bell, an Anglican priest, opened a centre for training near Durham in 1810, and the National Society opened one in Baldwin’s Gardens in 1812. In 1831 David Stow founded his influential ‘normal seminary’ in Glasgow to which English Methodists and Anglicans repaired before building their own institutions. These important developments were nevertheless haphazard and voluntary, nor was there systematic financial reward for teachers who had attended.

Beginning in 1839, Parliament began to disburse funds for religious societies to build their own training colleges, and it is on these colleges that the thesis will focus presently. Before turning to the colleges, however, it is important to recognize and analyse the majority form of training for teachers between 1846 and the First World War: apprenticeships known as the pupil-teacher system.

¹³¹ Dent, *The Training of Teachers in England and Wales, 1800-1975*, p. 2.

¹³² *Ibid.*, p. 5.

2.1.1 The Pupil-Teacher System

This thesis is occupied with the question of shifts in educational philosophy between 1839 and 1944. As such, it examines elite educational culture, focusing primarily upon University Training Departments and teacher training colleges. However, a substantial number of teachers before the First World War never attended a training college but passed instead through the pupil-teacher system. Its origins were with Dr. James Kay-Shuttleworth. While serving as Permanent Secretary to the Committee of Council on Education, he surveyed the landscape in the 1830s, and was appalled at the lack of teacher training. At best, those marked for teaching were given ‘monitorial’ responsibility within existing schools, in which they served as assistant teachers. In 1838 Kay-Shuttleworth visited Holland, which had enacted a statutory programme of apprenticeships in 1816, and returned to establish something similar in England and Wales.¹³³ In 1846 the Committee of Council agreed, and the result was as follows: at age 13, an able elementary school child could teach during the school day and study with the Head of School after hours. Each year for five years, he or she was examined by Her Majesty’s Inspectors. The Committee of Council paid £2.50 per annum to boys and £2.00 to girls; Heads were paid at least twice that for each year of supervision. After five years, a pupil-teacher had three options: to sit a public Queen’s Scholarship exam for a scholarship to a training college; to take a post as an uncertificated teacher (and to prepare, if desired, for certification over time); to work as a low-level civil servant.¹³⁴ When Her Majesty’s Inspectors surveyed the schools in 1860, there were 14,403 pupil-teacher apprentices and merely 2,826 training college students.¹³⁵

¹³³ *Ibid.*, p. 17.

¹³⁴ *Ibid.*, p. 20.

¹³⁵ Hurt, *Education in Evolution*, p. 9.

Over the next several decades, public opinion on the pupil-teacher scheme was divided. Working-class families saw it as an opportunity for their children to move up the economic scale. Elite opinion viewed the academic and professional training as inadequate. At times the cost of the pupil-teacher scheme was overwhelming and restrictions on the number of pupils in training were imposed and released frequently.¹³⁶ The Government coaxed students into the training colleges by offering them higher salaries upon completion.

By 1900, there were 28,000 pupil-teachers serving in the nation's 20,000 schools, whereas the sixty-two training colleges housed only 5,800 students.¹³⁷ Although many pupil-teachers went on to training colleges, the majority took the Board of Education certificate and remained in the school system. In 1900, half of England's teachers were still uncertificated.¹³⁸

The Education Act of 1870 created School Boards which possessed the power to levy rates for 'Board' schools, although not for training colleges. During that decade, many of the more progressive school boards opened pupil-teaching centres which provided more robust academic, professional, and social support for the apprentices. The London School Board, for instance, raised the entrance age to 15 (in 1875 for boys and in 1881 for girls), reduced their teaching schedules from five days to three per week, and mandated attendance at the centres five times a week.¹³⁹ By 1906 London boasted twelve centres, most of whose students went on to formal training in the London-area colleges.¹⁴⁰

¹³⁶ Dent, *The Training of Teachers in England and Wales, 1800-1975*, p. 24.

¹³⁷ Sir Ronald Forbes Adam, 'From Day Training College to Institute of Education', in University of London Institute of Education (ed.), *Jubilee Lectures Delivered in the Beveridge Hall, the Senate House, Spring Term* (London: Evans Brothers, 1952), p. 11.

¹³⁸ *Ibid.*

¹³⁹ Dent, *The Training of Teachers in England and Wales, 1800-1975*, p. 26.

¹⁴⁰ I.J. Hayward, 'The London County Council and the Training of Teachers, 1902-1952', in University of London Institute of Education (ed.), *Jubilee Lectures, Delivered in the Beveridge Hall, Senate House, Spring Term* (London: Evans Brothers, 1952), p. 24.

How many students went through these centres? According to educationalist H.C. Dent, Professor of Education at Sheffield University, 'By 1890, most pupil-teachers were being educated in pupil-teacher centres'.¹⁴¹ But R.W. Rich, whose study of teacher training was funded by the University of London in the 1930s, noted smaller numbers in the centres: in 1902, he wrote, out of 32,000 pupil-teachers, 17,000 received instruction in centres, i.e., just over one-half.¹⁴² One thing was clear: pupils affiliated with centres outperformed those who were not. The Cross Commission found in 1888 that 'results in Queen's Scholarship exams showed the centrally-trained candidates to be distinctly the best'¹⁴³ In the 1902 Board of Education exam, 'ninety-one out of the first one hundred came from large centres'¹⁴⁴

However, by the turn of the twentieth century, elite opinion in England stood decisively against the pupil-teacher system. Between 1881 and the First World War, *The Journal of Education*, at the time at the forefront of progressive educational opinion, ran at least one attack on the pupil-teacher system per year. In 1881, for instance, a short article stated that:

The Birmingham School Board have declined to engage any more of these young persons, wisely preferring to employ trained assistants. It is to be hoped that [Vice President of the Privy Council] Mr. Mundella will abolish pupil-teachers as soon as possible, and insist on the employment of adult trained teachers in all State-aided schools.¹⁴⁵

In 1904, in a piece entitled 'Pupil-teachers in the Balance', the editors considered the recent Board of Education Report on the King's Scholarship Examination 'depressing reading': only 15 to 20 % of the essays 'could be adjudged "good"'.¹⁴⁶

¹⁴¹ Ibid.

¹⁴² Rich, *The Training of Teachers in England and Wales During the 19th Century*, pp. 244-5.

¹⁴³ Ibid., p. 239.

¹⁴⁴ Ibid., p. 245.

¹⁴⁵ 'Occasional Notes', *The Journal of Education: A Monthly Paper Devoted to the Interests of the Scholastic Profession*, III/1 (January 1881), 6.

¹⁴⁶ Editors, 'Pupil-Teachers in the Balance', *The Journal of Education: A Monthly Record and Review*, XXVII:11 (November 1905), 751-52, p. 751.

The Cross Commission (1886-1888) which specifically aimed to examine teacher training in England and Wales, was of two minds. The Majority Report recommended trivial changes within the pupil-teacher system (such as raising the age) but leaving it otherwise intact. The Minority Report, on the other hand, wanted the Centres converted into secondary schools. Eventually, the Government sided with the Minority, with Robert Morant as the Secretary to the Department of Education. A signature piece of the Education Act of 1902 required all training college students to have had four years of secondary schooling---a move which, in effect, dismantled both the pupil-teacher system and its most recent development, the Pupil-Teacher Centre. By 1907 virtually all of the latter had been converted into secondary schools.

Historians disagree about whether the dismantling of the pupil-teacher system was a good thing. Wendy Robinson chronicled the celebratory attitude of most twentieth-century historians towards the process. She also described the passion which surrounded debate as well as the varying historiographical interpretations.¹⁴⁷ On the one hand, the staff of the centres organised into a Federation which campaigned through the teachers' press. They strenuously disputed the notion that secondary schools would provide a better academic education than the centres, claimed that secondary schools would marginalize pupil-teachers and their entire economic class, and held that centres alone offered the ideal balance between professional, academic, and practical training. Robinson is inclined to believe that the centres' advocates were right. However, the Cross Commission's Minority Report, the Department of Education's Committee on the Pupil-Teacher System (1898), and Robert Morant himself, stood firmly against the

¹⁴⁷ Robinson, 'Expert and Novice in the Pupil Teacher System of the Latter Nineteenth Century'; Robinson, 'In Search of a 'Plain Tale': Rediscovering the Champions of the Pupil-Teacher Centres, 1900-1910'; Robinson, 'Historiographical Reflections on the 1902 Education Act'. See also Philip Gardner, 'Intending Teachers and School-Based Teacher Training, 1903-1939', *Oxford Review of Education*, 21/4 (December 1995), 425-45.

centres; their position won the day. The Act of 1902 raised the leaving age and shortened the apprenticeship. Starting in 1903 pupil-teachers were forced into secondary schools, and under regulations between 1904 and 1907, 'the majority of pupil-teacher centres in England and Wales [were] swallowed up by new municipal secondary schools'¹⁴⁸ The pupil-teacher system persisted in rural areas but nowhere else. In 1910 renowned writer and former Master of Method at Westminster College, Joseph Cowham, commented disapprovingly of the new rules, that now new teachers had no long-term body of experiences in the classroom.

The pupil-teacher system has been changed, and this year sees practically the last of it. ...The destructive policy has gone almost too far. We don't know how we are going to replace some of the things we have destroyed. *We have destroyed the pupil-teacher system, but I am not sure that we have got a rational system in its place* [italics mine].¹⁴⁹

It is important to remember that the pupil-teacher system was on its way out by the First World War, and that training colleges and University Training Departments were the 'wave of the future' Therefore it is appropriate to focus upon the training colleges to understand the dominant educational philosophy. Nevertheless, because pupil-teachedom provided the framework for the majority of teachers until 1907, it would be helpful to know what comprised the curriculum for them.

Pupil-teachers seem to have used some of the same textbooks recommended by the training colleges. The introduction to the 1882 version of Gill's textbook, for instance, specifically acknowledges its adoption by school boards for pupil-teachers.¹⁵⁰ It has not been possible to find data from the pupil-teacher centres themselves as far as lectures, reading lists, or

¹⁴⁸ Robinson, 'In Search of a 'Plain Tale': Rediscovering the Champions of the Pupil-Teacher Centres, 1900-1910', p. 53.

¹⁴⁹ *Daily News*, June 14 1910. 'The Ideal Teacher: Reminiscences of Dr. Cowham', in A/3/C/1, 'Workman Papers, Logbook, 1903-1911', (1903-1930).

¹⁵⁰ Gill, *Introductory Text Book to School Education, Method, and School Management: A Treatise on the Principles, Aims, and Instruments of Primary Education*; Robinson, 'In Search of a 'Plain Tale': Rediscovering the Champions of the Pupil-Teacher Centres, 1900-1910', p. vi.

syllabuses are concerned. However, the institutional structure and the staff of the centres make it likely that the pupil-teachers trained there were exposed to the same theoretical trends which are evidenced in training college archives. Institutionally, the centres were the product of the more progressive school boards. It is likely that the school board members approved of and followed the intellectual trends established in the training colleges and universities. According to Robinson, the centre staff were highly motivated, academic, and often had university degrees:

This combination of highly qualified subject teachers who were well versed in the mores of the profession and serving head teachers who could offer up-to-date relevant practical guidance offered the potential to empower young teachers with the necessary framework for their continued professional development with the effect of significantly raising academic and professional standards.¹⁵¹

They were, said Robinson, a ‘noteworthy group of late nineteenth century elementary trained teachers...[who] raised academic, professional, social, and cultural standards’.¹⁵² Some faculty members became heads of higher educational institutions. In 1885, Joshua G. Fitch opened Liverpool’s Edgehill Training College. He commented upon its founding Principal, ‘Miss Yelf’, who had most recently been Principal of the Liverpool School Board’s college for Pupil-Teachers and an inspector of schools.¹⁵³

Other centre leaders were prominent writers. R.D. Chalke, for instance, Head of Rhondda Pupil-Teacher Centre and Lecturer on Education at Glamorgan Council’s certificate classes, published a popular book on the ontological commitments of Froebel and Herbart.¹⁵⁴ Frank Herbert Haywood, Principal of the Pupil-Teachers’ Centre for the Torquay and Dartmouth

¹⁵¹ Robinson, ‘In Search of a ‘Plain Tale’: Rediscovering the Champions of the Pupil-Teacher Centres, 1900-1910’, p. 55.

¹⁵² Robinson, ‘Historiographical Reflections on the 1902 Education Act’, p. 168.

¹⁵³ Joshua G. Fitch, *An Address on the Office and Work of a Training College* (Liverpool: Liverpool Printing and Stationery Company, Ltd., 1885), p. 7.

¹⁵⁴ R.D. Chalke, *A Synthesis of Froebel and Herbart* (London: WB Clive University Tutorial Press, Ltd, 1912).

district, published books on Pestalozzi, Froebel, and Herbart, and articles in *The Journal of Education*.¹⁵⁵

As noted, by the First World War the entire system of apprenticeship was dying out (or forced to die out), and the educational establishment channelled future teachers into more formal institutions. Nevertheless, because they formed so many twentieth-century teachers, the centres are crying out for in-depth study. While a tentative conclusion might be that the centres (and therefore their charges) followed the elite trends in educational theory, it might prove to be the case that they remained substantially more grounded in traditional pedagogies and metaphysics than the more authoritative educationalists at the University of London.

2.1.2 Training Colleges, the State, and the Universities

The development of formal training for teachers reflects an intricate conversation between religious bodies, the Board of Education, universities, and individual educators. For a long time, many educators and legislators resisted the view that formal training could really help a teacher. Whether teaching was an ‘art’ which was fundamentally temperamental, or a ‘skill’ which could be learned, provided fodder for journals, articles and books throughout the nineteenth century. Ample evidence exists for this, but there is only space here for a few examples: In 1834 the Clerical Superintendent of the National Society was asked by a Parliamentary Inquiry whether ‘If a man were sufficiently well skilled in writing, reading and arithmetic, he could learn in five months the difficult art of teaching’, to which he responded, ‘Yes, decidedly: and it may be learnt in three months, if he has tact’¹⁵⁶ Three months was a far

¹⁵⁵ ‘Review: Hayward’s *the Educational Ideas of Pestalozzi and Froebel*’, *The Journal of Education: A Monthly Record and Review*, XXVI/12 (December 1904), 870.

¹⁵⁶ Evidence of the Rev. William Johnson, in the *Report of the Parliamentary Committee on the State of Education, 1834*, in Maclure, *Educational Documents: England and Wales - 1816-1963*, p. 31.

cry from the several years which had become the norm by 1900. Even the majority view represented in the Cross Commission (published 1888), whose purview was to examine teacher training, doubted that *all* teachers needed to receive training, as they feared that this would exclude some 'with a natural aptitude and a love of learning' who had been unable or unwilling to become formally trained.¹⁵⁷ Throughout the last decade of the nineteenth century the (private) Headmasters Conference had trouble agreeing that they would hire only certificated teachers for their secondary schools; in 1900 the Heads finally passed a resolution stating

That this Conference heartily sympathizes with the establishment of professorships, lectureships, and other University of collegiate agencies for the training of secondary school teachers, and presses upon all those preparing for the profession the importance of systematic training in the theory and practice of education.¹⁵⁸

This resolution did not indicate, however, that headmasters were prepared to compensate 'trained' teachers more than 'untrained'

Once persuaded of the need for formal training, educators debated such questions as 'Should the training be shaped by academic or professional content?' 'What is the nature of the professional content?' 'Who should determine the curriculum?' 'How much autonomy may the colleges have in selecting and forming their graduates?' The colleges answered these specific question unevenly (as their individual histories reveal) and differently over time (as the history of each period demonstrates). Nevertheless the clear trajectory was towards formal training, towards university oversight, and towards uniformity of syllabus.

Alongside these explicit and highly-argued questions lay another concern for educators: religious competition. The training colleges were founded in an era of intense competition over the ownership of schools, colleges, and the views of England's citizenry. The Methodist

¹⁵⁷ *Ibid.*, p. 129.

¹⁵⁸ 'Report on the Headmasters' Conference', *The Journal of Education: A Monthly Record and Review*, XXII/1 (January 1900), 75.

Education Committee, the National Society and the British and Foreign School Society¹⁵⁹ all articulated a fierce desire that the other denominations not control the education of the young. Major pieces of social legislation were disrupted over this issue: religious disputes de-railed the passage of factory legislation in 1843, because Nonconformists so strenuously protested against its preference for Anglicanism that the Home Secretary (Sir James Graham) withdrew his bill.

Each of the colleges surveyed possesses a fascinating history in its own right, many of which have been chronicled aptly by collegiate historians. The purpose of the next section is first to summarize by type and then to present brief histories of each college researched, focusing upon questions of identity and educational philosophies originally embedded in each. Despite persistent differences in atmosphere, beliefs and infrastructure, the educational philosophy in all the religious colleges passed through a similar yet not inevitable trajectory. Initially, theological imperatives provided the intellectual groundwork; then, the training of pupils' intellect using the tools of early psychology appeared in the foreground; finally, scientific psychology dominated older ways of thinking and guided textbook selection, staff hiring, and examinations. The theological voice was crowded out. This is not to say that the institutions 'lost their faith,' *per se*, but rather that they failed to provide a coherent theological critique of psychology's ontological and teleological claims with respect to theories about education.

2.2 Anglican Institutions

2.2.1 Anglican Colleges: Introduction

Anglican educational endeavours were shot through and through with the sense of national mission and responsibility which gave them a distinctly different flavour from

¹⁵⁹ While the British and Foreign School Society aimed at merely non-denominational education, and as such attracted some liberal Anglicans, in reality most of its schools and training colleges were Nonconformist in nature.

Nonconformist, Roman Catholic or secular versions. This lent great potency to Anglican building campaigns and fund-raising efforts. The role of the Archbishop of Canterbury was often decisive in shaping the Government's educational policies, for better or worse. In the 1920s, a period of great duress for the colleges, Anglican educators placed great hopes upon Archbishop Cosmo Gordon Lang (1928), whose regime in fact proved ineffectual in negotiations with the Department of Education.¹⁶⁰ A more effective leader was Archbishop William Temple (1942), who exercised great influence in rejuvenating the Anglican Church and in influencing national education. Temple's insistence that religion belonged in the classroom deeply affected the Education Act of 1944, which included a statutory mandate for Religious Education. There is no evidence that Temple was able to affect the educational philosophy within the colleges, however.

In the beginning, Anglican training colleges owed their lives to the Diocesan Boards of Education, which in turn owed their origins to the frantic activities of a group of young men influenced by the Tractarians and determined to make education the preserve of the Church, not the State. The Oxford theological circle known as the Tractarians, active in the 1830s and 1840s, 'were conscious of the fact that the Church's fundamental mission was the salvation of individual souls but, as [they] saw it, the Church was also called to consecrate the nation's soul and social life', and education embodied all of these hopes.¹⁶¹ A particularly vigorous group of young Anglican men, influenced by Tractarian Oxford and led by a future Prime Minister, took action when they sensed a rising Governmental interest in education and a corresponding flurry of activity among Nonconformists. William Gladstone, Gilbert Farquhar Graeme Mathison,

¹⁶⁰ Mark Lofthouse, *The Church Colleges 1918-1939: The Struggle for Survival* (Leicestershire: J. Billings, 1992), p. 36.

¹⁶¹ James Peirero, 'Tractarians and National Education, 1838-1843', in Sheridan Gilley (ed.), *Victorian Churches and Churchmen: Essays Presented to Vincent Alan McClelland* (Woodbridge: Catholic Record Society, Boydell Press, 2005), p. 249.

Samuel Francis Wood, Thomas Dyke Acland, and Samuel and Robert Wilberforce, met in 1838. Their core concern was how the Church might guide educational developments.¹⁶² Their particular passion was to secure training for schoolmasters. The Gladstone Papers reveal a list of seventy-two points on education (no doubt written for his circle of friends) which amounted to, in his words, ‘a comprehensive educational system of public instruction from the university to the infant school’ with the Church as the responsible party.¹⁶³

The ‘Young Gentlemen’ purposed to work through the National Society and sixty Diocesan Boards. Generous donations to the National Society earned them an audience with the Archbishop, who promptly endorsed their vision. For the next two years, Gladstone, Mathison and Acland travelled England, preaching to the Diocesan boards and garnering support. By 1839, twenty-four strong Diocesan Boards had committed themselves to education.¹⁶⁴ Tussles over Church involvement in education continued, and the question of civil inspections bothered the National Society sufficiently to prevent its receiving any grants at all for schools or colleges until 1840. Eventually, however, both National Society and Government reached agreement. Thus most of the Anglican training colleges developed within a web of relationships: the State, the National Society (and the Archbishop of Canterbury, its President), and the Diocesan Boards.

The consequences of Gladstone’s efforts were immediate and material: by 1850 there were twenty-five Anglican training colleges for teachers.¹⁶⁵ The foremost National Society training college, St. Mark’s, Chelsea, opened in 1841 with Samuel Coleridge’s son at its helm.¹⁶⁶ Gladstone worked with the Diocesan Board of Education of Chester to conceive, articulate and

¹⁶² *Ibid.*, p. 254.

¹⁶³ John L. Bradbury, *Chester College and the Training of Teachers 1839-1975* (Chester: Governors of Chester College, 1975), p. 34.

¹⁶⁴ Peirero, ‘Tractarians and National Education, 1838-1843’, p. 260.

¹⁶⁵ Dent, *The Training of Teachers in England and Wales, 1800-1975*, p. 14.

¹⁶⁶ Peirero, ‘Tractarians and National Education, 1838-1843’, p. 259.

fundraise for the training college in Chester. He opened it himself in 1842 with the help of the local bishop and aristocratic luminaries. The Winchester Diocesan Board of Education became active in 1838 at the instigation of its bishop (Charles Richard Sumner, cousin to Samuel Wilberforce), John Keble who lived within the diocese, six Members of Parliament, local clergy and landed gentry; in 1840 the Winchester Training College opened its doors.¹⁶⁷ The Archbishop of York led the same process in his archdiocese and opened a training college in 1841.¹⁶⁸ Lincoln's training college opened in 1862, and its trust deeds required it to follow the principles of the National Society.¹⁶⁹ This pattern was repeated again and again across England and Wales. Two of our case histories below (Culham and Fishponds) indicate the immediate consequences of Diocesan Board activity. On the other hand, some Anglicans resisted National Society control when it was perceived as promoting Roman values or as weak towards Evangelicalism; hence the creation of alternatives, such as the College in Cheltenham.¹⁷⁰

The following section provides brief histories of the Culham, Fishponds and Cheltenham Training Colleges: their institutional founding and intellectual and spiritual atmosphere.

¹⁶⁷ Martial Rose, *A History of King Alfred's College, Winchester: 1840-1980* (London: Phillimore & Co., Ltd., 1981), pp. 7-8.

¹⁶⁸ Gordon McGregor, *Towards True Education: Essays in the Celebration of the First 150 Years of the University College of Ripon and York St John* (York: The University College of Ripon and York St John, 1994), pp. 10-12.

¹⁶⁹ D.H.J. Zebedee, *Lincoln Training College 1862-1962* (Lincoln: Keyworth Fry, 1962), p. 30.

¹⁷⁰ Ua6/9/1, 'Correspondence between Hon. Sec. Percy Waller and the Archbishop of Canterbury, Regarding the History of the Prayer Book', (1901). In 1901 Cheltenham's Governing Body protested a particular book, *The History of the Prayer Book*, written by the Rev. Prebendary B. Reynolds and published by the National Society, which had become recommended reading for the Archbishop's Inspector of Training Colleges. A letter to the Archbishop of Canterbury indicated that the Governors found the textbook too generous towards Roman Catholicism, too flippant towards Protestant history: 'The Committee considered that although some of the very objectionable passages have been omitted or altered in this new revised edition, yet the book itself was not an honest record of the history of the Prayer Book and was misleading. They considered that in its tendency it is subversive of the ['Protestant' is scratched] faith and that it upholds ['Romish' is scratched] error. They therefore think that a book so prejudiced should not be put forth by the Archbishop's Inspector of Training Colleges...and that the writer of this book be no longer entrusted with the important work of inspecting the Church Training Colleges under the Archbishop's auspices.' And Ua4/1/10, 'Annual Report of the General Committee of the Training College, Cheltenham', (1910-1918), p. 23. During the First World War, the National Society recommended that the Board close Cheltenham for the duration, which it did. Cheltenham's Governing Body had never been consulted, and the National Society's actions were bitterly resented.

Culham and Fishponds were Diocesan Board of Education projects, whereas Cheltenham's sponsorship came from individual Evangelicals, not the National Society.

2.2.2 Culham Training College

Culham College began in February, 1839, when an assembly of lay and clerical leaders in the Diocese of Oxford founded the Diocesan Board of Education (DBE). With the Bishop of Oxford, Richard Bagot, at its helm, the DBE inaugurated a plan to build a training school. The first institution opened in Summertown, Oxford, in 1840, and for the next twelve years, 121 students passed through its doors. They were from varied backgrounds intellectually and socially, and hailed from Oxfordshire, Berkshire and Buckinghamshire.¹⁷¹ Clergy and bishops supported the College's mission by encouraging bright young boys to 'try their hand' at teaching. One student, Frederick Hobley, left a particularly poignant account of how he found his way to Culham in 1849 from a poor family with twelve children living in Thame, Oxfordshire:

In the early part of the year, I think 1849, I was asked if I would like to go to Oxford, and learn to be a schoolmaster. I said, I should... In the month of March, I went to Oxford to sit for the Exam. I must have walked there thirteen miles and passed through the Examination and then walked home again. The Examination took place in Merton College, and at the end I was told that I had passed and was instructed to get some sheets, and towels, and take up my residence in the Oxford Diocesan Training School, which was at the village of Summertown about 1 ½ to 2 miles out of Oxford.¹⁷²

Hobley's tuition was covered by the Bishop of Oxford (then Samuel Wilberforce) and by the vicar in Thame. Hobley was placed at the top of his class and went on to teach in Pembrokeshire. This little story characterizes both the economic opportunities which teaching

¹⁷¹ Leonard Naylor and Gerald Howat, *Culham College History* (Culham: Culham Educational Foundation, 1982), pp. 2-7.

¹⁷² Cu1006, 'The Autobiography of Frederick Hobley Written at the Request of His Children', in *Culham Frederick Hobley, 1849* (ed.), (1905), p. 29.

offered, and the interlocking relationships between National Society policies and local church initiatives.

Bishop Samuel Wilberforce, third son of William and previously Chaplain to Prince Albert, orchestrated Culham's move to larger premises near Abingdon, creating 'the most up-to-date college building of its time, and one of the largest'.¹⁷³ The sermon Wilberforce delivered at the laying of the foundation stone revealed how he, and the Board, construed the purpose of the Training College. After regretting the inadequate participation of the Church in education hitherto, Wilberforce said that

We do see that the office of the training of Christian children is a high office. If any of you doubt whether it is good to extend education, believe me it is a settled question...*All you can settle now is the quality of the education you will give them – whether it shall be the training of Christ's church, to make them meet instruments for doing His will, or whether it shall be an irreligious, a puffing up, a vain, an empty and miserable earthly training, which shall make them unfit for serving God, and unfit for doing their duty in that condition of life to which God calls them...*[italics mine].¹⁷⁴

From the beginning, then, the Diocesan Training College student was meant to be nurtured in Christian theology. The principal was to be in holy orders and a graduate of either Oxford or Cambridge. Chapel was compulsory and twice daily. As late as the Cross Commission, Divinity still claimed the largest share of course work for both Juniors and Seniors.¹⁷⁵ Indeed, high chapel attendance, though rendered optional by a 1944 conscience clause, was recorded all the way through the end of the 1950s. Its Christian foundations continued to be important throughout Culham's history: the first lay Principal, F.I. Venables (1946-1961) left the position to become director of the Institute of Christian Education,¹⁷⁶ and Culham's last chaplain, Rev. Dr. John Gay, currently serves as the Church of England's official spokesman on education. The

¹⁷³ Naylor and Howat, *Culham College History*, p. 20.

¹⁷⁴ Cu1006, 'The Autobiography of Frederick Holey Written at the Request of His Children', p. 19.

¹⁷⁵ *Ibid.*, p. 51.

¹⁷⁶ Naylor and Howat, *Culham College History*, p. 104.

Christian emphasis persisted throughout regulation by the Board of Education (1840–1928), the University of Reading (1929-1950), and the University of Oxford’s Institute of Education (1951-1977). The Christian emphasis persists in the trust which formed from the College’s closure: the Culham Institute continues to fund research into Christian education and to provide national leadership on religious education in schools. However, despite its strong and continuing Christian emphasis, Culham College came to promote a naturalistic view of education far adrift from the intentions of its founders. How we can trace this shift, and the reasons behind its occurrence, are the subjects of Chapters IV and V

2.2.3 Fishponds Diocesan Training College

When Samuel Wilberforce moved his College to the village of Culham near Abingdon, he worked with the dioceses of Gloucester and Bristol to establish ‘a sister college to Culham’. On 10 September 1853, Fishponds Training College (originally named the Stapleton Training Institution) opened its doors to sixty women.¹⁷⁷ Trust Deeds proclaimed the spiritual emphasis of the College:

It is hereby declared that the said institution shall be conducted upon the principles of the Church of England in conformity with the catechism, offices, and articles of the said Church...the Principal shall be a clergyman of the United Church of England and Ireland in priest’s orders. He shall openly in the Institution say, or cause to be said by some other clergyman, the daily morning and evening service of the Church according to the Book of Common Prayer; and shall be diligent in enjoining the attendance thereat of all the Inmates who shall not in his judgment be reasonably hindered.¹⁷⁸

The first prospectus cohered with the vision in the Trust Deed:

The object of this institution is to train young women to act as schoolmistresses in Parochial Schools...The Religious Instruction and Moral Training of the students are entrusted to a resident Principal in holy orders, who also superintends the general teaching of the Institution...The secular studies will be conducted by two governesses

¹⁷⁷ Leslie Vincent, *The Annals of the College of St Matthias Commemorated in 1976* (1976), p. 3.

¹⁷⁸ 37168-02, 'Minutes of Council Meetings, 1855-1875', (1855-1875), Executed May 24, 1851.

under the guidance of the Principal... Education is religious training in Holy Scriptures according to the principles of the Church of England, and Instruction in Reading, Writing, Arithmetic, Geography, History, English Grammar, Vocal Music, and Needlework.¹⁷⁹

Conceptually, its founders intended the College to be shot through with religious purpose and its graduates prepared for a life of what was essentially religious service.

The spiritual emphasis continued through the early twentieth century. The alumnae association referred in its founding documents (1897) to the 'spiritual bond of union which belongs to those who side by side have worshipped in the same chapel, communed at the same altar, and who are remembered in special prayers at the daily services'.¹⁸⁰ The rules for membership were three: to receive Holy Communion once a month; to 'remember daily to ask God's blessing on their work as teachers, and also, at least once a week, to offer a prayer of intercession for the College and its work'; and to perform voluntary service for parish churches. Indeed, in 1947 the College Governing Body issued a strong statement that, even though Christian colleges were 'frequently ask[ed] whether the specifically religious work of the Church Training Colleges [wa]s such as to justify the large sums of money which will have to be raised to equip them to play their part in the future educational system of the country' the Christian framework of Fishponds remained as important as ever. 'The teaching of the Christian faith is part of the course of the College,' the Governors wrote, and 'emphasis [was] laid on the importance of religion in the school, and on the development of a child's religious life'.¹⁸¹ At the same time, the internal records of the College register a lack of attention to a theological philosophy of education in the classroom. Fishponds was therefore typical of the religious

¹⁷⁹ Ibid., *Prospectus*, 1853.

¹⁸⁰ Vincent, *The Annals of the College of St Matthias Commemorated in 1976*, p. 27.

¹⁸¹ Ibid., p. 55.

atmosphere persistent in confessional colleges and the simultaneous blind eye turned towards the underlying metaphysical claims of scientific psychology. Chapter V expands upon this theme.

Fishponds continued as a diocesan enterprise, fending off near-closure in 1933.¹⁸² It was incorporated into Bristol Polytechnic in 1975.¹⁸³ The governing body's resolutions, the students' performance on religious examinations, and student organisations evidence an ongoing commitment to a religious atmosphere well after the Second World War. At the same time, academic performance at Fishponds was considered weak, which, as subsequent chapters argue, made the College more vulnerable to direction first from the Inspectorate and secondly from the Universities.

2.2.4 Cheltenham Training College

In 1846 most of the Anglican training colleges in England were of High Church orientation, due to their affiliation with the National Society. Cheltenham, by contrast, was an Evangelical institution. The (Evangelical) Rector of Cheltenham, Francis Close, had founded an infant school in 1827 and wanted to open a training college as well. He secured the help of Evangelical businessmen in Cheltenham and London, who established a trust to propagate training which was, 'Scriptural, Evangelical and Protestant, in accordance with the articles and Liturgy of the Church of England'¹⁸⁴ The College commissioned its students for a sacred task, concluding its brochures with the words:

The students are regarded as having devoted themselves to a great work in the service of God, and for the good of their country. They are therefore expected to conduct themselves in a manner worthy of their intended profession. The discipline and rules of the College impose upon them only such restrictions as are necessary for the welfare of

¹⁸² Lofthouse, *The Church Colleges 1918-1939: The Struggle for Survival*, p. 49.

¹⁸³ Vincent, *The Annals of the College of St Matthias Commemorated in 1976*, p. 64.

¹⁸⁴ Ua5/1/1, 'Church of England Normal Training College at Cheltenham. Prospectus', (Cheltenham, 1855).

the body of which they are members, and for their own preparation for their future duties.¹⁸⁵

Perhaps the most striking articulation of the College's mission is found in two sermons preached by Francis Close. His sermons will be revisited in Chapter III, but in summary, in 'Cooperation with the Committee of Council on Education Vindicated and Recommended,' Close argued that education must exist for every English child, and that the Church must exert leadership in making it so.¹⁸⁶ In fact, he justified the entire enterprise of education upon the principle of the *Imago Dei*, that every child was made in the image of God, and therefore equally deserving of educational opportunity irrespective of social standing.

'Within a few years of its launching', wrote College historian Charles More, 'Cheltenham was to be both the largest training college and the one consistently lauded by the inspectorate as the best-run and most advanced'.¹⁸⁷ Besides high praise from Her Majesty's Inspectors, three other things distinguished the College: laity comprised half of the Governing Body; women attended from the start; and the College received no help from the national Church.¹⁸⁸

The women's and men's divisions were kept separate geographically but united administratively. In 1921, the Government ordered them to separate administratively; in 1979, the Government combined them again. The 'College of St. Paul and St. Mary' joined with the Gloucestershire College of Arts and Technology to become the Cheltenham and Gloucester College of Higher Education (in 1989), and then the University of Gloucestershire (in 2001). The Francis Close campus, once the centre of St. Paul's, now houses the Education, Social

¹⁸⁵ *Ibid.*

Ua20/1/4, 'Cooperation with the Committee of Council on Education Vindicated and Recommended', in Rev. Francis Close (ed.), (London: Hatchard and Son, 1848).

¹⁸⁶ Ua20/1/4, 'Cooperation with the Committee of Council on Education Vindicated and Recommended', pp. 48-50.

¹⁸⁷ More, *The Training of Teachers, 1847-1947: A History of the Church Colleges at Cheltenham*, p. 17.

¹⁸⁸ S. O'Brien, 'A Distinctive Church College: St Paul and St Mary, Cheltenham', in Trevor Brighton (ed.), *150 Years: The Church Colleges in Higher Education* (Bognor Regis, West Sussex: West Sussex Institute of Higher Education, 1989), p. 122.

Science, Theology, Religious Studies, and Environment Departments. The original Trust funds two full-time chaplains, but the University's website today mentions neither the chapel nor the College's religious heritage. In subsequent chapters, the case unfolds that even as Cheltenham students overwhelmingly participated in religious life well past the Second World War, its educational philosophy became discordant with the ontologies expressed in its trust deeds and in Close's sermons.

2.3 Nonconformist Institutions

2.3.1 Nonconformist Colleges: Introduction

Nonconformists did not constitute a unified body, and they certainly disagreed about the nature and scope of education. Most supported an education which was generally religious but not framed by specific denominational formularies. Although the British and Foreign School Society (BFSS) aimed to create a non-creedal but nevertheless religious national education, which enabled it to attract liberal Anglicans such as Lord John Russell, its schools were unmistakably Nonconformist in tenor. As Home Secretary, Russell surveyed conflicts over religion and education (most particularly in Liverpool)¹⁸⁹ and concluded that sectarianism had no place in schools. In 1838 he proposed that religious education be reduced to Bible study alone, and that Catholic, Jewish and dissenting children be allowed to leave during Bible reading. Most importantly, Russell wanted the laity to be in charge of education, and for the Government to sponsor a nonsectarian training college.¹⁹⁰ Russell's plans never gained sufficient support in Parliament and were withdrawn after two months. A different type of conflict occurred in 1843, when Home Secretary James Graham withdrew his factory legislation because the

¹⁸⁹ Murphy, *The Religious Problem in English Education : The Crucial Experiment*, p. 139 ff.

¹⁹⁰ Hurt, *Education in Evolution*, p. 32.

denominations simply could not agree about which form of Christianity should shape the education of children in textile factories.

Some of the Nonconformists who had helped to topple the Corn Laws in 1846 applied themselves to education: in 1847 John Bright and Samuel Lucas formed the Lancashire Public School Association (from 1850 'The National Public School Association') which demanded 'free, rate-supported and locally-controlled education'¹⁹¹ Originally, Bright had asked for 'secular' education, but Richard Cobden, Bright's ally in Parliament and an Anglican, convinced the Association to substitute 'nonsectarian' instead. This move alienated some of the ardent secularists but made the group viable politically. On the other hand, some Nonconformists were 'voluntaryists' who adamantly opposed state funding. From 1843 the Congregationalists, for instance, created their own network of schools which reached 364 in number by 1851 and was funded by subscription alone; in 1846 they founded Homerton Training College upon voluntaryist principles.¹⁹²

The Methodists differentiated their educational efforts from those of both the British Foreign and School Society and the Congregationalists. John Wesley had opened Sunday schools in London, Newcastle and Kingswood, and by 1833 there existed 3,339 Methodist Sunday schools with 59,277 teachers and 341,442 pupils.¹⁹³ These numbers were impressive. But Methodist leaders simultaneously noted the paucity of day schools (9 for infants, 22 for older children), and with determination launched the Methodist Education Committee, which had, by 1839, opened an additional seventy day schools.¹⁹⁴ By 1900, these numbered over 800.¹⁹⁵ They

¹⁹¹ Donald K. Jones, 'Lancashire, the American Common School, and the Religious Problem in British Education in the 19th Century', *British Journal of Educational Studies*, 15(1967), 292-307, p. 292.

¹⁹² *Ibid.*, p. 294.

¹⁹³ *Ibid.*, p. 3.

¹⁹⁴ *Ibid.*, p. 4.

¹⁹⁵ *Ibid.*, p. 7.

created their own training institutions as well. Ultimately, Nonconformists tended to support 'Board' schools over confessional ones for their children. Many Nonconformists wanted denominational schools but lacked the national structures and the theologically expansive social theory of the Anglicans.¹⁹⁶ Schools originally sponsored by the British and Foreign School Society transferred to 'controlled' status in droves during the twentieth century.

The training colleges run by the BFFS remained adamantly non-creedal. At the training college run by Methodists, the atmosphere was slightly more doctrinaire, but the administration was more disposed than any other training college to forge an alliance with the university. The next section provides brief histories of two colleges run by the British and Foreign School Society (Borough Road and Stockwell) and one run by the Wesleyan Methodists (Westminster).

2.3.2 Borough Road and Stockwell Colleges

Borough Road Training College had its roots in 1808, when Joseph Lancaster opened a training college for schoolmasters in Southwark. When his lack of financial acumen nearly closed the place down in 1814, he turned it over to the governance of the BFSS. The BFSS watched over the College and its female department, Stockwell (separated into a distinct institution in 1861), until the latter was sold to the Kent Education Committee (1975) and Borough Road incorporated into Brunel University (1996). The male and female Colleges exhibited some differences: kindergarten techniques flourished at the latter but not the former, and there is little evidence that the women sought advanced degrees (the few who did stood out¹⁹⁷). The Joint Board affiliation and the ATO networks afforded increasing opportunity to

¹⁹⁶ Maclure, *Educational Documents: England and Wales - 1816-1963*, Introduction, p. 5.

¹⁹⁷ *Stockwell College Old Students' Association, 1892-1992* (Trowbridge, Wiltshire: Rosemary F. Carr, 1992), p. 48: 'Three students were able to remain for a third year to take a further course. Two read for the Social Science Certificate at the LSE, one was resident at the Rachel Macmillan Training College in Deptford', in 1930.

attend lectures at the University of London and to sit for its education exams. Insofar as both were directly managed by the BFSS and used many of the same teaching materials, they will be considered together. Many of their records were destroyed by a twentieth-century fire in the BFSS offices. What remains from each College complements the other and presents a narrative of change.

What framed these Colleges' *ethos*? Initially, the only textbook used was the Bible.¹⁹⁸

This decision reflected two things: the Society's theological view of education, and its desire that no one Christian denomination's particularities be privileged over another's. Neither catechisms nor textbooks was sanctioned. As the Society discussed in conference in 1844,

By confining religious instruction to the sacred scriptures, and by inculcating points which unite rather than those which divide real Christians, it presents truth to the minds of children in its just proportions; it avoids the danger of forming sectarian artisans instead of enlightened Christians...it thus binds together in a common cause.¹⁹⁹

Eventually, this view widened to include *Popular Education* (second edition, 1837) by Henry Dunn, the Society's permanent secretary. Dunn's work was used by the Male Department in 1854 and by the Female Department in 1856.²⁰⁰ His work is discussed in Chapter III. The view that education ought to be Biblically-framed persisted until the twentieth century. Borough Road's application form from the 1890s, for instance, included the following questions: 'Have you considered the importance of the teacher's work, and are you prepared to engage in it as *Christian service*?' and 'Will you strive to *train* as well as to *teach* the children committed to your care, making them acquainted with the Scriptures without using your influence in favour of

¹⁹⁸ Br401, 'Normal Institution', (1830-1856), p. 1, Educational Conferences held by the BFSS on 14th and 15th March, 1844.

¹⁹⁹ *Ibid.*

²⁰⁰ *Ibid.*, *The Normal Schools of the British and Foreign School Society (Female Department) Printed in London for the Society*, 1856.

one sect of Christians or another [italics original]?’²⁰¹ The BFSS exists today, although it has sold its colleges and transferred its schools to the State. Today, the BFSS administers trusts and runs the Religious Education Centre in London. The Society’s aim is ‘the advancement of education, that is, the physical, mental, moral, religious and spiritual development of the whole person regardless of national, racial or cultural background in accordance with the principles of the Christian faith but on a non-sectarian and inter-denominational basis and without creedal tests’²⁰²

Despite the persistence of Christian terminologies, both Colleges followed a similar pattern to Anglican colleges. That is, their philosophies of education moved from a theological framework to a psychological one. At the end of the day, Borough Road and Stockwell lost their distinct identities, conceptually and materially. Academically, Borough Road and Stockwell students ranked well. Borough Road greatly impressed Matthew Arnold, who inspected and praised it in 1855.²⁰³ Its graduates vied with Westminster College for the highest number of university degrees in the late nineteenth century, and it produced such noteworthy graduates as James Runciman (who vilified teacher training colleges in his *Schools and Scholars*, 1887) and P.B. Ballard (who graduated in 1887 and went on to become the Chief Inspector under the LCC and an author of the Hadow Report). Borough Road in particular moved quite close to the work of the London Day Training College. Both Colleges distinguished themselves intellectually and made a significant contribution to teacher training in England and Wales. Both Colleges mirrored the tendency of the universities to draw upon psychology rather than theology or philosophy.

²⁰¹ Br415, 'Printed Forms', (1870-1895), Training College Application Form, 1890s.

²⁰² British and Foreign School Service, 'Aims,' listed on its website: www.bfss.org.uk/past.html, seen on 23 July 2006.

²⁰³ G.F. Bartle, *A History of Borough Road College* (Kettering: Dalkeith Press Limited, 1976), p. 28.

2.3.3 Westminster Training College

The Methodist Education Committee (MEC), having aggressively opened many schools, determined to equip teachers. The MEC hired three men who had studied under David Stow in Glasgow, to act as peripatetic trainers of teachers. It supplied scholarships to train in Glasgow itself; by 1840 there were six Methodist men and in 1841, two Methodist women, at Stow's seminary. Then, the MEC began to consider opening its own teacher training college in London, and by 1846 such a place had been secured. The new College, officially opened in 1851, required academic accomplishment and personal conversion before admittance. Interviews were rigorous and led by the College's Principal, Rev. Dr. John Scott. The College was state-aided and state-inspected from the beginning. In 1872 the Methodist Education Committee opened Southlands, for women students, and Westminster became male-only.

Westminster distinguished itself academically and spiritually throughout its existence. The most important thing about Westminster, however, is that it was unique among the colleges in forging an alliance with the University of London early in the twentieth century. As early as the 1890s, Westminster made overtures to the University of London for concurrent degrees, and in 1894 two students gained B.A.s.²⁰⁴ In 1903 a new Principal came to Westminster, Rev. Herbert B. Workman. Workman had taken his degree in philosophy at the University of London and began an extended effort (which culminated in the 1930s) to strengthen the bond between University and College. This demanded heightened academic rigour. Workman laboured, for example, to admit more students based upon the matriculation exam written by the University, rather than by the customary King's Scholarship exam. Had the war not interrupted this process (Westminster closed until 1919), Workman's aim would have been accomplished much sooner.

²⁰⁴ Pritchard, *The Story of Westminster College, 1851-1951*, p. 79.

By the 1924-1925 session, Westminster only admitted men who were prepared to read for the external degree exam of the University of London.²⁰⁵ During the Joint Board period (1926 to 1944), Westminster students lived in College four years but studied for three years at one of the University of London's Colleges (University, King's, or the London School of Economics) and devoted their fourth to specialized teacher training at Westminster.

Westminster's coveted relationship with the University of London demonstrates the high cultural status of English universities, and of the University of London in particular, in setting the agenda for educational philosophy. Indeed, it would be difficult to imagine an independent training college more enmeshed in a university setting, than was Westminster, between 1903 and 1944. With respect to its staffing, its syllabus, its coursework, its students' experiences, and, not least, its educational theory, Westminster College was in many ways an extension of the University of London's Department of Education run by Sir John Adams and Sir Percy Nunn. Thus the College came to participate in the naturalistic view of education marketed by Adams and Nunn, despite the College's confessional origins and ongoing Christian infrastructure.

2.4 Roman Catholic Institutions

2.4.1 Roman Catholic Institutions – Introduction

Each of the religious communities in England and Wales presented its own vision for education, circumscribed by its own texts, tradition, and moral philosophy. Yet in many ways, the Catholic vision differentiated itself more than the others. Roman Catholics perceived their community in general, and their educational system in particular, as distinct from any other and

²⁰⁵ *Ibid.*, p. 139.

as under siege both from secularists and from other denominations. Catholic leaders drew heavily upon official doctrine to carve out a distinctive sphere within English education.

In 1800 the English Catholic population, estimated at 60,000, had only ten schools of their own.²⁰⁶ This number slowly increased so that when the Catholic Poor School Committee was founded in 1847, there were eighty Catholic schools eligible for State grants. Few Catholic schools could take advantage of the grant, however, as it was contingent upon local matching funds, which proved impossible for the largely impoverished Catholic body whose numbers swelled by at least 200,000 following the potato famine in Ireland.²⁰⁷ The matter of State inspections proved likewise problematic, and the Church began a long battle to ensure inspections by Catholics.

Catholics, more than any other religious body, resisted the urge to separate 'secular' and 'sacred' subjects, or to divorce 'religious instruction' from the remainder of the school schedule. The entire atmosphere of a school was to be charged with theological truth. On 24 April 1875, the Archbishop of Westminster, Henry Edward Manning, addressed the student body and staff at St Mary's College. His speech epitomized the Catholic imperative.

The head and the heart are united together by God, and cannot be separated. The whole man must be educated. The whole intellectual, moral, and spiritual form and character, must be complete. The culture of the intellect may be developed to an extraordinary degree, and the rest of the man left barren and stunted. The Education which takes possession of the whole soul, with all of its faculties, is alone worthy of the name.²⁰⁸

Thus, Manning argued that humanity consisted of body, soul, and mind, and the three ought not be separated. Because this was not possible under any other regime, Catholic children must have a Catholic education. As did other Catholics, Manning firmly rejected both the concept of

²⁰⁶ Jeremy Hurst, 'Religious Requirement: The Case for Roman Catholic Schools in the 1940s and Muslim Schools in the 1990s', *Journal of Beliefs and Values*, 21(12000), 87-97, p. 87.

²⁰⁷ *Ibid.*, p. 88.

²⁰⁸ Smh/3/08, 'Principal's Correspondence and Papers', (1875-1876), Archbishop of Westminster, Address to the Students and Staff at St Mary's, 24 April 1875.

secular education as well as the extracting of Religious Instruction from the daily time table, such as was urged by Nonconformist and secular models of education. Catholics had taken famous stances in this conflict, such as the Papal Admonition (1867) which prohibited Catholics from studying at Oxford and Cambridge even after the religious tests had been abolished.²⁰⁹

Catholic economic vicissitudes further distinguished them from their fellow citizens. They felt disadvantaged economically and perceived their population as needier, and with bleaker prospects, than those of the average Englishman. The burden of education was felt, therefore, to be not only salvific but financial. Thus, wrote the Liverpool and District Catholic Teachers' Association to the foremost lay Catholic (His Grace the Duke of Norfolk) in 1881:

Catholic poor people have no influence at their back to assist them in giving their children a start in life, and the only way the rising generation of Catholics have of elevating themselves in the social scale or of commanding places of emolument is by obtaining a superior education. The children leaving our Poor Schools have to compete, not only for position, but even for their very existence, with those turned out by the more favoured establishments existing in this country. Non-Catholic schools can already turn out better clothed, better fed, and if in the future we have to add – better educated youths than comparatively speaking our, as a rule, poor home neglected children, what an incalculable injury will be done them. What an additional shackle will be added to their already too-numerous fetters.²¹⁰

Thus, there were two motivating issues for Catholics in sponsoring their own distinct education: protection from secularism, and release from economic disadvantage.

In 1869, Manning issued an appeal to all London clergy to preach about educational support.

About thirty schools and three thousand children have been added to the Education of the Diocese...[but] not less than fifteen hundred Catholic children are still being robbed of their Faith, in the Protestant Poor-Law Schools. I can find no words too urgent to implore

²⁰⁹ Hurst, 'Religious Requirement: The Case for Roman Catholic Schools in the 1940s and Muslim Schools in the 1990s', p. 89.

²¹⁰ Smh/3/11, 'Principal's Correspondence and Papers', (1881-1882), Letter from the Liverpool and District Catholic Teachers' Association, to His Grace the Duke of Norfolk, June 5, 1881.

the Clergy and Laity to labour together in united and self-denying efforts...to provide the means of rescuing the last of these poor Catholic children from the certain loss of Faith.²¹¹

Because the Act of 1870 did not satisfy Catholic requirements, the Church embarked upon a 'huge programme of expansion, increasing the number of its schools from 350 in 1870 to 1,066 in 1902, and quadrupling the number of pupils'.²¹² By way of comparison, during this period 1,500 voluntary schools were either closed or transferred, but 'not one Catholic school was so affected' The drive continued, and by 1939 Catholics owned 1,299 schools and enrolled 380,000 pupils, or 7% of the elementary school population in England and Wales.²¹³

A plan for training colleges followed suit. In contrast to the Church of England training colleges, the number of which contracted during the early twentieth century, Catholic training colleges proliferated. In 1900 there were three for women (Mount Pleasant, Liverpool, opened in 1856; Wandsworth, 1874; Cavendish Square, 1896 but recognized in 1922), and one for men (St Mary's). By the First World War, five more had been added (Salford in 1903; La Sainte Union, 1904; Fenham, Newcastle, in 1905; Endsleigh in Hull, 1905; Selly Park, Birmingham, 1911).²¹⁴ In 1927 the Principal of St Mary's was able to boast that, since 1850, Roman Catholics had produced between 11,000 and 12,000 teachers.²¹⁵ Catholic colleges clung to their distinct identity throughout the period. The records show that they resisted affiliation with universities in

²¹¹ Smh/3/03, 'Principal's Correspondence and Papers', (1862-1869), Letter from the Archbishop of Westminster, 17 June 1869.

²¹² Hurst, 'Religious Requirement: The Case for Roman Catholic Schools in the 1940s and Muslim Schools in the 1990s', p. 89.

²¹³ Ibid.

²¹⁴ Smh/3/42, 'Religious Inspection Reports', (1911-1928), Report on the Religious Inspection of the Training Colleges of England and Scotland, 1922-1923.

²¹⁵ Pri/1/3/5, 'Principal's Correspondence and Papers', (1927). 'The Catholic Training Colleges', evidently written by Principal James J. Doyle.

the 1920s, choosing to do so only under Governmental pressure, and maintaining strong distinctive cultures well into the last quarter of the twentieth century.²¹⁶

Chapters III, IV and V explore the educational philosophy taught in two of these places (St Mary's and La Sainte Union) and seek to demonstrate that the Catholic colleges resisted complete naturalization of theory much longer than their Anglican and Nonconformist sisters. The next sections provide historical narratives of each and comments upon the similarities of tone present in both campuses.

2.4.2 St Mary's College

In 1850 the Catholic Poor School Committee (later the Catholic Schools Committee; later still the Catholic Education Committee) opened St Mary's Training College for men in Hammersmith. The Brothers of Christian Instruction, a French fraternity for teachers, gave instruction and leadership. This relationship endured until 1899, at which point the Vincentian Brothers (The Congregation of the Mission) assumed responsibility. St Mary's was run by Vincentians until the death of Father Desmond Beirne, Principal in 1992. During the term of the *first* Vincentian Principal (Father William Byrne 1899-1909) the student body and staff grew in size, and the College property was extended by a grant from the Catholic Education Committee.²¹⁷ By 1924 there were 129 students at the College, and a new site was deemed necessary. The College removed to the Walpole-Waldegrave property at Strawberry Hill, Twickenham, in 1925 with room for 150 residential, and forty non-residential, students.

²¹⁶ John D. Gay, 'The Churches and the Training of Teachers in England and Wales', in Alan McClelland (ed.), *Christian Education in a Pluralist Society* (London: Routledge, 1988), p. 214.

²¹⁷ 'Personal Papers at St Mary's College', *Administrative/Biographical history* (www.aim25.ac.uk/cgi-bin/search2?coll_id=7217&inst_id=67, 2005), 'St Mary's College Centenary Record', *Hammersmith 1850-1925, Strawberry Hill 1925-1950* (London: F. Mildner and Sons, 1950), Viewed in January, 2005.

In 1928 the College entered into the Joint Board scheme under the *aegis* of the University of London, which monitored syllabuses and examinations. The four resident male colleges in London (St Mary's, Borough Road, St Mark's and St John's, and Westminster) clustered under the specific supervision of University College, London, an arrangement which St Mary's greeted with ambivalence (see Chapter V). Following the recommendations of the McNair Report, St Mary's became a constituent College of the University of London's Institute of Education in 1949. This did not imply that St Mary's became part of the University, but rather that the University accredited and certificated the College and its graduates. In 1964 the College became the largest teacher training college in England and Wales with 800 students; in 1966, 1,000 places were filled and women were admitted.²¹⁸ In 1979 the College transferred its affiliation from the University of London to the University of Surrey. Today, it offers degrees in a variety of academic courses 'as part of a planned diversification to offset reductions in teacher training numbers'²¹⁹ St Mary's has over 2,500 students and offered the first M.A. programme in the United Kingdom in Catholic School Leadership. St Mary's has retained its pronounced Catholic vision. Recent newsletters and mission statements continue to advert to Christian doctrine, Catholic liturgy, and 'an experience and witness to Christ's presence in today's society'²²⁰ At the same time, naturalistic psychology seems to have elbowed out catechistic concerns within educational studies. However, this seems to have happened rather later than in the Anglican and Nonconformist colleges, having been evidenced more in the 1950s and 1960s than in the period before the Second World War. Chapter VI explores this further.

²¹⁸ St Mary's College Centenary Record', p. 5.

²¹⁹ Ibid., p. 17.

²²⁰ Ibid., *Vision Statement*, 2000.

2.4.3 La Sainte Union College

The sisters of La Sainte Union came from France to England in the nineteenth century, founded convents and schools in London and Southampton, and opened St Edmund's, England's first new Catholic church since the Reformation.²²¹ The Belgian Headmistress of the Southampton high school, Mother Antonia Goestseels de Hinnisdael, developed a pupil-teacher centre. She worried about the Catholic women attending the Teacher Training Department of Hartley College (now Southampton University), and in 1903 opened a hostel for twenty women who attended there. Because the trust deeds of Hartley College were decidedly opposed to association with sectarian entities, however, the Southampton Educational Authority refused to help those students financially.²²² There followed a lengthy debate which is reflected in dozens of meetings, panels, and newspaper articles.²²³ Ironically, the resistance of the Local Educational Authority and some of Hartley's officials prompted the Principal to move forward quickly with a training college where Catholic women could train without harassment. In 1904, LSU opened on its own site with thirty-one students and received accolades from HMI Scott-Coward, who soon thereafter served on the Governing Body.²²⁴ By 1907 the College served 112 women, who continued to do well, but not brilliantly, in examinations.

The College was courted in the mid-1920s by University College, Southampton, in the wake of the Government's determination to abjure examining training college students. La Sainte Union resisted at first but in 1928 agreed to affiliate and embarked upon dozens of meetings which resulted in joint examinations and the vetting of syllabuses. In 1935 the Western

²²¹ Mary Desales, *Lsu: 100 Years of La Sainte Union in Southampton* (Southampton: Paul Cave Publications, 1980), pp. 9 and 10.

²²² *Ibid.*, p. 18.

²²³ Lsu.1.Annals, 'Annals of the College', (1903-1923), 8 September 1903; Lsu.F22.70-90, 'Press Cuttings', (1903-1979).

²²⁴ Lsu.1.Annals, 'Annals of the College', Easter 1906, and 25 June 1907.

Joint Board was expanded to include the University of Bristol and King Alfred's College, Winchester, among others.²²⁵ During the Second World War the College evacuated to Cheltenham, and when it returned to Southampton was encouraged to join the Institute of Education at Southampton University College (1950). Although the Institute was configured so as to preserve the autonomy of each college as much as possible, the Institute had to be consulted in the making of appointments and the scheme of exams.²²⁶ The College went through various amalgamations in the second half of the twentieth century but managed to retain its autonomy and its Catholic identity. It was only after the appointment of the first lay Principal, Dr. Armand Chitnis, in 1990, that the creedal framework of LSU moved into the background, at least as far as its public presentation was concerned.²²⁷ In 1997 the College was closed following a devastating academic report from the Department of Education and Science.

2.4.4 St Mary's and La Sainte Union: Atmosphere

The atmosphere at St Mary's and at LSU was affected by the religious orders which ran them. At St Mary's, the Order of the Day in the 1870s, for instance, included morning prayer, meditation, and holy mass daily at 6:30 am, a short visit to the blessed sacrament at 1 pm, and evening prayers at 10 pm during the week, and a full day of worship (7:30 am until 3 pm) on Sundays.²²⁸ At LSU, the meticulous annals reflect a constant attention to the liturgical calendar. While they cite visitations from royal inspectors, the majority of entries between 1903 (when the College was founded) and 1945 (when the Annals ceased to be written) concern Feast Days and

²²⁵ Desales, *Lsu: 100 Years of La Sainte Union in Southampton*, p. 36.

²²⁶ Lsu.IV.B(E).09-10, 'Southampton - Lsu College', (1932-1992), 9.87, University College, Southampton, Institute of Education founding documents.

²²⁷ See the contrast between IV B(e)10.24, Principal's Report to the Governors, Academic Year 1986-7, and IV B(e) 10.34, Prospectus, LSU College of Higher Education, 1991.

²²⁸ Smh/2/1, 'Managing Committee Signed Notes', (1871-1896), recorded in the front of the memo book.

homilies. Frequently the chief points from Rev. Father O'Mahony's sermons were noted.²²⁹ In 1928 the students prayed during May for 'the conversion of England, once the Dowry of Mary, to a real and vital devotion to God's Holy Mother as a preliminary to complete return to the Faith'.²³⁰ Unlike the Anglican training colleges, which tended to make the case for their existence, increasingly, upon their similarities with secular bodies, LSU and St Mary's emphasized their confessional distinctiveness. Their tenacity with respect to identity and difference permitted both St Mary's and La Sainte Union to be more selective in the importing of educational psychology, well past the Second World War. This was true of the Catholic religious community as a whole, and it was true of the Catholic community's educational endeavours.

2.5 University Day Training Colleges

2.5.1 University Day Training Colleges – Introduction

The Cross Commission discussed whether universities should be allowed to open training colleges (UTDs). The idea was contentious from the beginning. The objections were as follows: first, that non-residential colleges could not possibly achieve the depth and influence of atmosphere which inhered in a residential college experience; secondly, that day colleges would be secular and therefore would not be able to prepare students for the religious component of teaching; thirdly, that day colleges would provoke unwelcome competition for the residential training colleges. The advocacy for UTDs ran as follows: first, that day training colleges would provide a broad and elevated academic environment which would be of particular benefit to future teachers; secondly, that day training colleges would pave the way for teachers to gain

²²⁹ Lsu.1.Annals, 'Annals of the College', 23 June 1922.

²³⁰ Lsu.3.Annals, 'Annals of the College', (1927-1932). 30 April 1928.

university degrees; thirdly, that day training colleges would provide necessary competition to the residential training colleges; fourthly, that the paucity of teacher training placements demanded that new avenues be opened. In the end, the Government gave its cautious approval. Universities seized the opportunity to open teacher training departments. In 1890 they opened six, another four in 1891, and four more in 1892. By 1900 'there were sixteen, containing over 1,150 students, nearly a quarter of the total number (5,200) in training'²³¹ They offered students the opportunity to read for an undergraduate degree concurrently, and in 1891 the Department of Education agreed to fund a third year of training to make this possible.²³²

Two things must be said at this point. First, the atmosphere of the University Training Departments (UTDs) was acknowledged to be secular. In his annual report on elementary schools and training colleges in 1901, His Majesty's Inspector Sir William Scott-Coward, who was a prominent Roman Catholic, noted his concern about the lack of religious emphasis there. After commending UTDs at great length, he wrote,

There are, I am convinced, some serious drawbacks to its system. One is the absence of any recognition of religion as a factor of the most powerful kind in education. This absence being all the more important in view of the fact that the teachers will work in schools in which religious instruction is necessary and placed in a very prominent position. The result will be, must inevitably be, the treatment of a subject by means of which some of the deepest and finest emotions of the heart can be quickened and made to be the guides of life, with no more interest or respect than the learning of a formula.²³³

Scott-Coward, then, recognised as early as 1901 that teachers who trained at the prestigious University Training Departments would not receive notions of theological transcendence there, and that this fact would bear upon the next generation of schoolchildren. Scott-Coward's successor, Mr. A Rankine, recognized the secularity of the UTDs but did not seem to share

²³¹ Dent, *The Training of Teachers in England and Wales, 1800-1975*, p. 33.

²³² *Ibid.*, p. 32.

²³³ D/1/C/1, 'Board of Education Report on Elementary Schools and Training Colleges', (1901), p. 181.

Scott-Coward's alarm; Rankine's report of 1902 noted simply, 'The University Colleges are completely secular'.²³⁴

Second, the universities carried far greater *cachet* than the training colleges from the beginning. In the cutting-edge *Journal of Education*, for instance, the following notes appeared in 1891:

At a meeting of Manchester teachers, Professor Laurie [the first professor of education in the United Kingdom] uttered the pious aspiration that the day might come when all elementary school teachers were prepared by the University, and not by the denominational training colleges...It would be not only unjust but ungracious to belittle the work that the training colleges have done, and are doing...but they must be satisfied to have served as stepping-stones.²³⁵

None of the residential training colleges wanted to be considered 'stepping stones' Yet with time, this is how they appeared. The prestige which accrued to the UTDs granted them ever-increasing responsibility and influence over the colleges, and ultimately the latter were simply subsumed not only intellectually but practically.

This thesis aims fully to explore the variegated influences which universities had over the colleges. For now, it is necessary only to introduce the histories and early outlook of two prominent University Day Training Colleges: Oxford's and London's.

2.5.2 Oxford University Day Training College

The Oxford University Day Training College opened in 1892 to train elementary teachers under the administration of the Delegacy for the Training of Teachers. Candidates needed to have earned a First Class in the Queen's Scholarship examination, to have passed an exam in Latin, to have acquired character testimonials from 'two responsible persons' such as school

²³⁴ D/1/C/2, 'Board of Education General Report on Elementary Schools and Training Colleges', (1902), p. 159.

²³⁵ 'Occasional Notes', *The Journal of Education: A Monthly Paper Devoted to the Interests of the Scholastic Profession*, XIII/4 (April 1891), 187.

managers, and to have become members of the University community, either as members of a college or as non-collegiate students.²³⁶ Most of these students therefore read for the B.A. and studied towards their Teacher's Certificate simultaneously. Men and women trained separately, with the women located initially at Cherwell Hall where they were shepherded by a Women's Tutor. After 1913, women candidates from various colleges and halls were supervised not by a Women's Tutor (the numbers were too small) but by head teachers at Oxford High School.

In 1896 the Delegacy set a Diploma course (for secondary school teaching), which in 1902 differentiated itself from the Delegacy for the Training of Elementary Teachers as the Delegacy for the Training of Secondary Teachers. Requirements included having attained a minimum of eight terms at a university and passing the examination in the Theory, History, and Practice of Education. To receive the Diploma, candidates had to satisfy the examiners that they were 'efficient', which meant submitting notebooks attesting to their success in practice schools.²³⁷ A Reader in Education was appointed in 1902, and his salary was paid for by the University. By 1910, the Delegacy was able to boast that:

Of the students who have been through the Oxford course of training ten have received Inspectorships under the Board of Education, and seven in the Indian Educational Services; four are Professors, Readers, or Lecturers in Education at British Universities or University Colleges...and in South Africa. As schoolmasters, men who have been through the course have secured appointments in schools of every type including Charterhouse, Clifton, Eton, Harrow, Manchester Grammar, Marlborough, Osborne, Repton and St Paul's.²³⁸

The Annual Report of 1911-1912 made it quite clear that even elementary school teachers, to qualify for their certificate, had to be university-qualified as well. In that year, the Government Grant was made to extend to a fourth year.

²³⁶ Ed1/1, 'Minutes of the Delegacy for the Training of Teachers', (1892-1918), March 2 1892.

²³⁷ Ed1/4/1, 'Minutes of the Delegacy for the Training of Secondary Teachers', (1902-1906), printed sheet inside the front cover.

²³⁸ Ed1/4/2, 'Minutes of the Delegacy for the Training of Secondary Teachers', (1906-1913), Letter to Prospective Students, 1910.

The first three years will be almost entirely devoted to work for the University Degree. The Professional work will be limited to class teaching in vacations, an average of two hours' lectures a week during term, and a very little Physical Drill, perhaps eight hours a year. After the Degree is taken, the fourth year will be devoted entirely to Professional Training.²³⁹

Even elementary teachers, then, were expected to have achieved a high level of special knowledge in their subjects. After 1919 the Delegacy prepared candidates for secondary school teaching only.

The Delegacy changed its name to the Department of Education in 1936. In the post-McNair years, the University established an Institute of Education which, from 1951, operated alongside the Department and supervised constituent training colleges (Westminster, Culham, Bletchley Park, and Newland Park). This arrangement produced high academic standards.²⁴⁰ In 1969 the Department and the Institute merged into the Department for Educational Studies. While its degrees have changed names, it continues to offer primarily graduate degrees in education.

As for intellectual atmosphere, the ODTC's students swam in a rich stream. Yet, the training programmes' relationship with the University must be characterized as problematic. On the one hand, the Delegacies saw themselves as part of the University, and members of the University sat on its governing body: in 1892, the Governing Body included the Vice Chancellor, the Provost of Worcester, the Rector of Exeter (both selected by the Hebdomadal Council), the Warden of Keble, and the President of Magdalen.²⁴¹ Despite the presence of these prestigious personages (Sir Michael Sadler, then Master of University College, played a very

²³⁹ Ed1/4/4, 'Minutes of the Delegacy for the Training of Secondary Teachers', (1922-1937), Annual Report, 1911-1912.

²⁴⁰ Ed1/46, 'Annual Reports of the Delegacy for Educational Studies', (1953-1980), Annual Report 1953.

²⁴¹ Ed1/1, 'Minutes of the Delegacy for the Training of Teachers', Delegates listed in the front of the Minutes.

active role),²⁴² the Delegacies struggled mightily for funding and for prestige. For instance, in 1903 HMI Kenney Herbert commented specifically on the lack of support the Elementary Delegation obtained from the University: 'It militates terribly against the success and influence of the College that it receives so little sympathy and support from the University'.²⁴³ The Delegation had to fight for every inch of success: in 1910 the Tutor for Women, Miss A.J. Cooper, had to wrest a concession from the Hebdomadal Council that graduates from other universities could study alongside Oxford graduates.²⁴⁴ In 1914 it had to mount a full-scale rescue mission for even the Readership in Education, which the University threatened to withdraw. In 1919 the University forced the two Delegacies to amalgamate.²⁴⁵ Elementary training ceased soon thereafter.²⁴⁶

The Delegation continued to press for its recognition as a real Faculty within the University structure. In 1925 Sir Michael Sadler argued as much on its behalf,²⁴⁷ as did a Royal Commission in 1925,²⁴⁸ but an official recognition of status within the University did not happen. Indeed, in 1964 the Department and Institute of Education wrote again, but their plea fell upon deaf ears.²⁴⁹ Therefore, however much the

²⁴² Ed1/4/4, 'Minutes of the Delegation for the Training of Secondary Teachers', 14 June 1924. See also 28 November 1924 and 12 June 1925 for evidence of Sadler's advocacy for the Delegation.

²⁴³ *Ibid.*, 15 June, 1904.

²⁴⁴ Ed1/4/2, 'Minutes of the Delegation for the Training of Secondary Teachers', 3 December, 1910.

²⁴⁵ Ed1/1, 'Minutes of the Delegation for the Training of Teachers', 13 November 1917. The Delegation believed that, because the two types of training were entirely different, an amalgamation would prove deleterious.

