

THE UNIVERSITY OF OKLAHOMA
GRADUATE COLLEGE

A CRITICAL COMPARISON OF THE EDUCATIONAL THEORIES
OF FIVE EDUCATIONAL SOCIOLOGISTS

A DISSERTATION
SUBMITTED TO THE GRADUATE FACULTY
in partial fulfillment of the requirements for the
degree of
DOCTOR OF PHILOSOPHY

BY
TIMOTHY J. BERGEN, JR.

Norman, Oklahoma

1974

A CRITICAL COMPARISON OF THE EDUCATIONAL THEORIES
OF FIVE EDUCATIONAL SOCIOLOGISTS

APPROVED BY

Clayman H. Stuart
John Pulliam
Tillman J. Ragans
John E. Steinbrink

DISSERTATION COMMITTEE

ACKNOWLEDGEMENTS

Like everyone else, the writer owes more debts than he can ever repay, or even tell. However to certain people, who have played a particularly important part in the development of this dissertation:

A very special debt of gratitude is extended to Dr. Chipman G. Stuart, Chairman of the writer's Dissertation Committee, for his encouragement, understanding, and able guidance in directing this work from its beginning to its conclusion.

The writer wishes to express his appreciation to Dr. John D. Pulliam, Dr. John E. Steinbrink, and Dr. Tillman J. Ragan for serving on the writer's Dissertation Committee and for making helpful suggestions for its improvement.

Assistance and suggestions offered by Michele Davis, without whose assistance this dissertation would never have been completed, were immensely appreciated.

Most of all, the writer wishes to acknowledge his indebtedness to his parents, Mr. and Mrs. Timothy J. Bergen, Sr., for their constant patience and encouragement given in the continuance of his education.

Finally, the writer wishes to express his gratitude to his students, who taught him much more than he taught them.

PREFACE

The primary purpose of this study was to compare the major areas of agreement and disagreement between five of the early leaders in the field of educational sociology: Ross L. Finney, E. George Payne, Charles C. Peters, Walter R. Smith, and David S. Snedden. This was a descriptive and historical investigation of the work of these educational sociologists. Particular attention was given the following questions as the questions are viewed by these educational sociologists: (1) What is the significance of educational sociology? (2) What is the sociological concept of education? (3) What has been the effect of religion and the family on education? (4) What is the purpose of social control? (5) What are the objectives of educational sociology in a democratic community?

According to these five educational sociologists, educational sociology must furnish all school personnel with definite standards and attainable objectives through the investigation of specific social groups. The fundamental contribution sociology can make to education is to increase

sociological insights and concepts that will allow an accounting of organizational, cultural, and interpersonal factors which influence educational decisions. These five educational sociologists have accentuated a pluralistic approach to educational issues.

In their investigations, and in their specific educational suggestions, these men have not in any disputed the economic, social, or educational pattern. Although these five educational sociologists have conceded the possibility that improvements could be made to both the democratic order and the educational system, their disclosures have been only moderate in character. These educational sociologists have done little to arouse the American public out of its complacency toward the public school system. They have not forced educators to re-examine their own ideas and to make these ideas more explicit and understandable to the general public. They have failed to help turn a national spotlight on educational problems.

Any definite prediction concerning the future trends in educational sociology is extremely dangerous. A critical view of society indicates that educational sociology must play a more significant part in the training of future teachers in this country. Educational trends lead one to reasonably assume that the social concerns of the schools must expand.

Consideration of the research needs in certain problem areas in educational sociology leads to the conclusion that education is a rich area for very necessary sociological inquiry. Many problems exist which can be solved only through systematic research. Exploration of these problems will undoubtedly yield a rich harvest to the storehouse of sociological knowledge and the field of education.

TABLE OF CONTENTS

	Page
ACKNOWLEDGEMENTS	iii
PREFACE	iv
CHAPTER	
I. INTRODUCTION	1
The Background	1
The Statement of the Problem	11
The Significance of the Study	11
Research Design and Methodology	13
The Procedure for Gathering Data	15
Limitations	16
Delimitations	16
Review of the Literature	17
Organization of the Study	19
Outline of the Study	20
II. THE HISTORICAL BACKGROUNDS OF EDUCATIONAL SOCIOLOGY	23
Sociology defined	23
The Development of Educational Sociology	26
Educational sociology and its relation to sociology	26
European influences	27
Early American influences	29
The Development of Teaching and Research	33
Educational sociology as a course of study	33
Publications in educational sociology	34
The advancement of survey research	37
The Five Selected Educational Sociologists	40
Ross Lee Finney	41
E. George Payne	42
Charles Clinton Peters	44

Walter Robinson Smith	45
David Samuel Snedden	46
Summary	49
 III. THE SIGNIFICANCE OF EDUCATIONAL SOCIOLOGY	 51
A Definition of Education	52
Future oriented	52
Consciously controlled learning process	58
Train man for participation in society	61
Transmits society's culture	62
A Definition of Sociology	64
Interaction between groups	64
The science of social relationships	65
Group processes and interactions	66
The pure and the applied	67
Social relationships	67
A Definition of Educational Sociology	69
Two distinct kinds of knowledge	69
Institutions and social forms	70
The social purposes of the educational process	71
Fundamental in the training of teachers	72
The science of social interdependencies	73
The Scope of Educational Sociology	75
Application of findings	75
Interested in social processes	76
Relates the school to other institutions	76
Determines educational objectives	78
The Aims of Educational Sociology	79
An effective agency for social readjustment	79
Develop means for social change	82
Indicates how youth is socialized	83
Makes efficient members of society	84
Develops principles by scientific methods	85
The Value of Educational Sociology	88
Related view of the social order	88
Socio-scientific approach to education	90
Improved institutional life	93
Scientific study of educational needs and values	95
Educational Sociology and Its Relation to Educational Psychology	96
Dependent on one another	96
Determination of educational objectives	98

Needs of society	100
Used in solving educational problems	101
Give direction to the schools	102
Summary	104
 IV. THE SOCIOLOGICAL CONCEPT OF EDUCATION	 105
A Definition of Socialization	108
Accumulation of beliefs	108
Not an isolated process	110
Solidarity of spirit	112
Highest cultural attainment	113
Orientation to values and beliefs	115
The Distinctions between Socialization, Learning, and Education	116
Problem solving techniques	116
Process of cultivation	118
Function in the future	120
Subject to tests	120
External stimulus	123
The Necessity of Socialization and Education for the Development and Maintenance of Our Society	125
Learning process	125
Situations are manipulated	127
Draw upon experiences	128
Personal ability would be used	130
Learning all the time	131
The Most Effective Social System Concerning Socialization and Learning	134
Social participation	134
Static practices	135
Vital educative experiences	137
Teacher training institutions	138
Free public education	141
Summary	142
 V. THE EFFECT OF RELIGION AND THE FAMILY ON EDUCATION	 145
The Educational Function of the Church	146
Cooperative type of human nature	146
Instruction of the young	150
Supplement the school	152
Participation with schools	154
Two kinds of functions	156

Religious Education in the Public Schools . . .	157
Separation of church and state	157
Released time	159
Inadequate religious instruction	159
Critical study of social values	160
The Function of the Family	162
Education social values	162
Social adjustment	163
Social relationships	164
Center of cultural interests	166
Transmits social heritage	168
The Importance of the Family as a Primary Group	169
Basic instruction	169
Harmonious relations of members	171
Direct education	172
Early impressions of members	174
Character formation	175
Summary	176
 VI. THE PURPOSE OF SOCIAL CONTROL	 179
 The Meaning and Forms of Social Control	 180
A matter of education	180
The necessity of social control	184
Application of pressure	186
Personal and social forces	187
Varied social control	189
The Origins of Social Control	190
Deep in the psychological process	190
Social control as sanctions	191
The growth of society	192
Adjustment of the young to the group	193
The Dominant Influences of Social Control . . .	195
From generation to generation	195
Conformity to the group	197
Predominance of group needs	199
Democracy and freedom of thought	201
The Role of the School as an	
Agency of Social Control	203
Transmission of mores	203
Positive and negative controls	205
Desired pupil behavior	207
Active student participation	208
Summary	209

VII.	THE MAIN OBJECTIVES OF EDUCATION IN A DEMOCRATIC COMMUNITY	212
	The Meaning of Democracy	215
	Two meanings of democracy	215
	Social and political democracy	215
	Blueprinting	216
	The goal of civilization	217
	Liberty and freedom	219
	Democracy in the United States	221
	Dependent on other social institutions	221
	Individual determination of the law	222
	The problems of stability	224
	Dynamic democratic change	226
	Promotion of democracy	227
	Democracy and Education	228
	Investigation of various ideas and theories	228
	The development of open mindedness	230
	The right kind of education	231
	Cause and effect	232
	The growth of the ruling class	233
	The Democratic Nature of the School Community	235
	The changing curriculum	235
	Real life experiences	236
	The lack of democracy	238
	Directed toward public end	239
	An important source of educative experience	241
	Summary	243
VIII.	SUMMARY, CONCLUSIONS, AND RECOMMENDATIONS	245
	Summary	247
	The Journal of Educational Sociology	264
	Conclusions	267
	Recommendations	271
	BIBLIOGRAPHY	275

LIST OF TABLES

Table	Page
I. Selection Matrix	14
II. Definition of Education	53
III. Definition of Sociology	53
IV. Definition of Educational Sociology	54
V. Scope of Educational Sociology	54
VI. The Aims of Educational Sociology	55
VII. The Value of Educational Sociology	55
VIII. Educational Sociology and Its Relation to Educational Psychology	56
IX. A Definition of Socialization	106
X. Distinctions Between Socialization, Learning, and Education	106
XI. The Necessity of Socialization and Education for the Development and Maintenance of Society	107
XII. The Most Effective Social System Concerning Learning and Socialization	107
XIII. The Educational Function of the Church	147
XIV. Religious Education in the Public Schools	147
XV. The Function of the Family	148

XVI.	The Importance of the Family as a Primary Group	148
XVII.	The Meaning and Forms of Social Control . . .	181
XVIII.	The Origins of Social Control	181
XIX.	The Dominant Influences of Social Control . .	182
XX.	The Role of the School as an Agency of Social Control	182
XXI.	The Meaning of Democracy	213
XXII.	Democracy in the United States	213
XXIII.	Democracy and Education	214
XXIV.	Democratic Nature of the School Community . .	214

CHAPTER I

INTRODUCTION

The Background

Educational sociology, primarily a subject for teacher-trainers and defined at present as the study of the relationship between education and society, is an American "brainchild" of the twentieth century.¹ Conceived and named by American educators and sociologists, this professional discipline grew and developed under their solicitous care. Like many American ideas, educational sociology traces its ancestral line to European thought, in particular to the educational, philosophical, and sociological theories of the seventeenth, eighteenth, and nineteenth centuries. These theories, which were to exert influence upon the formation of educational sociology, originated with such men as Comenius, Comte, Durkheim, Froebel, Hegel, Herbart, Hume, Locke, Pestalozzi, Rousseau, Spencer, and Tarde. They had propounded

¹Irene J. Lawrence, "A History of Educational Sociology in the United States" (unpublished Ph.D. dissertation, Stanford University, 1951), p. 12.

ideas concerning the significance of environment in accounting for individual differences, the perfectability of men through a controlled environment, and the utilization of universal education as the social instrument through which human perfectability and social progress could be achieved.¹

These European concepts attracted the interest of educational leaders in the United States, who began to regard the school as a social institution and education as a potent instrument for social progress. As early as post-Revolutionary days, educational theorists consciously planned a system of schools integrated with other social institutions and designed to further national democratic ideals. Beginning with Jefferson, there were outspoken educators who stood uncompromisingly for a democratic conception of life.² During the nineteenth century, prominent educators like Horace Mann, William Torrey Harris, John Dewey, James Mark Baldwin, and Samuel Train Dutton expended their efforts in serious thought regarding the social functions of education. After the middle of the nineteenth century, Mann voiced his beliefs about the relationship between society and education and

¹Florence W. Schaper, "The Rise and Development of Educational Sociology in the United States" (unpublished Ph.D. dissertation, New York University, 1932), pp. 98-99.

²Merle Curti, The Social Ideas of American Educators (New York: Charles Scribners and Sons, 1935), pp. 581-585.

popularized the idea of free and universal education as a means of achieving individual and social perfectability.¹ Harris, as United States Commissioner of Education in 1893, questioned the soundness of a philosophy of education not based upon sociology.² Three years later, John Dewey published a booklet entitled "My Pedagogic Creed" in which he confessed his faith in the student as "a social individual," in the school as "a social institution," in education as "the fundamental method of social progress," and in the teacher as "a social servant set apart for the maintenance of proper social order and the securing of the right social growth."³

James Mark Baldwin, whose book, Social and Ethical Interpretations in Mental Development, was published in the same year as Dewey's booklet, expressed views similar to those of his contemporary. However, he concentrated upon the

¹ Joseph S. Roucek, "Some Contributions of Sociology to Education," Contemporary Social Theory, ed. by Harry Elmer Barnes, Howard Becker, and Frances Bennett Becker (New York: Appleton Century Co., 1940), p. 797.

² William Torrey Harris, "Froebel and Education for Self-Activity," Educational Review, VI (June 1893), p. 34.

³ John Dewey, "My Pedagogic Creed," Journal of the National Education Association, Vol. 24, No. 1 (January 1935), pp. 13-16.

child as a social person rather than upon the social aspects of education.¹

In 1899 when Dewey lectured before an audience of parents and others interested in the Chicago University Elementary School, he again stressed the idea of socializing every phase of school life and summarized his position in a last lecture when he said:

. . . if the school is related as a whole to life as a whole, its various aims and ideals--culture, discipline, information, utility--cease to be variants, for one of which we must select one to study and for another another. The growth of the child in the direction of social capacity and service, his larger and more vital union with life, becomes the unifying aim; and discipline, culture and information fall into place as phases of this growth.²

Thus it was in the last half of the nineteenth century that American educators began to take interest in the social aspects of education. They were not alone in their interest. Sociologists later began to concern themselves with the relationship between their field and that of educators. They lagged somewhat behind educators for the very reason that sociologists had not a distinct status in the academic world until the last two decades of the nineteenth century. Prior

¹ James Mark Baldwin, Social and Ethical Interpretations in Mental Development (New York: Macmillan Co., 1897).

² John Dewey, The School and Society (Chicago: University of Chicago Press, 1899), p. 107.

to this time there were social scientists but no sociologists as such.¹ When sociologists had become established, Lester Frank Ward and the pioneer sociologists Small, Giddings, Koss, Cooley, Sumner, and Keller sought and found common ground between sociology and education.²

Ward devoted the final chapter of his 1883 book, Dynamic Sociology, to a discussion of "Education as One Proximate Means of Progress." The central theory of Ward was the control of social progress by means of education, "the proximate means of progress." To insure progress, knowledge must be available to all, and schools must become free and compulsory. Formal education should establish as its objective for educational procedure the criterion of social utility; it should be social education.³

The following quotation from Dynamic Sociology epitomizes Ward's position on education:

The problem of education, is therefore, reduced to this: whether the members of society shall continue to pass through life surrounded only by the natural and unrecognized influences which everywhere exist, . . . or, whether they shall be required to

¹Schaper, "The Rise and Development of Educational Sociology in the United States," pp. 46-48.

²Roucek, "Some Contributions to Sociology of Education," pp. 793-833.

³Lester Frank Ward, Dynamic Sociology, Vol. II (New York: Appleton-Century, 1883), p. 568.

pass a portion of their early lives under a system of artificial circumstances, so regulated that the bulk of the influences which appeal to the senses and produce ideas will be both reliable and important, and from which, under no other than the normal operations of the mind, reliable and valuable knowledge must necessarily result, solid characters be formed, and the highest ethical and dynamic actions be induced, exerting rigidly corresponding effects upon themselves and upon society.¹

Albion W. Small also spoke in defense of the interrelationships of sociology and education. In 1896, at the annual convention of the Department of Superintendence, he read a paper entitled "The Demands of Sociology Upon Pedagogy." Sociology, he emphatically stated, "demands first that for everybody the study of society shall begin with the nursing bottle, and continue so long as social relations continue; second, that for most people the study of sociology shall never begin at all; that educators . . . shall not rate themselves as leaders of children, but makers of society."

Another sociologist interested in education was Franklin H. Giddings. He believed that the consciousness of each individual was a microcosm of the social system. He envisioned the task of the school to be making minds attentive, persistent, organized, and liberal. He also felt that democracy was in

¹Ibid., pp. 622-633.

²Albion W. Small, "The Demands of Sociology Upon Pedagogy," National Education Association: Addresses And Proceedings, Vol. 35 (1896), pp. 180-184.

danger if the school continued to concentrate its efforts on the development of lowgrade minds. He therefore pointed to the importance of the cultivating of high-grade minds in order to preserve democracy.¹

Two other sociologists who considered the aim of education to be social control were Edward A. Ross and Charles H. Cooley. The latter believed control could be effected by making the school a primary group.²

Finally, William Graham Sumner and A. G. Keller, his successor, regarded the social objective of education to be a transmission of the mores. In his book Folkways, Sumner pointed to this educational aim when he said:

In the organization of modern society the school is the institutional apparatus by which the inheritance of experience and knowledge,--the whole mental outfit of the race,--is transmitted to the young. Through these institutions, therefore, the mores and morality which men have accepted and approved are handed down. The transmission ought to be faithful, but not without criticism. The reaction of free judgement and taste will keep the mores fresh and active, and the schools are undoubtedly the place where they should be renewed through an intelligent study of their operation in the past.³

¹Franklin H. Giddings, Principles of Sociology (New York: Macmillan Co., 1896), pp. 19-20.

²Roucek, "Some Contributions of Sociology to Education," p. 804.

³William Graham Sumner, Folkways (Boston: Ginn and Co., 1906), p. 635.

Keller further elucidated this theory and thereby formally connected education with a sociological system, a task which Sumner had not done.¹

So it was in nineteenth century America that educators and sociologists, influenced by European educational, philosophical, and sociological theories, became aware of the importance of sociology to education and of education to sociology. Awareness gave way to conviction and these men sought to propagate the "new" social concept of education through several channels of communication.

The period extending from 1910 to 1927 was characterized by two principal ideas concerning the nature of educational sociology. One was that of philosophical educational sociology, a concept which stemmed from a social philosophy of education. American educators and sociologists, influenced by the European educational and sociological theories of the seventeenth, eighteenth, and nineteenth centuries, formulated a social philosophy of education which they gradually incorporated into the field of educational sociology. Consequently, the chief subject matter of educational sociology dealt with the aims of education derived from a knowledge of sociology. This view of educational sociology was heightened and

¹Albert Galloway Keller, Societal Evolution (New York: Macmillan Co., 1915), p. vii.

accelerated by the First World War. The advent of such a catastrophe stimulated educators to investigate the objectives of the school. As a result of this investigation the concept of the social function of education, an idea which was by no means born with the war, assumed new importance, significance, and standing.¹ Writers who represented this point of view included David S. Snedden, Charles C. Peters, and Ross L. Finney.²

The other outstanding view of educational sociology was that of the application of sociology to education. Here the aim was to supply basic social cultural understandings to school administrators and teachers. This attempt, while still problem-oriented, had the purpose of adding to the theoretical framework and in using the most scientific study techniques. Some adherents to this view placed their emphasis on the school-community orientation, and others paid special attention to extra school factors.³ E. George Payne, Walter R. Smith, Harvey Zorbaugh, and Leslie Zeleny were representative of the former group.⁴

¹Curti, The Social Ideas of American Educators, p. 542.

²Florence G. Robbins, Educational Sociology (New York: Henry Holt, 1953), p. 7.

³Ibid.

⁴Schaper, "The Rise and Development of Educational Sociology in the United States," pp. 55-56.

This applied concept of educational sociology and the philosophical concept were the main theories of the subject between the years 1910 and 1927. At the end of this period a third theory began to take form; this was known as the "functional" educational sociology. Hence educational sociology courses given between 1910 and 1927 stressed the philosophical and applied concepts of the field.

In summary, the roots of educational sociology lie deeply embedded in the philosophical, educational, and sociological theories prevalent in the United States during the late nineteenth and early twentieth centuries. The American theories stemming from those of Europe were disseminated through the writings and discussions of educators and sociologists. They gradually resulted in academic courses offered by universities and normal schools. New York University, Stanford, Clark, Virginia, Chicago, Columbia, and the normal schools of Minnesota, Wisconsin, and North Dakota took the initiative during the eighteen-nineties in presenting courses designed to combine sociological and educational concepts. In the first decade of the twentieth century the multiplication of writings and professional discussions and the inception of "social education" provided further stimuli to the growth of these teacher-training courses.

Statement of the Problem

The purpose of this study was to compare the major areas of agreement and disagreement between five of the early leaders in the field of educational sociology. This was a descriptive and historical investigation of the work of these five educational sociologists.

The following selected questions were investigated:

1. How do these five educational sociologists view the significance of educational sociology?
2. What is the sociological concept of education in the work of these educational sociologists?
3. According to these educational sociologists, what has been the effect of religion and the family on education?
4. How do these educational sociologists regard the purpose of social control?
5. What are the main objectives of educational sociology in a democratic community, according to these educational sociologists?

Significance of the Study

Other writers have investigated some of the educational sociologists under consideration in this study. Irene

Lawrence's and Florence W. Schaper's dissertations on the history of educational sociology survey the historical setting around which educational sociology developed in the United States. They do not describe in detail the contributions or the educational views of the five selected educational sociologists. In David Snedden and Education for Social Efficiency, Walter H. Drost offers a very elaborate account of Snedden's life and contributions but only mentions Payne, Smith, Peters, and Finney in their relationship to Snedden.

This study does at least two things that other writers have not done. First, it presents a detailed comparison of the educational views of Ross L. Finney, E. George Payne, Walter R. Smith, Charles C. Peters, and David S. Snedden. This group of educational sociologists received nationwide attention during the 1920's and 1930's. They helped arouse a lethargic public to examine the public school system, and helped make education a topic of national concern. For these reasons their educational views merit a comprehensive critical examination. This comparison is important to educational historians and philosophers as well as educational sociologists because it will help to re-evaluate the importance of the sociological method in our emerging educational system. Secondly, the selected questions around which to consider the

contrast of views will be of value to students of educational sociology as they confront the uses of sociology in education.

Research Design and Methodology

The basic procedure employed in this investigation was to gather comprehensive information concerning the five selected educational sociologists and to compare their views on the selected questions. The educational sociologists were chosen on the basis of their identity with the early development of educational sociology in the United States.

The method of gathering information was carried out in three principal steps. The first step included reading the selected works of the five educational sociologists. Second, a review of all doctoral dissertations dealing with the educational sociologists under investigation and the field of educational sociology were read. Third, a further review of the literature included all available works that deal with the selected educational sociologists.

The Matrix on page fourteen of this prospectus was a tentative guide for this comparative method. In conclusion, this study attempted to evaluate the scope and significance of their ideas.

TABLE I

SELECTION MATRIX

	Sociological Method	
	Social Control	
	The Family	
	Social Interaction	
	The Church	
	The Significance of Educational Sociology	
	Democracy	
	Vocational Education	
	The Community	
	Interest Groups	
	Government	
Chancellor	X	X
Clow	X	X
Good		X
Kulp	X	X
Finney	X	X
Payne	X	X
Peters	X	X
Smith	X	X
Snedden	X	X

Procedure for Gathering Data

The selected works of the educational sociologists under investigation represented the primary sources of data for this study.¹ The educational sociologists were selected on the basis of their identity with the early development of educational sociology in the United States.