²⁴⁶ Ed1/4/3, 'Minutes of the Delegation for the Training of Secondary Teachers', (1913-1922), 20 February 1919.

²⁴⁷ Ed1/4/4, 'Minutes of the Delegation for the Training of Secondary Teachers', 12 June 1925.

²⁴⁸ Ed1/4/3, 'Minutes of the Delegation for the Training of Secondary Teachers', 1925 but no specific date.

²⁴⁹ Ed1/5/1, 'Minutes of the Institute for Education', (1951-1965), Report, 1964.

independent colleges looked with admiration upon the prestige of the University Day Training Colleges, it did not always feel so privileged from the inside.

The spiritual atmosphere of the College was nonexistent as such, although individual students may have participated in the religious offerings prominently available in Oxford. In contrast to the residential training colleges, Oxford's training department was bereft of theological framework. In contrast to Diocesan and private training colleges, there was no prayer at meetings. There was slim representation of Churchmen *qua* Churchmen on its Governing Body. The Dean of Christ Church sat on the Delegacy in 1938, but he was the first to be found in such a position.²⁵⁰ Other Churchmen took their places on the Delegacy, but they seem to have been selected for their academic positions rather than for their theology. While there were sporadic thrusts towards 'religious education', these originated, in the main, from outside the Delegacy. In 1913, for instance, theological students at Wycliffe Hall were allowed to attend 'one period of one and a half hours weekly for eight weeks' in educational courses.²⁵¹ How many participated in this, and which lectures they attended, was left unsaid. The influence seems to have worked from education and towards theology, not the other way around. Some instruction in Scripture must have been offered by the Delegacy, but mentions are few and far between.²⁵² In 1938 there was a flurry of activity around the establishment of a Readership in Religious Education, but nothing seemed to have come of it.²⁵³ In 1944 at Oxford, a vacation

²⁵⁰ Ed1/4/5, 'Minutes of the Delegacy for the Training of Secondary Teachers', (1937-1954), 10 June 1938.

²⁵¹ Ed1/4/3, 'Minutes of the Delegacy for the Training of Secondary Teachers', 21 October 1913.

²⁵² In 1920 the Minutes record the following: 'Dr. Knaffi's remuneration for lectures in the teaching of Scripture for the Michaelmas Term was fixed at 10 pounds'. In 1923 the Regius Professor of Divinity wrote to ask if the Delegacy would place 'provision of instruction for teachers and others in the teaching of Scripture' on a permanent basis. The Delegacy volunteered a sum 'not exceeding 25 pounds per annum for a period of three years', but no subsequent mention of this arrangement occurs.

²⁵³ Ed1/4/5, 'Minutes of the Delegacy for the Training of Secondary Teachers', 4 March 1938 and 25 November 1938.

course for schoolteachers who wished to ‘qualify themselves more fully for the teaching of theology’ was set up, but by the Faculty of Theology, not by the Delegacy.²⁵⁴

If there was no palpable religious presence in the training programme, what provided the philosophical framework? Do the archives betray any kind of educational ethos? Any pronounced ‘school of thought’? Any shift of the kind we witness in the religious training colleges? Answering this question is frustrating, because of the dearth of information. There are no lecture notes, no recommended reading lists, and precious few syllabuses, and the course descriptions offer only the vaguest of terms. The broadest window into educational philosophy is through the writings of its leaders, most notably, Maurice Walter Keatinge. He alone of the many tutors and readers left behind a *corpus* of work.

Despite the general lack of evidence, however, there are some points which bear making. First, there was no ‘shift’ in philosophy, since the training started as secular and continued as such. The general tenor can be described as both traditional in content, and progressive in framework. That is, the tutors and lecturers seem to have encouraged thorough subject study, but they seem to have framed it in terms which appealed to progressive notions of history, and to biological and psychological interpretations of the individual and society. This will become obvious particularly in the works of Keatinge which will be examined in Chapter IV. Second, the radicals in educational theory such as Edmund Holmes (*What is and What Might Be* – 1911) and H. Caldwell Cook (*The Play Way* – 1917) appear to have set some of the agenda, insofar as theirs were the voices which had to be heard and to which a response had to be made, but theirs were not the dominant voices. The University of Oxford prized balance. We shall see this throughout the course descriptions and in particular in the works of Keatinge. In summary, then,

²⁵⁴ *Ibid.*, 28 January 1944.

the Oxford University Day Training College was secular, highly academic, and progressive from the beginning.

2.5.3 London Day Training College

By the turn of the last century, London was the capital city of an empire which spanned thirteen million square miles and 300 million inhabitants.²⁵⁵ When the London County Council assumed the responsibilities of the School Board following its separate Education Act in 1903, it oversaw 20,000 teachers, a million children and an annual expenditure of £4 million.²⁵⁶ In addition to its numerous schools it ran twelve pupil-teacher centres and an illegal training college for teachers (Graystoke Place). In 1899 the London School Board had recommended a Day Training College in conjunction with the University of London, and the Technical Education Board (a subcommittee of the LCC), under Sidney Webb's leadership, began to pursue this aim aggressively. At the same time, the University of London opened a new faculty in South Kensington, and, working with Webb, established a Board of Studies in Pedagogy in 1900.²⁵⁷ The Board of Pedagogy established the Certificate and Diploma which were associated with the University of London.

In 1902 the Day Training College opened its doors to 58 students with funding from the Technical Education Board (65%), the Board of Education grants (24%) and student tuition (11%).²⁵⁸ The London County Council and the University of London together oversaw the programme. Most of the students had been pupil-teachers. All of them practised in London City schools, as demanded by the Board. From 1910 onward the College ran two Demonstration

²⁵⁵ Richard Aldrich, *The Institute of Education: 1902-2002* (London: University of London Institute of Education, 2002), p. 2.

²⁵⁶ *Ibid.*, p. 5.

²⁵⁷ *Ibid.*, p. 7.

²⁵⁸ *Ibid.*, pp. 10, 24.

Schools which occupied quite a bit of administrative energy. Students lived and worked in one of four University Colleges: King's, University, London School of Economics, and Bedford. King's itself had instituted a Day Training College for elementary teachers in 1890, and its director, John William Adamson, was well-known in educational theory; in 1903 he became a full Professor of Education and led the King's Day Training College into secondary school preparation as well.²⁵⁹ From the beginning King's and the LCC-run Day Training College worked in concert.

Originally, the College only prepared elementary teachers, but 'in 1909 the LDTC's academic status was confirmed by its admission as a school of the University', and by 1932 most of its students took the Diploma, not the Certificate, therefore indicating their preparation for secondary teaching.²⁶⁰ By 1911 there were only two courses offered: a one-year post-graduate course, and a four-year BA/professional course. This was a significant move and one which Percy Nunn considered 'the most important event in the recent history of training', for it enabled the student 'to pursue his academic studies not as one upon whom a conflicting obligation lay, but whole-heartedly and with a full enjoyment of the ordinary amenities of undergraduate life, and thereafter to turn with the same undivided mind to his professional preparation'.²⁶¹ Across England and Wales, the conflict between academic and professional studies had been acute, with many teachers in training obligated to complete the subject studies left unfinished by their earlier education, and also to appropriate sufficient theory and classroom practice to qualify as 'professionals'. Now at London, all students had to have attained a university degree prior to enrolment, or to be pursuing one concurrently with their professional training.

²⁵⁹ Christine Kenyon-Jones, *King's College London: In the Service of Society* (London: King's College, 2004), p. 84.

²⁶⁰ *Ibid.*, p. 2.

²⁶¹ Delegacy, 'Descriptive Booklet Issued by the Delegacy on the Occasion of the Formal Opening of the New Building by the Chairman of the London County Council', (1939), p. 9.

During the First World War the University sanctioned higher degrees in Education, and between 1916 and 1932 the College produced 50 M.A. and nine Ph.D. recipients, most of whom were supervised by psychologist Cyril Burt.²⁶² In 1938 alone there were 83 M.A. and Ph.D. students.²⁶³ The inter-war period saw the rapid expansion of students (in 1921 there were 913 students), the creation of the Colonial Department which trained teachers for service across the British Empire,²⁶⁴ the founding of Susan Isaacs' influential Child Development Department (1933), and publication of the Year Books of Education.²⁶⁵

The College changed its affiliation and its responsibilities multiple times.²⁶⁶ In 1932 the University accepted a full transfer to its own fold, and the College became an Institute of Education. Most significantly, all area training college students were allowed to attend lectures at the Institute. For instance, in 1932 the Institute offered classes on Principles of Education, Educational System, Elementary Educational Psychology, and History of Education. In that year Goldsmiths sent eleven students to all four classes; Furzedown sent six to 'Principles' and 'Educational Psychology,' Maria Grey sent 65 to the same two, and St Mary's sent eight students to all four series.²⁶⁷ From 1949 onwards its reach expanded as it not only certified but oversaw the work of thirty training colleges throughout the London area (an Area Training Organisation). The ATO ended in 1975; the University ceased affiliation in 1979 but re-instituted it in 1987.

²⁶² Aldrich, *The Institute of Education: 1902-2002*, p. 68.

²⁶³ *Ibid.*, p. 97.

²⁶⁴ *Ibid.*, p. 105. In 1936 alone there were 27 students from India, 13 from Australia and 8 from New Zealand.

²⁶⁵ *Ibid.*, p. 109.

²⁶⁶ Although the Haldane Report (1909) recommended that it become a Department of the University, it did not. In 1909 it did become recognised as a 'school of the University', although chief financial and administrative responsibility remained with the LCC. In 1928 the College accepted leadership of the Joint Board Scheme, through which it examined all the London training college students. This was an exceedingly important move, because with the right to examine came the necessity of vetting syllabuses.

²⁶⁷ *Ie.Tpn.1.2, 'Percy Nunn Papers'*, (1928-1936), Letter to Percy Nunn from Miss Wacey, the College Secretary, on 30 May 1932.

As for its purpose and atmosphere: from the start, the LDTC was more than instrumental. That is, its founders did not aim for merely the rapid production of able teachers. Rather, they aimed to nurture and disseminate a 'spirit of scientific inquiry' not only in its own students but throughout the region (ultimately, throughout the country). What did this scientific inquiry look like? The specific contents will be discussed in subsequent chapters, but in summary: in the course of its first four decades the progressive educational agenda at the LDTC itself changed, from one focused initially upon 'laws of mind' and quantitative analysis, to one which also incorporated notions of a subterranean, uncontrollable subconscious, which by definition could not be fully understood by the teacher. The College changed its composition, its jurisdiction, its degrees and its size numerous times over the next half-century, but its dedication to a scientific and progressive approach to education did not change. As we shall see, the College provided an intellectual centre for 'The New Education', employed the progressive movement's most important academics, sponsored its most important textbooks, and produced, from this school of thought, thousands of teachers. By 1949, one-quarter of all students training to teach in England and Wales did so under its *aegis*.²⁶⁸ The College's influence reached far more widely, however. Its educational theory became predominant throughout the country and even, perhaps, throughout the Empire.

2.6 Training Colleges: Summary

This survey has emphasized that the training institutions grew out of the particularity of English beliefs and organisations. Each college possessed its own distinctive framework and *praxis* which reflected the community of belief from whence it sprang. This was as true of the

²⁶⁸ Aldrich, *The Institute of Education: 1902-2002*, p. 143.

secular university colleges as of the Roman Catholic residential colleges. Chapter III examines the specific educational philosophy which inhered in each college, and Chapters IV and V explore the profound change which the expanded role of the universities, culturally and administratively, had upon the work of the confessional colleges. Particular emphasis is given to the rising dominance of the school of thought at the London Day Training College. Although the confessional colleges continued to demonstrate persistent distinctions, they also demonstrated a remarkably similar movement away from theological and towards psychological resources. The Catholic colleges remained the most distinct, both in their community structure and in their educational philosophy, throughout the period covered by the thesis.

Chapter III

First Period (1839-1886): Confessional Training Colleges through the Cross Commission

Education as a Religious Project

During this initial phase of national education, educationalists used cutting-edge psychological tools (originating from Rousseau, Pestalozzi, or Locke) and placed them within a firmly theological framework. That is, they deployed the concepts and vocabularies used by a nascent psychology within a theological theory of education. This chapter explores the dominant educational philosophy between 1840 and 1885, including particular material facts about education, current trends in psychology, and important publications. It also notes the minority viewpoint which distanced educational theory from religion and which, by the end of the first period, was beginning to be heard in significant quarters. The chapter then turns to the training colleges: to the textbooks, examinations and memorabilia which give concrete testimony to the ways in which the colleges framed key questions and presented key concepts.

3.1 Survey of Relevant Educational Events and Institutions

The great battles of educational institutions (who would control education, who would fund it, which administrative offices would survey it, how it ought to be inspected) have been well-chronicled by historians of education. Similarly, the key developments in educational philosophy have been aptly outlined.²⁶⁹ The purpose of this thesis is to not to survey the entire spectrum of educational theories at large during the period, but to focus specifically upon the

²⁶⁹ See Selleck, *The New Education: 1870-1914*, and Selleck, *English Primary Education and the Progressives, 1914-1939*.

dominant theories in academic educational circles, those theories which directly informed teachers in training. At the same time, rather than rehearse the well-documented events in educational history, the thesis highlights only those events and institutional structures which affected the intellectual process with which it is concerned.

The focus upon the formal educational philosophy within the colleges, on courses on the principles and practice of teaching, textbooks, syllabuses and lecture notes, is not meant to imply that the whole of the matter lay within such realms. Far from it: the colleges perceived their mission in terms of atmosphere as well. This was why they guarded so preciously the moral codes required of their students; this was why the principals were often men of the cloth; this was why worship was placed at the centre of community life and why the non-residential colleges of the 1890s felt so discordant and threatening by contrast. Ultimately, of course, the insistent religious atmospheres of the colleges did not prevent the naturalization of educational theory. Nevertheless, in our first period the congruence of atmosphere and philosophy is most obvious.

At the same time, the colleges simply could not set the entire tone for study unilaterally. Throughout this first period, the greatest outside influence upon them was the Privy Council (later the Board of Education)²⁷⁰ which, intentionally and unintentionally, affected the college administration and *ethos*. Because the Board funded, inspected, and certified, their officials inserted themselves into the college classrooms, syllabuses, admissions, and student relations. Because the Board was broadly supportive of a religious basis for educational theory, however, many Anglican and even Evangelical leaders such as Francis Close, Rector of Cheltenham,

²⁷⁰ National education was handled by the Privy Council (1839), the 'Education Department' (1856) and the Board of Education (1899). However, throughout its evolution it was often referred to as the 'Board of Education', which is the term this thesis adopts henceforth. See Lewis Amherst Selby-Bigge, *The Board of Education* (London: G.P. Putnam's Sons, 1927), p. 3.

advocated church-state cooperation from the very beginning. The case of Cheltenham's training college offers a clear window into the kinds of cooperation and struggle which ensued.

In 1848 Francis Close preached 'Cooperation with the Committee of Council on Education Vindicated and Recommended' in which he argued strenuously that the Church must accept Government's participation in the educational process because the voluntary principle had 'failed'.²⁷¹ Yet he argued equally forcefully that England ought not to jettison the voluntary system entirely.²⁷² Neither State nor Church ought to act alone. Rather,

A union of the pure principles of Christian benevolence, with a national provision administered through State officers, is exactly what is calculated to bring out the religious energies of the country – and to establish, extend and perpetuate a system of Christian education adequate to the present enormous demands of the people.²⁷³

Close believed that Government funding and regulations would render schools more efficient and donors more confident. Voluntary and state institutions could thus work together to elevate the entire educational system. To those who objected to State funds on principle, or who feared that money might be spent on schools of which they did not approve, Close argued that to require perfection was not only unrealistic but shameful.²⁷⁴ Close asked, 'Would the most conscientious person among us refuse to receive a good service pension because, perhaps, a person of infidel principles, or profligate character, was enjoying an annuity from the same fund'?'²⁷⁵ On the contrary. Close had no fear that, once having embarked upon a journey with the Government, the latter would betray Evangelical trust. As he made clear in 'Divine Teaching',

...the compact of the Government with us, as with various other denominations of Christians, is such, that even if it were disposed to [affect our schools], it is utterly impossible that it could ever interfere with our religious peculiarities....Having transacted much business with this department of Government, I never had to do with

²⁷¹ Ua20/1/4, 'Cooperation with the Committee of Council on Education Vindicated and Recommended', p. 14.

²⁷² *Ibid.*, p. 16.

²⁷³ *Ibid.*, p. 20.

²⁷⁴ *Ibid.*, p. 41.

²⁷⁵ *Ibid.*, p. 41.

persons who have acted in a more generous, a more liberal, or a more honourable manner. So far from trying to interfere with the openly avowed doctrinal views and intentions, they have held them entirely sacred.²⁷⁶

That is, Close perceived no threat of encroachment from the Government's ministers in the practice of Evangelical principles. Perhaps Close could afford to be sanguine about the relationship because the Evangelicals participated so strenuously in State efforts on education.

Cheltenham's earliest surviving college prospectuses referred proudly to the relationship between the College and the Government. Under 'The Advantages of the Institution', the 1855 brochure held that, besides the 'professional skill acquired, which will enable them to hold positions of usefulness and credit', there accrued to the graduate 'the professional emoluments to which they become entitled, under the established system of Government aid. The course of study in the Institution is calculated to raise students of average ability and diligence to the standard required by Government Examiners.'²⁷⁷ Even the College Log books from the early decades were 'supplied by the Board of Education and must be furnished for their information or for that of their Inspectors when required'.²⁷⁸ For much of this period there was no apparent conflict between the State's and colleges' version of educational philosophy (Roman Catholic colleges excepted). By all accounts, the Board of Education took its philosophical clues from the inspectors and from the colleges themselves. However, there were occasions on which the Board encroached upon college administrative and intellectual autonomy. In quotidian matters, the Board was in near-constant communication with the colleges about the minutiae of administration and student life. The Board wrote to St. Mary's Principal in 1874 concerning a deaf student, Moger, whom they did not want to honour with certification and whose name they

²⁷⁶ Ua20/1/2, 'Divine Teaching', in Rev. Francis Close (ed.), (The Pulpit; London, 1848), p. 359.

²⁷⁷ Ua5/1/1, 'Church of England Normal Training College at Cheltenham, Prospectus', p 2

²⁷⁸ Ua10/2/1, 'Staff Register, Cheltenham, St. Mary's', (1887), and Ua10/2/2, 'Staff Register, Cheltenham, St Paul's', (1895-1949).

refused to let appear in the Class List.²⁷⁹ This type of close monitoring was not uncommon. The 'Revised Code' of 1861 represented a more substantive mechanism of control. In an attempt to emphasize both academic fundamentals and economic efficiency, the State paid schools a *per capita* grant for each student who passed the national exams each year in reading, writing, and mathematics. Other subjects were not reimbursable, and the curriculum at both school and college narrowed. The Code left panic in its wake. At the school level, the Code obliged teachers to spend an inordinate amount of time on the failing students; mediocre students were left so; outstanding students fended for themselves.²⁸⁰ The colleges were put in a difficult spot. Not only did decreased salaries for pupil-teachers cause a reduction in the overall pool of applicants, but the Government withdrew funding from all but the most rudimentary components of the training college course. The Principal of Cheltenham College, Rev. C. H. Bromby, protested. His two letters of 1861, one to the Right Honourable Earl Granville, Lord President of the Privy Council, and the second to Robert Lowe himself,²⁸¹ vigorously rejected the imposition of payment-by-result and the reduction of training grants. He believed it accepted the lowest possible result and therefore the lowest possible skill on the part of its educationalists. There is no record of any response to Bromby's writings. The Revised Code remained in effect until 1890. Of course, the conflict recorded in these letters was an administrative one, not primarily an ideological one. But these letters do shed light upon a type of institutional conflict which Francis Close could hardly have anticipated when he championed church-state cooperation.

²⁷⁹ SMH/3/05, 'Principal's correspondence and papers', (1871-1875). letter from Education Department, 17 January 1874.

²⁸⁰ J. Black, 'On Some Defects in our Present School System: A Lecture', (Edinburgh: Edmonston and Douglas, 1876). This pamphlet shows the unified voice of training college leaders against Government policy.

²⁸¹ Ua20/1/20, 'Revised Educational Code: A Letter to the Right Hon. Earl Granville, K.G., Lord President of the Privy Council', in C.H. Bromby (ed.), (London: Simpkin, Marshall, and Co., 1861), and Ua20/1/21, 'A Letter to the Right Hon. Robert Lowe, M.P., Containing Structures Upon the False Assumptions and Inadequate Remedies of the Revised Education Code', in C.H. Bromby (ed.), (London: Simpkin, Marshall, and Co., 1861).

They further illustrate the bind in which the colleges sometimes found themselves, financially and administratively. The dependence of the colleges upon the State reached a crescendo in the mid-twentieth century, during which the State often unilaterally dictated college closures and mergers.

On the other hand, if the State sometimes ‘oppressed’ the colleges, it often supported their particular sensibilities as well. Until 1870, the Board of Education allowed each denomination to choose inspectors for its schools and colleges. After 1870, each denomination investigated the religious knowledge of its scholastic flock, and the Board inspected the non-religious subjects only. Additionally, and against pressure from various agitation groups, the Board permitted the colleges a denominationally-biased admissions process. Not until 1907/08 did confessional requisites spawn a full-fledged conflict (see pages 152-153). In the meantime, the colleges and the State sat in general cooperation and intermittent tension. For the first period, then, the most important social fact about education was the cooperation between voluntary and state sectors.

3.2 Survey of Psychology: Majority and Minority Views

3.2.1 Majority Views and their Interaction with Education

The larger questions of psychology, more commonly referred to as the ‘philosophy of mind’ during this period, revolved around the matter of the freedom of the will and the formation of conscience. Although the textbooks of the times spoke quite frankly of the child’s will which must yield to the teacher’s benevolent dictatorship, in the background was the question of how the will and the moral compass were formed in the first place. The theories which proved particularly provocative and innovative for teachers were three components of this debate: theories about association; theories about human faculties which must be exercised in the

educative process; theories about the child's development which sprang from Continental romanticism.

The two most obvious contributions of psychology during this period concerned 'learning by association' and 'faculty psychology'. 'Association' referred to the view, championed by John Locke and his disciple David Hartley, that the mind and the will developed in each individual by the association of pain and pleasure with different experiences. While religiously-minded educationalists rejected the hard-line associationist view ('*all* morality is developed by association; nothing is inherent'), they nevertheless employed associationist principles in the classroom. In particular, they used the notion that one concept, or one piece of educational data, could be linked to another and to overall experience. Pedagogically, this called for a classroom full of wonder, as excitement would be positively associated with the educational matter at hand, and for a recollection of past data, as previous knowledge would be associated in the brain with new information. The association of new data with prior data came to be formalized pedagogically by Johann Friedrich Herbart (1776-1841), whose influence was felt more strongly in our second period, even, than in our first.

The second idea, 'faculty psychology', envisioned the mind as having different compartments, each of which controlled a particular 'power' such as the will, the emotion or the intellect. Each of these powers needed to be exercised, and the effort of one component strengthened the others. For teachers, the application was obvious: children's minds, hearts and wills 'grew' by good use. The Scottish philosopher Thomas Reid was an early advocate of faculty psychology, but its most important popularizer was George Combe (1788-1858), coordinator of phrenology. Combe believed passionately in the scientific truth of his system and campaigned tirelessly for its application within schools.

An Edinburgh lawyer by trade, Combe developed and advocated the system which positioned itself as the science of the brain. Based upon early anatomical work, phrenology held that each portion of the brain controlled a different piece of character and intellect. Combe wrote prolifically: *Essays on Phrenology* (1819), *A System of Phrenology* (1822), *The Constitution of Man* (1828), and countless tracts and pamphlets. He founded the Edinburgh Phrenological Society (1820) and the *Phrenology Journal* (1823) and launched a speaking tour in 1830 which lasted twenty-one years.²⁸² He championed the inclusion of science in schools; he argued strenuously alongside Bright and Cobden for a secular, free education for all. Between 1848 and 1854 he ran a secular school which excluded doctrine but ‘exercised the moral and religious faculty’²⁸³ His *Remarks on National Education* (1846) went through five editions in two years;²⁸⁴ he lectured across America in the 1830s and exercised such an influence that Horace Mann’s *Life and Works* (1865) paid him tribute. His Majesty’s Inspector for Schools, William Jolly, who compiled Combe’s works on education, wrote in 1879 that ‘it was [Combe’s] constant aim to reduce his philosophy to practice, and to help in framing a system of Educational Science based on the Science of Mind’²⁸⁵ Combe himself said of education that its chief end was happiness, which could only be achieved ‘when all the faculties of body and mind are applied in their spheres of action, and exercised in just proportion to each other’²⁸⁶ Combe’s theories were employed by a vast spectrum of educationalists and theorists. Secularists Alexander Bain and Herbert Spencer took faculty psychology as a starting point; John Gill and James Currie, who were religiously-orientated, placed faculty psychology within a theological theory of education.

²⁸² George Combe, *Education: Its Principles and Practice*, ed. William Jolly (London: MacMillan and Co., 1879), p. xxi-xxxii.

²⁸³ *Ibid.*, p. xxi.

²⁸⁴ *Ibid.*, p. xlvi.

²⁸⁵ *Ibid.*, p. xvi.

²⁸⁶ *Ibid.*, p. 17.

A third psychological influence upon educational theories, albeit one which sounded a quieter note during the first period, was Continental romanticism. The romantic impetus in education began with Jean-Jacques Rousseau's *Emile* (1762). Therein, Rousseau introduced the notion of educating according to the natural qualities and developmental stages of the child, not according to the wishes and perceptions of the adult. He rejected book learning and the classroom. He placed his pupil in isolated 'nature', where the carefully-crafted techniques of his faithful tutor enabled Emile to grow to maturity exclusively by experience, not instruction. Rousseau acknowledged that his real purpose was metaphysical: 'I cannot believe that you take the book which bears this name for a true treatise on education', he wrote to a friend in 1764; 'it is rather a philosophical work on the principle...that man is naturally good'²⁸⁷ Rousseau rejected Calvinist doctrine, which assumed that the fallen state of human nature could only be cured by divine grace. Rousseau stated: 'It is an incontrovertible rule that the first impulses of nature are always right; there is no original sin in the human heart; the how and why of the entrance of every vice can be traced.'²⁸⁸ Rousseau's ideal education abstracted the child from social context and, ironically, created a highly-contrived environment which bore little resemblance to 'nature'.²⁸⁹ Nevertheless, three strands of his theorizing appealed to future educationalists. First, Rousseau rejected authority - except for that of the omnipotent tutor, of course.²⁹⁰ Second, Rousseau rejected formal instruction because he believed it corrupted the child's natural learning process.²⁹¹ Third, Rousseau sought to correlate education to developmental capabilities, assigning educational ends to chronological age.

²⁸⁷ Jean-Jacques Rousseau, *Emile*, trans. Barbara Foxley (London: Everyman, 1762, 1993), p. xxi.

²⁸⁸ *Ibid.*, p. 66.

²⁸⁹ *Ibid.*, p. 69. 'While the child is still unconscious there is time to prepare his surroundings, so that nothing shall strike his eye but what is fit for his sight...you will not be master of the child if you cannot control every one about him.'

²⁹⁰ *Ibid.*, pp. 64, 65.

²⁹¹ *Ibid.* p. 11.

Johann Heinrich Pestalozzi (1746-1827) and Friedrich Wilhelm Froebel (1782-1852) carried these three points into practice. Pestalozzi followed Rousseau's adulation of a 'natural' education. Education must harmonize with the 'natural instincts and desires of man', he wrote in *Investigations into the Course of Nature in the Development of the Human Race* (1797).²⁹² Pestalozzi's Swiss schools aimed, above all, to stimulate children's interest in the matter at hand, and to tailor lessons to their developmental capabilities. His 'object lesson', in which a teacher presented a tangible object and trained the children to explore its parts and its use, became standard fare by the late nineteenth century. Although he commended firm discipline, Pestalozzi insisted that children have space to play.

Froebel invented the kindergarten in 1837 in Blankenburg, Germany. All of activity was play, he wrote, and its purpose was to 'unfold our nature'²⁹³ In his schools, training character and experiencing the world were more important than intellectual attainment.²⁹⁴ Froebel was a pantheist, and his methods aimed to impart a vision of omnipresent divinity. He introduced his students to everyday shapes called 'Gifts' (balls, cubes, and blocks) which he saw as infused with mystical meaning. Froebel's teaching enjoyed wild popularity in America and England. In 1874 Joseph Payne, the Chair of Education at the College of Preceptors, lectured on Froebel and investigated German kindergartens; between 1870 and 1880, the number of kindergartens in America expanded from twelve to over four hundred.²⁹⁵ In 1946, Barbara Priestman wrote that it was

probably Froebel who has had the greatest influence on the trend of modern [English] education, from the inspiration he drew from Pestalozzi has been transmitted through

²⁹² Michael Heafford, *Pestalozzi: His Thought and Its Relevance Today*, ed. Ch Dobinson (The Library of Educational Thought; Suffolk: Chauver Press, 1967), p. 15.

²⁹³ Joseph Payne, *Froebel and the Kindergarten System of Elementary Education: A Lecture Delivered at the College of Preceptors* (London: College of Preceptors, 1874), p. 12.

²⁹⁴ Evelyn Lawrence, *Friedrich Froebel and English Education* (London: Routledge and Kegan Paul, 1952), p. 21.

²⁹⁵ *Ibid.*, p. 46.

the training colleges to thousands of teachers who work under his name, and has also affected the course of education in many a school which to-day knows nothing consciously of the old Thuringian schoolmaster.²⁹⁶

Froebel's enthusiasm for child-play was imitated by successors such as Maria Montessori (1870-1952).

What did these educationalists have in common? They eschewed formal authority; they sought to unfold, rather than to mould, the child; they championed interest and curiosity over order. Most importantly, these men acknowledged that they were playing with metaphysics when they practised education. Rousseau that knew he was doing ontology, and Pestalozzi began with the question, 'Man, in his essence, what is he?'²⁹⁷ and continued: 'My purpose...probes deeply into the very essence of higher intellectual and moral education, and into the most thorough investigations of human nature itself'.²⁹⁸ Froebel's pantheism drove his theory of the Gifts. Sometimes they, too, spoke of 'faculty development'. Pestalozzi, for instance, emphasized that the acquisition of knowledge was secondary to the exercise of mental powers. The romantic educationalists came into greater prominence during our second period, when their ideas were combined with an empirical approach to children in the form of Child Study. In the earlier period, however, one sees evidence of their work in the form of references to 'child nature', to 'play', to allowing the child to unfold. David Stow referred to Pestalozzi frequently, and it is difficult to conceive of John Gill's writings on the need to appeal to a child's imagination, without Froebel's influence. English educationalists in the first period displayed a striking facility for placing some of the ideas and tools of the romantics into a normative, religiously-orientated framework, just as they did with Combe's 'faculty psychology'

²⁹⁶ Barbara Priestman, *Froebel Education to-Day* (London: University of London Press, 1946), p. 7.

²⁹⁷ Heafford, *Pestalozzi: His Thought and Its Relevance Today*, p. 4.

²⁹⁸ *Ibid.*, p. 41.

3.2.2 Minority Views and their Interaction with Education

What other strains of thought can be discerned in this period with respect to psychology and education? The most innovative and important minority view, held by only a few but gradually becoming more prominent by the end of this period, sought to sever both psychology and education from metaphysics. This radical position stood completely at odds with the majority-held view that education was essentially a religious project; it denied even that education was a philosophical project. Its advocates adopted the terminologies of the physical sciences and sought to establish a realm in which psychology and its social projects (among them, education) could be biologically-based, rigorously-tested, and ideologically neutral. Two mid-Victorian figures were of particular importance in articulating and popularizing this view: Herbert Spencer (1820-1903) and Alexander Bain (1818-1903).

Herbert Spencer had trained in civil engineering but turned for a living to journalism, writing for and editing *The Economist Weekly*. He thus came into maturity in the company of 'philosophical radicals' such as George Henry Lewes, J.S. Mill, George Eliot and T.H. Huxley. Intellectually, Spencer is most famous for applying Comtean positivism and (Lamarckian) evolutionary doctrine to all spheres of life: individual, social, philosophical. He claimed to believe only in what might be proven. He championed laissez-faire economics and coined the term 'survival of the fittest', adopted by Darwin in later editions of *The Origin of Species*. His first best-sellers were *Social Statics* (1850) and *Principles of Psychology* (1855); our focus here is upon *Education: Intellectual, Moral, and Physical* (1859).²⁹⁹ Spencer began *Education* by

²⁹⁹ T.J. Jackson Lears, *No Place of Grace: Antimodernism and the Transformation of American Culture, 1880-1920* (Chicago: University of Chicago Press, 1981). Spencer's optimism and apparent scientific rigour catapulted him to

asking, 'What knowledge is of the most worth'? He answered, 'That which leads to happiness',³⁰⁰ which Spencer believed was material survival. The knowledge 'of most value' was that which helps one to survive: namely, a 'useful' or 'scientific' education. History, he wrote, consisted of 'almost valueless, useless facts'³⁰¹ Rather, one should study sociology (the 'science' of society), psychology (the 'science' of human beings), and ethology (the 'science' of morality). By these sciences the young could learn how to survive in a complex and competitive world. Spencer's use of the word 'science' here did not have the methodological edge which a later generation's educational researchers sought in the laboratory. It was, rather, a rhetorical leap, an attempted partnership with the physical sciences which stood in opposition to revealed religion. Neither should moral education import religion. Rather, a child must be taught the utilitarian calculus.³⁰² Additionally, a child must be taught 'by nature' and must be allowed to go through 'all the phases of the race, from the savage to the sophisticated', although Spencer did not specify an actual curriculum.³⁰³ The business of life which a child must learn was mutable even as the species, and subject to the exigencies of the moment. One thing was constant, though: physical education ranked above intellectual or moral education.³⁰⁴

Spencer's *Education* was extremely popular at the turn of the century and constituted required knowledge for government certification exams. Two professors of education wrote in 1932 that 'With the exception of Locke's *Thoughts*, it is the most widely read treatise on

trans-Atlantic fame. See page 22 for a discussion of a dinner held at Delmonico's in 1882 in Spencer's honour, at which were present 'the honour role of educated bourgeoisie'

³⁰⁰ Spencer, *Education: Intellectual, Moral, and Physical*, p. 7.

³⁰¹ *Ibid.*, p. 32.

³⁰² *Ibid.*, p. 106.

³⁰³ *Ibid.*, p. 127.

³⁰⁴ *Ibid.*, J. Dover Wilson and F.A. Cavanagh, 'Introduction', *Herbert Spencer on Education* (Cambridge: CUP, 1932), p. 177.

education that England has produced. It is still read.³⁰⁵ The editor of the 1958 *Year Book of Education* commended Spencer's power: 'For the first time for centuries a philosopher's influence appears to have been considerable, and especially in curriculum theory.'³⁰⁶ During the first period, Spencer was read by the important educationalists who, for the most part, managed to put his ideas within a traditional context. By the end of the first period some of the training colleges included his work in their syllabus. In the meantime, his writing affected the critique posed to traditional education by the cutting-edge *Journal of Education*, discussed below.

Another equally important champion of a non-metaphysical approach to life and education was Alexander Bain (1818-1903), a radical new-comer whose work John Stuart Mill praised in 1859 with the words, 'The sceptre of psychology has decidedly returned to this island, after two generations of neglect'.³⁰⁷ In fact, wrote Mill, the whole psychology of Locke, Hartley and (James) Mill was of 'a superficial manner' in comparison with the new professor of logic at Aberdeen.³⁰⁸ In some ways Bain simply carried on the associationist psychology championed by Locke, Hartley, and James Mill and denied by intuitionist philosophers such as Thomas Reid and Dugald Stewart. What set Bain apart from earlier psychologists, however, was his refusal to ask questions of meaning and his deliberate intent to detach psychology from its traditional roots in philosophy and theology. How, then, did Bain frame the work of psychology, and how did this affect his discourse on education? Along with Locke, Hartley, and both Mills, Bain considered human thoughts, beliefs, and actions to be ultimately reducible to the interplay of experiences

³⁰⁵ Wilson and Cavanagh, 'Introduction', p. xv. The same authors, however, condescended to 'the cocksureness about the Victorian gospel of science [which is] very far removed from the scientific attitude of to-day. The War showed us too clearly the two-edged sword of chemistry and physics. The faith of that generation strikes us now as pathetic or absurd', p. xxi.

³⁰⁶ B. Holmes, G. Bereday, J.A. Lauwerys, 'The Content of Education from the 1958 Yearbook of Education', in Joseph Lauwerys (ed.), *Essays in Comparative Education: Teachers and Training* (London: Evans Brothers, Ltd., 1969), p. 49.

³⁰⁷ John Stuart Mill, 'Bain's Psychology', in J.M. Robson (ed.), *Collected Works of Js Mill, Essays on Philosophy and the Classics* (X1; Toronto: University of Toronto Press, 1859), 339-74, p. 341

³⁰⁸ *Ibid.*, p. 352.

with pain and pleasure. As Bain wrote, ‘The freely-chosen conduct of any living creature is a final, though not infallible, criterion of its pleasure and pains’.³⁰⁹ The reformer then stands at an impasse: if all morality is traced to the associations inherent in society, what hope can there be for revolutionary change? Bain innovated: humans have excess energy which causes unintentional and unforeseen physical and mental movements. Unforeseen associations follow. Bain had just created space for creativity and learning which was contingent upon neither the five senses, nor the approval or disapproval of outsiders, nor the activities of God. This in turn provided hope to the radical who wished to transcend the *status quo*, which was one of the reasons Mill preferred Bain to Spencer.³¹⁰

Bain’s philosophy of mind contained other subversive elements such as an ontological relativism which implied not only that we might not know reality completely but that we might not know reality at all:³¹¹

It is perhaps proper at the very outset to give some intimation of a great mental law...namely, the Law of Relativity. Every mental experience is necessarily twofold. We can neither feel nor know heat, except in the transition from cold. In every feeling there are two contrasting states; in every act of knowing, two things are known together. The principle of Relativity applies to everything that we are capable of knowing.³¹²

We know only in contrast, not absolutely. Bain addressed the question of ontology directly and forcefully later in the text: ‘we cannot know the world except in reference to our minds....We

³⁰⁹ Alexander Bain, *The Emotions and the Will* (3rd edn.; London: Longmans Green, 1875), p. 14.

³¹⁰ Rylance, *Victorian Psychology and British Culture 1850-1880*, p. 160.

³¹¹ Christopher Herbert, *Victorian Relativity: Radical Thought and Scientific Discovery* (Chicago ; London: University of Chicago Press, 2001), pp. xv, 302. Christopher Herbert has highlighted Bain’s adjoining of psychology and relativity: ‘Bain’s work marks a watershed in the emergence of the relativity movement.’ Herbert refers to epistemological relativism in the work of Sir William Hamilton and Dean H.L. Mansel, in the Benthamite school, and in the work of John Stuart Mill himself. See pages 21 and 50.

³¹² Alexander Bain, *The Senses and the Intellect* (2nd edn.; Lond., 1864), pp. 9-10.

can speak only of a world presented to our own minds.’³¹³ Using some of the strongest language in any of his writing, Bain wrote,

I object to the Realistic creed [here: of Herbert Spencer] as presenting to us a statement involving terms of complex and derived signification, of doubtful meaning, and of unsuitable application. I cannot call the theory altogether false, any more than I can call it true. It is simply irrelevant.³¹⁴

How can a theory about reality be ‘irrelevant’? Because, said Bain, ‘such doctrines as an External World, the Freedom of the Will, a Moral Sense, are not in a shape to be submitted to the test of our consciousness’³¹⁵ Humans simply cannot devise a test for these things. Ontology therefore did not interest him. In jettisoning ‘reality’ Bain relinquished an objective morality, however construed. This posture presaged the view of the London educationalists of the 1920s (Nunn in particular) who questioned the validity of moral judgments and championed the rise of Individuality.

In addition to theoretically undermining absolute morality, Bain achieved significance in claiming disciplinary independence for a new scientific psychology which would then guide social projects such as education. The study of mind must occur within a scientific regime of objectivity, not one informed by theological or philosophical bias.³¹⁶ Religion held mankind back from achieving a metaphysics-free psychology, he believed. Bain wrote of religion in most unfavourable terms:

The perverted views on matters of common business, the superstructure of fable that envelops the narration of the past, the incubus of superstition and blind faith, have their foundation and source in the power of emotion to bar out the impressions of reality...The cloud of legend and fable...has only just begun to be dispersed.³¹⁷

³¹³ *Ibid.*, p. 379.

³¹⁴ *Ibid.*, p. 632.

³¹⁵ *Ibid.* p. 633.

³¹⁶ Bain, *The Emotions and the Will*, p. 22.

³¹⁷ *Ibid.*, pp. 21-22.

The difficulty of attaining ‘objectivity’ within a framework of epistemological relativism notwithstanding, Bain illustrated with this statement that the ‘new psychology’ contended, above all else, with entrenched theological vocabularies and casts of mind.³¹⁸ But how might one segregate disciplines? In particular, how might one pursue questions of function without simultaneously enquiring about purpose? Bain’s attempt to do so can be seen most clearly in *Education as a Science* (1879) in which he sought first to establish psychology as a discipline grounded in physiology, not philosophy. He then sought to apply this emerging science to the realm of formal education. He proposed that a science of education be comprised of two divisions: pure psychology (What is the mind? What does it do?) and the right subjects (Which information do we wish to impart?). Of course he removed metaphysics from the discussion.³¹⁹

Not too much should be made of Bain’s use of the term ‘scientific’ *per se*. Most writers in the mid-nineteenth century affixed this appellation to their projects, from Karl Marx to Herbert Spencer. What ought to be noticed is not the terminology but rather the content, which was naturalistic. For the first division, pure psychology, Bain referred once again to associations of pleasure and pain, whence we derive ‘all our lives’.³²⁰ The mellifluous and seemingly unpredictable plasticity of each human mind constituted the ‘central fact’ of a schoolmaster’s work.³²¹

The educationalist could not but cast a longing eye over the wide region here opened up, as a grand opportunity for his art. It is the realm of vague possibility, peculiarly suited to sanguine estimates. An education in happiness, pure and simple, by well-placed joyous associations, is a dazzling prospect.³²²

³¹⁸ This was exactly what Rylance argued in *Victorian Psychology*. See page 34.

³¹⁹ Bain, *Education as a Science*, p. 9.

³²⁰ *Ibid.*, p. 52.

³²¹ *Ibid.*, p. 7.

³²² *Ibid.*, p. 53.

The limitless ('dazzling') possibilities of the human mind obviously excited Bain greatly, but he shrank back from calling the educational project a 'moral' one. Morality did not belong within education, and he would not 'embroil the theory of education in a controversy that would seem to be alien to it'³²³ Educationalists must stick with physiology, from whence they might construct a learning environment most conducive to transmitting and retaining information. For the second division, the establishment of curricula, Bain specified a thoroughgoing knowledge of natural, applied, human and social sciences completely stripped of all transcendent reference:

The scientific handling of mind has been often impeded by the partisan solutions given to such questions as Absolute Being, Innate Ideas, and Moral Sense. Unless entire impartiality can be shown in dealing with these subtleties, a theory of the mind may darken all it touches.³²⁴

Not only biology and physics but politics, economics, legislation, ethics, and language studies, must be relentlessly naturalistic. History, geography, and literature were also important but must never be used to inculcate religious or patriotic values:

The same rigid principle of division of labour would exclude from English teaching whatever relates to the history, manners, and customs of the country, and all occasions for calling forth patriotic or moral sentiments. Such matters obviously belong to historical and other teaching.³²⁵

Somewhat reluctantly Bain suggested a method for examining moral education.³²⁶ He recommended carefully-crafted case studies, from which use 'the cardinal virtues in the modern treatment [of] prudence, probity, and benevolence', should emerge.³²⁷ In a section entitled 'What Requires Caution', Bain reminded us of our 'natural human repugnance to the whole subject'.³²⁸ He categorically rejected religious education in schools because 'this vexed subject'

³²³ Ibid., p. 59.

³²⁴ Ibid., p. 161.

³²⁵ Ibid., p. 358.

³²⁶ Ibid., p. 398. 'The difficulties of moral teaching exceed in every way the difficulties of intellectual teaching. The method of proceeding is hampered by so many conditions, that it barely admits of precise demonstration.'

³²⁷ Ibid., pp. 403-404.

³²⁸ Ibid., p. 411.

was not intellectual but rather emotional.³²⁹ As such it had no place in the schoolroom, and those who would find religion should seek it elsewhere.

Bain's desire to sever education and psychology from metaphysics set him radically apart from other educationalists of his time. His ideas were picked up by others such as Joseph Payne, Lecturer at the College of Preceptors in London, who lectured extensively on the 'science of education', and championed among existing teachers a near-identical methodology: 'to be effectual [education] must have an exact scientific relation to the nature of the machinery that is to be set in motion, a relation which can only be understood by a careful study of the machinery itself. If it is a sort of machinery which manifests its energies in acts of observance, perception, reflex and remembering, and depends for its efficacy upon attention...'³³⁰ Thus Payne described the detailed observation of children's behaviour which was required of an excellent teacher. Note, however, that he spoke of general laws of mind, not of individual proclivities; that concern entered later on, with Sully's importation of G. Stanley Hall (see next chapter). In Payne's schema, once the teacher had observed 'the machinery' closely, he would discover general laws inevitably:

He must proceed to study the nature of the mind in general and especially note the manner in which it acts in the acquisition of ideas. This study will bring him into acquaintance with certain principles or laws which are to guide and control his future action. The knowledge thus gained will constitute his initiation into the Science and Art of Education.³³¹

The general laws of the mind were 'those principles of Psychology by which the mind gains knowledge' and which the teacher might then subject to trial. Payne's lectures provided merely one example of the growing notion of an educational theory which was methodologically analogous to the natural sciences. As time went on, the affiliation with science enabled

³²⁹ *Ibid.*, p. 423.

³³⁰ Joseph Payne, *The Importance of the Training of Teachers* (London: William Ridgway, 1873), p. 19.

³³¹ *Ibid.*

adherents to insert this anti-metaphysical stance into elite educational journals and then into the mainstream. Moreover, as the internal narrative of psychology developed, it incorporated the story of progress away from metaphysics, through a period of introspection, and out the other side into the laboratory.³³² By the Second World War, all that Bain had argued for (disciplinary demarcation, an anti-metaphysical posture within psychology and education, and even ontological relativism) was constitutive of normative elite educational thinking. In this first period, however, Bain's and Spencer's views were very much a minority view.

3.3 Training Colleges and their Textbooks

When students entered the training colleges between 1840 and 1885, they found themselves in a well-ordered world which reflected the outlook of their parish priest or pastor. Daily worship, daily work, and daily study marked the hours; frugality, humility, punctuality and godliness were meant to mark the temper. How did teachers understand their vocation? The majority view was theologically informed and held that education aimed to uplift the whole person: spiritually, mentally, and physically. The dominant anthropological narrative sprang from the Bible. This can be seen in the reading lists, in the examinations, and in various college artifacts. At the same time, educationalists employed current psychological thinking (faculty, association, and nature), placed within a firmly-grounded theological framework. It is clear that most educationalists held Biblical views of the human person and technical views of the human mind simultaneously and without any sense that this presented difficulties. While theories about association, mental faculties and progressive development did not necessarily pose a challenge to

³³² See for instance Cyril Burt's and Susan Isaacs' description of psychology's disciplinary development in Chapter V.

a Biblical ontology, the same could not be said about the anthropology offered by Spencer and Bain, who reduced human intellect to the exclusive interaction between experience and choice and who believed that this programme evaded notions of a moral self. Yet this tension did not seem obvious at the time. That it went largely unremarked presents one of the curiosities of the early twentieth century and one which this thesis probes in later chapters.

Prominent textbooks offer the most obvious access to the educational philosophy maintained by the majority of educationalists and inculcated in intending teachers. In cases in which the author himself lectured at training colleges, textbooks grant access to the college classroom as well. Three styles of textbooks were present in this first period. The overwhelming majority of those published and used between 1831 and 1886 captured the theological framework which was institutionally expected; notions of the child derived from the Bible; teaching was seen as a religious mission; psychological concepts aided but did not define the project: David Stow, *The Training System, Established in the Glasgow Normal Seminary and its Model Schools* (1831 onwards); Henry Dunn, *Popular Education: the Normal School Manual* (1837); John Gill, *Introductory Text Book to School Education, Method, and School Management* (1863-1883); James Currie, *The Principles and Practice of Common-School Education* (1861); Edward Thring, *Education and School* (1867). A second, smaller, category of textbooks, published on the heels of the 1870 Act, aimed to familiarize teachers with the increasing number of regulatory requirements: F.J. Gladman, *School Method: Notes and Hints from Lectures delivered at Borough Road Training College* (1886); Thomas Edmund Heller, *The New Code of Minutes of the Education Department, Instructions to Inspectors and Official Forms and Documents* (1882). This category of texts overlay but did not replace the first. Last, one prominent textbook, Robert H. Quick's *Essay on Educational Reformers*, published several

times between 1868 and 1907 and often referenced in preparation for Certification exams, organized itself exclusively around psychological categories. Insofar as Quick avoided situating his work within a theological model, he prefigured the work of twentieth-century educational psychologists.

Within the first category, the standard was established by David Stow in 1831 with *The Training System*. The influence of David Stow upon English education is obvious in every college.³³³ Stow set ‘training’ (for a full life) against mere ‘teaching’ (bare, intellectual content); ‘the whole child’ against mere intellectual development; and the play-ground against a cramped schoolroom. Of the whole child Stow wrote: ‘Train not the head of the child merely, as to the general mode in popular education, but *the child* – the whole man – the moral being’³³⁴ He talked about the grand purpose of education: ‘Moral training is of course practical throughout and is the main end and object of the whole system in every department’.³³⁵ The Bible was the framework for understanding human nature, which itself was badly in need of redemption and correction. Biblical texts were to be memorized in small bits every day, which was meant to palliate not only the individual but the entire society.³³⁶

But Stow did not want children to sit inside memorizing scripture all day; he wanted them out in the world. Stow was the first prominent English educator to insist on visiting museums, on measuring fields for lessons on geography and geometry, on collecting specimens, on using real objects in Arithmetic and science.³³⁷ He wanted teachers to paint vivid pictures of history, of costumes, of beauty. He wrote page after page of exemplary

³³³ John Adamson wrote in the early twentieth century: ‘David Stow exercised an incalculable influence upon the conduct of English elementary schools long after his death.’ Adamson, *English Education 1789-1902*, p. 136

³³⁴ David Stow, *The Training System, Established in the Glasgow Normal Seminary and Its Model Schools* (Glasgow: Black and Son, 1840), p. 368.

³³⁵ *Ibid.*, p. 26.

³³⁶ *Ibid.*, p. 24.

³³⁷ *Ibid.*, pp. 299-319.

'object lessons' aimed at drawing out children's responses. The object lesson came to be derided for its artifice; in its day, it was revolutionary. Stow specifically cited Pestalozzi as the master of 'objects' and 'picturing out', thus demonstrating the practical influence of romantic psychologies. Stow's work was used at Westminster, Borough Road, and Stockwell Training Colleges.

Dunn, Gill, Currie and Thring took their cues from Stow. All of them wrote within a Biblical understanding of the human person and of education and drew upon contemporary psychological constructs to enrich their pedagogy. These authors viewed education and the child in staunchly religious terms. Dunn believed that education was directed towards 'the faithful inculcation of Divine Truth from the Bible' as a means of 'moral regeneration, God's appointed way of spreading sacred and salutary influences throughout the community'.³³⁸ Currie emphasized that education must nurture children's 'moral nature', which 'came from God and was most perfectly revealed in the Christian faith'.³³⁹ Thring, headmaster of Uppingham School, defined education as first and foremost 'nothing less than bringing everything that men have learnt from God, or from experience, to bear first upon the moral and spiritual being by means of a well-governed society and healthy discipline, so that it should love and hate aright'.³⁴⁰ Such phrases as 'nature [must be] restored, not merely taught'; 'original righteousness and fallenness'; 'no natural progress in the unassisted men towards the good'; fell frequently from his pen.³⁴¹ Education was rehabilitative, part of God's mandate to draw humans back to God and truth.

The teacher appeared in these works as the bearer of truth, and as a friend, disciplinarian and role model to the pupils. Dunn devoted his entire last chapter to the Christian virtues which

³³⁸ Dunn, *Popular Education; the Normal School Manager*, p. 14 and 148.

³³⁹ James Currie, *The Principles and Practice of Common-School Education* (Edinburgh: James Gordon, 1861), pp. 24 and 69.

³⁴⁰ Edward Thring, *Education and School* (London: MacMillan, 1867, 2nd edition), pp. 21-22.

³⁴¹ *Ibid.*, p. 18 and p. 20.

the teacher must embody and to which he must enjoin his pupils. The teacher's office rested upon both authority and charity. On the one hand, 'nothing [could] be done without unbending, unflexible determination on the part of the teacher. He must be an absolute monarch.'³⁴² At the same time, the teacher must represent the ideal of love.³⁴³ Within the Biblical worldview, these authors spoke about association and faculty as matters of fact which the teacher might employ for moral and intellectual ends. Dunn repeatedly mentioned the importance of 'impressions of pleasure and pain',³⁴⁴ and noted that 'the great object of the teacher must always be, to unite pleasant associations with what is right, and painful associations with that which is wrong'.³⁴⁵ Education, wrote John Gill, 'brings [the child] to use his faculties; it gives him the command of them'.³⁴⁶ Gill referred to the 'moral faculty', the 'language faculty', the 'representative faculty', the 'conceptual faculty', as if each were a separate part of the mind which must be exercised.³⁴⁷ Unlike later classrooms which emphasized self-actualization or individuality, Currie's sponsored traditional subject-matter not only for its inherent value, but because such study exercised the faculties of the mind and permitted further educational development.³⁴⁸ In everything, the teacher should encourage pupils' 'active exertion by questions and exercises'.³⁴⁹

Not all training colleges left records of their coursework, but these textbooks appeared as the core texts in the curriculum of Cheltenham, Westminster, Borough Road and Stockwell,

³⁴² Dunn, *Popular Education: the Normal School Manual*, p. 25.

³⁴³ *Ibid.*, p. 30.

³⁴⁴ *Ibid.*, p. 132.

³⁴⁵ *Ibid.*, p. 157.

³⁴⁶ Gill, *Introductory Text Book to School Education, Method, and School Management: A Treatise on the Principles, Aims, and Instruments of Primary Education*, pp. 2-3.

³⁴⁷ *Ibid.*, pp. 70-72.

³⁴⁸ Currie, *The Principles and Practice of Common-School Education*, p. 85. Learning about Arithmetic and geography, for instance, would 'cultivate the sense-perceptive faculty'

³⁴⁹ *Ibid.*, p. 217.

Southlands, and the Board of Education Certification Examinations.³⁵⁰ All of these authors made use of some of the same psychological theories which secularists also employed, but placed them instead within a religious framework. The doctrines of association, faculty psychology, and child development, used without religion in the hands of Spencer or Bain, became important tools within a theologically-charged programme. To understand the human mind, they turned to current psychology; to understand the human person, they turned to the Bible. Normative views of right and wrong accompanied an insistence that childhood nature be respected and that education provoke interest, not boredom.

The second category of books was highly technical and illustrated the extensive requirements levied by the Government upon teachers. The Education Act of 1870 had changed the landscape of English education: in 1870, there were only 8,282 public elementary schools receiving grants, but by 1881, the number had reached 18,062.³⁵¹ The Government increasingly formalized the inspection process and rationalized the gathering of data. Heller's text, for instance, set out the different types of inspections that schools underwent, the requirements upon pupil-teachers year by year, and all of the forms which teachers were expected to utilize annually (attendance records, and agreements with the Department of Education, for instance).³⁵² Gladman's textbook was designed 'for the use of Pupil-teachers, Young Teachers and Students', and framed 'especially with a view to the present requirements of Queen's Scholarship and First Year Certificate Examination'.³⁵³ Gladman aspired to be practical rather than theoretical, and

³⁵⁰ Pritchard, *The Story of Westminster College, 1851-1951*, pp. 12, 28. 'The Practical Teacher: A Monthly Educational Journal', (VI; London: Joseph Hughes, 1886); Sc604, 'College Staff', (1861-1891), Annual Reports of each year, 1871-1883.

³⁵¹ Thomas Edmund Heller, *The New Code of Minutes of the Education Department, Instructions to Inspectors (1882) and Official Forms and Documents* (London: Bemrose and Sons, 1882), p. 2.

³⁵² *Ibid.*

³⁵³ F.J. Gladman, *School Method: Notes and Hints from Lectures Delivered at the Borough Road Training College, London, 13th Edition* (London: Jarrold and Sons, 1886), Cover. It proved impossible to locate a first edition of

the book contained strategies for maintaining order and subject-by-subject methodologies.³⁵⁴ Nevertheless, theoretical windows peeped open on occasion. He mentioned 'responsibility to God' as one of the important pedagogical virtues, for instance, and wrote that history offered the opportunity to 'inculcate a righteous indignation at wrong doing, a detestation of meanness and a love of what is noble'.³⁵⁵ These passages suggest a broader metaphysical framework which lay in the background, and the training colleges made such connections explicit by using Heller and Gladman as accompanying textbooks alongside textbooks from the first category.³⁵⁶

The final important textbook from this period and the only one in the third category differed substantially from Stow, Gill and Currie in its lack of religious framework. Robert H. Quick (*Essays on Educational Reform*) did not disparage religion *per se*; he encouraged the solemnity of chapel services and the cultivation of piety.³⁵⁷ But Quick separated the religious component from educational theory proper. He presented education itself as a completely scientific enterprise, and as such his work augured that of the next generation. The teaching profession's task was to create a science of education based upon observation.

When teachers seek by actual observation to discover the laws of mental development, a science may be arrived at which, in its influence on mankind, would, perhaps, rank before any we now possess.³⁵⁸

With these words Quick affirmed the goal of Bain and Spencer: to let education rest upon the scientific laws of mind rather than revealed text or community tradition. His position

Gladman's book. Because the thirteenth edition was published just at the beginning of the second period, his work belongs properly at the end of the first.

³⁵⁴ *Ibid.*, p. 5.

³⁵⁵ *Ibid.*, pp. 16 and 109.

³⁵⁶ Br407, 'Principal's and Superintendent's Reports', (1880s and 1890s). Report 1889, and Sc604, 'College Staff', Prospectuses from 1881, 1882, 1883, 1884.

³⁵⁷ Robert Hebert Quick, *Essays on Educational Reformers* (London: Longmans, Green & Co., 1868), p. 293.

³⁵⁸ *Ibid.*, pp. 247-8.

strengthened in subsequent editions; in his 1890 version, as we shall see, he regretted the ‘haste’ and ‘fog’ of the first edition and emphasized that the first order of education was social theory.³⁵⁹

Quick’s *Essays* was required reading in preparation for the government’s certificate until the end of the century,³⁶⁰ and was re-printed in revised form as late as 1907. His background as a Cambridge graduate, curate, and secondary schoolmaster, heightened the status of the first English-language history of education. Because he cast his story within a distinctive framework which was both religious (in terms of educational practice) and scientific (in terms of theory) Quick was able to appeal to two cohorts: those who so assumed a religious backdrop that they could rest his educational history and theory upon it, and those who hoped that the religious backdrop would in fact disappear from theory altogether.

Quick was anomalous. The majority of training college textbooks throughout this first period stated explicitly that education was inherently a religious project and made sense of particular psychological concepts within this design. In the next period, many authors moved away from this model and placed psychological tools within a primarily intellectual programme. Religion was not attacked but rather omitted.

3.4 Training Colleges: Other Internal Documents and Data

Other sources contribute to our picture of educational theory in the colleges in addition to the major textbooks. The theologically-informed view of education breaks through in several recommended reading lists, for instance. The real proliferation of educational texts occurred in

³⁵⁹ Robert Hebert Quick, *Essays on Educational Reformers, Copyright 1890* (New York: D. Appleton and Company, 1907), Preface to the edition of 1890, p. xix.

³⁶⁰ Smh/3/13, ‘Examination Results’, (1884-1892), ‘Education Department, December 1891. Syllabus for Male Candidates: The Examination for Certification in Residential Colleges and for Acting Teachers.’

our second and third periods, during which time it was not uncommon for students of education to be handed a list of some twenty-five books of interest. Not so in the first period. Because the standard length of study was then two years, not three or four, and because many students entered the training colleges with little more than elementary-level academic knowledge, subject matter and classroom management lessons occupied most of their time. For instance, textbooks used by the Male Department at Cheltenham between 1865-75 encompassed general arithmetic and algebra, geometry, grammar, history, geography, a 'history of colonies,' an atlas, economics, singing, and school management (by Gill). The Female Department during the same period used textbooks on grammar, liturgy, history, geography, domestic economy, general arithmetic, singing and school management (also by Gill).³⁶¹ Borough Road's records reveal nearly identical lists of textbooks.³⁶² Perhaps due to the time constraints imposed by the college schedule, perhaps because the textbook industry had not caught up with the large-scale nature of the educational enterprise, perhaps because educational 'research' had not yet been invented, college lecturers did not often formally recommend additional books between 1840 and 1885.

There are some exceptions in the archives which confirm the general religious framework of education. Westminster instructors recommended a book to Emily Sedgewick, a student at Westminster in the 1870s, which Emily carried with her throughout her career, its margins thick with notes indicating the value of particular passages. It was *The Teacher, or Moral Influences employed in the Instruction and Government of the Young*, by Jacob Abbott, a classroom teacher. That Abbott and Gill (whose book Sedgewick also possessed at her death) shared the same

³⁶¹ Ua21/3/14, 'Student Records, Male Department', (1865-1875).

³⁶² Br401, 'Normal Institution', Prospectus, 'The Normal Schools of the British and FSS (Female Department)', Printed in London for the Society 1856.

theological canvas is evident from the editor's introduction and throughout the book.³⁶³ Abbott, like Gill, viewed education as orientated towards the whole child (defined as soul, body and mind). He urged his students towards excitement, creativity, engagement and experimentation in the classroom in order to nurture the mind. The ultimate goal of the classroom was knowledge of God, towards Whom children should be urged but never compelled. 'It has been my constant effort', wrote Abbott, 'and one of the greatest sources of my enjoyment, to try to win my pupils to piety, and to create such an atmosphere in school, that conscience, and moral principle, and affection for the unseen Jehovah should reign here'.³⁶⁴

Three informal pieces of writing from Cheltenham also yoked religion and education. In 1857, the Lady Superintendent Isabella Reynolds wrote to a student,

My dear young friend. You have asked me to mention some one thing which you may do for my sake, when you have finally left this place. The thing by which you can most rejoice my heart, is that you should show yourself a faithful and devoted servant of your chosen Master, and by the constant exhibition of all Christian graces, make it manifest that you have 'been with Jesus,' and are daily learning of Him to live as He lived in this world.³⁶⁵

John Gill himself reinforced the view of education as a sacred trust in a 'Farewell Address to the College' in 1889, which he ended with these words:

Your work is an art, it is a fine art, it is the finest of the Fine Arts... You have, as the main aim of your work, to bring up the child on its way to God's ideal. Hence your highest sphere is to be fellow-labourers with God. Let this raise your ambition and fire your souls. Despise not one of the little ones, for each is dear to God. Farewell.³⁶⁶

Throughout the 1880s a 'Book of Farewell Guidance' was given to all the graduates of St Mary's/Cheltenham, and from it the *gravitas* with which the College commissioned its graduates emerged:

³⁶³ Jacob Abbott, *The Teacher, or Moral Influences Employed in the Instruction and Government of the Young* (London: William Dalton & Sons), pp. iii-iv.

³⁶⁴ *Ibid.*, p. 239.

³⁶⁵ Ua29/1/1 (1857), 'My dear young friend', I. Reynolds.

³⁶⁶ Uad74, 'Farewell Address', in John Gill (ed.), (1889).

I would bid [you] to...solemnly enquire of your own heart whether indeed you have that preparedness for your office which is only to be found in a true and lively faith in your crucified and risen Saviour...None but an earnest Christian can be a real educator, because no other can bring to bear on the hearts and minds of the young those influences which can check evil tendencies, inspire right motives, and awaken good impulses.³⁶⁷

The small book by no means limited its guidance to matters spiritual. The bulk of its text proffered suggestions on handling school managers, influencing pupil-teachers, caring for self, avoiding worldly temptation, and extending help to the families of those they taught. It ended where it began, however: ‘Wait for the Lord’s coming’³⁶⁸ Certainly these teachers of intending teachers, asked to impart words of wisdom, pointed past the craft itself and towards something which, in their view, made the craft worth practising in the first place.

Culham College possessed two sets of memorabilia from individual students. Neither of these sets speaks directly to educational theory, yet each suggests that, early in the College’s history, the whole process of teacher training was Biblically-informed. The first documents relate to Henry Hughes, a student in 1848 and 1849. His writings were platitudinous but show quite clearly what Hughes thought he was doing in the classroom. His ‘Essay on Character’ began with the words

Man, made originally in the likeness of God, and endowed now with various powers of the mind, however humble his station in life, has in consequence of those powers, the necessity of appearing with a character, and this character, whatever it may be, is formed from the associations and conversions of each one throughout life.³⁶⁹

From this Biblical ontology Hughes drew a picture of the teacher’s obligation to guide the child towards the good, and away from the bad. ‘This training is often committed to the schoolmaster, or to the clergyman in the Sunday school...’ While no description of what exactly constituted ‘good’ and ‘bad’ character ensued, the assumption clearly was that such an ethic existed, and that

³⁶⁷ Uad106, ‘Book of Farewell Guidance’, (St. Mary’s Hall, Cheltenham, 1880), pp. 1, 2.

³⁶⁸ Ibid., p. 13.

³⁶⁹ Cu1004ii, ‘Essay of the Training College, ‘Formation of Character’, in Henry Hughes (ed.), (1848 or 1849).

it was commonly-agreed. Hughes's second essay, 'On School Discipline',³⁷⁰ reflected a similar perspective. Hughes portrayed the schoolmaster as an authority analogous to parents and clergymen. That Hughes construed his work, and indeed, his life, in Biblical terms is shown by an acrostic written nearly fifty years later: a description of the names of God under the title 'The Babe of Bethlehem'.³⁷¹

The second Culham artifact is a testimonial which Rev. James Ridgway, Principal between 1862 and 1873, wrote on behalf of a W.H. Brackett:

He was trained here two years, during which time his conduct was exemplary. His attention to his studies would make him a good acquisition to any parish. In the past four years I have formed a very high opinion of him as a good Churchman, as an exemplary man, and a good practical teacher.³⁷²

The qualities of Christian faith and professional skill, therefore, served together as important qualifying markers.

The governing body at Fishponds seems to have consistently privileged religious above secular preparation. Following the 1870 Act which transferred the responsibility of examining religious knowledge to the confessional bodies, Fishponds' Council passed a resolution which expressed concern over the applicants' lack of religious preparation. To remedy the situation, the Council required all candidates to pass an examination in religious knowledge and simultaneously issued a plea to diocesan clergy to nurture religious life amongst the pupil-teachers more sufficiently.³⁷³ The prior year, the Council had noted the too-meagre knowledge of Scripture which characterized most of its new students.

The only wish of the Council is that the young women who go forth from this Institute should be real Christian women; and as neither Christian knowledge nor Christian principles open up spontaneously in the human heart, they venture to suggest to the

³⁷⁰ Cu1004jii, 'Essay of the Training College, 'on the Discipline of a School'', in Henry Hughes (ed.), (1848).

³⁷¹ Cu1004i, 'Babe of Bethlehem', in Henry Hughes (ed.), (1904).

³⁷² Cu1101, 'Testimonial for a Student', in James Ridgeway (ed.), (1868).

³⁷³ 37168-02, 'Minutes of Council Meetings, 1855-1875', 24 January 1871.

consideration of school managers in general, whether something more might not be done to promote the moral and religious progress of pupil-teachers during the successive years of their apprenticeship.³⁷⁴

Clearly, the Council intended all education, and specifically College education, to be Biblically-informed and laden with religious meaning. Students who did not have sufficient understanding would simply not do.

St Mary's archives contain the lecture notes of Charles Quinn, student at St Mary's 1861-62. Quinn's notes on 'Education' are rather scanty but reveal a fascinating combination of faculty psychology and Christian doctrine. He stated, for instance:

Education means to lead forth. The faculties are to be developed and properly strengthened by training. It comprises the development of the powers of man considered as a being composed of a body and a soul...the soul has two principle [sic] powers: the Will and the Understanding. The development of the first is called Moral Education, that of the latter Intellectual Education.³⁷⁵

Quinn's lecturer, who was probably the Principal, the Very Reverend J.B. Rowe, placed himself within the realm of Catholic theology and used tools common to faculty psychology. All of these memorabilia testify only indirectly to educational theory. However, they evoke a world in which the assumptions of the churches permeated the atmosphere of teacher training.

Lastly, by the end of this period educationalists produced writing which indicate exactly why the historical divisions of this thesis should not be construed as theoretically rigid. There was movement towards Bain's and Spencer's position by the end of the first period, particularly in the precursors to University Training Departments. In 1884 *The Journal of Education* published a syllabus from the Skinner Street Training College, opened in London by the Teachers' Training and Registration Society in 1878 in a (failed) attempt to train men for

³⁷⁴ 37168-30-1, 'Annual Reports of the Training Institute, 1854-1893', (1854-1893), 1869.

³⁷⁵ Ddp/1/2, 'Lecture Notes of Charles Quinn', (1861-1862), Notes on School Management and Education.

secondary certification.³⁷⁶ The programme had been designed by Quick and Sully, both of whom lectured for the College. Their questions indicate that Spencer had begun to take his place in the general *corpus* of educational knowledge. Alongside the expected questions on Locke, on writing up a lesson in grammar, on the moral qualities which school ought to inculcate in pupils, there appeared three questions about Spencer's *Education*. This was not surprising, given Quick's affinity for Spencer and Sully's preference for a psychological over a religious framework for education. It suggests, more broadly, that certain collegiate environments took Spencer seriously by the end of our first period.

3.5 Board of Education documents

3.5.1 Syllabuses

The Board of Education offered specific guidelines to students in training. In the early years, the government coupled rigorous academic training, practical skill, and Biblical knowledge in what must have been an intimidating syllabus of required knowledge. The Committee of the Privy Council on Education issued a syllabus for Female Candidates in 1859, which included extensive academic requirements and 'the methods and principles of teaching all elementary subjects'³⁷⁷ Students not only had to teach a class in the presence of Her Majesty's Inspectors, but to respond to the Inspectorate's oral questions on school management. The inspectors were looking for a proven ability to organize a classroom, to impart information successfully, and to understand discipline. They were also looking for a hefty amount of

³⁷⁶ The Teachers Training and Registration Society was conceived and executed by the College of Preceptors, a London organisation which sought, from 1826, to train and accredit teachers. For more information on the College of Preceptors, see J. Vincent Chapman, *Professional Roots: The College of Preceptors in British Society* (Epping: Theydon Bois Publications, 1986).

³⁷⁷ Ua20/5/1, 'Committee of the Privy Council on Education, Examination for Female Candidates, Syllabus of Subjects', (1859).

religious knowledge, and teachers were examined in Biblical history, Biblical content, and Catechism, Liturgy, and Church History. Of course there were disputes about which confessional interpretation of revealed religion ought to be privileged, and to what extent. But the fundamental point is that the early syllabus reflected a theological framework for education.

3.5.2. Examinations

John Gill's 1863 textbook contained a list of 84 'Examination Questions, Collected Chiefly from the Minutes of the Committee of Council on Education' (reproduced as APPENDIX A).³⁷⁸ Teachers were meant to know how to hold a child's attention, which school subject ought to be introduced first, how to teach children to read by three different methods, which combinations of letters children found most difficult to pronounce, how to fill out a governmental register, and so on. At first read, the thrust seems to have been exclusively practical with no particular metaphysical stance or view behind it. A closer look reveals the presence of both cutting-edge psychology and a traditional metaphysic. The distinctiveness of the views represented in this examination become more obvious when contrasted with those in later exams, which emphasized, increasingly, the development of personality and the requisites of intelligence testing.

First, the questions in the 1863 examinations were reflective of faculty psychology. Numbers 2, 3, 5, 6, 7, 9, 17, 18, and 19 refer to those powers of mind which needed to be exercised and cultivated in the classroom. Second, the questions assumed a moral direction in which children ought to be urged (numbers 4, 6, 8, 12, 13, 14, 15, 16, and 28). The desired virtues were truthfulness, industry, cheerfulness, and moral and religious imagination. The implications are obvious: 'goodness' existed, and a teacher's job included drawing his or her

³⁷⁸ John Gill, *Introductory Text Book to School Management* (London: Longmans, Green & Co., 1863), Appendix. Pp. 217-220, attached as Appendix A.

pupils into the practice of goodness. However, while the exam questions imply that the religious and moral tone in a classroom mattered, the questions themselves were not denomination-specific. They could have been applied as easily to a Nonconformist as to an Anglican school. Third, the questions assigned complete authority to the teacher. Numbers 11 and 20-27 spoke to this point; see as exemplary number 21: ‘Describe briefly the various mechanical devices by which a good master may bring a new school into habits of order and prompt obedience’. Fourth, nearly half of the questions (38 out of 84) pertained to proper pedagogy. Consider question number 60: ‘Describe a reading lesson given to your first class, showing what methods you take to secure the five requisites of fluency, correctness, distinctness, intelligent emphasis, and proper expression’ A teacher was expected to impart certain quantifiable skills. Or question number 73: ‘To what extent and on what system may mental arithmetic be best combined with working on slates?’ Or question 74: ‘How would you teach a child to draw maps? Explain the process by the aid of diagrams.’ The pedagogical picture is that of someone set to accomplish a very practical task against a taken-for-granted religious backdrop.

The Education Department’s certification examinations in the 1870s focused upon school organisation (30%), pedagogical method (40%) and scholars’ character (30%). In the first category fell exhaustive queries about class register; in the second, questions about the best method by which young children should be taught to write (or learn maths, or study geography, and so forth); in the third, directives about inculcating punctuality, cleanliness, neatness and ‘cheerful obedience to duty’³⁷⁹ These examinations depict an ontological understanding not dissimilar to that of John Gill. The child was multifaceted, and thus moral and intellectual training continued together. The teacher was an adult (qualitatively different from a child), and

³⁷⁹ *Education Department, Christmas Examinations, 1875* (London: Her Majesty's Stationery Office, 1876); *Education Department, Examinations, Christmas, 1876* (London: Her Majesty's Stationery Office, 1877); *Education Department, Examinations, Christmas, 1878* (London: Her Majesty's Stationery Office, 1878).

therefore deliberately guided the children towards maturity themselves. Pedagogical training existed so that teachers might more effectively impart information, skills, and good character.

The Education Act of 1870 re-organised the Inspectorate by geography, not by religious affiliation. It placed religious education in the hands of the denominations, not the Government, and no clergyman acted as an Inspector from that point onwards.³⁸⁰ Neither did HMI interrogate scholars on Scriptural knowledge, nor Government syllabuses or certification examinations query as to Scriptural knowledge. This absence does not imply that educational theory itself had become bereft of religious moorings; rather that the latter was no longer the purview of the State. The similarities between the religious philosophy of the training colleges and the government examinations are not surprising. This was a shared educational world in which all but a vociferous minority believed that education was inherently religious and in which the training colleges themselves were led by men of the cloth. The government solicited syllabuses and internal examinations from the colleges, and it was from these authoritative sources that the certification exams were set. It was only when the theoretical authority shifted from the religious training colleges to the universities that the government examinations, and thus the suggested syllabuses, began to reflect new priorities. Her Majesty's Inspectors visited the colleges regularly and examined instructors and students alike. Copies of HMI reports from the first period do not survive. Government oversight expanded in later periods, and HMI reports became more often preserved in the college files. The turn of the century brought tussles between college and government over staff appointments and competencies, for instance, and in nearly every case the government view predominated. Similarly, in the twentieth century the government began to issue publications on the teaching profession to which, it was hoped, the

³⁸⁰ H.E. Boothroyd, *A History of the Inspectorate* (London: Printed for Private Circulation by the Board of Education Inspectors' Association, 1923), p. 28.

colleges adhered. Thus in the following two periods, shifts in the government's official thoughts on education are more accessible because the vehicles through which they were articulated increased, and the urgency with which they were received ensured their preservation in the archives.

3.6 Prominent Journals

Although they exercised more influence over the second period of study, two important journals were founded in the waning days of the first which illustrate the direction in which education was moving: *The Journal of Education* (1880) and *The Practical Teacher* (1881). Neither was denominational, as earlier journals had been (such as the *Schoolmaster*, published by the National Society). *The Journal of Education* was orientated towards the educational elite, *The Practical Teacher* towards a more modest audience. *The Journal of Education* emerged from the 'Society for the Development of the Science of Education', a club formed in 1875 and populated by up-and-coming leaders of the educational world. The Society voiced its *raison d'être* in the founding resolution: 'That it is desirable to form a Society for the purpose of examining, systematizing, and propounding definite and verifiable principles upon which the practice of Education should be formed'³⁸¹ By 1880 the London Society numbered 130 members, and branches had opened in Dublin, Southampton and Brighton.³⁸² Its originally-eclectic membership ranged from the agnostic Alexander Bain, to the Principal of the Wesleyan Training College (Rev. Dr. Rigg), and from a member of the Catholic University of Ireland (Rev. J. Molloy) to the progressive James Sully, examiner in Logic and Psychology at the University

³⁸¹ Education Society', *Journal of Education: A Monthly Paper Dedicated to the Interests of the Scholastic Profession*, II/1 (January 1880), 153.

³⁸² *Ibid.*

of London and the founder of the British Child Study movement (see next chapter).³⁸³ The journal was not anti-religious, but the religious voice was never dominant in the journal's pages. Rather, the journal gave centre stage to psychologists and educationalists whose work, intentionally or unintentionally, moved educational theory away from a religious framework. Not only its membership but its content revealed the *Journal's* elite readership. Throughout its history it listed Oxford and Cambridge appointments and referred to developments within the great public schools. Every month the *Journal* featured Greek and Latin translation prizes. In the first edition, the editors reviewed a translation of Aeschylus. Even as the publication expanded its scope to encompass international educational movements, teachers' organisations, and red brick universities, it was skewed towards public schools and Greats.

What did the Society (and the *Journal*) mean by 'definite and verifiable principles upon which the practice of Education should be formed'? From the very beginning, the *Journal* emphasized research, observation, and quantification, not metaphysics. Alexander Bain was the Society's first President and most consistently-mentioned author in the early decades.³⁸⁴ An editorial 'Occasional Note' from July, 1880 stated that the Society was 'very anxious to draw up and carry out a scheme for obtaining a large number of biological facts about children'³⁸⁵ Perhaps most telling is a letter of support from Francis Galton, one of the earliest educational researchers (and the 'father' of the eugenics movement):

I have read the proposed programme of the Education Society with unusual interest, for it deals with many subjects whose furtherance I have much at heart. *It cannot be too strongly enforced upon masters, that unequalled opportunities for psychological and many other kinds of statistical inquiry exist in their schools and have been most*

³⁸³ 'Back Cover', *The Journal of Education: A Monthly Paper Devoted to the Interests of the Scholastic Profession*, II/12 (December 1880).

³⁸⁴ Bain's *Education as a Science* was the featured work at a general meeting of the Society on May 19th, and he was given frequent mention in reviews, in 'Occasional Notes' and in comments by other papers.

³⁸⁵ 'Occasional Notes', *The Journal of Education: A Monthly Paper Devoted to the Interests of the Scholastic Profession*, II/7 (July 1880), 153.

*strangely overlooked. Under no other conditions are human beings so carefully classed, brought together in so compact a mass, or so continually under close inspection, as they are in schools. Under no other conditions is the inspection more intelligent, or is the classification conducted under so strict a system of numerical estimation... It is at this moment open to any Natural Science master, who cares to devote attention to the phenomenon of any faculty... to write a monograph upon it that shall be received with gratitude by all scientific men. A vast field of psychological inquiry lies perfectly open to such masters as have energy, desire, and capacity to explore [italics mine].*³⁸⁶

Galton perceived education as a field ripe for psychological study. In the classroom, the keen observer could learn facts about the faculties of attention, memory, retention, intelligence, and other aspects of psychological import. This project, the classroom-as-laboratory, became quite prominent in the early twentieth century; here, it appears as cutting-edge.

At the *Journal's* ten-year anniversary³⁸⁷, editors celebrated that it had 'trebled its bulk and more than trebled its circulation'. They further claimed to be 'the only English paper that professes to deal with education as a whole, and is not the organ of any sect of society' and whose 'conviction...[is] that education is one and indivisible, a science, or rather a particular application of the laws of human nature'.³⁸⁸ The most important reason to study *The Journal of Education* is this: in its pages are observable the changes in the ways in which educational elites viewed educational theory, such as the shift from faculty psychology to experimental psychology which occurred after the turn of the century, or the ambivalence towards Bain which was obvious by his death in 1903.³⁸⁹ It is possible as well to observe stable commitments across time, such as the editors' wish that teacher training colleges should be completely undenominational. This

³⁸⁶ 'Letter from Francis Galton', *The Journal of Education: A Monthly Paper Devoted to the Interests of the Scholastic Profession*, II/7 (July 1880), 154.

³⁸⁷ In its permanent form. The Society had published two years' worth of reports in 1878 and 1879.

³⁸⁸ 'Editorial', *The Journal of Education: A Monthly Paper Dedicated to the Interests of the Scholastic Profession*, XII/1 (January 1890), 13.

³⁸⁹ 'Obituary', *The Journal of Education: A Monthly Record and Review*, XXV/11 (November 1903), 760. When Bain died in 1903, the comments were short and mixed. The official obituary was a mere 17 lines and stated that although 'his treatment of educational problems was somewhat narrow (his outlook being too much that of the mechanics' institute), he did valuable service in urging the importance of the technical and scientific side of education' This with respect to the former President.

they asserted first in May, 1882,³⁹⁰ again in June, 1883,³⁹¹ and in 1892.³⁹² The year 1902 found the editors clamouring for the abolition of religious tests for training colleges, and in 1907 and 1908 they stood with the Government's attempt to impose religious quotas on the same.³⁹³

The most important commitment across time was the editors', reviewers' and writers' belief that the primary resources for education were physiology and psychology. Bain's writing, of course, provided grounds for this and was frequently referred to, but others raised their voices as well. In 1882 an unattributed piece entitled 'What does Training do for the Teacher?' answered that 'Professional preparation for dealing with human organisms, of which physiology and psychology give the laws, is one of the new, and not altogether popular, prescriptions for preventing waste of time in schoolroom life', for granting 'definite' responsibility and a better understanding of the 'relationship of subject to subject'.³⁹⁴ In the early period, James Sully's *Outlines of Psychology* (1884) received high praise for exactly this view: one editor called it 'the most important work on education that has appeared in England since Bain's *Education as a Science*'.³⁹⁵ That is, Sully (whose work will be fully discussed in the next chapter) had called upon just the right resources to speak about education. Further,

Mr. Sully has done more for the progress of Education, by supplying teachers with a really suggestive text-book on Psychology, than he could have done by giving us any quantity of good advice as *Theory of Education*. *What we want is a race of*

³⁹⁰ 'What Does Training Do for the Teacher?' *The Journal of Education: A Monthly Paper Devoted to the Interests of the Scholastic Profession*, IV/2 (February 1882), 43; 'Editorial', *The Journal of Education: A Monthly Paper Devoted to the Interests of the Scholastic Profession*, IV/5 (May 1882), 131.

³⁹¹ 'Editorial', *The Journal of Education: A Monthly Paper Devoted to the Interests of the Scholastic Profession*, VI/6 (June 1883), 193.

³⁹² 'Editorial', *The Journal of Education: A Monthly Paper Devoted to the Interests of the Scholastic Profession*, XIV/12 (December 1892), 634.

³⁹³ 'Editorial', *The Journal of Education: A Monthly Record and Review*, XXIII/9 (September 1902), 565; 'Editorial', *The Journal of Education: A Monthly Record and Review*, XXX/1 (January 1908), 18.

³⁹⁴ 'What Does Training Do for the Teacher?' *The Journal of Education: A Monthly Paper Devoted to the Interests of the Scholastic Profession*, IV/2 (February 1882), 43.

³⁹⁵ 'Review of James Sully's *Outlines of Psychology*', *The Journal of Education: A Monthly Paper Devoted to the Interests of the Scholastic Profession*, VI/5 (May 1884), 178-80., p. 180.

*psychologist-teachers; and, when we have that, the Theory of Education will grow apace [italics mine].*³⁹⁶

The assumption that psychology provided the proper foundation for education persisted across the *Journal's* history. The elite understanding of what constituted psychology changed across time; it began with faculty psychology and continued with Freudian-inspired theories of the unconscious. Nevertheless, the *Journal's* commitment to psychology as the bedrock of education remained.

The same educational elites who led the London Day Training College and worked for the London County Council filled the pages of the *Journal* in the early twentieth century. During the first period, that the anti-metaphysical paradigm sustained its own journal indicates that the work of Bain and Spencer had resonated. Their ideas had already begun to move from the bookshelves into conversation. In the next period this view would gain traction in the newly-formed University Training Departments and in the government examinations. As such, the *Journal* offers a window into the sociology of knowledge; it provides insights into how important ideas migrate from the unknown to the taken-for-granted.

The Practical Teacher, on the other hand, was written for the trenches. Its chief audience was elementary teachers, both those in training (at pupil-teacher centres) and in the classrooms. *The Journal of Education* announced *The Practical Teacher's* arrival with praise and understanding of its mission:

This new venture deserves success. It appeals mainly to elementary teachers and pupil-teachers, two-fifths of its columns being taken up with examination papers and answers. These are done in excellent style, and correct as far as we have tested them.³⁹⁷

³⁹⁶ Ibid.

³⁹⁷ 'New Journal', *The Journal of Education: A Monthly Paper Devoted to the Interests of the Scholastic Profession*, III/5 (May 1881).

It is difficult to describe the appeal of *The Practical Teacher*, because its greatest strength lay in diagrammatic and historical presentation. The first issue ran a four-page illustrated article on 'The Red Squirrel', an historical anecdote entitled 'The Emperor Akbar and His Subjects', a Cambridge graduate's advice on writing examination papers, and abundant reviews and articles.³⁹⁸ The second issue presented a sample object lesson on 'The Camel' and an account of phonetic teaching.³⁹⁹ One can imagine pupil-teachers poring over the practice examinations. Each issue included lessons on voice and music. The books which *The Practical Teacher* tended to review were elementary textbooks, such as *A Complete Dictionary of Caesar's Gallic Wars* by Albert Creak, or *Sentences for Analysis for Use In Schools* by J.H. Heeley.⁴⁰⁰ The educational books ('Education and School Works') which *The Practical Teacher* reviewed tended to be highly technical and practical. In 1883 the list ran as follows:

Bowden's Pocket Code
Cook's Patent Screen Seats
Health in Schools
Hume's School Attendance Guide
Imperial Register of Attendance and Fees
Moss's Handbook of the New Code
Morgan's Complete Class Register
Object Lessons, and how to Give Them
Object Lessons, Illustrated Manual of
Paragon Registers
Reform of English Spelling
Teacher's Diary and Pocket Code
Two Educational Lectures
Works of Joseph Payne

³⁹⁸ 'Anecdotal Histories', *The Practical Teacher: A Monthly Educational Journal*, 1/1 (March 1881), 3-12; W.P. Workman, 'How to Write an Examination Paper', *The Practical Teacher: A Monthly Educational Journal*, 1/1 (March 1881), 9-10.

³⁹⁹ 'Object Lesson and Comments', *The Practical Teacher: A Monthly Educational Journal*, 1/2 (April 1881), 98-99.

⁴⁰⁰ 'Reviews', *The Practical Teacher: A Monthly Educational Journal*, 1/2 (April 1881), 99.

The publication emphasized the nuts-and-bolts of educating large numbers of elementary children in an efficient manner.⁴⁰¹ Teachers across the British Empire read *The Practical Teacher*, something to which the Editor referred in the final issue (1911):

From all parts of the civilized world have come again and again the kindly words of greeting and of warm appreciation. *The Practical Teacher* has been the friend of lonely teachers on the confines of the Empire, linking them with 'home' in a way which can only be fully appreciated by those who have left these shores. Nowhere has the paper had more loyal and constant friends than among the teachers of India. In Australia and Canada it has helped to pass on the torch to the outer edge of civilization. It has assisted in moulding the educational methods of New Zealand. In South Africa, also, there are numerous teachers and educationalists who have used its pages.⁴⁰²

In summary, then, *The Practical Teacher* was orientated towards helping teachers do a better job of conveying elementary-level information and negotiating the increasingly complex tasks required by Government. Despite its practical aim, however, *The Practical Teacher* revealed an increased interest in, and acceptance of, the same model of education which the elites adopted. *The Practical Teacher*, too, began with faculty psychology and ended with experimental psychology. So, too, it nodded from the very beginning towards the kind of educational framework of which Bain and Spencer had written.

The first issue, for instance, featured a complimentary review of F Ryland's book, *A Student's Handbook of Psychology and Ethics*. Besides praising its use for teachers in training, the reviewer commented that 'at least one-half the work is taken up in analyses and quotations from Herbert Spencer, Stuart Mill or Professor Bain, and by this means the student is provided with a pleasant introduction to the gigantic literature of the subject'⁴⁰³ James Sully's *Outlines of*

⁴⁰¹ Index to Volume Iii: Reviews of Education and School Works', *The Practical Teacher: A Monthly Educational Journal*, III/11884).

⁴⁰² 'Announcement', *The Practical Teacher: With which is incorporated The Practical Teacher's Art Monthly*, XXXI/12 (June 1911), 2.

⁴⁰³ 'Review of Ryland's 'a Student's Handbook of Psychology and Ethics'', *The Practical Teacher: A Monthly Educational Journal*, I/2 (April 1881), 101.

Psychology (1884) was as favourably reviewed here as it had been in the *Journal*: ‘Students of psychology will welcome this new work by Professor Sully... This volume gives as much as yet exists of the theory of education, and for the teacher it is the most important work on psychology in the English language.’⁴⁰⁴ The reviewer agreed that psychology offered fit building blocks for education: ‘Are our teachers then to become psychologists? It will be asked; and we may reply at once, yes—at least to the extent that brewers and farmers must become chemists.’⁴⁰⁵ In 1886 *The Practical Teacher* published an even bolder claim in the first of an eight-month series on ‘The Elements of Moral and Oral Science as Applied to Teaching’, by John Adams, then of the Aberdeen Free Church Training College and later dean of the London Day Training College.

Physiology, the science of the healthy working of our bodily functions, supplies us with the principles of physical training; psychology, the study of the mind in its widest meaning, gives the basis upon which moral and intellectual education is founded.⁴⁰⁶

Adams clarified how psychology provided the basis in the November issue: ‘Man must try to bring into exercise all his latent powers, must seek to make the best of his nature and the most of his life. Morality is, in a word, self-realization. There exist many understandings of ‘virtue’; the terms “right” and “wrong” are not fixed.’⁴⁰⁷ Adams’ writing fitted perfectly with Spencer’s sociology (society is always changing; human values must adjust accordingly), and it bore little resemblance to the Biblical ontology of John Gill.

The above quotations demonstrate that *The Practical Teacher*, a publication geared for everyday teachers (not academic elites), incorporated the intellectual trends of the elite journals.

⁴⁰⁴ ‘Review of James Sully’s *Outlines of Psychology*’, *The Practical Teacher: A Monthly Educational Journal*, IV/4 (June 1884), 193-94.

⁴⁰⁵ *Ibid.*

⁴⁰⁶ Adams, ‘The Elements of Mental and Moral Science as Applied to Teaching’, *The Practical Teacher: A Monthly Educational Journal*, VI/2 (April 1886), 54-58, p. 54.

⁴⁰⁷ J. Adams, ‘Morality’, *The Practical Teacher: A Monthly Educational Journal*, VI/8 (November 1886), 395-98, p. 395.

This it accomplished by reviews and by giving space to elite educationalists such as John Adams, who published in nearly every issue, or, later, W.II. Winch, educational psychologist, who wrote a regular column on ‘Researches in Educational Psychology’ between 1908 and 1911. Adams and Winch knew their audience and wrote at a less erudite level for *The Practical Teacher* than for the *Journal*. Adams, for instance, used the popular figures of Sherlock Holmes and Dickens’ Fagan to illustrate points about memory and observation.⁴⁰⁸

In summary, then, *The Practical Teacher* focused upon practical method, elementary subject matter, non-academic extras such as music and drawing, and pupil-teacher exams. When it did turn to educational theory, its writing is nearly indistinguishable in content, if not in tone, from that elucidated in the pages of *The Journal of Education*. Thus, *The Practical Teacher* brought the world of Alexander Bain and Herbert Spencer a step closer to the classroom teacher. Both journals sponsored the view that psychological concepts ought to frame education, and both journals characterized education in increasingly scientific terminologies. The next two periods marked an even sharper convergence between the intellectual worlds of the classroom, the colleges, and the educational elite.

3.7 Conclusions

A study of the first period of national education, 1840-1885, suggests that the majority of educationalists held a theologically-informed view of the child, of the classroom, and of the entire educational project. This was bolstered by the fact that successive governments channelled grants through religious societies. A theological framework for education dominated college textbooks, which were the most academic vehicle through which intending teachers

⁴⁰⁸ J. Adams, ‘Sherlock Holmes: The Meaning of Observation’, *The Practical Teacher: A Monthly Educational Journal*, XVII/1 (July 1896), 6-8.

learned their craft. This framework can also be seen in the internal documents of the colleges. At the same time, most textbook-writers used some of the key tools of the increasingly independent field of psychology, even though some of the most famous psychologists explicitly rejected a theological model for both psychology and education. Theories about association, faculty training, and the child 'according to nature' worked their way into nearly all of the educational textbooks we have surveyed. The minority voices which spoke of severing psychology (and education) from theology (and metaphysics) grew appreciably throughout this period. By 1881 two important journals had been founded which, though intended for two profoundly different audiences, both created space for 'educational science'. The journals would soon be joined by a new generation of books, textbooks and psychologists who moved both elite and popular thinking further along the trajectory begun by Spencer and Bain. Their intellectual centre was the London Day Training College, founded in 1903.

Chapter IV

Second Period (1886-1920): Day Training Colleges to Percy Nunn's *Education*

Education as an Intellectual Project

4.0 Introduction

During the period between the Cross Commission and the publication of Percy Nunn's *Education*, teacher training began to emphasize intellectual attainment more than moral and spiritual development. While the moral and spiritual components of education remained important, they were overtaken within academic educational philosophy by a concern to fulfill the academic obligations of the classroom. Teachers continued to apply the concepts of association and faculty psychology, but, in a subtle shift, utilized them more for academic than spiritual ends. As psychology itself developed, newer categories such as 'instinct', 'stream of consciousness', 'self-regard', and 'psycho-analysis' stood alongside, and eventually superseded, association and faculty models. New models for studying child behaviour recruited parents and teachers into 'scientific observation', which aimed for the efficient categorization of pupils according to academic ability. Laboratories opened which researched children's attention spans, interest in various subjects, and memory. Psychology developed a narrative which emphasized the shedding of metaphysics and the rise of science. Psychology offered new ways of understanding the child, from a creature fallen and redeemed towards an individual produced by evolution and driven by instincts. All of this activity seemed to professionalize psychology and to lend it more scientific credibility, and many educationalists believed that their own status

stood to rise as they adhered to psychological protocols. As a consequence, teacher training textbooks proliferated which focused upon psychological research and its implications for the classroom. It was not that religious understanding was explicitly rejected; it was simply overwhelmed by the prestige of psychological constructs and the urgency of vast numbers of pupils to be educated.⁴⁰⁹ The research data and the psychological descriptions became tools, used not for spiritual refinement but for the acquisition of knowledge. Historians of education call this central drive to impart knowledge ‘instrumentary education’.

R.J.W. Selleck defined the instrumentary period as one in which educationalists focused predominantly upon reading, writing and arithmetic, and Selleck considers it to have run between 1862 and 1890 (roughly corresponding to the Revised Code regulations), at which point the ‘New Education’ took over.⁴¹⁰ I would define and locate the instrumentary period differently and more broadly. ‘Instrumentary education’, properly understood, placed academic attainment of all kinds (not merely reading, writing, and arithmetic) above other classroom goods, and it lasted well into the twentieth century. Because this pursuit was complicated by an awareness of the diverse abilities of English pupils, educationalists used what they considered to be scientific tools of observation to understand, that they might better instruct the pupils. Innovative men and women brought together the tenets of romanticism and the empirical sciences into a project known as Child Study. Their purpose was to create an environment in which every single child could learn the curriculum. While Child Study persisted in some training colleges until the 1930s, its heyday occurred in the 1910s. The end goal was intellectual attainment, and in this respect, ‘instrumentary education’ differed in emphasis both from what preceded and from what supplanted it.

⁴⁰⁹ This is not meant to detract from the anti-religious and/or anti-metaphysical agenda of some educationalists such as Bain.

⁴¹⁰ Selleck, *The New Education: 1870-1914*, p. 25.

What did Selleck mean by the 'New Education' which he said 'took over' after instrumentary education, a transition he thought occurred in 1890? Selleck characterized the instrumentary period as one which emphasized intellectual discipline against a moral (and often religious) backdrop. He therefore located the 'new education' as a reaction to all of these fixed points, as a rebellion against religious certainties, the military and the imperialist mandate. The 'new education' possessed its own certainties, of course, such as the certainty of 'science' and the rectitude of rationality.⁴¹¹ It sought a new emphasis: the development of the individual's personality. The new education is more commonly called 'progressive education', and Selleck dated its ascendance from 1890 through 1914. Selleck seems correct in discussing the motivations and passions of the progressive educationalists. However, he missed several important points which meant that he incorrectly dated the transition between instrumentary and progressive education. First, he missed both the subtle shifts and the subtle continuities between the early, religiously-orientated philosophy of education and the second, instrumentary period. Second, he accepted at face value the progressives' erroneous assessment of Victorian education (that it was harsh, uninteresting and teacher-centred). Third, he underestimated the time it took for progressive thinking to make sense to the broader public of teachers and trainers of teachers. The progressives were hard at work in the early twentieth century, to be sure, but there is ample evidence that they were still a minority until well after the Great War (see pages 233-235). While the present chapter chronicles the slow sloughing off of the theological view of education, it also affirms that the religious life of pupils remained important to teachers, and that a moral vocabulary (even though at times an outright secular one) still resonated with them. The persistence of a moral view of education may be seen in disputes about the Moral Instruction League, discussed fully on pages 299-302. The League, which operated between 1897 and 1917,

⁴¹¹ Ibid., pp. 87-93.

attempted to institute a systematic, secular moral education *in lieu* of religious teaching. Its attempt failed, to no small degree because teachers persisted in seeing religious formation as a key aspect of their work. Again, the instrumentary education of the early twentieth century possessed its own moral absolutes of which it was quite conscious. Whatever headway the progressives made in the twentieth century was not only against a religious mindset but against an intellectual and moral one as well.

In another respect, Adrian Wooldridge, who analysed the educational psychologists in London so helpfully, missed perhaps their greatest contribution: a new picture of human nature, its problems and their solutions. As discussed on page 15, Wooldridge skilfully demonstrated the power of the London psychologists to transform their profession and the educational world simultaneously. But he framed their work in terms of political meritocracy and interpreted their focus upon intelligence as essentially a radical agenda to change the political landscape based not upon ancestry but upon accomplishment. This may be true. But their work and legacy also involved a radical re-imagining of the human person, explicable neither in religious nor in particularly rationalistic terms. Rather, the human person was to be understood in terms of subterranean drives and desires, instincts and self-creation. Wooldridge secondly mistook all the London psychologists up to the Second World War for Child Study advocates, when in truth only the first generation in this period would have appreciated the title. By the time Percy Nunn wrote *Education* (1920), psychology had moved on. Other analysts make similar errors when they cite the Norwood Report (1943) as pandering to psychometrics, when in fact the Norwood Report looked askance at educational psychology and was perceived to have done so.⁴¹² Thomson's chapter on psychology and pedagogy focused exclusively on two aspects of

⁴¹² Denis Lawton and Peter Gordon, *A History of Western Educational Ideas* (London: Woburn Press, 2002).

educational psychology: mental testing and child guidance.⁴¹³ It is particularly disappointing that Thomson neglected the metaphysical implications of educational psychology, since he helpfully raised philosophical concerns in other portions of his book. The most striking contribution which the educational psychologists offered was their view of human nature from which all educational protocols would flow.

It is worth noting that during this period the general public experienced a variety of psychological movements, some of which reinforced instrumentary education. Pelmanism, founded in 1899 by William Joseph Ennever, presented a strategy to improve the memory. It claimed 200,000 adherents by 1915 and 400,000 by 1918.⁴¹⁴ The Psycho-Therapeutic Society, founded in London in 1901, treated depressive illnesses by emphasizing 'mind over matter'. Its London clinic saw thousands of cases a year in the first decade of the twentieth century.⁴¹⁵ The proliferation of Practical Psychology clubs after the First World War 'provided a site for regular lectures and meetings, libraries of psychological literature, and courses on self-improvement'⁴¹⁶ A key aim of these movements was to understand and strengthen the mind, thus handily reinforcing the aims of instrumentary education.⁴¹⁷ The movements were successful, wrote Mathew Thomson, insofar as they muted the radical way in which elite psychology viewed the human subject.⁴¹⁸ Clearly, the influence of academic psychologists upon education was greater than that of grass-roots clubs and lecturers. Nonetheless, the presence of popular institutions and journals created an environment in which psychology had a chance of permeating the classroom from both directions: from above and from below.

⁴¹³ Thomson, *Psychological Subjects: Identity, Culture, and Health in Twentieth-Century Britain*, pp. 109-139.

⁴¹⁴ *Ibid.*, p. 23.

⁴¹⁵ *Ibid.*, p. 28.

⁴¹⁶ *Ibid.*, p. 32.

⁴¹⁷ Thomson indicates that elite psychologists were 'violently' opposed to the popularisation of their beliefs (p. 68), and that popularisers rejected the abstractions of 'elite' knowledge (p. 39).

⁴¹⁸ Thomson, *Psychological Subjects: Identity, Culture, and Health in Twentieth-Century Britain*, p. 70.

In summary, the period between the Cross Commission and Nunn's *Education* was marked by a profound interest in the intellectual attainment of English pupils which overwhelmed the initial theological bent of educational philosophy. The overt psychological agenda aimed at rationalizing the classroom and gaining tools for the job, but its corollary was a re-working of educationalists' understanding of the human child and therefore, of the purpose of education. This undercurrent of new meanings may be discerned in this period but came to full fruition in the next. At the same time, the growth of non-specialist movements around an instrumentary psychology provided a backdrop against which a more scientific psychology was able to become prominent after the First World War.

4.1 Survey of Institutional Atmosphere

The two most important institutional factors in the shaping of educational theory during this period were the Board of Education's increased involvement in the internal workings of the colleges, and the creation of, and influence of, the University Training Departments. Both of these developments ultimately affected the content of the training college courses in educational philosophy, albeit in different ways.

4.1.1 The Board's Control

During the second period, the Board asserted greater control over all aspects of the training colleges' operations. Two aspects will be discussed here: the Board's control over staff appointments, and its attempts to establish quotas in confessional colleges. The Board became increasingly aggressive in evaluating the academic preparation and acumen of instructors, whose

appointments they increasingly controlled.⁴¹⁹ In the 1880s the Board protested against appointments they considered inappropriate, and by 1904, it required that a principal must be an honours graduate of a British university; that two-thirds of the whole staff of a new college must hold university degrees; that older colleges must reach the two-thirds ratio.⁴²⁰ Inspectors proved especially critical of those members of staff who had not received university degrees. The focus upon university degrees is significant to this thesis, which tracks the rising authority of the universities categorically. Inspectors' insistence that college lecturers have degrees provided only one example of this deference.

The most detailed account of Board control over staff comes from Fishponds. Over the course of four decades (1880-1920), the Board of Education's most prestigious inspectors visited Fishponds and commented unfavourably (with brief exception) upon the academic background and intellectual capability of Fishponds' lecturers. The College constantly sought to fulfill the expectations of the Inspectorate by firing staff and hiring more acceptable ones. This was first noticeable with the appointment of the renowned Joshua G. Fitch to the Inspectorate in 1886.⁴²¹ He mounted a robust critique of the College's teaching staff which the Council honoured in a series of resignations and hirings. He called forcefully for more academic rigour and even recommended that the Principal take a hand in instruction.⁴²² The Principal complied.⁴²³

Then Fitch's recommendations and complaints became more specific. In 1888 he commented on every teacher, often to her detriment:

⁴¹⁹ Lance, *The Training of Teachers in England and Wales: A Critical Survey*, p. 76.

⁴²⁰ *Ibid.*, p. 77.

⁴²¹ Fitch carried a high level of prestige amongst educationalists. Not only did he lecture at Cambridge but he had proven a prime mover in both the Cambridge Training Syndicate and the College of Preceptors in London, an independent certifying body for secondary school teachers. Fitch's lectures on education appeared on many College syllabuses and certainly on the Board of Education's examinations.

⁴²² 37168-02, 'Minutes of Council Meetings, 1855-1875', 6 May 1886.

⁴²³ *Ibid.*, 28 April 1887.

Miss Park is an excellent lecturer and has gained natural power from her experience. He considered the other teachers too young. Miss Christmas had grasped her subject well; Miss Gauld also seemed to be an efficient teacher; Miss Charlton had considerable knowledge of her subject, geography, but her lecture was crowded with a mass of facts, and was not clearly arranged and fixed; nor was her matter of attendance a good role model for her pupils. Miss Crow had been appointed Mistress of Method; her experience had been very limited, and he regretted that an older person had not been appointed to this post.... *He would suggest that the Teaching Staff might be improved by the introduction of some teachers of higher culture than those who had only the experience of elementary schools* [italics mine].⁴²⁴

Fitch's core complaint was that the staff did not have a sufficiently academic background themselves. In 1889 and 1890 the matter became more acute. Recent exams had yielded such low marks that Fishponds ranked among the lowest of the training colleges, and Fitch blamed the limited educational background of the instructors.⁴²⁵ In the wake of this report and of some strong Council resolutions, three Mistresses resigned.⁴²⁶ Over the next decade, Her Majesty's Inspectors H.E. Oakley, W. Scott Coward, and P.A. Barrett took it in turns to investigate the College. All three of them affected the firing and hiring of staff at Fishponds.⁴²⁷ The next ten years showed gradual improvement in the College, but in 1913 Miss Monkhouse, HMI Inspector, still complained that the 'intellectual qualifications of the Staff were not high'⁴²⁸ Two women pronounced 'not successful' and 'weak', resigned in consequence.⁴²⁹

⁴²⁴ Ibid., 13 April 1888.

⁴²⁵ 37168-02, 'Minutes of Council Meetings, 1855-1875', 23 April 1890.

⁴²⁶ 37168-03, 'Minutes of Council Meetings, 1876-1917', 20 May 1892, and 26 April 1893. A Council Minute states specifically that their resolution was due to the unsatisfying results of the last examination and the Council's Resolution (see below).

⁴²⁷ Ibid., 10 April 1894. Also see Scott Coward's far-reaching comments of 2 February 1895: 'The staff was on the whole scarcely up to the average standard. In the Lectures he had heard the Vice Principal secured well upon his special work. Miss Gauld had shewed knowledge, force, and taste; Miss Kay was not very successful – she seemed to have made a mistake both in her subject and in its treatment. Miss Millard's was on the whole the best lecture. Miss Keenlside was not sufficiently catechetical and didactic – too much of a set lecture. He remarked that the Principal's hand and eye should be everywhere – constantly looking over the students' work, and the governesses' lectures... He also urged the employment of a Teacher who was able to *speak* French.'

⁴²⁸ Ibid., 24 February 1913.

⁴²⁹ Ibid., 26 February 1914.

Fishponds was not alone in receiving such criticism; Catholic colleges came under particular assault.⁴³⁰ At La Sainte Union, for instance, the Board expressed concern in the 1910s about the academic training of the instructors. The College responded by appointing Mistresses of Method who were not in Holy Orders, and by ensuring that those Mistresses who had taken the habit were also academically credible.⁴³¹ For instance, in 1917, Sister Christine Mary was appointed Mistress of Method only *after* she had taken a leave of absence to earn her Diploma from the University of Cambridge and, according to the annals, 'was better qualified and better for the work of the College'⁴³² Of course, these one-year Certification and Diploma programmes invariably took place at the University Day Training Colleges, which exposed members of staff to the 'cutting-edge' psychologies at large there. By the close of the First World War, La Sainte Union's new appointments typically possessed a university degree.⁴³³ The Board was not entirely satisfied by the College's older staff, however, and required 'progress reports' on the staff qualifications every year.⁴³⁴ In 1917, the Board of Education sent a confidential letter to the Catholic Education Council which disapproved that 'The College takes a low place among the two-year colleges in England'. An anti-Catholic bias can be discerned in the following excerpt:

The whole difficulty is clearly traceable to the powerlessness of the Order to produce women of culture, of Educational experience, and of finely balanced character to staff the College... This method of staffing a College which is in the hands of a religious order is not satisfactory... It was unwise of this Order to found a Training College so early in its English life, and that they should think they were ready to do so rather emphasizes their unreadiness.⁴³⁵

⁴³⁰ Lofthouse, *The Church Colleges 1918-1939: The Struggle for Survival*, p. 33. One account of this period calls HMI 'savagely critical of the standards of Catholics'

⁴³¹ Lsu. I. Annals, 'Annals of the College', 8 September 1907, 10 September 1912, 6 November 1917.

⁴³² *Ibid.*, 31 August 1907.

⁴³³ *Ibid.*, January 1918, and May 1919. 'Miss Spencer BSC joined the Staff as lecturer in Arithmetic, Miss Bowsell BSC as lecturer in chemistry and Nature Study' (1918). 'Miss Seymour B.A. Honours in History took up duties as lecturer in history and geography' (1919).

⁴³⁴ *Ibid.*, 28 April 1920.

⁴³⁵ *Ibid.*, letter of 1920 from the Board of Education to the executives of the Catholic Education Council.

The College responded by appointing yet more staff with degrees, and by 1929 the new Principal, Mother Patricia, stated that 'all the principal posts in the College are now filled by sisters having their degrees, and all devoting themselves heart and soul to the work of Christian education'.⁴³⁶

The Board severely criticized St Mary's staff as well, as the years 1917-19 witnessed a pronounced disagreement between College and Board as to the academic competence of staff and students. The Board did not believe the Vincentians could run the College. St Mary's came off without staff attrition, however, because in 1919 St Mary's achieved a higher percentage of passes in the Certificate examination than St John's, St Mark's, or Westminster.⁴³⁷ This accomplishment might have been due to the fact that the Certificate examination itself was increasingly influenced by the London Day Training College, and the Education staff at St Mary's increasingly drew from that institution. At St Mary's, between 1905 and 1929, the only period for which we have adequate records, the Education and Methods lecturers had degrees from the University of London while the rest of the staff originated in Catholic seminaries.⁴³⁸ Albert P. Braddock, Normal Master and Lecturer in Method and Hygiene between 1903 and 1919, had attended St Mary's and then obtained a B.A. in Psychology and an M.A. in Education from London; George Mahon, appointed in 1912 to teach Arithmetic and Principles of Teaching, had also attended St Mary's and received his B.Sc. from London concurrently to his new appointment; Albert Arthur Cock had gone straight through the University of London (B.A.

⁴³⁶ *Ibid.*, letter of 24 July 1929 from Mother Patricia to a French sister.

⁴³⁷ Smh/3/55, 'Principal's Correspondence and Papers', (1917), Principal's Report; Smh/3/66, 'Principal's Correspondence and Papers', (1921), Letter to Mr. Anderton 23 October 1919.

⁴³⁸ The Principals and Vice-Principals emerged from predominantly the National University of Ireland and/or St Joseph's College, Blackrock. The Deans and most English lecturers had been similarly educated.

and King's College Day Training College), had lectured in Education there, and taught English and Education at St. Mary's between 1912 and 1920.⁴³⁹

At Cheltenham College, government funding and government oversight naturally grew together. By 1919, wrote one chronicler of the College, 'College's dependency on government grants was complete'. In that year, fees generated £175, government grants £5,194. Additional voluntary monies were scarce.⁴⁴⁰ At the same time, Board of Education Circular 1015 (approved in 1918) stated 'that the name of a candidate selected for a vacancy on a college staff had to be submitted to the HMI before the Board'. According to Governing Body reports, 'this narrowed unduly the College's freedom of choice'⁴⁴¹ In 1918, the Board and the College argued bitterly about candidates for vice principal of the women's department. The Board won, despite passionate letters from the Executive Committee of the College.⁴⁴²

A second obvious attempt on the part of the Board of Education to control the training colleges occurred in 1907 and 1908. The Board outlawed the preferential admissions procedures of confessional colleges (Article 8(d)(i) of *Regulations for the Training of Teachers*), obviously intending to force open admissions. *The Journal of Education* had lobbied for this for years, and Nonconformists looked with favour upon the new regulation. Anglicans and Roman Catholics were incandescent. Many colleges simply refused to comply.⁴⁴³ Others 'complied', but only in a manner of speaking. The Fishponds' Council, for instance, unanimously resolved to prevent the regulation's being effective.⁴⁴⁴ They allowed the Principal to admit Nonconformists but decreed

⁴³⁹ Smh/12/1, 'Staff Register', (1905-1929).

⁴⁴⁰ More, *The Training of Teachers, 1847-1947: A History of the Church Colleges at Cheltenham*, p. 15.

⁴⁴¹ *Ibid.*, p. 16.

⁴⁴² 10 Ua2/4/68:9, 'Two Letters from Principal Bren to Rev. Percy Waller, Hon. Sec. Of Executive Committee' (1918).

⁴⁴³ Michael V. Boyd, *The Church of England Colleges, 1890-1914: An Administrative Study* (Educational Administrative and Historical Monographs, 14; Leeds: University of Leeds, 1984), p. 9.

⁴⁴⁴ 37168-03, 'Minutes of Council Meetings, 1876-1917', 18 July 1907.

that they should be lodged outside College buildings.⁴⁴⁵ They also left the College prospectus unchanged, thus slyly limiting the number of Nonconformists who felt comfortable applying in the first place.⁴⁴⁶ The Board insisted that future prospectuses clarify the situation.

In the end, and after much pressure from the Archbishop of Canterbury, the Board agreed that the colleges might accept 50% on the basis of denomination, and 50% without reference to such. The reality was that the colleges had always admitted students from outside their denominations, and that the new regulations did not appreciably alter their religious configuration. In 1908, out of 1600 students in Anglican colleges, 168 were Nonconformists; after the new policy took effect, by 1913, this number stood only slightly higher, at 197.⁴⁴⁷ Governing bodies had become exercised not by the presence of other denominationalists, *per se*, but by the mandate from above that it must be so.

The Board's policies affected educational policy in the colleges in a significant way. The insistence upon university degrees meant, incidentally, more graduates of the new University Training Departments, which carried particular implications for the content of educational philosophy courses. To hire men and women from the UTDs was to import a new way of thinking about the entire project of education (its aims, the work of the teacher, the *telos* of the classroom). Furthermore, the quotas imposed on admission stood to affect the colleges' identity, in theory if not, immediately, in practice. The Board's policies also affected the colleges' tolerance of outside interference, which perhaps softened their concern about the same process once the universities, not the Board, sat on the opposite side of the table.

⁴⁴⁵ Ibid., 14 July 1910.

⁴⁴⁶ Ibid., 26 October 1911. Their pre-1906 version stated baldly that 'each application... must be a communicant of the Church of England', must present an article of Baptism, and must have either passed the Archbishop's Religious Knowledge examination, or 'satisfied the Principal that they have passed well in Diocesan examinations, or in the religious knowledge section of the University of London exams'

⁴⁴⁷ Boyd, *The Church of England Colleges, 1890-1914: An Administrative Study*, p. 13.

4.1.2 University Training Departments

The creation of the University Training Departments from 1890 onwards changed the landscape of teacher training, both materially and intellectually.⁴⁴⁸ Joshua Fitch, lecturing to the Cambridge Teachers' Training Syndicate in 1881, had put the case for university-based training this way: 'It is surely fitting that a great university, the bountiful mother whose special office it is to care alike for the best means of human culture and to assign to all arts and sciences their true place and relations should find an honoured place for the master science, a science which is closely allied to all else which she teaches – the science of teaching itself.'⁴⁴⁹ The UTDs did not attain the kind of status within the universities of which Fitch had dreamed; the prestige which 'Education' possessed within Universities was (and is) questionable. *Vis-à-vis* the outside educational world, however (the Board of Education, the colleges and the schools), the work done within the University Training Departments attained intellectual and administrative status quickly. This was due in large part to university affiliation *per se*. It was also due to the fact that, since they did not begin life as religious institutions, the UTDs were born with the language and model of the physical sciences.

The most prestigious University Training Department (though not the first chronologically) was in London, and its founding documents verify the connection between science and prestige. In his inaugural lecture (1902), Principal and Professor John Adams stated

⁴⁴⁸ Additionally, the day training colleges created by Local Education Authorities, legalized in 1902, provided further competition for the religious colleges. Cheltenham's Annual Report of 1911/1912 ended with a plea from the Principal for better recruitment, noting that 'The many training colleges that have been opened by Local Education Authorities have lessened the number of applicants for admission to the Church training colleges' Ua4/1/10, 'Annual Report of the General Committee of the Training College, Cheltenham', 1911-1912, p. 20.

⁴⁴⁹ Joshua G. Fitch, *Lectures on Teaching* (Cambridge: At the University Press, 1881), pp. 4-5.

that the College must be based upon 'true educational science'. This 'science' was founded upon the laws which govern the minds of children, psychology, the *sine qua non* of effective teaching.

Some believe that the mind of the pupil cannot be acted upon by the teacher as the body of a dog is acted upon by the trainer. This belief is without foundation. In direct proportion to the teacher's knowledge of the laws according to which a child's mind acts, and of the contents of the mind of the particular child acted upon, can he determine the action of that mind.⁴⁵⁰

Adams' assumptions were critical to the philosophy of the College: first, that there were laws governing human thought, and second, that these laws would become transparent to the scientific observer. Understanding the laws of 'child nature' was the basis of teacher training, and this alone gave sanction to education: 'school technique owes all its meaning to, and derives its only sanction from, its relation to child-nature and child ideas. The science of education must begin and end with the child.'⁴⁵¹ No educationalist up to that point would have disagreed that education, scientific or otherwise, began or ended with the child. What Adams meant was a particular kind of knowledge about the child: one derived from observation of the 'laws of mind' As an important brief from the LDTC also made clear, its scientific associations qualified Education to become a proper University discipline:

The culture value of the philosophy of Education is not inferior to that of the more general studies in mental science, and therefore might reasonably be treated as an alternative to these studies. But the practical side of Education may be fairly compared to the laboratory work connected with a science: so the science 'The Theory and Practice of Education' ought to be treated as equivalent to a science subject.⁴⁵²

Clearly, the appeal to science was meant to legitimate the entire enterprise. In 1909 the University of London's Board of Pedagogy drafted a report on its own powers and constitution. It stated its 'ultimate' goal to be

⁴⁵⁰ John Adams, *Inaugural Address on the Training of Teachers* (London: Co-Operative Printing Society, Ltd., 1902), p. 5.

⁴⁵¹ *Ibid.*

⁴⁵² *Ie.Mem.A.2, 'Miscellaneous Reports, 1907 Onwards', (1907), 'Memorandum on the University Status of Elementary Teachers,' probably 1907.*

*The operation of a school of thought and inquiry that shall advance the scientific treatment of educational problems over their whole range, and shall, in particular, raise the level of professional practice in all its grades throughout the University's area of influence [italics mine].*⁴⁵³

In other words, the ultimate aim was not, simply, to secure more teachers for London's local schools. The aim was for a 'school of thought' that aimed at scientific inquiry and its dissemination. It must, therefore, have been of great satisfaction to Percy Nunn, then the Director, to have received in 1925 the following accolade from the Inspectorate:

This school of the University not only maintains the highest standard of efficiency contemplated by those who laid its foundations...it merits the high position which it holds in public esteem and should be encouraged to develop with all the resources which public authorities can place at its disposal.⁴⁵⁴

From the very beginning, then, the UTDs stood on very different intellectual ground from the religious colleges. Their inspiration came neither from a revealed text nor from a community of religious faith, but from the laboratory. Some, such as Nunn himself, were explicitly opposed to a theologically-charged educational philosophy.⁴⁵⁵

Students increasingly expressed their desire to attend a UTD: by 1896, fully one-fifth of those on the list of first class Queen's scholars stated a preference for a University Day Training College.⁴⁵⁶ The universities were championed by the most practical and examination-oriented of teachers.⁴⁵⁷ By the First World War, the number of students within UTDs and other undenominational colleges outweighed those within denominational colleges: in 1911, there

⁴⁵³ Ie.Mem.A.1.1, 'Extract Book 1907-1913', (1907-1913), 'University of London Board of Pedagogy: Draft Report on the Constitution and Powers,' 1909.

⁴⁵⁴ Ie.Tpn.1.2, 'Percy Nunn Papers', Report of Inspectors of Research, Training and Equipment, 1925.

⁴⁵⁵ Freathy, 'Religious Education and Education for Citizenship in English Schools, 1934-44', p. 92. Nunn rejected religious education but championed citizenship training.

⁴⁵⁶ Boyd, *The Church of England Colleges, 1890-1914: An Administrative Study*, p. 4.

⁴⁵⁷ 'The Bachelor of Education', *The Practical Teacher*, II/7 (January 1900), 369, 'Great credit is due to the far-seeing few who are striving to get the guinea stamp of a university degree upon the teacher's certificate. ...the university could help the schoolmaster in widening his views and in ennobling his ideals more than it can help any other professional man.'

were 4,854 places in denominational colleges, 7,999 in nondenominational ones.⁴⁵⁸ By the end of this period, the UTDs exercised a controlling influence over the Board of Education's syllabus and examinations. In 1919, representatives from the Oxford, Cambridge, and London training departments met with the Inspectorate to determine the protocols of secondary school teacher training.⁴⁵⁹ This indicates that the power structures within education had migrated.

This position of power placed the UTDs, and in particular that in London, in a unique position from which to influence education and to sponsor the new discipline of educational psychology. In fact, the stature of educational psychology was largely accomplished by a tight network of just eleven individuals (James Sully 1843-1923; Francis Warner 1847-1926; John Adams 1857-1934; W.H. Winch 1864-1955; P.B. Ballard 1865-1950; Charles Spearman 1863-1945; Thomas Percy Nunn 1870-1944; C.W. Valentine 1879-1964; Godfrey Thomson 1881-1955; Susan Isaacs 1885-1948; Cyril Burt 1883-1971).⁴⁶⁰ Six of these eleven were affiliated with the University of London and influenced the teaching at the LDTC, and two more (Winch and Ballard) acted as psychologists to the LCC. Only three were located elsewhere.

4.2 Survey of relevant educational currents

During this period one of the most important psychological influences upon elementary education was Johann Friedrich Herbart (1776-1841) whose philosophy led to distinctive protocols in teacher training. Herbart's influence may be seen most clearly in the early decades of this period. Another important factor in educational theory was the conscious binding together of the disciplines of psychology and education into 'educational psychology' At the beginning

⁴⁵⁸ *Report of the Board of Education for the Year 1910-1911* (London: His Majesty's Stationery Office, 1911).

⁴⁵⁹ Ed1/4/3, 'Minutes of the Delegacy for the Training of Secondary Teachers', Report of the Policy Committee, 1919-1920.

⁴⁶⁰ Wooldridge, *Measuring the Mind: Education and Psychology in England, C. 1860-C.1990*, p. 1.

of this period, psychologists wrote about education; by the end of the period, a distinctive discipline had emerged. This was made possible by the intellectual groundwork laid by the Child Study movement, which recruited teachers, parents and academics in amassing voluminous data about childhood. Some accounts would emphasize the role of Froebel in determining early childhood education, and the Froebel Society remained active throughout this period. No doubt Froebelian views had an upward effect on elementary and secondary education. However, the evidence from the elementary and secondary teacher training programmes suggests that, while Froebelians played a major role in kindergarten programmes, they were less influential in realms which dealt with older children. For work within elementary and secondary schools, Child Study and Herbartian methods proved the most compelling.

4.2.1 J.F. Herbart and the English Methodology

Of the many new educational initiatives during this period,⁴⁶¹ the approach of greatest appeal and widest currency was developed by the German philosopher Johann Friedrich Herbart (1776-1841) and popularized by his numerous disciples. J.J. Findlay, professor of Education at Manchester during this period, commented that

In 1890 scarcely any English teacher knew of Herbart's existence; whereas, by 1896, almost everyone in the Training Colleges was talking and teaching the new pedagogy. No such stirring of dry bones had been witnessed before in Training Colleges!⁴⁶²

⁴⁶¹ Selleck, *The New Education: 1870-1914*, p. 204. R.J.W. Selleck wrote, 'One of the most striking features of English education during the period from 1870 to 1914 was the tendency to dally with new approaches to teaching; it was an amazing cacophony of theories' Pestalozzi and Froebel stood alongside newcomers such as Dr. Maria Montessori, and the Ethical Cultural Movement sponsored a non-theological moral curriculum. Henry Edward Armstrong promoted the 'heuristic' method of study which applied scientific method to all school subjects, and progressives established their own schools, and so on. All of these movements, which Selleck chronicled in great detail, affected teacher training to some degree.

⁴⁶² *Ibid.*, p. 244 for quotation from Findlay, ed., *Educational Essays by John Dewey (1910)*.

The colleges' archives verify Findlay's assessment, with Herbartian terminology and practices emerging in nearly every instance. Herbart himself operated from a complex understanding of human psychology and ethics which his followers distilled into accessible and practical form.⁴⁶³ Herbart speculated that an individual learned by correlating new ideas with established ones, and he championed the importance of 'interest' in this process. Taken together and in increasingly complicated groupings, these old and new ideas became part of the mental furniture which guided an individual's beliefs and behaviour. Thus education was ultimately about character and ethics: because individuals acted upon the accumulation of ideas, the instruction offered in the classroom provided a compelling body of information and perceptions which ultimately shaped action. Furthermore, Herbart still spoke in terms of mental 'faculties', which made his work easily comprehensible by the cohort of teachers trained throughout the late nineteenth century.

Herbart was a towering intellect who held Immanuel Kant's former chair of philosophy at Koenigsberg (1809) and founded a seminary of pedagogy. Much of his thought was lost on English educationalists, who read him in synopsis. Training college students did not read Herbart's *Psychologie Als Wissenschaft* (1824), even in translation (1892), or his many books on metaphysics. But they were likely to have read John Adams' classic *The Herbartian Psychology Applied to Education* (1897) or F.H. Hayward's *The Student's Herbart* (1902), *The Critics of Herbartianism* (1903), *Three Historical Educationalists: Pestalozzi, Froebel, Herbart* (1905), *The Secret of Herbart* (1907) or *The Meaning of Education as Intended by Herbart* (1907). Herbart's interpreters offered concrete steps of instruction: Prepare the pupils to be ready for the new lesson; present the new ideas; associate the new with earlier ideas; illustrate the main

⁴⁶³ In fact, it is fair to say that Herbart might not have recognized the form his ideas took when planted on English educational soil.

points; review and reinforce the new knowledge. Educationalists often referred to the five steps as 'Preparation, Presentation, Recapitulation, Generalisation, Application'.

The student record books from Borough Road demonstrate the popularity of the Herbartian method. Henry S. Leeke, a student at Borough Road between 1900 and 1902, was a successful student who was placed first in the Board of Education's exams in Theoretical Mechanics and Inorganic Chemistry and matriculated at the University of London in 1901.⁴⁶⁴ His criticism book reveals the strikingly rigid use of Herbartian techniques which Borough Road required of its students. Every single lesson, in every single subject, on every single page of Leeke's book followed the 'Preparation, Presentation, Recapitulation, Generalisation, Application' model.⁴⁶⁵ The Culham record books, discussed below, reveal the same requirement.

The popularity of Herbart throughout the 1910s indicates the extent to which instrumentary education still dominated the field then, in contrast to Selleck's chronology. The fundamental role of the teacher in the Herbartian scheme was to impart information, because from this information flowed not only academic accomplishment but moral character. In this respect Herbartian psychology issued a profound challenge to traditional religious ethics which held that spiritual regeneration and Scriptural belief alone led to righteous character. At the same time, in placing such weight on instruction, Herbart bolstered instrumentary education and with it, the directive and assertive role of the teacher. Whatever headway the progressives made during this period had to be directed against not only a religious view but against the instructional, Herbartian view of the classroom. Herbart championed the goods of traditional

⁴⁶⁴ Br475, 'Henry S. Leeke's Papers', (1900-1902), Board of Education, Kensington, awards: First Class in Theoretical Mechanics, 1901, First Class in Inorganic Chemistry, Theoretical and Practical, 1902.

⁴⁶⁵ *Ibid.*, Criticism Book.

morality, albeit goods obtained in a non-religious manner. Progressives ultimately rejected these goods, instituting in their place a subjective moral good tailored by each individual personality.

4.2.2 Child Study

The Child Study movement represents the most successful penetration of psychology into the arena of education, theoretically and practically, during this period. Its popularity was crucial to paving the way for the more rigorous educational psychology which, by 1920, was clearly distinguishing itself from the movement which had enabled it. Insofar as it was able to bind up 'romantic' love of the child, utilitarian concerns for efficiency, and a 'scientific' eschatological narrative into non-technical language, the Child Study movement commended itself to those in the trenches of educational practice.

The father of Child Study was the American professor of psychology G. Stanley Hall (1844-1924), who pioneered the strategy of gathering data from parents and teachers. When English psychologist James Sully (1843-1923) imported Hall's work and philosophy and founded the Child Study Association in 1894,⁴⁶⁶ Hall became the most famous psychologist in late Victorian and Edwardian England.⁴⁶⁷ In 1907 one advocate remarked of Hall: 'He has done more than any man living to promote the investigation of child-nature'.⁴⁶⁸ Sully imported Hall's techniques into the English setting, the most famous of which was the 'questionnaire' which was mailed out to school boards and parents and canvassed the 'deportment, scholarship, and attendance' of pupils with the aim of 'reducing the chance of failure'.⁴⁶⁹ Teachers assessed the 'temperament' of each pupil.⁴⁷⁰

⁴⁶⁶ Sully also lectured at the College of Preceptors and became the Grote Professor of Mind and Logic at University College, London.

⁴⁶⁷ Wooldridge, 'Child Study and Educational Psychology in England, 1880-1950', p. 18.

⁴⁶⁸ W.B. Drummond, *An Introduction to Child-Study* (London: Edward Arnold, 1907), p. 7.

⁴⁶⁹ F.W. Atkinson, 'Child Study in Secondary Schools', *The School Review*, 5/7 (September, 1897 1912), 461-66.

Researchers wanted to know whether the child was 'growing rapidly, has headaches, is robust, is nervous, or is delicate, and to 'note any physical defects in hearing or sight'.⁴⁷¹ They attempted to assess the family setting as 'favourable or unfavourable for intellectual and moral development'.⁴⁷² The hope in all of this activity was to formalize general laws about classroom atmosphere and correlations between aptitude and physical characteristics, all of which served the goals of instrumentary education.

Because it recruited parents and teachers alike, the Child Study movement appealed to a variety of enthusiasts. Diffuse, less scientific notions of child study can be seen in *Child Study and Education* (1908) by Coralie Evelyn Burke, which instructed mothers that the scientific observation of young children led to domestic concord.⁴⁷³ Child Study found staunch advocates in the medical community, such as W.B. Drummond, the assistant physician to the Royal Hospital for Sick Children, Edinburgh, and 'Medical Officer and Lecturer on Hygiene to the Edinburgh Provincial Committee for the Training of Teachers'. *An Introduction to Child-Study* (1907) illustrated the practical nature of Child Study in the schools:

The chief end of Child Study is to collect facts about children, and to formulate them in such a way as to make them available for science and for the use of those who need them for application to practical problems.⁴⁷⁴

Such scientific vocabulary lent credibility to the whole project. In its view of education 'according to nature', Child Study drew upon the romantic sources discussed on pages 104-107. In contrast to its romantic forebears, however, Child Study distanced itself from metaphysics and sought sanction rather in 'scientific' and therefore 'objective' data. While this impetus had

⁴⁷⁰ Ibid., p. 462. The questionnaire explained that this category was meant to indicate whether the child was 'cheerful, morbid, quick, slow, bright, conceited, happy-go-lucky, indifferent, winning, sunny, ambitious, diffident, or methodical'

⁴⁷¹ Ibid.

⁴⁷² Ibid., p. 463.

⁴⁷³ Coralie Evelyn Burke, *Child Study and Education* (Dublin: Brown and Nolan, 1908), p. 8.

⁴⁷⁴ Drummond, *An Introduction to Child-Study*, p. 3.

originated with Spencer and Bain, and while the attempt to yoke education and psychology had been long-standing,⁴⁷⁵ Child Study brought these aims to life by marrying Darwinian developmental theories to experimental laboratory work. Whereas earlier appeals to science had emphasized the physiology of the nervous system and the development of mental faculties, the newer educational psychology appealed to statistics and population studies. Child Study exhibited a fascination with the history of the race and a hope that the race's future could be guided. Consequently, Child Study shared vocabulary and some goals with the eugenics movement and with national efficiency. But although membership between eugenic and Child Study organisations overlapped, the movements were not coequal. Child Study had its own agenda which moved beyond the constraints of national fitness.

The affinity between the two movements may be seen at the point of origin. Francis Galton (1822-1911), cousin to Charles Darwin, sought to demonstrate the hereditary nature of intelligence by charting biological traits among populations.⁴⁷⁶ In 1884, he opened an anthropometric laboratory in London which investigated intelligence and heredity and which came to influence the work of the London educational psychologists. At his death in 1911, Galton bequeathed £45,000 to University College 'to promote research into eugenics and to found a Galton Eugenics Professorship'⁴⁷⁷ Karl Pearson (1857-1936) took the position, and his research inspired educational theory at the London Day Training College. Pearson's friend Charles Spearman (1863-1945) did much the same, setting up 'the most influential research school in psychology in the country' as professor of Psychology at University

⁴⁷⁵ Joseph Payne, 'The Science and Art of Education'. *An introductory lecture delivered at the College of Preceptors* (London: Henry S. King and Co, 1874), p. 10, for Payne's statement on 20 January 1874: 'Now the Science of Education is a branch of Psychology, and both Education and Psychology, as sciences, may be studied either deductively or inductively.'

⁴⁷⁶ Wooldridge, 'Child Study and Educational Psychology in England, 1880-1950', p. 108.

⁴⁷⁷ *Ibid.*, p. 114.

College/London.⁴⁷⁸ The work of Galton, Pearson and Spearman proved influential in justifying the practice of Child Study, and in time these men championed more finely-tuned instruments of intellectual delineation (the Stanford-Binet Intelligence Test, for example) which were not contingent upon the observations of non-specialists.

The medical reports which emerged from the Boer War frightened the British public about lack of general fitness, which explains in part why psychometrics and Child Study gained traction in the early twentieth century. But equally important to Child Study's popularity was the theoretical weight which children bore in the psychological-Darwinian construct. James Sully's work focused upon children because, in his view, studying childhood behaviour was a 'logical extension of Darwin' As he explained in *Studies of Childhood* (1895), children provided not only visions of purity and beauty in an industrial age,⁴⁷⁹ but scientific satisfaction to our 'inquisitive eyes'.⁴⁸⁰ Specifically, he believed that Child Study provided clues about the origins of the species. 'As we all know', wrote Sully, 'the lowest races of mankind stand in close proximity to the infants of civilised races',⁴⁸¹ and an 'evolutionary point of view enables the psychologist to connect the unfolding of an infant's mind with the mental history of the race'.⁴⁸² It followed that Child Study offered a novel view of children's behaviour and ethics. How might one explain childhood tantrums, defiance, and deception without recourse to moral theology? 'Young children have much in common with the lower animals', argued Sully; greed is 'a vigorous nutritive impulse' ⁴⁸³

⁴⁷⁸ Ibid., p. 2.

⁴⁷⁹ James Sully, *Studies of Childhood* (London: Longmans, Green and Co., 1895), p. 2.

⁴⁸⁰ Ibid., pp. 3-4.

⁴⁸¹ Ibid., p. 5.

⁴⁸² Ibid., p. 8.

⁴⁸³ Ibid., p. 231.

Evolution will, no doubt, help us to understand much of this. We should expect the child to show a germ at least of the passionateness, the quarrelsomeness of the brute and of the savage before he shows the moral qualities distinctive of civilized man.⁴⁸⁴

If Child Study explained behaviour, it also provided guidance in moral training. In contrast to earlier views of moral training, which usually invoked religious justification, modern training could be based upon the individual's experience of 'sympathy'. Sympathy, wrote Sully elsewhere, was 'a tendency to share in the expressed feelings of another, and to invite his expression of fellow-feeling, so as to secure an agreeable consciousness of unity of feeling'.⁴⁸⁵ Because children were often as defiant as the 'savages', so moral development must be gradual and learnt by imitation of adults' sympathetic feelings of kindness and hospitality. 'The teacher should remember that his task is pre-eminently that of evoking sympathy in response to sympathy.'⁴⁸⁶ This theme may be seen across educational archives, but it begged the question of sympathy towards whom and for what cause: Sully assumed that the human race always moved towards a normative vision of the good.⁴⁸⁷ Later progressives were uncertain about a universal moral ethic, as Percy Nunn's writings revealed. Nevertheless, what may be understood from Sully's writing is the potency of the Darwinian narrative in explaining the world and the human person's place within it. This narrative provided hope and meaning in non-theological terms.

If Child Study provided intellectual satisfaction, it also addressed four practical concerns. First, Child Study offered guidelines for educating the burgeoning school-age population in the wake of compulsory education and the raising of the leaving age. How was the State to organise education, given the disparity of ability, interest, and motivation of its children? How was it to

⁴⁸⁴ Ibid., p. 234.

⁴⁸⁵ Sully, *The Teacher's Handbook of Psychology*, p. 421.

⁴⁸⁶ Ibid., p. 426.

⁴⁸⁷ Ibid., p. 461. 'The moral consciousness of a community is ever undergoing further developments. Today, social institutions which have for many centuries been regarded as right and binding are being challenged. Yet in spite of such perplexing differences there is, with the gradual evolution of societies, a distinct tendency towards convergence of moral judgment.'

organise access to the best schools? How was it to educate the 'simple-minded'? The Child Study movement offered a process by which abilities might be differentiated. In 1886 Sully noted the variety of experiments designed to detect children's abilities.⁴⁸⁸ The 1899 Education Act ('Defective and Epileptic Children') empowered Local Educational Authorities to establish special classes. In 1907, Robert Morant, the first Secretary of Education, established medical services in the schools. School medical services used psychological tests to discern which children should be counted as 'mentally handicapped' and 'mentally gifted'⁴⁸⁹ In 1913 the Mental Deficiency Act gave new authority to LEAs to classify its children.⁴⁹⁰ Classification programmes increased throughout this period: in 1919 the Bradford Local Authority added psychological tests to junior scholarship exams, and Northumberland's educational leadership believed that mental tests could 'factor out environment' and enact true democratic selection.⁴⁹¹

Second, Child Study advocates sidelined the ongoing debate between classical and practical education.⁴⁹² Insofar as its thrust was towards the mental fitness of individual children, curricular concerns took second place. Third, Child Study excused its advocates from engaging in religious controversy. It sought to explain religious commitment in the light of psychological theories, not to enjoin religious practice in the light of confessional communities or national tradition. This view may be seen in most of the Child Study literature. Drummond stated baldly:

⁴⁸⁸ James Sully, *Teacher's Handbook of Psychology on the Basis of 'Outlines of Psychology'* (London: Longmans, Green and Co., 1886), p. 494.

⁴⁸⁹ Drummond's book recounts experiments with an 'ergograph', designed to measure children's 'vital energy', tables regarding the appropriate number of hours of rest per developmental stage, fatigue factors in each school subject. Drummond also established protocols for school ventilation, general hygiene and handling of contagious diseases. Drummond, *An Introduction to Child-Study*, pp. 182-3, 191.

⁴⁹⁰ Wooldridge, 'Child Study and Educational Psychology in England, 1880-1950', p. 70.

⁴⁹¹ Gerald Bernbaum, *Social Change and the Schools, 1918-1944* (Students Library of Education; London: Routledge and Kegan Paul, 1967), p. 80.