They were selected on a threefold basis:

1. The initial list came from John A. Kinneman's Society and Education (1932), in which he listed David S. Snedden, Daniel H. Kulp, E. George Payne, Charles C. Peters, Frederick R. Clow, Walter R. Smith, Alvin S. Good, and William E. Chancellor as among the outstanding leaders in educational sociology.
2. This initial list was checked against other pertinent works such as Frederick Bolton and J. E. Corbally, Wilbur B. Brookover, Francis J. Brown, Ronald G. Corwin, Walter H. Drost, Gale E. Jensen, Bernard N. Meltzer, and Francis G. Robbins.
3. The questions to which the educational sociologists addressed themselves were set up (see questions in

¹The selected books represented the major contributions made by the authors in the field of educational sociology. Who Was Who in America, pp. 398, 672, 1149, 1975, 2312.

the Statement of the Problem) and when doubt arose as to the writer's position in any one of these classifications, on the basis of these questions, he was eliminated from the list.

The selection of Ross L. Finney, the fifth and last educational sociologist selected, rested upon the frequency of his name arising in later works, his two early texts (1923 and 1927) in the field, and his ability to address himself to the questions being considered.

Delimitations

This study was delimited to five early educational sociologists: Ross Lee Finney, E. George Payne, Charles Clinton Peters, Walter Robinson Smith, and David Samuel Snedden. Gathering of information focused primarily on the five questions listed in the Statement of the Problem. With the exception of Emile Durkheim, Gale Jensen, Karl Mannheim, and W. A. C. Stewart, no attempt was made to review the works in educational sociology outside the United States.

Limitations

The difficulty in obtaining information concerning all the questions under consideration for the selected educational sociologists was the most serious limitation of the study.

Although each educational sociologist addressed himself to the questions more completely than others surveyed, each educational sociologist did not address himself equally to each question, thus making the gathering of information quite difficult.

Review of the Literature

The views of the five educational sociologists were taken from the following books: Ross L. Finney, The American Public School (1921), Causes and Cures for the Social Unrest (1922), Elementary Sociology (1923), General Social Science (1926), A Sociological Philosophy of Education (1927), and with Leslie Zeleny, An Introduction to Educational Sociology (1934); E. George Payne, Principles of Educational Sociology: An Outline (1928), and Readings in Educational Sociology (1933); Charles C. Peters, Curriculum of Democratic Education (1942), and Foundations of Educational Sociology (1924); Walter R. Smith, Introduction to Educational Sociology (1917), and Principles of Educational Sociology (1924); David S. Snedden, Problems of Educational Readjustment (1913), School Reports and School Efficiency with William H. Allen (1908), Problems of Secondary Education (1917), Educational Applications of Sociology (1924), Sociological Determinants of Objectives in Education (1921), Educational Sociology (1923), A Digest of

Educational Sociology (1920), What's Wrong With American Education (1927), Foundations of Curricula: Sociological Analysis (1927), School Educations: Sociological Sources of Values (1920), Towards Better Educations (1931), and An Introductory Sociology for Teachers.

All the books written by each educational sociologist were read, whether or not they were relevant to the topic. In a few instances, books authored jointly by the selected educational sociologist and someone else were regarded as though they were the product of the educational sociologist alone. Although it seems obvious that a book co-authored by men of such standing as these would not express views contrary to either author's thinking without so indicating, special care was exercised in the use of these books. All available periodical articles, notably those in The Journal of Educational Sociology, School and Society, Teachers College Record, and Educational Research, were reviewed.

A further research of the literature includes the following works that deal with the educational sociologists underinvestigation: Robert R. Bell and Holger R. Stub, The Sociology of Education: A Sourcebook (1962); Francis J. Brown, Educational Sociology (1950); Orville Brim, Sociology and the Field of Education (1958); Wilbur Brookover and David Gottlieb, A Sociology of Education; Fredrick Bolton and John E.

Corbally, Educational Sociology (1941); L. and E. F. Cook, A Sociological Approach to Education (1960); Ronald Corwin, A Sociology of Education (1965); William E. Chancellor, Educational Sociology (1919); Fredrick R. Clow, Sociology With Educational Implications (1920); Merle Curti, The Social Ideas of American Educators (1935); Emile Durkheim, Education and Sociology (1956); Walter H. Drost, David Snedden and Education for Social Efficiency (1967); Alvin Good, Sociology and Education (1926); Gale E. Jensen, Educational Sociology (1965); John A. Kinneman, Society and Education (1932); Daniel Kulp, Educational Sociology (1932); Karl Mannheim and W. A. C. Stewart, An Introduction to the Sociology of Education (1962); Joseph S. Roucek and Associates, Sociological Foundations of Education (1942); and Willard Waller, Sociology of Teaching.

Organization of the Study

Chapter I includes the background and introduction, the statement of the problem, the significance of the study, limitations delimitations, the research design and methodology, the procedure for gathering data, and the review of the literature. As an essential background for the choice of the five selected educational sociologists, Chapter II of the study begins with a description of the historical setting and

trends leading up to the work of the educational sociologists under investigation. Chapters III, IV, V, VI, and VII compare the views of Peters, Payne, Finney, Smith, and Snedden, allotting a chapter for each of the following questions:

1. How do these five educational sociologists view the significance of educational sociology?
2. What is the sociological concept of education in the work of these educational sociologists?
3. According to these five educational sociologists, what has been the effect of religion and the family on education?
4. How do these educational sociologists regard the purpose of social control?
5. What are the main objectives of educational sociology in a democratic society, according to the educational sociologists in question?

Chapter VIII is a recapitulation and evaluation of the scope of their ideas.

Outline of the Study

I. INTRODUCTION

1. Background
2. The Statement of the Problem
3. The Significance of the Study
4. Limitations
5. Delimitations

6. Research Design and Methodology
7. The Procedure for Gathering Data
8. Review of the Literature
9. Organization of the Study

II. THE HISTORICAL BACKGROUNDS OF EDUCATIONAL SOCIOLOGY

1. The Development of Educational Sociology
2. The Development of Teaching and Research
3. The Five Selected Educational Sociologists

III. HOW DO THE FIVE EDUCATIONAL SOCIOLOGISTS VIEW THE SIGNIFICANCE OF EDUCATIONAL SOCIOLOGY?

1. Definition of Education
2. Definition of Sociology
3. Definition of Educational Sociology
4. The Specific Aims of Educational Sociology
5. The Scope of Educational Sociology
6. The Value of Educational Sociology in the Organization and Operation of Our Schools
7. Educational Sociology and Its Relation to Educational Psychology

IV. WHAT IS THE SOCIOLOGICAL CONCEPT OF EDUCATION IN THE WORK OF THESE EDUCATIONAL SOCIOLOGISTS?

1. Definition of Socialization
2. The Distinction Between Socialization, Learning and Education
3. The Necessity of Socialization and Education for the Development and Maintenance of Society
4. The Most Effective Social System Concerning Learning and Socialization

V. ACCORDING TO THESE FIVE EDUCATIONAL SOCIOLOGISTS, WHAT HAS BEEN THE EFFECT OF RELIGION AND THE FAMILY ON EDUCATION?

1. The Educational Function of the Church
2. Religious Education in Public Schools
3. The Function of the Family
4. The Importance of the Family as a Primary Group

VI. HOW DO THESE EDUCATIONAL SOCIOLOGISTS REGARD THE PURPOSE OF SOCIAL CONTROL?

1. The Meaning and Forms of Social Control
2. The Origins of Social Control
3. The Dominant Influences of Social Control
4. The Role of the School as an Agency of Social Control

VII. WHAT ARE THE MAIN OBJECTIVES OF EDUCATIONAL SOCIOLOGY IN A DEMOCRATIC COMMUNITY, ACCORDING TO THE EDUCATIONAL SOCIOLOGISTS IN QUESTION?

1. The Meaning of Democracy
2. Democracy in the United States
3. Democracy and Education
4. Democratic Nature of the School Community

VIII. SUMMARY, CONCLUSIONS, AND RECOMMENDATIONS

This chapter focused on the background, the statement of the problem, the significance of the study, the limitations, the delimitations, the research design and methodology, the procedure for gathering data, the review of the literature, the organization of the study, and the outline of the study.

CHAPTER II

THE HISTORICAL BACKGROUNDS OF EDUCATIONAL SOCIOLOGY

Before considering question one concerning how the five educational sociologists view the significance of educational sociology, it is necessary to set the historical framework in perspective.

Sociology Defined. "Sociology," a term coined in 1839 by the French philosopher Auguste Comte, has been described as "the science of leftovers," that is, a science "which picks up the crumbs spilled from the groaning table of the other social sciences." For this reason it has been suggested that sociology be recognized as the basic social science, a "central switchboard" which would coordinate the others.¹

In Contemporary Social Theory, Harry Elmer Barnes declared:

Sociology is the only social science which views and analyzes the social processes in a comprehensive fashion, attempting to discover, describe and evaluate the significance of the many geographic, biological, psychological, economic, political and

¹Joseph S. Roucek and Associates, Sociological Foundations of Education (New York: Crowell, 1942), p. 3.

cultural factors which operate to produce the¹
institutions and activities of human society.

Sociology, according to Lester Frank Ward, the "Father of American Sociology,"² is a scientific inquiry into the actual condition of society. It alone can yield true self-consciousness. It answers the questions, What, Why, and How, by furnishing the facts, the causes, and the principles of sociology.³

Clarence Marsh Case, in Outlines of Introductory Sociology, maintains that sociology studies the various forms of casual relations between the activities of individuals that are always occurring in homes, schools, neighborhoods, crowds, publics and wherever human beings meet, and that give rise to public opinion, customs, and institutions.⁴

Sociology affords a clear view of the aims of education for it shows that distinctively human nature is second nature socially acquired, and that if from birth one could be

¹Harry Elmer Barnes, "Sociological Contributions to Political Thought," Contemporary Social Theory, ed. by Harry E. Barnes and others (New York: D. Appleton-Century Co., 1940), p. 647.

²Marvin Bressler, "Sociology and Collegiate General Education," The Uses of Sociology, ed. by Paul Lazarsfeld and others (New York: Basic Books, 1967), p. 45.

³Lester Frank Ward, Applied Sociology (Boston: Ginn, 1906), p. 3.

⁴Clarence Marsh Case, Outlines of Introductory Sociology (New York: Harcourt, Brace and Co., 1924), pp. 23-24.

excluded from all social contacts he would remain a "naked savage and a dumb brute." It illuminates the methods of education by its study of the effects of social contacts, and it supplies materials for moral instruction in the schools by its study of the relations between society and the individual and of the interdependence of groups. Such study presents in its full light the fact that all social life is team work. It tends to evoke the spirit of cooperation. It reveals grounds for ethical requirements and sources of ethical incentive.¹

H. Boyd Bode believes that sociology has something to contribute to the aims of education:

We must look to sociology for the determination of certain "immediate objectives" . . . (Sociology) specifies the conditions which must be taken into account if the general aim is to be promoted . . . it is necessary to tie up the school with the home, with the industrial order, and with various other social agencies and institutions, for this end the contribution which sociology can make is obviously indispensable. But this is clearly different from the assumption that if we pursue sociological investigations . . . long enough . . . the appropriate educational ideals will emerge of themselves.²

¹Ibid., p. 24.

²H. Boyd Bode, "Editorial," The Journal of Educational Sociology, Vol. I (1928), p. 309.

The Development of Educational Sociology

Educational Sociology and Its Relation to Sociology.

Educational sociology may be regarded as the synthesis of education and sociology. It is the study of the principles of sociology applied to the theory and practice of education. According to E. George Payne, educational sociology is "an applied science in the field of sociology."¹

Educational sociology, according to Alvin Good, is the scientific study of how people live in social groups:

. . . including the study of education that is obtained by living in social groups and the education that is needed . . . to live efficiently in the social groups. It is a pure science from the point of view of obtaining facts about the relations of education to social life and an applied science when it is used to improve or to modify the education given by the schools or other social groups.²

Educational sociology, like most social inventions, appears to have arisen when there was a need which was not entirely met by existing social institutions. As technological advances and accompanying cultural lags made the process of socialization increasingly "confused and confusing," there was a tendency to dump more responsibility on the existing institution which by name seemed best able to cope with social

¹E. George Payne, Principles of Educational Sociology—An Outline (New York: New York University Press, 1925), p. 18.

²Alvin Good, Sociology and Education: Sociology from the Viewpoint of Education (New York: Harper, 1926), pp. 24-25.

change. However, neither schools nor teachers were by philosophy, training, or practice ready for forthright assumption of roles in child socialization. Consequently, both by invitation and by attraction, social scientists began paying attention to the problems of the schools within and without from the standpoint of sociological analysis.¹

European influences. The historic roots of educational sociology can be traced to the writings of European social and educational philosophers. The field owes a debt to Auguste Comte (1798-1857); Garriel Tarde (1834-1904); Herbert Spencer (1820-1903); Georg Hegel (1770-1831); Friedrich Froebel (1782-1852); Johann Herbart (1776-1841); Jean Jacques Rousseau (1712-1778); Johan Pestalozzi (1746-1827); John Locke (1632-1704); David Hume (1711-1766); and especially Emile Durkheim (1856-1917), who called for research on the functions of the social "facts" of education and their relationship to social change.² Durkheim was the first to indicate clearly the need for a sociological approach to the study of education. Durkheim viewed education as a sociologist; he considered education "to be something essentially social in character, in its origins and functions, and that as a result

¹Florence G. Robbins, Educational Sociology (New York: Holt, 1953), p. 7.

²Emile Durkheim, Education and Society (New York: Free Press, 1956).

the theory of education relates more clearly to sociology than to any other social science."¹ Durkheim was emphatic in pointing out there was no single or ideal type of education for all men. He expressed the opinion that differences in socio-cultural needs would play a major role in the type of educational programs which would be established in various societies. He noted that education is not a static phenomenon but a dynamic and ever changing process. According to Brookover, we have only to compare current educational programs with those of a few years ago to note the accuracy of this observation.²

According to Smith, every sociologist from Comte to Charles A. Ellwood has recognized the fundamental nature of education as the basis of social control and amelioration; but very seldom in sociological literature has any reference been made to the possibility of a basic educational sociology.³ The first definite appeal for an educational sociology on the part of sociologists seems to have been from Ellwood in 1912:

Now the science of education has evidently two chief problems: the problem of the aim of education and the problems of organizing a curriculum which

¹Ibid., p. 10.

²Wilbur B. Brookover and David Gottlieb, A Sociology of Education (New York: American, 1964), pp. 3-4.

³Walter R. Smith, "Foundations of Educational Sociology," American Journal of Sociology, Vol. 22 (May, 1917), p. 763.

shall be in harmony with the aim. It is the contention of this paper that both of these problems are essentially problems in an applied sociology, and that science of education, in so far as it concerns these two fundamental problems in education, is essentially an applied science resting upon sociology.¹

Because of nineteenth century emphases upon biology and psychology, education had become highly individualistic, having for its chief function the mastery of subject matter. Herbart's "Five Formal Steps" had replaced the purely rote learning, but it was not until near the turn of the century that a need for the recognition of the social function of education began to be increasingly emphasized.²

Early American influences. Partially as a result of the early European pioneer efforts and partially independent of them, various men of different sections of the United States began to develop the field of educational sociology.³

The possibility of a social philosophy of education rested upon a clear understanding of the nature of society. This understanding was provided by the educational sociology movement. Following Ward's study of Dynamic Sociology in 1883,

¹Charles A. Ellwood, "The Sociological Bases of the Science of Education," Education, Vol. 32 (November 1911), pp. 133-140.

²Francis J. Brown, Educational Sociology (New York: Prentice-Hall, 1950), p. 40.

³Good, Sociology and Education, p. xx.

there was an increasing interest in the analysis of social problems in the United States.¹

As early as 1893, the suggestion that sociology be applied to education in the United States appeared over the signature of Dr. William Torrey Harris, whose interests were practical rather than sociological. Harris wrote that no philosophy of education is fundamental until it is based upon sociology:

The evolution of civilization is the key to education in all its varieties and phases--as found in family, civil society, state, and church, as well as in school. Once placed on this basis, it is easy to connect any one theory of education, that of Froebel for example--with another--that of Chinese verbal memorizing, or that of the study of Latin and Greek in American colleges--and to show the rationale and the amount and kind of positive help given to the pupil by each.²

Three years later Dr. Harris repeated before the National Education Association his conviction that education was founded upon sociology.³

During this time educators everywhere had been turning toward the social point of view.⁴ The year 1896 witnessed

¹Roucek, Sociological Foundations of Education, p. 726.

²William T. Harris, "Froebel Education by Self Activity," Educational Review, Vol. VI (1893), p. 84.

³William T. Harris, "Introduction," Addresses and Proceedings of the National Education Association (1896), p. 196.

⁴Smith, "Foundations of Educational Sociology," p. 764.

the appearance of a booklet comprising the educational credos of John Dewey, My Pedagogic Creed, and The Demands of Sociology Upon Pedagogy, by Albion W. Small of the University of Chicago.¹ Dewey may well be called the leader of the sociological school of thinkers with references to educational theory and practice.² The publication of Dewey's School and Society³ in 1900, a series of lectures to parents of the children in his experimental school in Chicago, and Democracy of Education⁴ in 1916, gave impetus to the rise of educational sociology since the books stressed the importance of the school as a social institution. Furthermore, Samuel Train Dutton, Superintendent of Schools in Brookline, Massachusetts, wrote:

Another and perhaps the latest phase of educational movement, is the conviction that the school is a social institution; that its aims are social, and that its management, discipline and methods of instruction should be dominated by the idea.⁵

¹John Dewey, My Pedagogic Creed, and Albion W. Small, The Demands of Sociology Upon Pedagogy (Chicago: University of Chicago Press, 1896).

²Smith, "Foundations of Educational Sociology," p. 764.

³Dewey, School and Society.

⁴John Dewey, Democracy and Education (New York: The Macmillan Co., 1916).

⁵Harris, "Introduction," p. 196.

Vincent, an early collaborator of Small's at the University of Chicago,¹ another advocate of social education, stated in 1897 that:

The thought of social philosophy which sees in the development of society the growth of a vast psychic organism to which individuals are intrinsically related, in which alone they find self-realization, is of the highest significance to the teacher, to whom it suggests both aim and method.²

In the United States, the field of educational sociology was inaugurated around the turn of the twentieth century by educators, sociologists, and philosophers. Among the outstanding leaders were Lester Frank Ward of Brown University, David S. Snedden and Daniel Kulp of Columbia University, Walter R. Smith of the University of Kansas, Charles C. Peters of Pennsylvania State College, E. George Payne of New York University, Ross L. Finney of the University of Minnesota, Alvin Good of Louisiana State Normal College at Natchitoches, Fredrick R. Clow of the State Normal School at Oshkosh, Wisconsin, and William E. Chancellor of the College of

¹Albion W. Small and George E. Vincent, An Introduction to the Study of Society (New York: American Book Co., 1894).

²George E. Vincent, The Social Mind and Education (New York: American Book Company, 1897), p. v.

Wooster.¹ The publications of nearly all of those mentioned have been made in the twentieth century, for only a few books related to the field of educational sociology were published before 1900.²

The Development of Teaching and Research

Educational sociology as a course of study. As early as 1898, Edward A. Ross was teaching a course in "Sociology for Teachers" at Stanford University, and in 1901, Snedden offered a course in "Sociology of Education" at the same institution. G. Stanley Hall introduced a course in the "Sociology of Education" at Clark University in 1902, and in 1906, the University of Virginia announced a course in "Educational Sociology." In 1908, Henry Suzzalo, one of the early American Herbartians and subsequently President of the University of Washington,³ declared, "As we have a school

¹John A. Kinneman, Society and Education (New York: Macmillan, 1932), p. 45; Fredrick Bolton and J. E. Corbally, Educational Sociology (New York: American, 1941), pp. 3-9; Ronald Corwin, A Sociology of Education (New York: Appleton-Century, 1965), p. 56; Walter R. Drost, David S. Snedden and Education for Social Efficiency (Madison, Wisconsin: University of Wisconsin Press, 1967), p. 163; Gale E. Jensen, Educational Sociology (New York: Center for Applied Research in Education, 1965), p. 2; Bernard N. Meltzer, Education in Society: Readings (New York: Crowell, 1958), p. 6; W. Brookover and D. Gottlieb, A Sociology of Education, p. 5; F. J. Brown, Educational Sociology, pp. 40-43; F. G. Robbins, Educational Sociology, p. 7.

²Kinneman, Society and Education, p. 45.

³Jensen, Educational Sociology, p. ix.

hygiene and an educational psychology, so we must have what is basic an educational sociology."¹ What is more to the point, according to Smith, is that Suzzalo began immediately to act upon his convictions and through his public lectures had been highly influential in popularizing the subject as well as laying the foundations of a scientific educational sociology.² Suzzalo taught the first course entitled "Educational Sociology" at Columbia University, in 1908, while John M. Gillete, the first to use the term in connection with a school course,³ pioneered in this area at Valley City, North Dakota, Normal School, about the same time. The establishment of departments of educational sociology at Columbia, under Snedden, and at New York University in 1922, under the chairmanship of E. George Payne, not only enhanced the importance of the new science but it likewise helped to attract an increasing number of graduate students who had special interest in the field.⁴

Publications in educational sociology. In 1898, the new educational movement prompted The Public School Journal,

¹Henry Suzzalo, "Education as a Social Study," School Review, Vol. 16 (May, 1908), pp. 330-340.

²Smith, "Foundations of Educational Sociology," p. 764.

³Ibid., p. 763.

⁴Walter R. Smith, An Introduction to Educational Sociology (New York: Houghton, Mifflin Co., 1917), p. 17.

a professional magazine, to change its name to School and Home Education, with the avowed purpose of correlating the educational activity in the school with the educational effort within the family.

Textbooks for the increasing number of courses in sociology for teachers began to make their appearance. The first work definitely intended for this new movement in educational development was Colin Scott's Social Education which appeared in 1907. There followed, in rapid succession, the following publications: Michael Vincent O'Shea, Social Development and Education (1909); Irving King, Social Aspects of Education (1912); Edwin A. Kirkpatrick, Fundamentals of Sociology: With Special Emphasis Upon the Community and Education (1916); Walter R. Smith, Introduction to Educational Sociology (1917); Charles L. Robbins, The Schools as a Social Institution (1918); William E. Chancellor, Educational Sociology (1919); Fredrick R. Clow, Sociology With Educational Applications (1920); "Education in Recent Sociology," a series of articles in Education (1921), by Joseph T. Williams; David S. Snedden, Educational Sociology (1922), and Educational Applications of Sociology (1924); Charles E. Martz and John A. Kinneman, Social Science for Teachers (1923); Charles C. Peters, Foundations of Educational Sociology (1924); E. George Payne,

Principles of Educational Sociology--An Outline (1925); and Alvin Good, Sociology and Education (1926).¹

In 1923, at the annual meeting of the American Sociological Society, Ross L. Finney joined David S. Snedden, Charles C. Peters, E. George Payne, Walter R. Smith, and others in establishing the National Society for the Study of Educational Sociology. The intention of this organization was to aid in organizing the subject matter of educational sociology as a teaching field on the university level and to create a method of research in the field. The society chose to assemble in February of each year with the Department of Superintendence and again in December with the American Sociological Society. Smith was elected the first president, Peters became secretary-treasurer, while Finney, Payne, and Snedden composed the first executive committee. In 1927, the society started publication of The Journal of Educational Sociology, with Payne as editor; however, the society that had been founded five years earlier ceased to exist the same year.² The journal soon won recognition as an authoritative source of information concerning educational research conducted by sociologists, educators, and psychologists. It

¹Harvey Lee, The Status of Educational Sociology in Normal Schools, Teachers Colleges, Colleges, and Universities (New York: New York University Press, 1932), p. 1.

²Corwin, A Sociology of Education, p. 56.

contained a wide variety of articles which reflected the shifting emphases and changing trends in educational sociology.¹

The advancement of survey research. In addition to these works written upon the subject, those interested in the development of educational sociology undertook surveys to determine the progress made by educational sociology. In 1910, Frederick R. Clow found forty normal schools offering sociology to their students. In 1913, a survey under the direction of the Mississippi Valley Historical Association discovered fifty-five institutions in which such a course was given.² By 1914, the number had grown to sixty. Of these, thirty were universities; thirty included normal schools, training schools and others. Seventeen of the thirty universities required their courses in sociology of all students of education; ten actually called the course "educational sociology."³

Not until 1916 was the first survey of this newly designated field of "educational sociology" undertaken. This survey⁴

¹Meltzer, Education in Society: Readings, pp. 6-7.

²John A. S. Keith, "The Place and Scope of Sociology in Normal Schools," National Education Association: Addresses and Proceedings, Vol. 53 (1915), p. 765.

³Ibid.

⁴E. George Payne, "Educational Sociology in City Training Schools," School and Society, Vol. IX (February, 1919), pp. 212-216.

sought to determine the status of the subject in city training schools in the United States. The subject was defined by Payne as "That science which describes and explains the institutions and social forms through which the child gains and organizes his experience, and those institutions and social forms in relation to which the child must function in adult life."¹ The subject as defined included a study of the development of the social consciousness of the child; the function of the school to meet the educational needs of the community; a study of the direct and indirect relationships into which the child would enter; and examination of the problems of the city, of growth in population and race. The subject as defined made place, also, for the development of a social theory as the basis for interpretation of educational procedure.²

Payne's survey led to the conclusion that there was no uniformity in the conceptions of educational sociology obtained from those who were teaching the subject; that material belonging in other courses was being handled under

¹Payne, Principles of Educational Sociology--An Outline, p. 212.

²Brown, Educational Sociology, pp. 334-335.

the name of educational sociology; and that there was a definite, felt need for the subject, as the survey defined it. Subsequent investigations of the field were made by Francis Stuart Chapin, Harry E. Blackmar, John M. Gillette, L. L. Bernard, Clyde B. Moore, Harvey Lee, and again by Clow.¹

Moore's study² found that four different approaches toward the determination of the content and method of courses in educational sociology prevailed in teacher training institutions. These were a description and analysis of social phases of education; education as a form of social activity; principles of sociology with the correlations of education to each principle; and educational sociology as a distinct science. The survey revealed twenty-one topics, ranked in order of preference, which were nominated for inclusion in a course in educational sociology. The study concluded on the note that:

Surely . . . the aim of a general course in educational sociology may well set itself to the task of . . . making clear . . . the function of education . . . to change the socius for the better of the socius.³

¹Ibid., pp. 308-309.

²Clyde B. Moore, "Aims and Contents of a Course in Educational Sociology," Education (November, 1924), pp. 160-168.

³Ibid.

In 1926, Lee compiled a questionnaire¹ for the purpose of determining the status of educational sociology among teacher-training institutions in the United States. This questionnaire was sent, under the auspices of the National Society for the Study of Educational Sociology, to 1,024 colleges and universities. Lee found that in the years between 1910 and 1926 the number of colleges offering a course in educational sociology increased from 40 to 194. By 1914, sixteen colleges and universities offered courses entitled "Educational Sociology," and twenty-five texts were published between 1916 and 1936.

The Five Selected Educational Sociologists

After the First World War, America was beset with staggering international responsibilities and domestic upheavals. Traditional concepts were no longer adequate to cope with a contracting world in a state of turmoil. Americans seemed to lose their sense of identity, their sense of purpose. A number of critics sought and found a scapegoat responsible for all of the ills of society--the American public school system.²

¹Lee, The Status of Educational Sociology

²Mary Anne Raywid, The Ax-Grinders (New York: The Macmillan Co., 1962), pp. 1-5.

Ross Lee Finney. Among the educators whose work belongs in part to educational sociology is Ross Lee Finney. Finney, according to Brameld, was one of the best known and influential social-education realists.¹ Finney was born in Postville, Iowa, in 1875. At the age of twenty-one he graduated from Upper Iowa University. After studying at Northwestern University and the University of Chicago, he received a bachelor's degree in sacred theology from Boston University in 1902. Between 1902 and 1909, he served as a minister in Minnesota, receiving his master's degree from Boston University in 1907. From 1909 to 1914 he was professor of philosophy and exconomics at Illionois Wesleyan University. Finney received his doctorate from Boston in 1911. In 1914, he became professor of education at the State Normal School, Valley City, North Dakota. In 1919, Finney was appointed professor of education, teaching educational sociology at the University of Minnesota. During his tenure at Minnesota he published The American Public School in 1921, Causes and Cures for the Social Unrest in 1922, Elementary Sociology in 1923, General Social Science in 1926, and A Sociological Philosophy of Education in 1927. Finney died in Minneapolis, Minnesota in 1934.

¹Theodore Brameld, Philosophies of Education in Cultural Perspective (New York: Holt, Rinehart and Winston, 1955), p. 239.

E. George Payne. E. George Payne has been acclaimed as the father of educational sociology, even though his only general book in the field is his Principles of Educational Sociology--An Outline, published in 1928. Through his distinct understanding of the significance of educational sociology and his belief as to its function Payne has constantly shown an inimitable authority.¹

Payne was born in Barren County, Kentucky, in 1877. He began his teaching career as an instructor in Alexander Academy, Burksville, Kentucky, in 1898. After receiving a bachelor's degree in 1901, from Lebanon University, Ohio, Payne taught at Steinmann College, Dixon, Illinois. From 1903 to 1907, he served as principal of Paducah High School, Paducah, Kentucky. In 1906, he received a second bachelor's degree from the University of Chicago.

At the University of Chicago he came in contact with a number of pioneer thinkers who influenced his professional life and thinking, such men as Albion Small, W. I. Thomas, and Graham Taylor in sociology; Frederic M. Thatcher in history; Frederick N. Judson in political science; and John Dewey and Addison Webster Moore in education and psychology.²

¹Brown, Educational Sociology, p. 43.

²Herman A. Ernst, "Dean E. George Payne--Student, Teacher, Scholar," The Journal of Educational Sociology, Vol. 13 (September, 1939), pp. 2-3.

He later studied at the Sorbonne, the College of France, and the University of Berlin, before receiving his Ph.D. degree from the University of Bonn in 1909.

Between 1909 and 1910, he served as Dean of the Department of Education and professor of psychology at Eastern Kentucky State Normal School. He later served as professor of sociology from 1910 to 1916, and also served as President of Harris Teachers College, Saint Louis, Missouri, from 1916 to 1922. In 1922, he was appointed professor of educational sociology at New York University, and served as Dean of the School of Education from 1939 to 1945.

Payne was President of the International Education Association and assumed charge of experimental work in the field of drug addiction in its relation to education. This undertaking, which concerned drug addiction among both adolescents and adults, gave him the responsibility of directing research throughout the world. Upon completion of this research, Payne was selected as a delegate to the World Narcotic Conference in Geneva, Switzerland, in 1931, where over forty nations were represented.¹ For fifteen years he served as Editor-in-chief of The Journal of Educational Sociology. Payne died in Pleasant Point, Maine, in 1953.

¹William F. Ogburn, "Contributions to Sociological Research," The Journal of Educational Sociology, Vol. 13 (September, 1939), p. 35.

Charles Clinton Peters. Charles Clinton Peters was born in Duffield, Pennsylvania, in November, 1881. He did his undergraduate work at Lebanon Valley College, Annville, Pennsylvania, receiving his A.B. degree in 1905.

Peters began teaching classical languages and mathematics at Clarksburg College, Missouri, in 1905, and served as President from 1906 to 1907. In 1907, he became professor of philosophy and education at Westfield College, Illinois. After a short period he received his M.A. degree at Harvard University in 1910, before assuming the position of Dean and professor of philosophy and education in 1911, at his alma mater, Lebanon Valley College.

From 1913 to 1916, he served as the Superintendent of Schools in Royersford, Pennsylvania, and after receiving his Ph.D. degree from the University of Pennsylvania in 1916, he became an instructor at Lehigh University in Pennsylvania.

Peters became professor of education at Ohio Wesleyan University in 1917, where he wrote his most significant work in educational sociology Foundations of Educational Sociology in 1924. In 1927, he became professor of education and Director of Educational Research at Pennsylvania State University where he authored Objectives and Procedures in Civic Education in 1930, and Curriculum of Democratic

Education in 1942. Peters remained at Pennsylvania State University until his death in 1955.

Walter Robinson Smith. Walter Robinson Smith, another leading exponent of educational sociology, was born in Excelsior Springs, Missouri, in 1885. After receiving his bachelor's degree from Missouri Valley College in 1899, he became a graduate student at the recently established University of Chicago in 1900. The following year he became a teaching fellow at Chicago and continued his studies there until 1903, when he assumed the duties of instructor of history and political science at Washington University, Saint Louis, Missouri.

In 1907, after receiving his Ph.D. degree from Chicago, Smith left Washington and was appointed professor of history and social science at Heidelberg College, in Ohio, where he taught until his resignation in 1909.

From 1909 to 1919, Smith taught sociology and economics at Kansas State Teachers College before assuming the position of professor of educational sociology at the University of Kansas, where he remained until his retirement.

Smith's major contributions to educational sociology include: Introduction to Educational Sociology in 1917, which is considered to be the "first regular textbook in the

field,"¹ and Principles of Educational Sociology in 1924. In 1937, at the age of sixty-two, Smith died at his home in Lawrence, Kansas.

David Samuel Snedden. While the development of educational sociology as a special field represented a reaction against the emphasis on both administration and psychology, its most outspoken leader, David S. Snedden, regarded the problem of post-war America with "eyes scarcely less conservative than those of administrative and psychological experts."²

Snedden was born in Havilah, California, in 1868, and held the position of school principal at Santa Paula, California, from 1892 to 1895. He received bachelor's degrees from Saint Vincent's College in 1889 and Stanford University in 1897. From 1897 to 1901, he was a school principal in Paso Robles, California.

After receiving his master's degree from Teachers College, Columbia University in 1901, he was appointed assistant professor of education at Stanford where he worked closely with Ellwood P. Cubberly. Snedden occupied this position

¹Brown, Educational Sociology, p. 41; Meltzer, Education in Society: Readings, p. 6.

²Merle Curti, The Social Ideas of American Educators (New York: Charles Scribners Sons, 1935), p. 565.

until 1905, when he assumed the duties of adjunct professor of educational administration at Teachers College, while working on his doctorate.

As a graduate student at Columbia, Snedden studied with John Dewey, Edward L. Thorndike, Franklin H. Giddings, Richard Charles Russell, James Russell, Frank McMurry, Edward T. Devine, and Samuel Train Dutton.¹ In 1907, he was awarded a doctorate in educational administration from Columbia.

Subsequently, at Columbia he published Administration of Educational Work for Juvenile Reform Schools in 1906, School Reports and School Efficiency, with William H. Allen in 1907, and Administration of Public Education in the United States, with Samuel Train Dutton in 1908.

In 1909, Snedden became state commissioner of education in Massachusetts, where he wrote Problems of Vocational Education in 1911, and Problems of Educational Readjustment in 1913. In 1917, with the passage of the Smith-Hughes Act, which provided federal funds a grants-in-aid to states offering vocational studies, the National Society for the Promotion of Industrial Education was formed, and Snedden was elected its first president in 1918. He was re-elected the following year.²

¹Drost, pp. 71-72.

²Ibid., p. 157.

The National Society for Vocational Education and the Vocational Education Association arranged to conduct their annual conventions concurrently in Chicago in 1920, with a single joint membership fee.¹

In 1922, Snedden was named editor of the new Vocational Education Magazine, the official publication of the National Society for Vocational Education. Its intention was to represent the point of view of the V.E.A., however, it discontinued publication only after the merger of the two organizations in 1925.²

David S. Snedden died in Palo Alto, California, in 1951 at the age of 83.

Snedden was a popular lecturer and prolific writer. He published over two hundred journal articles and over one hundred book reviews. Snedden's main works dealing with educational sociology include: Problems of Secondary Education (1917); A Digest of Educational Sociology (1920); Sociological Determinants of Objectives in Education (1921); What's Wrong with American Education? (1927); Educational Sociology for Beginners (1928); School Educations: Sociological Sources of Values (1930); Towards Better Educations: Some Critical Sociological Examinations (1931);

¹Ibid., p. 158.

²Ibid., pp. 158-159.

Cultural Education for Common Sense (1931); and Introductory Sociology for Teachers (1935).

Summary

As civilization advances, human interdependencies are multiplied. Increasing social complexity makes personal adjustments more difficult, and thus adds value to scientific social insight. The social sciences undertake to explain physical development. Sociology is the latest of the social sciences to develop, and it is still relatively new. Educational sociology is an applied phase of general sociology, and is basic for the study of education and the training of teachers. Its unit of study is the social group, and any analysis of the group aspects, as contrasted with the individual aspects of education, comes within the field. Organized education is a social function, carried on by social groups for their own perpetuation and improvement. In modern society its dominant agent is the state, which may include the objectives, administration, discipline, curriculum, and method, is filled with group phenomena. Therefore each of them requires sociological as well as psychological treatment. Since the rapid spread of urbanization, industrialization, and schools coincided with an age of extreme institutional individualism, the development of dynamic educational sociology,

with its emphasis upon social needs and social participation, is of particular importance.

It was the objective of this chapter to present the historical backgrounds of educational sociology. In Chapter III, the following chapter, how the five educational sociologists view the significance of educational sociology will be discussed.

CHAPTER III

THE SIGNIFICANCE OF EDUCATIONAL SOCIOLOGY

At the end of the nineteenth century, there developed in the United States an increased interest and concern for formal education. The interest was in part triggered by the dramatic growth in industrialization and urbanization in this country. This led many Americans to suddenly recognize the practical importance of education. With this increased interest and the larger number of individuals achieving higher levels of education, the institution of education in America was viewed with concern, and sometimes alarm.

The academic discipline which studies the social nature of education both as an institution and as an integral part of the total society is educational sociology. In this chapter, how the five selected educational sociologists view the significance of educational sociology will be considered.

The views of the five educational sociologists regarding: a definition of education; a definition of sociology; the specific aims of educational sociology; the scope of educational sociology; the value of educational sociology in the

organization and operation of our schools; and educational sociology and its relation to educational psychology are compared in Tables II, III, IV, V, VI, VII, and VIII.

A Definition of Education

Future oriented. In A Sociological Philosophy of Education, Finney writes, "The needs of individual life are to be satisfied through participation in the institutions of society."¹ The family, the local community, the state, the industries, the church, the school, the press, the standard of living, the customary recreations, the health-preserving activities, and certain miscellaneous activities are listed as the social institutions. Finney contends, "The institutions of society are the objectives of education . . . all education worthy of the name has the very practical objective of preparing young people to take their parts efficiently in all the institutions of our highly cultured society."² Formal schooling, Finney emphasizes, is designed merely to furnish such information as the social process itself does not adequately teach.³ John Dewey's famous aphorism that

¹Ross L. Finney, A Sociological Philosophy of Education (New York: Macmillan, 1928), p. 68.

²Ibid., pp. 93-94.

³Ibid., p. 149.

TABLE II
DEFINITION OF EDUCATION

Finney	The device by which adults delimit the institutions and civilizations of the future. Should be consistent throughout the nation. It is not just for children in more fortunate communities to have better schools than those in less fortunate communities.
Payne	The consciously regulated learning process in which circumstances are controlled for aims of generating behavior changes. It includes changes in behavior and all such changes suggest development whether the changes take place in a definite direction.
Peters	Must be interpreted in terms of particular training for the exact issues of life. Requires "blueprinting" the effects needed and then regulating educational attempts toward the actualization of the fundamentals of "blueprinting."
Smith	Must educate the individual for participation in society. Should endeavor to produce cultured members of society.
Snedden	One of the means followed by society to communicate its culture. The means by which a social group tries to furnish and mold the inexperienced generation to support the responsibilities of the more experienced.

TABLE III
DEFINITION OF SOCIOLOGY

Finney	Interested with the person as he participates in society. A collaborating group of people who experience a common culture and are organized in such a way to strengthen it.
Payne	The science of social relationships. Sociology is not sharply organized. Concepts, theories, and methods of study fluctuate substantially and are subject to rapid change.
Peters	The scientific study of the processes of interactions of individuals and the patterns these form in connection with biological, psychological, and cultural pressures.
Smith	Two views, the pure, or theoretic, and the applied, or practical. Pure sociology is interested with the underlying theories of social interaction. Applied sociology is concerned with the effective applicability of these theories in the control and direction of social activities.
Snedden	The science that discusses the social relations of human beings. Pure sociology is planned to relate, to define, and to test social phenomena without conscious reference to the effective conclusions that follow. Applied sociology is interested in the control and utilization of group life and social processes toward the cultivation of human conditions.

TABLE IV
DEFINITION OF EDUCATIONAL SOCIOLOGY

Finney	Educational sociology must perceive the select subject matter of education with consideration to the conscious direction of social evolution. Will become a distinctive science to the degree to which it advances scholarship within this distinctive field.
Payne	Defines the institutions and social forms through which the pupil increases and classifies his knowledge. These institutions and social forms are considered specifically in their connection to the educational system in its development and changing role.
Peters	Interested with the investigation of educational process from the significance of its social intentions and the social circumstances that influence its efficiency.
Smith	Interested with the relation of the methods, principles, and data of sociology to the study and procedure of education. Fundamental in the creation of a science and art of education, and a basic course in the instruction of teachers.
Snedden	Sociology is the science of social relationships and social interdependencies. Education is the inclusive sense of the control, the development, and the direction of instruction.

TABLE V
SCOPE OF EDUCATIONAL SOCIOLOGY

Finney	Educational sociology is concerned with investigating the structural and effective phases of the educative process. Interested in the investigation of the social and cultural processes as they pertain to the educative process.
Payne	This author does not discuss the scope of educational sociology.
Peters	Principal concern is empirical social conduct. Covers all social processes of nonschool educative institutions that can be investigated sociologically.
Smith	Relates the formal educational agencies to formal outside institutions. Describes how the individual becomes socialized after school hours as well as what elements in formal and informal education affect social attitudes.
Snedden	Interested in the scientific determination of educational objectives. Must assist in determining the significant characteristics among social groups due to heredity, environment, and opportunities.

TABLE VI
THE AIMS OF EDUCATIONAL SOCIOLOGY

Finney	If the school is to redirect society in accordance with the goals of sociology, sociology must first redirect the school in accordance with those goals. The primary opposition to such redirection is the position of the average teacher. Unless his position can be altered, there is not much assurance of quick and constructive readjustment.
Payne	Cannot limit itself exclusively to the investigation of the school as an educational institution. Appraises the educational work of the complimentary institutions in order to interpret the educational province of the school.
Peters	Specifies how individuals are socialized by the school as an institution on issues which have to be answered in terms of the detailed and intricate "culture mass," and how this procedure is controlled by the non-school educative agencies.
Smith	After the fundamental theories of social relations are answered, the purpose is to discover what education the individuals have in order to make a success of their energies.
Snedden	Should be aware of the theories that are applicable particularly to each of the different social groups from the perspective of the distinct relation of education to social groups.

TABLE VII
THE VALUE OF EDUCATIONAL SOCIOLOGY

Finney	Exploration of sociologists into social processes contributes immensely to education, because they furnish the fundamental element and related view of the social order. By stressing its sociological approach to all educational problems, sociology is focusing attention to the fact that schools should be complete propagandists for democracy.
Payne	Issue of education in contemporary society needs a socio-scientific approach for its interpretation. Provides the knowledge and the techniques required to describe the elements relating to struggles between individuals and groups.
Peters	This author does not discuss the value of educational sociology.
Smith	Sociologists have been tabulating social data, applying scientific methods of organization to them, and constructing a body of theories for use in the study of social problems. They have also led in applying the theories evolved to the enhancement of institutional life.
Snedden	Education needs guidance from sociology in the determination of the goals and objectives desirable in individual life, social grouping, or other situations.

TABLE VIII

EDUCATIONAL SOCIOLOGY AND ITS RELATION
TO EDUCATIONAL PSYCHOLOGY

Finney	Educational psychology provides principles for educational sociology. Although educational sociology is less reliant upon the improvement of all other sciences, it is unusually reliant upon educational psychology.
Payne	Primary function of educational sociology is interested in aims and curriculum. Educational psychology must influence the objectives that are appropriate to the demands of the children.
Peters	Educational psychology explains how education should be adapted to the needs of the individual. Educational sociology explains the adaptation of education to the demands of society and the bearing of group phenomena upon the educational procedures by which these needs are satisfied.
Smith	Similarities should be plain and unequivocal. They furnish contrasting approaches to educational investigation, and complementary factors in dealing with school issues.
Snedden	Both are applied sciences. Educational sociology is interested with the result of learning on the group as well as the result of smaller group life upon the larger society. Educational psychology influences whether the child's skillfulness would allow him to pursue that which is socially desirable.

education is life was found by Finney to be very misleading. Finney maintains that in a civilized society we have an elaborate system of formal schooling primarily because there is so much cognitive material that must be learned before we try to use it, because civilized life does require so much preparation. He cites the professional schools in which there is no nonsense to the effect that education is life, not preparation for life. The information needed as preparation is logically organized and systematically presented; students dig until they find it.¹

Finney discusses the function of education:

. . . education is the instrument by which adults now living predetermine the institutions and civilization of the future. Education is the steering gear of society. The social life of tomorrow will depend to a great extent upon what we put into the school program of today.²

Finney recognizes that the way to discern the social problem of education most clearly is to inquire what the institutions and social activities of the future ought to be, and what kind of education will best fit young people to take part in such activities and institutions.³

¹Ibid., p. 157.

²Ross L. Finney, Elementary Sociology (New York: Sanborn Co., 1923), p. 176.

³Ibid., p. 178.

Finney also says that educational opportunities ought to be uniform throughout the country. It is not fair to the citizens, not safe for democracy, for children in favored cities and states to have good schools, while children in rural districts and backward states have only poor schools.¹

Consciously controlled learning process. Payne's basic point is that education is the process going on in the individual whereby changes in behavior are produced:

These behavior changes may be consciously brought about through organized propaganda, through social pressure or direction in the family, school, community, religious organizations, gangs, clubs, or other organized agencies. Education may take place deliberately or in informal social contacts in the various industrial, commercial,² or organized groups, in which the individual lives.

Education in this sense, maintains Payne, begins at birth and goes on throughout life. It also goes on in every situation in which the individual is gaining and organizing the experiences which influence behavior changes. While education is here regarded as the result of the learning process, it is not equivalent to learning.³

¹Ibid., p. 179.

²E. George Payne, "Education and Social Control," The Journal of Educational Sociology, Vol. I, No. 3 (November, 1927), p. 137.

³Ibid., pp. 138-145.

In Payne's analysis, changes in behavior which are not the result of the educational process are constantly taking place in the individual. Behavior changes resulting in connection with the individual's life process may not be regarded as changes due to education. In Payne's judgement, "education . . . is the consciously controlled learning process in which situations are definitely manipulated for purposes of producing behavior changes."¹

Thus, Payne concludes, "all education is growth or development. Education involves changes in behavior and all such changes imply growth whether the changes take place in a desirable or undesirable direction."²

Concern with the problems of life. Traditionally the function of education, in Peters' view, has been conceived to be "the development of a broad view of man and of human destiny."³ Now there is emerging a constructive new theory to replace the old one; on the basis of it, educators all over the country are undertaking to reconstruct their curricula. Peters' basic point is that, "This theory conceives education as the acquisition of many specific

¹Ibid., pp. 137-138.

²Ibid., p. 138.