⁴⁹² For instance, see G.J. Goschen, *Mental Training and Useful Knowledge: An Address Delivered at the Victorian Rooms, University College, Bristol* (London: Simpkin, Marshall and Co., 1879). A Member of Parliament praised liberal arts for providing the finest training in mental acuity which permitted the student to decipher everything from bills of trading to bills of exchange. On the opposite side of the hall stood Herbert Spencer.

The general abandonment of belief in the special creation of the human species has naturally thrown discredit upon the doctrine of a fall from a state of pristine innocence...Conversion is the birth of a new ego...it is thus a genuine spiritual experience, but it is not a wholly unique experience.⁴⁹³

Following William James, Sully, Drummond and Nunn explained religious urges in terms of psychological development, often wondering out loud how much formal doctrine children could absorb, anyway. By standing outside religious life, that is, by analysing it psychologically, Child Study allowed its followers to step away from arguments about which type, if any, of religious training a school should impart.

Fourth, Child Study sought to address the embarrassing problem of the low social status accorded to both educationalists and psychologists by bolstering the 'expertise' in both fields. It was never clear that teachers attained 'professional' status; as late as 1953 *The Yearbook of Education*'s essay on the 'Social Position of Teachers' commented that the teacher '[wa]s an adequate but unimpressive member of the undifferentiated horde'.⁴⁹⁴ Insofar as a profession meant 'control of some esoteric knowledge'; 'measurable difference between the gifted amateur and the average professional'; a competent licensing system; a 'major source of livelihood'; and 'clearly demonstrated and social gains from improved techniques, organisations, and philosophy',⁴⁹⁵ it was difficult to count teaching in the professional category. Psychologists, too, suffered from low social status. 'Psychology is in the unenviable position of being the only science which needs to establish or justify its mode of procedure', wrote James Sully in 1884.⁴⁹⁶ Psychologists failed to win membership in the Royal Society. Galton and Spearman were

⁴⁹³ Drummond, *An Introduction to Child-Study*, .p. 280 and 312.

⁴⁹⁴ Nicholas Hans Robert K. Hall, Joseph Lauwerys, 'The Social Position of Teachers', in Joseph Lauwerys (ed.), *Essays in Comparative Education: Teachers and Training* (London: Evans Brothers, 1969), p. 3.

⁴⁹⁵ *Ibid.*, p. 34.

⁴⁹⁶ James Sully, *Outlines of Psychology with Special Reference to the Theory of Education* (London: Longmans, Green and Co., 1884), p. 681.

exceptions, but Galton was admitted for geography, Spearman in arithmetic.⁴⁹⁷ William McDougall at Oxford, and W.H. Rivers at Cambridge, felt 'unwelcome' and were handed small number of students; only in 1947 did Oxford permit undergraduates to read for Psychology, and then in combination with Philosophy and Politics.⁴⁹⁸ Even in 1939, there were only six chairs of psychology in England.⁴⁹⁹

A letter from Karl Pearson to *The Journal of Education* in 1898 indicates how the two groups (psychologists and educationalists) were of professional benefit to one another. Pearson wanted the teachers' help in a two-year project on 'heredity' which involved tracking three thousand pairs of siblings. Pearson proposed that teachers obtain data on stature, arm length, head measurements, and 'natural ability', to be categorized as 'very dull, slow dull, slow, slow intelligent, intelligent, quick intelligent' Pearson also wanted evaluations of 'power of observation, of imagination, of acquisition or retention, of drawing inferences (reasoning)'⁵⁰⁰ The classroom thus provided an opportunity for psychologists and teachers alike to engage in classification and experimentation, thus acquiring some of the glory associated with the rigorous methodologies of natural science.

By the end of this period, experimental psychology had developed coherent centres and protocols of its own and differentiated itself from the broader Child Study movement. However, throughout this second period, Child Study captured the imaginations of wide swathes of the population who worked with children, and it laid the intellectual and institutional groundwork for the more specialized educational psychology. It is important to notice that Child Study itself changed ontologically and practically over time, a fact which Wooldridge insufficiently

⁴⁹⁷ Ibid., p. 186.

⁴⁹⁸ Wooldridge, 'Child Study and Educational Psychology in England, 1880-1950', pp. 76, 80.

⁴⁹⁹ Ibid., p. 161.

⁵⁰⁰ 'Letter from Karl Pearson', *The Journal of Education: A Monthly Record and Review for the Classroom and for Study*, XX/9 (September 1898), 509-10, p. 510.

highlighted. In the early years, Child Study allied with instrumentary education, insofar as the goal was to impart academic information in the most efficient and fair means possible. Increasingly, the educational psychologists who shared an early alliance with Child Study moved, with Percy Nunn, into a psychological paradigm for education. In the 1880s and 1890s, Child Study aimed to categorize children's knowledge, so that teachers could build upon the existing intellectual foundation; by 1920, in contrast, their intellectual descendants talked about the psychological, rather than the logical, sequence of learning, and emphasized the development of personalities, not information. In the Victorian period, Child Study had appealed to classroom teachers and parents; by the end of this second period, such research became the province of experts. But that is the direction in which Child Study headed. Throughout this second period, Herbartian methods conspired with Child Study to emphasize the informational aspects of schooling (instrumentary education).

4.2.3 Psychology and Education: Minority View

During this period the minority view within psychology which became the dominant force by the 1920s talked about the subconscious, not the conscious, and about instinct, not inborn abilities. The picture of the human person which emerged from the writing of William McDougall, William James and Sigmund Freud conspired to undermine both the Enlightenment rationalistic ontology and the instrumental view of education. William McDougall co-founded the British Psychological Society (1901), was Wilde Professor of Mental Philosophy at Oxford (1904) and held the William James Chair of Psychology at Harvard (1920). His *Social Psychology* went through twenty-three editions between 1908 and 1936. He rejected Enlightenment ontology and stated instead that human behaviour was driven neither by reason

nor by understanding but by instinct.⁵⁰¹ McDougall defined instinct as ‘an inherited or innate psycho-physical disposition which determines its possessor to perceive, and to pay attention to, objects of a certain class, to experience an emotional excitement of a particular quality upon perceiving such an object, and to act in regard to it in a particular manner, or, at least, to experience an impulse to such action’⁵⁰² When instincts were partnered with emotions they led to action.⁵⁰³ For example, the tender emotion ‘[wa]s the germ of all moral indignation, and on moral indignation justice and the greater part of public law [were] in the main founded’, and the drive towards religion came from the instinct of flight and the emotion of fear. Ancillary instincts (towards construction, gregariousness and acquisition) also contributed to human behaviour. The raw material of instincts (themselves the product of evolution) interacted with the society in which an individual was born, to create the ‘self’, a being which McDougall said was socially constructed through and through.⁵⁰⁴

In McDougall’s writings morality, too, emerged from the relationship of instinct to the society in which the individual was born. He wrote extensively on moral development, which he perceived as a naturalistic expansion of the human ego in four coherent stages. The first stage was instinctive and ‘regulated by naturally-occurring pleasure and pain’; the second, modified by rewards and punishments; the third, controlled by ‘anticipation of social praise and blame’. The fourth and ‘highest’ stage was driven entirely by self-regard, irrespective of the ‘praise or blame of his immediate social environment’⁵⁰⁵ Self-regard thus became the goal of moral development. McDougall made no assertions about the content of moral development but only

⁵⁰¹ William McDougall, *An Introduction to Social Psychology* (London: Methuen and Company, 1922, 1908), p. 10.

⁵⁰² *Ibid.*, p. 29.

⁵⁰³ *Ibid.*, pp. 55-76. McDougall partnered his instincts with primeval emotion, and they were as follows: the Instinct of Flight and the Emotion of Fear; the Instinct of Repulsion and the Emotion of Disgust; the Instinct of Curiosity and the Emotion of Wonder; the Instinct of Pugnacity and the Emotion of Anger; Instincts of Self-assertion and Self-display and the Emotions of Subjection; the parental instinct and the Tender Emotion.

⁵⁰⁴ *Ibid.*, p. 180.

⁵⁰⁵ *Ibid.*, p. 181.

about its form. In this he prefigured the work of Lawrence Kohlberg later in the century, which, too, pictured moral development as naturalistic, ego-driven and without reference to transcendent categories.

It would be difficult to overstate McDougall's influence upon educational theory. Cyril Burt viewed McDougall as a hero who made psychology into a science, following the lead of Charles Darwin.

[McDougall] was first and foremost a biologist, eager to follow out in psychology the evolutionary interpretation propounded by Spencer and Charles Darwin. He found British psychology still a branch of general philosophy; he left it a firmly established member of the biological sciences.⁵⁰⁶

Burt praised McDougall's psychological laboratory, established in Oxford in 1906,⁵⁰⁷ his ongoing work on psychometrics with Galton and Pearson;⁵⁰⁸ and his surveys for the psychological subcommittee of the British Association which had moved human nature from speculation into quantifiable data.⁵⁰⁹ Burt mentioned the 'small band of students, many of whom have since obtained leading university posts in this country or abroad', whom McDougall trained at Oxford: 'Through his early pupils and his own later writings, his views have had a profound influence on child guidance and educational testing'⁵¹⁰ Burt himself was one of these early students. Of McDougall's *Social Psychology* (1908), Burt wrote, quoting an American educational historian, that 'this book marked the beginning of a new era in social psychology: it swept everything before it'. One hundred thousand copies of *Social Psychology* were sold

⁵⁰⁶ William McDougall, *The Study of Behaviour with an Introduction by Sir Cyril Burt* (London: Oxford University Press, 1952), p. vi.

⁵⁰⁷ *Ibid.*, ix.

⁵⁰⁸ *Ibid.*, x.

⁵⁰⁹ *Ibid.*, x.

⁵¹⁰ *Ibid.*, x.

between 1908 and 1933,⁵¹¹ and Burt argued in 1952 that there was still no better introduction to psychological inquiry of any kind (individual, social, abnormal, or animal).⁵¹²

McDougall's ideas were echoed and popularized by England's foremost educationalists in the 1920s and 1930s, most notably J.S. Ross and Percy Nunn. His naturalistic psychology was espoused by lecturers and adopted without cavil by students even in evangelical training colleges in the 1930s and 1940s. In John Gill's former lecture rooms at Cheltenham, students dutifully reiterated McDougall's stance, nearly verbatim, throughout the 1930s and 1940s. Nevertheless, during this instrumentary period, McDougall appeared as a voice in the wilderness which was taken up, gradually, by progressive students (such as Nunn himself) and circulated as these men and women came into places of prominence. The first edition of *Social Psychology* (1908) was not even reviewed by the forward-looking *Journal of Education*. However, at the publication of the 9th edition (1916) the *Journal* wrote that it was 'already regarded as a classic, and [wa]s therefore beyond the need of criticism',⁵¹³ thus indicating the fame within such circles which McDougall had attained in that time.

Other psychologists were read within elite educational circles. The American William James wrote *Talks to Teachers* which was recommended reading in the 1910s in progressive circles (such as the LDTC). His work moved psychological discourse further into the scientific camp; in the Preface to *Principles of Psychology* (1890) he allied himself clearly with science and against metaphysics.⁵¹⁴ James's work introduced the vocabulary of a 'train of thought' and a

⁵¹¹ Ibid., xii-xiii.

⁵¹² Ibid., xix.

⁵¹³ 'Review of William McDougall's *Social Psychology*, 9th Edition', *The Journal of Education: A Monthly Record and Review*, XXXVIII/4 (April 1916), 222.

⁵¹⁴ William James, *The Principles of Psychology* (1; New York: Dover Publications, 1890, 1950), Preface, v, vi. 'I have kept close to the point of view of natural science throughout this book. Every natural science assumes certain data uncritically, and declines to challenge the elements between which its own 'laws' obtain, and from which its own deductions are carried on. Psychology, the science of finite individual minds, assumes as its data (1) the thoughts and feelings, and (2) a physical world in time and space with which they coexist and which 3) they know.'

'stream of consciousness'. He wrote about the mind in the metaphor of a 'river' as opposed to a house with rooms and furniture.⁵¹⁵ In this, he articulated an important break with faculty psychology. However, James did not discuss the subterranean 'subconscious' in which Freud specialized. James exerted no overwhelming influence in either this or the next period; rather, his work served to support a movement which was already underway. Sigmund Freud, whose *Interpretation of Dreams* was published in 1905, was viewed with horror by the general public and with scepticism amongst English academics.⁵¹⁶ His sex-centred view of the human person seasoned educational theories in the 1920s and 1930s but were read only by a small elite during the instrumentary period. Freud, James and particularly McDougall placed primary emphasis upon psychological development and well-being as antecedent goals to intellectual attainment. Although Child Study and Herbart persisted throughout the instrumentary period, the newer views worked to undermine both the rationalistic ontology and the instrumentary goals of the early twentieth century. Throughout the instrumentary period the minority view emphasized a mysterious, mellifluous and highly individualized nature of the human mind, human behaviour and human purpose. Even the IQ tests, at first blush solidly part of the instrumentary agenda, became in their hands tools which were used to further individual psychological development. How this played out in the classrooms is the subject of the next chapter.

Of course these data themselves are discussable, but the discussion of them is called metaphysics and falls outside the province of this book.'

⁵¹⁵ Ibid., pp. 239, 260.

⁵¹⁶ McDougall himself resisted Freud's emphasis upon the sex instinct. In his Introduction to McDougall's *Psychology: The Study of Behaviour* (in its 25th edition in 1952), pp. xiii and xvi. Cyril Burt noted that McDougall had been a leading figure at the International Congress of Psychology in Geneva (1909) and had resisted the notions of Sigmund Freud as 'wildly fantastic.' The *Journal's* review of the 1916 version of *Social Psychology* commented McDougall's chapter on this subject, which, it said, presented a 'less extreme' view than that of Freud. McDougall's Preface from 1936 noted with satisfaction that the psycho-analytic viewpoint had become acceptably milder and could be taken on board. McDougall believed his *own* theories, which pre-dated Freud's, to have *more adequately* considered the effect of the unconscious upon behaviour.

4.3 Religious Training Colleges: Books, Curriculum, and other college artifacts

Throughout this instrumentary period, the religious training colleges continued to be confessional communities which emphasized religious life prior to admission and chapel attendance once there. However, within courses about education itself, a re-calibration of emphasis occurred, away from religious formation and towards intellectual development as the primary concern. Because Westminster's Master of Method was a prolific writer, this trend can be seen most clearly in Westminster's archives, but the practice books, recommended texts, and syllabuses of other colleges support this shift as well.

4.3.1 Nonconformist Training Colleges

In 1885, Westminster College hired Joseph Henry Cowham, who served as Master of Method until 1910.⁵¹⁷ Westminster College was therefore dominated for twenty-five years by this active and renowned man, who emphasized intellectual development far and above any other concern.⁵¹⁸ Cowham believed that the *raison d'être* of the teacher was effective instruction.⁵¹⁹ His writing was not remotely religious. Unlike Stow, or Gill, or Abbott, he discussed neither the spiritual requisites of the classroom, nor a Biblical ontology with respect to the pupils. His theory was intellectual and at times moral but not transcendent. His work was favourably reviewed by *The Practical Teacher* for its usefulness and practical attention to school management.⁵²⁰

⁵¹⁷ A/2/C/1, 'Staff Register', (1875-1937). Only in 1908, two years before retiring, did he receive an assistant.

⁵¹⁸ Cowham's writings sold as well in America as in England and earned him an honorary doctorate from the University of Missouri. The Westminster community responded with ambivalence to Cowham's honorary degree.... See E/2/H/1, 'Recollections of Gordon Fanstone', (1905-07), p. 17.

⁵¹⁹ A/3/C/1, 'Workman Papers, Logbook, 1903-1911', 25 July 1910. His 'Code of Requirements': 'first, the ability to come down to the intellectual plane of the class; second, the power to bring what is new into harmony with what the scholars know already; third, the gift of stimulating the children to do the greater part of the work themselves.'

⁵²⁰ 'Review of Cowham's Book on School Organisation', *The Practical Teacher: A Monthly Educational Journal*, XIX/8 (February 1898), 450.

A New School Method for Pupil-Teachers and Students (1894), a nuts-and-bolts guide to teaching children to read, was intensely practical and located Cowham's theory squarely in the intellectual model. Against earlier views of the classroom, Cowham did not mention a pupil's spiritual capacities, nor did he view the teacher-child interaction as of salvific import. Against later views of the classroom, Cowham was not primarily concerned with the pupil's sense of well-being. Rather, he wanted the pupils to gain skills. Because he knew that the task was difficult, he detailed meticulously the methods by which a skilful teacher should organize the reading, writing, spelling and drawing programmes.⁵²¹ Cowham published additional textbooks on geography, physics, fractions, school organisation, and Froebelian techniques for infants, all of which aimed to help teachers overcome basic barriers to learning.

When Cowham wrote about theory, he referred to Bain and Sully. In *The Principles of Oral Teaching and Mental Training* (1889) Cowham quoted copiously from these two men's work and repeated their ideas.⁵²² The role of the teacher, said Cowham, was to exercise the mind.⁵²³ The mind was tri-partite: knowing or intellect, feeling or emotion, willing or volition; the teacher must speak to all three components.⁵²⁴ It is striking that when Cowham called upon the most 'advanced' psychological insights of his time, he did not re-frame them in a theological model. Would it not have been natural for an educational leader, himself trained at Westminster, to have done so? But there is no mention of God as the author of mental faculties, or of the

⁵²¹ Joseph H. Cowham, *A New School Method for Pupil-Teachers and Students, Part I* (London: Simpkin, Marshall, Hamilton, Kent and Co., Ltd., 1894), pp. 3-50. The reading portion occupied forty-seven pages.

⁵²² *Ibid.*, p. 6. One example: 'In school work generally, and in oral teaching particularly, the Intellect i.e., the power of perceiving, remembering, conceiving, and reasoning, is that branch of mental activity which we set ourselves most diligently to exercise and train, not forgetting the vast importance, and indeed, the necessity, of exciting interest (Feelings) and of rousing the energies (Will) of the learner in all school.'

⁵²³ Joseph H. Cowham, *The Principles of Oral Teaching and Mental Training* (London: Simpkin, Marshall, Hamilton, Kent and Co., Ltd, 1889), p. 1.

⁵²⁴ *Ibid.*, p. 2.

child's having been made in the image of God, or indeed of any broad spiritual duties of the teacher in the process of instruction.

Cowham was also well-known for his development of the 'school journey', which became a fixture in primary schools during this period and which supported the goals of instrumentary education. In *The School Journey: A Means of Teaching Geography, Physiography, and Elementary Science* (1900), Cowham proclaimed that the journeys' educational value lay in the development of mental capabilities:

The School Journeys are not ordinary school excursions. A Journey which results in the pleasurable exercise of the observing powers upon a great variety of attractive objects, but which does not attempt to trace the deeper connections of causal relationships between any of them, will not effect much that is of real educational value....The successful exercise of the higher faculties – imagination and reason – requires very thorough preparation before entering upon the journey. The permanent acquisition of knowledge in the field depends very largely upon that which his class-room preparation has led the scholar to anticipate...Preparation of the features before the journey, associations leading to the discovery of relationships, of cause and effect during the journey, and application of the knowledge gained to fresh cases after the journey, form the threefold condition of successful effort in this new branch of educational method.⁵²⁵

The journeys therefore aimed to develop mental faculties and to strengthen intellectual associations.⁵²⁶ Cowham's programme earned praise in Her Majesty's Departmental Blue Book of 1898-9 and was emulated into the 1920s.⁵²⁷

What is striking is that, just like Cowham's theoretical work, the journey literature avoided theological or even metaphysical language. Nor did Cowham's lecture notes reflect a theological orientation. His notes on 'Second Year Students' Third [School] Visit, 1896-7',

⁵²⁵ Joseph H. Cowham, *The School Journey: A Means of Teaching Geography, Physiography, and Elementary Science* (London: Simpkin, Marshall, Hamilton, Kent and Co., Ltd., 1900), Preface.

⁵²⁶ *Ibid.*, p. 9.

⁵²⁷ *Ibid.*, p. 40. Sir H. Evelyn Oakley wrote of Westminster: 'The study of geography has for twenty years been supplemented by a 'school journey' from Croydon to Godstone, under the guidance of the Master of Method (Mr. Cowham). Before it, maps and plans of the district are drawn, and the general arrangement of the geological formations is studied...the value of thus connecting the facts of geography with their causes, and of exercising and reason in place of a mere remembrance of names, is obvious. This is the best way to teach geography.'

required students to comment on the 'Ethical Training' of the pupils they observed. But his type of moral formation could have been articulated as easily at a secular institution (pupils must be urged away from lateness, laziness, impertinence, sullenness, disobedience).⁵²⁸ Yet the culture at Westminster during this period was notably religious.⁵²⁹ Once again, it would have seemed more consonant with his institution for Cowham to have articulated his educational philosophy in religious terms.

Despite Cowham's religious reticence, teachers who had trained at Westminster sometimes did refer to theological ends for school journeys. Alfred Body, a student at Westminster in the early 1920s, compiled a beautiful book of the Ranelagh Road Boys' School Journey to Kent. Body included 'The Aims of a School Journey', a list which was significantly richer from a metaphysical standpoint than Cowham's own original aims:

To get into close touch with Nature, and to learn, through her, something of the mysterious ways of God; to train those taking part, in the habits of comradeship, unselfishness, self-reliance and self-respect; to develop the powers of observation and reasoning; to make history live by visiting places of historical interest; to visit new surroundings, see new types of scenery, and modes of living; to make collections of interesting objects; to gain health and energy from a stay in the country.⁵³⁰

Body framed the journey, for his pupils, in much broader terms than had Cowham: the journey aimed not only at faculty development, but at emotional maturity and spiritual growth as well. This illustrates that religious views of education existed into the 1920s. It also indicates the very important general point that a teacher's own beliefs and culture influence the use to which formal educational theories are put. However, the intellectual leadership of educational theory at Westminster College privileged intellectual over spiritual elements and as such participated in

⁵²⁸ E/2/D/1, 'Notes from J.H. Cowham', (1896), From the records of John Taylor.

⁵²⁹ E/2/a/1, 'The Diary of John Taylor'. (1895-1897). One example alone suffices: the diary of John Taylor, 1895-97, makes copious mention of Cowham's talks, school trips, and scientific experiments; the diary also mentions constant Christian gatherings and student mission trips to impoverished and even dangerous neighbourhoods.

⁵³⁰ E/2/B/4, 'School Journey, Presented by Alfred H. Body', (1923), Ranelagh Road Boys' School.

the shift towards instrumentary education. As for the other Nonconformist colleges: Borough Road and Stockwell employed both Gladman and Heller until the early twentieth century which indicates their commitment to instrumentary education.⁵³¹

4.3.2 Anglican Training Colleges

Like Borough Road and Stockwell, the Anglican residential training colleges also used many of the same textbooks from the earlier period, such as Gladman's handbook, still recommended by *The Practical Teacher* in 1897.⁵³² Reading lists were hard to come by in the archives, so other resources (practice books, evaluations and syllabuses) inform our understanding. These sources show that whereas in earlier decades (1840-1885) the Anglican colleges superimposed psychological tools onto a theological framework, in this period, the theological bottom seems to have dropped out. One rare syllabus (from Fishponds, 1901-03) began with 'Psychology as applied to Teaching'; it referred to Froebel and Pestalozzi but to no other educational figures; it implied no broader metaphysical or religious framework but only the terms set by naturalistic psychology.⁵³³

A focus upon instrumentary education without theology may be seen in Culham's Practice School Registers, which recorded the training college instructors' evaluations of their students in real schools. The evaluators remarked on class management and the personality of the teacher, and the students' grades depended upon whether or not the pupils were learning the information. Methodologically, teachers worked under the influence of James Sully and

⁵³¹ Sc604, 'College Staff'. Annual Reports of 1889 and 1900.

⁵³² 'Child Study at the Oxford Summer Meeting', *The Practical Teacher: A Monthly Educational Journal*, XVIII/4 (October 1897), 178, 'Review of Gladman's School Method', *The Practical Teacher: A Monthly Educational Journal*, XVII/12 (June 1897), 607.

⁵³³ 37168-228, 'Scattered Files, Probably of Principal Gill', (1895-1907).

Friedrich Herbart. The first group of registers dates from 1880 to 1887.⁵³⁴ The most common question in this period was whether the teacher held the students' 'interest', taught in an 'interesting' fashion, took an 'interest' in the class, or was in contrast 'uninteresting'. In the school year 1886-1887, when forty Culham students were evaluated, the word 'interest' appeared in some guise on thirty-four evaluations. Being an 'interesting' teacher turned on being 'energetic'. Teachers were certainly praised for being 'punctual', but neither punctuality nor 'conscientiousness' could compensate for dullness. William Humphries, for instance, was 'capable of interesting children'; Henry Berry '[could] be more sympathetic and kindly in his teaching, but he retain[ed] the attention and interest of his class very well'. On the other hand, Charles Black was 'much too quiet- wants energy – has no power of interesting children'. The instructor was scathing about Joseph Child's lesson on 'Physical features of India':

Poor lesson – dreadfully and decidedly poor in every respect; poor, bookish, dull notes and thoroughly devoid of enthusiasm or even of interest. Manner painfully quiet. Lectures too much.

Fred Everton's reading lesson was 'simply a pattern of dullness'. Fred Marsh 'means well' but was 'a quiet unenthusiastic teacher sadly lacking in method...carefully painstaking but somewhat dull'. William Long was 'a fairly good teacher...but rather lifeless'. Although there was a striking emphasis on the need for teachers to enthuse their pupils, as there had been in Stow and Gill, these second-period comments made it clear that the aim of pedagogy was to help children learn information.⁵³⁵ The question of religious formation did not appear, and that of character only rarely.

⁵³⁴ Cu0005i, 'School Work Registers', (1880-1887).

⁵³⁵ Cyril Beevor 'seemed rather haughty and unsympathetic with his class. His style assumed was rather that of a lecturer', though he seemed to have 'improved' by the end of his course. Tom Warham on 'Salt' 'told the boys everything'. He 'wrote too much on the Black board' instead of eliciting comments from the pupils themselves.

The second group of registers dates from 1887 to 1895.⁵³⁶ A concern for ‘interest’ prevailed, used as a point of critique in relation to 28 out of 45 students in the 1887/8 year, and to 29 out of 44 students in the 1895/6. References to ‘sympathy’ occurred in eight of the 44 reports. The words ‘exercise’ and ‘vigour’ and ‘energetic’ and ‘rigorous’ emerged again and again: a teacher was graded on the interest he aroused, on his energy level, and on the boys’ themselves being urged to participate. Many students excelled in these aspects.⁵³⁷ Teachers were praised for creating an exciting atmosphere of learning in the classroom. The boys were said to be successful when they produced good work themselves. Pedagogy aimed at a definite end: the attainment of knowledge, and the ability to think through, use, and enjoy that knowledge. The third cohort dates from 1895-1905 and is replete with the influences of the Child Study movement and Herbartian methodologies.⁵³⁸ A teacher’s sympathy was mentioned in eighteen of forty-four records in the 1903 class.⁵³⁹ Child Study projects were required and evaluated for the first time. Percy Brown did a good job: ‘Child Study reports very good. Thoroughly exhaustive and indicative of both keenness of observation and considerate knowledge of child nature’. Felix Cobbold’s Child Study reports were ‘well-written; quite good estimates of character and temperament’; Charles Dyer’s reports showed ‘both keenness of child

⁵³⁶ Cu0005ii, ‘School Work Registers’, (1887-1895).

⁵³⁷ Harry Brooks, for example, was ‘a thoroughly good teacher. He works hard himself and works his class well...interest of class sustained throughout.’ Arthur Kemp was ‘a hard-working teacher who really teaches and boys learn. He cultivated thought on the part of the boys who thus made very intelligent progress in understanding.’ George Leeds prompted the term ‘brisk’ twice, ‘energetic’ twice, ‘vigorous’ twice and ‘enthusiastic’ three times, across the observations of four different instructors. Under James Atherton’s care, ‘the intelligence of the boys well exercised’, and under F.C. Bradbury’s, ‘the boys were taught to think intelligently’.

⁵³⁸ Cu0005iii, ‘School Work Registers’, (1895-1905).

⁵³⁹ Of Frank Berry, it was said that ‘his sympathy with children needs cultivation’ James Fassridge was ‘too slow’ and needed ‘to combine sympathy with firmer class control’ Henry Ball was hard-working but ‘not sufficiently encouraging and sympathetic.’ Thomas Ballard, on the other hand, was sympathetic, ‘encouraging’, and ‘earnest and alert’. Sympathy had born a great weight in Sully’s scheme: it was ‘the great force which binds the individual to his social environment,’ initially imitative and ultimately constitutive of identity’ The term indicated a feeling of ‘mutuality’ between teacher and pupil which alone could sponsor learning and formation. Sully, *Outlines of Psychology with Special Reference to the Theory of Education*, p 506.

study and a good knowledge of child mind'. Thomas Hope was commended for 'indicating a line of treatment' in his Child Study reports. On the other hand, George Grafton created 'superficial' child reports 'with respect to mental aptitude of children'; Arthur Ballard's reports 'were good as far as observation goes, but conclusions are exaggerated and doubtful probabilities discussed'. Herbartian technology abounded: William David was told that 'reproduction and recapitulation should precede lessons that belong to a series'; George Launder that he must 'prepare with recapitulating'; Harold Leaver that 'systematic reproduction must be employed in all lessons.' By the early twentieth century, then, Culham's educational philosophy turned upon the work of Child Study and Herbart.

Instrumentary education was even more obvious within another Culham resource: a booklet which outlined the purpose and structure of practice teaching (attached as APPENDIX B). Nothing remotely theological appeared in the 1909 version.⁵⁴⁰ Furthermore the booklet was used as late as 1934 in virtually unmodified form.⁵⁴¹ It thus represents Culham College's official educational philosophy across three decades. Within the general framework of instrumentary education, its loudest themes were Child Study, the teacher's personality, and Herbartian methodology. A lengthy section explained the purpose and function of Child Study reports.⁵⁴² Two important extracts, however, summarized the scientific observation which each teacher must follow and to what end.

The object of this exercise is to introduce standards to what must always be an important and interesting element in the work of a professional teacher, *and an element upon which the real success and lasting results of his efforts will always largely depend*; and that is the estimation of the characteristics of children as individuals, as well as in a mass... The Child Study exercise should assist students to appreciate the advantages of *systematic and conscious observations*, as opposed to casual and unconscious impressions [italics mine].

⁵⁴⁰ Cu2039, 'Record Book of H.C. Cole', (1909-1911)., Culham Practice Teaching, booklet.

⁵⁴¹ Cu3064, 'Miscellaneous Materials for Entering Students', (1934).

⁵⁴² See Appendix B.

An attempt may be made to determine how far the child illustrates or departs from what is supposed to be the normal type of childhood, in such points as imitativeness, love of change, strength of memory, liberalness in interpretation, limitation of reasoning power; romantic imagination, love of physical activity, curiosity, etc. The student should also suggest treatment that he would consider suitable in view of either physical, mental or moral characteristics.⁵⁴³

The teacher's success hinged upon his ability to observe each child scientifically, that he might convey information appropriately to each. The teacher himself was to be 'sympathetic, patient, bright, stimulating, fluent, and empathetic'. His voice was to be 'well-modulated, distinct, not carelessly or monotonously dropped'. His delivery was to be 'crisp and attractive.' None of this would have been out of place in John Gill's classroom of the 1880s. But what was conspicuously absent was reference to a theologically-informed view of the child, the teacher, and the *telos* of teaching. This document represented Culham's official intentions for its teachers and gave the clearest extant statement of its educational philosophy. Yet what it displayed was simply the current thinking on psychology.

The booklet also reflected Herbartian methods. It listed 'Suggested Schemes for Notes of Lessons', and the 'Herbartian Five-Step Method': Preparation, Presentation, Association or Comparison, Formulation, and Application. Further, 'the places for Reproduction and Recapitulation should be noted; if the Herbartian Method is used, the whole five steps are neither always necessary nor possible'. Four sets of practice books, in which training college students wrote out lesson plans, reflect all of the requisites set out in the booklet.⁵⁴⁴ H.C. Cole's lesson plans (1909) followed this schema exactly. At every turn, in every class, he wrote his notes with Herbart in mind. In a lesson on 'Screws', for instance, taught on Tuesday 16 November, 1909, at the Abingdon Practising School, Cole carefully listed the 'Apparatus, preparation, presentation,

⁵⁴³ Cu2039, 'Record Book of H.C. Cole', Culham Practice Teaching booklet, pp. 3-4.

⁵⁴⁴ Culham's archives contain four sets which date from 1909, 1928, 1952 and 1955.

reproduction, association, generalization and application' required. On 18 November 1909, he used Herbart in teaching on 'The Netherlands'. None of this would have seemed inappropriate to David Stow, insofar as Herbart's method was used to convey information which Stow would also have conveyed. What would have bothered Stow, rather, was the omission of a larger metaphysic. It is, of course, possible that Cole perceived his role as something larger than his student notes would suggest. But it would not be due to the overarching framework of the practice school instructions booklet, from which metaphysics and theology were conspicuously absent.

An examination of Cole's Child Study reports suggests why educational psychologists ultimately rejected Sullian Child Study. Cole wrote three: one in Abingdon (1909), one at Culham College School (1911), and one at North Hagbourne School (1911).⁵⁴⁵ They seem most unscientific, and indeed, rather banal. In the report on Vera Strange, a pupil at North Hagbourne, for instance, we are told that 'she seems to enjoy good health, but I should say that in winter time, she would be the sort of girl to suffer from colds more than others' How would he have deduced this? 'Repression would choke her and spoil her forever. Stimulation of the wrong kind would spoil her, because she would become moody and irritable and fidgety.' Again, on what basis did he make this statement? The report was entirely devoid of specific example. Nevertheless, all three of Cole's reports received high marks from the instructors. The reports are instructive because they illustrate the extent to which Child Study was disconnected from religious thinking, even in a religious training college. The natural thing might have been for Culham to add to the Sullian model an additional requirement: an understanding of the child's spiritual life and needs. This was not the case. Secondly, the reports' somewhat insipid and

⁵⁴⁵ Cu2039, 'Record Book of H.C. Cole'.

subjective approach indicate perhaps why later educational psychologists rejected observation by parents and teachers as ‘untrained’ and ‘unscientific’ (see Chapter VI).

4.3.3 Catholic Training Colleges

Catholic training colleges held in tandem both confessional and psychological literature on the child and education. Roman Catholics resisted secular psychology publicly to a degree unparalleled in either Anglican or Wesleyan circles, particularly in the period surrounding the First World War. For instance, Bishop McIntyre, Auxiliary Bishop (later Archbishop) of Birmingham, offered a robust critique of contemporary psychology in the light of Catholic doctrine, in his article ‘Catholic Schools,’ printed in *The Journal of Education* in 1913.⁵⁴⁶ McIntyre supported State funding for and inspections of schools, but he doubted that the State could safeguard the qualifications of teachers which were ‘inseparably connected with psychology’, he wrote, ‘the psychology which has inspired the training and moulding of the teachers’. In other words, profound beliefs about the human person lay at the heart of all educational programmes. Catholics must be mindful of which psychology they learnt, for there was a ‘fundamental antagonism between Catholic psychology and a widespread system of psychology which, for want of a better term, I call Secular psychology’. The latter idealised an education which omitted the spirit.

It trains the senses, the memory, the imagination, the emotions, the aesthetic sense, the reason, and even moral action, but it ignores the spiritual side of our humanity – that spiritual side which is which is as living and as real, which is far more important than, and at least as necessary to a true education as, those items upon which alone stress is laid. *To this omission we cannot reconcile ourselves* [italics mine].⁵⁴⁷

⁵⁴⁶ John McIntyre, ‘Catholic Schools’, *Journal of Education: A Monthly Record and Review*, xxxv(1913), 686-87, p. 687.

⁵⁴⁷ Ibid.

Secular and Catholic psychologies (ontologies) differed, he said, and thus the ideal education differed as well. It was incumbent upon the State to finance the different training colleges and to support the distinctive psychologies within each.

Catholic resistance to modern psychology may also be seen in a training book for teachers, *The Education of Catholic Girls* (1912, sixth edition 1927), by Janet Erskine Stuart, the Superior-General of the Society of the Sacred Heart. The Preface by Cardinal Bourne, Archbishop of Westminster, referred to the problem immediately:

The effect on some of our Catholic schools of the newer methods has not been free from harm. Compelled by force of circumstances, parental or financial, to throw themselves into the current of modern educational effort, they have at the same time been obliged to abandon the quieter traditional ways which, while making less display, left a deeper impress on the character of their pupils.⁵⁴⁸

In the text itself, Stuart made clear her familiarity with modern educational theory. ‘Play’, ‘adolescence’, ‘development’, ‘active learning’ were urgent concepts for teachers. But Stuart believed that the Catholic doctrine, not modern psychology, provided the underlying educational foundation.⁵⁴⁹ Both of these examples indicate that Catholics were perhaps more aware than Protestants of the ontological implications of psychological theories.

In the Catholic training colleges, secular psychology was taught, but so were religious theories about education. In 1898 St Mary’s appointed R. Smythe to the position of Master of Method,⁵⁵⁰ which he held until his untimely death in 1906.⁵⁵¹ Smythe had studied at St Mary’s and also with C.W.L. Welton, Lecturer on Education and Master of Method, Cambridge and

⁵⁴⁸ Janet Erskine Stuart, *The Education of Catholic Girls* (London: Longmans, Green & Co., Ltd., 1927, sixth edition), p. vi.

⁵⁴⁹ *Ibid.*, p. 39. ‘Catholic family life, Catholic citizenship, Catholic patriotism are the truest, the only really true, because the only types of these virtues that are founded on truth. But they do not come of themselves. They must be taught.’

⁵⁵⁰ Smh/3/30, ‘Principal’s Correspondence and Papers’, (1903-1904), Report for the Education Department, year ending 30 June 1903.

⁵⁵¹ Smh/3/35, ‘Principal’s Correspondence and Papers’, (1907), Report of His Majesty’s Inspector Dr. Airy, 23 July 1907.

Victoria Universities.⁵⁵² Smythe also had undertaken a course of lectures at the College of Preceptors, London, where he had been exposed to James Sully's theories of education.⁵⁵³ Smythe's list of readings for his 1898 classroom included not only Fitch's *Lectures on Teaching*, Thomas Livesey's 'little manuals' (history textbooks from a religious perspective) and 'a little paper by Father Berry' on 'the theory of every day teaching', but Jevons' *Principles of Logic* and Conwy Lloyd Morgan's *Psychology for Teachers*.⁵⁵⁴

In recommending the writings of Lloyd Morgan (1852-1936), Smythe was potentially at odds with Roman Catholic theories of education. Lloyd Morgan had rejected religious orthodoxy, and with his illustrious career in psychology and ethics had come an evolutionary view of education.⁵⁵⁵ He enjoyed great stature in the psychological community, having been President of the Psychological Section of the British Association for the Advancement of Science in 1921. Lloyd Morgan's book, *Psychology for Teachers* (1894), was associationist and faculty-oriented and was hailed by J.G. Fitch as the first publication of scientific educational lectures in England.⁵⁵⁶ The work emphasized the relationship between sense-data, impressions, perception, and consciousness, in the process of amassing intellectual knowledge. Lloyd Morgan viewed the child as a natural (non-transcendent) being made up of body and mind, both of which

⁵⁵² Smh/3/22, 'Principal's Correspondence and Papers', (1897-1898). Letter from Welton to Principal Graham 23 May 1898. Welton recommended Smythe to the Principal in 1898 with the following words: 'I have known Mr. Smythe for nearly seven years. For six sessions he has attended my advanced courses of lectures to teachers on Psychology, Logic, and the General Philosophy and Practice of Education.'

⁵⁵³ Ibid., Letter from Smythe to Graham, 25 November 1898.

⁵⁵⁴ Ibid., Letter from Smythe to Graham, 12 September 1898.

⁵⁵⁵ G.C. Field, 'Conwy Lloyd Morgan (1852-1936)', in Brian Harrison and Colin Matthew (eds.), *Dictionary of National Biography* (Oxford: Oxford 2004). <http://www.oxforddnb.com/view/article/35101> 07 May 2008. He had trained at the Royal College of Science under Thomas Huxley, and had become Principal of University College, Bristol, where he taught geology and zoology and assumed the Chair of Psychology and Ethics between 1910 and 1919. He 'assumed the reputation of one of the foremost researchers in the field of mental evolution...[and was] one of the founders of the scientific study of animal psychology'

⁵⁵⁶ Conwy Lloyd Morgan, *Psychology for Teachers* (London: Edward Arnold, 1894), p. viii.

were purely evolutionary products.⁵⁵⁷ The first aim of the classroom was to develop intellectual faculties.⁵⁵⁸

Smythe therefore brought into his classroom an ‘alien’ ontology. However, he simultaneously required a Catholic educational book. It is difficult to discern which note sounded more loudly in his classroom, but it seems that Smythe found it possible to combine both Catholic orthodoxy and modern psychological theory. This interpretation is borne out in Smythe’s *Notes for Education Students* of 1900, in which are evident derivations from Bain (‘synthesis and analysis’) and simultaneously from Catholic doctrine:

Religious Instruction takes the first place amongst subjects of instruction because of its supreme importance. Natural science may be dispensed with, but supernatural truth must be known by all who have come to the use of reason....Since Instruction is not the whole of Education, the teacher, as a Catechist, whilst informing the mind, will try also to excite the affections of the children for God.⁵⁵⁹

In his course on education, Smythe put religious instruction first. The juxtaposition of psychological theory and religious doctrine demonstrates that, in the late nineteenth century, St Mary’s students were taught to extract applicable portions of psychology and place them in a theological context.

At the end of this period (1919-20) St Mary’s prescribed a book by an Associate of Newnham College, Cambridge: Laura Brackenbury’s *Primer of Psychology* (1909).⁵⁶⁰ The book rests upon an ontology which in itself would have been unacceptable to Roman Catholic doctrine, insofar as it focused upon the mind and not the spirit, as the cornerstone of human existence and value: ‘Psychology is concerned with the processes of an individual mind....the

⁵⁵⁷ Ibid., p. 147.

⁵⁵⁸ Ibid., p. 224.

⁵⁵⁹ Smh/24/1, ‘Notes for Education Students’, (1900).

⁵⁶⁰ Ddp/39/18, ‘Records of Patrick Fagan’, in C. Birchenough (ed.), *History of Elementary Education in England and Wales from 1800 to the Present Day* (1914; London: University Tutorial Press, 1919-1921).

mind is individual, that is to say, it is the mind which constitutes individuality'.⁵⁶¹ Furthermore, Brackenbury viewed psychology as the ultimate 'revealed text' for truth.

All the great questions that man persists in asking tend in some minds to reduce themselves to psychological problems. We know of no truth that no man has held, and can *truth* be considered apart from the *holding*? Hence one would expect Psychology to be of special interest to those whose claim it is to be the bearers of the torch of truth, and to those whose function it is to impart to one generation the truths that have been gained and held by preceding generations.⁵⁶²

Brackenbury placed psychology, then, at the centre of cosmological enquiry. If we would understand human nature, purpose and meaning, we must take the tactic of the psychologist, who is 'a scientist, not a philosopher'; we must accept this completely 'new attitude to the universe'.⁵⁶³ St Mary's students read this in tandem with Catholic doctrine on education. That the two cosmologies differed in emphasis does not seem to have been discussed.

Why Catholics combined two philosophies may be seen from a glimpse at the official views of the Catholic training colleges, in records of the Inaugural Conference of Catholic Colleges, 1896, which concerned Catholic involvement in secondary education. In the course of the meeting the Archbishop of Westminster summoned a 'most loyal Catholic and one devoted to the Church,' Her Majesty's Inspector of Training Colleges, Mr. W Scott Coward. Scott Coward highlighted the importance of education to English Catholics, who needed desperately to establish their academic credentials. Sending young men to the Universities would provide 'a highly trained staff of teachers', which should be 'the crowning aim and effort'.⁵⁶⁴ Catholics, he commented, had lacked the 'cachet which belonged to the educated men of England' If Catholics were to 'stand abreast with our fellow countrymen', they needed outstanding

⁵⁶¹ Laura Brackenbury, *A Primer of Psychology* (London: John Murray, 1909), p. 4.

⁵⁶² *Ibid.*

⁵⁶³ *Ibid.*, pp 3 and 5.

⁵⁶⁴ Smh/3/21, 'Principal's Correspondence and Papers', (1896-1897), Report of the Inaugural Conference of Catholic Colleges upon Secondary Education, held at Archbishop's House, Westminster, 3 and 4 January 1896, p. 4

teachers.⁵⁶⁵ Scott Coward wanted Catholics to attain the highest level of university education and to carry these standards back into the Catholic schools.

At the same time, Scott Coward adjured English Catholics to maintain their distinctive spiritual *ethos*. Within education and culture, he said, ‘the Catholic Church alone could maintain definite religious belief in this country, and at the same time retain all the higher intellectual qualities of the nation... We were the only body with a definite religious belief, a definite corpus of Theology. All round us articles of Faith were losing their definiteness... anxious minds would necessarily turn to us’⁵⁶⁶ Scott-Coward, one of the most prestigious educationalists of his time, therefore commended to other Catholics a thorough-going engagement with elite education as well as a tenacious attachment to confessional particularity. The posture of the Catholic training colleges, in both this period and the next, reflected this emphasis.

4.3.4 Religious Training Colleges - Summary

A survey of the religious colleges illustrates several things. The educational philosophy taught at the religious training colleges had changed since the 1840s and privileged above all else the academic attainment of pupils. The most predominant methodologies, Child Study and Herbart, were practised to this end. It was not that the colleges themselves became less religious (they did not); it was that the courses on educational philosophy simply did not appeal to religious sanctions. Catholic colleges provided the sole exception to this rule. In the University Training Departments we find a world bereft not only of religious educational philosophy but of religious atmosphere. We find further, a school of thought which moved initially with instrumentary education, but quickly beyond it and into a world of psychological sanction. The

⁵⁶⁵ *Ibid.*, p. 5.

⁵⁶⁶ *Ibid.*, p. 5-6.

authority and prestige which clustered around the newly-created UTDs allowed their writings and views to make quite rapid headway.

4.4 London and Oxford Day Training Colleges: Textbooks and Classrooms

What makes this and the next periods so messy and so interesting to study is that so many instructors wrote textbooks. Thus, one artefact grants access not only to one particular college's classroom but to an entire world of classrooms. The following discussion, then, encompasses both important textbooks and important classrooms within the University Training Department network. During their period of infancy, the University Training Departments supported instrumentary education and provided a challenge to the religious framework of education by omission. By the end of the period they provided a challenge to the instrumentary framework of education by their subtle re-framing of priorities, which thrust the psychological health of the individual to centre stage.

4.4.1 London Day Training College

The small size of the original staff of the LDTC meant that the influence of each faculty member was large. John Adams, Percy Nunn, Margaret Punnett (Cambridge Teacher Training College; University of London Teacher's Diploma), and Clotilde von Wyss (Maria Grey Training College) ran the entire programme for ten years. They had had experience as classroom teachers, and all but Punnett had subject degrees. In 1910 Nunn taught for 22 hours a week, Punnett for 20, von Wyss, 25.⁵⁶⁷

⁵⁶⁷ Wooldridge, *Measuring the Mind: Education and Psychology in England, C. 1860-C.1990*, p. 45.

As the staff expanded over the years, the College employed more people who had trained specifically in psychology. During the First World War, two part-time masters in experimental psychology joined the College. After the War, Albert Arthur Cock (B.A. London in Philosophy) taught pedagogy and philosophy from an experimental slant.⁵⁶⁸ Walter Guy Sleight possessed a D. Litt in Psychology from University of London; after a year of teaching psychology he was appointed to the headmastership of an LCC Central School. Cyril Burt had three subject degrees from Oxford but acted as a psychologist to the LCC and eventually, Professor of Psychology, University College, London.⁵⁶⁹ Burt supervised the majority of graduate degrees at the Institute between 1916 and 1932.

The staff travelled and wrote widely, which helped to reinforce London's increasing influence over educational theory. Reports of the London staff's extensive travels and lectures emerged from nearly every contemporary source (other archives, journals, government reports). For instance, Percy Nunn simultaneously served as the Principal to the London Day Training College, as a member of the Labour Party's advisory committee on education, and as a participant with the New Education Fellowship, the Child Guidance Council and the Committee of Inquiry into Examinations. He regularly supervised examinations at Oxford University Training Department and lectured for years at Oxford's summer school for teachers. In 1912-1913 he addressed London's teachers on 'The Arithmetics of Citizenship', which covered insurance, statistics, money markets, investments, and theory of finance.⁵⁷⁰ In 1918 he invited elementary and secondary teachers to a series of lectures on 'the logic and psychology of

⁵⁶⁸ In 1918 he became a Professor of Education at the University College of Southampton.

⁵⁶⁹ *le.Sfr*, 'Staff Register', (1902-1933).

⁵⁷⁰ *le.Mem.A.1.1*, 'Extract Book 1907-1913', Notice, 1912.

science⁵⁷¹; in 1929 he reviewed the University of Liverpool's educational programme for them;⁵⁷² in 1932 he was lecturing to training college students across London.⁵⁷³

Nunn was not unique: all of the College's key staff members influenced both London teachers and the wider educational world. John Adams was Vice President of the London Child Study Society and Vice Principal of the College of Preceptors. He examined and taught courses at other Universities. He toured Australia, New Zealand and South Africa, and spent his last years at the University of California/Los Angeles. By the time he retired in 1922, 'the LDTC had become the intellectual and professional centre for London's teachers, while Adams himself had become their role model'⁵⁷⁴

The leaders of the LDTC disseminated their message not only through travel and presence but through publishing, an activity which increased in our third period. Their texts reveal not only their corporate 'cast of mind' but the content of their lectures for intending teachers. Their writings are fascinating not only because they reveal exactly what students at the LDTC were taught about the nature of the child, the role of the teacher, and the purpose of the classroom, but because they appeared on college syllabuses all over the country. The curriculum at the LDTC served initially to bolster instrumentary education, but by the end of this period its work turned towards sponsoring individual psychological development in the classroom above all else.

In the first ten years of its existence, the LDTC staff recommended books to their students which supported instrumentary education. Within these books, however, lay the

⁵⁷¹ Ie.Mem.A.1.3, 'Extract Book 1915-1918', (1915-1918), Letter of 9 January 1918.

⁵⁷² Ie.Tpn.1.1, 'Percy Nunn Papers', (1925-1928), Correspondence with Professor E.T. Campagnac, Professor of Education at Liverpool, 6 November 1929.

⁵⁷³ Ie.Tpn.1.2, 'Percy Nunn Papers', Letter from the London County Council to Percy Nunn, 30 May 1932.

enumerating the students from other training colleges who were attending the Institute of Education's lectures.

⁵⁷⁴ Aldrich, *The Institute of Education: 1902-2002*, pp. 60-61.

groundwork upon which educationalists could move beyond instrumentary and into psychological education.⁵⁷⁵ All of them shared an ontology grounded in biology, not metaphysics. All of them viewed as authoritative the ‘hard data’ of the natural sciences.

One key work which was assigned at the LDTC in the 1910s was Karl Groos’s *The Play of Man* (1898, 1901). Groos believed that the human child was the product of Darwinian struggle and biological drives. Taking it as given that human actions are based in instinct, he believed that only biology could adequately explain those instincts and their purpose. ‘A biological investigation alone can reveal the sources of human impulse’, he wrote. For this we need ‘a genetic explanation of play, and the appraisal of its biological value’⁵⁷⁶ As to how we might obtain a narrative about human meaning, we had only three choices: ‘the choice among metaphysics, Darwinism, and resignation’⁵⁷⁷ Groos chose Darwin. He was not an educator and offered no curriculum or pedagogy, but he added weight to the argument against a transcendent human nature and a directed classroom. Within educational theory, Paul Monroe’s *Text-Book of the History of Education* (1905) attached the power of information to the Darwinian struggle itself. Indeed, education was seminal in the evolutionary process: ‘Education becomes the most advanced phase of evolutionary process, or at least its most effective method’ This, wrote Monroe, constituted ‘the fundamental characteristic of modern education’. Thus, ‘Education becomes for the social world what natural selection is for the subhuman world – the chief factor in the process of evolution’.⁵⁷⁸

J.J. Findlay’s *Principles of Class Teaching* (1902, 1904) also framed education in Darwinian terminology and allied education with ‘ordered, systematized, and classified data’,

⁵⁷⁵ Ie.Mem.A.1.2, ‘Extract Book 1913-1915’, (1913-1915).

⁵⁷⁶ Karl Groos, *The Play of Man* (New York and London: D Appleton and Co., 1901), p. 369.

⁵⁷⁷ *Ibid.*, p. 370.

⁵⁷⁸ Paul Monroe, *A Text-Book in the History of Education* (Norwood, Mass: MacMillan, 1905), p. 721.

correlation with other sciences, technical and specialized terminologies, and observation and experience.⁵⁷⁹ Practically, his chief sources were Herbart, Sully, Froebel and Dewey. While he embraced ‘the whole child’ on naturalistic terms, his book focused upon the intellectual child in a methodical study of each school subject. Edward Bradford Titchener (*A Text-Book of Psychology*, 1909), James Welton (*Principles and Methods of Teaching*, 1906, 1909), Edward Lee Thorndike (*Educational Psychology*, 1903, 1910), and Robert Rusk (*Introduction to Experimental Education*, 1912-1919), also articulated a view of the child closely allied with the work of the laboratory and an anthropology in sharp contrast to that of the religious period of education. Titchener believed that attention, subject-matter, the effect of co-education, native intelligence, mental measurement, and even feelings must be subject to rigorous observation, repetition and analysis. Ultimately, Titchener believed the laboratory could create a stable science of the human mind: ‘There is no doubt that, in principle, every single problem that can now be set in psychology may be set in quantitative form. The psychological textbooks of the next century will be as full of formulas as the textbooks of physics are to-day’, he exulted.⁵⁸⁰ Titchener’s biological view of the human went all the way down: bodies and minds themselves were reducible to quantitative data.⁵⁸¹ The new frontier, he wrote, was to quantify human emotion.⁵⁸² Titchener’s friend in this matter was Karl Pearson, who was prominently placed at the University of London. Titchener’s view that ‘science begins when men begin to interpret the universe in mechanical terms, when the world is looked upon as a vast machine’⁵⁸³, and Pearson’s own work, reinforced the view that human ‘facts’ were quantifiable. Thorndike’s

⁵⁷⁹ J.J. Findlay, *Principles of Class Teaching* (London: MacMillan, 1904), p. x.

⁵⁸⁰ Edward Bradford Titchener, *A Text-Book of Psychology, Volume I* (New York: MacMillan Company, 1909), p. 223.

⁵⁸¹ *Ibid.*, p. 6.

⁵⁸² *Ibid.*, p. 240.

⁵⁸³ *Ibid.*, p. 3.

book, too, commenced with claims about the human person which stood in obvious contest with the ontological suppositions of the first period. In the second edition Thorndike wrote: ‘This book attempts to apply to a number of educational problems the methods of exact science. The problems chosen are those of the mental natures of individual men, and the causes of their differences.’⁵⁸⁴ In Chapter 2 (‘The Measurement of Individual Differences’), he continued, ‘Exact knowledge of the nature and amount of individual differences in intellect, character and behaviour is valuable to educational theory and practice for two reasons’, the first of which was ‘the general need of knowledge of what human beings are in order to choose the best means of changing them for the better’. Whereas thirty years before, the top textbooks had indicated that a religious ontology would have answered those questions, Thorndike turned to the ‘exact’ sciences. The second reason for studying individual differences was to learn the ‘means of making all men more wise, skilful and efficient’⁵⁸⁵ Welton’s view that data could tell us everything we needed to know about humans and their education may be seen at every point in the book, and he chided any reader who used ‘qualitative language’.⁵⁸⁶ Robert Rusk, too, championed the view of humans held by McDougall and the meticulous data-collection of Spearman and Galton, which alone, he held, placed education upon the certitudes of ‘science’.⁵⁸⁷ According to Rusk, education qualified as a science because of its coming-of-age as a quantitative pursuit.⁵⁸⁸

These books marshalled their data for the purpose of helping pupils achieve academic success. Rusk’s studies citing ‘natural affinities between Arithmetic and manual work’ or the

⁵⁸⁴ Edward Lee Thorndike, *Educational Psychology* (2nd edn.; New York: Teachers College, Columbia University, 1910), no page.

⁵⁸⁵ *Ibid.*, p. 3.

⁵⁸⁶ *Ibid.*, pp. 4-5.

⁵⁸⁷ Rusk, *Introduction to Experimental Education*, p. 7

⁵⁸⁸ ‘The most important stage in the development of a subject arrives when its data and conclusions can be presented in quantitative as well as in merely qualitative terms; its claim to be recognized as a science can then no longer be disputed, for, as Herschel says, “numerical precision is the soul of science.”’ *Ibid.*, p. 1.

complexity of fixed attention,⁵⁸⁹ or children's colour preferences,⁵⁹⁰ were not idle speculation but infinitely practical: how might we create a classroom in which all of these children can learn?⁵⁹¹

At the same time, there were hints of things to come in the recommended books. Whereas the authors focused invariably upon intellectual attainment, many of them granted wide open space to the notion of individual development, and of intellectual life itself furthering this end.

Birchenough referred to 'individuality both in children and teachers' and said that 'personality has become of first-rate importance'.⁵⁹² Welton believed that the chief end of education was mastery of information,⁵⁹³ but thought this held meaning of another kind: through the process of mastering information, a child's personality and 'individuality' developed and blossomed.

In this ever-widening process [of mastery] his own individuality grows and develops: his powers are realized only as they are exercised on appropriate material. Thus the development of his relations to his surroundings is the development of his own personality. This development is possible only through his own activity. He himself must organize and systematize his ideas so that they are in true relations to each other....the aim of education should be the attainment of that masterly power of dealing with life.⁵⁹⁴

Percy Nunn and others privileged the personality above the information, but Welton did not yet make that move. Information and personality had equal weight in his classroom. Whatever their ultimate emphasis, however, all of these books assumed in common a biological view of the child and focused upon either instinct or data-collection.⁵⁹⁵ None of the authors talked about

⁵⁸⁹ Ibid., p. 38.

⁵⁹⁰ Ibid., p. 55.

⁵⁹¹ Rusk was an Examiner in Education at the University of St Andrews. His effect on the next generation of educationalists was profound: J.S. Ross, Principal of Westminster and a prolific writer of teacher training manuals, cited him as the foremost influence of his life.

⁵⁹² Charles Birchenough, *History of Elementary Education in England and Wales* (London: W.B. Clive, 1914), p. 286.

⁵⁹³ James Welton, *Principles and Methods of Teaching, Second Edition* (London: W.B. Clive, 1909), p. 20. 'It is only when the teacher clearly appreciates the instrumental character of his work that teaching fulfils its true function of causing others to learn.'

⁵⁹⁴ Ibid., p. 13.

⁵⁹⁵ Karl Groos's *The Play of Man* (1898, 1901), recommended by the LDTC in the 1910s and 1920s and by Cheltenham in the 1930s and 1940s, took it as given that human life was driven by instinct and that only biology could adequately explain those instincts and their purposes.

transcendence. By the end of this period, the leaders of the LDTC published books which formalized the psychological emphasis.

The curriculum was shaped by the ontological and pragmatic concerns of instrumentary education. We have seen that Education at the LDTC was to be 'scientific', which meant 'psychological', both in its psychometric tangent and in its metaphysical-explanatory tangent. That is, the 'science of education' at the LDTC took two forms of psychological expression: the measurement of mind, and the ontological narrative. To understand the pragmatics of education, the staff turned to statistics and testing; to understand and explain children's behaviour and needs, the *telos* of the classroom, and the role of the teacher, the staff turned towards biological and psychological categories.

In some respects, the academic agenda at the LDTC resembled those of other colleges. In 1906, first-year students worked on methods for each subject and school practice.⁵⁹⁶ Second-year students undertook the 'psychological, logical and ethical topics set forth in Syllabus No. 3 of the Board's Regulations', History of Education, Physical Training and School Practice. In the third year, students worked on a particular educational author and participated in elaborate child study projects.⁵⁹⁷ Indeed Child Study was woven throughout the curriculum during the pre-War period.⁵⁹⁸ But these typical materials obscured a non-traditional interpretive theory underneath. A note for supervisors in the practice schools (1909) indicated a psychologically-oriented interpretation of classroom disorder.

The students have been taught to regard conduct as a development of Instinct and to think of the Instincts as responses to stimuli (S) exhibiting two closely associated aspects – the

⁵⁹⁶ Instructors highlighted questions of 'interest' and 'attention', and students hoped to learn the 'sound sequence and development of ideas' necessary to 'fruitful teaching' In 1907, Nature Study, Drawing, Music, Drill, Modelling, Woodwork, Needlework, Phonetics, Reading and Recitation, and Physical Education were included in the curriculum. Ie.Mem.A.1.1, 'Extract Book 1907-1913', LDTC Three Year Course.

⁵⁹⁷ Ie.Mem.A.2, 'Miscellaneous Reports, 1907 Onwards', 'Outline of the Professional Course to come into effect in 1906-07'

⁵⁹⁸ Ie.Mem.A.1.1, 'Extract Book 1907-1913', 'Types of Attention,' probably 1909.

emotional (E) and the active (A). Thus a slap (S) may awaken in a child the instinct of Pugnacity, arousing the emotion of Anger (E) and provoking striking and kicking movements, etc. (A). The term ‘temperament’ connotes individual differences with respect to what maybe called the ‘ratio’ to the stimulus of the emotional (E/S) and the active (A/S) sides of the instinctive response respectively.⁵⁹⁹

Clearly, the ability to hold classroom order was important at the LDTC. However, childhood misbehaviour was not explained in terms of theological narrative or even instrumental understandings, but rather in terms of naturalistic (psychological) categories.

The College set one or two books per year which followed the Board’s recommendations. For instance, in 1911 the Academic Board determined that third-year students should be asked to read Thring’s *Theory and Practice of Teaching* (5th ed., 1899). The Board’s *Suggestions for Teachers* should be ‘treated as far as possible in the revision of the Methods course’⁶⁰⁰ But students were not examined on these texts. Rather, discussion groups were put in place for those who wanted them. The LDTC used its own certification examinations, not those of the Board, and was not obligated to comply with the Board’s syllabus. A syllabus for the College’s two demonstration schools, compiled in 1912 by Nunn, Adams, and Punnett, showed a similar ability to combine traditional material with a progressive theory. The syllabus journeyed through historical surveys, studies of nature and elementary science, Shakespeare and Scott and Hawthorne and Tennyson. But its introduction revealed the radical nature of educational methodology:

The child’s instincts and other specific tendencies are an inheritance which gives him his start in life and determines the general character of his activities. His environment determines which of these instincts are called into play most often, and which are arrested and wiped out. Growing intelligence controls and modifies the instincts, so that adolescence becomes a period of conscious and deliberate adaptation to conditions...the child’s environment should be such as to

⁵⁹⁹ Ibid., ‘Notes for Supervisors,’ August 13 1909.

⁶⁰⁰ Ie.Acb.A.1, ‘Staff Meetings/Academic Boards 1909-1939’, (1909-1939), Note on ‘Theory.’

stimulate in him all the most important tendencies, so that by the manifold processes of experience and adaptation normal development may be ensured.⁶⁰¹

Without even looking at the date, we could have located this text somewhere in the pre-War years. McDougall was present, but not yet Freud. Something besides the dissemination of information was at stake here. The focus was on 'adjustment' and 'norms' and the irrational elements of the human psyche. Again, the curriculum from this period evidenced a commitment to instrumentary education but a deep interest in psychological frameworks.

In 1920 Percy Nunn published *Education: Its Data and First Principles*, and in 1922 John Adams published *Modern Developments in Educational Practice*. These books disturbed the theoretical landscape of education; they gave authoritative voice to the psychological emphasis which had existed as an undercurrent during the instrumentary period. Nunn's work has been analysed in Chapter I but may be bolstered with reference to his Haldane Lecture at Birkbeck College, June 27, 1939.⁶⁰²

In the Haldane lecture, Nunn adverted to what he called his 'creed': 'That the central aim of education should be to foster individuality'.⁶⁰³ A person's individuality, said Nunn, was the sum of collective 'attitudes and tendencies and aptitudes' which constitute 'hormic systems': 'A person's individuality is the whole body of these hormic systems, with their varying degree of range and coherence, and their varying degrees of integration with one another'.⁶⁰⁴ Hormic systems were 'built up under the control of purpose, interest, and instinct, together with other "drives" that are now said to have their origin in unconscious sources'.⁶⁰⁵ Human experiences

⁶⁰¹ Ulic.2.1912, 'London Day Training College Syllabuses in Use in the College Demonstration Schools', in London County Council (ed.), (1912).

⁶⁰² As Nunn did not appreciably amend *Education* throughout the twenty-five years of its prominence, referring to later samples of his work offers a reminder of his general educational philosophy.

⁶⁰³ T. Percy Nunn, *The Haldane Memorial Lecture, Birkbeck College* (London: J. W. Ruddock & Sons, 1939), p. 13.

⁶⁰⁴ Ibid. 'Undoubtedly it [power] is too often 'naked' power, aggressive, destructive or sadistic self-assertion, but we need here consider it only in its pleasanter modes. These I call conservation and creation.'

⁶⁰⁵ Ibid., p. 12.

created, and evoked, powerful and often subconscious forces. If these experiences occurred often enough, they formed psychological systems which influenced an individual's feelings and behaviour. Music, arithmetic, football, social life, 'all end or should end in forming systems of this kind' That a person's drives, writ large, actually constituted the human personality sounded similar to the arguments of Bergson, Freud, Bertrand Russell or even Nietzsche. While Nunn recognised that these drives had destructive possibilities, he glossed over them and focused exclusively on beneficial aspects.⁶⁰⁶

The teacher's role was to provide pupils with material which might enforce their own individuality, and the classical tradition was marshalled for this purpose. In the Haldane lecture Nunn referred to A.E. Housman, who, when asked why he favoured literature over other academic pursuits, replied that 'it attracts me, therefore it is best for me', and to Professor G.B. Jeffery, who, at a Presidential Address to the London Mathematical Society, remarked that his reason for wanting pupils to study mathematics was simple: 'pure Arithmetic is a good subject because I like it'.⁶⁰⁷ At the end of the day, then, the classroom existed to provide experiences for pupils which helped them to find their own individuality.

John Adams retired in 1922 and wrote *Modern Developments in Educational Practice*, a work which summarized his views on educational theory during the previous two decades. Adams framed education in terms of individuality and self-realisation; he believed the individual child was the centre of the whole educational enterprise.⁶⁰⁸ But what commanded Adams's attention was neither the child's spiritual capacities, nor his physical endowments, nor even his intellectual attributes, but rather his psychological make-up. The ultimate goal of teaching was

⁶⁰⁶ Ibid., p. 17.

⁶⁰⁷ Ibid., p. 14.

⁶⁰⁸ Adams, *Modern Developments in Educational Practice*, p. 14. : 'Let us boldly accept paidocentrism as the name of what appears to have a fair claim to be regarded as the underlying principle of the New Teaching.'

not the intellectual capacity of this child, but the 'self-realisation' of the child's personality: 'we should like to regard the promotion of the self-realisation of the educand as its ultimate goal' ⁶⁰⁹

Following directly from his psychological goals for the classroom, Adams predicted that psycho-analysis would have an increasingly important educational role.⁶¹⁰ He wrote, 'psycho-analysts themselves evidently look to education as one of the most likely departments for the exercise of their functions' ⁶¹¹ Teachers used to be concerned with the conscious ('that old-fashioned psychology'), but 'the new psychology explores the unconscious'.⁶¹² The teacher must be ever-mindful of his/her potentially damaging role, and of not creating 'complexes'.⁶¹³ While he believed that psycho-analysis should be left to physicians, not teachers, every classroom teacher needed to be able to apply 'certain incidental applications of psycho-analysis' in the classroom.⁶¹⁴

The teacher's role should be one of 'benevolent superintendence' over pupils which 'let the young people develop according to the laws of their own nature' ⁶¹⁵ The teacher should delegate most responsibility to the pupils but retain the power of veto, which balance would inform the children about social authority. Society's authority was not ultimate, though, nor was the teacher's, who at times appeared as a sinister being in Adams' book. Individual self-realisation remained paramount for Adams: 'Ego-centrism, so far from being a drawback, is an

⁶⁰⁹ Ibid., pp. 27-28.

⁶¹⁰ Ibid., p. 249. Adams noted that 'not only is psycho-analysis one of the most widely discussed subjects of the day, but it is having a very direct bearing on educational ideas and is thus exercising an influence on the work of the schools'

⁶¹¹ Ibid.

⁶¹² Ibid., p. 253.

⁶¹³ Ibid., p. 275.

⁶¹⁴ Ibid., p. 265-275.

⁶¹⁵ Ibid., p. 282.

advantage. It gives stability to our social structure. The vigorous self-reference of a child at school is really Nature's protection against society in general, and the teacher in particular.'⁶¹⁶

Both Nunn and Adams saw the classroom from a fundamentally different angle than had James Sully, Friedrich Herbart or Joseph Cowham. While these three were profoundly interested in the intellectual function of every child, Nunn's and Adams' interest lay elsewhere: in the psychological health and development of every child. The intellectual and psychological goals need not have been mutually exclusive, and no doubt as practised in the classrooms, they were not. However, over time, the subtle shifting of priorities resulted in an educational project which reflected different assumptions and anticipated different results. Although Nunn and Adams published in 1920 and 1922 respectively, it is likely that they seasoned their lectures with these views well before then. Therefore, these two key leaders may be seen as having supported instrumentary education (through the curriculum) but also as having undermined it ultimately.

The only intellectual leader affiliated with the LDTC who called for metaphysics was John Adamson. Adamson headed the (Anglican) King's College's training department, not the LDTC, but because there was considerable co-operation between the students of both departments and because Adamson's work was required reading at the LDTC, he bears mention. Adamson's *English Education 1789-1902* (1925) provided a technical, Act-by-Act description of the expansion of public education in England. He acknowledged the progressive narrative which held that because of scientific advancements the 'religious motive' in education had fallen by the wayside and education therefore could be 'neutral'.⁶¹⁷ Like Adams and Nunn, Adamson

⁶¹⁶ Ibid., p. 228.