³Charles C. Peters, Objectives and Procedures in Civic Education (New York: Longmans, Green and Co., 1930), p. 19.

preparednesses for the many particular problems of life. Each citizen will be confronted with the necessity for running down certain topics in books, if he is to vote most intelligently on questions put before him." Education for citizenship consists in part, therefore, in such practice in finding things in books as will send everyone forth with the ability to make use of them.¹

To be a practical force, Peters readily admits, education must be defined in terms of specific preparation for the particular problems of life. Such a definition is now the accepted one and curricula are being formulated in harmony with its implications. This definition of education demands "blueprinting" the outcomes we want and then directing out educational efforts toward the realization of elements of the blueprints.²

Peters believes that education is a kind of social engineering:

The engineer first plans the object he wishes to make. . . . He sets up . . . a detailed blue-print, and studies the adequacy of each of its parts from the standpoint of established theories. After he has perfected his blue-print . . . his next step is to have the plan embodied in concrete materials. . . . The same procedure characterizes

¹Ibid., pp. 19-20.

²Ibid., pp. 18-21.

the new education. Our first step is to get the blue-print of the individual and of the society we want . . . indicating the specific ideals, skills, bodies of information, attitudes of mind, prepared judgments, abilities to reason, which are needed for getting on in this life. Our second step is then by using such instrumentalists as school subjects, discipline, and example as tools, to forge out individuals to conform to those blue-prints.¹

Train man for participation in society. Education, according to Smith, must teach cooperation, service, and altruism. The educated man must feel his dependence upon society and his responsibilities for its betterment. His ideas must not merely be personal, but social. His intellectual notions and his moral and ethical views must harmonize more or less fully with those of society or he will be estranged and isolated from it and his life rendered futile. Education must train the individual for membership in the family, the state, the church, the club, and the business world no less than make him an effective thinker and athlete.² Public education should not strive to develop cultivated individuals merely for their own sake; it should develop cultivated members of society.³

¹Ibid., p. 21.

²Walter R. Smith, An Introduction to Educational Sociology (New York: Houghton-Mifflin, 1917), pp. 12-13.

³Ibid., pp. 33-36.

Smith concludes that all human contact is educative. It is not, however, all equally educative, nor is all experience helpful. The criminal is educated into his criminality as well as the philosopher into his wisdom or the virtuous man into his goodness. Since whatever facilitates human contact facilitates education, the whole process of social organization and control is at least an indirect means of education.¹ Education, though, as a by-produce of general social activities, is insufficient to satisfy a progressive society.²

Transmits society's culture. Snedden formulated the following clear, descriptive description of the subject: "Education . . . is one of the means adopted by society to transmit to succeeding generations its accumulated stores of knowledge, arts, customs, beliefs, and other fruitful elements of social inheritances."³

Education, states Snedden, is also the means by which a particular social group tries to equip and shape a younger generation to carry on the works and responsibilities of the

¹Walter R. Smith, "The Fundamentals of a Socialized Educational Program," School and Society (July 13, 1918), p. 35.

²Smith, An Introduction to Educational Sociology, pp. 43-46.

³David S. Snedden, Towards Better Educations: Some Sociological Examinations (New York: Columbia University Press, 1931), p. 43.

old, and perhaps advance the valued things of the old to new high levels.¹

In Snedden's view, education has been carried on in human societies for centuries, though primitive societies could have developed only the beginnings of those specialized agencies devoted to the offering of education which we call schools.² Under these primitive conditions, he says, various social groups evolved their educative responsibilities. Initiations were a kind of graduation ceremony marking the culmination of years of education. Novitiates were accepted into crafts and guilds on the condition that they would learn "the skill, the moral qualities, and the hidden knowledge which gave power to the masters in the field."³

From those earlier beginnings, according to Snedden, changes can be traced into contemporary times. Just as specialized agencies evolve to heal the sick, to make our shoes, and transport our goods, so schools are developed as educative agencies. This is done partly to effect new learnings not needed under old conditions, but also partly

¹Ibid., pp. 42-47.

²Snedden, "Sociology, A Basic Science to Education," Teachers College Record (March, 1923), 24, pp. 95-96.

³Snedden, Towards Better Educations, pp. 44-49.

to perform better the education which even many millenia ago were vaguely felt to be desirable.¹

A Definition of Sociology

Interaction between groups. Sociology, according to Finney, is the scientific study of the ways in which people interact in groups. Derived from the Latin word "socius," meaning a companion or associate, sociology implies activity that involves two or more persons. "Socius" has at times been subjected to incorrect interpretation, some writers treating the term as though it referred to an isolated human being. The proper concern of sociology is with the individual as he participates in social relations. The importance of this distinction is made clear, Finney says, when we consider some of the other concepts derived from "socius." For example, "social" refers to behavior that is carried on in the company of others. "Sociable" describes the person who is inclined to prefer the companionship of his fellows. "Sociability" denotes the tendency to form groups. A "society" is a relatively permanent cooperating group of people who share a common culture and are organized to perpetuate it.²

¹Ibid., pp. 49-51.

²Ross L. Finney, "The Function of Sociology in the Training of Teachers," Educational Review (February, 1922), Vol. 63, pp. 110-111.

The science of social relationships. Payne believes sociology is the "science of social relationships (structures), the consequences (functions) of those relationships for ongoing social systems, and the processes of social change." Since all social sciences deal with more or less the same world of experience, man's behavior with regard to his fellows, the special sphere of each science is likely to be "lazy at the boundaries."¹ Arbitrary, shifting and overlapping areas of observation and theory have been characteristic of all scientific disciplines and are not unique to the sciences that study man. Yet the historical and the contemporary practice of scholars would seem to indicate that the primary focus of sociology is the group or the larger social entity. Payne considers man's existence as social; his life is bound up with various groups and, partly through these groups, with the encompassing social system that we call society. Various theoretical schemes may focus attention on one aspect or another of social life, but the sociologist particularly emphasizes beliefs, values, moral rules, and symbolic communication, which form the distinctive features of human life.²

¹E. George Payne, "Sociology and Education," The Journal of Educational Sociology (February, 1939), Vol. 12, No. 6, pp. 321-322.

²E. George Payne, "A Socio-Scientific Approach to Education," Compass Needle, Vol. III, No. 4 (December, 1936), pp. 4-6.

The field of sociology as a whole, Payne adds, is not highly standardized and systematic. Concepts, theories, and methods of study vary considerably among scientists in the field, and are subject to relatively rapid change. These conditions arise in part from the recency of a scientific approach to social phenomena, in part from the complexity of the subject itself.¹

Group processes and interactions. After defining sociology as "the scientific study of the processes of interactions of persons and the patterns these form in relation to biological, psychological, and cultural influences," Peters cautions against reducing sociology to too exact terms. He believes social relationships and all the interplay of environmental forces are too dynamic and too ever-changing to be reduced easily to a few words.² "Perhaps it is better to remember," says Peters, "that persons, each differing from the other, are human beings upon whom physical and cultural forces are ever playing, and that these persons, each bearing his own heredity, act and react upon each other in ways not yet predictable."³

¹Ibid., p. 45.

²Charles C. Peters, Foundations of Educational Sociology (New York: Macmillan, 1924), pp. 3-15.

³Ibid., p. 16.

The pure and the applied. Sociology, says Smith, is the latest entrant into the general scientific field. Like each of the other sciences, sociology, according to Smith, has two aspects, the pure, or theoretic, and the applied, or practical. Pure sociology is concerned with the underlying principles or laws of social interaction. Applied sociology deals with the practical utilization of these principles and laws in the control and direction of social activities.¹

Thus, pure sociology attempts to account for social origins, to trace social differentiation and evolution, to analyze the principles of social organization and control, and to outline the laws of social progress. Applied sociology is more concerned with specialized group functions, institutional management, and social reconstruction. In studying the family, for example, pure sociology deals with its origin, development, and present status; applied sociology analyzes its weaknesses and strong points, and suggests practicable methods for its improvement.²

Social relationships. Snedden considers sociology as the science that treats of the social relations of human

¹Walter R. Smith, "Reflections of an Educational Sociologist," School and Society (May 20, 1922), Vol. XV, No. 386, pp. 541-542.

²Smith, Principles of Educational Sociology (New York: Houghton-Mifflin, 1924), pp. 5-9.

beings. These social relationships are of many kinds, including those between parent and child, leader and follower, buyer and seller, friend and friend, employer and employee.¹

Pure sociology, like any other so-called "pure" science, is designed to describe, to interpret, and to evaluate social phenomena without conscious reference to the practical results that may follow. For example, sociologists study the social groups formed by primitive human beings, the interdependencies of men within these groups, and the influence of the groups upon one another. In a sense, Snedden states, they are seeking "knowledge for its own sake." According to Snedden, it is probably that all knowledge has, sooner or later, some practical value.²

Sociology as applied knowledge makes a different appeal. Snedden emphasizes that the disturbances in our group relationships, like disturbances in the body, so distress us that we make all kinds of demands for relief. The wise social scientist, like the wise physician, sees that relief is not to be accomplished by the methods of magic or incantation.³

¹David S. Snedden, Educational Sociology (New York: Century, 1923), p. 17.

²Ibid., pp. 19-24.

³David S. Snedden, "Some Sociological Foundations," The Journal of Educational Sociology (March, 1934), Vol. 7, pp. 420-421.

Crime, bad government, widespread poverty, prevalent vice, war oppression, general loneliness, insecurity, ignorance, deterioration of race, monopoly, intolerance, obstructed distribution of economic goods, and numberless other disorders are "the diseases of the body politic." They call for remedy, but provision of remedy calls for knowledge, knowledge of values and conditions of sound group life, of properly harmonized human relationships, of rightly adjusted and satisfied interdependencies.¹

Snedden sums up his position in the following way:

Pure sociology is concerned primarily with the nature of social groups and social processes, just as pure chemistry seeks to understand the nature of chemical compounds and chemical processes. Applied sociology can well be thought of as concerned with the control and utilization of group life and social processes toward the improvement of human conditions in exactly the same way that we think of the uses of applied chemistry.²

A Definition of Educational Sociology

Two distinct kinds of knowledge. The minor task of educational sociology, according to Finney's analysis, is to reorganize the teaching process into a social process. Its major task is to reorganize the contents of education with a view to the conscious guidance of social evolution. As a

¹Ibid.

²Ibid., p. 20.

science it has two distinct kinds of knowledge to deal with. The first, and most important, is the knowledge derived from the older social sciences; for it is this derived knowledge which is to force upon education a new point of view, new objectives, and a new program. A second type of knowledge, according to Finney, is that accumulated by research within the school itself. It pertains to the methods, contents, and organization by which the new objectives are to be achieved.¹ Educational sociology will become a special science to the extent to which it promotes research within this special field.²

Institutions and social forms. Payne insists that educational sociology is the science which explains the institutions and social forms through which the student gains and organizes his experiences. These institutions and social forms are viewed particularly in their relation to the educational system in its evolution and changing function.³

The subject, as defined by Payne, will include such topics as:

¹Ross L. Finney, "The Prime Task of Educational Sociology," School and Society (May 19, 1924), Vol. 19, pp. 623-627.

²Finney, "Education as a Factor in Social Progress," Educational Review (June, 1919), pp. 43-44.

³E. George Payne, "Educational Sociology in City Training Schools," School and Society (February, 1919), Vol. 9, pp. 212-216.

1. The social consciousness as it develops in the child in his contact with the family, the neighborhood, the school, etc.
2. The changing function of the school; that is, the widening function of the school to meet the educational needs of the community.
3. A study of social relationships: (a) those in direct personal contact, such as the crowd, mass meeting, deliberate assembly, etc.; (b) those not in direct personal contact as fads, fashions, custom, conventionality, public opinion, etc.
5. The development of a social theory as the basis for the interpretation of educational procedure.¹

The social purposes of the educational process. In Peters' opinion, the specialization of sociology also discloses definite interests that demand their own group of courses. One of these is known as educational sociology and is concerned with the study of the educational process from the point of view of its social purposes and the social conditions that determine its efficiency. Although this is a relatively new point of view, Peters insists, it has developed through the effort to interpret education as preparation for successful living together. As educational psychology emphasizes the means by which education carries out its program and brings to light these facts regarding human personality that condition educational success, so educational sociology attempts the task of defining the objectives of the educational program. Society finances and organizes education

¹Ibid., p. 212.

primarily for social welfare; even though it deals with the individual, justification of what it does rests upon its success in building desirable social relationships.¹

Fundamental in the training of teachers. To Smith, educational sociology may be defined as the application of the methods, principles, and data of sociology to the study and practice of education. Its interests center about the learning process. It is a differentiated phase of the broad field of sociological study and, although characterized as an applied science, it has certain theoretic as well as practical aspects. The theoretic aspects are concerned with the analysis of education as a social institution, its relation to other social institutions, and the development of the general principles of education as they have affected and continue to affect social history, social organization and control, and social progress. Its more specifically applied aspects deal with the utilization of group concepts and group activities in schoolwork.²

In all fairness, Smith says that "educational sociology is more than a mere branch of general sociology; it is a basic pillar in the construction of a science and art of

¹Charles C. Peters, "Healthy Disagreements to Educational Sociology," School and Society (July 12, 1924), Vol. 20, pp. 53-54.

²Smith, Principles of Educational Sociology, p. 6.

education, and a fundamental discipline in the training of teachers." In linking together the science of sociology and the practice of education, Smith says, the combination is comparable to other compound studies, such as navigational astronomy, engineering physics, industrial chemistry, agricultural biology, and vocational psychology.¹

The science of social interdependencies. In Educational Sociology, Snedden is of the opinion that:

Sociology . . . is the science of social groups, social processes, and social values--in a word, of social relationships or social interdependencies. Men are constantly at work seeking to improve societies and social conditions, promoting health, lessening crime, increasing knowledge, advancing numberless forms of cooperation.²

In his view, "education is the inclusive sense of the control, the development, and the organization and direction of training and instruction." It is one of the "gigantic social processes" designed partly to prevent each generation from losing any of the ground gained by previous generations, and partly to assist it to reach higher levels than has any previous generation.³

Snedden contends that the purposes, aims, objectives, or goals of any particular form of education are derived from a

¹Ibid., p. 7.

²Snedden, Educational Sociology, pp. 31-32.

³Ibid., p. 32.

study of the needs of some social group. The father of the family educates his son to be a good filial member of the family, to succeed in business, and to win approval in the world of men. The father studies sociologically the conditions and the needs of the various social groups in which his son is expected to play a role. To a great extent, of course, he simply follows crystallized custom; but he does so because he approves it.¹

"But among all civilized peoples," Snedden argues, "these relatively unorganized forms of education are being steadily supplemented--in many cases replaced--by more purposive and specialized forms of instruction and training and, in recent years, controlled development."² The governing and aristocratic classes have at all times quite consciously educated their children to carry on the aristocratic tradition from other social traditions, thus making their education socially purposive.³

Therefore, according to Snedden, complexity of educational purposes grows apace in modern democracies, especially when scientific psychology reveals the wide ranges of abilities among those to be educated:

¹Ibid., pp. 31-37.

²Ibid., p. 32.

³Ibid., pp. 32-37.

The speculative thinker still asks, "What is the aim of education?"--that is the paramount or all-inclusive aim. Practical sociology as yet disclaims ability to answer that question; but practical sociology can formulate scores, if not hundreds, of concrete objectives, derived largely as goals or "optimum resultants" from consideration of three factors--the educabilities of specified types of learners, the personal needs of these learners, the¹ needs of their societies--from families to nations.

The Scope of Educational Sociology

Application of findings. Educational sociology, according to Finney's interpretation, is a special sociological area which deals with the structural and dynamic aspects of the educative process.² It is interested in studying this structure to discover the theories and philosophies entailed, its cultural systems, and the structural aspects of personalities and interrelations with the total social scheme. It is likewise concerned with the study of the social and cultural processes and personality processes as they relate to the educative process. Educational sociology is concerned with making application of these findings for the "instillation of democratic values, in short, social or democratic education."³

¹Ibid., p. 33.

²Ross L. Finney, "The Function of Sociology in the Training of Teachers," pp. 111-112.

³Finney, Elementary Sociology, pp. 1-21.

Interested in social processes. Peters asserts that formal education has begun to recognize the crucial significance of nonschool educational agencies. Only a short time ago did we first realize that the organized school is only one of society's educational agencies. Therefore school objectives and techniques, and educational problems and results, must be studied in terms of objectives and efforts of these other agencies. Educational sociology is interested primarily in social behavior, but only on those portions that can be described in empiric terms. And as the stimulus of social behavior is derived from the environment, the matter of control of the educational environment attains supreme importance. Here, in Peters' view, sociological research must point the way. Hence educational sociology covers all social processes of nonschool educative agencies that can be analyzed sociologically.¹

Relates the school to other institutions. Educational sociology, according to Smith, relates the formal educational institutions to informal outside agencies.² It describes how the child becomes socialized after school hours; how the educative, and miseducative, influence of society operates

¹Peters, Foundations of Educational Sociology, pp. 40-54.

²Smith, An Introduction to Educational Sociology, pp. 7-8.

on the individual outside of formal schooling; and what factors in formal and informal education determine social attitudes.¹ Considered thus, this discipline connects the school with other social institutions and has two definite contributions to make. In the first place, it indicates how the formal school process is strengthened, weakened, modified, or nullified by the group activities of which each individual is a unit, and by the changes in the behavior of the individual in his relation to the groups. In the second place, it shows how the school is limited in its efforts to make the world over in a relatively short period of time because of its dependence on the particular character of the society, state, or nation which it was created to serve. It also points out "variants of the general type of cultural and social backgrounds," their effect upon the developing personality of the child and the extent to which they must be taken into account in the construction and operation of an educational program.²

Smith explains his position this way:

Our knowledge of the social and cultural groups that condition our behavior in our daily contacts is still very limited, although growing each day.

¹Smith, Principles of Educational Sociology, p. 6.

²Smith, "The Sociological Aspects of Our Educational Aims," pp. 88-91.

Only recently, for instance, empirical studies were made of the influence of motion pictures upon our youth. Still, we have a growing number of investigations of the family, school, community, religious organizations, gangs, clubs, immigrant and Negro groups, and other organized agencies.¹

Determines educational objectives. According to Snedden, educational sociology has as its chief province the scientific determination of educational objectives. It constitutes an applied or linking science between the fields of sociology (as a pure science) and social economy (as the science of all phases of human well-being) on one hand, and the practice of education on the other.²

As a linking science, Snedden insists, educational sociology is comparable with such other so-called applied sciences as:

. . . educational psychology, agricultural chemistry, electrical physics, navigational astronomy, medical sociology, medical bacteriology, aeronautic mechanics, political history, educational history, household (graphic and plastic) art, life-insurance (actuarial) mathematics, educational architecture, educational hygiene, educational physiology or biology, political economics, and many others.³

¹Ibid., p. 91.

²David S. Snedden, A Digest of Educational Sociology (New York: Columbia University Press, 1920), pp. 1-3.

³Ibid., pp. 4-6.

In all these cases, Snedden explains, we find on the one hand a relatively large field of general knowledge, a science or a fine art with well-defined principles; and on the other a well-defined field of practical work. The latter may employ contributions from many sciences, as does, for example, "agriculture, which now draws heavily upon physics (i.e., soil physics), chemistry (i.e., chemistry of fertilizers), bacteriology (i.e., plant and animal pathology), botany (i.e., plant breeding), and economics (i.e., marketing)."¹

Educational sociology, in Snedden's opinion, must aid in accounting for the large differences among social groups due to heredity, environment, and opportunities. From these differences flow differences of educational programs.²

Snedden insists that in part, the work of public schools should smooth out or remove differences among groups composing homogeneous society; in part, it should accentuate certain differences due to abilities or opportunities.³

The Aims of Educational Sociology

An effective agency for social readjustment. According to Finney, the prime aim of educational sociology requires

¹Ibid., pp. 6-10.

²Snedden, Educational Sociology, pp. 33-34.

³Ibid., p. 34.

two divergent answers. There is the school master's answer, which Finney rejects, and there's the sociologist's answer, which he endorses. He believes that educational sociology will make a contribution of the first magnitude, not only to education itself, but to civilization as a whole, if it adopts the sociologist's point of view; but so long as it accedes to the school master's concept of its task, Finney fears that it will do nothing more significant than "to ride a series of hobbies across the pedagogical stage."¹

Sociology, Finney explains, has produced new material, which will change educators' concept of education:

(A) new point of view is by far the most important contribution that (sociology) can make to education. . . . To ask teachers what educational sociology ought to do is like driving a horse and buggy into a garage to get a tire set, or into a filling station for a feed of oats. If one would patronize a garage or a filling station to any advantage he must first invest in an automobile.²

Charles A. Ellwood, in Finney's opinion, says this very precisely in The American Journal of Sociology when he states:

Educational sociology has been developed chiefly by men who were primarily educationists rather than sociologists. Consequently, the science has been developed, most sociologists would say, in too narrow a way, with practical educational

¹Finney, "The Prime Task of Educational Sociology," p. 623.

²Ibid., pp. 623-624.

problems dominating its development, rather than the larger questions of the educative process.¹

The ultimate practical aim of sociology, Finney argues, is to make the world over into a better place for men and women to live in; and sociologists regard the school as the most available and effective agency for social readjustment.² However, if the school is to redirect society in accordance with the aims of sociology, sociology must first redirect the school in accordance with those aims. The importance of this redirection is "commensurate with the urgency of the modern social problem." The chief obstacle to such redirection, Finney maintains, is the attitude of the typical educator. "His prime concern is in operating the school-that-now-is; not in revolutionizing it. The average school administrator is interested in making the wheels go round; he has a very subsidiary interest in installing a new machine."³ Unless this attitude of the typical educator can be changed and his outlook broadened, according to Finney, there is little hope of prompt and effective readjustment in the modern world. To effect that change in educational leadership is the chief

¹Ibid., p. 624.

²Ross L. Finney, "Sociological Principles Fundamental to Pedagogical Method," Educational Review (February 1918), Vol. 55, pp. 94-95.

³Ibid., pp. 624-627.

contribution that sociologists expect of educational sociology. Finney asserts, however, that is precisely what will not be likely to occur so long as educational sociology takes its cue primarily from the schoolmaster.¹

Develop means for social change. According to Payne, educational sociology seeks to discover the principles and indicate the practices essential to educational procedure in its social implications. The science starts with a consideration of social behavior and the principles of its control with reference to specific ends or purposes as consciously controlled through the special institution, the school. Educational sociology cannot, however, limit itself exclusively to the study of the school as an educational agency, since in any society much of the important work of education takes place outside the school, in social institutions not designed primarily for educational purposes but which, nevertheless, perform an important educational function. Educational sociology, then, evaluates the educational work of the supplementary institutions in order to define the educational functions of the school. In brief, according to Payne's analysis, educational sociology seeks to explain the social forms, social groups, and the social processes, that is, the special relationships through which the individual

¹Ibid., pp. 97-98.

gains and organizes his experiences or behavior in their relation to the school as a coordinating agency.¹

Payne explains his position in the following paragraph:

One of the aims of educational sociology . . . is to develop means for determining social change through education, and to place emphasis upon the subject matter of the curriculum, the method of school instruction, and the school organization for the purpose of bringing about changes in social behavior. The problem here indicated merely suggests one aim of educational sociology.²

Indicates how youth is socialized. Educational sociology, Peters explains, is interested primarily in the socialization of youth, the transformation through social contacts and planned social personalities. We take it for granted, says Peters, that the socialization of the child is realized best in children's groups and that the child is the best educator and teacher of other children. It is equally important to notice, however, that the adults are the first educators of their children. Therefore, the social experiences of the adults, and particularly the parents (adult education, propaganda, radio, race conflicts, motion pictures, etc.) must be considered also, especially as they project themselves on

¹E. George Payne, Principles of Educational Sociology: An Outline (New York: New York University Press, 1928), pp. 20-22.