⁶¹⁷ Adamson, *English Education 1789-1902*, p. 26 and page 471. 'The great advance in the physical sciences had changed the conception of the universe and of [our] relation to it in the minds of the educated. The material and social conditions of the time conspired with this new order of thought to convince many that between science and religion there was an irreducible conflict and that in the struggle religion had been worsted....the radical idea won. The LEA while it maintained denominational schools must itself be strictly neutral.'

welcomed the psychological influence on education.⁶¹⁸ But Adamson also wrote about the limitations of psychology to determine educational ends: ‘On the other hand, aims, purposes, ends, can only be understood in the light of philosophy illustrated by history’⁶¹⁹ In fact, although Adamson rejected the utilitarian approach to education exemplified by Spencer and the Mills, he praised them for grappling with teleology.⁶²⁰ He even complained about just that element of Alexander Bain which others had found so compelling: the call to a metaphysics-free classroom.⁶²¹ Adamson closed his text with the lament that while the twentieth-century classroom had plenty of psychological tools, ‘the teleological factor was and is still ignored’⁶²² Adamson did not engage in a robust defence of a more appropriate teleological model, and one can only imagine that, for students at the LDTC, his voice was overwhelmed by the ‘scientific school of thought’ emerging from within the College.

The London Day Training College provided a critical mass of scholarship which considered education to be a science with roots in biological psychology. Its leaders eschewed explicit metaphysics and preferred to speak in terms of ‘science,’ ‘data,’ and ‘research’. Their chief intellectual resources, too, came from the developing discipline of psychology informed alike by the psychological writings of McDougall and the laboratory work of Spearman. While the institution’s practical thrust was to respond rationally to an enlarged sphere of public education, its main contribution was an implicit metaphysical stance which construed humanity in terms of instinct and biology, not soul. The LDTC provided functionalist imperatives with respect to divisions within classrooms and even within vocations, but at its core this school of thought offered ontological insights which moved it beyond instrumentary and into

⁶¹⁸ Ibid., p. x. ‘Psychology is an indispensable foundation for a sound method of education.’

⁶¹⁹ Ibid.

⁶²⁰ Ibid., p. 474.

⁶²¹ Ibid., p. 475.

⁶²² Ibid., p. 494.

psychological education by the end of this period. Because of its unique association with the University of London, the work of the LDTC was admired and imitated by the other training colleges.

4.4.2 Oxford University Training Department: Keatinge

The Oxford University Training Department did not enjoy the kind of renowned lecturers and professors who clustered at the University of London's Training Department. The Reader in Education, Maurice Walter Keatinge, left the only significant body of work which it is possible to analyse. Because Keatinge acted as the Reader for so many years (1903-1935) and managed so many of the lectures himself, his works informed the whole of the department. The clear theme was classical content within a progressive framework.

Keatinge's ability to place a relentless commitment to instrumentary education within the psychological and biological narratives held by the broader progressive movement earned him his reputation as a man of balance. In 1906 he applied (unsuccessfully) for a position at the University of Glasgow, and the recommendations he won from Oxford colleagues referred to 'the moderation and soundness of his views', his 'scientific temperament', the 'discriminative judgment' which 'enabled him to introduce psychological...matter only in so far as it was really relevant' Oxford's former and present Readers in Psychology (Stout and McDougall) endorsed him. Mr. Graham Balfour, Director of Education for Staffordshire, simply wrote: 'He is singularly free from fads'.⁶²³

⁶²³ Maurice Walter Keatinge, *Applications and Testimonials of Maurice Walter Keatinge, Candidate for the Directorship in Glasgow* (1906).

Studies in Education (1916) was the most important of Keatinge's writings, although its core ideas had been prefigured in three earlier works.⁶²⁴ The foundations of education, he wrote, lay within biology, modern industrial life, and aesthetics. By 'biology' he meant that education aimed at the perfection of the race. Keatinge rejected the Herbartian view that education was all about character, which slogan meant nothing more than an 'absence of aim'⁶²⁵ Keatinge rejected the religious view that education was about God, for a call to the Kingdom of God granted 'no guidance towards the solution of the problems connected with our curriculum and organisation which confront the modern educator'.⁶²⁶ He rejected Bain's anti-metaphysical view, remarking simply that false aims would step into the void. Keatinge saw the first, primary, overwhelming foundation of education as biology, and its corresponding aim as a consciously-directed racial improvement (eugenics). Education could not control the native intelligence of an individual, but it could help him direct his inborn qualities, which would in turn affect marriage, the most important selection an individual makes.⁶²⁷ Education aimed first at the will, which, properly formed, would choose the best course for self-improvement and racial progress.⁶²⁸ The teacher's role was to urge the pupils' will towards self-control and survival.⁶²⁹

Keatinge's other foundational concerns, modern industry and aesthetics, played a much smaller role than biology. Modern industrial life, he wrote, cramped the soul, and education should teach us about leisure and aesthetics.⁶³⁰ Because modern people spent most of their lives in monotonous technological pursuits, they must train for enjoyment when not at work, and for

⁶²⁴ Maurice Walter Keatinge, *Suggestion in Education* (London: Adam and Charles Black, 1907); Maurice Walter Keatinge, *Studies in the Teaching of History* (London: Adam and Charles Black, 1910); Maurice Walter Keatinge and N.L. Frazer, *An Introduction to World History with Maps and Illustrations* (London: Adam and Charles Black, 1913).

⁶²⁵ Maurice Walter Keatinge, *Studies in Education* (London: Adam and Charles Black, 1916), p. 6.

⁶²⁶ *Ibid.*

⁶²⁷ *Ibid.*, p. 47.

⁶²⁸ *Ibid.*, p. 63.

⁶²⁹ *Ibid.*, p. 69.

⁶³⁰ *Ibid.*, p. 191.

peaceful coexistence in their communities. Democratic participation could be taught through school life which formed a sort of ‘commonwealth’, and thus ‘citizenship training’ was far more important than religious instruction.⁶³¹

Keatinge’s earlier writings demonstrated that instrumentary education bolstered his biological (eugenics) agenda. High-level academic content was a good precisely because it increased the mental energy and ‘vitality’ of individuals, which in turn strengthened the race.⁶³² Keatinge placed the study of history above all others, because he believed that it taught pupils about evolutionary progress. He associated human progress with amassing concrete data and with the methodology of the physical sciences; he felt that historical studies were growing into this model. Psychology and sociology had ‘widened’ the scope of historical studies, he wrote.⁶³³ A syllabus of history ought to include sociology, the ‘conditions of equilibrium and conditions of progress’, economic sociology, political sociology, principles of democracy, and ‘moral, juridical, and criminal sociology’.⁶³⁴ Keatinge believed ardently that the past was not ontologically connected to the present: we must not conceal the ‘difference between the then and the now’, and we must reject the ‘false atmosphere’ of portraying the events as ‘equally true for all periods and equally serviceable for all’ Rather, teachers must impress upon pupils ‘the deep gulf that separates age from age’,⁶³⁵ as well as ‘the ugliness and brutality of past ages’, for ‘there has been a true progress, a real evolution in time’⁶³⁶ At the close of *Introduction to World*

⁶³¹ Ibid., p. 179.

⁶³² Keatinge, *Studies in the Teaching of History*., p. 171. ‘All that we can ask of education is that it shall increase energy in the individual and not diminish energy in the community.’

⁶³³ Ibid., p. 25.

⁶³⁴ Ibid., p. 27.

⁶³⁵ Ibid., p. 139.

⁶³⁶ Ibid. See also Keatinge and Frazer, *An Introduction to World History with Maps and Illustrations*, pp. 1-2. ‘In describing the various customs and beliefs of mankind, the gradual progress from life guided by brutal instincts to the gentler manners of our own times, the development from a slave community and autocratic government to modern democracy, the growth of the rights of individuals and their corresponding duties within the community, we shall begin not with such remains as spear-heads, but with the earliest records in writing.’

History, Keatinge mentioned that none of the accomplishments of the nineteenth century could compare with Darwin's *Origin of Species*. The theory of evolution, he said, had explained natural science, social science, and social theory. 'Thus', he concluded, 'in spite of the fresh problems and dangers to which each advance of civilization gives rise, there is no need to despair of future progresses' ⁶³⁷

Keatinge viewed humans in Darwinian terms. Bare biological imperatives (survival and propagation) informed his educational theory, and religious requisites played no noticeable role in his discussions. Keatinge's work supported instrumentary education, because of the special role that knowledge played in his schema: knowledge worked on the will and ultimately upon the survival and improvement of the species. At the same time, because he called upon McDougall and not Sully, Bain, and Herbart, he helped to prepare the way for the psychological education of Percy Nunn. It was a short distance from 'perfecting the race' to 'sponsoring the individual'.

Information about the Oxford Summer School, the crown jewel of Oxford's programme, offers insights into the content of the College's year-round course. Running for four to six weeks during August, the Vacation Course enabled students to qualify rapidly for a Diploma: two full terms of study in tandem with the Vacation Course could qualify a student to sit for the Diploma. ⁶³⁸ Likewise, teachers and Heads who had worked in the classroom for at least seven years could undertake the Vacation Course and then sit for the Diploma. ⁶³⁹ The Course had international appeal; the minutes of 1926 mentioned that 'thirty students came from abroad, even Australia', ⁶⁴⁰ and we know that American journals carried advertisements. The Annual

⁶³⁷ Keatinge and Frazer, *An Introduction to World History with Maps and Illustrations*, p. 276.

⁶³⁸ Ed1/4/2, 'Minutes of the Delegacy for the Training of Secondary Teachers', May 1909, 18 June 1909.

⁶³⁹ *Ibid.*, March, 1911.

⁶⁴⁰ Ed1/4/4, 'Minutes of the Delegacy for the Training of Secondary Teachers', 21 May 1926.

Reports list no attendance numbers until the 1920s, but during the first five summers of that decade 145, 135, 170, 161 and 137 teachers participated respectively.⁶⁴¹ Students typically spent a week on each segment of the traditional curriculum and examined Keatinge's theoretical insights throughout the month. The advertisements noted that 'a series of lectures on educational theory and on new experiments in school organisation runs through the Course. It is thus equally suited to specialists and to those who wish for an introduction to the scientific study of education.'⁶⁴²

The summer school thus served as a sort of microcosm of the entire Oxford educational programme: traditional subject-matter set within a progressive framework. Each of the subject areas was covered in detail by teachers from prestigious schools and by university professors. Keatinge delivered such talks as 'Method as determined by psychology, by logic, and by experiment', throughout the course. Progressive educationalists such as Percy Nunn and H.C. Cook (*The Play Way*) provided additional intellectual heft. Percy Nunn lectured at the summer school in 1910, 1913, and 1919 at least, and probably more frequently; the above dates are the only ones for which syllabuses remain.⁶⁴³ Cyril Burt lectured in 1920 on 'Subnormal Children' and other psychological topics.⁶⁴⁴ In 1920 Keatinge lectured nineteen times with lectures entitled 'The Use of Explorers' Narratives in Teaching Geography', 'The Teaching of Economics in the Study of History', or 'The Modern Doctrine of Instinct and Its Meaning for

⁶⁴¹ Ed1/2/2, 'Minute Book of the Standing Committee Delegacy for the Training of Teachers', (1925-1937), 22 October 1925.

⁶⁴² Ed3/32, 'Oxford University Summer School of Education', (1920), 'Oxford University Summer School of Education, 1920'

⁶⁴³ Ed4/10, 'Letters from M. Keatinge', (1907-1913); Ed4/8, 'Letters, Miscellaneous, to the Secondary Teachers Delegacy', (1902-1919).

⁶⁴⁴ Ed3/32, 'Oxford University Summer School of Education'.

Education.⁶⁴⁵ Thus throughout the second period, the model of education championed by Keatinge held at the summer school, and it is likely that it pervaded the College during the year.

Keatinge and his colleagues had had a substantial intellectual background. They had been highly trained in their field of specialism. They were not, primarily, trained in pedagogy. Thus, they were able to negotiate the marriage of very specific data with very progressive educational philosophy. Regardless of how they framed it, they had something to teach. Their rich, classical content served the growth of a new philosophy of education: one which privileged individuality and personality above either spiritual or intellectual growth.

There was considerable cross-pollination in the student population and among instructors which the Oxford archives display. Early *Gazette* notices, for example, show that students from across Great Britain sat for Oxford's Diploma. In May of 1903, for instance, eight B.A.s from Oxford, one from the Royal University of Ireland, one from University of London and one Oxford home student, qualified; in January of 1907, seven B.A.s from Oxford, six from University of London, four from Cambridge, and one each from Dublin and Cambridge satisfied the examiners.⁶⁴⁶ In 1907, St. Katherine's/Wantage was granted University affiliation.⁶⁴⁷ The summer school courses offered an extension of the Oxford *ethos* into other educational environments. Outside educationalists not only taught at the summer school but participated in Oxford's examinations. John Adams, then the Director of Education at the University of London, acted as an assessor in 1907.⁶⁴⁸ J. J. Findlay, Professor of Education at the University

⁶⁴⁵ Ed4/8, 'Letters, Miscellaneous, to the Secondary Teachers Delegacy'.

⁶⁴⁶ Ed3/46, 'Notices and Correspondence Relating to the Conduct of Examinations', (1901-1919), *Gazette*, 8 May 1903 and 18 January 1907.

⁶⁴⁷ Ed1/4/2, 'Minutes of the Delegacy for the Training of Secondary Teachers', St Katherine's Wantage, 15 June 1907.

⁶⁴⁸ Ed3/46, 'Notices and Correspondence Relating to the Conduct of Examinations', *Gazette*, 7 May 1907.

of Manchester, did the same in 1911 and 1912.⁶⁴⁹ Percy Nunn made a near-constant appearance at exams: he wrote and marked them every term between 1914 and 1916 and again in 1919.⁶⁵⁰ Nunn therefore clearly affected both the coursework leading to the examination and the framing of examination questions. The Delegacy enjoyed a good relationship with other training colleges, and the strongest of these relationships seems to have been with the University of London.⁶⁵¹

4.4.3 Summary: The Ethos of the University Training Departments

During the instrumentary period, which we have dated *contra* Selleck from the founding of the University Training Departments until the publication of Percy Nunn's *Education* (1920), the majority view of educational philosophy chose intellectual comprehension as the most important goal of the classroom, and the mind as the most important part of the pupil. In the religious training colleges, the intellectual view of education surpassed even the earlier theological understandings, although the religious atmosphere of these colleges clearly persisted. The UTDs easily sponsored a non-theological view of education which also focused upon academic accomplishment, and which employed the language and methods of the natural sciences, newly applied in laboratories to the work of the classroom. Thus they recommended work which sponsored educational research, such as that of Titchener and Rusk.⁶⁵²

⁶⁴⁹ *Ibid.*, *Gazette*, 3 July 1911, 16 January 1912.

⁶⁵⁰ *Ibid.*, Hand-written reimbursements for Nunn on 16 December 1915, 10 July 1915, December 1916, June 1916, June 1917, and July 1919; Letter from Secretary, June 1914.

⁶⁵¹ Ed1/4/3, 'Minutes of the Delegacy for the Training of Secondary Teachers', 11 June 1914. 20 September 1919. We do know, for example, that the Women's Tutor between 1914 and 1919, Miss Katharine Scott Moncrieff held a B.A. from London.

⁶⁵² *University of Cambridge, Teachers' Training Syndicate, Examinations for Certificates, 1903* (London: C.J. Clay & Sons, 1903). Cambridge and Oxford recommended similar texts (Sully, Spencer, Adams, Lloyd Morgan) and posed similar questions ('What is the scientific basis of the Art of education?' 'How might we train the senses, the memory, the imagination and taste, the powers of judging and reasoning?').

At the same time, the universities also nurtured the growing belief that education was about something other than intellectual work: that education was fundamentally about psychological health and well-being. This view, while in the minority during the early years of the university departments, came to the educational forefront in the decades following Nunn's publication. As Chapter V illuminates, education as a psychological project stood at the door, ready for use. The authority of the university stood ready to push it through and into the colleges.

4.5 Board of Education documents

The Board prioritized instrumentary education by the type of literature they required, by supporting the Child Study movement and by urging teachers towards the tools of 'scientific' psychology. The Board's articulation of education as an essentially religious project ceased. Its officials expressed concern that the instructors in training colleges be properly trained in the methods and theories of modern psychology, so that these tools could be marshalled in support of academic content.

The most important publication issuing from the Board during this period was *Suggestions for the Consideration of Teachers* (1905). This booklet was widely read, for it was recommended by LDTC and *The Practical Teacher*,⁶⁵³ and it was reprinted in 1912 with minimal changes.⁶⁵⁴ The purpose of *Suggestions* was to offer a tentative, theoretical framework for the Government's teachers and to commentate on methodologies within each classroom subject. The thrust was towards intellectual attainment. Faculty training, Child Study,

⁶⁵³ 'Review of 'Suggestions for the Consideration of Teachers', *The Practical Teacher: A Monthly Educational Journal for the Classroom and for Study*, XXVI/3 (September 1905), p. 121-22. Ulic.2.1912, 'London Day Training College Syllabuses in Use in the College Demonstration Schools', title page.

⁶⁵⁴ 'Suggestions for the Consideration of Teachers and others concerned in the work of Public Elementary Schools', in Board of Education (ed.), (London: His Majesty's Stationery Office, 1912).

sympathy, 'keen observation' and the scientific method emerged at every point in this plan. The Board noted, for instance, that education was to lead a child towards good citizenship, a disciplined mind, and the 'intelligent use of leisure' through the 'careful development of the faculties of the child'.⁶⁵⁵ As Herbert Spencer would have appreciated, the Board privileged the scientific subjects:

Nature study and elementary science teaching possess advantages which literary studies cannot claim: the child learns to observe and learn by observation; he can ascertain by practical experience why and how the results at which he aims are brought about...

This kind of careful observation led to the exertion of '[pupils'] own reasoning powers'.⁶⁵⁶ The teacher played an important, and prescriptive, role in all of this. His job was to 'call out the natural reasoning powers' of the pupils as well as to 'know and to sympathise with [them]', mirroring the Child Study of James Sully.⁶⁵⁷ But unlike the teachers of Percy Nunn's world, who were to be passive in the face of children's preferences, the Board's teachers in 1905 were to guide in a particular direction. Character was to run towards 'impressive examples of obedience, loyalty, courage, strenuous effort, serviceableness, and indeed of all the qualities which make for good citizenship', as witnessed in the school curriculum and in the life of the teacher.⁶⁵⁸ Where did religious life, broadly speaking, fit in? A short paragraph described the Board's urgent wish that educational authorities work with local religious leaders to devise means outside the school for this 'most important and difficult of all educational problems'.⁶⁵⁹ While the booklet assumed that children have religious needs, it did not draw upon religious sources to framed discussions of character or intellect. *Suggestions* of 1905 and 1912, therefore,

⁶⁵⁵ 'Suggestions for the Consideration of Teachers and Others Concerned in the Work of Public Elementary Schools', in Board of Education (ed.), (London: His Majesty's Stationery Office, 1905), p. 7.

⁶⁵⁶ *Ibid.*, p. 8.

⁶⁵⁷ *Ibid.*, p. 14.

⁶⁵⁸ *Ibid.*, p. 8.

⁶⁵⁹ *Ibid.*, p. 10.

adopted the terminologies and priorities of the educational elites. The edition of 1918 moved further away from the world of theological education, mentioning religious life not at all, and becoming even more articulate about the priority of intellectual development, Herbartian formulae, and medical inspections.⁶⁶⁰

Examinations from this period further indicate that the Board had embraced the same approach to a 'scientific' education as that sponsored by *The Journal of Education*, Alexander Bain and the Child Study movement. The Board's *Syllabus for Male Candidates* for 1891 included readings from Sully, Bain and Spencer.⁶⁶¹ The *Syllabus* for 1892 included the same, requesting that students comment on Spencer's *Education*, Chapters 1 and 2, Locke's *Thoughts Concerning Education*, and Sully's *Teacher's Handbook of Psychology*.⁶⁶² The certification examinations across this entire period displayed the Board's commitment to a rich intellectual content and towards the best manner of ensuring that pupils learned it. For instance, the examination in 1888 included the question: 'Give such explanation as would be needed in a class to make the following lines interesting and entirely intelligible to a class of children: "Thy wish was father, Harry, to that thought;/ I stay too long by thee, I weary thee/ Dost thou so hunger for my empty chair/That thou wilt needs invest thee with my honours,/Before thy hour be ripe? O foolish youth!/ Thou seek'st the greatness that will overwhelm thee.'" ⁶⁶³ At the end of the period, in 1917, the examination inquired, 'What events would you emphasize with a class of Standard II scholars if you were dealing with the lives of any two: The Venerable Bede, Simon

⁶⁶⁰ 'Suggestions for the Consideration of Teachers and Others Concerned in the Work of Public Elementary Schools', in Board of Education (ed.), (London: His Majesty's Stationery Office, 1918). See especially pp. 5, 10-14.

⁶⁶¹ Smh/3/13, 'Examination Results', Board of Education, *Syllabus for Male Candidates, The Examination for Certificates in Residential Colleges and for Acting Teachers*, 1891.

⁶⁶² Smh/3/20, *Principal's Correspondence* (1891-1895), Board of Education, *Syllabus for Male Candidates, The Examination for Certificates in Residential Colleges and for Acting Teachers*, 1892.

⁶⁶³ See *Education Department, Christmas Examinations, 1888* (London: Her Majesty's Stationery Office, 1889).

de Montfort, Richard Coeur-de-lion, Prince Charles Edward and Robert Clive?⁶⁶⁴ Alongside difficult intellectual material, the Board examinations required knowledge of faculty psychology, Child Study, and Herbartian methodology.⁶⁶⁵

The Board of Education's syllabus from 1908 portrays a fascinating contrast to the requirements of the first period. Neither religious understanding, nor even metaphysical understanding, but 'the scientific spirit', was to frame the study of education. One passage is worth quoting in full:

If this scientific spirit is to find its right expression in the teaching given in Elementary Schools it must be made to affect the whole study of the intending teacher during his course in the Training College. It must not be confined to any one branch of the curriculum...Scientific method is of equal importance, and is indeed of ancient application, in the field of history, literature, language, and philosophy...Even on the professional side of the Training College course, this principle must be remembered. Then necessity for experiment and observation over ever-widening groups of phenomena is the most striking aspect of modern psychological investigation, and the teacher in training will gain much by watching some of the work that is now proceeding in the observation of children...⁶⁶⁶

The framing of education, then, ought to be 'scientific', by which was meant a knowledge of school hygiene, an understanding of great educationalists, a rich experience with the principles of Child Study, and 'an application of psychological principles in the practice of teaching'.⁶⁶⁷

Significantly, the Board regulated the syllabuses and the examinations of the residential training colleges but not those of the University Training Departments. The latter were left to

⁶⁶⁴ *Board of Education, Examination Papers Set at the Certificate Examination for Teachers in Elementary Schools, 1917* (London: His Majesty's Stationery Office, 1918).

⁶⁶⁵ *Board of Education, Examination Papers Set at the Certificate Examination for Teachers in Elementary Schools, 1904* (London: His Majesty's Stationery Office, 1905). See for reference to mental discipline, logic, attention and 'hindrances' attaining the 'ideal ends' of Recitation' *Board of Education, Examination Papers Set at the Certificate Examination for Teachers in Elementary Schools, 1904*. See for references to Herbartian methods. *Board of Education, Examination Papers Set at the Certificate Examination for Teachers in Elementary Schools, 1917*, in which were required meticulous lesson plans aiming to teach a mathematical rule or principle, attention and interest, and the most successful ways to evaluate pupils' knowledge.

⁶⁶⁶ Ua20/1/26, *Regulations for the Training of Teachers for Elementary Schools*, ed. Board of Education (London: His Majesty's Stationery Office, 1908), p. xvii.

⁶⁶⁷ *Ibid.*, xxi.

their own devices, with the Board perusing their examinations after the fact.⁶⁶⁸ Differentiation of treatment suggests a different level of intellectual trust, which again points to the higher prestige associated with the universities.

While the Board crafted certification examinations with reference to college curricula, it was not content to leave it that way. That Board saw itself as prophetic and prescriptive. As a Chief Inspector wrote of this period, the agents of the Board were ‘the chief agent[s] of cross-fertilization, the transference from school to school and from one body of teachers to another of the latest ideas and experiments in method or organisation’.⁶⁶⁹ The Board urged the religious training colleges towards the ‘higher’ views evident in the UTDs.

4.6 Prominent Journals

The educational journals supported instrumentary education in a fashion similar to the Board’s. *The Journal of Education*, *The Practical Teacher*, and an important newcomer, *The Training College Record*, each in its own way, identified intellectual achievement as the goal of teaching, and psychology as the foundational discipline of education. *The Journal of Education*, having led the turn towards intellection, eventually distanced itself from Child Study and towards the laboratory. *The Practical Teacher* selectively supported Child Study and wholeheartedly embraced Herbart, only sporadically entertaining the language of the subconscious and personality. At the behest of the training colleges *The Training College Record* (TCR) came into being, and its contents reveal collegiate affinity for the academic and experimental ideals held by the London school. Taken together, the three journals reinforce our understanding that the instrumentary period was much longer than Selleck supposed, and that, *contra* Wooldridge, the professionalization of psychology changed the work of Child Study beyond recognition.

⁶⁶⁸ *Report of the Board of Education for the Year 1903-1904* (London: Her Majesty's Stationery Office, 1904).

⁶⁶⁹ Boothroyd, *A History of the Inspectorate*, p. 51.

4.6.1 *The Journal of Education*

In this second period, the *Journal* continued to weave science, psychology and education together. In context this meant a non-metaphysical approach to all three, and an affinity with the LDTC in its loves and rejections. In 1892, for instance, a review of one of Sully's books on psychology praised his 'empirical' and non-metaphysical approach to psychology.⁶⁷⁰ In a 1906 book review, the editors listed the foundations of education to be 'ethics, psychology, methodology, sociology, and hygiene'.⁶⁷¹ And in 1909, in an article entitled 'The Teaching of Psychology to Students in Training', by J.H. Wimms, Lecturer in Education at Goldsmiths' College, London, the author called it 'undisputed by all serious students of the subject' that 'education should find its foundation in psychology'.⁶⁷²

During this period the *Journal's* understanding of science, psychology and education shifted while the parameters (the model of the natural sciences) remained. Exactly as the LDTC leadership, the *Journal's* writers moved from an informal, recruit-everybody attitude towards a more elite, expert-orientated approach which was as much about the laboratory as the classroom. They praised Titchener's *Primer of Psychology* (1898) not only for its 'comprehensive' nature but for its 'list of apparatus and materials which is given in the appendix for psychological experiment'.⁶⁷³ They adored Robert Rusk's *Experimental Education* (reviewed in 1910) and stated that the new methods would 'deliver the [teacher] from the tyranny of tradition and the

⁶⁷⁰ 'Review: James Sully on the Human Mind', *The Journal of Education: A Monthly Paper Devoted to the Interests of the Scholastic Profession*, XIV/8 (August 1892), 422-23, p. 423.

⁶⁷¹ 'Review: William Chandler Bagley's *the Educative Process*', *The Journal of Education: A Monthly Record and Review*, XXVIII/1 (January 1906), 46.

⁶⁷² J. H. Wimms, 'The Teaching of Psychology to Students in Training', *Ibid.* XXXI/4 (April 1909), 253-55, p. 253.

⁶⁷³ 'Review: Edward Titchener's *Primer of Psychology*', *The Journal of Education: A Monthly Paper Devoted to the Interests of the Scholastic Profession*, XX/9 (September 1898), 552.

caprice of the faddist. But it will bring him under the servitude of his science.’⁶⁷⁴ They reviewed favourably the works of Thorndike on ‘educational psychology’, agreeing most adamantly with the need to quantify the child’s environment, sex, race, family, maturity, and individual differences with ‘formulae’.⁶⁷⁵ The *Journal* moved towards an increasingly narrow, specialized and rigorous interpretation of a ‘scientific’ approach to education.

At the same time, the *Journal* charted a move away from a mechanistic ontology into a more mysterious one, tracking with the minority view within psychology. Although the *Journal* showed resistance to an unmodified Freud (‘psychoanalysis needs to get rid of its sex obsession’⁶⁷⁶), it accepted Freud’s framework of subterranean drives and instincts which controlled behaviour. This framework was also shared by McDougall. In 1913, an essay stated that the ‘machine-made mechanistic ideas which have dominated our philosophical, religious, educational, social and political ideals for the last hundred years’ had been ‘ousted’, and that ‘we are beginning to admit that man is not only a machine but an organism’⁶⁷⁷ In 1920, P.B. Ballard, in ‘Psychology and the Teacher’, provided a narrative of the twin disciplines which made the same point. In the old days, he wrote, only Sully and Lloyd Morgan understood applied psychology, but then along came Adams, Winch, Thorndike, and Freud, and ‘the barriers between psychology and education began to break down’. Ballard called for all teachers to read McDougall and Rusk and celebrated the fact that the Board of Education’s *Suggestions* and *Syllabus of Examination* ‘were full of camouflaged psychology’.⁶⁷⁸ As for Percy Nunn’s famous

⁶⁷⁴ ‘Review: Robert Rusk’s *Experimental Education*’, *The Journal of Education: A Monthly Record and Review*, XXXII/12 (December 1910), 835-36, p. 835.

⁶⁷⁵ ‘Review: Edward Thorndike’s *Educational Psychology*’, *The Journal of Education: A Monthly Record and Review*, XXXIII/1 (January 1911), 45-46.

⁶⁷⁶ ‘Psychoanalysis in Education’, *The Journal of Education: A Monthly Record and Review*, L/3 (March 1918), 152-53.

⁶⁷⁷ Cloudesley Brereton, ‘Criteria of Physical Exercises in the Light of Education as a Whole’, *Ibid.* XXXV/7 (July 1913), 511-12.

⁶⁷⁸ P. B. Ballard, ‘Psychology and the Teacher’, *Ibid.* LH/8 (August 1920), 541-43.

book itself, the *Journal* proclaimed that ‘every generation needs to have the philosophic basis of the best educational thought and practice restated, and for the present generation Professor Nunn has performed [this] masterfully’; it was ‘the best of recent investigations upon routine and play, nature and nurture, imitation and instinct, knowledge and action’.⁶⁷⁹ *The Journal of Education* exhibited the same trajectory as that of the LDTC. In its pages flourished first a Child Study which became ever-more experimental, and an ontology which adopted the language of Darwinian evolution (‘instinct’) rather than the machine (‘faculties’).

4.6.2 *The Practical Teacher*

The Practical Teacher ceased publication in 1911, largely because of the demise of the pupil-teacher system. Until its closure, *The Practical Teacher* demonstrated an emphasis upon instrumentary education through the vehicles of Child Study and Herbartian methods. In 1896, John Adams wrote on methods of Child Study, a review explored Herbart and German pedagogy, and editors praised a medical doctor’s book on *The Children, How to Study Them*.⁶⁸⁰ When the journal reported on ‘Child Study at the Oxford Summer Meeting’ in 1897, it affirmed that teachers themselves could become scientific observers, and urged teachers to study at the Laboratory for Experimental Psychology in University College, London, under the direction of Professor Sully.⁶⁸¹

The Practical Teacher also disseminated the newer views on consciousness, praising, for instance, G.F. Stout’s *Manual of Psychology* (1899) for ‘casting off the verbal dead-weights’ of

⁶⁷⁹ ‘Review: Percy Nunn’s *Education: Its Data and First Principles, and Others*’, *The Journal of Education: A Monthly Record and Review*, LII/4 (April 1920), 238-40, p. 238.

⁶⁸⁰ ‘Review: Francis Warner, Md’s *the Children, How to Study Them*’, *The Practical Teacher: A Monthly Educational Journal*, XVII/12 (June 1897), 624; ‘Review of *Educational Essays*’, *The Practical Teacher: A Monthly Educational Journal*, XVII/12 (June 1897), 624., John Adams, ‘What Is a Boy?’ *The Practical Teacher: A Monthly Educational Journal*, XVII/12 (June 1897), 701-02.

⁶⁸¹ ‘Child Study at the Oxford Summer Meeting’. *The Practical Teacher: A Monthly Educational Journal*, XVIII/4 (October 1897), 178.

faculties and using, in their stead, 'ultimate modes of being conscious'.⁶⁸² A four-part series in 1900-01 entitled 'With Our Children: Talks with Teachers on Psychology' made the same point.⁶⁸³ *The Practical Teacher* reviewed an American work, *Education as Adjustment* by M.V O'Shea, concluding 'it is evident [from a biological standpoint] that the great function of education is to secure the individual the most complete adjustment to his whole environment', and urging a 'dispassionate and scientific approach'.⁶⁸⁴ But while *The Practical Teacher* did praise many things about the newer psychology, it articulated some reservations about the agenda of the London psychologists. While they recruited one of them, W.H. Winch, to write a column on 'Researches in Educational Psychology', they had already criticized his book (*Problems in Education*) for its abstract and impractical nature.⁶⁸⁵ *The Practical Teacher* remained firmly rooted in the classroom, not in the laboratory or the college lecture hall.

The Practical Teacher further differed from *The Journal of Education* and from the university-based colleges in its advocacy of religious particularity. In contrast to the *Journal*, it was sharply sceptical of the 'neutral' moral agenda of the Moral Instruction League. The League thrived between 1897 and 1917. It emerged from the Ethical Culture movement, and advocated national, secular moral instruction in lieu of religious education in board schools. The League earned a presence in national education and influenced the Board of Education's *Code* in 1906; it is discussed more fully on pages 299-302. In contrast to the *Journal* which favoured the

⁶⁸² 'Review of Cowham's Book on School Organisation', 'Review: Stout's *Manual of Psychology*', *The Practical Teacher: A Monthly Review for the Schoolroom and for Study*, XX 8 (February 1900), 447.

⁶⁸³ J. Gunn, 'With Our Children: Talking with Teachers About Psychology', *The Practical Teacher: A Monthly Magazine and Review for the Classroom and for Study*, XXXI/1, 2, 8, 9 (July, August, February, March 1900-1901), 27-28, 57-58, 385-88, 441-45.

⁶⁸⁴ 'Review: M.V. O'shea's *Education as Adjustment*', *The Practical Teacher: A Monthly Magazine and Review for the Schoolroom and for Study*, XXIV/12 (June 1904), 624.

⁶⁸⁵ W. H. Winch, 'Researches in Educational Psychology', *The Practical Teacher: With which is incorporated The Practical Teacher's Art Monthly*, XXIX/6 (December 1909), 281-82, until 'Announcement'. For the review, see 'Review: W.H. Winch's *Problems in Education*', *The Practical Teacher: A Monthly Magazine and Review for the Schoolroom and for Study*, XXI/5 (November 1900), 274.

League and reported quite often upon its activities, the *Practical Teacher* criticized the League's methods and lack of religious foundation.⁶⁸⁶ On this point, in 1907, some of the editors visited a successful London Council school which was praised for its 'high moral tone' which it attributed explicitly to the Bible lessons, the repetition of Christian scripture, and the moral lessons throughout the curriculum. 'This', stated the Principal, 'explodes the idea that moral instruction is irreligious.

I grant the possibility of laying down a system of morals or ethics of non-religious cast for the adult mind, but such an idea is absurd for children by reason of its abstract character. For the child-mind moral instruction must be concrete and real...[in this school] based upon the Golden Rule, the Sermon on the Mount, the lessons of the parables, the lessons learned by studying the characters of men whose life-histories are found portrayed in the Bible.⁶⁸⁷

The Practical Teacher, then, offered a valuable, if partial, counter-balance to the tenor of the *Journal*, by supporting religious particularity. Nevertheless, it is not clear that this subtle difference would have been noticeable to the readership, since in the broader issues (psychology as the foundation for education, academic achievement as the goal of the classroom, a nod towards experimental education), *The Practical Teacher* followed the line of thought common in more elite publications.

4.6.3 The Training College Record

The Training College Record began its life in 1908 as the official publication of the Training College Association (TCA), and by 1931 it was produced by the British Association's psychology section. Thus, it reflected the commitment of the training colleges to sponsoring educational psychology. The colleges differed in their internal views about the TCA; the

⁶⁸⁶ 'Report: The Moral Instruction League's 9th Annual Meeting', *The Practical Teacher: A Monthly Magazine and Review for the Schoolroom and for Study*, XXVII/9 (March 1907), 442.

⁶⁸⁷ 'Moral Instruction in Practice', *The Practical Teacher: With which is incorporated The Practical Teacher's Art Monthly*, XXVIII/11 (May 1908), 564-66.

relationship of an individual college to the TCA might vary from sycophantic to resistant. Nevertheless, the TCA (and its mouthpiece) received the official sanction of training colleges. The publication changed its name several times: to the *Journal of Experimental Pedagogy and the Training College Record* in 1911, *The Forum of Education* in 1923, and the *British Journal of Educational Psychology* in 1931. At every juncture its editors and writers comprised the most famous psychologists and educationalists in the United Kingdom: from Spearman, Burt and Nunn in 1911 to Ballard, Winch, and Valentine in 1913, to Adams, Thomson and A.G. Hughes in the 1920s. Its leadership overlapped significantly with the London psychologists.

Understandably, given the dominance of the London psychologists amongst its staff, the most important thrust of the journal was towards psychological experiment and intelligence testing. By 1913, the back of the journal stated that ‘The purpose of the Journal is primarily to promote pedagogic research. To that end, a first place will be given to original enquiries bearing on pedagogic problems.’⁶⁸⁸ The assumption was that a perfect science of education might be crafted out of accumulated data. Certainly, psychology was seen as the key resource for educationalists. Religious thought was completely absent from its pages. Therefore, from its inception, *The Training College Record (The Record)* appealed to a scientific sanction. In ‘Experiment in Education’ (1908), Professor J.A. Green wrote that the proper principles of education derive ‘legitimately from the sciences of psychology and physiology’ To bring education fully into the scientific fold, teachers must cease to rely upon tradition and embrace ‘the facts with which it has to deal’, having investigated them ‘under field conditions and by means of comparative statistics and by experiment’.⁶⁸⁹

⁶⁸⁸ ‘Back inside Cover’, *The Journal of Experimental Pedagogy and the Training College Record*, II/2 (June 1913).

⁶⁸⁹ J.A. Green, ‘Experiment in Education’, *The Training College Record*, I/1 (March 1908), 75-77, p. 75.

The Record gave space for the London psychological circle and its school of thought, expressed in articles, book reviews, surveys and obituaries. The articles published in March, 1911, for instance, were as follows:

- 'The Way to Develop Experimental Pedagogy,' by C. Spearman
- 'Attention, "entweder willkuerlich oder unwillkuerlich,"' a footnote by J.W Adamson
- 'Modern Educational Psychology' by W. Brown
- 'Social Class and Mental Proficiency in Elementary School Children' by W.H. Winch
- 'The Function of Experiment in Educational Science' by H. Bompas Smith, Headmaster of King Edward VII School, Lytham
- 'M. Binet's Method for the Measurement of Intelligence-Some Results' by Katharine L. Johnston
- 'Educational Measurements' by P Sandiford
- 'The Evidence of Mental Fatigue during School Hours' by Gladys W. Martin
- 'The Psychological Bases of School Geography' by C. Birchenough
- 'Memory Training – is it general or specific?' by W.G. Sleight⁶⁹⁰

The bias of these titles is clear: the most important facet of education lay in scientific investigation of psychological facts. In November of that year, Percy Nunn praised Alex Darroch's *The Place of Psychology in the Training of the Teacher*, and noted that teachers in training were gradually absorbing his important principles: 'That the young teacher should learn from psychology that the educational process must be based upon the child's instinctive tendencies to activity, and that knowledge...is always a means to a desired end'⁶⁹¹ In 1912, Welton reviewed a book by Adams, Nunn praised Rusk's *Experimental Education*, and T. Loveday called McDougall's *Psychology: The Study of Behaviour* 'the best short sketch...of the position and aim of modern psychology'.⁶⁹²

⁶⁹⁰ 'The Journal of Experimental Pedagogy and the Training College Record', *The Journal of Experimental Pedagogy and the Training College Record*, 1/1 (March 1911), Table of Contents.

⁶⁹¹ T. Percy Nunn, 'Review: Alex Darroch's *the Place of Psychology in the Training of the Teacher*', *Ibid.*/2 (November, 173).

⁶⁹² James Welton, 'Review: John Adams's *the Evolution of English Educational Theory*', *Ibid.*/5 (December 1912), 403-04; T. Percy Nunn, 'Review: Robert Rusk's *Experimental Education*', *The Journal of Experimental Pedagogy and the Training College Record*, 1/5 (December 1912), 407-09; T. Lovejoy, 'Review: William McDougall's

Initially, *The Record's* emphasis upon experiments may be interpreted as one more aid to intellectual attainment: behind every survey was the hope for academic efficacy. And while *The Record's* early rejection of Herbartian principles⁶⁹³ differentiated it from the *Journal* and *The Practical Teacher*, the preference for laboratories was only a difference of means, not ends. At the same time, *The Record*, more consistently and frequently than either the *Journal* or *The Practical Teacher*, presented education as first and foremost a matter of psychological health. A review praised an English translation of Freud's *Interpretation of Dreams* in 1913;⁶⁹⁴ a training college principal described 'The Teacher as Social Worker' and specifically denigrated the concept of a teacher as intellectual mentor.⁶⁹⁵ Psycho-analysis was taken seriously; 'repression' and 'dissociation' were applied to the subjects and games of schools, and the general mental content of entire civilizations came under the microscope.⁶⁹⁶

The last volume before our period ended contained numerous references to a psychological framing of education. For instance, in June 1919, Professor Bompas Smith wrote in 'The Standpoint of Educational Psychology' that education's core principles were value, growth, mental unity, freedom, reality, individuality and experience.⁶⁹⁷ He wanted educational psychology to sponsor individualism, unique personalities and self-determination, not academic attainment. The 'systematic investigation of concrete facts' must aim towards a more adequate understanding of psychological development, and only through this process might the new discipline take shape. Of course Nunn's *Education* was favourably reviewed, although the

Psychology: The Study of Behaviour, *The Journal of Experimental Pedagogy and the Training College Record*, 1/5 (December 1912), 410-12.

⁶⁹³ J. J. Findlay, 'Method in Teaching', *The Journal of Experimental Pedagogy and the Training College Record*, 1/3 (March 1912), 234-35.

⁶⁹⁴ J. A. Green, 'Review: Sigmund Freud's *the Interpretation of Dreams*', *Ibid.* 11/2 (June 1913), 155.

⁶⁹⁵ 'Review: M.B. Reaney's *the Psychology of the Organised Group Game*', *The Journal of Experimental Pedagogy and the Training College Record*, 111/6 (December 1916), 385; M. M. Allan, 'The Teacher as Social Worker', *The Journal of Experimental Pedagogy and the Training College Record*, 111/4 (March 1915), 217-25.

⁶⁹⁶ 'Review: M.B. Reaney's *the Psychology of the Organised Group Game*', *Ibid.*

⁶⁹⁷ Bompas Smith, 'The Standpoint of Educational Psychology', *Ibid.* 1/2 (June 1919), 57-67, p. 60.

reviewer's dialogue with Nunn is instructive. The reviewer (J.A. Green) agreed entirely with Nunn's framing of education as a march towards individuality; his disagreement was with Nunn's grounding of 'Individuality' in nature rather than in society.⁶⁹⁸

Thus *The Record* bore the imprint of the London school of thought and transported it right into the common rooms of the colleges. It must be noted that, however much the training colleges participated in this publication, their lecturers did not follow its shifts until the 1920s, 1930s or even 1940s. The evidence from within the training colleges suggests that instrumentary education was still very much in vogue throughout the period, that Child Study and Herbart led the charge, and that 'experimental education' made its way only haltingly into the portals of Cheltenham, Culham and St. Mary's. The colleges were even further behind when it came to McDougall and Freud. *The Training College Record* might publish glowing reviews of both, and the LDTC might recommend progressive texts to its post-graduate students, but the emphasis in the training colleges seemed to be upon a psychology which aimed towards academic accomplishment and a religious framework which still affected the *ethos* of the schools.

4.7 Summary of Instrumentary Education

Between the Cross Commission and the publication of Nunn's *Education*, English educational philosophy changed. It continued to talk about character and ethics. Religious education occupied an important place. Nevertheless, in contrast to the earlier period, which placed religious formation as the first priority, the instrumentary period privileged the academic attainment of school-age children. In this endeavour, training colleges turned most frequently to

⁶⁹⁸ J. A. Green, 'Review: Percy Nunn's *Education: Its Data and First Principles*', p. 250-55.

the practice of Child Study and to Herbartian techniques. The Board of Education was complicit as it reinforced this view through examinations, syllabuses and inspections.

This period also witnessed a new model of teacher training in the form of university-affiliated training departments which acquired an instant *cachet* among educational circles. Founded upon the search for scientific certitude rather than upon religious community, the UTDs were perfectly poised to frame and sponsor the development of educational psychology. The literature which emerged from the University Training Departments during this period was demonstrably more 'experimental' and clinically-orientated than that which was used by the residential colleges, but it supported the same goal of intellectual achievement. By the end of this period, the university programmes had moved beyond a parent- and teacher-sponsored child study programme and into the laboratory. Additionally, they had embraced an understanding of the role played by the unconscious, and by conation, which was much less positivistic and more mysterious than the views carried by Child Study and Herbart. The new views were inspired by McDougall and Freud and sought to capture the latest thinking on instinct, drives, and neuroses. In the next period, emotional and psychological well-being flourished as the primary goal of the classroom.

Religious training colleges adapted slowly to the brisk changes at large within the university-based training programmes. This suggests that the university programmes provided intellectual leadership which the colleges followed by a lag of some fifteen to twenty years, as our comparisons in Chapter V explore.

Chapter V – Third Period (1921-1944) Joint Boards to the McNair Report

Education as a Psychological Project

During the final period examined in this thesis, the views expressed in Nunn's *Education* became normative across the educational spectrum. Far from being primarily a theological or even an intellectual project, education became primarily a psychological project. The human narrative was told in terms of racial survival and individual development. The goals of character formation and academic accomplishment remained, of course, but they were superseded by the goal of allowing individuals to become who they wanted to be, unencumbered by neuroses or curricular pressures. The London Day Training College stood at the centre of this transformation. This priority is clear whether one looks at University, Anglican, Wesleyan or Nonconformist colleges. Only the Catholic colleges continued to emphasize the religious nature of education.

The existence of Nunn's ideas, however, ensured neither their acceptance nor their ubiquity. Against the presence of educators brought up in quite a different curricular tradition, against the persistence of religious practice in the larger English community, how did the psychological view of education become predominant? While broader cultural changes may have opened up the possibilities of an increasingly naturalistic framework for education, these changes in and of themselves were not sufficient to have wrought the kind of paradigm shift which is observable across the archives. It is unlikely that the psychological view would have come to the fore without two important factors: the new administrative leadership of the

universities and the points of view which had become enshrined therein, and the disillusionment with traditional frameworks and customs engendered by the First World War. The radical re-framing of education which had been going on in the universities was transmitted directly to the colleges by institutional and personal relationships; the unease with Western culture brought by the War made it easier for educators to accept new ideologies which promised individuality above tradition.

5.1 Institutional and Historical Factors

5.1.1 The Rising Authorities of the Universities

The most important institutional change during this period was that the training colleges ceased to be examined by the Board of Education following the Board's Circular 1372 (1926). That duty devolved upon the universities under the 'Joint Board Scheme', in which the training colleges clustered under the *aegis* of a full-fledged university. The McNair Report (1944) and subsequent Acts of Parliament strengthened the universities' role even more.

The University of London had sought this role before the Joint Board Scheme was even suggested by the Government. In 1921 the University of London invited the area training colleges into a regulatory relationship which the colleges rebuffed (at that time). The University's proposal pronounced the colleges' standards inadequate and offered leadership in evaluating college syllabuses and examinations. Admission to the scheme would be contingent upon 'the adequacy, numbers and qualifications of the teachers; the equipment, laboratories and libraries; the numbers of students; and also the degree to which the University would be represented' on the college governing bodies. Additionally, the University sought to 'scrutinize'

the calibre of lecturers.⁶⁹⁹ The scheme was resisted by area principals that year with the exception of Westminster, which had already forged inroads into the University of London.⁷⁰⁰ In fact, it would be difficult to imagine an independent training college more enmeshed in the University of London than was Westminster during this period, with respect to its staffing, its syllabus, its coursework, its students' experiences, and, not least, its educational theory. Westminster had made overtures to the University of London in the 1890s, and in 1894 two students gained B.A.s concurrently.⁷⁰¹ In 1903 Principal Rev. Herbert B. Workman heightened the College's academic rigour, which he thought would prepare the College for a stronger bond with the University. He succeeded in replacing the customary King's Scholarship exam with the University matriculation exam as a criterion for admission.⁷⁰² Had the war not interrupted Workman's mission (Westminster closed until 1919), it would have accomplished academic convergence quickly. When the College re-opened after the war, Workman's aims were intact, and by 1924 it only admitted men who were prepared to read for the external degree exam of the University of London.⁷⁰³ Westminster, at least, had been groomed by its leadership for the Joint Board Scheme.

When the Joint Board Scheme officially commenced, Westminster went further than any other college. It won its students three full years at a University of London College (the London School of Economics, King's College, or University College) during which they prepared for a

⁶⁹⁹ Smh/3/65, 'Principal's Correspondence and Papers', (1921).. University of London, 'Training of Teachers,' passed on 22 June 1921.

⁷⁰⁰ Smh/3/67, 'Principal's Correspondence and Papers', (1922).. Meeting of the Principals of London Training Colleges at St Mark's, July 7, 1921; Smh/3/67, 'Principal's Correspondence and Papers'. A year later, the four men's colleges (St Mark's, St John's, Westminster and St Mary's) agreed in principle but not in practice to a Joint Examination Board

⁷⁰¹ Pritchard, *The Story of Westminster College, 1851-1951*, p. 79.

⁷⁰² *Ibid.*, p. 107.

⁷⁰³ *Ibid.*, p. 139.

University B.A. and resided at Westminster. The Board of Education provided fees.⁷⁰⁴ The fourth and final year, students spent exclusively at Westminster and studied the theory and practice of education. What was lost in this arrangement was the constant influence of a creedal community. What was gained was status.⁷⁰⁵ Fred Jeffrey, a student at Westminster between 1933-1937, recalled the prestige lent by this arrangement. 'It was the nearest approach one got to, you might say, a Cambridge situation in London, and it was provided for us by Westminster', he wrote.⁷⁰⁶ Westminster attracted staff from the University. Between 1885 and 1940 Westminster hired eleven men to teach educational philosophy of whom nine had received a B.A., a Teaching Diploma, or a Master's from the University of London.⁷⁰⁷ As per the Joint Board arrangements, Westminster's Governing Body included University representation. Between 1929 and 1936, Sir Percy Nunn sat on Westminster's governing body.⁷⁰⁸ The administrative and intellectual associations were noted with pride by the Wesleyan Committee of Education.⁷⁰⁹ It considered Westminster's emphasis upon psychology a sign of high achievement.⁷¹⁰

Other London colleges, Catholic ones in particular, consistently hesitated to affiliate with the University of London. St. Mary's Principal found London's initial overture of 1921 full of 'exorbitant' demands, 'involving a complete surrender of independence for the paltry benefit of acquiring a nominal, extrinsic connection with the University by examination' He doubted whether St Mary's staff and laboratories would meet with University approval. Nevertheless, he did believe that on balance affiliation would benefit St Mary's, particularly since he had

⁷⁰⁴ A/2/a/3, 'Governing Body Minutes', (1929-1940), 23 April 1928.

⁷⁰⁵ Pritchard, *The Story of Westminster College. 1851-1951*, p. 148.

⁷⁰⁶ E/2/H/4, 'Recollections of Fred Jeffrey', (1933-1937).

⁷⁰⁷ A/2/C/1, 'Staff Register'

⁷⁰⁸ A/2/a/3, 'Governing Body Minutes'.

⁷⁰⁹ 'The Wesleyan Committee of Education: The 85th Annual Report', (Somerset: Purrell and Sons, 1924-1925, .p. 43.

⁷¹⁰ *Ibid.*, pp. 47-48.

'assurance' that the College would never be turned into a 'hostel' to the University.⁷¹¹ This was no small concern, because the colleges' close-knit communities stood to diminish in influence over students who spent the majority of their time on the University's premises.

Two Catholic women's colleges objected more strenuously to the 1921 proposal. The Principal of St. Charles complained that the University's conditions would prove utterly impossible for them and that 'there would be no Catholic Women's college in London which could offer the University Diploma' The consequence would be that 'our best Catholic girls might be tempted into non-Catholic training colleges'.⁷¹² The Principal and Governing Body of La Sainte Union rejected affiliation altogether for fear of being reduced to 'mere hostels'.⁷¹³ After 1926 the Governing Bodies had no choice. St Mary's Principal stated in 1927 that each Catholic college had become 'linked up with one or other university; we are all recognized as efficient for secondary as well as elementary training'⁷¹⁴ By 1928, the University College of London was in charge of setting the syllabuses and examining all its area training colleges, and the pattern repeated across the country.⁷¹⁵

The Joint Board scheme became another channel through which the psychological view of education flowed to the colleges. The extent to which the colleges moved from an academic to a psychological emphasis may be seen in a paper on 'The Training of Teachers' released by the Training College Association in 1932. This document praised the Universities for raising the

⁷¹¹ Smh/3/69, 'Principal's Correspondence and Papers', (1922-1924), Letter from JJ Doyle to Mr. Anderton of the CEC, 12 July 1922.

⁷¹² Ibid., letter from P.M. Ward to Mr. Anderton of the CEC, 14 July 1922.

⁷¹³ Smh/3/70, 'Principal's Correspondence and Papers', (1923), Extracts from a letter from the Training College, Southampton, to the CEC.

⁷¹⁴ Pri/1/3/5, 'Principal's Correspondence and Papers', 'The Catholic Training Colleges,' written by Principal Doyle.

⁷¹⁵ Pri/1/3/6, 'Principal's Correspondence', (1928), Minutes from University College, University of London, 19 March 1928. The Minutes of University College reveal that Dr. Percy Nunn (LDTC) and Dr. Ross (Westminster) set the syllabuses along with Mr. Dowling of St Mary's, Mr. Chapman of St Mark's and St John's, and Mr. Hughes of Borough Road.

standard of teaching in the training colleges⁷¹⁶ and noted smugly that thus ‘the narrowness and segregation of the training college’ had been alleviated. The TCA celebrated the attendant role of psychology:

A new orientation has occurred because of the advancing knowledge of psychology, accompanied by and contributing to a new philosophy of education. The course on Principles of Education has become the substructure...through this course, the students come to a realization of the aims which will inform all their work in school and they learn something of the nature of the children they will teach and of their own nature, so that they can understand the wisest ways of approaching their goals. These psychological principles they will apply in the teaching of all subjects to the children. The academic subjects and the crafts take their rightful place as a means of helping children towards a full realization of themselves and also as a means of enriching the students’ own personalities. ...Such a theory of training seems to be widely accepted, but the revolution is not complete [italics mine].⁷¹⁷

This passage summarized the teaching of MacDougall, Nunn, Isaacs, and Ross: psychology was the key intellectual resource for understanding humanity; psychology provided the substructure for education; education existed to further children’s personalities and individualities, not to pass on a body of knowledge.

Because the universities controlled the certification process, they became more important in the internal lives of the training colleges than the Board of Education. That the university departments of education bested the Board of Education may be seen from their posture towards the government: in 1947 the Education staff at Oxford, Cambridge and London spurned Government inspections completely and issued a report to the effect that ‘the three Universities objected very strongly to entry into the lecture rooms or inspection of the lectures by officials of the Ministry of Education except by invitation’⁷¹⁸ At the same time, it is important to remember

⁷¹⁶ Pri/1/3/18, ‘Principal’s Correspondence’, (1938), ‘The Training of Teachers: Memorandum drawn up by the Joint Standing Committee of the Training College Association and Council of Principals, confidential to members of the TCA and Council of Principals’, 1938, p. 2.

⁷¹⁷ Ibid., p. 10.

⁷¹⁸ Ed1/4/5, ‘Minutes of the Delegacy for the Training of Secondary Teachers’, 11 March 1947.

that the Board of Education still controlled the funding of the training colleges, and the Board's ability to demand the closure of denominational colleges loomed over the colleges throughout this period.

5.1.2 The Great War and Scientific Discourse

The form of authority over the training colleges changed, from confessional communities and the Board of Education, to the intellectual and administrative authority of the universities. But the question remained why the colleges accepted the content of the university's educational paradigms. The plausibility structures behind this acceptance included the devastation of the First World War, and the perceived moderation and scientific nature of the educational psychologists.

The 'new education,' broadly speaking, had already declared the old moralities and the old curriculum to be oppressive,⁷¹⁹ and the First World War confirmed their suspicions. A.S. Neill wrote, 'The world today is a moralist-made world...it has just killed a few million men'; Edmond Holmes, former Chief Inspector of Elementary Schools and the author of *What is and What Might Be*, asserted: 'The war has revealed to us the hollowness of the materialist civilisation on which we had prided ourselves'; Nunn himself said in *Education*, 'we stand at an hour when the civilisation that bred us is sick-some fear even to death'⁷²⁰ Nunn further stated that moral judgment was theoretically impossible except on one count: the question whether a given action sponsored individual expressiveness.⁷²¹ Disaffection with traditional certitudes bore

⁷¹⁹ See in particular Edmond Gore A. Holmes, *What Is and What Might Be: A Study of Education in General and Elementary Education in Particular* (London: Constable and Company, 1911).

⁷²⁰ Selleck, *English Primary Education and the Progressives, 1914-1939*, pp. 91-92.

⁷²¹ Nunn, *Education: Its Data and First Principles*, p. 197.

significant consequences for the classroom. A world in which each individual could find freedom and autonomy appealed.

Furthermore, the educational psychologists within the university had two advantages over their intellectual compatriots: they had an institutional centre of operations, and they managed to embrace the core philosophy of the progressives while shedding their offensive rhetoric. Progressive education was diffuse and had many tangents. The Conference of New Ideals in Education offered the most coherent effort: it met from 1915 onwards to coordinate those involved in 'the new education'.⁷²² The Conference explained the 'essentials of the new spirit' as 'reverence for the pupil's individuality and a belief that individuality grows best in an atmosphere of freedom'.⁷²³ The Conference included Froebelians, Montessorians, theosophists, arts and crafts people, Project Method advocates, Play Way devotees, and so on. The educational psychologists, on the other hand, operated within prestigious institutions and controlled prominent journals.

Second, the educational psychologists employed the calm language of science. The broader progressive movement embraced Freud and Bergson, rejected the traditional curriculum and talked about pupils' self-government. They were extreme. For instance, A.S. Neill, founder of the progressive Summerhill School, called home life and religion 'oppressive', did away with time tables and textbooks, spent hours each day counselling pupils about their Freudian neuroses and masturbation, and wrote books with such titles as *The Problem Parent* (1932). 'We set out to make a school in which we should allow children freedom to be themselves. In order to do this we had to renounce all discipline, all direction, all suggestion, all moral training, all religious

⁷²² Selleck, *English Primary Education and the Progressives, 1914-1939*, p. 210.

⁷²³ Ibid., p. 211, from *Report of the Conference of New Ideals in Education*, Stratford-on-Avon, 1915, introduction.

instruction', he wrote in a retrospective (1937).⁷²⁴ Training college students knew about Neill; he was a celebrity and an eccentric who lectured in colleges and whose books were on recommended reading lists.⁷²⁵ Few instructors, though, advocated his approach. The extreme progressives aimed at conversion and took no prisoners. Adrian Wooldridge has written: 'Progressive education was not produced by cool, poised, detached philosophers intent on sifting ideas until they found the few grains of truth. Its theories did not result from the careful piecing together of an intricate argument. They came white-hot, forged on the reformers' anvil.'⁷²⁶ In contrast, although they shared the broader progressive movement's ontological and eschatological thrusts and participated in their organisations,⁷²⁷ educational psychologists seemed cool and rational. Nunn kept the curriculum, but he reframed it according to the same progressive tenets which Neill embraced: the purpose of education was to sponsor the individual's self-development, and a liberal arts education was only legitimate insofar as it helped to foster this journey. The London psychologists attempted to ground their work in scientific experiment which contributed to the legitimization process. Thus, while training college students knew about the educational views of A.S. Neill, Edmond Holmes and H.G. Wells, they studied Nunn, Rusk and Ross.

5.2 Survey of relevant educational currents

During this period the parameters, language and aims of the educational psychologists became normative. Their views were enshrined in the most important journals, across the

⁷²⁴ A. S. Neill, *That Dreadful School* (London: Herbert Jenkins, Ltd., 1937), p. 14. See also A.S. Neill, *The Problem Parent* (London: Herbert Jenkins, Ltd., 1932); A.S. Neill, *The Problem Teacher* (London: Herbert Jenkins Ltd, 1939), Neill, *The Problem Child*.

⁷²⁵ Ua10/6/25, 'Termly Lectures at St Paul's', (1956-1961); Uad394, 'Student Notebooks; Philip J. Howell', (1947-1949).

⁷²⁶ Selleck, *English Primary Education and the Progressives, 1914-1939*, p. 74.

⁷²⁷ Wooldridge, *Measuring the Mind: Education and Psychology in England, C. 1860-C.1990*, p. 207.

curriculum in training colleges, and in government reports. Their narrative about the development of educational psychology was firm and in place.

During this period also emerged an obvious divide between the academic elite's view of education and the general population's views. Educational theory within English universities and training colleges had moved sharply away from confessional or even vaguely religious categories and into a naturalistic world governed by biology and instinct. English educational practice, on the other hand, increased financial support for religious schools and in 1944 created for the first time a statutory obligation for religious instruction. One analyst put it this way: 'The 1944 Act was passed in a far more 'secular' period than the 1902 Act; and yet its provisions, when compared point for point, are more favourable to the religious interest; and it established, for the first time, the legal obligation of every state school in this country to provide a religious education'.⁷²⁸ Charmian Cannon attributed the obligation to a national decline in religion, which, she said, left an atmosphere of 'indifference' and made way for the articulate religionists to forge new favourable legislation.⁷²⁹ Others see it differently. Historian Rob Freathy argued that while Britain experienced a religious slump in the 1910s and 20s, the 1930s witnessed a 're-Christianisation' which was 'indicative of a widespread belief that English social and political traditions, including freedom, justice and democracy, would only endure if national religious traditions, values and morality were supported'.⁷³⁰ Freathy has argued that this re-Christianisation resulted from the churches' offensive moves⁷³¹ and by ecumenical work amongst Christian statesmen and lay leaders. Matthew Grimley, too, has argued that in the 1930s, Anglican leaders and the media alike affirmed the national church as a hedge against the

⁷²⁸ Charmian Cannon, 'The Influence of Religion on Educational Policy, 1902-1944', *British Journal of Educational Studies*, 12/2 (May 1964), 143-60, p. 147.

⁷²⁹ *Ibid.*, p. 160.

⁷³⁰ Freathy, 'Religious Education and Education for Citizenship in English Schools, 1934-44', p. 223.

⁷³¹ *Ibid.*, p. 204.

kind of nationalism seen in Germany.⁷³² Indeed, English church attendance increased through the Second World War and up to 1958.⁷³³ There is some indication that the Board of Education attempted to engage the question of religion in school life. It sponsored conferences on 30 November 1933 and 20 March 1934, 'On the Provisions of Improved Opportunities for Teachers to Equip Themselves for Giving Religious Instruction'. The conferences drew from all sectors of education (LEAs, University Training Departments, confessional training colleges) and asked how to better equip future teachers for 'the very difficult subject' of religious instruction. An ensuing report encouraged University Training Departments to provide more courses in religious education, but there is no evidence that they did so until The Butler Act necessitated it.⁷³⁴

On the contrary, during this period the 'scientific', educational psychology of the University of London Training Department became the dominant theoretical view across educational institutions. At the end of this period, educational practice enshrined religious education as a permanent fixture in English schools. The segregation of 'RE' from educational theory as a whole could itself be seen as indicative of secularisation. However, the persistence of the view, held alike among parliamentarians and the wider population, that education and religious training belonged together, indicated a growing divide between academic and popular thinking on education. The divorce between educational theory and public policy was first noticeable in our third period, but it persists in the present day.

5.3 University Training Departments

The educational paradigms at both London and Oxford Universities veered more sharply towards the psychological during this period. The LDTC (from 1932, the Institute of Education)

⁷³² Grimley, *Citizenship, Community and the Church of England: Liberal Anglican Theories of the State between the Wars* (Oxford Historical Monographs), p. 198.

⁷³³ *Ibid.*, p. 205.

⁷³⁴ A/2/a/3, 'Governing Body Minutes', (1929-1940), 10 July 1934.

not only extended its use of educational psychology during this period but made it the centerpiece of the entire programme. The development of individual personality became the *sine qua non* of the classroom. The research which had reinforced instrumentary education in prior decades now supported the psychological view of education. In 1933, for example, out of 56 acceptable essay topics, one-third centred on psychological development, and Burt, Nunn, Dewey and Adams topped the list of the approved authors.⁷³⁵ Psychological research became expected of staff. For instance, in 1930 the LDTC hired Herbert Russell Hamley, whose degrees in mathematics and natural philosophy had evolved into psychometric research. E.B. Castle, a postgraduate in 1936-7 who himself became a Professor in the Department of Education, wrote that 'Hamley was a psychologist, a statistician and a progressive educationalist without any of the failings often associated with these epithets'⁷³⁶ Furthermore, the requirements for the position of Lecturer and Research Assistant in the 1930s indicated that 'they must have a sound knowledge of general psychology and of the methods and results of experimental education. Preference will be given to applicants who have made a special study of the psychology of personality. Teaching experience will be regarded as a further qualification.'⁷³⁷ Educational psychology courses were constantly oversubscribed.⁷³⁸ Coursework for the M.A. and Ph.D. Degrees in Education in the 1930s covered predominantly 'Experimental Education and Advanced Educational Psychology'.⁷³⁹ The Department of Child Development was inaugurated at the Institute in 1933 by Susan Isaacs and became a primary vehicle through which educational psychology moved into classrooms. This new venture sponsored and disseminated research on

⁷³⁵ *Ie.Mem.A.1.5*, 'Extract Book, 1933-1936', (1933-1936), 'Essays'

⁷³⁶ *Ibid.*, 'Recollections from 1936-7'

⁷³⁷ *Ibid.*, 'Particulars of Post of Lecturer and Researcher Assistant in the Department of Higher Degrees and Research, 1937.'

⁷³⁸ *Ie.Acb.A.2*, 'Staff Meetings/Academic Boards 1909-1939', dates listed above.

⁷³⁹ *Ibid.*, 'Course for M.A. and Ph.D. Degrees in Education, 1936-7.'

child development and Freudian analysis.⁷⁴⁰ Through the Department of Child Development, current teachers and those in training received psychological and educational research, genetic psychology, ‘mental hygiene’, and the ‘technical problem of teaching psychology to students in training colleges’.⁷⁴¹

What did the London students read? The graduate students were steeped in Nunn’s world. ‘Higher Degrees, Principles of Education, 1937’, opened with the words ‘In general, Nunn’s *Education* may be regarded as a general survey or “map” of the whole field. It should be supplemented by other general works.’⁷⁴² Under the section entitled ‘General Development of the Individual’, ‘some knowledge of Freudian psychology is essential, and the quite independent line of research represented by the writers Jean Piaget and Susan Isaacs. Beyond these, students would do best to pick out the references in Nunn, Morrison and others which attract them.’

Dewey’s works appeared in more than one section, as did McDougall’s and Spearman’s work.

There are no records of the general course’s reading material, but it is easy to imagine that, in addition to Nunn’s textbook, the curriculum would have been seasoned by the work and lectures of the other staff. What kind of books did they write, and what kind of theory must have been found in their classrooms?

5.3.1 Cyril Burt

Burt’s probable lecture material emerges from three sources which coincided with his tenure at the LDTC. He intended *Experimental Psychology and Child Study* (1922) for teachers; it summarized recent research into psychology. *The Measurement of Mental Capacities: The*

⁷⁴⁰ le.Mem.A.1.6, ‘Extract Book 1936-1937’, (1936-1937), ‘University of London Institute of Education, Department of Child Development, 1935.’

⁷⁴¹ Ibid.

⁷⁴² Ibid., ‘Higher Degrees, Principles of Education, 1937.’

Henderson Trust Lectures (1927), constituted lectures delivered in the Anatomy Theatre, University of Edinburgh. *How the Mind Works* (1933) issued from BBC lectures given by Burt himself, Ernest Jones (President of the International Psycho-analytic Association and Director of the London Clinic of Psycho-analysis) and Emanuel Miller, MD (Director of the East London Child Guidance Clinic), and others. From these three works, Burt's narrative of psychology, his understanding of human nature and his educational philosophy may be seen.

Burt's narrative of psychology as a discipline reflected the progressive view of Bain and Ribot, that disciplinary maturity depended upon shedding metaphysics and accruing data. This transformation was well-nigh complete. Whereas early psychology had been based upon introspection and 'traditional categories',

With the beginning of the nineteenth century a new move was made. *Psychology, so long a branch of general metaphysics, turned suddenly into a branch of natural science.* Influenced by the methods applied with such success in other spheres, it ceased to be speculative and became empirical [italics mine].⁷⁴³

Although Burt's sense of the chronology was egregiously faulty, this was a means of providing a backdrop to his own approach. He saw his work as of a piece with biology and physics, possessed of the same empirical methodology and accompanied by an attendant certainty. Burt believed that this new, scientific psychology provided the framework within which to understand human nature. When he described the experiments on intelligence for which he was most famous, he went beyond the technical and into the ontological. He adopted McDougall's understanding of the human being as comprised of instinct and experience:

Mr. William McDougall... has set forth a scheme which provides a very promising basis for further investigation into the interaction of individuals in a social group. Basing on the fundamental instincts and their corresponding emotions, and using A.F. Shand's theory of the sentiments, he provides a sort of atomic table which may be used in the building up of binary and ternary compounds which future writers will no doubt so manipulate as to produce a

⁷⁴³ Cyril Burt, *The Measurement of Mental Capacities* (Edinburgh: Oliver and Boyd, 1927), p. 4.

working guide to the class teacher. In the meantime, we have only the rudiments of a science...⁷⁴⁴

Burt accepted that the interplay between instinct, experience, and behaviour had not yet been categorised scientifically, but he had every hope that soon it would be. He explained even religious experience in terms of psychological science.⁷⁴⁵ The new understanding of humans rendered them as amenable to scientific investigation as agriculture or industry, and according to the same methodologies:

Modern civilization is based on science; and it is our belief that, if that civilization is to continue, scientific thinking must be applied to man as well as to inanimate nature. The methods that have revolutionized agriculture, industry, medicine, and war, must be adopted for the study of ourselves – of the individual, the family, the nation, and the race. Already psychology is beginning to affect us at many different points. Its discoveries are being employed by teachers, doctors, and men of business... Educational psychology has improved the means by which we train the child at school; vocational psychology will soon be deciding his future occupation and career...⁷⁴⁶

Burt's faith in the science of psychology was therefore both philosophical (perhaps unbeknownst to him) as well as technical. In this new, technical classroom the teacher 'practises a technique almost as specialized as that of the modern surgeon or physician, and that technique, in turn, rests upon a large body of knowledge almost as specialized as anatomy, physiology, or pathology..... Education [is] an applied science' Burt believed the most urgent educational questions were 'the development and peculiarities of the individual minds to be educated, and the best methods to be adopted in educating them'⁷⁴⁷ These two questions (what is the individual brain, and how do we stimulate it?) resembled the two questions which Alexander Bain thought appropriate for the teacher; what was new in Burt's time was not only the

⁷⁴⁴ Cyril Burt, Ed., *Experimental Psychology and Child Study* (London: Sir Isaac Pitman & Sons, Ltd., 1922), p. 45.

⁷⁴⁵ *Ibid.*, p. 320 and 322. Burt accepted Freudian explanations for religious experience: the convert (typically an adolescent) experiences a similar 'awe' to that which a small child feels for the father. Converts may *think* they are experiencing God, or reasoning through problems and into faith, but in reality, they are responding to urges which are unconscious.

⁷⁴⁶ Cyril Burt, Editor, *How the Mind Works* (London: George Allen & Unwin, 1933), pp. 7-8.

⁷⁴⁷ *Ibid.*, p. 2.

availability of data which now made Bain's goals seem attainable, but the less mechanistic psychology which made content highly fluid. For Burt, psychology, human nature and education all became amenable to scientific diagnosis and prescription, while the end product was unpredictable because it was individualized. Instrumentary education was therefore of less import than individual development.

5.3.2 Susan Isaacs

Of Susan Isaacs (nee Brierley), Adrian Wooldridge wrote, 'she did more than any other English psychologist to popularize the work of Jean Piaget, Sigmund Freud, and Melanie Klein'.⁷⁴⁸ Isaacs was respected because, more than any of the others we have surveyed, she was 'on the ground'. As the Director of the progressive Malting House School near Cambridge, 1924-1927, she had had occasion to study children *in situ*, and her work consequently possessed enormous credibility. A survey of five books published in the 1920s and 1930s – *An Introduction to Psychology* (1921), *Intellectual Growth in Young Children* (1930), *The Children We Teach* (1932), *Social Development in Young Children* (1933), and *The Psychological Aspect of Child Development* (1935), henceforth referred to by their dates of publication – indicated that her intellectual resources, her scientific posture, her educational posture, and her moral posture, sponsored the new psychological paradigm.

To begin with, Isaacs' intellectual loves were clearly McDougall, Nunn and Freud. In 1921 she quoted McDougall extensively, adverting to his 'biological outlook', his notions of instinct and of 'purposive activity', his scientific starting-point ('observation'), and his belief in

⁷⁴⁸ Wooldridge, *Measuring the Mind: Education and Psychology in England, C. 1860-C.1990*, p. 12.

‘dynamic processes of life’.⁷⁴⁹ Percy Nunn, too, played a prominent role, from the Preface in which he received explicit acknowledgement to his copious references throughout the text itself.⁷⁵⁰ Isaacs commended Freud’s writings in her ‘suggestions for further reading’, and as time went on, Freud’s psycho-analytic framework sounded the long, strong note of her work. Her own personal work, she stated, ‘has served only to increase my deep admiration and gratitude for the genius of Freud, in being able to penetrate so deeply and so surely to the actual mind of the little child’.⁷⁵¹ An outline of her book of 1933 showed the ‘deeper sources of love and hate’ as sexual in nature: ‘oral erotism and sadism; anal and urethral interests and aggression; exhibitionism (direct and verbal); sexual curiosity; sexual play and aggression; masturbation, castration fears, threats and symbolism; family play and ideas about babies and marriage; cosy places’ were the headlines in this most important section of the book.⁷⁵² Psycho-analysis alone could unlock the powerful unconscious wishes which were invariably sexual in nature.⁷⁵³ Isaacs summarized in 1935: ‘the psycho-analytic technique alone enables us to understand those unconscious mental processes which control the conscious flow of mental life with the child, as with the adult’⁷⁵⁴ Even ‘engines and motors and fires and lights and water and mud and animals’ derived from erotic roots.⁷⁵⁵ The most important human fact was therefore neither spiritual nor rational but psychological, and it could be accessed only through Freudian methodologies.

⁷⁴⁹ Susan S. Brierley, *An Introduction to Psychology* (London: Methuen & Co., Ltd., 1921), pp. 4-8. Also see pages 110-125.

⁷⁵⁰ *Ibid.*, p. v., and referred to on p. 44.

⁷⁵¹ Isaacs, *Social Development in Young Children: A Study of Beginnings*, p. xi.

⁷⁵² *Ibid.*, p. 25.

⁷⁵³ *Ibid.*, p. 283. ‘Psycho-analysis has revealed an intimate nexus of genetic connections between the sorts of facts which are included here, and through these we are able to arrive at a general understanding not otherwise available of the total development of the child...’

⁷⁵⁴ Susan Isaacs, *The Psychological Aspects of Child Development* (London: University of London Institute of Education and Evans Brothers, 1935), p. 10.

⁷⁵⁵ Isaacs, *Social Development in Young Children: A Study of Beginnings*, p. 210.

Isaacs considered her vocation scientific, not metaphysical. She shared Burt's narrative of psychology's development, but opined that psychology had been only recently wrested from ethereal concerns and was 'still too intimately connected with philosophical theories' This was understandable, because

All sciences lie under the shadow of metaphysics in their infancy; they only succeed in establishing and developing themselves as they break away from its influence, becoming concrete and experimental. Psychology is the youngest member of the family to assert its independence...⁷⁵⁶

Isaacs saw herself as an activist, moving her discipline away from metaphysics and towards hard data, asserting that one 'has to measure to be scientific': 'the work of science proper may only begin when we can begin measuring,'⁷⁵⁷

Isaacs' educational posture recognized a distinction between psycho-analyst and teacher. The teacher needed the psychologist, whose 'much wider view of the child' enabled him to guide the teacher and whose skills included determining which psychological knowledge a teacher needed.⁷⁵⁸ The teacher need not understand everything about the 'unconscious sexual reasons' for the child's interests:

As an educator, she has no concern with the deep symbolism of the child's everyday activities. What she needs is to understand the normal conscious movement of the child's mind, as expressed in interests and activities and conscious pleasure or fears.⁷⁵⁹

In fact, wrote Isaacs, psycho-analysis could be 'very disturbing emotionally', and only mature teachers, not teachers-in-training, should be exposed deeply to its doctrines.⁷⁶⁰ Echoing Nunn, Burt and Adams, Isaacs claimed that education aimed to provide experiences for children which

⁷⁵⁶ Brierley, *An Introduction to Psychology*, pp. 1-2.

⁷⁵⁷ Susan Isaacs, *Intellectual Growth in Young Children* (London: George Routledge and Sons, Ltd., 1930), p. 6.

⁷⁵⁸ Susan Isaacs, *The Children We Teach: Seven to Eleven Years* (London: University of London Press, 1932), pp. 12-15.

⁷⁵⁹ Isaacs, *Social Development in Young Children: A Study of Beginnings*, p. 411.

⁷⁶⁰ *Ibid.*, p. 415.

suiting their interests and made the world interesting to them.⁷⁶¹ Education should respond only to the children's requests; Isaacs 'took [the] cue from the children. When we wanted to introduce new pursuits, this was usually because the children had put out a query in that direction.'⁷⁶² Isaacs had moved decisively away from instrumentary education. The point was not to get across particular content but rather to use content to stimulate children's individual development.⁷⁶³

In terms of moral formation, Isaacs took a sharp turn away from the Herbartian world of characterological certitude.⁷⁶⁴ A teacher must create a stable backdrop for the child's development but must not interfere with the child's own powers of assessment, she felt. Indeed, Isaacs said, the staff at Malting House School 'never even asserted our opinions when asked'⁷⁶⁵ An educator must be passive with respect to morality. He should not, for example, 'introduce a moral element into the teaching of art, as by over-valuing neatness, accuracy, or formal virtues'⁷⁶⁶ Indeed, in the most important portion of education, that of enabling a child's creative urges, the teacher must be 'passive and merely supporting'. He must concentrate exclusively upon 'maintaining the stable framework of ordered routine and in the control of aggressive, destructive impulses in their crude form'.⁷⁶⁷ Educators must not attempt to influence a child's personality or behaviour, which could not be done at any rate:

The psycho-analytical study of young children, and especially of the early phantasies and anxieties, thus altogether reemphasizes the importance of respecting the child's individuality...the personality of the child...rests in the last resort upon the flux of forces within his own mind, which it is beyond our power to affect and control by any deliberate act.⁷⁶⁸

⁷⁶¹ Isaacs, *Intellectual Growth in Young Childre*, pp. 21-22.

⁷⁶² *Ibid.*, p. 35.

⁷⁶³ *Ibid.*, p. 17.

⁷⁶⁴ *Ibid.*, p. 40.

⁷⁶⁵ *Ibid.*, p. 39.

⁷⁶⁶ Isaacs, *Social Development in Young Children: A Study of Beginning*, p. 426.

⁷⁶⁷ *Ibid.*

⁷⁶⁸ *Ibid.*

In these words may be seen the most compelling difference between the world of Susan Isaacs and that of John Gill, or even between Isaacs' world and that of the Moral Instruction League. Isaacs would have rejected both. The role of the educator, she held, was not to teach anything specific but rather to allow the child to find his or her own way within a safe psychological environment.

Despite putatively rejecting metaphysics, Isaacs' work was highly charged morally. The psycho-analytic stance necessitated bringing up children in a particular way, avoiding particular complexes, and viewing individuality in certain terms. Furthermore, in eschewing questions about meaning and purpose in the classroom, Isaacs was nevertheless teaching the children something: she was teaching children that their nature did not require moral questioning, and she was teaching them that they stood alone as individuals whose lives did not need to be lived in reference to long-standing philosophical or religious thought or communities.

5.3.3 Influence on other institutions

In its capacity as the leader of the Training Colleges Delegacy, the LDTC co-ordinated all the London syllabuses and the certification examinations. The colleges grouped into six.⁷⁶⁹ Despite the striking variations amongst the college atmospheres, their syllabuses were remarkably concordant: all aimed towards individual development. All adverted to the 'mental endowment of children' and 'individual differences'; four mentioned Instinct at least once; they

⁷⁶⁹ At University College clustered Borough Road, St Mark's and St John's, St Mary's, and Westminster (Group 1); at King's College, Furzedown, Stockwell and Whitelands (Group 2). Group 3 consisted of the Kings College of Household and Social Science, and four cookery and household colleges belonged there. Group 4 based itself at Bedford College and included St Charles, St Gabriel's and St Katherine; Group 5 was just the LSE and Avery Hill College. Group 6, hosted by Birkbeck College, consisted of additionally Gipsy Hill, Graystoke Place, and Southlands.

stressed child development, not innate abilities, and psychological health, not academic attainment. Even the syllabus at the Anglican King's College considered education from a naturalistic viewpoint. The group which cohered around the London School of Economics seems to have been lifted directly out of Nunn's *Education*: its syllabus opened with the words, 'The Aim of Education: from Native Individuality to Integrated Personality' The outline was replete with such terms as 'instinct', '*horme*', 'suggestion', 'complexes', and 'repression'⁷⁷⁰

Of course, the Roman Catholic, Wesleyan and Church of England colleges signed on for these syllabuses, and there was variation in their interpretations of the psychological paradigm. Westminster College assimilated the world of Percy Nunn; St Mary's nuanced it. But all the students in these training colleges were expected to acknowledge the psychological model of education.

London also influenced geographically-dispersed training colleges by its textbooks and the peripatetic nature of its prominent staff. A look at the Annual Reports, only in existence following its official transfer to the University in 1932, reveals the intellectual energy of all the staff members. In 1933, for instance, Professor H.R. Hamley published in trade journals, reviewed books, lectured to the Durham Branch of the N.U.T. on 'Dull and Backward Children', spoke at the Mathematical Association, delivered a course of lectures at Hendon on 'Religious Education', and spoke at the Cambridge Education Society. At the same time James Fairgrieve, in charge of Geography and the Colonial Department, lectured to the British Association, moderated the Central Welsh Board and University of London School Exams, acted as Vice President of the Royal Meteorological Society and Vice President of the Royal Geographical Association, and was President-elect of that same body.⁷⁷¹ Susan Isaacs also travelled

⁷⁷⁰ Ulie.2.130, 'Training Colleges Delegacy Regulations for the Examination for the Teacher's Certificate', (1930).

⁷⁷¹ Ie.Ar.p.7.1.5.5, 'Annual Reports, 1933-1947', (1933-1947), Annual Report for 1933-1934.

extensively that year. Having published *Social Development in Young Children* and numerous articles in the popular press, she delivered six lectures on 'Intellectual Growth in Young Children' for LCC teachers, sixteen lectures on 'The Psychology of the Child under Seven', for University College, delivered an autumn seminar on research with infants, eight lectures on 'The Contribution of Psycho-Analysis to Anthropology' at the Institute of Psycho-Analysis, two lectures on children's fantasies at the same place, four lectures on 'the psychology of early childhood' for the Board of Education's summer school, lectures for the London Society for the Blind, the Froebel Training College, the New Education Fellowship, the Workers' Education Association, and the Nursery School Association. She also broadcast two series of talks for the BBC.⁷⁷²

In 1934 Hamley wrote and lectured frequently and widely, was a member of the Editorial Committee of the *British Journal of Educational Psychology*, belonged to the International Examinations Inquiry, chaired the Education Section of the British Psychological Society, was an Executive of the Child Guidance Council, and moderated examinations for Manchester University. Susan Isaacs was as active as before, Mr. Lauwerys edited numerous reviews and published a book on *Education and Biology*, and Mr. W.B. Mumford toured Africa and delivered BBC lectures.⁷⁷³ In 1935 Hamley and a colleague consulted with the Wiltshire County Education Committee 'in keeping cumulative records of the abilities and emotional qualities of school children'.⁷⁷⁴ In 1937-1938 Hamley lectured all around Europe and became Chairman of the Mathematical Association (London); he served as a member of the Editorial Committee on Educational Abstracts (United States), of the Faversham Committee on Mental Hygiene, and as

⁷⁷² *Ibid.*

⁷⁷³ *Ibid.*, 1934-1935.

⁷⁷⁴ *Ic.Acb.A.2*, 'Staff Meetings/Academic Boards 1909-1939', Note on June 27, 1935.

Moderator in Education Diplomas at Nottingham and Edinburgh Universities. Susan Isaacs' honours and activities occupied an entire printed page.⁷⁷⁵

The highly-mobile nature of London's educational psychologists ensured that intellectual proximity to London was not dictated by geography. The lecture notes of Henry Saxton, a student at Chester Day Training College, indicate that educational philosophy at Chester relied upon McDougall and Freud quite explicitly with references to psycho-analysis, inferiority complexes, dream material, and the power of the subconscious mind. The teacher's job was to prevent complexes from developing. The instructor encouraged teachers to focus on suggestion because the rational, conscious parts of the mind simply could not absorb enough information, but the subconscious had no such limitations and should therefore be harnessed by the teacher for educational use.⁷⁷⁶

During the third period, then, the LDTC continued to develop educational psychology until the discipline held a near-monopoly on academic educational discourse. In this task it was served by its high-powered staff which researched, wrote, and travelled widely to disseminate a particular disciplinary narrative, human ontology, and correlative philosophy of education.

5.3.4 Oxford University Training Department (after 1936, the Department of Education)

The few extant internal examinations and notices indicate that Oxford attended to the language, framework, and concerns of individuality and personal development. An examination paper from 1921 referred at every turn to the agenda set by psychological laboratories and the theoretical work of McDougall. The examination also placed importance upon the historical development of contemporary education.⁷⁷⁷ In 1933 Diploma students had to understand 'the

⁷⁷⁵ *Ie.Ar.p.7.1.5.5, 'Annual Reports, 1933-1947', 1937-1938.*

⁷⁷⁶ *Uad406, 'Student Notebooks, Henry Saxton, Chester College', (1944).*

⁷⁷⁷ *Ed3/47, 'Examination in the Theory, History, and Practice of Education', (1921).*

development of the individual and the social aspects of education' within the psychological framework elucidated by McDougall and Nunn. Students again needed a thoroughgoing knowledge of educational theories from the Renaissance to the present.⁷⁷⁸ Again, it seems, Oxford held together both a recognition of history (and by extension, of other subjects' historical value), and a preference for the progressive framing of these histories. In 1945 the Curriculum Committee required final examinations to reflect 'psychology and its educational implications – with special reference to childhood and adolescence' in addition to queries about educational organisation and history.⁷⁷⁹ Certainly Oxford persisted in requiring exacting historical information from its students, which indicates a somewhat broader interest than that of the London school. However, the general framing of Oxford's educational theory mirrored the concerns at the LDTC. Religious or even intellectual sanctions were absent, and the concerns of individual development and psychological health predominated.

5.4 Nonconformist Training Colleges

In the Wesleyan and Nonconformist training colleges, the psychological nurture of the child emerged as the *telos* of the classroom during this period. The archives attest to this in numerous ways, but none more so than in the famous textbooks written by Masters of Method there.

5.4.1 Westminster

Educational theory at Westminster was led in this period by James Scriven Ross, who was appointed as tutor (1921), then as Master of Method (1930), and then as Principal (1940). Ross had received his Master's in Education at the University of London, having studied under

⁷⁷⁸ Ed1/4/4, 'Minutes of the Delegacy for the Training of Secondary Teachers', 5 May 1933.

⁷⁷⁹ Ed1/4/5, 'Minutes of the Delegacy for the Training of Secondary Teachers', 23 October 1945.

Adams and Nunn. By virtue of Ross's training and leadership at Westminster, the College's graduates became immersed in the tenets and practice of educational psychology.⁷⁸⁰ Ross wrote numerous textbooks for teachers throughout the 1930s and 1940s, but the most renowned, read, studied, and examined was *Groundwork of Educational Psychology*, first published in 1931 and reprinted in 1931, 1932, 1933, 1935, 1936, 1938, 1940, 1941, 1942, 1944, 1945, 1946, 1947 twice, and, finally, 1948, with no appreciable changes. The continuity with McDougall's psychological work was nearly seamless, the only difference being a hefty injection of Freud; Ross concurred in precise fashion with the narrative, ontologies, and educational understanding of Nunn. As Ross made clear, he wanted to found his educational theories upon psychology, which he felt provided the clearest account of human nature: 'I have sought to give students of education a workable knowledge of human nature on which to base their craft, and I have found that the doctrine most useful to them and to myself is that based on the teaching of Sir John Adams, Sir T. Percy Nunn, Dr. William McDougall, and Dr. James Drever'. In fact, 'what I owe to the above-named thinkers will be apparent on every page of the book'.⁷⁸¹ Indeed, Ross's indebtedness is evident in the very index: McDougall appeared on fifty-nine pages, Nunn on thirty-five; the Oedipus complex was mentioned twice but 'religion' only once, and that in reference to adolescents' tendency towards conversion experiences; Henri Bergson appeared four times but John Gill not once. At each chapter's end, Ross suggested future reading, which adverted at every turn to McDougall and Nunn and also to Freud, Jung, 'and other psychoanalysts' This textbook is immensely important, not only because it illuminates for us the

⁷⁸⁰ Pritchard, *The Story of Westminster College, 1851-1951*, p. 160.

⁷⁸¹ James S. Ross, *Groundwork of Educational Psychology* (London: George G. Harrap and Co., Ltd., 1931), p. 5.

intellectual atmosphere at Westminster College, but because it was used as a core text in other training colleges. It was, for instance, required reading at Cheltenham in the 1930s and 1940s.⁷⁸²

Ross began with the narrative of psychology the discipline. His survey began with faculty psychology, which, according to Ross, was inadequate because it depended upon introspection and 'nebulous metaphysical speculations'.⁷⁸³ When this failed, psychologists attempted another unscientific project, Child Study which proved futile because the parents and teachers who amassed the data 'lacked scientific training'.⁷⁸⁴ Finally, he wrote,

With the advent of the twentieth century there has come into being an ever-growing body of psychological knowledge which gives every promise of providing a background of fundamental principles in education. The psychologist of today is taking a less philosophical, more practical view of his subject, and a sure, if gradual, reorientation has taken place...⁷⁸⁵

This latest re-orientation had to do with a post-Freudian understanding of consciousness, unconsciousness, and instinct. Ross's historical account omitted earlier models of psychological understanding which would have included Biblical ontologies. Later in the textbook he explicitly dismissed one aspect of Biblical metaphysics out-of-hand:

Before the days of the 'new' psychology it was usual to attribute adolescent misdemeanours to an overdose of original sin. Now, however, our understanding of empathetic conflict helps us to be more sympathetic and helpful. It is generally agreed that delinquency is due to a failure in adjustment. The individual reverts to the moral standards of early childhood, and his repressive instinctive urges are side-tracked...⁷⁸⁶

Ross, then, described the march of psychological thought as a progressive one, from archaic Biblical notions, to outmoded introspection, to group study, to the now-cutting-edge world of unconscious drives and instincts. He provided vernacular descriptions of

⁷⁸² Uad402, 'Student Notebooks, Gwendolyn C. Reeves', (1938-1940); Uad394, 'Student Notebooks; Philip J. Howell'.

⁷⁸³ Ross, *Groundwork of Educational Psychology*, p. 10.

⁷⁸⁴ *Ibid.*, p. 13.

⁷⁸⁵ *Ibid.*

⁷⁸⁶ *Ibid.*, p.164.

instincts and emotions, suggestion, child development, complexes, *mneme*, and group mind. When it came to prescribing educational ideals, Ross believed that psychology provided the necessary data about human nature which a teacher needed to know.⁷⁸⁷

Understanding his own complexes and instincts enabled the teacher to respond to the child's. Understanding suggestion permitted subtle influence in the classroom.⁷⁸⁸

Ross's ontology was steeped in McDougall and Freud. He spoke of the human person as possessed by subterranean drives which could be named but of which human actors were not always cognizant. As such, feeling and emotion were far more important than intellect:

There can be no doubt that the somewhat meagre results achieved during the first half-century of popular education are due to an overemphasis on the intellectual side of the mind and a corresponding neglect of the emotions. In the modern psychology of education, however, the emotions occupy a prominent place...⁷⁸⁹

The teacher must solicit the individual's emotional response to material, not an intellectual response. This emphasis indicated not that the intellectual component of the classroom had become irrelevant, but that its import had been surpassed by the psychological component. To be more specific, Ross believed (like Nunn) that education aimed at the development of individuality which it was the teacher's primary objective to foster. Unlike the more extreme progressives, Ross objected to chaotic classrooms on psychological grounds, because 'Psychology [says]...that order is in accordance with child-nature; kids prefer order'⁷⁹⁰ In this, he mirrored Isaacs. Like Isaacs, Ross thought that the teacher must provide for play within order. 'The whole of education should be conducted in the spirit of play. Such a doctrine will not lead to soft pedagogics, but to hard and strenuous, albeit joyful, spontaneous, and expressive

⁷⁸⁷ *Ibid.*, p. 16. 'The actual or prospective teacher will expect psychology... to shed light on the nature of those two persons in the bipolar process of education, himself and the educand. He will rightly hope that, since his task is to influence others, his study of psychology will enable him to understand himself.'

⁷⁸⁸ *Ibid.*, p. 17.

⁷⁸⁹ *Ibid.*, p. 71.

⁷⁹⁰ *Ibid.*, p. 100.

action.⁷⁹¹ Ross's talk about 'self-government' and 'play' and 'developing individuality', notwithstanding, his teacher was directive. The teacher had to 'sublimate and redirect instinctive energy',⁷⁹² 'foster the growth of worthy sentiments by being himself an exemplar of the desired qualities',⁷⁹³ and 'cultivate a group-mind in our educational institutions'.⁷⁹⁴ Rather than leading children directly, the wise teacher enlisted the class leaders in his agenda.⁷⁹⁵ In effect, the teacher should exert an indirect pressure on the classroom towards a certain morality and certain commitments. Thus we find in Ross a desire for individual development unencumbered by older notions of morality, and a simultaneous expectation that the teacher might urge his or her own particular vision onto the students. In this respect, Ross differed from Isaacs, who eschewed any overt attempt to model particular behaviour or to enjoin particular commitments.

In summary, then, as Master of Method and then as Principal, Ross imported into Westminster the legacy of his own teachers: a psychological explanation of the human person, an individually-orientated goal of education, and a protocol for the classroom which cohered with his anthropology. This project obviously differed in kind from the education enjoined by Gill or Stow. It also differed in kind from that sought by Cowham, whose focus had been on imparting important information to the pupils. Instead, Ross's focus was on fostering the pupils' personalities.

Westminster's syllabuses from the 1930s and 1940s bore Ross's imprint. The 1937 entitled 'General Course in the Principles of Teaching', attached as APPENDIX C, combined

⁷⁹¹ Ibid., p. 112.

⁷⁹² Ibid., p. 107.

⁷⁹³ Ibid., p. 131-132.

⁷⁹⁴ Ibid., p. 258.

⁷⁹⁵ Ibid.

broad principles from Ross's *Groundwork* with practical suggestions for classroom management.⁷⁹⁶ A syllabus from the mid-1940s mirrored Ross's book almost exactly.⁷⁹⁷

5.4.2 Borough Road and Stockwell Colleges

There is scanty evidence about educational theory at either College between the 1890s and the late 1920s; it is possible that these records were lost in the fire which consumed the BFSS itself. When the records recommenced in the late 1920s a pronounced shift in favour of the psychological model of education had occurred, which was manifested in research reports, in textbooks written and used at both institutions, in special lectures, and in the staff's composition.

At Stockwell the Principal's Reports demonstrated a consistent interest in eugenics, in intelligence testing, in sociology and in psychology, as these pursuits became core resources for teachers. Every month, the Principal's standard report to the BFSS listed a 'special lecture' section which signalled what the principal deemed especially important to the College's well-being and status. Between 1928 and 1944 the most regular visitors to campus were lecturers in 'Eugenics and Social Hygiene', the influence of anthropometric tests increased, and child guidance began to play a stronger role in education. What was deemed important at Stockwell had changed profoundly from the Biblically-oriented years. Lecturers on eugenics visited the College in March 1928, December 1928, February 1930, March 1930, May 1931, March and April 1932, June 1932, March and April 1934, May 1934, May 1935, May 1936 (three lectures that month), January 1937 and February, March and April 1938.⁷⁹⁸ The Principal's Annual

⁷⁹⁶ G/1/a/1, 'Westminster College and London University Syllabuses', (1937-1959).

⁷⁹⁷ Ibid.

⁷⁹⁸ Sc627, 'The Principal's Report', (1927-1940), Principal's Reports from March 1928, December 1928, February 1930, March 1930, May 1931, March and April 1932, June 1932, March and April 1934, May 1934, May 1935, May 1936, January 1937 and February, March, April 1938.

Reports highlighted the eugenics series.⁷⁹⁹ The College compensated the lecturers; they were not volunteers.⁸⁰⁰ Lectures on psychology and testing abounded. In February 1932 there were four lectures on Child Guidance; in May 1932 lectures on psychological tests; in June 1932 the students visited a guidance clinic; in November 1933 students attended Cyril Burt's series of lectures on psychology.⁸⁰¹ The Principal's Report of 1933/34 emphasized that 'the course of lectures on Psychology, given by Professor Burt, which many of [the students] attended, was very valuable'.⁸⁰² At the same time, the Principal called religious education 'a subject admittedly difficult to teach' and encouraged the students to avail themselves of the King's College Divinity lectures.⁸⁰³ The abundance of psychological lectures, juxtaposed with the Principal's comment that religious education was 'difficult to teach', signified that the framework of educational theory had changed, from one in which the vocabulary and discourse of theology was normal, to one in which it required outside intervention. At the same time, the language and work of psychology had become more prominent.⁸⁰⁴ The Student Christian Movement held lectures, too, but the Principal did not highlight them in his reports.⁸⁰⁵ While there was nothing perhaps unusual in an educational institution's examining current or noteworthy ideas and movements, the emphasis upon psychological categories was overwhelming and unexamined and coupled with a corresponding unease about religious education.

⁷⁹⁹ Ibid., Annual Reports of 1933/34 and 1934/35.

⁸⁰⁰ Ibid., January 1937.

⁸⁰¹ Ibid., Principal's Reports from February 1932, May 1932, June 1932, November 1933.

⁸⁰² Ibid., Annual Reports of 1933/34.

⁸⁰³ Ibid.

⁸⁰⁴ Ibid., Annual Report of 1934/5. In fact, the Annual Report of 1934/35 indicated that, after having attended multiple lectures under the auspices of the 'Central Association for Mental Welfare and the National Institute of Industrial Psychology,' Stockwell students submitted to vocational tests, apparently for a second time

⁸⁰⁵ *Stockwell College Old Students' Association, 1892-199*, Annual Report of 1942/43. In contrast, the Report from 1942/43 showed the introduction of a course on sociology. The special lectures emphasized psychological diagnoses and institutions of progressive learning. They were entitled: 'Homes for Difficult Children', 'The Senior School', 'Psycho-analysis', 'Delinquency', 'Story Telling', and 'West Hill School' (a progressive institution).

Borough Road experienced similar changes, as demonstrated in the writings of its leaders and in official insights such as that offered by the Board of Education regarding Borough Road in 1925:

As a rule, preference was shown by the students for questions dealing directly with psychology. While there was a satisfactory absence of unnecessary technicalities or jargon, there was a tendency (a) to reproduce *in extenso* notes or text book information – eg on Imitation or the different theories of the Play Instinct – where a passing reference would have sufficed; (b) to limit the answers to a statement of psychological principles without the practical application.⁸⁰⁶

Borough Road students, in other words, were well-versed in McDougall's outlook. The commentary also pointed out that 'all degrees of repression are not equally dangerous, nor were all the schools of ten or fifteen years ago the purgatories which the (perhaps pardonable) exaggeration of the students would suggest'.⁸⁰⁷ These comments suggest that the students had adopted the anti-Victorian narrative used by Burt, Nunn, and Isaacs, and used their categories, albeit clumsily. The commentary also suggests that at least one Board reviewer held a more moderated view of Victorian education than that which had filtered to the students. The Board's comments on the exams of the following year (1928) indicated the some of the same awkwardness but the same general framework:

In question 12, 'Instinct' and Temperament' were the favourite topics, and the answers were inclined to be stereotyped...there was among many the pardonable tendency to see in certain matters – individual work, the team-system, the cinematograph, their knowledge of instincts and temperaments – a panacea for all the ills of education, yet evidence was abundant that the students had benefited in no small measure from what appears to have been an efficiently conducted course.⁸⁰⁸

According to the Board, then, Borough Road students were uncritical but well-versed in the most important educational terms of the day. The most important source of information about

⁸⁰⁶ Br559, 'Principal Attenborough's Correspondence and Papers', (1925-1931), Final Examination, 1927.

⁸⁰⁷ Ibid.

⁸⁰⁸ Ibid., Final Examination 1928.

Borough Road educational philosophy, however, came not from the Board but from three important figures in the College: Principal Hamilton (1932-1961), and Masters of Method Panton and Hughes.

E.R. Hamilton was selected as Borough Road's Principal after an entire year's search. Two distinguished members of the University of London (G.B. Jeffery and G.B. Butler) served on the search committee, as did P.B. Ballard, who became the chairman of the committee during this period. Naturally, they selected an educationalist whose interests and focus mirrored their own. Hamilton's published and non-published writing across his lifetime indicate that he fitted completely into the mould of a London educational psychologist and should be considered part of their circle. His early career was marked by an attention to statistical educational enquiries, intelligence tests, and psychology.⁸⁰⁹ The books he had published at that time included *The Art of Interrogation: Studies in the Principles of Mental Tests and Examinations* (1929) which contained an introduction by C. Spearman, another London psychologist. A précis of the book noted that 'its first aim is to make a serious donation to exact science, to clear up much that has been nebulous even in the writings of the leading authorities, and to disentangle much that is now unprogressively uncontroversial'⁸¹⁰ Hamilton had also published *The Grammar of Mental Testing; The Dependence Upon General Ability of Correlations between Specific Abilities; Intelligence and Testing; and The Psychology of Mathematics*.⁸¹¹

⁸⁰⁹ Br561, 'Principal Hamilton Papers, Personal Correspondence', (1932-1961). List of publications for an unknown purpose. A roster of his pre-Borough Road publications included 'Mathematical Ability – A Plea for Research,' *Mathematical Gazette*, October 1923; 'Judgment and Measurement in Education,' *Educational Times*, November 1923; 'What is Meant by Mechanical Arithmetic?' *Schoolmaster*, November 1923; 'On Educational Enquiry,' *Teacher's World*, September 1924. 'Notes on the Interpretation of Correlation Measures,' *Forum of Education*, November 1924; 'The Judgment of Quality in Handwriting,' *Educational Research*, December 1924; 'Insight and Skill in Arithmetic,' *Journal of Educational Research*, September 1925; Arithmetic and Intelligence,' *Journal of Educational Research*, February 1926; 'The Interpretation of Mental Tests,' *Psyche*, January 1929.

⁸¹⁰ *Ibid.*, Advertising slip form Kegan Paul.

⁸¹¹ *Ibid.*, List of publications for an unknown purpose.

Throughout his life, Hamilton enjoyed friendships with the top tier of educational researchers. Percy Nunn wrote him a personal letter of congratulations upon the 1932 appointment.⁸¹² P.B. Ballard was his close friend and served as committee chair for Hamilton's early tenure. When Hamilton unsuccessfully sought another post in 1939, Ballard wrote in a recommendation, 'I have much pleasure in certifying to the sterling character of Mr. Hamilton, and in strongly supporting his application...His attitude towards education is scientific. Not only has he a sound knowledge of the methods and results of research in psychology and education, but he has himself made noteworthy contributions to the literature of his profession.'⁸¹³ Hamilton spoke at Ballard's funeral in 1950 and said Ballard was an artist in paint, words, and thought, but 'above all, he was an artist in friendship'.⁸¹⁴ Because of the College's proximity to and relationship with the University of London, and because of the affinity between Hamilton and the University's educational leaders, Nunn and Ballard visited the College frequently.⁸¹⁵ This social fact illustrates again the highly-networked quality of the London psychologists.

There was no conflict between earlier staffers and the 'new psychology' represented by Hamilton. Indeed, the Master of Method, J.H. Panton, described his course to Hamilton as already consonant with Nunn's work and drawing heavily upon *Education* itself.⁸¹⁶ Borough Road students therefore had been introduced to a psychological framing of education before Hamilton arrived, and his leadership embodied this view and reinforced it.

Hamilton left behind volumes of hand-written lectures between 1932 and 1954. In 'General Principles of Education' (1932), he wrote that any theory of education must concern itself with 'the whole process of human evolution. Evidently all sciences that contribute to the

⁸¹² Ibid., Letter from Percy Nunn, 29 December 1931.

⁸¹³ Ibid., Letter from P.B. Ballard, 20 September 1939.

⁸¹⁴ Br571, 'Principal Sessional Reports', (1927-1961), Eulogy on P.B. Ballard, 1950 (undated).

⁸¹⁵ Ibid., Sessional Reports, September 1927, February 1928, May 1929, November 1932, December 1939.

⁸¹⁶ Br561, 'Principal Hamilton Papers, Personal Correspondence', Letter from Panton, 10 February 1932.

study of man are data of educational theory.⁸¹⁷ Those core sciences were sociology and psychology.⁸¹⁸ It was not curious that a man of his time would include sociology and psychology, but it was curious that a man of his position would exclude philosophy and theology as sources for understanding human beings and how to educate them. In fact, he explicitly rejected a theological view. In a lecture entitled 'The Search for a Philosophy' (1949) Hamilton proceeded to say that while human behaviour suggested purpose, this purpose must remain indeterminate. It certainly could not be found in 'the will of God': 'If our critic refers us to the Bible, or some other book accepted as divinely inspired, we shall reply that all writings were written by men, and that only through men can God's will be known'.⁸¹⁹ At the end of the day, only the social sciences could help us discern the meaning behind human life. Borough Road's preference for psychology showed no signs of slowing down: by 1951, newly-enrolled students were sent a list of summer readings which included two books by J.S. Ross and Knight & Knight's *Modern Introduction to Psychology*.⁸²⁰ Once on campus, they were asked to perform personality tests on fellow students, but there was no corresponding work on various approaches to religious life.⁸²¹

There were two other men who shaped Borough Road's philosophy of education in the inter-war period: A.G. Hughes and J.H. Panton. Both of these men arrived at Borough Road in the late 1920s, and both published textbooks for college students.⁸²² Hughes had served as a

⁸¹⁷ Br560, 'Principal Hamilton Papers, Articles and Notes on Education', (1932-1961), 'General Principles of Education,' 1932/33.

⁸¹⁸ Ibid.

⁸¹⁹ Ibid., 'The Search for a Philosophy,' 1949.

⁸²⁰ Ibid., 'Borough Road College, Isleworth, Pre-College Study: Advice to Accepted Candidates for Admission,' November, 1951.

⁸²¹ Ibid., personality tests.

⁸²² Bartle, *A History of Borough Road Colleg*, p. 72.

London inspector of schools and lectured at the City of Leeds Training College.⁸²³ ‘Hughes & Hughes’ became a reference book for many colleges, including Cheltenham, Chester and Westminster. What did Hughes think about the nature of the child, the purpose of the classroom, and the role of the teacher? So similarly did Hughes’ book read to that of Ross, Sturt and Oakden, Thomson, McDougall, Nunn and Isaacs, that it would be redundant to repeat specifics. The child was a biological product driven largely by instinct (McDougall, Nunn); repression was real and should be avoided (Isaacs); quantifiable research was an important part of understanding differences in ability and personality (Thomson); structure and freedom were both important (Ross). There were, of course, subtle points of difference between each of these authors, but their cast of mind was more similar than distinctive. Hughes acknowledged these debts in the preface and in the reading lists.⁸²⁴ Nunn, Sturt, Ross, Rusk, Thomson, Cattell, Raymont, McDougall, Hall and Ballard were recommended readings. Each chapter provided homework for students, such as ‘Make a list of the instinctive tendencies described in this chapter. Watch a nursery class...noting as many examples as you can of the working of each instinct. Repeat the observation with a class of older children. Discuss the differences between the results’;⁸²⁵ or, after having read Susan Isaacs’ *Intellectual Development in Young Children* and *Social Development in Young Children*, ‘Discuss the value of fantasy-play in children’.⁸²⁶

Why did Hughes and Hughes write a book which was so obviously derivative? No doubt they had expended a lot of time refining their own use of these resources in lecture form, and as the introduction states, hoped to weave together practice and theory in a helpful, not an abstract,

⁸²³ A.G. Hughes and E.H. Hughes, *Learning and Teaching: An Introduction to Psychology and Education* (London: Longmans, Green and Co., 1937), Title page.

⁸²⁴ *Ibid.*, p. vi.

⁸²⁵ *Ibid.*, p. 20.

⁸²⁶ *Ibid.*, p. 38.

way.⁸²⁷ That they considered psychology the core intellectual resource of training colleges is obvious: the book aimed to introduce students in training colleges and current teachers to ‘modern developments in educational psychology and methods’.⁸²⁸ At no juncture did they mention philosophy; at no juncture did they consider a theological perspective on ‘the child’. It is safe to conclude that neither philosophy nor theology made an appearance in Hughes’ classroom.

J.H. Panton joined the staff of Borough Road in 1928 to teach Education.⁸²⁹ Nunn’s *Data* provided the core text for his classes on education (see above). Panton had gone through the training course at the London Day Training College; by the time he published his own book, *Modern Teaching Practice and Technique* (1945), he was not only Lecturer in Education but Vice Principal of Borough Road.⁸³⁰ Panton’s book was as derivative as Hughes’. His most common references, in fact, were to Hughes and Hughes, after which to Nunn, Burt, Spearman, and Hamley. Panton’s preface stated a debt to ‘Professor Sir T. Percy Nunn, Professor Cyril Burt, Professor Spearman, and Professor H.R. Hamley for the help and inspiration which I received from their teaching and guidance of my own studies as a student of the LDTC and the University of London’.⁸³¹ Theoretically, Panton, too, accepted an evolutionary/biological understanding of human nature, and psychology as the more important resource to understand that nature: ‘If the aim of teaching is to develop the potentialities of human beings we must at least know what these potentialities are and how they can be developed...modern psychology can give us considerable help in this direction’.⁸³² Within psychology, Panton followed

⁸²⁷ Ibid., p. v.

⁸²⁸ Ibid.

⁸²⁹ Br559, 'Principal Attenborough's Correspondence and Papers'. Staff and Class sizes, no date.

⁸³⁰ J.H. Panton, *Modern Teaching Practice and Technique* (London: Longmans, Green & Co., 1945). Title page.

⁸³¹ Ibid., p. vi.

⁸³² Ibid., p. 7.

McDougall's understanding of instincts and of character development.⁸³³ He concurred with Nunn's understanding of education: that its aim was that 'each member of the community shall have the means of developing to the full his own individual potentialities'.⁸³⁴ He supported the traditional curriculum as J.S. Ross did, and with Ross rejected the old model of 'bossy authoritarian attitudes' in the part of the teacher.⁸³⁵ Rather, he thought, teachers should lead rather than drive, and their personalities should be marked by 'initiative, persistence, sociability, and sense of humour'.⁸³⁶

Panton's lectures must have differed in no appreciable way from Hughes', or from Hamilton's. Nor would they have differed appreciably from any that we have surveyed in any other training college, save those in Roman Catholic colleges. They stood distinct, however, from the earlier lectures at Borough Road in their omissions. Philosophy made no overt appearance, theology none at all.

5.4.3 Conclusions

It seems clear from the recommended reading lists, the examinations, the lecture notes and most importantly from the textbooks written by staff, that the intellectual resources upon which Westminster, Borough Road and Stockwell Colleges called to frame their educational philosophy, had changed. During the years between the two world wars, the shift away from theological doctrines and instrumentary goals and towards scientific psychology, was complete.

⁸³³ Ibid., p. 260.

⁸³⁴ Ibid., p. 5.

⁸³⁵ Ibid., p. 279.

⁸³⁶ Ibid., pp. 281-282.

5.5 Anglican Training Colleges

The Anglican Training Colleges presented their education courses in a manner absolutely consonant with that of the secular colleges which surrounded them. For instance, Culham College joined two diocesan colleges, an independent Anglican college, and two municipal colleges under the umbrella of the University of Reading during the Joint Board period. The University of Reading produced a complete guide of its constituent colleges for 1937-1939, and a remarkable similarity between them may be seen. Culham described its 'Psychology' course in McDougallian terms:

The study of character development in physique, intelligence, and character; the sense and sense-training; instincts and their relation to children's interests; forms of activity and expression; the function of play; imitation and suggestion; habits and their formation; memory and imagination; interest and attention; formation of ideas; reasoning; the growth of the will.⁸³⁷

Culham's 'Theory of Education' course described quite utilitarian topics: functions and ideals of primary schools; stages of the school course and corresponding curriculum; environment as an agent in education; forms and characteristics of class teaching; the teacher's part in continuing education (i.e., Boy Scouts); and the study and practice of various subjects. 'History of Education' aimed to help students to evaluate 'important teachers' of the past, to develop an appreciation of the Oxfordshire region, and to observe 'different types' of education. There was no discernible distinction between the above prospectus and those of the other constituent colleges. The Diocesan Training College, Brighton, commenced its description in exactly the same terms. The Municipal Training College contained the same McDougallian terminology and started off with the words: 'Psychology of Education: The aim of this course is the study of education theoretically and practically through knowledge of the psychological principles

⁸³⁷ Cu0019i, 'Culham Training College Syllabus', (1930-1932). Culham kept the same course description for ten years.

involved'. The Training College, Portsmouth, framed its 'Principles of Teaching' in psychological terms and focused nearly exclusively on stages of development.⁸³⁸ The practice books and school registers from Culham offered compelling evidence of change as well. Whereas in earlier periods, instructors spent two-thirds of their time evaluating teachers' facility with subject-matter, in the years 1920-1925 the emphasis was upon their managerial and psychological know-how.⁸³⁹

Fishponds' staffing reflected the growing relationship with the University of London's educational structures. In 1930, College appointed its first female Principal Miss E.R.H. Nunn (no relation), who had taken degrees from Girton College, Cambridge, and from the University of London (an M.A. in Education, 1929).⁸⁴⁰ Out of nine women who taught method to future primary and secondary school teachers between 1920 and 1945, eight had trained at the University of London.⁸⁴¹ Two key staff members received diplomas from the University of London's Child Development Course.⁸⁴² Another joined the staff in 1947, having received the University of London Diploma in Psychology in 1934 and taken the University of London Child Development Course.⁸⁴³ Additionally London sent speakers to Fishponds, whose Annual Reports from 1931, 1933, and 1936 announced that Sir Percy Nunn had lectured on campus. Staff minutes from 1932 revealed his presence there as well.⁸⁴⁴

But the most convincing sign of psychology's dominance comes from the most evangelical of all training colleges, Cheltenham. Three students left entire notebooks taken

⁸³⁸ Cu0019ii, 'University of Reading and Associated Training Colleges', (1937-1939).

⁸³⁹ Cu0005iv, 'School Work Registers', (1920-1925).

⁸⁴⁰ 37168-196, 'Staff Register', (1904....).

⁸⁴¹ *Ibid.*

⁸⁴² 37168-30-4, 'Annual Reports of the Training Institute, 1930-1953', (1930-1953), Year of 1934. According to the Annual Report of 1934, 'Miss M. Smith is at present taking the course in Child Development at the University of London'

⁸⁴³ 37168-196, 'Staff Register'.

⁸⁴⁴ 37168-13, 'Staff Minutes, 1926-1955', (1926-1955), 14 September 1932.

during education, psychology and divinity lectures. The two principal influences were Sigmund Freud and William McDougall, channelled through the work of Sir Thomas Percy Nunn.

Gwendolyn Reeves, a student at Cheltenham between 1938 and 1940, framed education entirely in psychological terms. In a class entitled 'Education', the latter was defined as 'the process of fitting the individual to take his place in society...the influence of the environment on the individual to produce a permanent change in his habits of behaviour, of thought, and of attitude'.⁸⁴⁵ Acceptable aims for education included for 'complete living', for 'citizenship', for 'individuality', for 'harmonious development', for 'self-expression', or for 'self-realisation'. Each of these leaned heavily upon the notion that the child should 'express himself freely and without restraint' and forge his or her own ideal self. In practical classroom management, Miss Reeves was given a bias against the instrumentary education and the psychology of the previous period, and a preference for child-directed learning.

The giving of dead and inert material probably arose from inherited tradition that the school was the place for book-learning, and from [the] old theory of mental discipline or mental training. This grew from the fact that the school lagged behind the progress of life outside school...School remained very bookish. The Project Method attempts to break down the rigid formality of the school.

In [the old] idea of correlation, the idea comes from the teacher. In projects, suggestions should come from the class.⁸⁴⁶

Education must not only be for the child but at the child's direction. The standard of expressiveness outweighed academic achievement, because 'it is more important to keep alive a creative and constructive attitude than to secure external perfection'. What mattered most was not content but the process of self-discovery.⁸⁴⁷

⁸⁴⁵ Uad402, 'Student Notebooks, Gwendolyn C. Reeves'.

⁸⁴⁶ *Ibid.*

⁸⁴⁷ Of course, we observe here not the beginnings of the curriculum wars (they were quite obvious in mid-nineteenth-century) but at least the middle, the most vitriolic rounds still to be fired in the 1980s. For an interesting historical study of the role of 'classics' in the lives of English working men, see Jonathan Rose, *The Intellectual Life*

Miss Reeves's notes from lectures in 'Psychology' also privileged Sigmund Freud and William McDougall. The instructor lifted McDougall's theory of moral development directly out of *Social Psychology*. Much like an animal, said the instructor, the young child was driven by pure instinct and was thus 'non-moral', and could 'no more be made subject of moral judgments'. From this non-moral state, he passed through the four necessary and consecutive stages which culminated in 'conduct that enables a man to act in the way that seems to him right regardless of praise or blame in his environment'.⁸⁴⁸ This highest stage of moral development, said McDougall, depended upon the 'growth of the ego', referred to in *Social Psychology* (but not in Miss Reeves's notes) as 'the self-regarding instinct'. The puzzling thing was not that Miss Reeves was taught McDougall's theory of moral development, but rather that the theory was left naked without any regard for the direction of moral development. In *Social Psychology* McDougall did not articulate a preference for any particular moral direction (although we know he favoured social eugenics⁸⁴⁹), but why did not a professor at Cheltenham, a place with Christian foundation? Why was moral development not urged in a particular direction?

Reeves' divinity notebook revealed a robust and progressive, if not exactly Evangelical, outline of the Old Testament history and themes (complete with the Graf-Wellhausen Documentary Hypothesis, outlined but not named) and New Testament history and themes (complete with discussions of 'Q'). Located in the very middle of the course, however, stood a section which reduced religion to a necessary phase of development and which defined religion

of the British Working Classes (2001), in which he argues that *Iliad*, *Ivanhoe*, and the Bible became revolutionary texts in the lives of many working-class men and women who absorbed them.

⁸⁴⁸ Uad402, 'Student Notebooks, Gwendolyn C. Reeves'.

⁸⁴⁹ Graham Richards, 'William McDougall (1871-1938)', in Brian Harrison and Colin Matthew (eds.), *Dictionary of National Biography* (Oxford: Oxford University Press, 2004).

<http://www.oxforddnb.com/search/quick/?quicksearch=quicksearch&docPos=1&searchTarget=people&simpleName=William+McDougall&imageField.x=15&imageField.y=13> 07 May 2008.

in psychological terms.⁸⁵⁰ The lecturer described the religious ideal as ‘a free personality, able to enter into all the relationships of life with intelligence and control’, and urged that individuals ‘make his or her own adjustments and develop the right development of a self-ideal’⁸⁵¹ A potential conflict between a ‘higher stage of self-regard’ (McDougall’s pinnacle of moral development) and a particularist religious ethic of any kind, let alone an Evangelical one, does not appear to have been discussed.

Reeves’s class notes demonstrate that, far from religious thought framing psychology, psychology framed religious thought. Again, the curious thing is not that this happened in any context, but that it occurred in a specifically religious, and specifically Evangelical, context. The same could be said of later lecture notes from Jean Bainton, 1946-1948, who left a treasury of notes from ‘Psychology’. Her assigned readings included *Social Psychology* and *Outline of Psychology*, and her professor discussed William James, P.B. Ballard, and Percy Nunn in detail.⁸⁵² ‘The power of suggestion’ formed a pivotal point of instruction.⁸⁵³ These lecturers encouraged teachers to employ suggestion in the classroom. Because it appealed to the subconscious, it was deemed more effective than reason. Miss Bainton’s notes included a lengthy discussion on play and discussed a variety of modern explanations for its purpose.⁸⁵⁴ However, her instructor did not consider a Biblically-informed view of play, such as a notion of God’s delight in creation.

⁸⁵⁰ Uad402, ‘Student Notebooks, Gwendolyn C. Reeves’. The professor discussed G. Stanley Hall’s theories of adolescence which had also informed McDougall; Miss Reeves’s notes reflected Hall’s perception that adolescence was, developmentally, a time of ‘crisis’ and that religious educationalists should tread lightly.

⁸⁵¹ Ibid.

⁸⁵² Uad408, ‘Student Notebooks, Jean Bainton’, (1946-1948).

⁸⁵³ ‘Suggestion’ had emerged from the therapeutic environment used by Freud in which a hypnotised patient responded to the commands of the therapist by virtue of the therapist’s superior position (McDougall called it ‘prestige’).

⁸⁵⁴ The class discussed Herbert Spencer’s ‘surplus energy’ theory (play exists to rid the individual of excess energy), the recapitulation theory championed by G. Stanley Hall (in play the child re-enacts the stages of development through which the human race has passed), Karl Groos’s preparation for life theory (play prepares children for serious activities of adulthood), the cathartic theory of ancient Greece, and ‘probably the least true of all’, the relaxation theory which the lecturer attributed to Friedrich Blatz.

Miss Bainton took copious notes on memory which showed a familiarity with the writings of Percy Nunn and P.B. Ballard. Her professor quoted Nunn's *Education: Its Data and First Principles* and described Ballard's investigation of memory deterioration in twelve year-old boys. 'From all experimental work it has been shown that memory itself cannot be improved', wrote Miss Bainton, but 'meaningful material is much more easily retained and produced than unintelligible material' Despite a lengthy discussion on suggestion, which implied that the teacher needed to urge students in a particular direction, the instructor opined that a child's contemporaries rightly influence her moral development more than the teacher does, quoting Bertram [sic] Russell: 'Its [sic] only contemporaries who give scope for spontaneity in free competition and equality in cooperation, self respect without tyranny, consideration without slavishness...' In terms of education's underlying aims, the instructor said they must be 'for complete living; education for citizenship; education for individuality; education for harmonious development; education for self-expression; education for self-realization'.⁸⁵⁵ There followed no critique. There was no guidance about which, if any, types of self-realization a teacher should *discourage*. There was no judgement about which demands of a society should be tolerated, and which should not.

Another Cheltenham student who arrived just after the Second World War, Philip J. Howell, attended a nearly identical course on psychology in which human life was framed in terms set by McDougall. Additionally, the Howell lecture notes manifested a sharp contrast between 'old' models of education and 'new' models of education (and ontologies) which privileged the progressive above the theological. The professor taught the narrative of psychology's progress away from a theo-centric and into a child-centric view of education. 'Early psychologists', the notes reflect, 'were primarily concerned with what was good for

⁸⁵⁵ Uad408, 'Student Notebooks, Jean Bainton'.

society and thought that a child should be educated for this purpose. The more modern idea is that education should be for the child's benefit. What can we do to ensure that this child becomes the most he can be?'⁸⁵⁶ He objected to 'the old view of a child' since it 'assumed that we know the way he ought to go, and that we can keep him along these lines'; Proverbs 22:6 was disparaged in this context. But the newer, 'more truthful picture...is that the mind is like a plant which grows'. The newer view held that 'the initiative in education must be with the child' Further, the teacher's business was not to lead but 'to stand back and let the child grow'. The 'idea of a good teacher ha[d] changed in the last thirty years', remarked the instructor. 'She used to have to be a dominating character imposing something on the child. The modern idea is rather to look for sympathy, helpfulness, and trying to find out other people's ideas.' The contrast here was clear: the old idea saw the teacher's role as content-rich and directive, the new idea as passive and therapeutic.

Mr. Howell's notes from 'Education' made earlier classrooms look even grimmer. 'The nineteenth-century idea of education as being utilitarian in purpose, though largely outmoded, tends to be forgotten', he wrote. The instructor dismissed the nineteenth-century classroom under the caption 'IDEALISM', which was characterised by the following: 'There is an ideal personality to which all children should be guided; [teachers must] mould or stamp them, knocking them into shape; [teachers must work from] a cultural heritage which must be passed on and [which makes for] an overcrowded curriculum with no time for class activities' In contrast, the twentieth-century classroom, under the caption 'NATURALISM', placed a high premium on 'stories they like...self-expression...doing and creating' While the historical veracity of this narrative is debatable, its content indicated a re-configuration of the teacher's role as well as the purpose of education.

⁸⁵⁶ Uad394, 'Student Notebooks; Philip J. Howell'.

The instructor closed the course with quotations from A.S. Neill, famous for having written *The Problem Child* (1929), *The Problem Parent* (1932), *That Dreadful School* (1937), and *The Problem Teacher* (1939). These quotations reinforced the belief that teachers could assume no superiority to their pupils whatsoever. Rather, he quoted, ‘Humanity is so ignorant of ultimates that no adult should dare tell a child how to live’; ‘We shall not mistake the coming of old age for wisdom’; ‘We shall have a school where a child can follow his inner nature’; ‘We are not wiser than children’.

The instructors for these classes had been influenced by the London school of thought. Miss Reeves was probably taught by Miss Margaret H. Allen who had received a B.A. in Liverpool in Modern Languages (1918), and a B.A. from London, First Class Honours, in Psychology (1930). Allen was also a member of the Child Guidance Fellowship and had worked in a Child Guidance clinic for six years.⁸⁵⁷ The other female lecturer in Education, Miss Gladys Maud James, had earned the Higher Certificate from the National Froebel Union (1909) and a Diploma in Psychology, University of London (1932). Miss Bainton was probably taught by Ethel Winifred Jones, who had earned her Training Diploma at University of London in 1916 and an M.A. in London (Education) with Distinction, 1931. Jones had acted as Vice Principal between 1931 and 1938 and Principal from 1938 on.⁸⁵⁸ She was a Fellow of the British Psychological Association and served as the psychologist for the Cheltenham and District Child Guidance Clinic.⁸⁵⁹ She was Secretary for the Gloucestershire Psychological Association.⁸⁶⁰

⁸⁵⁷ Ua27/1/8, 'Preparation for Inspection', (1938).

⁸⁵⁸ Ibid.

⁸⁵⁹ Uad440, 'Documents on E.W. Jones', (1989).

⁸⁶⁰ Ua27/1/8, 'Preparation for Inspection'.

The Western Joint Board regulated Cheltenham's certification process, and its examinations of 1938⁸⁶¹ and 1940⁸⁶² reflected the same educational psychology as Cheltenham's classrooms. 'Self-expression', 'self-realisation', 'freedom', 'play', 'development', and 'enjoying oneself', the *lingua franca* of educational psychology, all made an appearance. The Western Joint Board's examination on Principles of Teaching in 1941 evidenced great familiarity with the concerns of Freudian psychology and the attendant aims of expressivism.⁸⁶³ The foundational concern of the teacher was to create the right atmosphere in the classroom so that the child might develop emotionally. Academic information took second-place.

If the framing of education in the Anglican colleges' lectures parroted the paradigms of the University of London's Institute for Education, so too did their textbooks. Mary Sturt's and Ellen Oakden's *Matter and Method in Education* (1928) not only offered a psychological view of education but rejected and ridiculed religious life and belief. The authors, both instructors at London-affiliated training colleges, claimed to still be 'religious' and yet blamed religion for a flawed view of human nature and a deeply sadistic classroom regime: 'When we look back on the 19th Century, the most revolting feature is the co-operation of religion with misery', they wrote. 'Current religion had three elements which had a great influence educationally and socially, and which seem to us to-day definitely wrong, or at least completely misapplied', they continued. 'These were as follows: -that children are wicked by nature...that society is arranged in a strict order...and lastly that we should learn resignation, and not fight against divine decrees.'⁸⁶⁴ Thankfully, they wrote, 'we have abandoned the doctrine of Original Sin....and the

⁸⁶¹ Uad208, 'Western Joint Board Examination for Students in Training Colleges, Principles of Teaching', (1939).

⁸⁶² Uad208, 'Western Joint Board, Examination for Students in Training Colleges, 1940, Principles of Teaching', (1940).

⁸⁶³ Uad426:1, 'Western Joint Board Examination for Students in Training Colleges, 1941, Principles of Teaching', (1941).

⁸⁶⁴ Mary Sturt and Ellen C. Oakden, *Matter and Method in Education* (London: Kegan Paul, Trench, Trubner & Co., 1928), p. 2.

hard regime of fear of the rod or of Divine Wrath'.⁸⁶⁵ In Sturt's and Oakden's minds, science, not religion, had led to the more 'humane treatment of children'.⁸⁶⁶ Additionally, Sturt and Oakden were oblivious to Stow's and Gill's insistence on excitement, imagination and material culture within the classroom: whereas the 'old teaching' was dry, they wrote, current teachers knew to bring clothes, food, theatre and biography, into history lessons.⁸⁶⁷

Sturt and Oakden were far from rebel-writers. They recommended Edmund Holmes's book but went nowhere near him in tone or content; they rejected religious sanction but supported 'civic virtues'.⁸⁶⁸ Nevertheless one has to ask why their explicit rejection of a religious influence in education was not immediately off-putting to Anglican training colleges. In summary, the Anglican colleges imported hook, line and sinker the narratives, ontological assumptions, and language of the London educational psychologists.

5.6 Roman Catholic Training Colleges

Roman Catholicism before the Second World War offered an intellectual resistance to naturalistic psychology in training colleges, which was not evident in the archives of Wesleyan, Nonconformist or Anglican training colleges. In those instances we have seen ontologies imparted without question which subtly challenged the denominations' theological view of human nature and education. In Roman Catholic colleges, on the other hand, competing ontologies were taught side-by-side, and Catholic doctrine overwhelmed naturalistic views.

⁸⁶⁵ *Ibid.*, p. 3.

⁸⁶⁶ *Ibid.*, p. 4.

⁸⁶⁷ *Ibid.*, p. 94.

⁸⁶⁸ *Ibid.*, pp. 271-2.

5.6.1 St Mary's College

At St Mary's, instructors in Education expected their students to understand both Catholic views on education and contemporary psychological categories. Lecturers believed that they could impart the 'best of both', that psychology offered helpful scientific tools, and that theology offered ultimate explanations of human nature and behaviour into which the data of psychology could handily fit. It is likely that instructors felt additional pressure to initiate students into psychological writings, since such information was sure to be expected by London's Institute of Education which approved the examinations. As at Cheltenham, so at St Mary's: two students (D.P. McPherson, 1938-39⁸⁶⁹ and William MacGregor, 1938-40⁸⁷⁰) left meticulous notes from courses on 'Education' and 'Psychology', which attest to this side-by-side approach. The lecturer for MacGregor, and probably for McPherson as well, was the Rev. James Thompson, who had obtained double degrees from the National University of Ireland and been appointed at St Mary's in 1925.

In McPherson's notes on education, Thompson included intellectual, practical, individual, social and religious aims for education. The words and viewpoints of naturalistic psychologists stood side by side with religious language and concepts without any articulation of metaphysical conflicts. For instance, in approaching a definition of education, Thompson quoted copiously from Percy Nunn and invoked such concepts as 'natural development', 'scientific lines', 'making the most of the powers of the individual', 'developing sociability', and 'active, not passive'. He placed these terms within a theological stance, however, and ultimately defined 'education' as 'the formative development of all the powers of a human being by and for their individual and social uses, directed towards the complete union of these human activities with

⁸⁶⁹ Ddp/7/1, 'Lecture Notes of D.P. Mcpherson', (1938-1939). These lecture notes contained neither pagination nor dates.

⁸⁷⁰ Ddp/9/1, 'Lecture Notes of William Macgregor', (1938-1940).

their Creator as their final end’ Thompson stated, ‘Naturally everything we do in this world should be directed towards a spiritual end and religion should always be the dominating factor behind education. The fact, however, is so obvious that it does not need to be expounded.’

In other sections he quoted in the same breath both Newman and Sir John Adams. He placed religious instruction as the first among other subjects, yet talked about developing ‘the fullest scope of individuality’ Thus McPherson’s notes displayed both an articulated commitment to Catholic theories of education and a deep knowledge of naturalistic psychology. What they did not display was a critique of one by the tools of the other. Perhaps he believed that all the goals of progressive education were in fact found in Christianity.

McPherson’s notes in ‘Psychology’ had far fewer religious references. That course took as intellectual resources the work of Nunn, Adams, McDougall, and quoted all three extensively.

Two examples suffice:

Mneme refers to all that is concerned with memory – the part that is in the unconscious (eg habits, instinct) as well as the part in the conscious...Horme refers to the purposes or urge within us. Hormic activities are purposive activities. Conscious purpose is conation. Our past experiences (mneme) have a large part in determining our future purpose activities (horme).

Thompson quoted directly from McDougall and followed McDougall’s belief in the power of instinct to craft human character. His long list of the instincts of the child culminated, as usual, in the ‘self-regarding sentiment’, which was seen as the wellspring of moral activity. The only reference to spiritual life came in a section on ‘the aesthetic in education,’ and it is unclear exactly what Thompson meant here by ‘the spiritual’:

The spiritual contribution is something that is emotional rather than critical. The main object of teacher’s work is to teach our pupils to discern and enjoy the beautiful. Are there certain things that are beautiful in themselves, or is it correct to say that ‘the beautiful does not exist in objects: it is seen by you in them?’ The latter implies the importance of the spiritual contribution by you.

What Thompson meant by the 'spiritual contribution' is vague. What is clear, however, is that in the psychology lectures exhibited a lesser degree of synthesis than those in education courses.

MacGregor's notes covered four courses: 'Education', 'Psychology', 'Religion', and 'Education by Subjects'. The first three, at least, were taught by Father Thompson, as noted by MacGregor.⁸⁷¹ Thompson opened the course on education with Pius XI's comment on the subject: 'Education consists essentially in preparing man for what he must be, and what he must do, in order to attain the sublime end for which he is created'. Thompson also quoted Plato, Roscoe, Pestalozzi, Findlay, Bagley and Kant, thus highlighting modern concepts such as 'fostering of individuality' and 'fitting the individual for his environment' and 'the development in the individual of all perfections'. In the second lecture, Thompson spoke at length of Pius XI's *Divini illius Magistri* (1929). He emphasized that, according to the Pope 'Christian education takes in the whole aggregate of human life, physical and spiritual, intellectual and moral, individual, domestic and social, not with a view of reducing it in any way, but in order to elevate, regulate and perfect it, in accordance with the example and teaching of Christ'⁸⁷² The Pope decried the demise of the Church influence on family and society, the 'neutral' and 'lay schools', co-education and the modern educational 'heresy' of 'unlimited freedom'. Thompson mentioned more of the encyclical's salient points and commended them to his listeners. He went on, however, to list the 'functions of the school', and none of them was transcendent in nature. One can infer that, again, the traditional and modern understandings of education sat side by side in his classroom, possibly without cross-examination.

⁸⁷¹ MacGregor wrote in the cover, 'Father Thompson, who taught RE as well as Education and Psychology, also ran the Dramatic Society. He was a brilliant lecturer and a wonderful priest.'

⁸⁷² *Divini Illius Magistri*, ed. Pope Pius Xi (Rappresentatanti in Terra; Raleigh: McGrath Publishing Company, 1929) 355-69.

The course on psychology followed exactly that recorded by McPherson, with McDougall, Ross, Sandiford and Welton playing the largest roles. 'Instinct', the 'self-regarding sentiment', 'habit', 'play', the Dalton Plan, and of course 'imitation' and 'suggestion' made an appearance. But at the close of the lectures, Thompson wrapped the course in a religious perspective. He noted, for instance, that four things might change a person's character: conversion, psycho-therapy, multiple personalities, and emotional development. The first, of course, admitted Christian possibilities. He ended the course with a coherent ontological statement:

Man exists in four realms. He is a physical entity, a human entity (bringing him into the social realm), a rational entity, a supernatural entity. Every action of man affects his status in each of these realms. He can accept or reject his original status in any of these realms subjectively. They remain an objective fact.

This statement has everything to do with Catholic orthodoxy and nothing to do with McDougallian or Nunnian psychology. Thompson had been trained in the Catholic faith and adhered to its concepts. While the notes of his lectures do not give evidence of his having rebutted one ontology or the other, the fact that he highlighted both of them indicates that either he did not see any inherent conflict between them, or that he presented naturalistic psychology as part of the necessary corpus of knowledge but did not consider its judgements ultimate.

MacGregor's notes on 'Religion', taught by Thompson, were filled with Scriptural references such as John 17:3, 'This is eternal life, that they may know Thee the one true God, and Jesus Christ whom thou hast sent', following on from exhortations about the classroom teaching of religion ('The primary aim of teaching Religion is to lead children to a knowledge of God that they may serve him and love him'). Thompson wanted his students to 'ensure that each child leaves school with a firm grasp on the fundamentals of his religion', but this not in rote, 'parrot-like' formulae but with practical knowledge and interest. He suggested that children

view pictures, read the Catholic press, and learn ‘the greatness of the Church’s work’; he wanted teachers to urge participation in Catholic social action and to bring parents alongside the work.

5.6.2 La Sainte Union

La Sainte Union kept no record of lecture notes, of required reading, or even of course outlines. Board of Education reports from the 1920s indicate that staff and students possessed an unsophisticated familiarity with psychology which ‘hampered’ their work.⁸⁷³ This changed in the 1930s. The Principal between 1933 and 1953, Sister Mary Gabriel Murphy had been educated at Bedford College, University of London and was ‘the first of the Principals to have Academic qualifications officially recognized by the Board of Education’⁸⁷⁴ Her successor, Sister Mary de Sales Ward, had also been trained at the University of London (in English and German) and presumably took her Diploma in Education there as well. The Prospectus of 1959 mentioned Ward’s teaching ‘Educational Psychology’ for the first time.⁸⁷⁵ An exhaustive HMI report from that same year praised the shrewdness and ability of the Principal who, it said, ‘taught principles of Education and Psychology’⁸⁷⁶ In 1959, the College hired its first male lecturer, Mr. H.N. Dickenson, who lectured specifically on ‘psychology and principles of education’.⁸⁷⁷ The 1959 HMI report said of Dickenson, ‘He holds an external B.A. and Diploma in Education of the University of Manchester...He is now confronted with all the problems of both planning and conducting the course in general principles and psychology for the whole

⁸⁷³ Lsu.F22.900, ‘College of Southampton - Reports’, (1904-1927), F22.921, ‘Final Examination, 1927.’ In 1927 the Board stated that, while some students had shown adequate knowledge of psychology, ‘the weaker students appeared to be positively hampered with what psychological terminology they had acquired’

⁸⁷⁴ Lsu.F22.800, ‘Southampton Manuscripts of the History of the College’. F22.866, ‘Former Principals of LSU College.’

⁸⁷⁵ Lsu.Miscellaneous, ‘Lsu - Miscellaneous and Un-Catalogued’, (1958-1991). ‘The Training College of the Immaculate Conception, Nature and Scope of College Work, 1958-9.’

⁸⁷⁶ *Ibid.*, 9.89, Ministry of Education Report by HM Inspectors in April, 1959.

⁸⁷⁷ Lsu.F22.800, ‘Southampton Manuscripts of the History of the College’, F22.861, ‘Post-War Expansion.’

College...⁸⁷⁸ In 1966 he became the first lay Vice Principal. Educational psychology made its way into LSU, then, but it did so manifestly later than in the Anglican and Nonconformist colleges.