²Payne, "Editorial," The Journal of Educational Sociology, Vol. 1, No. 1 (September, 1927), p. iv.

the children. The socialization process is a socio-psychological process. It is a process centered fundamentally around the school, the base of all organized educational efforts and aims, which gives the whole educational process a definite direction. The main task of the school, as Peters advocates, is to impart a curriculum, and this curriculum must be made up out of "culture mass." Therefore, educational sociology indicates how youth is socialized by the school as an institution, a problem which has to be solved in terms of the elaborate and complex "culture mass," and how this process is influenced by the nonschool educational agencies.¹

Makes efficient members of society. The aim of educational sociology, Smith maintains, is in connection with the education that is needed by the individuals who participate in the groups in order to make them efficient members of the groups.² After the basic principles of social relations are determined, it is then the aim to find what education or training the individuals have or should have in order to make a success of their activities. This is a weakness of some educational programs. They are based upon present relations and not on possible better relations that will make for improvement.

¹Peters, Foundations of Educational Sociology, pp. 22-31.

²Smith, An Introduction to Educational Sociology, pp. 15-16.

Smith says that the aim of the student or research worker in educational sociology is to discover just what education or training will make efficient members of various social groups. In order to be an efficient citizen of the state, for instance, how much and just what facts should an individual know about law, government, officers, duties, principles of economics, the relation of the state to economic activities, and so on? In a similar way, each group should be studied and the education and training common to two or more of the groups recognized.¹

Develop principles by scientific methods. For Snedden, educational sociology should collect from sociology the principles of how people live in social groups. Educational sociologists need to know the principles that apply specifically to each of the various social groups from the point of view of the particular relation of education to social groups. They will need to know, for instance, the common principles underlying family life as a group "whether of poor or rich families or of harmonious and disharmonious families--not only of the native whites, but also of the immigrants and of the Negroes." If the schools have training for family life as a part of their task, educators should be able to

¹Smith, Principles of Educational Sociology, pp. 6-8.

secure from educational sociology not only the general principles of family life, but also the specific principles that apply to the families of all classes of the population. Thus, Snedden says, the school may train for those relations discovered in the efficient families and prevent relations that make for inefficiency. Similarly, each social group for which the school attempts to fit individuals should be carefully analyzed and studied by educational sociologists, so that whether social or state groups are being considered, educators can call upon educational sociology to indicate the relations that make for individual efficiency in each group.¹

It should also be an integral part of the aim of educational sociology, according to Snedden, to evaluate the principles concerning social relations in each group from the point of view of the effect of those relations within and without the group:

That certain social relations exist is not sufficient evidence that the schools should train for those relations, even though they may well serve to cause a given group to function. It may be that other relations will cause the group to function better or it may be that the relations should not exist. . . . That the present principles of social life are the standards by which education should be developed is a common

¹David S. Snedden, School Educations: Sociological Sources of Values (New York: Columbia University Press, 1930), pp. 141-143.

fallacy both in the field of education and in the development of educational sociology.¹

It may often be found, Snedden argues, that there are certain activities in various social groups that are positively injurious to other social groups. Many acts, for instance, in vocations or recreations, may be found to be immoral or unnecessary or injurious in some way. In this case, no matter how those acts may be in harmony with the natural development of some individuals or how much they may give pleasure or profit to certain individuals or smaller groups, nevertheless the schools should not give training to them. On the other hand, Snedden says, there may be certain facts and relations that are not prevalent that should consciously become a part of the program of the schools because of their assured value to the individuals directly involved, as well as to larger social groups.²

Snedden concedes that educators are going to have to take largely for granted that present social relations considered acceptable by the people quite generally are beneficial and should be trained for. Here then, Snedden insists, is the first field of research and study for those interested in educational sociology, namely to discover what

¹Ibid., p. 145.

²Ibid., pp. 145-146.

social activities and social relations should exist to further individual or group welfare.¹

The Value of Educational Sociology

Related view of the social order. Although educational sociology is a very young and marginal science, Finney maintains that it is fully justified to stand on its own feet. If education is a vital factor in the social process, then the sociologist and the educator must come together to consider their problems.² The research of sociologists into social processes contributes greatly to education, because their research provides the basic ingredient and related view of the social order. If the object of a general education may be identified as the preparation of the student not only to adjust himself to the current crisis of western civilization, but also to aid in its solution, then he must understand it in its totality and integral terms.³ By emphasizing its sociological approach to all educational problems, sociology is calling attention to the fact that the schools must be, in

¹Ibid., pp. 146-149.

²Ross L. Finney, "The Function of Educational Sociology," School and Society, Vol. 19 (May 19, 1924), pp. 624-625.

³Ross L. Finney, "Ultimate Aim of Education," Educational Review, Vol. 56 (November, 1918), pp. 309-310.

the present danger, outright propagandists for democracy. Their platform for indoctrination should be based on an interpretation of the "American frame of reference." At the same time, leaders in all fields should arrive at a common interpretation of basic national attitudes, and this ground of common agreement should be incorporated in the curriculum of the public schools. The preoccupation of many educators with what have been termed "individual student needs," Finney insists, must be revised from the viewpoint of educational sociology, which shows that individual needs cannot be considered at the expense of the "needs" of our nation, our own United States.¹

The value of educational sociology to scientific education, Finney explains, will be even more valuable in the future:

Its destiny is to do more expertly . . . what it has been doing; its task of the future . . . will be to make available to education enough scientific information on the true conditions of changing society and the methods by which the educational goals may be best achieved. . . . educational sociology will be called upon more and more to contribute to the great American educational premise that we can guide our civilization rationally and intelligently and that this guiding process can be directed along the lines that appear most desirable to us on the basis of patient research and empiric knowledge.²

¹Ross L. Finney, Elementary Sociology, pp. 215-223.

²Ibid., pp. 223-224.

Socio-scientific approach to education. According to Payne, educational sociology is a distinctive field of study. It includes a factual analysis of personality growth and development as influenced by all the agencies of education, both informal and formal.¹ Educational sociology recognizes the contributions of the subjective approach through philosophy and the individualistic emphasis of psychology, but is primarily concerned with a third approach: the influence of cultural and group factors upon personality and social control.²

Payne believes that personality grows out of situations to which the individual responds. An understanding of the educational process is not possible without an evaluation of the relative effect of all the situations that impinge upon the individual in his group contacts, whether those are in school, in the family, in the neighborhood, in the community, or in other situations to which the individual is exposed.³ While philosophy and psychology involve these situations, they have neither the technique nor the function to deal with them as required in the complex educational process. The

¹E. George Payne, "Editorial," The Journal of Educational Sociology, Vol. 5, No. 9 (May, 1932), pp. 531-532.

²E. George Payne, "Sociology and Education," pp. 321-323.

³E. George Payne, "Editorial," The Journal of Educational Sociology, Vol. 2, No. 1 (September, 1928), pp. 1-2.

problem of education in modern society, Payne says, requires a socio-scientific approach for its solution which educational sociology is in a position to make. This has often been regarded as the most important contribution to be made to education at the present time.¹

Educational sociology is concerned with the techniques that must be used in understanding the basic factors and situations that are responsible for personality and the relation of the school program to them.² These techniques and the methods in the classroom can never be adapted to children without knowing in detail the specific needs of children in terms of their environment and background.³

Payne emphasizes this point with an example of a study in health, which takes account of the aims of education as conceived by modern philosophy:

(It) takes account of the scientific knowledge relating to the factors involved in health . . . It does not take account of the needs of children in terms of their background. Thus we have an ideally constructed program . . . without reference to the specific needs of the children involved. In spite of the fact that health conditions vary enormously in different school districts, and, therefore, the emphasis should be totally different,

¹Payne, "Sociology and Education," pp. 322-323.

²E. George Payne, "Editorial Notes," The Journal of Educational Sociology, Vol. 2, No. 5 (January, 1929), p. 261.

³Payne, "Sociology and Education," pp. 323-324.

the emphasis is essentially the same because the school has left out of account the important variable (i.e.,) the health conditions. These vary as to mortality, types of ailments, the causes of ailments, the factors of air, sunlight, play space, and other elements too numerous to mention.¹

Educational sociology, Payne believes, provides the knowledge and the techniques necessary for the educator to take account of the numerous background factors relating both to typical situations and to social maladjustments, such as delinquency, crime, and other conflicts between individuals and groups. Only by an analysis of that which is typical can a basis be established for an understanding of all types of behavior.² The social processes which lead to social control, Payne argues, are developed inductively through a thorough treatment of their operation in a changing environment of the family, the play group, the community, and the nonformal agencies of education. These social processes are then analyzed in their relation to the many functions of the school: character development, health, curriculum, method, and school-community relationships.³

Payne explains his position this way:

¹Ibid., pp. 324-325.

²E. George Payne, "A Program of Educational Sociology," The Journal of Educational Sociology, Vol. 2, No. 8 (April, 1929), pp. 459-460.

³Payne, "Sociology of Education," pp. 326-327.

No other subject in the teacher training program is concerned with these areas of study in the same way . . . (as) educational sociology. Without adequate sociological knowledge and experience there is a definite gap in the training of . . . (the) teacher. The . . . emphasis upon the sociological approach to modern social problems makes it . . . imperative that this course be retained as a requirement for all teachers.¹

Improved institutional life. In Smith's opinion, the effect of sociological investigation upon the school is direct and immediate. Sociologists have been collecting social data, applying scientific methods of organization to them, and building up a body of principles for use in the study of social problems. They have also led in applying the principles developed to the improvement of our institutional life. Sociologists have insisted that all institutions have social backgrounds which must be understood in order to explain their spirit and working principles. "Government, legal systems, social classes, the church, the business world, can be understood and improved only upon the basis of our human nature as unfolded through social organization."² For this reason the appeal is being made for sociological study of all phases of existing society, and the communal point of view is coming more and more to dominate our present day thinking.³

¹Ibid., p. 327.

²Smith, An Introduction to Educational Sociology, p. 14.

³Ibid., pp. 14-15.

No other institution is more in need of sociological treatment than the school. Formal education is purely social in origin and practice.¹ It is based upon social sanctions and must work through social channels. "Modern school systems are so . . . fundamentally important for human welfare that all of the aid which all of the arts based upon those sciences can render in administering and improving them is needed." The science of psychology has rendered great service to education by revolutionizing modern pedagogy. As its principles are better developed and applied we may expect still further aid to be rendered. Nor is there any reason to suppose that sociology has not fully as great a contribution to make to education. Every sociologist from the time of Comte to the present has recognized the fundamental nature of educational institutions, and most sociologists have made some definite contribution to their study.² "Just as scientific differentiation has made educational psychology one of the most if not the most important branch of psychology, so we may expect educational sociology to become one of the most important differentiations of the sciences of sociology."³

¹Smith, "The Fundamentals of a Socialized Educational Program," pp. 38-39.

²Smith, An Introduction to Educational Sociology, pp. 15-18.

³Ibid., p. 18.

Scientific study of educational needs and values.

Snedden explains the indifference towards sociology manifested by educators:

It has been due largely to the fact that . . . educators have had little . . . appreciation of the . . . possibilities of the scientific study of educational needs and values. . . . Long after many educators had become . . . appreciative of . . . scientific methods of administration and method, they remained content to accept the contributions of custom . . . as to educational values. Endless debates over . . . materialistic tendencies in education, the value of the humanities, the conflict between cultural and vocational education . . . (have) brought the disputants out at the same doors that they entered, because of the . . . absence of sociological criteria and methods. . . . the changes in the actual aims of education achieved . . . have¹ been due to the . . . processes of trial and error.

Snedden says that a too narrow interpretation of education should be avoided. The schooling of the kindergarten stage may prove to be no less important than that of the liberal arts college. Vocational, civic, and health aims of education are tending to parallel the cultural in importance.² The scientific study and control of education cannot ignore the tremendous potency of numerous forms of extra-school instruction and training, even though these be largely informal and customary, such as "education of home, street, and workshop,

¹David S. Snedden, "Sociology, A Basic Science to Education," Teachers College Record, Vol. 24 (March, 1923), p. 9.

²David S. Snedden, Vocational Education (New York: Macmillan Co., 1920), pp. 84-85.

and the varieties of education resulting from newspapers, movies, or club life.¹

In Snedden's conception, education requires guidance from sociology in the determination of the aims, the objectives desirable in any given area of child life, social grouping, or other situation. To the extent to which educators must work these objectives out for themselves they are, obviously, doing the work of sociologists, "just as certainly as are physicians doing the work of organic chemists when they conduct research into the character and functions of vitamins."²

Educational Sociology and Its Relation to Educational Psychology

Dependent on one another. Educational sociology, in Finney's opinion, is dependent upon the development of other sciences for its own development. In a certain sense there is only one science, and each of the sciences as commonly called is but a part of this one science.³ As a natural conclusion from this point of view, it follows that no part

¹Snedden, "Sociology, A Basic Science to Education," p. 100.

²Ibid., pp. 101-102.

³Finney, "The Sociological Principle Determining the Elementary Curriculum," pp. 341-343.

of the one science can be developed completely without the development of the other parts, as each part depends more or less on other parts. As educational sociology is a part of the whole field of knowledge, it depends upon other sciences and could not be developed to any great extent before the other sciences were developed.¹

In all fairness, Finney concedes, educational psychology furnishes the principles for educational sociology. Although educational sociology is more or less dependent upon the development of all other sciences, it is peculiarly dependent upon educational psychology.² Educational sociology treats of the psychic activities of man that are of social importance. Before these psychic activities can be understood, and scientifically used in educational sociology, the underlying principles of psychic activities themselves must be understood, and this is the field of educational psychology. Thus, Finney believes, educational psychology is needed for the development of educational sociology and they have both only recently attained a scientific stage of development.³

¹Finney, Foundations of Educational Sociology, pp. 3-10.

²Finney, "The Sociological Principle Determining the Elementary Curriculum," pp. 343-344.

³Finney, Foundations of Educational Sociology, pp. 10-13.

Determination of educational objectives. Payne says that the development of educational sociology and educational psychology as sciences has been so recent that we may well expect that there should be much confusion as to what each science includes and where lies the line of demarcation between the two.¹

Psychology, Payne insists, will determine the most economical method of learning, but will not discover for us the effect of the method of procedure involved in the learning process upon group life or society. For instance, educational psychology might discover by experimentation that children learn most rapidly when the teacher or school authorities set up standards of achievement and then test the pupils at stated periods, thus making the learning process a sort of contest of the pupil with himself for standard attainment. But educational sociology might find weaknesses in the group life resulting from such a method, such as inability to cooperate, lack of team-work, insensitiveness to community needs, and a thousand and one other weaknesses that educational psychology itself might not display.²

¹ E. George Payne, "The Relation of Educational Sociology and Educational Psychology," School and Society, Vol. 19, No. 493 (June 7, 1924), pp. 653-655.

² E. George Payne, Principles of Educational Sociology (New York: New York University Press, 1925), pp. 14-15.

Educational psychology, Payne admits, has provided us with a rather effective method of attaining the knowledge desired, but we have not developed individuals that will function as effective citizens in the community. Social capacities have not been developed and thus we find corresponding social weaknesses. Psychology can never determine these social weaknesses nor provide in detail all essentials of method in the elimination of the weaknesses.¹ The method itself must be fundamentally social. The educator must therefore always check psychological experiments against educational sociology to determine whether the ways of effective learning are adequate for the social demands. Both sciences must have a say as to method.²

Therefore, in Payne's view, many regard the chief function of educational sociology as that of aims and curriculum. Others feel that educational sociology is chiefly concerned with the determination of educational objectives. However, this subject matter, which is regarded as so exclusively a matter for the educational sociologist, does not belong exclusively to his field.³ Educational psychology must

¹Ibid., pp. 15-16.

²Ibid., p. 15.

³Payne, "The Relation of Educational Sociology and Educational Psychology," p. 656.

determine the objectives that are appropriate to the needs of children. It must determine whether the child's ability would permit him to pursue that which is socially desirable and in what way the objective should be pursued. The point of Payne's discussion, then, is simply this: "That whatever the problem in education may be, there are two fundamental sciences that must be called upon to determine ways of educational procedure and both are equally indispensable."¹

Needs of society. In Foundations of Educational Sociology, published in 1924, Peters maintains:

A science of Educational Sociology must be built up from a very large number of research studies. . . . There is a need for an Educational Sociology that will be paralleled to, and equal in importance to, Educational Psychology. But to attain this status Educational Sociology must cease to be a philosophy; it must, instead, employ the qualitative methods of science.²

Emphasizing this point, Peters says that educational sociology should not seek to study sociology from the standpoint of education but rather to study education in its sociological aspects. The educational psychologist shows how education should be adjusted to the needs of the individual. The educational sociologist should show the adjustment of education to the needs of society and the bearing of group phenomena upon

¹Ibid., pp. 655-656.

²Peters, Foundations of Educational Sociology, p. v.

the educational procedures by which these needs must be met. Thus, according to Peters, educational sociology is a branch of education even more than it is a branch of sociology.¹

Used in solving educational problems. Smith insists that the relations between educational sociology and educational psychology should be plain and unequivocal. They provide contrasting approaches to educational study, and complementary factors in dealing with school problems.² Wherever the individualistic elements in a school situation are easier to grasp than the social, or seem to be more significant, the principles of educational psychology should be appealed to and applied. On the other hand, Smith maintains, when the social elements seem to predominate, and the group unit forms the easiest and most promising approach, the methodology and principles of educational sociology should be utilized. Neither alone can furnish a complete guide to educational practice. Both personal and social interests, ideals, and purposes enter into every "recitation, assembly, athletic team, literary society, religious association, departmental club, and sociability organization." Therefore, in Smith's program, every problem connected with them has

¹Ibid., pp. v-vi.

²Smith, An Introduction to Educational Sociology, pp. 21-22.

both individual and social aspects, and "wise dealing with them demands both psychological and sociological insight."¹

Give direction to the schools. Psychology, Snedden explains, is a study of the individual whereas sociology is concerned with cultural factors which make up the person. This generalization indicates the major difference between educational psychology and educational sociology. The latter stresses the individual's relation to society rather than evaluate experience or learning, as is done by educational psychology. The line of demarcation is definite between psychology and sociology, but is not as apparent between educational sociology and educational psychology because both deal with the same agency, the school, and both seek to determine and give direction to the school's effect upon individual behavior.²

Educational psychology is an applied science and lies in the field of applied psychology. It is concerned primarily with the laws of psychology applied to the acquisition, organization, and evaluation of experience or learning. In a broad sense, Snedden concedes, it seeks to answer the

¹Ibid.

²Snedden, A Digest of Educational Sociology, pp. 28-34.

question, "What is the optimum condition for learning and how can this best be realized?"¹

Educational sociology, on the other hand, says Snedden, is likewise an applied science in the field of sociology. It is concerned not with method of acquisition and organization of experience, but with the effect of learning upon group life, and in turn the effect of smaller groups on the larger society. It seeks to explain how education as a social process may, under optimum conditions, eliminate social defects, perpetuate desirable institutions, group activities, group forms and practices, and attain for society the ideals and standards it aims to achieve.²

In Snedden's opinion, educational sociology is concerned with the problem of personality or behavior as determined by culture. It may be defined as the science of social control. Educational psychology is concerned with the learning process. These basic conceptions define not only the relationships but also the differences between the two fields.³

¹David S. Snedden, "Educational Sociology Again," School and Society, Vol. 12 (July 31, 1920), pp. 93-94.

²Snedden, A Digest of Educational Sociology, pp. 39-42.

³Ibid., p. 42.

Summary

Educational sociology does not possess the perfect answer to man's search to know himself. No single field of study can satisfy the pursuit of mankind to be the master of surrounding forces. The biological sciences and psychology have cultivated man's understanding of his physical and mental culture and maturity. The social sciences have investigated the history, structure and function of the cultural heritage which is both the result and the influence of human behavior. Sociology has disclosed the intricate patterns of socialization. Through investigation of the social processes, sociology has demonstrated that personality is the result of the regular interaction of the individual and the cultural world with which he comes in contact. Educational sociology applies the principles, research data, and techniques of sociology to the educational process, both within the classroom and in the total educative experience of the person. It sees education, in this inclusive sense, as social control. This necessitates an investigation of the total pattern of socialization.

The purpose of this chapter has been to discuss how the five educational sociologists viewed the significance of educational sociology. In Chapter IV, what the sociological concept of education is in the work of these educational sociologists will be studied.

CHAPTER IV

THE SOCIOLOGICAL CONCEPT OF EDUCATION

A fully socialized identity is not acquired overnight. Children born into a society come without any standards of thinking about themselves, and the moral education of a child is an involved process. The end product of the socialization process is a person who practices self-regulation of his behavior, who is familiar with and voluntarily observes the rules of good behavior that prevail in his society. This chapter seeks to show what the sociological concept of education is in the work of the five selected educational sociologists under consideration.

Tables IX, X, XI, and XII present the views of the five educational sociologists concerning: a definition of socialization; the distinctions between socialization, learning, and education; the necessity of socialization and education for the development and maintenance of society; and the most effective social system concerning socialization and learning.

TABLE IX

A DEFINITION OF SOCIALIZATION

Finney	Involves more than the learning of skills and the acquisition of information about how the society works or how it should work. Most important part involves unconscious assimilation of beliefs, values, and patterns of behavior of significant others with whom the individual comes in contact.
Payne	Interplay of forces produces personality, not an isolated subjective process. This process by which the individual develops toward his maximum capacity is not one which goes on within the mind of the individual independent of outside influences.
Peters	Operation of the instinctive tendencies called into play by certain situations welds mankind into a compact unit. Process by which individuals are thus fused into "solidarity of spirit" is called socialization.
Smith	Does not just refuse to exclude the cultural idea; rather lays much emphasis upon it. Insists that culture must be fundamental aim of education. An educational system is not socialized unless the program produces the highest cultural attainment.
Snedden	Transmits to the individual the basic knowledge of a society which allows him to employ his skills intelligently in correct situations. The process whereby society orients the individuals towards those values and beliefs which it deems ultimately important.

TABLE X

DISTINCTIONS BETWEEN SOCIALIZATION,
LEARNING AND EDUCATION

Finney	Socialization includes learning how to solve issues of all types. The gathering of problem-solving techniques is an important segment of the educational process.
Payne	Society relies for its life and progress upon the processes of education. Socializing the child is a process of developing in him tastes and interests that inspire activities which satisfy himself and cultivate society.
Peters	An individual's educative experiences lie in his having to take particular viewpoints which have been rendered more likely to recur and to function in the future. Educative experiences furnish more skills, foresights, methods of procedure, which tell an individual how to act when crises recur in the future.
Smith	Socialization expresses the aims of an education as broad as life. This education must be precise as well as broad and must be subject to both individual and social tests. An individual may be able to read accurately, and still fail to use this ability in acquiring information from the printed page.
Snedden	Learning, socialization, and education are due to interactions between the nature of the individual and external stimulations. They can not occur unless there are specific amounts of "receptivity" in the learning organism.

TABLE XI

THE NECESSITY OF SOCIALIZATION AND EDUCATION FOR
THE DEVELOPMENT AND MAINTENANCE OF SOCIETY

Finney	Social process is a result of the learning process. Social entities are mental entities; mental entities are learned entities; therefore social entities are learned entities.
Payne	Education is the process going on in the individual wherein deviations in his behavior are produced. It eventually ends in an effective personality for the individual and socialization for the group. Education is the most effective social system in which the situations are controlled for purposes of producing learning and socialization.
Peters	Man benefits by experiences and draws upon the experience of his ancestors and contemporaries for guidance. These experiences increase from generation to generation, so that each succeeding one is able to rise higher.
Smith	A socially educated person must have extensive interests and associations and a sane outlook upon life. A fully socialized education would ensure that whatever personal ability and character one owned would be readily and intelligently used in social, civic, and cultural affairs.
Snedden	Almost all individuals are learning all the time. The interest for learning is most noticeable in children. However, even old people are steadily accumulating new knowledge, and new feelings and attitudes.