During the Joint Board years LSU had to affiliate with Southampton University College,⁸⁷⁹ and experienced joint control of syllabuses, external examinations and dozens and dozens of new meetings every year.⁸⁸⁰ LSU continued to exhibit ambivalence to this arrangement, but it is unclear whether from administrative or ideological reasons (or both). The Principal went along to scores of meetings but had a wicked dislike of the professor of Education at the University College of Southampton, Professor Cock, who had trained at the London Day Training College. He was often depicted as pompous and insensitive. When Cock visited LSU for 'contact' with out-going seniors, 'he was more disposed to give his own views and opinions than to discover those of the students'.⁸⁸¹ When he viewed a debate in College, 'he spent over-much time addressing the students, and the debate had to be continued in the evening'.⁸⁸² This same man as convener of the Board of Studies throughout the 1930s helped to set the examination questions and therefore guided the syllabus, and it is therefore fair to suggest that he affected the philosophical content of examinations and therefore of course content.⁸⁸³ The annals of the College suggest, however, that LSU was able to retain autonomy for its lecturers. At a meeting of the Board of Examinations in 1931,

There was a tendency on the part of the representatives of University College to arrive at a rigid definition of an 'approved course.' Members of our college required freedom and elasticity to afford scope for the varied talents of lecturers

⁸⁷⁸ Lsu.Iv.B(E).09-10, 'Southampton - Lsu College', HMI Report, 1959.

⁸⁷⁹ Lsu.3.Annals, 'Annals of the College', 2 Jan 1928.

⁸⁸⁰ Ibid., 1 March 1928, 15 May 1928, 20 June 1928, for example.

⁸⁸¹ Lsu.5.Annals, 'Annals of the College', (1935-1940), 5 May 1937.

⁸⁸² Ibid., 14 March 1938.

⁸⁸³ Lsu.3.Annals, 'Annals of the College', 14 January 1930, 21 January 1930 and 6 February 1930, for example.

and students. The matter was referred to the Standing Committee. The results approved for our college were most satisfactory.⁸⁸⁴

LSU recorded no further curricular conflicts, and one can only conclude that the College maintained some degree of academic autonomy.

In 1935, the Western Joint Board expanded, and LSU found itself affiliated not only with the University College of Southampton but the University of Bristol and several other training colleges. There are only scanty records of this relationship. Certainly the Second World War disrupted the operations of the southernmost training colleges; it is entirely possible that crucial archives were lost or disposed of during the evacuation to Cheltenham. During the War, the buildings of the Order in Southampton were used by Pirelli, an electric cable maker, under contract with the Government. After the war (in 1950), LSU became a constituent college of Southampton University College's Institute of Education. There is no record of any resistance to this arrangement, and in fact the Governing Body approved it as early as 1947.⁸⁸⁵

LSU ultimately made a move towards psychology as one of the resources for framing education. However, it did so more hesitatingly, and later chronologically, than did St Mary's. It certainly did so later than any of the Protestant training colleges. 'Psychology' did not feature as a distinct subject, for instance, in the 'Courses of Study' from 1960 or even a 1984 Department of Education and Science Report,⁸⁸⁶ whereas in Protestant training colleges it featured separately by the 1950s.

Perhaps LSU lagged behind other training colleges in assigning primary conceptual power to the discipline of psychology for two reasons. First, the community maintained a sharply-guarded Catholic identity, as we have seen. Second, the Joint Board scheme which had

⁸⁸⁴ Ibid., 24 September 1931.

⁸⁸⁵ Lsu.6. Annals, 'Annals of the College', (1940-1945), 28 February 1947.

⁸⁸⁶ Ibid., 9.90, 'Courses of Study, 1960' and 10.24, 'Principal's Report to the Governors: Academic Year 1986-7.'

exerted such force upon St Mary's curriculum, yoked LSU to the University College of Southampton in 1928 and to the University of Bristol in 1935. Neither of these universities was as overwhelming intellectually or administratively as the University of London.

When one compares the Catholic training colleges to their counterparts in the Anglican and Nonconformist flocks, there is a pronounced difference in the degree and velocity of theoretical change. Catholic training colleges resisted psychological master-frames longer than other confessional colleges. However, the psychological emphasis made incursions into the Catholic training colleges during this period, as the material above attests.

5.7 Influence of the Board of Education

The universities exerted a more powerful intellectual influence upon the training colleges than the Board of Education did during this period. Nevertheless, because the Board controlled the funding of the training colleges and set national place numbers, it possessed immediate material influence which no doubt had an impact upon collegiate intellectual atmosphere. The Inspectorate left behind a trail of woeful comments about the pitiful physical condition of the denominational colleges, and the Board continued its intense scrutiny of staff. LEA and university-based training colleges were seen as more current than the denominational ones, with the Board issuing shots such as 'uncultivated nuns', demanding Catholic college closures, and forcing representatives from Wesleyan colleges to wait for hours at the Board's offices.⁸⁸⁷ Even Anglican colleges were on the defensive. The Burnham Report (1925) insisted that, while LEA colleges were satisfactory, and the UTDs had the best students, denominational colleges were

⁸⁸⁷ Lofthouse, *The Church Colleges 1918-1939: The Struggle for Survival*, pp. 33-35.

inferior and should look to the universities for intellectual leadership.⁸⁸⁸ By 1932 the Board's position was that 'if full inspections of the denominational colleges were applied, three-quarters of the Anglican colleges and half of the Catholic institutions would be closed immediately'⁸⁸⁹ The financial and administrative pressure upon Anglican colleges proved unrelenting.⁸⁹⁰ Turmoil reigned throughout the 1930s, and by 1940, three Anglican colleges had been forcibly closed.⁸⁹¹ What were the consequences of this pressure for colleges' philosophy of education? There is no clear correlation between the Board's policy of closures and the training colleges' shifts towards a psychological framework for education. However, the Board's clear preference for UTDs and LEA colleges must have contributed to the denominational colleges' emulation of their framework.

That the Board accepted and privileged the University of London's approach to education may be seen in its policy statements and in the reports of the Consultative Committee, which constituted a clear intellectual influence which the Board held over the denominational colleges. The Board had established the Consultative Committee as an advisory body in October 1900, and it operated until the Second World War. Cyril Burt, Percy Nunn, and P.B. Ballard authored reports for the Committee which carried the educational psychologists' assumptions into public policy statements, and others such as Rusk, Winch and Thorndike served as key witnesses in the

⁸⁸⁸ Ibid., p. 18. See also 'Report of the Departmental Committee on the Training of Teachers for Public Elementary Schools', in Board of Education (ed.), (London: His Majesty's Stationery Office, 1925). 'The universities stand for the values of thinking and knowing, of intellect and knowledge, in the national life. It is natural that any institutions concerned with these values should look to the universities for standards and inspiration, and we cannot doubt that they on their side will always be ready to cooperate.' p. 103.

⁸⁸⁹ Lofthouse, *The Church Colleges 1918-1939: The Struggle for Survival*, p. 55.

⁸⁹⁰ Ibid., p. 56. The Anglican community had formed a Board of Supervision to protect and regulate its colleges. Supposedly on their side, the Board of Supervision voted with the Government to close three colleges in 1932. The abandoned colleges revolted, and the Church Assembly reversed the decision, but it could not sustain the Government's wishes. By 1940, three had been forcibly closed.

⁸⁹¹ Ibid., p. 65. The colleges closed were Brighton, Truro and Peterborough; Culham, Cheltenham and Winchester narrowly escaped.

Committee's evidence.⁸⁹² The Committee published reports on *Psychological Tests of Educable Capacity* (1924), on *The Education of the Adolescent* (1926), on *The Primary School* (1931), on *Infant and Nursery School* (1933), and on *Secondary Education* (1936). These reports were widely read as 'textbooks for scientific teaching'; they were circulated by trainee teachers and acclaimed in the press.⁸⁹³ The Committee's power lasted until 1943 and 1944, when the Norwood Report veered back towards traditionalist approaches, and the 1944 Education Act replaced the Consultative Committee with a quieter advisory council. All of the reports up to Norwood reflected the narrative of psychology as told by Burt, Ross, and Isaacs, and privileged expression above academic content. The Report of 1924, for instance, began with the explanation that 'For over two thousand years, in its general problems and accepted principles, psychology presented no great change or development. It continued, as it had begun, a branch of metaphysics rather than of science.' The Report went on: 'The chief method of the psychologist was still introspection; and his chief subject, himself. All that he could offer to the teacher was an *a priori* system of generalized maxims, vague, speculative, commonplace, and of little practical use.' Help was on the way, however: 'During the early part of the nineteenth century, influenced chiefly by the introduction from other natural sciences of an experimental procedure and of a mathematical technique, the study of the mind took a new direction. The psychologist left his armchair for the laboratory.'⁸⁹⁴ The discipline developed further still with Spearman's work, which allowed for a study not of minds in general but of individual minds. This scientific urge to understand individual difference, the report asserted, had resulted in tests of 'educable

⁸⁹² 'Report of the Consultative Committee on Psychological Tests of Educable Capacity and Their Possible Use in the Public School System of Education', in Board of Education (ed.), (London: His Majesty's Stationery Office, 1924), pp. 148-149.

⁸⁹³ Wooldridge, *Measuring the Mind: Education and Psychology in England, C. 1860-C.1990*, p. 249.

⁸⁹⁴ 'Report of the Consultative Committee on Psychological Tests of Educable Capacity and Their Possible Use in the Public School System of Education', p. 1.

capacity', more commonly known as 'intelligence tests' Furthermore, the report promised, soon psychologists would devise tests to categorize temperament and character. In essence, the report captured the anti-metaphysical expectations and the ontological beliefs of the London school flawlessly.

The reports also emphasized the psychological and social goals of education over the academic. Besides certain 'tools' such as reading and writing which were necessary to the rest of the educational project, the reports, with Burt and Nunn, minimized the import of subject matter. Again and again, for instance, the report on primary education (1931) stated that 'What is important is not that a high standard of attainment should be reached in any one of [the subjects], but that interest should be quickened, habits of thoroughness and honesty in work established, and the foundations on which knowledge may later be built securely laid',⁸⁹⁵ and 'we are of the opinion that the curriculum of the primary school is to be thought of in terms of activity and experience, rather than of knowledge to be acquired and facts to be stored'.⁸⁹⁶

In addition to the Committee's reports, the Board continued to issue *Suggestions for Teachers* which were recommended reading in denominational training colleges and at UTDs. During this period, the *Suggestions* specifically distanced themselves from instrumentary education. Academic attainment was definitively not the goal of education: 'None of the past aims (literacy, disseminating useful information, training faculties, developing intelligence)...would in itself now be regarded as a satisfactory account of the purpose of

⁸⁹⁵ Report of the Consultative Committee on the Primary School', in Board of Education (ed.), (London: His Majesty's Stationery Office, 1931), p. xxi.

⁸⁹⁶ Ibid., p. 139.

education’⁸⁹⁷ Rather, the new understanding was that education’s first responsibility was to sponsor individual and social development.

We may sum up the function of the school as being (1) to provide the kind of environment which is best suited to individual and social development; (2) to stimulate and guide healthy growth in this environment; (3) to enable children to acquire the habits, skills, knowledge, interests and attitudes of mind which they will need for living a full and useful life; and (4) to set standards of behaviour, effort, and attainment, by which they can measure their own conduct.⁸⁹⁸

It was not that the Board failed to demand academic attainment or expect certain standards of behaviour; it did. Rather, the Board had placed both character and academic attainment within an overarching goal known as ‘individuality’, to which had been added the corollary, ‘sociality’ Religious sanction had long been abandoned. Even a discussion of a teacher’s authority was shot through with Freudian references: ‘There are dangers in giving adults absolute control over young people’, stated *Suggestions*, ‘for even well-meaning adults are apt to use children as a means of satisfying their own conscious or unconscious desires’ This could come about because ‘there are some adults...who find in unquestioned authority over children a compensation for a feeling of inferiority towards people of their own age’.⁸⁹⁹ The Board did not publish *Suggestions* between 1939 and 1959, but when it returned to this practice the psychological impulse was still entrenched: ‘the ultimate criterion of the quality of education is the quality and balance of the personality which results’⁹⁰⁰

Of course, the Board ceased to certify training college students after the Joint Boards came into effect. But their last few examinations indicate that they required students to be conversant with psychological models of growth and with intelligence testing. The Board’s

⁸⁹⁷ ‘Suggestions for the Consideration of Teachers and Others Concerned in the Work of Public Elementary Schools’, in Board of Education (ed.), (London: His Majesty’s Stationery Office, 1937), p. 9.

⁸⁹⁸ *Ibid.*, p. 15.

⁸⁹⁹ *Ibid.*, p. 131.

⁹⁰⁰ ‘Primary Education: Suggestions for the Consideration of Teachers and Others Concerned with the Work of Primary Schools’, in Board of Education (ed.), (London: Her Majesty’s Stationery Office, 1959), p. 115.

Certification Examination from 1922 asked the students to weigh fostering ‘ordered and sustained effort’ over and against ‘natural development’, to evaluate the teacher’s function if ‘the only true education [were] Self-education’, and how to prioritize a child’s reasoning over a teacher’s rationalism.⁹⁰¹ The Board of Education’s examination from 1928 on ‘Principles of Teaching’ assumed the diminishing role of the teacher, as Nunn’s expressivism took hold.⁹⁰²

It is clear that the Board’s priorities had shifted. Psychological aims had elbowed out the goals of instrumentary education. The teacher’s role had been redefined in confusing ways. On the one hand, the authority of the teacher had expanded in the psychological direction, since he had to attend to possible neuroses and to create an inspiring atmosphere in which individuality flourished, while it diminished in the intellectual direction, since the school was to be less subject-driven. Whether or not an individual college adhered to these principles, as the Roman Catholic colleges manifestly did not, it was nevertheless required to prepare its students to articulate them. The Government’s official educational policy privileged personality development.

5.8 Prominent Journals

Between 1920 and 1945, *The Journal of Education* and *The Training College Record* increasingly embraced a psychological framework for education. In the *Journal* this appeared in diluted form, since it persisted in covering a spectrum of educational issues, from the political machinations of the Board of Education to Oxford and Cambridge appointments to the work of the National Union of Teachers. In the 1920s the *Journal* featured the now-familiar account of

⁹⁰¹ Uad138, ‘Board of Education Examinations’, in 1920-22 (1922).

⁹⁰² Uad397, ‘Board of Education Examinations’, (1928).

psychology's development, from metaphysical entanglements to a laboratory orientation.⁹⁰³ Its support for the agenda of the London school, and its shift from instrumentary to psychological education, may be seen throughout its book reviews. The reviewers could not say enough for Sturt and Oakden's textbook;⁹⁰⁴ they praised C.W. Valentine's *Psychology of the Unconscious* as the best resource on the unconscious available;⁹⁰⁵ they pronounced Ross's *Groundwork of Educational Psychology* 'sound and thorough'⁹⁰⁶

An even more obvious turn towards a psychological view of education is evident in *The Training College Record* because it ultimately determined to cover educational psychology and nothing else. There was an intermediate step: in 1923 the publication became *The Forum of Education* and covered a variety of issues appertaining to a scientific education. Its editor, C.W. Valentine explained that, 'If the study of education is to be lifted above the level of a mere interchange of opinions, if it is to approximate to a science, it must insist that where actual facts can be obtained instead of suppositions, where an experiment can supply evidence on a problem, in all such cases statistics and experiments must be used'⁹⁰⁷ Adams, Burt, Nunn and Thomson served on the editorial board, and A.G. Hughes appeared frequently in its pages. Under the general guise of 'science', the *Forum of Education* published articles about the philosophy and history of education. At times the *Forum* published articles which probed religious life and religious language in the classroom.⁹⁰⁸ These were far outweighed by reviews of books on

⁹⁰³ P. B. Ballard, 'Psychology and the Teacher', *The Journal of Education: A Monthly Record and Review*, LII/8 (August 1920), 541-43.

⁹⁰⁴ 'Review: Sturt and Oakden's *Matter and Method in Education*', *Journal of Education: A Monthly Record and Review*, LXI/7 (July 1929), 543-44.

⁹⁰⁵ 'Review: C.W. Valentine's *New Psychology of the Unconscious*', *The Journal of Education: A Monthly Record and Review*, LXI/6 (June 1929), 468.

⁹⁰⁶ 'Review: J.S. Ross's *Groundwork in Psychology*', *The Journal of Education: A Monthly Record and Review*, LXIII/7 (July 1931), 548.

⁹⁰⁷ 'Editorial', *The Forum of Education*, I/1 (February 1923), 3-4.

⁹⁰⁸ H. Bompas Smith, 'Education and Spiritual Realities: A Paper Read at the T.C.A. Conference on Religious Education, 1922', *Ibid.*, 35-39.

psycho-analysis, reports on laboratory experiments and a rationalistic view of education.⁹⁰⁹ One interesting project the *Forum* undertook was to circularize training colleges about the extent to which psychology had permeated the training college curriculum. In 1924, the *Forum* mailed 'An Inquiry in Reference to the Teaching of Psychology' to ninety-two training colleges and University Education Departments; sixty-three replied.⁹¹⁰ The results indicated that half of the sixty-three colleges provided a distinct course on psychology, and the other half 'fused' psychology with a general course on education. The authors of the survey examined course outlines and determined that most colleges went beyond the minimum requirements of the Board and were therefore 'more adequate to the systematic presentation of modern genetic and educational psychology'. McDougall's moral development, instinct and intelligence testing, and Freudian categories were ubiquitous.⁹¹¹ The survey probed the extent of experimental research undertaken by training college students, and concluded that laboratory work only occurred in UTDs, that child study was the most common form of experimental work, and that students were coached in the necessity of mental testing. Most importantly, 'almost all replies emphasize[d] a close relationship between the teaching in psychology and the lectures on the principles of education and the training in practical teaching'. Indeed, of the sixty-three responses only one was 'dissentient' to the 'fundamental importance of training in psychology'. This survey indicated that, by 1924, psychology had become a mainstay of the training college curriculum and not merely the hope of laboratory enthusiasts.

⁹⁰⁹ In the same issue as the above article, for instance, the *Forum* reviewed books on the Dalton Plan, psycho-analysis and experiments in education; an article on the (progressive) 'play-way'; reports on intelligence testing; and an article on the psychology of a criminal.

⁹¹⁰ 'An Inquiry into the Teaching of Psychology in Training Colleges', *Forum of Education*, II:11 (June 1924), 133-40.

⁹¹¹ 'Authority', 'phantasy', 'fears', 'dreams', 'repression', and 'the unconscious' were the terms used.

Over time, the publication by and for the training colleges distanced itself from philosophy and history. In 1931 it became *The British Journal of Educational Psychology* (*British Journal*) and focused exclusively upon the object of its new name.⁹¹² The new publication issued from both the Training College Association and the British Psychological Society, and its editorial board included Isaacs, Piaget and Thorndike. The cooperation of the Training College Association and the British Psychological Society in one journal signified their joint commitment to a psychological framing of education as well as an educational future marked by intelligence testing, psycho-analytic categories, and a preference for child-driven activity.

The London school dominated the pages of the *British Journal* and its forerunners. They reviewed one another's books constantly and favourably. In a lengthy review, Valentine said that Isaacs' *Intellectual Growth in Young Children* (1930) was 'beyond doubt one of the most important recent contributions made to the psychology of childhood' and that she 'analysed the material in a penetrating and lucid manner from the psychological point of view'.⁹¹³ Ballard rejoiced in the Consultative Committee's report of 1939 because it championed the psychological influence upon the curriculum.⁹¹⁴ Burt gave Valentine's *The Psychology of Early Childhood* (1942) a stunning blow-by-blow review culminating in proclaiming it 'authoritative' not only for early childhood psychology but for 'psychology of the mind' in general.⁹¹⁵ The editors engaged in fierce international combat with American behaviourists, and sided nearly unanimously with the 'instinct' of McDougall over the 'machine' presented by J.B. Watson.

⁹¹² 'Editorial', *The British Journal of Educational Psychology* (Incorporating 'The Forum'), 1/1 (February 1931), 104.

⁹¹³ C.W. Valentine, 'Review of Susan Isaacs' *Intellectual Growth in Young Children*', *Ibid.*, 106-09, p. 106.

⁹¹⁴ P.B. Ballard, 'Review: *The Spens Report*', *Ibid.*, IX/1 (February 1939), 196-200.

⁹¹⁵ Cyril Burt, 'Review: C.W. Valentine's *Psychology of Early Childhood*', *Ibid.*, XII/3 (November 1942), 176-81, p. 181.

The editors acknowledged that psychology was not monolithic.⁹¹⁶ Despite the variety of opinions expressed within the journal, however, McDougall, Freud, Spearman and Nunn dominated its pages. In November, 1935, three articles addressed 'The Place of Psychology in the Training of Teachers', in which the first author suggested that psychology could test the viability of any philosophy of education,⁹¹⁷ and the second author stated that having been a philosopher at an earlier point in his career, he was now convinced that 'the one and only sound foundation for educational theory and practice is psychology'⁹¹⁸ In the third article, A. Lloyd-Evans wrote simply that 'psychology has come to permeate the atmosphere of a training college. It is true now to say that without psychology we would not exist.'⁹¹⁹ H.R. Hamley wrote a fourth article which responded to eight letters mailed in by teachers who were disgruntled by the earlier series. Their complaints, however, did not dispute that psychology provided the key intellectual resource for their craft, but rather that psychology had not been sufficiently applied to practical matters of bad behaviour and discipline.⁹²⁰

Did the articles in the *British Journal* represent reality on the ground in training colleges, or were its editors and authors simply engaging in polemic, a wishful-thinking designed to move education in a certain direction? The former seems likely. The fact was that the *British Journal* had the sanction and the funding of the Training College Association. It represents the closest thing we have to the official priorities of the majority of training colleges. Psychology had become all. The *British Journal* held its course: throughout 1944, the two most common themes in the *British Journal of Educational Psychology* were intelligence testing, and avoiding

⁹¹⁶ P.B. Ballard, 'Review: Smith and Harrison's *Principles of Class Teaching*', *Ibid.* VIII/1 (February 1938), 96-99.

⁹¹⁷ James Drever, 'The Place of Psychology in the Training and Work of the Teacher', *Ibid.*, V/3 (November 1935), 242-49, p. 248.

⁹¹⁸ A.W. Wolters, 'Psychology in the Work of Teachers', *Ibid.*, 250-56, p. 251.

⁹¹⁹ A. Lloyd-Evans, 'The Place of Psychology in the Training of Teachers', *Ibid.*, 257-63, p. 263.

⁹²⁰ H.R. Hamley, *Ibid.* VI/1 (February 1936), 1-8, p. 5.

neuroses in the classroom.⁹²¹ In 1961, its articles concerned anxiety, intelligence attainment, maladjusted children, neuroticism and personality.⁹²² Valentine was still writing. Burt was still speaking. Nothing in its pages challenged the psychological framework for education.

5.9 Summary of Psychological Education

The situation could not be clearer: between 1920 and 1945, the sectors of the English educational establishment which trained teachers had followed the lead of the University of London educational psychologists. Only the Catholic training colleges persisted in bringing theological categories into the formal conversation. Whether one looks at training college lecture notes, prominent teacher training textbooks, educational journals or Board of Education documents, the role of the teacher, the purpose of the classroom, and, indeed, the aim of the entire educational project, revolved, at heart, around the individual child's psychological well-being. Academic attainment continued to be important, and powerful voices within society talked loudly about citizenship and character. Indeed, The Butler Act of 1944 required all state-aided schools to provide religious instruction and worship for students. But academic educational philosophy had become resolutely a-religious. Why this happened is the topic of the last chapter.

⁹²¹ 'Index', *The British Journal of Educational Psychology (Incorporating 'The Forum')*, XV/1-3, 1944). Out of 16 articles, five were on intelligence testing, three on emotional health. The remainder covered scattered topics such as teaching method, religion among adolescents, and research after the war.

⁹²² 'Index', *The British Journal of Educational Psychology (Incorporating 'The Forum')*, XXXI/1-3, 1961).

Chapter VI

Post-War Trends and Final Conclusions

This thesis has examined academic educational theory between 1839 and 1944 with particular emphasis upon the shift from a theological to a psychological framework. Teacher training across this time period underwent a radical alteration in how the child was understood, how the role of the teacher was construed, and, in fact, how the whole project of education was to be articulated and accomplished. The current chapter offers a tentative explanatory model in light of the history reviewed, while challenging established understandings of cultural change.

6.1 Post-War Direction

In retrospect, the change from a theological, to an intellectual, to a psychological emphasis within teacher training is easily discernible from the sources, although these shifts were far from clear at the time. Whereas educationalists from the first period operated within a Biblical narrative which focused on religious grounds for education, those from the second stressed intellectual development and those from the third psychological health. Whereas the earliest textbooks spoke of the ‘body, soul and spirit’ of the child, those from the second period emphasized his mental furniture and those from the third his expressivity. Whereas an earlier view saw teachers as exemplary, a later one stressed their responsiveness. Whereas the first formal training looked to theology as the most important resource for understanding the whole project, by the Second World War scientific psychology played that role. That educational theory had been re-framed is clear; the only question is why it happened as it did.

Before discussing causal factors in the shift, however, it is important to glance at the post-Second World War trajectory of educational theory. Examining the direction academic theory took provides data as to whether the changes wrought by the educational psychologists were deeply entrenched or merely superficial. The University Day Training Colleges (now Institutes of Education), which had carried the movement in the first place, stayed their course.⁹²³ What happened to the religious colleges?

6.1.1 Anglican Colleges

After the Second World War, the Anglican colleges presented their students with an educational theory shorn of a theological framework, short on intellectual demands and driven by the concerns of personality and individuality. At Fishponds, the minutes of a staff meeting in 1949 reveal a faculty which had abolished final examinations and wondered whether to document students' academic performance at all. The discussion was led by an instructor, Miss Dorothy Estelle May, who had had considerable experience with psychological research at the University of London.⁹²⁴ Miss May argued that academic evaluations were inherently problematic because they did not take into account the 'personality and character of the student'⁹²⁵ 'The abolition of the exam' necessitated some kind of record-keeping, but Miss May concluded that a 'student profile, a summary of a student's character and personal goals', would be sufficient. Staff could confer in order to give a final overall assessment, but one which avoided the academic, and therefore 'arbitrary', grade. The Fishponds faculty approved May's plan and submitted it to the University of Bristol's Institute of Education. Bristol agreed with the

⁹²³ Ed1/46, 'Annual Reports of the Delegacy for Educational Studies', Reports from 1953 and 1954; Ed1 /5/2, 'Minutes of the Institute for Education', (1965-1969), B.Ed. Syllabus, 1967.

⁹²⁴ 37168-30-4, 'Annual Reports of the Training Institute, 1930-1953', Year 1943.

⁹²⁵ 37168-13, 'Staff Minutes, 1926-1955', 14 October 1949.

scheme of personality profiles but insisted that the College re-institute examinations.⁹²⁶ The staff minutes assigned more space to this discussion than to any other issue over a thirty-year period. Clearly, the psychological aims of education so overwhelmed the College courses, that the academic accomplishments of students were considered significantly less important.

Fishponds' associate, Culham, presented its education course in the late 1940s and early 1950s in entirely non-theological terms. Its syllabus from 1947 to 1949 referred to the social aspect of education, intelligence tests, and psychological principles.⁹²⁷ It is possible but not probable that the general course considered Christian ontology, since the description catered to a functionalist view of the school and to a psychological view of the child. Its syllabus from 1953 presented an identical outline but with more elaboration. MacDougall's work controlled the narrative of human development, and psychology drove the ethical discourse. Instead of religious 'virtues', certain 'qualities of disposition' were desired: 'perseverance, sociability, conscientiousness, leadership, stability, co-operation, self-confidence'⁹²⁸ The presumed sanction was social comity.

Cheltenham, too, continued to refer to psychological definitions of education and a non-interventionist view of the teacher. Thomas Mayhew (1949-1951) left a notebook from a course on psychology, and it was framed with reference to MacDougall and Nunn.⁹²⁹ The instructor's lecture followed a now-familiar pattern: the modern world had rejected the view of a child as 'plastic or clay to be fashioned' because 'we don't know the way and have not the right'; the modern educator must 'assess the child's initiative' rather than 'mould' him; the school's job was to provide the right environment in which a child might explore his own interests and

⁹²⁶ Ibid., January 1950.

⁹²⁷ Cu0019iii, 'University of Reading, Regulations and Syllabuses', (1947-1949).

⁹²⁸ Cu4132, 'Culham College Syllabus for Education', (1953).

⁹²⁹ Uad375, 'Student Notebooks, Thomas Mayhew', (1949-1951).

aptitudes. The instructor defined 'education' as 'the development of personality, and opined that 'personality cannot grow in isolation but grows as a result ...of friendship' In Cheltenham's educational theory, individuality and sociability stood front and centre.

6.1.2 Borough Road, Stockwell and Westminster Colleges

The Nonconformist colleges continued to frame their educational theory after the works of Nunn, Ross, Hamilton and Hughes, who were also their administrative leaders. These administrators carried on well past the Second World War, and in both Presidents Hamilton's and Ross's cases, until 1961. Even though in 1953 Hamilton delivered a dramatic speech in which he turned against the dominance of psychology within education, there is no evidence that he changed the curriculum. Having been a champion of scientific psychology throughout his adult life, in 1953 he publicly voiced his dissatisfaction with some of its consequences in the classroom. Twice that year he condemned the excesses of 'freedom' and 'instincts' in the classroom⁹³⁰ and questioned the certainty of psychological insights.⁹³¹ Additionally, in 1954 Hamilton gave a public lecture in which he turned against the attempt to segregate education from metaphysics, a project of which he had earlier been a part. Rather, he appealed 'for a more philosophical approach to the study of education in courses of training for teachers'⁹³² So Hamilton turned away from the emphasis upon psychological data. Yet significantly, he did not look to the theology associated with his institution to supply any answers; to which philosophy he would turn was left unsaid.⁹³³ Westminster continued on the course set by J.S. Ross in the

⁹³⁰ Br560, 'Principal Hamilton Papers, Articles and Notes on Education'. 'Teachers and Children: Sidelights on some Modern Problems,' August 1953.

⁹³¹ Ibid., 'Belief: A Chapter in Educational Psychology.'

⁹³² Ibid., 'Lecture before two branches of the ATCDE on 6 March 1953 and 15 May 1954.'

⁹³³ Br562, 'Principal Hamilton Papers, Staff Correspondence', (1932-1961), Letter of reference for Dr. D.J. Martin, 17 May, 1962. Hamilton seems to have discounted theological options, as a letter of recommendation from 1962 suggests. Of his colleague Dr. D.J. Martin who had applied for a Lectureship in Divinity at Avery College, Hamilton wrote: "I am glad to strongly support [his application]. I regard Dr. Martin as a dedicated person in the

1920s. There is very little relevant documentation from Stockwell, save that from 1950 it was grouped with four other colleges under the London Institute of Education (which had a common examination for all constituents)⁹³⁴ and that the staff continued to be drawn from the University of London.⁹³⁵

6.1.3 Catholic Colleges

The Catholic community increased the number of its colleges from nine to thirteen in the immediate postwar era, by contrast to the Anglicans and Nonconformists.⁹³⁶ In terms of educational theory, both St Mary's and La Sainte Union gradually shifted in the post-war period to privilege a psychological framework for educational theory, and at a pace which seemed to accelerate in the late 1950s and early 1960s. Although this was demonstrably later than the Anglican and Nonconformist colleges, by the 1980s, the educational courses in Catholic colleges were indistinguishable from their non-Catholic counterparts'.

Naturalistic psychology elbowed out catechistic concerns in St Mary's educational studies. The Prospectus of 1960-1961 indicated that the education course covered educational psychology, child development and the sociology of education.⁹³⁷ The Prospectus of 1981-82 was similar.⁹³⁸ It seems probable that, even within this specifically Roman Catholic college, education became severed from divinity.

The leadership and public literature of La Sainte Union moved towards psychological priorities. The Principals between 1933 and 1953, Sister Mary Gabriel Murphy and Sister Mary

matter of religious education, but he is entirely free from the narrowness of outlook and intolerance that is sometimes found in dedicated people'

⁹³⁴ Sc631, 'Minutes of the College Committee', (1948-1955), 13 March, 1950.

⁹³⁵ *Ibid.*, 8 May 1950.

⁹³⁶ Dent, *The Training of Teachers in England and Wales, 1800-1975*, p. 130.

⁹³⁷ Pub2/3, 'St Mary's Prospectus', (1960-61).

⁹³⁸ Pub2/11, 'St Mary's Prospectus', (1981-82).

de Sales Ward, had been educated at the University of London.⁹³⁹ The Prospectus of 1959 for the first time mentioned ‘Educational Psychology’, taught by Ward.⁹⁴⁰ An exhaustive HMI report from that same year praised the shrewdness and ability of the Principal who, it said, ‘taught principles of Education and Psychology’.⁹⁴¹ In 1959, the College hired its first male instructor, Mr. H.N. Dickenson, who lectured on ‘psychology and principles of education’⁹⁴² and framed the educational courses for the entire College.⁹⁴³ In 1966 he became the first lay Vice Principal. Despite the lack of available course material, it is possible to assume that LSU made a move towards psychology as one of the key resources for framing education. However, it did so more hesitatingly, and later chronologically, than St Mary’s.

Both Catholic colleges turned to psychology later than any of the Protestant training colleges. ‘Psychology’ did not feature as a distinct subject in the ‘Courses of Study’ from 1960 or even in a 1984 Department of Education and Science Report,⁹⁴⁴ whereas in Protestant training colleges it featured separately by the 1950s. Nevertheless, the evidence suggests that in the post-War period, the Catholic colleges relinquished their inter-War position of holding both catechistic and psychological concerns together.

6.1.4 Summary

In the decades following the Second World War, all the religious colleges followed the UTDs in using psychology as the primary intellectual resource for framing education. Even the Catholic colleges, which had managed to place theological and psychological constructs side by

⁹³⁹ Lsu.F22.800, ‘Southampton Manuscripts of the History of the College’, F22.866, ‘Former Principals of LSU College.’

⁹⁴⁰ Lsu.Miscellaneous, ‘Lsu - Miscellaneous and Un-Catalogued’. ‘The Training College of the Immaculate Conception, Nature and Scope of College Work, 1958-9.’

⁹⁴¹ Lsu.Iv.B(E).09-10, ‘Southampton - Lsu College’ 9.89, Ministry of Education Report by HM Inspectors in April, 1959.

⁹⁴² Lsu.F22.800, ‘Southampton Manuscripts of the History of the College’. F22.861, ‘Post-War Expansion.’

⁹⁴³ Lsu.Iv.B(E).09-10, ‘Southampton - Lsu College’ 9.89, ‘Ministry of Education Report in April, 1959.’

⁹⁴⁴ *Ibid.*, 9.90, ‘Courses of Study, 1960’ and 10.24, ‘Principal’s Report to the Governors: Academic Year 1986-7.’

side, relinquished the former in educational courses. Could it be said that the educational theory within these colleges was ‘secularised’? That by 1950, educational theory in these colleges possessed neither reference to *Imago Dei*, nor to God Himself, nor to natural law, nor even to comparative views about what a human being was and was meant for, constituted a thinning out, if not an utter absence, of theological resources. Discussions of ethics and ‘the good’ proved similarly barren, as concepts considered desirable (‘leadership’; ‘conscientious’; ‘perseverance’) stood without explicit sanction. Indeed, an elaborated appeal to any sort of metaphysical concern, whether utilitarian or Darwinian or Rousseauan or Thomistic, was absent. In the place of religion or philosophy these colleges used the language of science. In this sense, educational theory had certainly been secularised.

6.2 Academic and Public Educational Theory

Academic educational theory had become secularised, in the Protestant colleges before World War II, and in the Catholic colleges, afterwards. Academic theory therefore differed from the broader, public educational philosophy as enshrined in educational practice. During the period this thesis examines, the general public supported religious education in the schools, most teachers championed it, and Parliament actually expanded it. Despite the colleges’ turning away from a theological sanction for educational theory as a whole, the importance of religion within educational practice remained strong.⁹⁴⁵ Thus there was a sharp difference between what the general public thought and how teachers in training were taught. This difference suggests that any theory of secularisation needs to account for the unevenness of its movement and implications.

⁹⁴⁵ From a Roman Catholic standpoint the schools secularised in 1870 when religious education became a separate part of instruction, which was why Catholics held so adamantly to separate schooling for their children.

Furthermore, there is a noticeable difference between the ways in which the general public and the academic elites viewed psychology. Thomson went to great lengths to explain the accommodationist strategies of some popular psychological movements, placing what might otherwise be construed as offensive doctrines about human nature onto existing moral values. For instance, MacDougall's theories of instincts was softened by referring to the influence of society upon behaviour in the 1910s; various Protestant ministers in the 1920s considered practical psychology 'a safe and sane exposition of psychology from the definitely Christian standpoint as the basis upon which the whole structure of human character must rest'; in the 1930s, popular interpretations of industrial psychology sought an ethical, and not merely a material, basis for social change.⁹⁴⁶ Yet this accommodation was not evident in the teacher training colleges. At no point did the lecturers and writers whose work we have surveyed soften academic psychology for students' consumption; at no point did they illuminate possible conflicts between systems of thought. The Catholic colleges alone retained religious language in education courses.

During the early twentieth century, the same period in which scientific psychology became normative at the London Day Training College, classroom teachers persisted in viewing religion as an integral part of the classroom. Compelling evidence for this comes from the records of the Moral Instruction League (1897-1917), which campaigned to remove religion from the schools and failed to do so. The League was born from the Union of Ethical Societies (1895), an organisation inspired by the Idealist T.H. Green, the Positivist Auguste Comte, and the charismatic American preacher Felix Adler. It sought to replace orthodox Christianity with an absolute morality based upon the sanctions of reason and social activism.

⁹⁴⁶ Thomson, *Psychological Subjects: Identity, Culture, and Health in Twentieth-Century Britain*, pp. 42, 72, 141.

In its third year (1897), the Union passed the following resolutions at its annual

Congress:

That there is urgent need of introducing systematic moral instruction without theological colouring into the Board-schools in place of the present religious teaching; that this moral instruction should be made the central, culminating, and converging point of the whole system of elementary education, giving unity and organic connection to other lines of teaching, and to all the general discipline of the school life.⁹⁴⁷

The members declared their intention to replace theological instruction with a secular ethic which would provide the basis for all of school life. In light of the history of English education, and the persistence of the Liberal Anglican view that the Church should season all of English life⁹⁴⁸, this goal was lofty indeed. The League had its own curriculum, its own lobbying group, and access to Parliamentary power; because of its influence the Board of Education's 1906 *Code of Regulations for the Public Elementary Schools* commended explicit, secular moral instruction to the Local Education Authorities (LEAs). It was a great disappointment to League members when this plan was not taken up by the LEAs.⁹⁴⁹ Why not? The answer to this question may be found within the League's most ambitious project: an international investigation into moral instruction in schools. The project's seventy-three-member Executive Committee read like a *Who's Who* of Edwardian education.⁹⁵⁰ They formulated a questionnaire which probed moral education in England, the Commonwealth, Europe, the United States, and Japan. The questionnaire canvassed the general moral atmosphere of each school⁹⁵¹ and whether the teachers

⁹⁴⁷ G. Spiller, *The Ethical Movement in Great Britain: A Documentary History* (London: The Farleigh Press, 1934), p. 111.

⁹⁴⁸ For the best account of the intellectual atmosphere of Liberal Anglicanism, see Grimley, *Citizenship, Community and the Church of England: Liberal Anglican Theories of the State between the Wars* (*Oxford Historical Monographs*).

⁹⁴⁹ Spiller, *The Ethical Movement in Great Britain: A Documentary History*, p. 125.

⁹⁵⁰ Michael Sadler and Editor, *Moral Instruction and Training in Schools: Report of an International Inquiry, Volume I* (London: Longmans, Green & Co., 1908), p. xi.

⁹⁵¹ *Ibid.*, p. li.

there desired the kind of secular, explicit moral instruction which the League wanted to install.⁹⁵²

The published volumes spanned fifty-one chapters and over eight hundred pages of copy and were edited by Sir Michael Sadler. Within the two volumes comprising *Moral Instruction and Training in Schools: Report of an International Inquiry* (1908), emerged two central objections raised by educationalists against the League's agenda: the question of method (not discussed here), and the question of sanction.

The survey uncovered vociferous resistance to the League's programme for secular, moral instruction. Only three prominent educationalists supported 'systematic, non-theological moral instruction'. Every other one rejected non-theological sanctions in the strongest of terms. Alice Ravenhill, for instance, canvassed staffs of 'Council schools, Church of England, Roman Catholic, Wesleyan and Jewish Schools in London, East Anglia, the Northeast Coast, the West Riding of Yorkshire, Lancashire, the Midlands, the West of England, and the Southeast Coast'.⁹⁵³ On the question of sanction, she wrote that

...with a remarkable unanimity, teachers volunteered their conviction that the root of all morality lies in religion, and that to divorce the one from the other is impossible...In the opinion of nearly all, the secularisation of the schools would be a menace to the national life...The feeling of many women is decidedly adverse to any secularisation of the curriculum.⁹⁵⁴

Teachers from across the spectrum of schools affirmed a religious sanction. They also personally enjoyed religious education and did not want to relinquish the 'privilege' of leading it.⁹⁵⁵ Elizabeth P. Hughes, former Head of Cambridge Training College, surveyed five hundred documents and visited schools across her native Wales. There, too, education, ethics and

⁹⁵² Ibid.

⁹⁵³ Ibid., p. 256.

⁹⁵⁴ Ibid., pp. 259, 272.

⁹⁵⁵ Ibid., p. 257.

religion were inextricably bound in the minds of teachers and parents.⁹⁵⁶ Despite the prevalence of religious education outside of school, wrote Miss Hughes, ‘still a majority of teachers were of the opinion that no moral satisfaction could be given which did not give answers, and that this must be based on religion’.⁹⁵⁷

The League became inactive during World War I, after which it re-constituted as a lobbyist for civic education. But its international survey provided clear indication that religious instruction remained vital to the classroom teacher. Of course, religious instruction as a subject is not coequal to religious educational theory. Nevertheless, it is clear that in the early twentieth century, most classroom teachers considered education impoverished without recourse to religion.

6.3 Why?

Why did educational theory become as secularised as it did? That educational theory need not have secularised at all should be obvious. The social infrastructure around education did not demean religion, and legislation continued to protect and support confessional schools. The colleges need not have taken on board the language and assumptions of psychology without critique, particularly given a mid-nineteenth century practice of placing psychological tools (‘faculty’, ‘association’) firmly within theological frameworks and the twentieth-century popular habit of synthesizing psychological and moral views of the human person. The Child Study advocates of the 1890s need not have adopted Darwinian struggle as their model; the Biblical story offered reason enough to value and study the child. One can imagine a situation in which twentieth-century educationalists had followed the St Mary’s model of the 1930s and 1940s:

⁹⁵⁶ Ibid., p. 403.

⁹⁵⁷ Ibid., p. 404.

teaching modern psychology alongside creed; or one in which confessional and secular colleges presented slightly different versions of educational theory, each of which was given its place in English society and its separate system of certification. One can even imagine theological voices which judged psychological insights according to their agreement with broader themes of theological reflection: the value of neighbour, the value of liturgy, the transcendent value of 'good', the blessing of vocation, the multi-sided nature of the child. Given these possibilities, why did educational theory secularise? If it did not happen mechanistically (as the secularisation theory would have had it), did it happen as a result of general social shifts which were not inevitable but chosen? Or had the colleges themselves changed so profoundly that a theological critique was no longer possible?

6.3.1 General Social Shifts

No historian disputes the fact that patterns of religious behaviour and belief changed in the course of the twentieth century. Religious people wrestled with these changes along the way and wondered how to remain relevant in a world which they perceived as inimical or indifferent to their faith. In 1938, for instance, an ecumenical group of ministers and lay leaders addressed the question 'Religion under Present-Day Conditions' in which they ruminated over the challenges to Christian community which inhered in English society. One participant described the 'rapid changes' which he believed created an atmosphere of disconnection and isolation: 'the impersonal character of modern industry, an increase of horizontal relationships, the increase of leisure and the extension of social amenities', the 'loosening of the ties of traditional home life', and 'the acceptance of ideas formerly held only by a few, e.g., Evolution and Biblical criticism'⁹⁵⁸ At the same time, as Freathy has argued persuasively, the 1930s witnessed an

⁹⁵⁸ A/3/D/5, 'Harrison Papers, Westhill Conference on Religious Education', (1938), pp. 1-3.

aggressive campaign to 're-Christianize' the nation which seemed to have produced visible results.⁹⁵⁹ Furthermore, as *Redefining Christian Britain* suggests, 'attitudes to religion and morality often zigzag between generations, as well as varying across points in the lifecycle' The unpredictability of tradition ('it is handed down – or not – in partial and reconfigured ways which are informed by relations between the generations and interaction with the surrounding cultural context') indicates that to find both defensive postures and renewal simultaneously should not surprise us.⁹⁶⁰ Even a random survey of the state of religion in English life at the beginning of the twenty-first century illustrates no clear pattern of decline or of resurgence. Despite low church attendance (8-10%), 71.6% of the British people considered themselves Christians according to the 2001 National Census, and 55% claimed to believe in the physical resurrection of Jesus on Easter Sunday. These figures were echoed by a *Times* telephone poll taken in 2004.⁹⁶¹ Spiritual New-Age practices such as the Glastonbury Festival have proliferated. Grace Davies' research suggests a resurgence of traditional religious practice in several key sectors in English society, such as cathedral attendance and participation in pilgrimages.⁹⁶² The activities of Muslim terrorists have forced Britons (academic and otherwise) to re-consider the importance of religion in contemporary life, and major initiatives in both England and on the Continent explore how to teach children about religious beliefs. Lastly, Enlightenment epistemology, which held that only information considered 'scientific' and therefore 'neutral' could be considered 'true', no longer holds centre stage intellectually. In sum, it cannot simply be that educational theory within the colleges secularised because society secularised. Nor is it sufficient to say that the training college staff and students were incapable

⁹⁵⁹ Freathy, 'Religious Education and Education for Citizenship in English Schools, 1934-44'.

⁹⁶⁰ Jane Garnett (ed.), *Redefining Christian Britain: Post 1945 Perspectives*, p. 13.

⁹⁶¹ Terence Copley, *Indoctrination, Education, and God: The Struggle for the Mind* (London: SPCK, 2005).

⁹⁶² Grace Davie, *The Sociology of Religion* (London: Sage Publications, 2007), pp. 123-124; 146.

of detecting divergent ontologies because of the proliferation of accommodationist psychological institutions. That some individuals and institutions were able to synthesize religion and psychology to their own satisfaction does not imply that religious institutions simply followed suit, becoming impossibly, culturally blind to the challenge offered by a different view of human nature. More specific explanations must be sought.

6.3.2 Institutional Drift

Was it possible that academic educational theory became secularised because the religious colleges lost their Christian flavour in the inter-War period? Or was the unquestioned psychology taught there merely part and parcel of an internal secularisation process? On the one hand, the colleges seem to have lost their sharp denominational definitions in favour of a more ecumenical approach. On the other hand, they seem to have retained religious atmospheres well past the Second World War. Whatever institutional de-Christianising occurred, happened at least ten years after the War and thus significantly later than the implicit secularising of educational theory.

Catholic colleges maintained their confessional identity post-War longer than their Protestant counterparts. St Mary's has retained its Catholic vision to the present day, despite having been under the authority of the Universities of Roehampton and Surrey since 1979.⁹⁶³ At LSU the record is even more conclusive. Its official annals (1903-1939) occasionally mentioned governmental visits, or outside lectures, or HMI reports, but the majority of entries concerned Feast Days, homilies, and the renewing of sacred vows. For instance, the entry about Graduation Day, 1922, noted that the day occurred on the Feast of the Sacred Heart, and that Rev. Father O'Mahony's address proclaimed that 'the influence of a teacher mainly depended on

⁹⁶³ 'St Mary's College Centenary Record'. *Vision Statement*, 2000, p. 7.

the inner spiritual life she led, no less than on her regularity at the Sacraments and other external manifestations of a good life'.⁹⁶⁴ In November of that year the students participated in a three-day retreat, during which their attention was focused on character formation and on 'The Church – our mother and the bride of Christ'. The weekend was full of Catholic doctrine, and the students were taught that 'there is more Christian fervour today than ever before'.⁹⁶⁵ In April of 1928 the Mother Superior reminded the students that their devotions during May were to be for the 'conversion of England, once the Dowry of Mary, to a real and vital devotion to God's Holy Mother as a preliminary to complete return to the Faith'.⁹⁶⁶ In 1935, the entire College celebrated the elevation to sainthood of the English martyrs.⁹⁶⁷ During the Second World War, the students, evacuated to Cheltenham, sung *Te Deums* after every Allied victory.⁹⁶⁸ The Principals of the College emphasized its spiritual foundations until the 1980s. In 1979, for instance, Sister Imelda Marie O'Hara wrote that she saw her role as the 'custodian of a mission' which 'g[a]ve witness to an essentially Christian way of living, not by preaching, nor even primarily by doing, but by the spirit which animates the institution'.⁹⁶⁹ The Principal's Report to the Governors in 1986/87 emphasized the same.⁹⁷⁰

The records of the other confessional colleges evidence both a diminishing denominational fervour and a continuing Christian witness for some years after the end of the Second World War.

⁹⁶⁴ Lsu.1.Annals, 'Annals of the College', 23 June 1922.

⁹⁶⁵ Ibid., 3 November 1922.

⁹⁶⁶ Lsu.3.Annals, 'Annals of the College'. 30 April 1928.

⁹⁶⁷ Lsu.4.Annals, 'Annals of the College', (1932-1935), 19 May 1935.

⁹⁶⁸ Lsu.6.Annals, 'Annals of the College'. 30 October 1942.

⁹⁶⁹ Lsu.F22.001-100, 'Southampton - Lsu College', (1903-1972). F22.89, Letter of Sister Imelda Marie O'Hara, 24 July 1979, to 'Dear Alan', about her vision as Principal of the College.

⁹⁷⁰ Lsu.Iv.B(E).09-10, 'Southampton - Lsu College', 10.24 'Principal's Report to the Governors: Academic Year 1986-7.'

Cheltenham's historian remarked that, between 1900 and 1940, 'all the evidence suggests that...there was a continuing shift to a community-based and participative, but less theologically distinctive, religious life'.⁹⁷¹ Denominational lines had softened since the late nineteenth and early twentieth centuries. In 1886, a French Roman Catholic student had been refused admission; in 1896 a science master had been forced out because of his Nonconformity;⁹⁷² in 1901 the Governing Body had protested against a required reading book because of its High Church prejudice. However, in 1909 the Bishop of Gloucester laid a foundation stone for a new, nondenominational chapel, which was the culmination of Principal Henry Bren's leadership in the direction of Christian inclusivity.⁹⁷³ In 1936 compulsory Sunday morning chapel ended.

This softening tendency, however, did not denote a secularising tendency. On the contrary, in Philip Cole's interviews with former students, he discerned that the chapel was 'the height of life' in the inter-War period. One graduate wrote that 'Walking to service was not by force of habit but by habit of force – but often the Principal's sermons were very searching and made a deep impression'.... There is no doubt that Chapel was the focus for the corporate life of College'.⁹⁷⁴ Another historian noted the vitality of the British Colleges Christian Union and InterVarsity Christian Fellowship, which had joined the campus in 1898 and 1928 respectively.⁹⁷⁵

Even after the Second World War, the University of Bristol's Institute of Education, which oversaw Cheltenham, gave liturgical homage to its historic connection with the Church of England each Ascension Day. In 1949, the Director of the Institute led prayers for the work of

⁹⁷¹ More, *The Training of Teachers, 1847-1947: A History of the Church Colleges at Cheltenham*, p. 38.

⁹⁷² *Ibid.*, p. 37.

⁹⁷³ *Ibid.*, p. 27.

⁹⁷⁴ Philip G. Cole, 'Extracts of a Dissertation, 1967-70 on Servicemen after the Great War', *St Paul's College* (Cheltenham, 1970), p. 8.

⁹⁷⁵ More, *The Training of Teachers, 1847-1947: A History of the Church Colleges at Cheltenham*, p. 36.

the University and Colleges, and in 1960 the University's intercessions were led by Cheltenham's chaplain.⁹⁷⁶ As late as 1989, a professor at the College questioned the wisdom of the proposed union with Gloucestershire College of Arts and Technology, precisely because of Cheltenham's persistent Evangelical *ethos*:

Will the College be able to offer the required distinctively evangelical perspective in religious studies? Can it develop evangelical perspectives on educational and moral issues? Or again, will it be able to sustain an active evangelical social concern particularly for the disadvantaged elements of society?⁹⁷⁷

Today, as part of the University of Gloucestershire, Cheltenham funds two full-time, evangelical chaplains who minister to the wider campus but play no prominent part in the University's public face.

At Westminster, too, the archival evidence points fairly strongly towards the prevalence of a Christian atmosphere at the College past the Second World War. In 1923, applicants still required a reference from the minister, and religious participation was assumed.⁹⁷⁸ The second question on the admissions form read: 'State whether you are a member or an adherent of the Wesleyan Methodist Church. If not, of which Church are you a member or an adherent, and what offices (if any) have you filled?'⁹⁷⁹ Student reminiscences of the 1920s recalled a deeply vital religious life. For instance, according to the Rev. Dr. John T. Watson (1922-24), 'To become immersed in the religious life of London was another profound spiritual experience which came to me at this time'⁹⁸⁰ Watson went on:

What halcyon days those were! And our normal Sunday services in College were notable, for we had on our teaching staff a number of exceptionally gifted

⁹⁷⁶ Ua6/7/11, 'The University of Bristol Institute of Education, Services in Gloucester Cathedral, Ascension Days', (1949-1960).

⁹⁷⁷ Ua27/1/44, 'The Colleges of St. Paul and St. Mary, Cheltenham: A Unique Evangelical Enterprise in Anglican Higher Education', in Nigel Scotland (ed.), (HES Bulletin No. 44, 1989).

⁹⁷⁸ A/3/C/5, 'Workman Papers, Applications for Admissions, 1921-1923', (1903-1930).

⁹⁷⁹ Ibid.

⁹⁸⁰ E/2/1/1, 'Reminiscences, Rev. Dr. John T. Watson', (1922-1924), p. 11.

preachers....My college experience also brought me into contact, not only with Christians of other communions, but in some way with the world-wide church.⁹⁸¹

Westminster College strengthened, rather than impairing, Watson's religious commitment. In 1930, Principal Harrison wrote to an African journalist,

The very strong religious life of the College is more marked to-day than it ever has been, and a new Sunday night service in the Chapel that is open to all students of the University, men and women, grows steadily in favour. It is often followed by discussions on religious and social questions in another room, where refreshments are provided. Recently there were one hundred people present.⁹⁸²

The Board of Education recorded a high chapel attendance in 1938.⁹⁸³ In 1953 the Inspectorate returned and once again reported a 'vibrant' Christian fellowship:

The students have been well chosen and they are well-nurtured... They are a community of Christian men and as such they conduct themselves. The chapel is full in the morning and in the evening for the services, which men attend because they wish to.⁹⁸⁴

Of course, the content of the chapel services might have become quite different from that which was inaugurated in the nineteenth century. The point remains the same, however: religion may have been re-configured, but it continued to be important in the College's life.

In contrast to the Anglican and Catholic colleges, those controlled by the British and Foreign School Society were not originally bound by creed. The fiercely non-sectarian attitude evidenced at Borough Road and Stockwell may have contributed to drift away from a staunchly theological theory of education. The formal reports of both colleges were not particularly religious in the 1920s and 1930s. However, Stockwell's post-War Principal noted that Stockwell students were still asked to attend worship; that the college branch of the Student Christian

⁹⁸¹ Ibid. p. 12.

⁹⁸² A/3/D/4, 'Harrison Papers, Article on Westminster Training College', (1930).

⁹⁸³ D/1/C/3, 'Board of Education Inspection of Westminster Training College', (1938).

⁹⁸⁴ D/1/C/4, 'Board of Education Inspection of Westminster Training College', (1953), p. 23.

Movement had ‘been very active in these years’; and that students understood that ‘religious fervour went hand-in-hand with social reform’⁹⁸⁵

The answer cannot be that educational theory was secularised as a natural consequence of institutional weakness. It is not that the religious colleges never became secularised institutionally; John Gay has argued that they often did.⁹⁸⁶ It is simply that they did so significantly after educational theory was secularised, and not the other way around. What, then, happened to the theory?

6.3.3 An Agenda, the University and Prestige

There is no evidence that broader cultural or institutional changes in and of themselves would have produced the kind of secularisation of theory which happened in the religious colleges. Rather, causes need to be found elsewhere: in the long-term agenda of anti-metaphysicians, in the hard work and motivations of the close-knit educational psychologists (particularly those in London), and finally in the search for status and prestige which played the insecurities inherent in theological training colleges off against the universities.

First, there was a steady stream of educationalists who saw religion and philosophy as the enemy of their trade. They viewed metaphysics, variously construed, as resting upon unproven, subjective sentiments; they preferred the ‘certainties’ of the hard sciences and sought to establish education on the same ground. A similar movement may be seen within psychology. In the beginning, an anti-metaphysical stance was represented by the lone few such as Alexander Bain. It later became the property of groups and journals and finally, decades into its life, found

⁹⁸⁵ Sc633, ‘Former Students, Testimonials and Reports’. ‘Principal’s Report, Annual Meeting,’ 1945.

⁹⁸⁶ John D. Gay, ‘Chaplaincy in Church Colleges: A Study of the Role of Chaplain in Thirteen Anglican Colleges of Higher Education’, *Culham Occasional Papers* (Abingdon: Culham College Institute, 1983); John D. Gay, ‘The Christian Campus? The Role of the English Churches in Higher Education’, in John D. Gay (ed.), *Culham College of Education Working Papers* (Abingdon: Culham College of Education, 1978-1979), especially pp. 9-10.

its way into the majority of textbooks on education and psychology. By the time Percy Nunn and Susan Isaacs put pen to paper in the 1920s and 1930s, the developmental narrative of both education and psychology had become routine. The tale rehearsed the move away from a Biblical view of the child, into an early model of scientific psychology (Child Study) and finally into the laboratory or the therapist's couch which signified the discipline's maturation (see pages 236-249). A non-theological outlook was crucial to this view and was often quite explicit in the educationalists' writings.⁹⁸⁷ The long-term effect of Bain's agenda had flowered.

The second key factor was the institutionalizing of Bain's viewpoint at the London Day Training College and its progeny. The LDTC provided a critical mass of progressive scholarship which saw the child, the teacher and the educational enterprise in a distinctive way. Its leaders created a school of thought which considered education to be a science, the roots of which lay in a biological psychology. They deliberately eschewed metaphysics and preferred to speak in terms of 'science,' 'data,' and 'research' In limiting their intellectual resources to those culled from the natural and mental sciences, they cut themselves off from whole worlds of thinking. Nevertheless, their *locus* at the centre of the Empire and within a research university lent credibility and prestige to their project. As Adrian Wooldridge rightly pointed out, modern educational psychology developed in, around, and from the University of London and thence into the rest of the English-speaking world.

But there is something more. As Michael Polanyi put it, for ideas to succeed they must compel us with their beauty and inspire our intellectual passion.⁹⁸⁸ It is not enough for ideas to be well-articulated, well-funded or even, in objective terms, truer than other ideas. They have to

⁹⁸⁷ See Freathy, 'Religious Education and Education for Citizenship in English Schools, 1934-44', p. 92, for instance, on Percy Nunn's 'theologically-neutral individualism'.

⁹⁸⁸ Michael Polanyi, *Personal Knowledge: Towards a Post-Critical Philosophy* (Chicago: University of Chicago Press, 1958), p. 3.

resonate richly within human agents who receive it. This is one of the lessons learnt from the story of the Moral Instruction League's failure. The League was well-funded and well-placed; it had a clear mission; its syllabus provided direction to overworked teachers; the LEAs were encouraged to employ its materials. But educationalists rejected it, for it did not ring true for them. The religious colleges, however, acceded to London's school of thought without obvious resistance. What was the obvious need on the other side of the table? What did the work of the educational psychologists offer which deeply satisfied the colleges?

The religious colleges accepted the intellectual superiority of the universities and were, with a few exceptions, happy to emulate them. This thesis has focused upon the cultural leadership which universities held in English educational circles, from Westminster's requirement that its applicants should have passed London's matriculation examination, to the prominent place given in college literature to the faculty's degrees, from the clamour of *The Journal of Education* for the colleges' closer affiliation, to the Board's allowing the universities near-autonomy. This respect reached a crescendo in the wake of the McNair Report which had put forth possible schemes for the college-university relationship. 'Scheme A' represented the closest link possible, a relationship in which colleges stood specifically under the intellectual direction and administration of the universities. In 1944, the Association of Teachers in Colleges and Departments of Education (ATCDE), an organisation to which most college teachers belonged, articulated a very strong preference for closer university ties on grounds of status. When Sir Fred Clarke, a professor at the University of London's Institutes of Education, endorsed Scheme A because it represented the strongest link, he grounded his support in terms of status, prestige, and authority:

[Scheme A] could guarantee to the teaching profession adequate standards and status. The Universities were the only source with the necessary prestige and power of

resistance to deterioration. The word 'training' had come historically to mean something inferior (especially on the social scale), having its origin in the 19th century efforts to train the children of the labouring poor to provide the succeeding generations with a modicum of literacy. To 'educate' the prospective teachers would have been socially obnoxious. This historical stigma has got to be recognised and cleared away. Training must mean a final bringing together of every stage of education. But there was always the equally important issue of authority. The Board had always been regarded as a mentor...Where was cultural authority now to be sought? Only in the University.⁹⁸⁹

Clarke's speech took it as given that teachers suffered from inferior status which a robust affiliation with universities could remedy. On the next day, the Executive Committee of the ATCDE passed a resolution endorsing Scheme A because 'at this critical point in English education it is essential to establish a close and integral association with the universities through whom alone the standards, status and freedom of the profession can be assured'.⁹⁹⁰ Clarke's speech, and the ATCDE's actions, showed the extent to which educationalists hung their hats upon university affiliation.

But what ontological assumptions did the university departments of education carry? Within university departments of education generally, the intellectual hegemony of the London educational psychologists is easily seen. From the heavy travel and writing schedules of London's educationalists to the invocation of praise from His Majesty's Inspectors, the London school of thought flourished everywhere.⁹⁹¹ Thus when the colleges imported the textbooks, the examinations, the speakers and the faculty which had been formed within the thought-world of the LDTC, they imported theories which differed substantially from the colleges' originating mission and persistent atmosphere. These new theories stressed the psychological health and individual expression of the child above other concerns, viewed the teacher as a counsellor rather than an authority, and placed even rigorous academic study within a programme for individual

⁹⁸⁹ Cu3585, 'Association of Teachers in Colleges and Departments of Education, Documents', (1944).

⁹⁹⁰ *Ibid.*, 20 May 1944 Executive Committee Resolution.

⁹⁹¹ *Ie.Tpn.1.2*, 'Percy Nunn Papers', Report of Inspectors of Research, Training and Equipment, 26 January 1925.

growth rather than for the pursuit of truth. The prestige of the universities and of the London Day Training College in particular, and the particular vision of education which they gave birth to and disseminated, were causal factors in the secularisation of the training colleges' educational theory.

Because the colleges chose to take on board this new view of education, they were complicit in the striking change in educational theory between 1839 and 1944. They saw a danger from ideologies (such as Nazism or communism), but not from psychology with its scientific discourse and authoritative voice.⁹⁹² There is no evidence that the colleges intended to secularise. Rather, the flattening out of theological particularity occurred as an unforeseen by-product of the search for prestige and authority. In this respect, Julie Reuben's description of the secularisation process complements Christian Smith's. There were certainly human actors (the educational psychologists), possessed of a compelling vision, who were well-funded and well-placed. But these human actors were effective not only because they spoke the language of science and because they were located in the capital city's research university, but also because the recipients were after something else (prestige) which happened to carry with it an ontological challenge to which they were blind. The colleges' blindness to their loss is evident in conflicts over governmental funding in the 1930s and 1940s, during which time the leadership often justified the colleges' existence on the basis of their equivalence to, not superiority over, non-sectarian training. When the Anglican Board of Supervision presented its case for the Church colleges to be funded (1943), it did not, surprisingly, make the claim that the very uniqueness of these institutions required that they be supported. Rather, in answering supposed objections to the funding of Church colleges (on grounds of inefficiency, disunity, and misuse of public funds), the Board proclaimed the similarities, not the differences, between Church colleges and

⁹⁹² Freathy, 'Religious Education and Education for Citizenship in English Schools, 1934-44', pp. 56 and 66.

secular, and even suggested that staff need not adhere to collegiate confessions of faith.⁹⁹³ In summation, then, the story of the secularisation of English educational theory offers a sharp look at how the process occurs and affirms the core theses of both Christian Smith and Julie Reuben.

6.4 The Question of Success

The last question to be asked is whether the various players were ‘successful’ It seems that the educational psychologists were completely successful in establishing intellectual ascendancy. By the Second World War, their position controlled the academic agenda. In all the important textbooks and lectures, the human being was seen as a product of biology (instincts) and society (experiences). The classroom was to aim at psychological health above all other aims. Psychological health was defined in terms of individual expressiveness, and the academic curriculum was marshalled in this task. It was not that religion or intellectual accomplishment became unimportant; rather, religion was explained in psychological terms, and intellectual accomplishment was subordinated to psychological development. Most importantly, when educationalists determined which questions to ask and where to go to find the answers, they turned most obviously and frequently to the authority of psychology, not philosophy or theology.

On the other hand, from the vantage point of the twenty-first century it seems they were not successful in avoiding metaphysics. That there is no ‘neutral’ information is one of the hallmarks of a post-modern epistemology. Alasdair MacIntyre stated of the attempt to avoid metaphysics, ‘This appeal to an impersonal, timeless standard, so often taken for granted in the post-Enlightenment world by those who take themselves to have rejected metaphysics, is itself

⁹⁹³ Ibid.

only to be understood adequately as a piece of metaphysics'.⁹⁹⁴ In describing the therapeutic model within education, David Reisman noted that the teacher simply could not avoid attaching value to certain attributes and not to others. In the psychological education, it 'is not important whether Johnny plays with a truck or in the sandbox, but it matters very much whether he involves himself with Bill via any object at all....The teacher continues to hold the reins of authority in her hands, hiding her authority like her compeer, the other-directed parent, under the cloak of "reasoning" and manipulation'.⁹⁹⁵ Consequently, wrote Reisman, the teacher privileges some behaviours and dismisses others:

The teacher's emotional energies are channeled into the area of group relations. Her social skills develop; she may be sensitive to cliques based on 'mere friendship' and seek to break them up lest any be left out. Correspondingly, her love for certain specific children may be trained out of her. All the more, she needs the general cooperation of all the children to assure herself that she is doing her job. Her surface amiability and friendliness, coupled with this underlying anxiety concerning the children's response, must be very confusing to the children who will probably conclude that to be uncooperative is about the worst thing one can be....Thus the children are supposed to learn democracy by underplaying the skills of intellect and underplaying the skills of gregariousness and amiability.⁹⁹⁶

The psychological classroom always select sets of 'positive' and 'negative' behaviours and in so doing rests upon implicit moral assumptions. Thus, while the London Day Training College may have provided functionalist imperatives with respect to intelligence levels, at its core this school of thought was ontological. It believed and stated distinctive things about human nature, and it carried these commitments into a particular agenda for the classroom.

Lastly, a post-modern epistemology has called into question the very thing which attracted Bain and McDougall to the world of science in the first place: objective status.

⁹⁹⁴ Alasdair Macintyre, *Three Rival Versions of Moral Inquiry: Encyclopaedia, Genealogy and Tradition* (London: Duckworth, 1990), p. 45.

⁹⁹⁵ David Reisman, *A Study of the Changing American Character, Revised and Abridged* (New Haven: Yale University Press, 2001), p. 63.

⁹⁹⁶ *Ibid.*, p. 64.

Cambridge chemist Michael Polanyi commenced his ground-breaking book *Personal Knowledge* with an explicit rejection of ‘the ideal of scientific detachment’ which ‘false ideal’ he believed ‘exercises a destructive influence in biology, psychology and sociology, and falsifies our whole outlook far beyond the domain of science’⁹⁹⁷ In Polanyi’s view, the real practice of science had everything to do with ‘passionate, personal, and human appraisals of theories,’ notions of beauty and the strong force of an authoritative community of scientists.⁹⁹⁸ As philosopher Charles Taylor put it more generally, ‘doing without frameworks is utterly impossible for us; otherwise put, that the horizons within which we live our lives and which make sense of them have to include these strong qualitative discriminations. Stepping outside these limits would be tantamount to stepping outside what we would recognize as integral, that is, undamaged human personhood.’⁹⁹⁹ If there is indeed something unavoidable about master-frames, then it would seem that the educational psychologists’ project foundered on their desire for an objective, anti-metaphysical framework for education.

What about the religious colleges? Did taking on board the views of educational psychologists help them achieve their goals of retaining relevance and acquiring prestige? This question is slightly more difficult. Once the Board of Education framed certification examinations in the terminologies of London psychologists; once the colleges themselves came under the umbrella of the universities; once the majority of staff appointed came from the UDTs; the overwhelming force of psychological theory would have been hard to circumvent. One can imagine that it might have been possible for college faculty to have mounted an

⁹⁹⁷ Polanyi, *Personal Knowledge: Towards a Post-Critical Philosophy*, p. vii.

⁹⁹⁸ *Ibid.*, p. 16.

⁹⁹⁹ Charles Taylor, *Sources of the Self: The Making of the Modern Identity* (Cambridge: Cambridge University Press, 1989), p. 27.

effective critique of educational psychology before it became normative, however. Why did they not do so?

The secularising of theory was a symptom of a broader collegiate malady: an insufficient appreciation of their identity. The religious colleges seem to have lost sight of what they stood to offer to the educational world: a unique view of the human person and the world based upon community and creed. This failure of identity was obviously not apparent at the time, yet it is to this that one historian of Church colleges attributes the colleges' ultimate demise. When the threat of closures came in the 1920s and 1930s, '[m]ost of the colleges survived, but at a price. The struggle for survival proved so severe that they jettisoned their Christian distinctiveness and, in so doing, collectively lost the rationale for their existence. When the post-war period finally arrived, the colleges were, once again, to become "the very playthings of circumstances" because they had severed the roots which sustained their existence'¹⁰⁰⁰ One can imagine an alternative scenario in which when times became difficult, the colleges became more vociferous about difference, not less. Instead, the religious colleges foundered, amalgamated, and closed.¹⁰⁰¹

6.5 Conclusion

This thesis has examined changes within English educational theory between 1839 and 1944. It has explored internal and external changes within the training colleges for teachers. It has concluded that, over a hundred-year period, educational theory secularised even while aspects of educational practice did not. It has probed the causes of this specific example of secularisation and has determined that while mechanistic accounts are insufficient, one which incorporates human agency, human networks and human passion makes sense of the data.

¹⁰⁰⁰ Lofthouse, *The Church Colleges 1918-1939: The Struggle for Survival*, p. 79.

¹⁰⁰¹ John D. Gay, 'The Church College Trusts', in Trevor Brighton (ed.), *150 Years: The Church Colleges in Higher Education* (West Sussex Institute of Higher Education, 1989), p. 99.

Lastly, it has taken into consideration a post-modern epistemological view of human action which views the avoidance of metaphysics as untenable. A thoughtful research agenda which follows might consider concrete ways in which educational institutions today attempt to identify with the ethnic, religious and national experiences of their students and teachers; probe the embedded assumptions of educational institutions; and pose theoretical bridges between the ontological claims of particularist identities and those of academic theory.

APPENDIX A

Examination Questions Collected Chiefly from the Minutes of the Committee of Council on Education, in *John Gill's Introductory Text Book to School Management, 1863*

1. What do you understand by the education of a child? What ground is there for having faith in education?
2. By what principles should teachers be guided in developing the faculties of children?
3. What are the faculties which it is the object of education to exercise and cultivate?
4. What may be urged for pre-occupying the minds of children with moral and religious truths?
5. Write a theme on early impressions and habits.
6. Show the connection between mental and moral habits, and their mutual action and reaction.
7. How may the memory be most effectually developed and strengthened?
8. What is the province of the imagination in moral and religious instruction?
9. Show the necessity of co-operation on the part of the children.
10. Explain the law of exercise.
11. State the method by which you endeavour to obtain the co-operation of your scholars in securing order and discipline.
12. Write an essay on the connection between moral and intellectual training.
13. What rules are most important for the moral training of children?
14. What kind of children give most trouble, and how are they best kept in order?
15. Write an essay on the best way of training children in habits of truthfulness and industry.
16. Describe the arrangements by which you would prevent waste of time, correct indolence and inattention, and promote a general tone of cheerfulness and willing obedience.
17. By what exercises are habits of attention best cultivated?
18. What mental faculties are exercised by appropriate instruction in geography, grammar, arithmetic, and history?
19. What are the laws of association? Write out notes of a lesson in which these laws may be made available in the instruction of children.
20. Upon what qualities in a master does the good discipline of a school chiefly depend?
21. Describe briefly the various mechanical devices by which a good master may bring a new school into habits of order and prompt obedience.
22. Enumerate the principal drill movements required for preserving order in a school.
23. What are the proper sources of authority in a school?
24. Write a theme on- 'Other things besides the gravity of the offence are to be taken into account in the punishment of a child.'
25. Do you allow places to be taken? If so, in what lessons? State the reasons for or against this system.
26. Classify the punishments most generally adopted in schools with reference to the faults to which they are severally appropriate.
27. What expedients should be adopted to secure a regular attendance of the children in school?
28. By what means can a master aid the formation of right, moral, and intellectual habits, out of school hours?
29. Write a short theme on discipline.
30. What objects should specially be kept in view in the organisation of a school? What different plans have been proposed for the organisation of elementary schools?
31. What forms of classification would you use in a school?
32. Explain the tripartite method of organisation.
33. What considerations must guide a schoolmaster in drawing up a time-table?
34. How would you organize a school of 130 children, with two pupil-teachers and four paid monitors?
35. How would you organize a school which had connected with it an evening school and an industrial class?

36. What are your views on mixed schools? What organisation would you require in a mixed school?
37. In what different ways may a school be divided into classes, and what are the advantages and disadvantages of each?
38. What is the proper use of parallel desks, and what use is to be made of the black-board?
39. What are the most important statistics to be recorded in a school-(a) to aid the schoolmaster in his work; (b) for the information of the school managers; (c) for the information of the legislature?
40. What advantages are derived from accurate school registers? What form of register do you prefer?
41. What registers must be used, and how must they be kept to enable a schoolmaster at any time easily to State (a) how many boys there are in his school between the ages of nine and eleven; (b) how many boys in his school are learning compound division; (c) how many boys have been in the school more than three years and less than four?
42. State distinctly how you obtain from the Registers the several averages. Explain why each number is wanted, and any check on the working with which you are acquainted.
43. How do you find the average attendance of each child that has been present at all in a school-(a) for any given week; (b) for a quarter; (c) for a year?
44. What do you mean by method? Explain the relation between principles and methods, and illustrate this by examples.
45. Explain what is meant by the simultaneous method of instruction, and what by the elliptical and interrogative methods, and point out the advantages and the evils attendant upon them.
46. What are the advantages of oral instruction, and what its disadvantages? What are the advantages of making this instruction collective, what its disadvantages, and how can they best be guarded against?
47. What are the uses of questioning as a method of teaching? To what extent may exposition best be united with it? What relation ought oral teaching to have to the teaching of books?
48. Name the subjects which you would propose to teach in an elementary school, the order in which they should be introduced, and the manner in which you would preserve connection between them.
49. Explain the difference between analytic and synthetic methods, with examples of both.
50. What different methods have been proposed for teaching children to read, and on what principles have they respectively been founded?
51. What are the advantages, and what the disadvantages, of the individual and simultaneous methods respectively of teaching to read, and how may the disadvantages best be obviated? If you are acquainted with any union of the two methods which has been adopted with advantage, describe it.
52. After the mechanical difficulties of reading have been overcome, what are the difficulties which the elementary teacher has chiefly to contend with in the manner of reading, and how may they best be overcome?
53. What are the characteristics of a good manner in reading? What methods may be used to teach accentuation and intonation?
54. Describe clearly the system on which you propose to teach infants the elements of reading.
55. Describe accurately the different steps by which children are best taught to learn the sounds of letters in monosyllabic words.
56. Name all the devices by which you propose to keep up the attention of children, and to prevent waste of time in a reading lesson of a very easy narrative.
57. Describe one of the following methods of teaching to read, and point out its advantages and disadvantages-(a) the alphabetic method; (b) the phonic method; (c) the look-and-say method.
58. Describe such apparatus, and the general characteristics of such a series of reading-books as you would require to teach children to read.
59. How can the learning of reading and writing be made most effectually to tell upon each other.
60. Describe a reading lesson given to your first class, showing what methods you take to secure the five requisites of fluency, correctness, distinctness, intelligent emphasis, and proper expression.
61. What have we lost by discarding the old spelling-books, and how is it to be replaced?
62. What combinations of letters present the greatest difficulties to children in learning to read and spell? By what exercises are those difficulties best surmounted?
63. Describe a series of dictation lessons, graduated so as to illustrate the difficulties of English spelling.
64. What is the best means of correcting a dictation lesson?
65. What lessons in spelling do you propose to give in the first, second, and third divisions of your school?

66. In commencing writing with a child, explain how you would begin, and what you would tell him to do.
67. Describe the proper position of the body, the paper, the finger and the pen when writing. What is the use of regulating the position?
68. State precisely what use is to be made of copies set on the black-board, of printed copies, and of copies set by hand in the children's books.
69. Compare Mulhausar's method of teaching to write with that of Locke, and explain which you would use with a child that fell behind the class in penmanship.
70. Analyze the forms of written letters, and State in what order you would teach a class to make them, separately and in conjunction with each other.
71. How do you propose to teach arithmetic to young children?
72. What means must you adopt to secure practical skill in arithmetic?
73. To what extent and on what system may mental arithmetic be best combined with working on slates?
74. How would you teach a child to draw maps? Explain the process by the aid of diagrams.
75. How are children best made to understand the meaning and use of maps?
76. Describe exactly the best method of teaching grammar to children.
77. In what order and with what aim do you propose to teach grammar?
78. What do you consider to be the chief purposes of teaching history to children?
79. What is the most suitable kind of historical teaching for children under 13?
80. How would you endeavour to give a class a conception of the life of a nation as distinct from the mere series of events in its history?
81. Make out a full list of the faults which an apprentice is likely to commit in lessons on arithmetic, grammar, writing, and dictation.
82. What are the advantages of parallel desks? Give directions for their construction, with diagrams and measurements.
83. Draw up a full time-table for a school of 120 boys.
84. Explain the difference between simultaneous instruction and simultaneous answering.

APPENDIX B

Culham College Workbook for School Practice, 1909 and 1934 Selection on Child Study Reports Pages 3 and 4

Child Study

Certain children will be indicated to each student for special observation, the result of which is to be embodied in a written account...

The object of this exercise is to introduce standards to what must always be an important and interesting element in the work of a professional teacher, and an element upon which the real success and lasting results of his efforts will always largely depend; and that is the estimation of the characteristics of children as individuals, as well as in a mass. Even within the first half hour of his introduction to a class, every teacher consciously or unconsciously begins to form some provisional opinions about his pupils; and at the end of a week or fortnight he feels, perhaps, rather than knows, that he has a sort of working theory of the character of each, which further experience would confirm or correct.

The Child Study exercise should assist students to appreciate the advantages of systematic and conscious observations, as opposed to casual and unconscious impressions.

Among the points to which observations may be made are the following:

1. Physical characteristics – including age, facial expressions, head, balance, gesture, hand indications, nutrition, evidence of ill health or weakness. The organs of Sight, Hearing, etc.
2. Tidiness, cleanliness, care of teeth, manners and hearing, other indications of home training.
3. Disposition and moral evaluations, tastes, and prejudices. Industry.
4. Intellect – strong and weak points. Power of expression. Quickness in response and retentiveness.

The child to be observed should be noticed under as great a variety of circumstances as opportunity may offer; eg, when praised or reproved; when successful with work and when indifferent; tired and fresh; in movement and at rest; in the playground as well as in school. The student should seek opportunities of talking to him and discussing his interests, and preferences, and prejudices. Possibly the characteristics of his home may be ascertained, and its influence estimated. But in all this, great care must be taken that the child does not become aware that he is under special observation; for if that happens he is liable to become self-conscious and unnatural, and observation will be useless.

The written account should be headed 'Child Study' with the child's name beneath.

In his written account the student should avoid vague generalities and aim at definiteness and precision. The child's actions and sayings should, if possible, be recorded, in justification of the conclusions stated, or in illustration of characteristics thought to be discerned. Careful record should be made of whatever seems to illustrate the mental attitude, characteristics, and difficulties of childhood. An attempt may be made to determine how far the child illustrates or departs from what is supposed to be the normal type of childhood, in such points as imitativeness, love of change, strength of memory, liberalness in interpretation, limitation of reasoning power; romantic imagination, love of physical activity, curiosity, etc. The student should also suggest treatment that he would consider suitable in view of either physical, mental or moral characteristics. A notice of the child's abilities and attainments is often quite appropriate, especially for illustrative purposes...

APPENDIX C

Westminster College, 1937 General Course in the Principles of Teaching

The correlation of Educational Ideals with Ideals of Life

Aims of Education. The Individual Aim; the Social Aim. The application of these Aims to the Public Elementary School.

Other means of Education. Home. Church. General Environment.

The Psychological Bases of Education.

Instincts. Their importance to the educator

The Routine Tendency. The Play Tendency. Their utilization in the school.

Imitation. Sympathy. Suggestion.

Habits and their formation.

Memory. Obliviscence. Freudian Forgetting.

Senses. Sense-Training.

Imagination. Child Fantasy. Fairy Tales.

Thinking and Reasoning.

Interest and Attention.

Sentiments. The Self-Sentiment. The Will.

Methods of School Discipline. Free Discipline. Self Government in Schools. Their object.

The stages of the School course: junior, middle, senior.

Classification, curriculum, general methods of teaching suitable to the various stages.

The principles underlying the curriculum. Correlation of studies.

The various methods of teaching.

The main findings of Group Psychology as applied to the corporate life of the school and to Class Teaching. The Inspirational Lesson.

Individual Work and the Dalton Plan.

The Psychological justification of Practical Work in Schools.

Preparation of Lessons and of series of Lessons.

The principles underlying the Time Table.

BIBLIOGRAPHY

(1) Manuscripts and archival sources

(a) Bath

La Sainte Union Training College Archives
Congregation of La Sainte Union des Sacres Coeurs
 29 Pultney Road
 Bath BA2 4EZ

- LSU.1.ANNALS, 'Annals of the College', (1903-1923).
- LSU.3.ANNALS, 'Annals of the College', (1927-1932).
- LSU.4.ANNALS, 'Annals of the College', (1932-1935).
- LSU.5.ANNALS, 'Annals of the College', (1935-1940).
- LSU.6.ANNALS, 'Annals of the College', (1940-1945).
- LSU.F22.001-100, 'Southampton - LSU College', (1903-1972).
- LSU.F22.70-90, 'Press Cuttings', (1903-1979).
- LSU.F22.800, 'Southampton Manuscripts of the History of the College'.
- LSU.F22.900, 'College of Southampton Reports', (1904-1927).
- LSU.IV.B(E).09-10, 'Southampton - LSU College', (1932-1992).
- LSU.MISCELLANEOUS, 'LSU Miscellaneous and Un-Catalogued', (1958-1991).

(b) Bristol

Fishponds Training College Archives
Bristol Record Office
 'B' Bond Warehouse
 Smeaton Road
 Bristol BS1 6XN

- 37168-02, 'Minutes of Council Meetings, 1855-1875', (1855-1875).
- 37168-03, 'Minutes of Council Meetings, 1876-1917', (1876-1917).
- 37168-13, 'Staff minutes, 1926-1955', (1926-1955).
- 37168-30-1, 'Annual Reports of the Training Institute, 1854-1893', (1854-1893).
- 37168-30-4, 'Annual Reports of the Training Institute, 1930-1953', (1930-1953).
- 37168-196, 'Staff Register', (1904....).
- 37168-228, 'Scattered files, probably of Principal Gill', (1895-1907).

(c) Cheltenham

Cheltenham Training College Archives

*University of Gloucestershire**Francis Close Hall**Swindon Road**Cheltenham GL50 4AZ*

- UA2/4/68:9, 10, 'Two letters from Principal Bren to Rev. Percy Waller, Hon. Sec. of Executive Committee', (1918).
- UA4/1/10, 'Annual Report of the General Committee of the Training College, Cheltenham', (1910-1918).
- UA5/1/I, 'Church of England Normal Training College at Cheltenham, Prospectus', (Cheltenham, 1855).
- UA5/2/1, 'St. Paul's Training College, Cheltenham, Department for Masters, Prospectus', (1910).
- UA6/7/11, 'The University of Bristol Institute of Education, Services in Gloucester Cathedral, Ascension Days', (1949-1960).
- UA6/9/I, 2, 'Correspondence between Hon. Sec. Percy Waller and the Archbishop of Canterbury, regarding The History of the Prayer Book', (1901).
- UA10/2/I, 'Staff Register, Cheltenham, St. Mary's', (1887).
- UA10/2/2, 'Staff Register, Cheltenham, St Paul's', (1895-1949).
- UA10/6/25, 'Termly lectures at St Paul's', (1956-1961).
- UA20/1/2, 'Divine Teaching', in Rev. Francis Close (ed.), (The Pulpit; London, 1848).
- UA20/1/4, 'Cooperation with the Committee of Council on Education Vindicated and Recommended', in Rev. Francis Close (ed.), (London: Hatchard and Son, 1848).
- UA20/I/20, 'Revised Educational Code: A Letter to the Right Hon. Earl Granville, K.G., Lord President of the Privy Council', in C.H. Bromby (ed.), (London: Simpkin, Marshall, and Co., 1861).
- UA20/1/21, 'A Letter to the Right Hon. Robert Lowe, M.P., containing Structures upon the False Assumptions and Inadequate Remedies of the Revised Education Code', in C.H. Bromby (ed.), (London: Simpkin, Marshall, and Co., 1861).
- UA20/1/26, *Regulations for the Training of Teachers for Elementary Schools*, ed. Board of Education (London: His Majesty's Stationery Office, 1908).
- UA20/5/1, 'Committee of the Privy Council on Education, Examination for Female Candidates, Syllabus of Subjects', (1859).
- UA21/3/14, 'Student Records, Male Department', (1865-1875).
- UA27/1/8, 'Preparation for Inspection', (1938).
- UA27/1/44, 'The Colleges of St. Paul and St. Mary, Cheltenham: A Unique Evangelical Enterprise in Anglican Higher Education', in Nigel Scotland (ed.), (HES Bulletin No. 44, 1989).
- UAD74, 'Farewell Address', in John Gill (ed.), (1889).
- UAD106, 'Book of Farewell Guidance', (St. Mary's Hall, Cheltenham, 1880).
- UAD138, 'Board of Education examinations', in 1920-22 L. Sully (ed.), (1922).

- UAD208, 'Western Joint Board Examination for Students in Training Colleges, Principles of Teaching', (1939).
 ---, 'Western Joint Board, Examination for Students in Training Colleges, 1940, Principles of Teaching', (1940).
 UAD375, 'Student notebooks, Thomas Mayhew', (1949-1951).
 UAD394, 'Student notebooks; Philip J. Howell', (1947-1949).
 UAD397, 'Board of Education examinations', (1928).
 UAD402, 'Student notebooks, Gwendolyn C. Reeves', (1938-1940).
 UAD406, 'Student notebooks, Henry Saxton, Chester College', (1944).
 UAD408, 'Student notebooks, Jean Bainton', (1946-1948).
 UAD426:1, 'Western Joint Board Examination for Students in Training Colleges, 1941, Principles of Teaching', (1941).
 UAD440, 'Documents on E.W. Jones', (1989).

(d) London

Borough Road Training College Archives
The British and Foreign School Society Archive Center
The Haywood Building
Former Runnymede Campus
Cooper's Hill Lane
Englefield Green
Egham, Surrey TW20 0JZ

- BR401, 'Normal Institution', (1830-1856).
 BR407, 'Principal's and Superintendent's Reports', (1880s and 1890s).
 BR415, 'Printed Forms', (1870-1895).
 BR475, 'Henry S. Leeke's Papers', (1900-1902).
 BR559, 'Principal Attenborough's correspondence and papers', (1925-1931).
 BR560, 'Principal Hamilton Papers, Articles and notes on Education', (1932-1961).
 BR561, 'Principal Hamilton Papers, Personal correspondence', (1932-1961).
 BR562, 'Principal Hamilton Papers, Staff Correspondence', (1932-1961).
 BR571, 'Principal Sessional Reports', (1927-1961).

London Day Training College Archives
Institute of Education
University of London
20 Bedford Way
London WC1H 0AL

- DELEGACY, 'Descriptive Booklet Issued by the Delegacy on the Occasion of the Formal Opening of the New Building by the Chairman of the London County Council', (1939).
 IE.ACB.A.1, 'Staff Meetings/Academic Boards 1909-1939', (1909-1939).

- IE.ACB.A.2, 'Staff Meetings/Academic Boards 1909-1939', (1909-1939).
 IE.ARP.7.1.5.5, 'Annual Reports, 1933-1947', (1933-1947).
 IE.MEM.A.1.1, 'Extract Book 1907-1913', (1907-1913).
 IE.MEM.A.1.2, 'Extract Book 1913-1915', (1913-1915).
 IE.MEM.A.1.3, 'Extract Book 1915-1918', (1915-1918).
 IE.MEM.A.1.5, 'Extract Book, 1933-1936', (1933-1936).
 IE.MEM.A.1.6, 'Extract Book 1936-1937', (1936-1937).
 IE.MEM.A.2, 'Miscellaneous Reports, 1907 onwards', (1907).
 IE.SFR, 'Staff Register', (1902-1933).
 IE.TPN.1.1, 'Percy Nunn Papers', (1925-1928).
 IE.TPN.1.2, 'Percy Nunn Papers', (1928-1936).
 ULIE.2.130, 'Training Colleges Delegacy Regulations for the Examination for the Teacher's Certificate', (1930).
 ULIE.2.1912, 'London Day Training College Syllabuses in use in the College Demonstration Schools', in London County Council (ed.), (1912).

St Mary's Training College Archives
St Mary's University College
Waldegrave Road
Strawberry Hill
Twickenham TW1 4SX

- 'Personal Papers at St Mary's College', *Administrative/Biographical history*
 (www.aim25.ac.uk/cgi-bin/search2?coll_id=7217&inst_id=67, 2005).
 DDP/1/2, 'Lecture Notes of Charles Quinn', (1861-1862).
 DDP/7/1, 'Lecture notes of D.P McPherson', (1938-1939).
 DDP/9/1, 'Lecture notes of William MacGregor', (1938-1940).
 DDP/39/18, 'Records of Patrick Fagan', in C. Birchenough (ed.), *History of Elementary Education in England and Wales from 1800 to the Present Day* (1914; London: University Tutorial Press, 1919-1921).
 PRI/1/3/5, 'Principal's correspondence and papers', (1927).
 PRI/1/3/6, 'Principal's Correspondence', (1928).
 PRI/1/3/18, 'Principal's Correspondence', (1938).
 PUB2/3, 'St Mary's Prospectus', (1960-61).
 PUB2/11, 'St Mary's Prospectus', (1981-82).
 SMH/2/1, 'Managing Committee Signed Notes', (1871-1896).
 SMH/3/03, 'Principal's correspondence and papers', (1862-1869).
 SMH/3/08, 'Principal's correspondence and papers', (1875-1876).
 SMH/3/11, 'Principal's correspondence and papers', (1881-1882).
 SMH/3/13, 'Examination results', (1884-1892).
 SMH/3/20, *Principal's Correspondence* (1891-1895).
 SMH/3/21, 'Principal's correspondence and papers', (1896-1897).
 SMH/3/22, 'Principal's correspondence and papers', (1897-1898).
 SMH/3/30, 'Principal's correspondence and papers', (1903-1904).
 SMH/3/35, 'Principal's correspondence and papers', (1907).

- SMH/3/42, 'Religious Inspection Reports', (1911-1928).
 SMH/3/55, 'Principal's correspondence and papers', (1917).
 SMH/3/65, 'Principal's correspondence and papers', (1921).
 SMH/3/66, 'Principal's correspondence and papers', (1921).
 SMH/3/67, 'Principal's correspondence and papers', (1922).
 SMH/3/69, 'Principal's correspondence and papers', (1922-1924).
 SMH/3/70, 'Principal's correspondence and papers', (1923).
 SMH/12/1, 'Staff Register', (1905-1929).
 SMH/24/1, 'Notes for Education Students', (1900).

Stockwell Training College Archives
The British and Foreign School Society
The Haywood Building
Former Runnymede Campus
Cooper's Hill Lane
Englefield Green
Egham, Surrey TW20 0JZ

- SC604, 'College Staff', (1861-1891).
 SC627, 'The Principal's Report', (1927-1940).
 SC631, 'Minutes of the College Committee', (1948-1955).
 SC633, 'Former Students, Testimonials and Reports'.

(e) Oxford

Culham Training College Archives
Oxfordshire Record Office
St Luke's Church
Temple Road
Cowley, Oxford OX4 2HT

- CU0005I, 'School Work Registers', (1880-1887).
 CU0005II, 'School Work Registers', (1887-1895).
 CU0005III, 'School Work Registers', (1895-1905).
 CU0005IV, 'School Work Registers', (1920-1925).
 CU0019I, 'Culham Training College Syllabus', (1930-1932).
 CU0019II, 'University of Reading and Associated Training Colleges', (1937-1939).
 CU0019III, 'University of Reading, Regulations and Syllabuses', (1947-1949).
 CU1004I, 'Babe of Bethlehem', in Henry Hughes (ed.), (1904).
 CU1004II, 'Essay of the Training College, 'Formation of Character'', in Henry Hughes (ed.),
 (1848 or 1849).
 CU1004III, 'Essay of the Training College, 'On the Discipline of a School'', in Henry Hughes
 (ed.), (1848).

- CU1006, 'The Autobiography of Frederick Hobley Written at the Request of his Children', in Culham Frederick Hobley, 1849 (ed.), (1905).
 CU1101, 'Testimonial for a student', in James Ridgeway (ed.), (1868).
 CU2039, 'Record Book of H.C. Cole', (1909-1911).
 CU3064, 'Miscellaneous materials for entering students', (1934).
 CU3585, 'Association of Teachers in Colleges and Departments of Education, documents', (1944).
 CU4132, 'Culham College syllabus for Education', (1953).

Oxford Day Training College Archives
University of Oxford
Bodleian Library
Broad Street
Oxford OX1 3BG

- ED1/1, 'Minutes of the Delegacy for the Training of Teachers', (1892-1918).
 ED1/2/2, 'Minute Book of the Standing Committee Delegacy for the Training of Teachers', (1925-1937).
 ED1/4/1, 'Minutes of the Delegacy for the Training of Secondary Teachers', (1902-1906).
 ED1/4/2, 'Minutes of the Delegacy for the Training of Secondary Teachers', (1906-1913).
 ED1/4/3, 'Minutes of the Delegacy for the Training of Secondary Teachers', (1913-1922).
 ED1/4/4, 'Minutes of the Delegacy for the Training of Secondary Teachers', (1922-1937).
 ED1/4/5, 'Minutes of the Delegacy for the Training of Secondary Teachers', (1937-1954).
 ED1/5/1, 'Minutes of the Institute for Education', (1951-1965).
 ED1/5/2, 'Minutes of the Institute for Education', (1965-1969).
 ED1/46, 'Annual Reports of the Delegacy for Educational Studies', (1953-1980).
 ED3/32, 'Oxford University Summer School of Education', (1920).
 ED3/46, 'Notices and correspondence relating to the conduct of examinations', (1901-1919).
 ED3/47, 'Examination in the Theory, History, and Practice of Education', (1921).
 ED4/8, 'Letters, miscellaneous, to the Secondary Teachers Delegacy', (1902-1919).
 ED4/10, 'Letters from M. Keatinge', (1907-1913).

Westminster Training College Archives
Oxford Brookes University
Westminster Institute of Education
The Wesley Centre
Harcourt Hill Campus
Oxford OX2 9AT

- A/2/A/3, 'Governing Body Minutes', (1929-1940).
 A/2/C/1, 'Staff Register', (1875-1937).
 A/3/C/1, 'Workman Papers, Logbook, 1903-1911', (1903-1930).
 A/3/C/5, 'Workman Papers, Applications for Admissions, 1921-1923', (1903-1930).
 A/3/D/4, 'Harrison Papers, article on Westminster Training College', (1930).

- A/3/D/5, 'Harrison Papers, Westhill Conference on Religious Education', (1938).
 D/1/C/1, 'Board of Education Report on Elementary Schools and Training Colleges', (1901).
 D/1/C/2, 'Board of Education General Report on Elementary Schools and Training Colleges', (1902).
 D/1/C/3, 'Board of Education Inspection of Westminster Training College', (1938).
 D/1/C/4, 'Board of Education Inspection of Westminster Training College', (1953).
 E/2/I/1, 'Reminiscences, Rev. Dr. John T. Watson', (1922-1924).
 E/2/A/1, 'The Diary of John Taylor', (1895-1897).
 E/2/B/4, 'School Journey, presented by Alfred H. Body', (1923).
 E/2/D/1, 'Notes from J.H. Cowham', (1896).
 E/2/H/1, 'Recollections of Gordon Fanstone', (1905-07).
 E/2/H/4, 'Recollections of Fred Jeffrey', (1933-1937).
 G/1/A/1, 'Westminster College and London University Syllabuses', (1937-1959).

(2) Printed primary sources

a) Department of Education

- Education Department, Christmas Examinations, 1875* (London: Her Majesty's Stationery Office, 1876).
Education Department, Examinations, Christmas, 1876 (London: Her Majesty's Stationery Office, 1877).
Education Department, Examinations, Christmas, 1878 (London: Her Majesty's Stationery Office, 1878).
Education Department, Christmas Examinations, 1888 (London: Her Majesty's Stationery Office, 1889).
Report of the Board of Education for the Year 1903-1904 (London: Her Majesty's Stationery Office, 1904).
Board of Education, Examination Papers set at the Certificate Examination for Teachers in Elementary Schools, 1904 (London: His Majesty's Stationery Office, 1905).
 'Suggestions for the Consideration of Teachers and Others Concerned in the Work of Public Elementary Schools', in Board of Education (ed.), (London: His Majesty's Stationery Office, 1905).
Report of the Board of Education for the Year 1910-1911 (London: His Majesty's Stationery Office, 1911).
Board of Education, Examination Papers set at the Certificate Examination for Teachers in Elementary Schools, 1917 (London: His Majesty's Stationery Office, 1918).
 'Suggestions for the Consideration of Teachers and others concerned in the work of Public Elementary Schools', in Board of Education (ed.), (London: His Majesty's Stationery Office, 1918).
 'Report of the Consultative Committee on Psychological Tests of Educable Capacity and their possible use in the public school system of education', in Board of Education (ed.), (London: His Majesty's Stationery Office, 1924).
 'Report of the Departmental Committee on the Training of Teachers for Public Elementary Schools', in Board of Education (ed.), (London: His Majesty's Stationery Office, 1925).

- 'Report of the Consultative Committee on the Primary School', in Board of Education (ed.), (London: His Majesty's Stationery Office, 1931).
- 'Suggestions for the Consideration of Teachers and others concerned in the work of Public Elementary Schools', in Board of Education (ed.), (London: His Majesty's Stationery Office, 1937).
- 'Primary Education: Suggestions for the consideration of teachers and others concerned with the work of Primary Schools', in Board of Education (ed.), (London: Her Majesty's Stationery Office, 1959).

b) *The Journal of Education*

- 'Back Cover', *The Journal of Education: A Monthly Paper Devoted to the Interests of the Scholastic Profession*, II/12 (December 1880).
- 'Education Society', *Journal of Education: A Monthly Paper Dedicated to the Interests of the Scholastic Profession*, II/1 (January 1880), 153.
- 'Letter from Francis Galton', *The Journal of Education: A Monthly Paper Devoted to the Interests of the Scholastic Profession*, II/7 (July 1880), 154.
- 'Occasional Notes', *The Journal of Education: A Monthly Paper Devoted to the Interests of the Scholastic Profession*, II/7 (July 1880), 153.
- 'New Journal', *The Journal of Education: A Monthly Paper Devoted to the Interests of the Scholastic Profession*, III/5 (May 1881).
- 'Occasional Notes', *The Journal of Education: A Monthly Paper Devoted to the Interests of the Scholastic Profession*, III/1 (January 1881), 6.
- 'Editorial', *The Journal of Education: A Monthly Paper Devoted to the Interests of the Scholastic Profession*, IV/5 (May 1882), 131.
- 'What does Training do for the Teacher?' *The Journal of Education: A Monthly Paper Devoted to the Interests of the Scholastic Profession*, IV/2 (February 1882), 43.
- 'Editorial', *The Journal of Education: A Monthly Paper Devoted to the Interests of the Scholastic Profession*, V/6 (June 1883), 193.
- 'Occasional Notes', *The Journal of Education: A Monthly Paper Devoted to the Interests of the Scholastic Profession*, VI/4 (April 1884), 139.
- 'Review of James Sully's Outlines of Psychology', *The Journal of Education: A Monthly Paper Devoted to the Interests of the Scholastic Profession*, VI/5 (May 1884), 178-80.
- 'Editorial', *The Journal of Education: A Monthly Paper Dedicated to the Interests of the Scholastic Profession*, XII/1 (January 1890), 13.
- 'Occasional Notes', *The Journal of Education: A Monthly Paper Devoted to the Interests of the Scholastic Profession*, XIII/4 (April 1891), 187.
- 'Editorial', *The Journal of Education: A Monthly Paper Devoted to the Interests of the Scholastic Profession*, XIV/12 (December 1892), 634.
- 'Review: James Sully on The Human Mind', *The Journal of Education: A Monthly Paper Devoted to the Interests of the Scholastic Profession*, XIV/8 (August 1892), 422-23.
- 'Letter from Karl Pearson', *The Journal of Education: A Monthly Record and Review for the Classroom and for Study*, XX/9 (September 1898), 509-10.

- 'Review: Edward Titchener's *Primer of Psychology*', *The Journal of Education: A Monthly Paper Devoted to the Interests of the Scholastic Profession*, XX/9 (September 1898), 552.
- 'Report on the Headmasters' Conference', *The Journal of Education: A Monthly Record and Review*, XXII/1 (January 1900), 75.
- 'Editorial', *The Journal of Education: A Monthly Record and Review*, XXIII/9 (September 1902), 565.
- 'Obituary', *The Journal of Education: A Monthly Record and Review*, XXV/11 (November 1903), 760.
- 'Review: Hayward's *The Educational Ideas of Pestalozzi and Froebel*', *The Journal of Education: A Monthly Record and Review*, XXVI/12 (December 1904), 870.
- 'Review: William Chandler Bagley's *The Educative Process*', *The Journal of Education: A Monthly Record and Review*, XXVIII/1 (January 1906), 46.
- 'Editorial', *The Journal of Education: A Monthly Record and Review*, XXX/1 (January 1908), 18.
- 'Review: Robert Rusk's *Experimental Education*', *The Journal of Education: A Monthly Record and Review*, XXXII/12 (December 1910), 835-36.
- 'Review: Edward Thorndike's *Educational Psychology*', *The Journal of Education: A Monthly Record and Review*, XXXIII/1 (January 1911), 45-46.
- 'Review of William McDougall's *Social Psychology*, 9th edition', *The Journal of Education: A Monthly Record and Review*, XXXVIII/4 (April 1916), 222.
- 'Psychoanalysis in Education', *The Journal of Education: A Monthly Record and Review*, L/3 (March 1918), 152-53.
- 'Review: Percy Nunn's *Education: Its Data and First Principles*, and others', *The Journal of Education: A Monthly Record and Review*, LII/4 (April 1920), 238-40.
- 'Review: C.W. Valentine's *New Psychology of the Unconscious*', *The Journal of Education: A Monthly Record and Review*, LXI/6 (June 1929), 468.
- 'Review: Sturt and Oakden's *Matter and Method in Education*', *Journal of Education: A Monthly Record and Review*, LXI/7 (July 1929), 543-44.
- 'Review: J.S. Ross's *Groundwork in Psychology*', *The Journal of Education: A Monthly Record and Review*, LXIII/7 (July 1931), 548.
- BALLARD, P. B., 'Psychology and the Teacher', *The Journal of Education: A Monthly Record and Review*, LII/8 (August 1920), 541-43.
- BRERETON, CLOUDESLEY, 'Criteria of Physical Exercises in the Light of Education as a Whole', *The Journal of Education: A Monthly Record and Review*, XXXV/7 (July 1913), 511-12.
- EDITORS, 'Pupil-Teachers in the Balance', *The Journal of Education: A Monthly Record and Review*, XXVII/11 (November 1905), 751-52.
- WIMMS, J. H., 'The Teaching of Psychology to Students in Training', *The Journal of Education: A Monthly Record and Review*, XXXI/4 (April 1909), 253-55.

c) *The Practical Teacher*

- 'Anecdotal Histories', *The Practical Teacher: A Monthly Educational Journal*, I/1 (March 1881), 3-12.
- 'Object Lesson and Comments', *The Practical Teacher: A Monthly Educational Journal*, I/1 (April 1881), 98-99.
- 'Review of Ryland's 'A Student's Handbook of Psychology and Ethics'', *The Practical Teacher: A Monthly Educational Journal*, I/2 (April 1881), 101.
- 'Reviews', *The Practical Teacher: A Monthly Educational Journal*, I/2 (April 1881), 99.
- 'Index to Volume III: Reviews of Education and School Works', *The Practical Teacher: A Monthly Educational Journal*, III/1 (1884).
- 'Review of James Sully's Outlines of Psychology', *The Practical Teacher: A Monthly Educational Journal*, IV/4 (June 1884), 193-94.
- 'The Practical Teacher: A Monthly Educational Journal', (VI; London: Joseph Hughes, 1886).
- 'Child Study at the Oxford Summer Meeting', *The Practical Teacher: A Monthly Educational Journal*, XVIII/4 (October 1897), 178.
- 'Review of *Educational Essays*', *The Practical Teacher: A Monthly Educational Journal*, XVII/12 (June 1897), 624.
- 'Review of Gladman's School Method', *The Practical Teacher: A Monthly Educational Journal*, XVII/12 (June 1897), 607.
- 'Review: Francis Warner, MD's *The Children, How to Study Them*', *The Practical Teacher: A Monthly Educational Journal*, XVII/12 (June 1897), 624.
- 'Review of Cowham's Book on School Organisation', *The Practical Teacher: A Monthly Educational Journal*, XIX/8 (February 1898), 450.
- 'The Bachelor of Education', *The Practical Teacher: a monthly Educational Journal*, II/7 (January 1900), 369.
- 'Review: Stout's *Manual of Psychology*', *The Practical Teacher: A Monthly Review for the Schoolroom and for Study*, XX/8 (February 1900), 447.
- 'Review: W.H. Winch's *Problems in Education*', *The Practical Teacher: A Monthly Magazine and Review for the Schoolroom and for Study*, XXI/5 (November 1900), 274.
- 'Review: M.V. O'Shea's *Education as Adjustment*', *The Practical Teacher: A Monthly Magazine and Review for the Schoolroom and for Study*, XXIV/12 (June 1904), 624.
- 'Review of 'Suggestions for the Consideration of Teachers'', *The Practical Teacher: A Monthly Educational Journal for the Classroom and for Study*, XXVI/3 (September 1905), 121-22.
- 'Report: The Moral Instruction League's 9th Annual Meeting', *The Practical Teacher: A Monthly Magazine and Review for the Schoolroom and for Study*, XXVII/9 (March 1907), 442.
- 'Moral Instruction in Practice', *The Practical Teacher: With which is incorporated The Practical Teacher's Art Monthly*, XXVIII/11 (May 1908), 564-66.
- 'Announcement', *The Practical Teacher: With which is incorporated The Practical Teacher's Art Monthly*, XXXI/12 (June 1911), 2.
- ADAMS, J., 'The Elements of Mental and Moral Science as Applied to Teaching', *The Practical Teacher: A Monthly Educational Journal*, VI/2 (April 1886), 54-58.
- , 'Morality', *The Practical Teacher: A Monthly Educational Journal*, VI/8 (November 1886), 395-98.

- , 'Sherlock Holmes: The Meaning of Observation', *The Practical Teacher: A Monthly Educational Journal*, XVII/1 (July 1896), 6-8.
- ADAMS, JOHN, 'What is a Boy?' *The Practical Teacher: A Monthly Educational Journal*, XVII/12 (June 1897), 701-02.
- , *Inaugural Address on the Training of Teachers* (London: Co-Operative Printing Society, Ltd., 1902).
- , *Modern Developments in Educational Practice* (London: University of London Press, 1922).
- GUNN, J., 'With Our Children: Talking with Teachers about Psychology', *The Practical Teacher: A Monthly Magazine and Review for the Classroom and for Study*, XXXI/1, 2, 8, 9 (July, August, February, March 1900-1901), 27-28, 57-58, 385-88, 441-45.
- WINCH, W. H., 'Researches in Educational Psychology', *The Practical Teacher: With which is incorporated The Practical Teacher's Art Monthly*, XXIX/6 (December 1909), 281-82.
- WORKMAN, W.P., 'How to Write an Examination Paper', *The Practical Teacher: A Monthly Educational Journal*, I/1 (March 1881), 9-10.

d) *The Journal of Experimental Pedagogy and Training College Record*

- 'The Journal of Experimental Pedagogy and the Training College Record', *The Journal of Experimental Pedagogy and the Training College Record*, I/1 (March 1911), Table of Contents.
- 'Back Inside Cover', *The Journal of Experimental Pedagogy and the Training College Record*, II/2 (June 1913).
- 'Review: M.B. Reaney's *The Psychology of the Organised Group Game*', *The Journal of Experimental Pedagogy and the Training College Record*, III/6 (December 1916), 385.
- 'Editorial', *The Forum of Education*, I/1 (February 1923), 3-4.
- 'An Inquiry into the Teaching of Psychology in Training Colleges', *Forum of Education*, II/ii (June 1924), 133-40.
- 'Editorial', *The British Journal of Educational Psychology (Incorporating 'The Forum')*, I/1 (February 1931), 104.
- 'Index', *The British Journal of Educational Psychology (Incorporating 'The Forum')*, XV/1-3 (1944).
- 'Index', *The British Journal of Educational Psychology (Incorporating 'The Forum')*, XXXI/1-3 (1961).
- ALLAN, M. M., 'The Teacher as Social Worker', *The Journal of Experimental Pedagogy and the Training College Record*, III/4 (March 1915), 217-25.
- BALLARD, P.B., 'Review: Smith and Harrison's *Principles of Class Teaching*', *The British Journal of Educational Psychology (Incorporating 'The Forum')*, VIII/1 (February 1938), 96-99.
- , 'Review: *The Spens Report*', *The British Journal of Educational Psychology (Incorporating 'The Forum')*, IX/1 (February 1939), 196-200.
- DREVER, JAMES, 'The Place of Psychology in the Training and Work of the Teacher', *The British Journal of Educational Psychology (Incorporating 'The Forum')*, V/3 (November 1935), 242-49.
- FINDLAY, J. J., 'Method in Teaching', *The Journal of Experimental Pedagogy and the Training College Record*, I/3 (March 1912), 234-35.

- GREEN, J. A., 'Review: Sigmund Freud's *The Interpretation of Dreams*', *The Journal of Experimental Pedagogy and the Training College Record*, II/2 (June 1913), 155.
- , 'Review: Percy Nunn's *Education: Its Data and First Principles*', *The Journal of Experimental Pedagogy and the Training College Record*, V/5 (June 1920), 250-55.
- GREEN, J.A., 'Experiment in Education', *The Training College Record*, I/1 (March 1908), 75-77.
- HAMLEY, H.R., 'The Place of Psychology in the Training of Teachers', *The British Journal of Educational Psychology (Incorporating 'The Forum')*, VI/1 (February 1936), 1-8.
- LLOYD-EVANS, A., 'The Place of Psychology in the Training of Teachers', *The British Journal of Educational Psychology (Incorporating 'The Forum')*, V/3 (November 1935), 257-63.
- , 'The Place of Psychology in the Training of Teachers', *British Journal of Educational Psychology*, V (1936), 257-65.
- LOVEJOY, T., 'Review: William McDougall's *Psychology: The Study of Behaviour*', *The Journal of Experimental Pedagogy and the Training College Record*, I/5 (December 1912), 410-12.
- NUNN, T. PERCY, 'Review: Alex Darroch's *The Place of Psychology in the Training of the Teacher*', *The Journal of Experimental Pedagogy and the Training College Record*, I/2 (November 1911), 173.
- , 'Review: Robert Rusk's *Experimental Education*', *The Journal of Experimental Pedagogy and the Training College Record*, I/5 (December 1912), 407-09.
- SMITH, BOMPAS, 'The Standpoint of Educational Psychology', *The Journal of Experimental Pedagogy and the Training College Record*, V/2 (June 1919), 57-67.
- SMITH, H. BOMPAS, 'Education and Spiritual Realities: A Paper Read at the T.C.A. Conference on Religious Education, 1922', *The Forum of Education*, I/1 (February 1923), 35-39.
- VALENTINE, C.W., 'Review of Susan Isaacs' *Intellectual Growth in Young Children*', *The British Journal of Educational Psychology (Incorporating 'The Forum')*, I/1 (February 1931), 106-09.

e) Textbooks: Education and Psychology

- ABBOTT, JACOB, *The Teacher, or Moral Influences employed in the Instruction and Government of the Young* (London: William Dalton & Sons).
- ADAMSON, JOHN WILLIAM, *English Education 1789-1902* (Cambridge: Cambridge University Press, 1930).
- BAIN, ALEXANDER, *The senses and the intellect* (2nd edn.; Lond., 1864).
- , *The emotions and the will* (3rd edn.; London: Longmans Green, 1875).
- , *Education as a science* (Internat. sci. ser. vol.25; Lond., 1879).
- BIRCHENOUGH, CHARLES, *History of Elementary Education in England and Wales* (London: W.B. Clive, 1914).
- BRACKENBURY, LAURA, *A Primer of Psychology* (London: John Murray, 1909).
- BRIERLEY, SUSAN S., *An Introduction to Psychology* (London: Methuen & Co., Ltd., 1921).
- BURKE, CORALIE EVELYN, *Child Study and Education* (Dublin: Brown and Nolan, 1908).
- BURT, CYRIL, *The Measurement of Mental Capacities* (Edinburgh: Oliver and Boyd, 1927).
- , 'Review: C.W. Valentine's *Psychology of Early Childhood*', *The British Journal of Educational Psychology (Incorporating 'The Forum')*, XII/3 (November 1942), 176-81.

- BURT, CYRIL, ED., *Experimental Psychology and Child Study* (London: Sir Isaac Pitman & Sons, Ltd., 1922).
- BURT, CYRIL, EDITOR, *How the Mind Works* (London: George Allen & Unwin, 1933).
- CHALKE, R.D., *A Synthesis of Froebel and Herbart* (London: WB Clive University Tutorial Press, Ltd, 1912).
- COMBE, GEORGE, *Education: Its Principles and Practice*, ed. William Jolly (London: MacMillan and Co., 1879).
- COWHAM, JOSEPH H., *The Principles of Oral Teaching and Mental Training* (London: Simpkin, Marshall, Hamilton, Kent and Co., Ltd, 1889).
- , *A New School Method for Pupil-Teachers and Students, Part I* (London: Simpkin, Marshall, Hamilton, Kent and Co., Ltd., 1894).
- , *The School Journey: A Means of Teaching Geography, Physiography, and Elementary Science* (London: Simpkin, Marshall, Hamilton, Kent and Co., Ltd., 1900).
- CURRIE, JAMES, *The Principles and Practice of Common-School Education* (Edinburgh: James Gordon, 1861).
- DRUMMOND, W.B., *An Introduction to Child-Study* (London: Edward Arnold, 1907).
- DUNN, HENRY, *Popular Education; the Normal School Manual* (London: The Sunday-School Union, 1837).
- FINDLAY, J.J., *Principles of Class Teaching* (London: MacMillan, 1904).
- FITCH, JOSHUA G., *Lectures on Teaching* (Cambridge: At the University Press, 1881).
- , *An Address on the Office and Work of a Training College* (Liverpool: Liverpool Printing and Stationery Company, Ltd., 1885).
- GILL, JOHN, *Introductory Text Book to School Management* (London: Longmans, Green & Co., 1863).
- , *Introductory Text Book to School Education, Method, and School Management: A Treatise on the Principles, Aims, and Instruments of Primary Education* (London: Longmans, Green & Co., 1882).
- GLADMAN, F.J., *School Method: Notes and Hints from lectures delivered at the Borough Road Training College, London, 13th edition* (London: Jarrold and Sons, 1886).
- GROOS, KARL, *The Play of Man* (New York and London: D Appleton and Co., 1901).
- HARTLEY, DAVID, *Observations on Man, His Frame, His Duty, and his Expectations.* (London: S. Richardson, 1749).
- HELLER, THOMAS EDMUND, *The New Code of Minutes of the Education Department, Instructions to Inspectors (1882) and Official Forms and Documents* (London: Bemrose and Sons, 1882).
- HUGHES, A.G. and HUGHES, E.H., *Learning and Teaching: An Introduction to Psychology and Education* (London: Longmans, Green and Co., 1937).
- HOLMES, EDMOND GORE A., *What is and What Might Be: A Study of Education in General and Elementary Education in Particular* (London: Constable and Company, 1911).
- ISAACS, SUSAN, *Intellectual Growth in Young Children* (London: George Routledge and Sons, Ltd., 1930).
- , *The Children We Teach: Seven to Eleven Years* (London: University of London Press, 1932).
- , *Social Development in Young Children: A Study of Beginnings* (London: George Routledge and Sons, Ltd., 1933).

- , *The Psychological Aspects of Child Development* (London: University of London Institute of Education and Evans Brothers, 1935).
- JAMES, WILLIAM, *The Principles of Psychology* (I; New York: Dover Publications, 1890, 1950).
- KEATINGE, MAURICE WALTER, *Applications and Testimonials of Maurice Walter Keatinge, Candidate for the Directorship in Glasgow* (1906).
- , *Suggestion in Education* (London: Adam and Charles Black, 1907).
- , *Studies in the Teaching of History* (London: Adam and Charles Black, 1910).
- KEATINGE, MAURICE WALTER and FRAZER, N.L., *An Introduction to World History with Maps and Illustrations* (London: Adam and Charles Black, 1913).
- KEATINGE, MAURICE WALTER, *Studies in Education* (London: Adam and Charles Black, 1916).
- LLOYD MORGAN, CONWY, *Psychology for Teachers* (London: Edward Arnold, 1894).
- LOCKE, JOHN, *Some Thoughts Concerning Education*, ed. John W. and Jean W. Yolton (Oxford University Press, 1693, 1989).
- , *An Essay Concerning Humane Understanding* (The second edition, with large additions. edn.; London: printed for Thomas Dring at the Harrow over-against the Inner-Temple Gate in Fleet-street; and Samuel Manship at the Ship in Cornhill near the Royal Exchange, 1694).
- MCDUGALL, WILLIAM, *An Introduction to Social Psychology* (London: Methuen and Company, 1922, 1908).
- , *Psychology: The Study of Behaviour* (London: Oxford University Press, 1952).
- , *The Study of Behaviour with an Introduction by Sir Cyril Burt* (London: Oxford University Press, 1952).
- MILL, JOHN STUART, 'Bain's Psychology', in J.M. Robson (ed.), *Collected Works of JS Mill, Essays on Philosophy and the Classics* (XI; Toronto: University of Toronto Press, 1859), 339-74.
- MONROE, PAUL, *A Text-Book in the History of Education* (Norwood, Mass: MacMillan, 1905).
- NEILL, A. S., *That Dreadful School* (London: Herbert Jenkins, Ltd., 1937).
- NEILL, A.S., *The Problem Child* (London: Herbert Jenkins, Ltd., 1926).
- , *The Problem Parent* (London: Herbert Jenkins, Ltd., 1932).
- , *The Problem Teacher* (London: Herbert Jenkins Ltd, 1939).
- NUNN, T. PERCY, *Education: Its Data and First Principles* (London: Edward Arnold, 1920).
- , *The Haldane Memorial Lecture, Birkbeck College* (London: J. W. Ruddock & Sons, 1939).
- PANTON, J.H., *Modern Teaching Practice and Technique* (London: Longmans, Green & Co., 1945).
- PAYNE, JOSEPH, *The Importance of the Training of Teachers* (London: William Ridgway, 1873).
- , *Froebel and the Kindergarten System of Elementary Education: A Lecture Delivered at the College of Preceptors* (London: College of Preceptors, 1874).
- , 'The Science and Art of Education', *An introductory lecture delivered at the College of Preceptors* (London: Henry S. King and Co, 1874).
- QUICK, ROBERT HEBERT, *Essays on Educational Reformers* (London: Longmans, Green & Co., 1868).
- , *Essays on Educational Reformers, copyright 1890* (New York: D. Appleton and Company, 1907).
- RIBOT, THEODULE A., *Modern English Psychology* (London: Henry S. King and Company, 1873).

- ROSS, JAMES S., *Groundwork of Educational Psychology* (London: George G. Harrap and Co., Ltd., 1931).
- ROUSSEAU, JEAN-JACQUES, *Emile*, trans. Barbara Foxley (London: Everyman, 1762, 1993).
- RUNCIMAN, JAMES, *Schools and Scholars* (London: Chatto and Windus, 1887).
- RUSK, ROBERT R., *Introduction to Experimental Education* (London: Longmans, Green & Co., 1912).
- SADLER, MICHAEL and EDITOR, *Moral Instruction and Training in Schools: Report of an International Inquiry, Volume I* (London: Longmans, Green & Co., 1908).
- SPENCER, HERBERT, *Education: Intellectual, Moral, and Physical* (London: Watts and Company, 1929, 1859).
- STOW, DAVID, *The Training System, Established in the Glasgow Normal Seminary and its Model Schools* (Glasgow: Black and Son, 1840).
- STUART, JANET ERSKINE, *The Education of Catholic Girls* (London: Longmans, Green & Co., Ltd., 1927, sixth edition).
- STURT, MARY and OAKDEN, ELLEN C., *Matter and Method in Education* (London: Kegan Paul, Trench, Trubner & Co., 1928).
- SULLY, JAMES, *Outlines of Psychology with Special Reference to the Theory of Education* (London: Longmanns, Green and Co., 1884).
- , *Teacher's Handook of Psychology on the basis of 'Outlines of Psychology'* (London: Longmanns, Green and Co., 1886).
- , *Studies of Childhood* (London: Longmans, Green and Co., 1895).
- , *The Teacher's Handbook of Psychology* (London: Longmans, Green and Co., 1909).
- THORNDIKE, EDWARD LEE, *Educational Psychology* (2nd edn.; New York: Teachers College, Columbia University, 1910).
- THRING, EDWARD, *Education and School* (London: MacMillan, 1867, 2nd edition).
- TITCHENER, EDWARD BRADFORD, *A Text-book of Psychology, volume 1* (New York: MacMillan Company, 1909).
- WELTON, JAMES, *Principles and Methods of Teaching, second edition* (London: W.B. Clive, 1909).
- , 'Review: John Adams's *The Evolution of English Educational Theory*', *The Journal of Experimental Pedagogy and the Training College Record*, 1/5 (December 1912), 403-04.
- WOLTERS, A.W., 'Psychology in the Work of Teachers', *The British Journal of Educational Psychology (Incorporating 'The Forum')*, V/3 (November 1935), 250-56.

f) Miscellaneous printed primary works

- University of Cambridge, Teachers' Training Syndicate, Examinations for Certificates, 1903* (London: C.J. Clay & Sons, 1903).
- 'The Wesleyan Committee of Education: The 85th Annual Report', (Somerset: Purrell and Sons, 1924-1925).
- Divini Illius Magistri*, ed. Pope Pius XI (Rappresentatanti in Terra; Raleigh: McGrath Publishing Company, 1929) 355-69.
- 'St Mary's College Centenary Record', *Hammersmith 1850-1925, Strawberry Hill 1925-1950* (London: F. Mildner and Sons, 1950).

- Stockwell College Old Students' Association, 1892-1992* (Trowbridge, Wiltshire: Rosemary F. Carr, 1992).
- ATKINSON, F.W., 'Child Study in Secondary schools', *The School Review*, 5/7 (September, 1897 1912), 461-66.
- BLACK, J., 'On some Defects in our Present School System: A Lecture' (Edinburgh, Edmonston and Douglas, 1876).
- GOSCHEN, G.J., *Mental Training and Useful Knowledge: An Address delivered at the Victorian Rooms, University College, Bristol* (London: Simpkin, Marshall and Co., 1879).

(3) Secondary works

- History of Education for the Twenty-First Century*, ed. David Crook and Richard Aldrich (Bedford Way Papers; London: Institute of Education, University of London, 2000).
- ADAM, SIR RONALD FORBES, 'From Day Training College to Institute of Education', in University of London Institute of Education (ed.), *Jubilee Lectures Delivered in the Beveridge Hall, the Senate House, Spring Term* (London: Evans Brothers, 1952).
- ALBISETTI, JAMES, 'The Debate on Secondary School Reform in France and Germany', in Franz Ringer Detlef K. Mueller, Brian Simon (ed.), *The Rise of the Modern Educational System: Structural Change and Social Reproduction 1870-1920* (Cambridge: Cambridge University Press, 1987).
- , 'Systemization: A Critique', in Franz Ringer Detlef K. Mueller, Brian Simon (ed.), *The Rise of the Modern Educational System: Structural Change and Social Reproduction 1870-1920* (Cambridge: Cambridge University Press, 1987).
- ALDRICH, RICHARD, *The Institute of Education: 1902-2002* (London: University of London Institute of Education, 2002).
- BARTLE, G.F., *A History of Borough Road College* (Kettering: Dalkeith Press Limited, 1976).
- BEREDAY, GEORGE Z.F. and LAUWERYS, JOSEPH A., *The Education and Training of Teachers* (The Year Book of Education; New York: Evans Brothers, 1963).
- BERGER, PETER, 'Globalization and Religion', *The Hedgehog Review*, 4/2 (2002), 7-20.
- BERNBAUM, GERALD, *Social Change and the Schools, 1918-1944* (Students Library of Education; London: Routledge and Kegan Paul, 1967).
- BOOTHROYD, H.E., *A History of the Inspectorate* (London: Printed for Private Circulation by the Board of Education Inspectors' Association, 1923).
- BOYD, MICHAEL V., *The Church of England Colleges, 1890-1914: An Administrative Study* (Educational Administrative and Historical Monographs, 14; Leeds: University of Leeds, 1984).
- BRADBURY, JOHN L., *Chester College and the Training of Teachers 1839-1975* (Chester: Governors of Chester College, 1975).
- CANNON, CHARMIAN, 'The Influence of Religion on Educational Policy, 1902-1944', *British Journal of Educational Studies*, 12/2 (May 1964), 143-60.
- CHAPMAN, J. VINCENT, *Professional Roots: The College of Preceptors in British Society* (Epping: Theydon Bois Publications, 1986).
- COPLEY, TERENCE, *Indoctrination, Education, and God: The Struggle for the Mind* (London: SPCK, 2005).

- DAVIE, GRACE, *Religion in Britain since 1945: Believing Without Belonging* (Oxford: Blackwell, 1994).
- , *Religion in Modern Europe: A Memory Mutates* (Oxford: Oxford University Press, 2000).
- , *The Sociology of Religion* (London: Sage Publications, 2007).
- DENT, H.C., *The Training of Teachers in England and Wales, 1800-1975* (London: Hodder and Soughton, 1977).
- DESALES, MARY, *LSU: 100 Years of La Sainte Union in Southampton* (Southampton: Paul Cave Publications, 1980).
- EAGLESHAM, E.J.R., *The Foundations of Twentieth-Century Education in England* (Students Library of Education; London: Routledge and Kegan Paul, 1967).
- FIELD, G.C., 'Conwy Lloyd Morgan (1852-1936)', in Brian Harrison and Colin Matthew (eds.), *Dictionary of National Biography* (Oxford: Oxford 2004), <http://www.oxforddnb.com/view/article/35101>.
- FRITH, SIMON, 'Socialization and Rational Schooling: Elementary Education in Leeds before 1870', in Phillip McCann (ed.), *Popular Education and Socialization in the Nineteenth Century* (London: Methuen, 1977).
- G. BEREDAY, B. HOLMES, J.A. LAUWERYS, 'The Content of Education from the 1958 Yearbook of Education', in Joseph Lauwerys (ed.), *Essays in Comparative Education: Teachers and Training* (London: Evans Brothers, Ltd., 1969).
- GARDNER, PHILIP, 'Intending Teachers and School-Based Teacher Training, 1903-1939', *Oxford Review of Education*, 21/4 (December 1995), 425-45.
- GARNETT, JANE, 'Religious and Intellectual Life', in Colin Matthew (ed.), *The British Isles: 1851-1901* (Oxford: Oxford University Press, 2000).
- GARNETT, JANE; GRIMLEY, MATTHEW; HARRIS, ALANA; WHYTE, WILLIAM; WILLIAMS, SARAH (ed.), *Redefining Christian Britain: Post 1945 Perspectives* (London: SCM, 2007).
- GAY, JOHN D., 'The Christian Campus? The Role of the English Churches in Higher Education', in John D. Gay (ed.), *Culham College of Education Working Papers* (Abingdon: Culham College of Education, 1978-1979).
- , 'Chaplaincy in Church Colleges: A Study of the Role of Chaplain in Thirteen Anglican Colleges of Higher Education', *Culham Occasional Papers* (Abingdon: Culham College Institute, 1983).
- , 'The Churches and the Training of Teachers in England and Wales', in Alan McClelland (ed.), *Christian Education in a Pluralist Society* (London: Routledge, 1988).
- , 'The Church College Trusts', in Trevor Brighton (ed.), *150 Years: The Church Colleges in Higher Education* (West Sussex Institute of Higher Education, 1989).
- GIDDENS, ANTHONY, *Profiles and Critiques in Social Theory* (London, 1982).
- GREEN, S.J.D., 'Religion and the Rise of the Common Man: Mutual Improvement Societies, Religious Associations and Popular Education', in Derek Fraser (ed.), *Cities, Class and Communication: Essays in Honour of Asa Briggs* (London, 1990).
- GRIMLEY, MATTHEW, *Citizenship, Community and the Church of England: Liberal Anglican Theories of the State between the Wars* (*Oxford Historical Monographs*) (Oxford: Clarendon Press, 2004).
- HAYWARD, I.J., 'The London County Council and the Training of Teachers, 1902-1952', in University of London Institute of Education (ed.), *Jubilee Lectures, Delivered in the Beveridge Hall, Senate House, Spring Term* (London: Evans Brothers, 1952).
- HEAFFORD, MICHAEL, *Pestalozzi: His Thought and its Relevance Today*, ed. CH Dobinson (The Library of Educational Thought; Suffolk: Chauver Press, 1967).

- HERBERT, CHRISTOPHER, *Victorian relativity : radical thought and scientific discovery* (Chicago; London: University of Chicago Press, 2001) xv, 302.
- HURST, JEREMY, 'Religious Requirement: The Case for Roman Catholic Schools in the 1940s and Muslim Schools in the 1990s', *Journal of Beliefs and Values*, 21/1 (2000), 87-97.
- HURT, JOHN, *Education in Evolution* (second edn.; London: Paladin, 1972).
- JONES, DONALD K., 'Lancashire, the American Common School, and the Religious Problem in British Education in the 19th Century', *British Journal of Educational Studies*, 15 (1967), 292-307.
- , 'Socialization and Social Science: Manchester Model Secular School 1854-1861', in Phillip McCann (ed.), *Popular Education and Socialization in the Nineteenth Century* (London: Methuen, 1977).
- KENYON-JONES, CHRISTINE, *King's College London: In the Service of Society* (London: King's College, 2004).
- LANCE, G.E. JONES, *The Training of Teachers in England and Wales: A Critical Survey* (London: Oxford University Press, 1924).
- LAWRENCE, EVELYN, *Friedrich Froebel and English Education* (London: Routledge and Kegan Paul, 1952).
- LAWTON, DENIS AND GORDON, PETER, *A History of Western Educational Ideas* (London: Woburn Press, 2002).
- LEARS, T.J. JACKSON, *No Place of Grace: Antimodernism and the Transformation of American Culture, 1880-1920* (Chicago: University of Chicago Press, 1981).
- LOFTHOUSE, MARK, *The Church Colleges 1918-1939: The Struggle for Survival* (Leicestershire: J. Billings, 1992).
- MACINTYRE, ALASDAIR, *Three Rival Versions of Moral Inquiry: Encyclopaedia, Genealogy and Tradition* (London: Duckworth, 1990).
- MACLURE, J. STUART, *Educational Documents: England and Wales - 1816-1963* (London: Chapman & Hall, 1965).
- MARTIN, DAVID, *Pentecostalism: the World Their Parish* (Oxford: Blackwell, 2002).
- MCCANN, PHILLIP, 'Popular Education, Socialization, and Social Control: Spitalfields 1812-1824', in Phillip McCann (ed.), *Popular Education and Socialization in the Nineteenth Century* (London: Methuen, 1977).
- MCGREGOR, GORDON, *Towards True Education: Essays in the Celebration of the first 150 years of the University College of Ripon and York St John* (York: The University College of Ripon and York St John, 1994).
- MCINTYRE, JOHN, 'Catholic Schools', *Journal of Education: A Monthly Record and Review*, xxxv (1913), 686-87.
- MILLER, HELENA, 'Meeting the Challenge: The Jewish Schooling Problem in the UK', *Oxford Review of Education*, 27/4 (December 2001), 501-13.
- MORE, CHARLES, *The Training of Teachers, 1847-1947: A History of the Church Colleges at Cheltenham* (London: The Hambledon Press, 1992).
- MUELLER, DETLEF K., 'Introduction', in Franz Ringer Detlef K. Mueller, Brian Simon (ed.), *The Rise of the Modern Educational System: Structural Change and Social Reproduction 1870-1920* (Cambridge: Cambridge University Press, 1987).
- MURPHY, JAMES, *The Religious Problem in English Education the Crucial Experiment* (Liverpool: Liverpool University Press, 1959).

- , *Church, state and schools in Britain, 1800-1970* (Students library of education; London: Routledge & Kegan Paul, 1971) xv, 152.
- NAYLOR, LEONARD and HOWAT, GERALD, *Culham College History* (Culham: Culham Educational Foundation, 1982).
- O'BRIEN, S., 'A Distinctive Church College: St Paul and St Mary, Cheltenham', in Trevor Brighton (ed.), *150 Years: The Church Colleges in Higher Education* (Bognor Regis, West Sussex: West Sussex Institute of Higher Education, 1989).
- OWEN, DAVID, *English Philanthropy 1660-1960* (London: Oxford University Press, 1965).
- PEIRERO, JAMES, 'Tractarians and National Education, 1838-1843', in Sheridan Gilley (ed.), *Victorian Churches and Churchmen: Essays Presented to Vincent Alan McClelland* (Woodbridge: Catholic Record Society, Boydell Press, 2005).
- POLANYI, MICHAEL, *Personal Knowledge: Towards a Post-Critical Philosophy* (Chicago: University of Chicago Press, 1958).
- PRIESTMAN, BARBARA, *Froebel Education To-Day* (London: University of London Press, 1946).
- PRITCHARD, F.C., *The Story of Westminster College, 1851-1951* (London: The Epworth Press, 1951).
- REISMAN, DAVID, *A Study of the Changing American Character, revised and abridged* (New Haven: Yale University Press, 2001).
- REUBEN, JULIE A., *The Making of the Modern University: Intellectual Transformation and the Marginalization of Morality* (Chicago: University of Chicago Press, 1996).
- RICH, R.W., *The Training of Teachers in England and Wales During the 19th Century* (London: Cambridge University Press, 1933).
- RICHARDS, GRAHAM, 'William McDougall (1871-1938)', in Brian Harrison and Colin Matthew (eds.), *Dictionary of National Biography* (Oxford: Oxford University Press, 2004), <http://www.oxforddnb.com/search/quick/?quicksearch=quicksearch&docPos=1&searchTarget=people&simpleName=William+McDougall&imageField.x=15&imageField.y=13>.
- ROBERT K. HALL, NICHOLAS HANS, JOSEPH LAUWERYS, 'The Social Position of Teachers', in Joseph Lauwerys (ed.), *Essays in Comparative Education: Teachers and Training* (London: Evans Brothers, 1969).
- ROBINSON, WENDY, 'Expert and Novice in the Pupil-teacher System of the Latter Nineteenth Century', *Journal of Educational Administration and History*, 28/2 (July 1996), 129-41.
- , 'In Search of a 'Plain Tale': Rediscovering the Champions of the Pupil-Teacher Centres, 1900-1910', *History of Education*, 28/1 (March 1999), 53-72.
- , 'Historiographical Reflections on the 1902 Education Act', *Oxford Review of Education*, 28/2/3 (June-Sept 2002), 159-72.
- ROSE, MARTIAL, *A History of King Alfred's College, Winchester: 1840-1980* (London: Phillimore & Co., Ltd., 1981).
- RUBENSTEIN, DAVID, 'Socialisation and the London School Board 1870-1904: Aims, Methods and Public Opinion', in Phillip McCann (ed.), *Popular Education and Socialization in the Nineteenth Century* (London: Methuen, 1977).
- RYLANCE, RICK, *Victorian Psychology and British Culture 1850-1880* (Oxford: Oxford University Press, 2000).
- SECORD, JAMES A., *Victorian sensation : the extraordinary publication, reception, and secret authorship of Vestiges of the Natural History of Creation* (Chicago, Ill. ; London: University of Chicago Press, 2000).
- SELBY-BIGGE, LEWIS AMHERST, *The Board of Education* (London: G.P Putnam's Sons, 1927).

- SELL, ALAN P. F., *John Locke and the Eighteenth-century Divines* (Cardiff: University of Wales Press, 1997).
- SELLECK, R.J.W., *The New Education: 1870-1914* (London: Sir Isaac Pitman and Sons, 1968).
- , *English Primary Education and the Progressives, 1914-1939* (London: Routledge and Kegan Paul, 1972).
- SMITH, CHRISTIAN, *The Secular Revolution: Power, Interests, and Conflict in the Secularisation of American Public Life* (Berkeley: University of California Press, 2003).
- SPILLER, G., *The Ethical Movement in Great Britain: A Documentary History* (London: The Farleigh Press, 1934).
- STEPHENS, W. B., *Education in Britain, 1750-1914* (Social history in perspective; Basingstoke: Macmillan, 1998).
- TAYLOR, CHARLES, *Sources of the Self: The Making of the Modern Identity* (Cambridge: Cambridge University Press, 1989).
- THOMSON, MATHEW, *Psychological Subjects: Identity, Culture, and Health in Twentieth-Century Britain* (Oxford: Oxford University Press, 2006).
- VINCENT, LESLIE, *The Annals of the College of St Matthias Commemorated in 1976* (1976).
- WILLIAMS, SARAH, 'Religious Belief and Popular Culture: a Study of the South London Borough of Southwark, c. 1880-1939', (Oxford University D. Phil, 1993).
- , 'Victorian Religion: Class or Culture?' *Nineteenth Century Studies*, 17 (2003), 13-19.
- WILSON, J. DOVER and CAVANAGH, F.A., 'Introduction', *Herbert Spencer on Education* (Cambridge: CUP, 1932).
- WOOLDRIDGE, ADRIAN, *Measuring the Mind: Education and Psychology in England, c. 1860-c.1990* (Cambridge: Cambridge University Press, 1994).
- ZEBEDEE, D.H.J., *Lincoln Training College 1862-1962* (Lincoln: Keyworth Fry, 1962).

(4) Unpublished theses

- COLE, PHILIP G., 'Extracts of a Dissertation, 1967-70 on Servicemen After the Great War', *St Paul's College* (Cheltenham, 1970).
- FREATHY, ROBIN JAMES KENNETH, 'Religious Education and Education for Citizenship in English Schools, 1934-44', (University of Exeter D. Phil, 2005).
- WOOLDRIDGE, ADRIAN, 'Child Study and Educational Psychology in England, 1880-1950', (Oxford University D. Phil Thesis, 1985).