TABLE XII

THE MOST EFFECTIVE SOCIAL SYSTEM CONCERNING
LEARNING AND SOCIALIZATION

Finney	The learning process is the reproductive function of society; it transmits social heritage from one generation to the next. An individual in isolation could learn nothing of human living. Social cooperation is the aim and purpose of the learning process.
Payne	Education must transfer static practices into line with knowledge and technical progress. Educators have been concerned with the measurement of intelligence, achievement testing, the project method, and progressive education. They have not been interested in the social function of education, namely, bringing group and individual behavior into line with scientific progress.
Peters	Education goes on wherever one is having experiences that will allow him to handle better any predicament in the future. All education must be by experience. Any schooling that does not consist of giving vital experiences to the student is really not educative.
Smith	Socialization must follow a plan of slow development as social knowledge increases and as teachers can be educated to comprehend its importance.
Snedden	Some of the major accomplishments of American high school education include the position of the American people towards furnishing free high school facilities for everyone. In America, free public education is open to all.

A Definition of Socialization

Accumulation of beliefs. According to Finney, socialization, even within the context of a formal educational system such as the school, involves more than the learning of skills and the acquisition of information about how the society works or how it should work. Learning that results from more or less formal pedagogical procedures constitutes only a part of the preparation of the child for behaving in accordance with the roles of a participating adult member of the society. The most important part of the socialization process involves the "unconscious assimilation and internalization of beliefs, values, and patterns of behavior of significant others with whom the individual comes in contact."¹ The preschool child soon begins to emulate aspects of the behavior of his parents, his brothers and sisters, and certain of his peers. As new figures (his teacher, his classmates) are added to the circle of "significant others" surrounding the child, the resulting influences on his behavior become increasingly diverse and complex. "The possibility of conflict in the emulated behaviors is also increased, and the child must face the task of ranking the people with whom he deals, consciously or

¹Ross L. Finney, "Education as a Factor in Social Progress," Educational Research, Vol. 58 (June, 1919), pp. 39-58.

unconsciously, in terms of the influence he will permit them to have on his behavior."¹

Finney believes that since most children spend a considerable part of their early years in school, it is not surprising that those whom the child encounters in school can have an important influence on his behavior. It is only through widening his circle of "significant others" that the individual has an opportunity to prepare himself adequately for the diverse roles which the adult in our society must assume. "To function adequately as an adult, the child must learn not only the roles of father or mother but also those of student, teacher, group leader, and, eventually, wife or husband."¹ Although it is obvious that children do not learn a great deal about some of these roles until they have reached the status of adult, many of the decisions that a child makes require him to know something about what is expected of individuals occupying various positions in the adult society. In addition, the child begins to acquire more generalized capacities for assuming adult roles at an early age. The school plays a major role, for example, in helping

¹Ibid., pp. 45-46.

²Ibid., pp. 48-49.

children learn to control their emotions and to assume positions of authority.¹

Therefore, in Finney's opinion, even if it were considered desirable to keep children from learning about adult roles, such a course would be impossible without isolating young people from all contact with the adult world. With the rapid development of the mass media, children are exposed to this world earlier than ever before. The influence of the mass media is clearly a fact of modern life that must be considered in any discussion of the processes of socialization and cultural transmission.²

Not an isolated process. For Payne, a child is born a "complete egoist." Whatever capacities he may possess are not organized to a point where he is able to participate in society in any sense. Society rests upon him in terms of protection and care, but he is quite oblivious to society as such. Even those who most immediately provide for his needs are not thought of in terms of persons. His behavior is altogether "self-centered."³

¹Ibid.

²Ibid., pp. 54-56.

³Payne, Readings in Educational Sociology, Vol. I, pp. 145-146.

Payne asserts, "he does not think in terms of others, because he cannot."¹ The child is consistent enough in his behavior, "but his consistency lies in his complete egoism."² Neither the adjustments which society demands nor the "values which inhere in social conformity is as yet possible to the child."³ Before he can become a member of society he must acquire certain skills and accept certain social values in a reasonably consistent system, with a fair degree of freedom from emotional conflict.⁴

Payne says:

The nervous system possesses the subtle property by virtue of which some adjustments yield satisfaction, while others yield annoyance. Closely related to this capacity for affective consciousness is the tendency of affective states to condition future behavior. In the course of a child's experience the varied influences of environment are constantly stimulating these capacities.⁵

Emphasizing this point, Payne says that a rich interplay of forces produces personality, not an isolated subjective process. This process by which the individual develops toward

¹E. George Payne, "Education, the War and After," The Journal of Educational Sociology, Vol. 15, No. 1 (September, 1941), p. 83.

²Ibid., p. 84.

³Ibid.

⁴Ibid., pp. 86-87.

⁵Payne, Readings in Educational Sociology, Vol. II, p. 34.

his maximum capacity is not one which goes on within the mind of the individual independent of outside influences. Psychology alone cannot describe the learning that "eventuates in a person."¹ However complete may be the kingdom of the mind, it is not a kingdom which can be isolated from the world of other minds. The picture which psychology draws of inner processes must always be supplemented by further pictures of the social forces which stimulate those processes and of the social outcomes which flow from them. Payne cautions that it must never be forgotten that the major forces which stimulate the learning process are social, and that all the outcomes which are significant are likewise social. The more highly socialized, the more complete the personality. The integration of personality is one and the same process with the socializing of the individual.²

Solidarity of spirit. Peters believes that no normal human being can live strictly by himself. Apart from social relations he could not develop his intellectual powers above the level of "feeble-mindedness." "In even a reasonably difficult situation he could not glean his living from nature nor successfully combat his enemies."³ Deprived of association

¹Ibid., pp. 34-35.

²Ibid., p. 36.

³Peters, Foundations of Educational Sociology, pp. 225-226.

with his fellows in adulthood he relapses to idiocy or terminates his misery by suicide. Peters explains his position in

Foundations of Educational Sociology:

Man's nature is inescapably social. Conditions draw him as irresistibly into group life as the leaf drifting on the river is drawn in the vortex. These social propensities are, of course, not accidental but are grounded in instincts that were necessitated by the conditions of survival in the struggle for existence. Blessed with fewer natural facilities for escape and for combat than most of his competitors, man was obliged to seek strength through co-operation with his fellows and out of this need arose, as a basis for effective group life, the instinctive tendencies to sympathy, gregariousness, altruism, co-operation, and loyalty, in much stronger form than among any of the lower animals.¹

The operation of the instinctive tendencies, according to Peters, called into play by certain types of situations, welds mankind into a compact unit. The process by which individuals are thus fused into "solidarity of spirit" is called socialization.²

Highest cultural attainment. Smith implies that socialization of the curriculum is the adaptation of the program of studies in both content and method to the nature of the child as he is, and to his needs in the society in which he is to live. The more effectively the school can

¹Ibid., p. 226.

²Ibid.

train the student for adapting to society, the greater will be the part of his school life in determining the nature of his total life. Stated conversely, Smith says:

The more remote the school life from ordinary life the less chance it has to influence that life; and the greater the gap between the types of knowledge gained and the methods and discipline used in the schoolroom and in general society, the less will be the influences of the school on future lives of pupils.¹

This conclusion is implied by the fundamental laws of psychology, and is fully recognized in the newer definitions of education.

In all fairness, Smith concedes, the term socialization must not be confused with "practicalization" and "vocationalization."² It might be possible to read into the two terms all that is meant by socialization, but in ordinary use they are not so inclusive. Socialization does not merely refuse to exclude the cultural idea; rather it lays much emphasis upon it. It insists that culture must be a fundamental aim of education. An educational system is not socialized unless the program produces the highest cultural attainment. Generally, the vocational, the industrial, and the practical programs have contented themselves with the immediate end of producing economic efficiency. However, the socialized program is much

¹Smith, An Introduction to Educational Sociology, p. 265.

²Ibid., p. 266.

broader. It must be practical and to a certain extent vocational, but only because culture has a material base.¹

Orientation to values and beliefs. Snedden regards socialization as transmitting to the individual the basic knowledge of a society which allows him to employ his skills intelligently in correct situations. The primitive child learns of the gods and spirits which rule his world and how to control them through appropriate rituals. The twentieth century Western child attends school and studies courses in the basic sciences and humanities. The child of the aristocrat is taught family geneology and studies in private schools. Through the accumulation of appropriate skills and knowledge, the individual becomes a potentially productive member of his particular social system.²

Socialization, as Snedden defines it, is the process whereby society orients the individual towards those values and beliefs which it deems ultimately important.³ All we learn in school is not a matter of simple basic skills and knowledge. Many high schools require courses in state, local, and national government of all students. In a democracy we traditionally look upon the school as one of the most important

¹Ibid., pp. 266-267.

²Snedden, Educational Sociology, p. 303.

³Ibid., pp. 303-304.

socializing agents for transmitting the values of freedom, equality, and fraternity. Through socialization, individuals personalize the skills, knowledge, and values of their society into their own self-conceptions.¹

The Distinctions between Socialization,
Learning, and Education

Problem-solving techniques. To Finney, a frequently overlooked aspect of the socialization process that has great relevance to any discussion of the functions of the school in modern society concerns the nature of the intellectual process itself. Socialization involves learning how to solve problems of all types. The acquisition of problem-solving techniques is an integral part of the educational process, although this is not always made explicit, partly because of the current state of the understanding of the intellectual processes. It is not completely clear, for example, which of the various ways of going about solving different kinds of problems is of greatest overall usefulness. Many scholars have advocated an essentially inductive approach to certain kinds of problems, whereas others have maintained that the deductive approach is of greatest usefulness. Learning theorists have not yet

¹Snedden, Sociological Determinants of Objectives in Education, p. 17.

fully explored the relative roles of reward and punishment in the learning process.¹ Although during recent years most educators have held firmly to the assumption that optimum learning takes place under conditions of rewards, it is not entirely clear that this is the case in all learning situations. Even assuming that some kind of positive reinforcement is most pertinent to learning, it might turn out that rewards intrinsic to the learning situation itself are all that are needed in certain kinds of learning. The intrusion of potentially conflicting external rewards from a teacher or parent may serve only to impede the process.²

Finney insists that although new insights into learning and thinking processes are forthcoming all the time, relatively little attention has been given to the problem of how these discoveries relate to what is going on in the school and, more importantly, to what should go on in the school.³ If one of the most important functions of the school is to teach students how to learn and to solve problems, then it would be reasonable to ask whether the techniques students are learning will be of greatest usefulness to them as they assume

¹Finney, Causes and Cures for Social Unrest, pp. 83-85.

²Ibid., p. 86.

³Finney, "Sociological Principles Fundamental to Pedagogical Method," p. 94.

responsibilities as adult members of the society. Obviously it is important for those individuals who make decisions affecting the society to be able to adapt effectively to the continually changing demands upon them and to learn how to handle their responsibilities in the most effective way. The responsibility of the school in preparing society's members for such positions involves more than the development of technical knowledge along with some tradition. Of even greater importance is the school's responsibility for teaching the child how to use whatever skills and knowledge he may possess.¹ The educator's responsibility, as Finney seems to advocate, does not permit him to ignore the question of how children are being taught to solve problems and absorb new knowledge. The technique for approaching new information that is acquired by the child in the course of his experiences in school may turn out to be the most important part of the educational process.²

Process of cultivation. In Payne's analysis, society depends for its life and progress upon processes of education, whether in or out of school, which transform the motives of its members. "The feelings are dynamic; and the outcome of feelings in conduct as well as quality of satisfaction in

¹Ibid., p. 95.

²Ibid., pp. 101-102.

consciousness depends upon the educational influences which are brought to bear upon the growing child."¹ Socializing a child is essentially a process of cultivating in him tastes and interests that motivate activities which satisfy himself and enrich society. Until a program of education is devised and put into operation by means of which tastes, attitudes, and ideals are controlled in the interests of social welfare, "society will continue to face the danger of catastrophe."

Emphasizing this point, Payne says:

The educator with which catastrophe is racing depends for its victory not primarily upon its extension but upon its inherent quality. That quality cannot be sufficiently improved by refinements in technique of drill and instruction. It can be secured only by such changes in content and method as will build motives for socially wholesome behavior.²

According to Payne, it would be quite false to imply that society must abandon a program of intellectual culture and shift completely to one of affective emphasis. Knowledge does have a place in education, but its place is not so dominant as present practice and even present theory imply.

Payne believes that knowledge is directive:

A knowledge of the laws of health will enable the owner of a factory to protect the workmen, but it will do no more. It will not create in him a sense of concern for the welfare of his employees.

¹Payne, "A Socio-Scientific Approach to Education," p. 5.

²Ibid., p. 6.

That calls for a training of attitude, and no amount of knowledge can cancel the necessity for the motive.¹

Study of modern social problems, economic, political, moral, and religious, offers no guarantee that the knowledge will ever be put into practice. Social intelligence functions only in so far as social interests have been cultivated.

Function in the future. Peters implies that the individual gets experiences and preserves the results of such experiences so as to act differently in the future. His educative experiences consist in his having to take certain viewpoints, which have been rendered more likely to recur and to function in the future. In the first of Peters' phases of education, however:

. . . the experiences yield . . . sentiments, biases, attitudes . . . which effectively consolidate one with his group; while, in the second place, they yield more . . . skills, foresights, methods of procedure, which forewarn one as to how to act when emergencies, analagous to the educative ones, recur in the future.²

Subject to tests. Smith's basic point is that there is no magic in the term socialization. It merely expresses the aim of an education as broad as life. This education must be specific as well as broad. It must be subject to testing. The tests applied must be both quantitative and qualitative,

¹Ibid., p. 7.

²Peters, Foundations of Educational Sociology, p. 35.

both individual and social.¹ One of the difficulties of the specific tests now being worked out in arithmetic, spelling, and penmanship is that they are largely quantitative. Their attempt is to determine how many elementary processes a child can go through within a certain period of time. They test mechanical processes rather than "soul" processes. As technical tests they are valuable. It is abundantly worthwhile to gain facility in the use of tools of learning, and to be able to know when we have gained it. Smith says:

If this facility is not made too much of an end, if it does not lead to returning over-emphasis on drill, the means of knowing when a predetermined standard of skill is attained in fundamentals will eliminate much waste and will greatly increase efficiency in our elementary education.²

Smith believes that these formal tests are not yet socialized. An application of the handwriting scale does not test the willingness of the pupil to use handwriting in increasing his range of communication. Many good "penmen" are not good writers, and could not write an acceptable note for the local newspaper. Some people are adept in the mechanical use of figures, but fail to use the arithmetical sense or number judgment in their business and household affairs. A person may be able to read accurately and understandably, and still

¹Smith, "Sociological Aspects of Our Educational Aims," p. 87.

²Ibid., p. 90.

fail to use this ability in acquiring information or inspiration from the printed page. What is needed to supplement these mechanical tests is a series of social tests that will determine the use to be made of the skills acquired, and that will measure the values of the knowledge and training materials within the curriculum.¹

In all fairness, Smith concedes, "Direct tests of the use to be made in after life of the skills acquired in school are impossible, but indirect social tests of great value are being worked out through social surveys."² For example, in spelling, local and occupational vocabularies are being collected, and special attention is being paid to drill on the words most often misspelled. In grammar, the errors most often committed in the community are specified; special attention is given to the principles underlying them and the steps necessary to be taken in eliminating them. Similar social tests are being applied to arithmetic by making a study of the problems and the types of figuring done in the homes of the pupils and in the business of the community, and by collecting actual problems as a basis for the arithmetic taught in schools. Smith admits, "The same principle is being applied in civics,

¹Smith, An Introduction to Educational Sociology, p. 267.

²Ibid., p. 268.

geography, hygiene, literature, science, and domestic economy. The criterion of social use is the nearest approach we have to a test of social value."¹

External stimulus. According to Snedden, the learning, socialization, and educational processes of individuals are usually very tangible things. Every individual learns some things and does not learn others. During certain portions of his life and under certain conditions it can easily be noted that the individual learns some things with great rapidity, while under other conditions he learns such things slowly.²

In What's Wrong with American Education, Snedden says:

Some kinds and some degrees of learning, socialization, and education are obviously spontaneous, natural, and easy, perhaps by virtue of existing plasticities or "urges," or instinctive predispositions. Other kinds or degrees of learning, socialization, and educations are hard, tedious, and repellent, perhaps because of low native acquisitive powers or of social motivation.³

For Snedden, learning, socialization, and education are obviously due to interactions between the nature of the individual and external stimulations. It is obvious to all that no learning, socialization, and education can take place unless there are definite amounts of "receptivity or plasticity" in

¹Ibid.

²Snedden, What's Wrong with American Education, p. 42.

³Ibid., p. 43.

the learning organism.¹ On the other hand, no learning, socialization, or education can take place in the absence of external stimulus, example, control, or communication.²

As Snedden implies, it may be difficult to draw sharp boundaries between growth and learning. Certain kinds of physical growth seem to take place in the almost complete absence of external stimulations, "provided natural conditions are right."³ On the other hand, most of the forms of change expressed as "growth of knowledge, ideals, specific skills of body, and the like," seem to take place only in response to external stimulation. It is appropriate, in view of the history of our language, to talk about these as "growths" in knowledge, in experience, in ideals, or in habits, just as certainly as one talks about growth in size of body, or in differentiations of functions of body, or in strength of body. Obviously, then, it is fairly useless to spend much time in endeavoring to make fine discriminations between the changes popularly understood in connection with the word "growth" and those others associated with "learning, socialization, and education."⁴

¹Snedden, "New Aims of Education," Teachers College Record, Vol. 29 (February, 1928), pp. 398-399.

²Ibid., p. 400.

³Ibid., p. 401.

⁴Ibid., p. 403.

The Necessity of Socialization and Education for
the Development and Maintenance of Our Society

Learning Process. For Finney, "The social process is a product of the learning process. Social entities are mental entities; mental entities are learned entities; therefore social entities are learned entities."¹

According to Finney's analysis:

The minor premise of this syllogism is simply the well known principle of modern psychology that there are no such things as innate ideas; and, in human behavior, very few inherited reflexes. From which it follows that the social₂ process is a product of the learning process.²

Finney argues that "this principle only requires to be stained with a tincture of voluntary attention to make it clearly visible to the naked eye."³ It is merely one of those perfectly obvious facts which have been neglected in theory because they are normally so unassuming in attention. Therefore, Finney says, consider the learning achievements of a child by the end of the second year. He has learned the elementary decencies; however, he has not learned the "folkways" of behavior in public gatherings. Barely has he learned how to transfer food from his plate to his mouth. If his body

¹Finney, A Sociological Philosophy of Education, p. 55.

²Ibid., p. 56.

³Ibid.

were to grow to adult size, without any further growth of his "mental stock-in-trade," he could not participate in the social process at all. If the learning process were to stop at the age of six his participation would remain strictly limited to the simpler social processes.¹

Emphasizing this point, Finney says:

If at the age of two or three he were captured and reared by a tribe of . . . Indians,--as in the story in the old McGuffey's Reader--he would by the age of twenty have learned neither the knowledge, the habits, nor the wants of civilized society.²

As a result of the learning process he would have adopted the tribe that had adopted him, having learned to participate in their institutions only. And Americans see exactly the same principle illustrated daily in the behavior of their immigrants who have not been as yet assimilated. They do not participate easily in American institutions because they have not learned them.³ In Finney's opinion, "we have the same experience ourselves when we visit another than our own of the three churches, Protestant, Catholic, or Jewish; or when . . . if country bred, we have our first experiences in a great city." Everything has to be learned.⁴

¹Ibid., pp. 56-57.

²Ibid., p. 57.

³Ibid.

⁴Ibid., pp. 57-58.

Situations are manipulated. Payne argues that education is the process going on in the individual where changes in his behavior are produced. Therefore education eventually results in an effective personality for the individual and socialization for the group. Education is the most effective social system in which the situations are manipulated for purposes of producing learning and socialization.¹

As Payne sees it, formal education has been concerned primarily with the transition of traditional learning that has become formalized in a conventional school curriculum. The school has been little concerned with those traditional values that have proved significant in history. Undoubtedly the school has neglected this aspect of education, because in the past the family and the community cared for the incorporation of these essential elements of behavior in the younger generation. The disintegration of the family and community in the twentieth century left them impotent and incapable of performing the historical educational tasks; these requirements fell upon the school. The educational sociologist is, therefore, interested in seeing that the school really performs adequately this new function of education, a function which it has almost wholly neglected in theory and practice.²

¹Payne, "The Social Meaning of Education," p. 10.

²Ibid., pp. 11, 50.

Draw upon experiences. Peters believes that man is able to profit by his own first-hand experience but he also has the unique power of drawing upon the experience of his ancestors and his contemporaries. This is made possible by his faculty of speech. His ancestors "bottled up their experiences and put them in cold storage encased in oral and written language."¹ His contemporaries do likewise. Upon the storehouse of experience he can draw for guidance much as he would draw upon that preserved in his own memory. This store of experiences grows larger from generation to generation, so that each succeeding one enters upon life with more nearly perfect guidance at its command than any preceding one has had, and therefore is able to rise higher. For man, education consists not only in gaining first-hand experience for himself but also in appropriating this rich social heritage as a means of making more effective his own conduct.²

Peters asserts that condensing experience by crystallizing it into language is an advantageous means of education:

When one describes his journey he does not put into the description every incident. . . . He leaves out all of the non-essential features, and preserves for the guidance of his followers only the quintessence. But he does put in the fruitful turns and warns against the false ones. In consequence of the

¹Peters, Foundations of Educational Sociology, p. 37.

²Ibid., pp. 37-38.

omission of all the accidents and the preservation of only the essentials, his follower can retrace the pilot's experience, and profit by his successes and errors, in but a fraction of the time required by the guide. . . . Were it not possible to condense when reducing to language, there would be required as much time for retracing as for originally passing through the experience.¹

However, as Peters advocates, there are also great dangers involved in education through these condensed experiences.

Material thus learned functions educatively only on condition that the learner be actually initiated by the words "into the experiences" that they preserve. The learner must reconstruct,

think through, live again, these experiences. If the learner does not do so, but merely memorizes the words, the material is not educative in the intended way. Yet it is a matter of common knowledge that much schooling is conducted on almost a purely verbal level, the pupils not being thrown into an active, thinking, re-creative attitude at all.²

A second major danger, according to Peters, is that children may be required to study material that is not a forecast of their future problems. The educator's interest may be, not in training people for efficiency in their actual adjustments, but in communicating to them certain subject matter for

¹Ibid., p. 38.

²Charles C. Peters, "How to Translate a List of Detailed Objectives into a Practical Program of Civic Education," The Journal of Educational Sociology, Vol. I, No. 1 (September, 1927), pp. 49-51.

its own sake. The learning of books is so easily made an end in itself that vast numbers of teachers yield to temptation. This danger of making the subject matter, rather than the pupil, the center of interest is not an imaginary one, but a very real one.¹

Personal ability would be used. The essential idea of socialization, Smith says, is that our educational system shall be adapted to the production of socialized members of society who are not merely trained to personal efficiency but who are trained into active membership in the various social groups necessary for social progress. A socially educated person must have "wide interests and associations, catholic tastes and a sane outlook upon life."² He must touch society at many points and this contact should be vital and constructive. A fully socialized education would guarantee that whatever personal ability and character one possessed would be actively and intelligently used in social, civic, and cultural affairs. Such a task would certainly be a commendable one, but if the process of socialization were complete it would be no more impossible to properly direct personal ability than it now is to produce it.

¹Ibid., pp. 51-52.

²Smith, "Fundamentals of a Socialized Educational Program," p. 36.

In a broad sense, Smith concedes that personal ability and character are not inseparable from social participation and effectiveness is evident:

We have plenty of citizens who are self-supporting and yet are nonentities . . . We have money makers who are uncultured bores. We have artists and professional experts who are social burdens . . . We have skilled workmen who are anti-social agitators and educated fanatics whose every impulse is for the destruction of the social order. . . . Neither personal ability nor personal morals necessarily eventuate in social services and the only way to make them do so is to educate as definitely for the one as for the other.¹

Learning all the time. According to Snedden's analysis, the total growth of children into competent adulthood can be analyzed into two categories:

- (a) "Natural growth" of body and inherited qualities, a growth not greatly different in kind from that of a tree, a horse, or an eagle; and
- (b) "social growth" through taking in (imitating, trying, memorizing, using, and all other phases of learning) the social inheritance of knowledge, speech, customs, lore, attitudes, skills, arts, games, roads, rooms, and the rest which their elders--parents, older playmates, teachers in personal contacts, and writers, picture makers, tool makers, road builders in impersonal contacts--have already provided or assimilated.²

Snedden believes that almost all human beings are learning all the time, though it may seem to be frequently the case that in childhood and youth the interest for learning is most

¹Ibid., pp. 36-37.

²Snedden, What's Wrong with American Education, p. 365.

prominent. However, even old people are constantly acquiring new knowledge, and sometimes new feeling states or attitudes, "through reading newspapers, gossiping, travel, and other expenses."¹

Snedden admits that many animals also learn from experience. They learn what to avoid, where food and shelter can be found, and how to adjust themselves to each other. Perhaps ants and bees are so completely equipped with instincts that they do not have to learn much. However, "it is clear that deer, rabbits, and quail are ready learners from experience, while horses, elephants, and dogs are such good learners that we say they can be trained or educated."²

Snedden further maintains that education is also an activity in which all human beings and at least some animals engage from time to time. Older brothers and sisters are constantly educating their younger relatives. Older or stronger youngsters often take pleasure in teaching younger, weaker, or less capable youngsters a great variety of things. Most people like to give counsel, tell stories, or convey news, all of which are forms of education.³

¹Ibid., pp. 365-366.

²Snedden, School Educations, p. 144.

³Ibid.

According to Snedden, the following is illustrative of this situation:

When parents or teachers systematically set to work to hurry up, regularize, specialize, or otherwise modify natural growth or the assimilation of portions of the social inheritance--as erect posture, correct syntax, the multiplication table, a moral code,, or the art of using a tool--we have "education."¹

Snedden argues that sometimes educators, "as ambitious parents, thoughtless teachers, work-prepossessed employers or masters to apprentices, army captains, or religious teachers," try to force the acquisition of social inheritance too soon, in too large quantities, in too unreal form. This education often becomes injurious to natural growth processes. Very probably ancient warriors often forced their sons too soon into learning the arts of war. Ancient farmers sometimes forced their sons to learn hard work too soon. Leaders in ancient times had literary selections too "high brow" for youthful appreciative learning.²

A meaningful perspective of Snedden's thought is provided in the following:

A more modern pedagogy--its John the Baptists having been Comenius, Froebel, Pestalozzi, and Parker among others--tries to do two or three things:

¹David S. Snedden, Educational Applications of Sociology (New York: Century, 1924), p. 79.

²Ibid., pp. 79-80.

(a) To give the "natural growth" processes fullest practicable chance; (b) to let the more natural learning processes--play, satisfaction of curiosities, "intrinsic learning," "developmental learning"--have fullest chance at all stages; and (c) to adapt highly "artificial learning"--hand-writing, a trade, ancient history, mathematics, exacting processes--as far as practicable to the maturity stages, and the innate capacities, of the learners.¹

The Most Effective Social System Concerning Socialization and Learning

Social participation. Finney's thesis is that the learning process is the reproductive function of society. Only by learning is the social heritage transmitted from one generation to the next. "herein lies the continuity of institutions; by this means the intellectual capital accumulates from age to age. The school is the germ plasm of the higher civilization."² Teachers are, therefore, in charge of social selection at the source of origins for each new generation.³

Finney suggests that the ultimate purpose of all this learning is to afford each new quota of candidates an opportunity to enter into real humanity through participation in the social process. An individual in isolation could learn

¹Snedden, What's Wrong with American Education, p. 368.

²Finney, A Sociological Philosophy of Education, p. 56.

³Ibid., pp. 56-57.

nothing of human living. Self realization is achieved only through taking part in the institutions of society, and in utilizing the mental resources of the race. Social participation is, therefore, the aim and purpose of the learning process.¹

Static practices. Payne describes education as involving new needs determined by our changing civilization, and growing out of the problems created by technical development on the one hand and by growth of scientific knowledge on the other.²

The following illustration provides insight into Payne's thought:

The appearance of the automobile is a typical example of the development which has created serious problems. . . . With the appearance of this machine as a necessity of modern civilization came numerous hazards, resulting from failure to make adjustments in behavior in line with the requirements of this machine. Therefore, the automobile has become one of the greatest modern menaces to life and welfare. It accounts for an annual total of deaths of 36,000 with a million serious accidents. The first deaths from the automobile occurred in 1907, therefore this serious situation has wholly developed within a period of thirty years.³

Many similar technical developments have become the necessities of modern life and have likewise brought with them similar

¹Ibid., p. 57.

²Payne, "Determining the Results of Education," The Journal of Educational Sociology, Vol. I, No. 8 (April, 1928), p. 468.

³Payne, "The Social Meaning of Education," p. 10.

social consequences, simply because we have failed to make adjustments required by the new creations essential to present day life. The only means of making adjustments is through the school, the institution responsible for education, but the school has been concerned with a conventional curriculum and not with education in the social sense.¹

Payne concludes that the growth of scientific knowledge has likewise created lags in our behavior, thus bringing our conduct out of adjustment with the necessities of present day life. "The increase in knowledge of nutrition is an example. This increased knowledge of food essentials and the technical development which has resulted in new food preparation and new food supplies have definitely affected the health situation."² Education must bring our relatively static practices into line with our knowledge and technical advances. This function of education has not been seriously considered by contemporary educators. They have been excited about the measurements of intelligence, about achievement in testing, the project method, and progressive education. However, contemporary educators have not been concerned with the social

¹Ibid.

²Ibid., p. 11.

function of education, namely, bringing group and individual behavior into line with our technical and scientific advance.¹

Vital educative experiences. In Peters' analysis, education consists of acquiring experience in terms of which one can more effectively meet his problems; it is plain that education is not confined to the school. Education goes on whenever one is having experiences that will enable him to handle better any situation in the future. This education is as broad as life, and the old distinction between learning by experience and learning in school is a false one. All education must be by experience. Any schooling that does not consist of giving vital experiences to the student is really not educative.²

However, Peters argues that school differs from out-of-school life in its systematic character. Experiences do not come to the pupil in school as haphazardly as they do out of school. In school, pupils' experiences are selected, graded, and organized. The teacher so manipulates the environment of the pupil as to expose him to the experiences which are most useful in preparing him for future life. In the ideal school these experiences will prepare the pupil for any important problem. There will be no gaps left, as there are when one

¹Ibid., p. 50.

²Peters, Foundations of Educational Sociology, p. 40.

prepares for life through unselected out-of-school experiences. Each experience, too, will be repeated often enough, and only often enough, to bring the desired adjustment to the required degree of perfection. Again, there will be no such "blind duplication" as the repetitions involved in out-of-school life.¹

The school, in Peters' analysis, is society's agency for systematically guiding the youth through those selected experiences that are regarded as essential preparation for future life. It is, in the social economy, essentially a time and labor saving device. It is a scheme for concentrating life, for bringing the youth as rapidly as possible into those modes of adjustment that have been found fruitful. Its function is to shorten the period of trial and error, and thus carry the youth in a few years through the disciplinary experiences which otherwise would take him half a lifetime to meet:

(The teacher) assists the pupil to find more expeditiously the best books and the best way of using them, to pick out the most important data and the most effective methods of organizing these, and to arrive more quickly at the correct method of pronouncing and phrasing words, of writing letters, and of translating sentences.²

Teacher training institutions. Smith cautions that socialized education must not be confused with industrial, vocational or even practical education. Any system of

¹Ibid., pp. 40-41.

²Ibid.

education to be socialized must look beyond industry and vocation and must transcend the merely practical ideals of the materialist. It must supplement industrial and vocational efficiency with other types of social efficiency. It must aid the individual to increase his income but it must also aid him in using his income to elevate his level of living. It is just as essential to learn how to spend as to learn how to earn.¹ "The variety of American resources and the richness of American opportunity have led to the production of enormous wealth, but it has left us extravagant, wasteful and thoughtless in the use of our money."² Under a socialized vocational education we must have equal emphasis upon the consumption and production phases of economics. This requires an adequate appreciation of culture as a practical end of life. Esthetic tastes, refined manners, and moral idealism are necessary to wholesome living. Likewise these qualities must be extended to society in the form of "cultural appreciation, social activity and civic helpfulness."³

Smith proposes that an adequate program of socialization must be comprehensive and will lead to several specific changes

¹Smith, "The Fundamentals of a Socialized Education Program," p. 35.

²Ibid., pp. 35-36.

³Ibid., p. 36.

in our educational regimen. It will call for greater emphasis upon social analysis as a basis for fixing educational aims. As compared with the study of social organization and its requirements, the study of the individual child and his growth and needs has received much more attention than a fully socialized education would warrant. This social analysis must be specific as well as general and local as well as national.¹

Therefore, Smith suggests, socialization must follow a plan of slow development as social knowledge increases and as teachers can be trained to understand its import and be given the materials which make it effective. Facts and principles must be organized, illustrative literature must be collected, and text books must be prepared. The first steps will be taken in teacher training institutions by instilling into prospective teachers the right social attitude toward education in general and toward the particular work they are expected to do. Following this will come the gradual development of a more cooperatively helpful attitude on the part of outside social agencies such as public libraries, cultural organizations, business firms, and government officials.²

Emphasizing this point, Smith asserts:

¹Ibid., pp. 36-37.

²Ibid., pp. 38-39.

Mutual understanding and aid between the school and the church, the school and business, the school and the local government, the parent teacher organizations, the use of the school and social surveys, and a wide variety of other progressive movements will aid in vitalizing school work and will stimulate the social functioning of school pupils. In many of our efforts to socialize we may expect to flounder and stumble and indulge in soft pedagogy; but, in spite of difficulties and failures, we shall in the end learn to make our work function definitely in social service.¹

Free public education. In Snedden's view some of the outstanding achievements of American high school education include certainly the very generous attitude of the American people towards providing free high school facilities for all classes of the population. Everywhere throughout America there are available public schools in which no tuition charge is made and in which text books and other supplies are provided to students without charge.²

Snedden believes that an achievement of scarcely less importance consists in the provision of housing facilities for these schools. In literally thousands of American communities public high schools are the most monumental and otherwise most outstanding buildings of the communities. A third achievement is due more to parents, employers, and other direct patrons of these schools. 'This consists in the willing disposition to

¹Ibid., p. 40.

²David S. Snedden, Foundations of Curricula: Sociological Analysis (New York: Teachers College, 1927), pp. 160-164.

provide for prolonged attendance upon high school and to give recognition to whatever seem to be superior elements in the students thus taking advantage of prolonged schooling."¹ The fact that in many communities "fifty per cent of all pupils of suitable ages at least enter high schools and attend one or more years without compulsion is itself an eloquent testimonial to parental and public interest in superior school education."²

Snedden adds that by some standards a fourth significant achievement of our public high schools "is the triumph therein of the principles of co-education." American communities began establishing coeducation before the middle of the nineteenth century and they have constantly maintained this principle in secondary schools in all but a few cities.³ Coeducation has gradually resulted in a freedom of fellowship that, as contrasted with European conditions, presents many advantages.⁴

Summary

Man's intellectual supremacy distinguishes him from other animals, as does his capacity to communicate and to transmit a culture. The capacity to employ the spoken word

¹Ibid., p. 164.

²Ibid., pp. 164-165.

³Ibid., pp. 166-167.

⁴Ibid., pp. 167-168.

allows man to transmit what he knows, liberating him from dependence upon sounds, signs, and gestures. Socialization may be thought of as an extensive series ranging from non-socialization through partial socialization to adequate socialization. The social isolates may be at one end of the extensive series and the sufficiently socialized individual at the other.

The preconditions for socialization are a biological organism capable of learning, a society or cultural environment to furnish the content and guidelines for socialization, and individuals who assist in the socialization process. There must be feedback in the development of mutual references and traits in the symbolic interaction process as it results between persons. Interaction may include hostility and alienation as well as acceptance, identification, accomodation, and toleration.

All social systems take part in the socialization process, but the school, church, and family are particularly important in socialization. Behavior models are important whatever their source. Learning is basic in socialization. The school emphasizes formal learning in its socialization, whereas in the family and in the church the process may be more informal.

The process of socialization changes greatly in particular social systems. Each system leaves its mark on behavior, attitudes, values, and motivations.

The aim of this chapter has been to describe what the sociological concept of education is in the work of these educational sociologists. Chapter V will compare what the effect of religion and the family has been on education.

CHAPTER V

THE EFFECT OF RELIGION AND THE FAMILY ON EDUCATION

Education is a comprehensive and many-sided thing. When we speak of getting an education we generally think of going to school. School is only a small factor in the total process of education. For centuries men survived without any schools at all; our founding fathers had, on the average, only a few months of schooling. Although there are some who speak of schools as total institutions, school occupies only a small part of one's time. The average person spends six of his most impressionable years before starting school. During this time he learns the vernacular, learns to get along with people, and learns to protect himself. In fact, there is probably no other six year period in which he learns an equal amount that is so fundamental to social and individual living.

There are educational forces of the most profound significance continually playing upon a person, whether out of school or in. Sometimes education is one direct aim of other social institutions, as in the case of the church and the family. However, more often these institutions yield education only

as a by-product, while their main function lies elsewhere. The purpose of this chapter is to indicate the function of these social institutions, to show their influence in education, and to present their relationship to the school.

The ideas of the selected educational sociologists regarding: the educational function of the church; religious education in public schools; the function of the family; and the importance of the family as a primary group are discussed in Tables XIII, XIV, XV, and XVI.

The Educational Function of the Church

Cooperative type of human nature. In Finney's view, what the world needs today, if it is to develop a human nature of the cooperative type, is a new religion that "abandons the primary appeal to self-preservation," and appeals instead to group-preserving instincts.¹ Religion must set up, as the main business of life, the enterprise of helping make this a better world to live in. Religion will emphasize the responsibilities of democracy more and its privileges less. A religion that sets up the social good as its prime objective will stimulate to action the "latent cooperativeness" now dormant in human nature, and so produce the "cooperative

¹Ross L. Finney, Causes and Cures for the Social Unrest (New York: Macmillan Co., 1922), p. 274.

TABLE XIII

THE EDUCATIONAL FUNCTION OF THE CHURCH

Finney	Functions to generate the cooperative type of human nature that is necessary to make the new cooperative social order work. Must educate the public to adopt the social point of view.
Payne	Should assume responsibility for religious instruction of the young in their particular memberships. Most churches conduct Sunday schools, as well as youth and adult study groups.
Peters	Should supplement the moral education of the school and the common religious attitudes the school can produce, by appeals to sanctions not available to this institution. Should serve as the "continuation school" for adults who no longer are able to gain the assistance of any other educational agency.
Smith	Should participate with the schools in a program of religious education. Should research religious education and experiments in which recommended curricula may be tried out.
Snedden	The functions of religions are of two kinds; by the individual it is a felt need. But when men think and act cooperatively, religion is also perceived to be a necessary means toward the realization of some of the larger aims of life.

TABLE XIV

RELIGIOUS EDUCATION IN THE PUBLIC SCHOOLS

Finney	The American Constitution provides for the separation of church and state; prohibits use of public funds for the maintenance of religious education. Public schools must depart entirely from the teaching of sectarian religious beliefs.
Payne	This author does not discuss religious education in the public schools.
Peters	Some schools have excused pupils during school hours for religious instruction by special teachers. However, the work was not subsidized by the public schools, attendance was voluntary, and the work was often done by private church agencies.
Smith	Neither the church nor the school is giving adequate religious education. They should cooperate; some of the spiritual aspirations and ethical idealism of the church may be introduced into the school, and the teaching efficiency of the school may be introduced into the churches.
Snedden	The "social education" processes of public schools may not include religious thinking, much less religious propaganda. They may include a critical study of the social values of all religions.

TABLE XV
THE FUNCTION OF THE FAMILY

Finney	A critical function is education. The family teaches manners, decency, respect, and obedience. It teaches all the virtues that the community and play groups teach.
Payne	Furnishes the first social group in which the child increases and arranges his social experiences. Most basic group in giving direction to personality and social adjustment.
Peters	Most fundamental of all social groups. Offers the most intimate and personal contacts. In the family one enters into all the relationships that characterize social life.
Smith	Primarily an economic and social institution rather than an educational institution. Family training is essential to emotional direction and control. Throughout life the family remains the center of the cultural interests.
Snedden	An important test of the family is its effectiveness as an institution for the rearing of children into adulthood, and the transmission to them of the best portions of the social inheritance. All other functions of the family group are secondary to these.

TABLE XVI
THE IMPORTANCE OF THE FAMILY
AS A PRIMARY GROUP

Finney	Chief purpose is care and training of the child. Family life is the best possible preparation for giving young children an infinite amount of very basic instruction.
Payne	Unity of family life is in member interaction. Does not depend for existence on the harmonious relations of its members, nor does it necessarily dissolve as a result of struggles between its members. The family lives as long as interaction takes place and dies only when it ceases.
Peters	Does not shape youth as powerfully in contrast with other social agencies as it once did. Still is an educational agency of immense significance. Influences the power of the individual and the advancement of society by selection of stock as well as contributing to direct education.
Smith	The most influential of the primary groups. Within the family the child gets his early impressions of life. These impressions are first general, and then differentiate into separate mental concepts.
Snedden	Is accountable for the early care and rearing of children. Influential in the formation of character and the development of personality. Strength and stability of society rests upon the strength and stability of its family institution.

society" it sets up as its goal. "Such a religion will be a new thing under the sun."¹

The function of the church in the present social crisis, according to Finney, is to generate the "cooperative type" of human nature that is necessary to make the new cooperative social order work. To do this it must formulate and expound a new, "socio-centric theology" that will stimulate the social instincts as few historic religions have ever succeeded in doing. It may be worthwhile to subdivide this function into certain subsidiary tasks that can be more concretely stated. "For the sake of rhetorical emphasis we may specify the duty of the church toward each of three classes, the public, the capitalists, and the laboring class."²

Finney cautions that the church must educate the public to adopt the social point of view:

Christians must be induced to inquire habitually: What is for the general good? instead of: What is for my private interest? So far as concerns one's attitude toward the social question the test of a Christian is whether or not he is willing to examine his prejudices critically, to admit the truth when it conflicts with his interests, and to advocate just reforms in face of personal loss.³

¹Ibid., p. 275.

²Ross L. Finney, "A Sociologist's View on Character Education," Religious Education, Vol. 25, No. 3 (March, 1930), p. 207.

³Finney, Causes and Cures for the Social Unrest, p. 282.

A second responsibility toward the public, Finney stresses, is to show the social significance of the traditional virtues. Social reasons must acquire an authority "quite as categorical and imperious as the old supernatural sanctions."¹

Finney therefore suggests that the social function of religion is too often too narrowly conceived:

Although it is the local church's function to provide amusement for the young people, and foster a wholesome sociability for the community, this is not what the church exists for primarily. Neither does the church exist primarily to rehabilitate decadent rural communities, nor to maintain employment bureaus and day nurseries in the cities; though it is sometimes desirable to her to render these services.²

The social function of the church is to formulate and motivate the ideals upon which the vitality of all institutions depends, and without which the lives of the people are futile. "The age that lacks vitalizing ideals is decadent." Democracy is certain to fail in such an atmosphere. "But no crisis is appalling to a society that is transfigured by a glorious vision."³

Instruction of the young. The primary function of the religious institution, in Payne's thought, is to satisfy a need for relationship with a supreme being. In almost every

¹Ibid.

²Ibid., pp. 285-286.

³Ibid., p. 286.

society, human beings have explained natural phenomena by a belief in the existence of a god or gods. The efforts of human beings to conform to the will of a supreme being and thereby attain a kind of immortality have led them to associate themselves with religious organizations called churches. A church, in this sense, is a body of people who believe in the same creed, code, and cult. Collectively the churches form the core of the religious institution in any society.¹

Religion, Payne believes, is an external, social expression of recognition of a supreme being as the source and support of life, growth, perfection, and happiness. Because religion is best expressed through association, it has also come to mean particular systems of belief, behavior, and worship; observing distinctive rituals of worship and practicing codes of moral behavior are some behavior patterns. Positive results of these patterns are the belief in human dignity and the stability which religion gives society.²

Payne further contends that churches fulfill an important function in the United States by assuming responsibility for religious instruction of youth in their respective memberships.

¹E. George Payne, "Editorial," The Journal of Educational Sociology, Vol. 2, No. 6 (February, 1929), pp. 331-332.

²E. George Payne, "Determining the Results of Education," The Journal of Educational Sociology, Vol. I, No. 8 (April, 1928), pp. 468-469.

Nearly all congregations conduct Sunday schools, as well as youth and adult study groups. In some localities the churches impart this instruction through released time programs set up by arrangement with state and local school agencies. Some churches have established independent school systems in which religious instruction and training are integrated into the general curriculum.¹

Supplement the school. For Peters, the first educational function of the church should be to supplement the moral education of the school and the general religious attitudes the school can develop, by appeals to sanctions not available to this institution. However, the appeal to the "other-worldly sanctions" once relied upon is less potent in controlling conduct now than previously, and may be still less potent in the future.²

In the second place, Peters explains that the church should implant suggestions, build up taboos, habits, and attitudes of mind in earlier life, "the plastic period of life," which will be favorable to religion.³

Third, Peters stresses that the church should serve as the "continuation school" for adults, who no longer have at

¹Ibid., pp. 470-472.

²Peters, Foundations of Educational Sociology, p. 199.

their service the assistance of any other educational agency of a systematic character. This "further education" is, in practice, now largely restricted to ethical and theological topics, but there is no reason why it might not be made more inclusive. At present there is no adequate means for helping adults meet the big social, political, and economic problems of the day. The church might even designate itself a continuation school for such a function and, in its church service, discuss these matters in lieu of other topics in such a way as to afford its members clear ideas regarding them.¹

The fourth function of the church, Peters states, should foster and focus the ethical opinions of the community upon every question that has an ethical significance, as well as organize practical activities in promotion of ethical aims.²

The last function of the church, according to Peters, should be to organize a wholesome social and recreational life for the community:

. . . most social institutions of complex purposive character had to be instituted by charity and proved effective before public agencies were willing to take them up, and recall the church's part in this kind of philanthropy. Universities, colleges, primary schools, kindergartens, vocation schools, school lunches, etc., were first supported by the church.³

¹Ibid., p. 200.

²Ibid., p. 201.

³Ibid.

Participation with schools. In Smith's thought, an analysis of present theological training will indicate that ministers are not adequately prepared for religious instruction of the young. Child psychology, sociology, or pedagogy is seldom attempted in the seminaries. Thus, radical measures should be avoided until religious education can be dealt with from the top.¹

The most obvious educational problem of the church, Smith says, is to inject vitality into Sunday school work. Much of the present teaching is confined to memorization of isolated Biblical texts. Before Sunday school can become a genuine agency of religious education, it must have a curriculum of organized Bible study, supplemented by a candid treatment of the religious aspects of current social problems.²

Churches of the past, maintains Smith, were so concerned with the theological interpretations that they overlooked the religious nature and needs of children. They failed to realize that, just as there is differentiation in other social institutions, religious services should be adapted to different age levels. This has been remedied somewhat in recent years by the organization of a variety of young people's religious

¹Smith, Principles of Educational Sociology, p. 226.

²Ibid.

organizations but much still remains to be done by way of increasing their effectiveness.¹

Smith admits that the church should cooperate with the schools in a vast program of religious education, beginning in theological seminaries.² Prospective ministers must be trained to look forward more than backward, and the research idea must dominate their class work. Successful professional training has elsewhere become mainly a laboratory affair, in which the student faces practical problems and searches for truth rather than a defense of traditional ideals and practices. Only by adopting such methods can the ministry be kept in touch with current issues.³ There can be little doubt that ministers will be given the opportunity to give religious instruction to pupils as soon as they can demonstrate their ability to do so effectively. Smith concludes that one of the greatest contributions the church can make is "liberally to subsidize researches into religious education and experiments in which proposed curricula may be tried out."⁴ Special departments and training schools for religious teachers should

¹Ibid., pp. 226-227.

²Smith, An Introduction to Educational Sociology, p. 130.

³Ibid., pp. 130-131.

⁴Ibid., p. 131.

then be established, and a comprehensive program of church and school cooperation in religious education be started.¹

Smith exemplifies this in the following statement:

. . . we shall have to "muddle through" without expert guidance, either ignoring the problem, as in the immediate past, or experimenting with tentative proposals which promise worthwhile but meager results. . . . Any rapid progress in religious education must await an aroused Church, conscious of the difficulties and complexities of the problem and willing to invest money and intelligence as well as feeling into its solution.²

Two kinds of functions. According to Snedden, the functions of religion, like those of knowledge, wealth, beauty, fellowship, and the rest, are clearly of two kinds:

By the individual it is a felt need. But when men think and act collectively, religion is also perceived to be a means, often a necessary means, toward the realization of some of the larger ends of life.³

Social psychology, Snedden argues, does not yet give adequate light on the problems of the priority of these values. It is probable that the very processes of natural evolution have conspired to make men feel personally many of the values that have final significance only as contributing to "the good of the whole."⁴

¹Ibid., pp. 132-133.

²Smith, Principles of Educational Sociology, p. 227.

³David S. Snedden, "Educational Sociology: Its Province and Possibilities," The American Journal of Sociology, Vol. 25, No. 2 (September, 1919), p. 131.

⁴Ibid., pp. 132-133.

Religious Education in the Public Schools

Separation of church and state. The American Constitution, Finney states, has provided for the separation of church and state and has forbidden the state to use any public funds for the support of religious bodies or sectarian religious education. In a country of multiple religious bodies, each desiring that its beliefs be taught, the public school can avoid giving offense only by refraining entirely from the teaching of sectarian religious doctrines.¹

In Finney's article "Religion and the Reconstruction," published in 1918, he wrote about a current well organized effort to get the public schools to cooperate in the teaching of religion. This was accompanied by an equally determined effort to prevent "sectarian invasions of the public schools."² The courts had held that any use of public funds or public school facilities for sectarian religious instruction was unconstitutional, but forms of cooperation involving no use of public funds or facilities were permissible. Under the "released time" plan, children were to be released during school hours to receive religious instruction away from the

¹Ross L. Finney, "Sociological Principles Determining the Elementary Curriculum," School and Society, Vol. 7 (March 23, 1918), p. 338.

²Ross L. Finney, "Religion and the Reconstruction," Bible World, Vol. 52 (November, 1918), p. 227.

school premises. Supporters were convinced that the benefits of such religious training would far outweigh any possible inconveniences or objections. Opposition came partly from those who doubt that such religious training would be as effective as claimed and partly from those who maintained that the school should not be expected to assemble classes for the church. Finney further maintained that opposition also came from school personnel who objected to the disruption of the school's schedule:

To release part of the children while retaining the rest creates a dilemma for the school. If, for those children who do not elect to take religious instruction, the school arranges an interesting activity, then it draws children away from the religious program; if the school does not plan an interesting activity for those remaining, a discipline problem develops.¹

Therefore, Finney conceded that in some communities this had become a bitter issue. "Dispute becomes intense; neighbors attack one another's character and impugn one another's motives."² In an earlier period, when the church functioned as a community center, no such problems arose. However, in recent decades the school had increasingly become a center of community life and had absorbed a growing share of the children's time. It was not surprising that some in the church moved to

¹Ibid., pp. 228-229.

²Ibid., p. 321.

reclaim a portion of the time which they felt the school had seized. At the time of Finney's writing, only a minority of communities had responded. Finney doubted whether the "released time" program would become general.¹

Released time. Peters stated that a number of cities had recently introduced week-day religious instruction. The schools excused the pupils during some regular school time, usually from one hour a week to one afternoon a week and during this time they were given religious instruction by special teachers. For this time they sometimes went to their respective churches, or to a single neighboring church. The special teachers sometimes came to the public schools and used the regular school classrooms. However, the work was financed from sources outside the public school funds, the attendance was voluntary, and the work was administered by private agencies, usually by an organization promoted through the churches.²

Inadequate religious instruction. A significant view is provided in Smith's book Principles of Educational Sociology:

. . . the tendency toward secularization has been extreme. The fear of sectarianism . . . has led to the complete exclusion of religious instruction from the public schools. . . . the Church is now floundering about in its efforts to discover a substitute . . . Since neither the church nor the school is giving

¹Ibid., pp. 231-232.

²Peters, Foundations of Educational Sociology, p. 202.

adequate religious education, one aspect of human nature which history, psychology, and sociology unite in proclaiming important, is neglected. Until a system of emotional training can be devised, . . . contemporary society will continue to seethe with emotional crises.¹

Emphasizing this point, Smith says that since social differentiation moves forward rather than backward, there can be no reunion of church and state, or of church and school. The only hope of developing such an education lies in cooperation between the church and the school; some of the spiritual aspiration and ethical idealism of the church may be injected into the school, and the teaching efficiency of the school may be introduced into the churches.²

Critical study of social values. Religious education, Snedden says, is always a means, not only of furthering each type of faith, but of making its social applications effective. "Formerly the state, because of its patronage of a state church or because of its supposed dependence upon religion as a means of fullest political service and control, fostered such education in a variety of ways."³

Snedden further asserts that modern political evolution has tended toward progressive separation of church and state:

¹Smith, Principles of Educational Sociology, pp. 222-223.

²Ibid., p. 223.

³Snedden, School Educations, p. 143.

Presently, the schools of the state cease altogether to participate in religious education, even where no rival sects dispute over ends and means so hotly as to necessitate strict neutrality on the part of the public schools. In most modern republics the state tends to leave to religious organization complete responsibility for religious education.¹

However, by Snedden's analysis, that certainly does not mean indifference to religious values on the part of organized society. A more fully developed program of social education in public schools than now exists will succeed, without "sectarianism," in promoting widespread respect in the rising generation for the social values of all religions.² The gradual acceptance of certain basic principles of social evolution will make it practicable for large numbers to understand that the religious life is something that must perpetually change as knowledge expands. The "social education" processes of public schools may not include religious teaching, much less religious propaganda. They may well include an objective study of the social values of all religions and the "promotion of respect for all as among the finest achievements of human effort."³

¹Ibid., pp. 139-140.

²Snedden, Educational Sociology, p. 138.

³Ibid., p. 140.

The Function of the Family

Education social virtues. Finney contends that an important function of the family is education. In less developed societies the family took care of industrial education and elementary schooling. It has been only within the past century that elementary schooling for the masses has been taken over by the state.¹ However, moral education is a more basic type than either industrial or elementary schooling. It can never be wholly taken over by the school, because such an important part of it occurs before school age. In the home the child is taught the fundamentals of decency, manners, and customs. The family teaches all the virtues that the community and play groups teach. It also trains the child in obedience and respect for "properly constituted authority."²

Another function of the family, according to Finney, is the happiness of its members. The instincts of human nature are such that the most substantial joys of life are those associated with "love and marriage, motherhood and family life." In Finney's view, these joys are ends in themselves; they are the ultimate values of life:

¹Ross L. Finney, General Social Science (New York: The Macmillan Co., 1926), pp. 107-109.

²Ibid., pp. 119-120.

(The) society is extremely unwise that sacrifices them to wealth-getting, fashionable display, social frivolity, carnal indulgence, or any other line. Nor may the marriage vows be lightly repudiated when some individual fancies he sees a forbidden short cut to personal happiness.¹

Happiness is a "cooperative enterprise." The happiness of all is bought by the hard duty of each. To desert one's family duties does serious damage to society. In Finney's program there is no "more effective opportunity for the ordinary person to do good in the world than just to perform the duties incident to his family life with joyous, affectionate efficiency."²

Social adjustment. Payne admits that all the experiences of the individual, from which he builds his social world, grow out of his situation-response relationship. The family provides the first social group in which the child acquires and organizes his social experiences. It is the most fundamental group in giving direction to personality and social adjustment. "The effectiveness of the family results from the intimacy, the sympathetic understanding, and the interdependence of the various members comprising the group."³ It is necessary, therefore, to know not only the general strength and weakness

¹ Ross L. Finney, The American Public School (New York: The Macmillan Co., 1921), p. 3.

² Ibid.

³ Payne, Readings in Educational Sociology, Vol. I, p. 214.

of the family, but also the particular family influences operating in the case of children who come into the school for "further tuition." The school begins its educative work with children who have already acquired many of their social patterns, who have developed definite personalities, and who have numerous habits, knowledges, and attitudes that will determine their whole future adjustment.¹ Without a specific picture of this background of influence, the educator cannot adequately adjust the school work to the child. In Payne's view, he cannot play an important role in the readjustment and further development of personality. He may fail in his educational endeavors in not taking account of the experiences in the pre-school life of the child. The importance of the pre-school period has been overlooked. "Not until recently have we come to realize that the future of the person may hinge upon it and taken this fact into practical account."²

Social relationships. Peters admits that in discussing the solidarity and the socializing power of groups, sociologists are accustomed to recognizing two categories: primary and secondary. The primary groups are those in which the members come into face-to-face contact with each other, as

¹Ibid., pp. 214-215.

²Ibid., p. 215.

they do in "the family, the classroom, the church, the lodge, and the community."¹ Secondary groups are those in which the members come into only indirect contact with each other, "through reports, hearsay, agreements effected at a distance, or some passing acquaintance." The socializing influence, as well as all other crowd phenomena, of the primary group is vastly greater than that of the secondary group; the former is correspondingly more important as an educational force than the latter.²

Peters' basic point is that of all the primary groups the family provides the most intimate and personal contacts:

It is . . . the most fundamental of all social groups. Historically, the horde or clan may have acquired solidarity before the family did, but certainly in modern life no other institution reacts so powerfully upon its members to mold them as does the family.³

Peters argues that in the family one enters into all the relationships that characterize social life:

There are here the rudiments of division of labor and economic co-operation; legislation; courts with their agreements, weighing of merits, and judicial decisions; moral inhibitions and adjustments; property and property rights; superordination and subordination.⁴

¹Peters, Foundations of Educational Sociology, p. 167.

²Ibid., pp. 167-168.

³Ibid., p. 168.

⁴Ibid., p. 171.

Historically, by Peters' analysis, the family arose out of the necessity to care for the offspring during its period of helplessness. "Where this necessity does not exist, the relations involved in perpetuating the species are purely promiscuous."¹ Biologically considered, love has no other meaning than to provide a place for the young. It is children that insure the stability of family life. More divorces occur in homes where there are no children than in those where there are. Even among the lower animals, matings are much more likely to be permanent where there are offspring than where there are not. "There may possibly be some excuse for marriage and a separate home where children are not anticipated and intended, but to enter into such relation with that expectation and intention is completely abnormal."²

Center of cultural interests. Smith believes that while the family is primarily an economic and social rather than an educational institution, its lessons are not all incidental and informal. Many things are taught, "line upon line and precept upon precept."³ Family training is most significant with reference to emotional direction and control, but is

¹ Ibid., pp. 171-172.

² Ibid., p. 172.

³ Smith, An Introduction to Educational Sociology, p. 63.

not confined to ethical matters. Children are taught courtesy, social forms, correct speech, and manual arts:

They are familiarized with certain customs and traditions, folk lore, Biblical and other stories, vegetable, animal, and bird life, mechanical devices, and principles, musical instruments, drawing and color, numbers, and not infrequently reading and writing.¹

"Cultivated parents" take great pains to guard the surroundings of their young children, to stimulate their intellectual curiosity, and to provide educative play and other activities.²

The influences of the family, Smith implies, are not confined to the pre-school age. They follow the pupil through his school course and beyond, "either as a blight or a blessing." The relationships of family life are less powerful during the formative period of youth than in childhood. Moreover they continue to exert a vital influence into maturity, affecting one's "vocation, citizenship, sociability, and cultural choices." Marriage, with its creative new home ties, renews family life and revitalizes it through the "oneness of parents" and their mutual responsibilities.³

¹Smith, Principles of Educational Sociology, p. 128.

²Ibid., pp. 128-129.

³Smith, An Introduction to Educational Sociology, p. 72.

Smith's basic tenet is that throughout life the family remains the center of the cultural interests manifested in "reading, music, hospitality, . . . architecture, landscape, gardening, and household adornment; and of the generation of the finer emotions of kindness, mutual aid, and love."¹

A meaningful view of Snedden's analysis is provided in Educational Sociology:

The family group is . . . characterized by the deep-rooted instincts making for the marriage of men and women, the protective attitude of the mother toward her children, the protective attitude of the father toward his dependents, mutual jealousy of infidelity, and the enforced socialization of younger members.²

The family group "is almost unique in the unlikeness of its members as to sex, age, and powers. Along with this goes . . . extreme interdependence."³

Transmits social heritage. Snedden stresses that the family group is one of the most ancient of all social groupings among "the higher vertebrates." To its biological characteristics, society adds many qualities such as "prolongation of care of the young, religious and legal sanction for the institution of marriage, and the development of patrimony in various forms."⁴

¹Smith, Principles of Educational Sociology, pp. 128-129.

²Snedden, Educational Sociology, p. 55.

³Ibid., pp. 55-56.

⁴Snedden, A Digest of Educational Sociology, pp. 14-15.

In a broad sense, Snedden concedes that polygamous and polyandrous family organizations have been the "by-products of continual warfare of peoples on a tribal plane of development, extending down into modern times and torrid zones." In temperate zones, and with the decrease of the kinds of warfare that resulted in the extinction of males and adoption of females, the monogamous marriage has steadily evolved and assumed both religious and political importance.¹

The central test of the family, in Snedden's thought, is its effectiveness as an institution for the rearing of children into adulthood, and the transmission to them of the best portions of the social inheritance. All other functions of the family group are incidental to these.²

The Importance of the Family as a Primary Group

Basic instruction. In Finney's opinion, the prime purpose of the family is the care and training of the child. The family provides for the physical needs of the child, furnishing him food, clothing, and shelter during his early years. It also looks after his health. It has been proven that children do not thrive as well in orphanages. They need the affection

¹Ibid., p. 15.

²Snedden, School Educations, p. 43.

of a father and a mother. It seldom happens that anyone but a mother will give a child the careful attention he really needs.¹

Family life is the best possible arrangement for giving young children a great deal of very fundamental instruction, such as "the primal decencies, language, manners and usages, and a fund of general information."² Emphasizing this point, Finney says that in homes of culture and enlightenment, the family conversation amounts almost to a liberal education by the time the children are grown:

In most well regulated homes the daughters learn the essentials of housekeeping; and . . . a chance for a boy to learn . . . his father's trade. . . . children learn how to spend money wisely and to take care of things so that nothing is wasted.³

When it comes to moral training nothing can take the place of the family. According to Finney's analysis, it is in the family that children get their first lessons in obedience:

This is of great importance to society . . . for the youth who has not learned obedience at home is pretty sure to be a nuisance to his school; and if neither home nor school succeeds in teaching him to obey, he is pretty sure to be a nuisance in every group of which he is a member.⁴

¹Finney, General Social Science, p. 105.

²Ibid., pp. 105-106.

³Ibid., p. 106.

⁴Ibid., p. 107.

After obedience comes self control. Home life trains children to control themselves and not to do just anything they feel like doing. A person who has never learned this lesson well is a dangerous member of society.¹

Finally, the family life trains young people in "sympathy, mutual help, and loyalty" as nothing else can do. Each member of a family has to give up some things for the rest, do some work for the good of all and respect the rights of all the others. To Finney, this training is basic; "the person who has not learned these virtues makes a bad neighbor, a poor citizen, and a troublesome fellow-worker."²

Harmonious relations of members. Payne says that the family is a unity of interacting persons, that is, a "living, changing, growing thing."³ The actual unity of family life has its existence, not in any legal conception nor in any formal contact, but in the interaction of its members. For the family does not depend for its survival on the harmonious relations of its members, nor does it necessarily disintegrate as a result of conflicts between its members. "The family

¹Ibid., pp. 107-108.

²Ibid.

³E. George Payne, "A New Educational Function," School and Society, Vol. 20 (August, 1924), p. 216.

lives as long as interaction takes place and dies only when it ceases."¹

The following illustration provides insight into Payne's viewpoint of the sociological conception of the family:

. . . the family is an interplay of personalities, rather than . . . a common fixation of sexual, parental, and filial instincts. The . . . description of family interaction will . . . be in terms of impulses socially defined, as wishes, attitudes, and sentiments.

The family also exists in interaction with the larger society of which the family and its members are component parts. . . . (The family's) role as defined in the mores, in public opinion and by law, the changes in the family which result from the play of social forces in the community, are all illustrations of the significance² for the family . . . of interaction with society.²

Therefore, in Payne's view, the family is even more than an interaction of personalities. In this interaction, the family develops a conception of itself. When the conception of family relations is recognized by the community, the family acquires an institutional character.³

Direct education. To Peters, although the family no longer molds youth as powerfully in comparison with other social agencies as it once did, it is still an "educational agency of vast importance." Not only does the family affect

¹Ibid., p. 217-218.

²Payne, Readings in Educational Sociology, Vol. II, p. 215.

³Ibid.

the strength of the individual and the progress of society by "selection of stock," but it also makes a contribution to direct education.¹ No other institution outside the school makes a contribution equal to that of the family. It is in the home that the child generally learns his language. In the family a wealth of literature is handed down, "such as fairy tales, folklore, and songs." It is largely through this channel that basic moral traditions are handed down, as well as basic hygienic ideas and habits, tastes, interests, prejudices, and biases.²

It is in the family, Peters asserts, that the basic attitudes toward economic life are caught and the child gets his first training in industry. In the family the ideas and ideals regarding domestic life are nurtured. It would be possible to get along with only the education the family can give, but it would not be possible to get along without it.³

Peters' fundamental point is that the education given by the family is not all conscious and intentional. The larger part of it is due to the associations in the family. "Imitation, suggestion, and sympathetic radiation" play an important

¹Peters, Foundations of Educational Sociology, p. 170.

²Ibid., p. 171.

³Ibid.

role in the molding of character and the shaping of ideas. Nowhere else is the child influenced so much by "suggestion and social radiation" as he is in the family.¹

The most important of the primary group units, Smith says, is the family. Within the family the child gets his early impressions of life. These impressions are first general, and then differentiate into separate mental concepts. One set of impressions is formulated into "self-consciousness, another into social consciousness."² The relations of mother and child are the first and most elementary of all social relations, and "form the germ plasm out of which ideas of self and what is not self evolve."³

Early impressions of members. According to Smith, the child begins to separate self from mother, then from father:

(while) ideas of relationship, of dependence, of antagonism and sympathy, of resentment and love, spring into existence. The "I" and the "you" and the "we" feeling grow up together, a single identity with varied manifestations, the nature of these manifestations depending upon whether the impression is primarily one of self, or of self as separated from others, or of self in accord with others.⁴

¹ Ibid., pp. 171-172.

² Walter R. Smith, "Program for Socializing Education," Educational Research, Vol. 56 (October, 1918), pp. 199-201.

³ Ibid., p. 209.

⁴ Smith, An Introduction to Educational Sociology, p. 62.

Smith concludes that by continued repetition these impulses become "habitual, and the self-assertive and self-repressive qualities become fixed." Selfish instincts are counteracted by the development of the sentiments of "sympathy, loyalty, fairness, and service" to other members of the small family group with whom contact is frequent and continuous. The family thus becomes the starting point in the development of the basic virtues.¹

Character formation. The family, Snedden explains, is the most important and the most common of all social groups. Its major social roles are father, mother, and children. "The family provides a father with a purpose and pleasure, a mother with a fulfillment and involvement, and children with guidance and security."² It forms a circle of daily intimate contacts and relationships. Married couples and their children look to the family as the permanent social organization in which their needs can best be fulfilled. Society depends upon the family especially for the transmission of certain social and cultural values, for the education of the young, and for emotional stability.³

¹Ibid., pp. 62-63.

²Snedden, Educational Sociology, pp. 54-55.

³Ibid., p. 56.

Snedden maintains that the family is a primary group because, in satisfying needs and acquiring skills, its members interact frequently with one another on a face-to-face basis. Being responsible for the early care and rearing of children, the family becomes a force and influence in the formation of character and the development of personality. In certain ways the family serves as an agency of social control. The strength and stability of its family institution. The family is likewise a basic economic unit. Material needs in a society are usually satisfied within the family unit. It is also considered a basic unit of the religious institution. The family is still largely responsible for the welfare of its members in "sickness, ill fortune, and old age."¹

Summary

In the past, the church has been a vital force in the life of the individual and the community. However, if the church as an institution is to adequately translate its idealism into effective programs of action, all denominations need to join in a total church program of genuine service to the community and the nation. The church needs to go further and cooperate with other agencies of the community to gear

¹Ibid., pp. 58-60.

its services into a total community plan. The church may well provide for physical facilities for the entire community it serves. The individual church that still seeks only to serve a commuting membership of a particular class or caste, and ignores the conditions in its immediate neighborhood, is losing its opportunity of being a dominant influence in directing the behavior patterns of the community.

On the other hand, from ancient times, the family has played a major role in the training of youth for adult roles. The family is man's oldest institution which has been concerned with reproduction, the rearing of children, providing the necessities of life, and religious expression. Through the years education has become increasingly specialized. As specialization occurred, educational functions were slowly removed from the basic institutions, especially the family.

Family roles cannot be divorced from the culture, although the culture is the only determinant of family types and roles. While the culture broadly defines major family roles, each family establishes some level of agreement concerning alterations of these expectations. Thus each family role is somewhat different from similar roles in other families. Family influences extend over into the life of the school. The family influences educational readiness and potential

educational success. However, a high family position in the community will not ensure a child a similar position in the classroom.

Doubt exists in the minds of some educators as well as of parents concerning the responsibility of the schools to provide instruction in family living. However, many parents do not possess either information or the ability to deal objectively with questions concerning marriage and family relations. If the schools are forced to assume this function, opportunities for family life training should be made available at all levels of the educational process.

This chapter reviewed what the effect of religion and family has been on education, according to these five educational sociologists. In the following chapter, how these educational sociologists regard the purpose of social control will be discussed.

CHAPTER VI

THE PURPOSE OF SOCIAL CONTROL

One of the realms of societal functioning consists of the controls which are exercised over groups, institutions or individuals. This control, often referred to as regulation, arises from the organization of society into groups and institutions. It is a part of the societal functioning which cannot be avoided. It is a natural product of human association that some persons, in regulating their affairs, will want to extend their regulatory code to others. Whether society ultimately benefits from the control which is imposed is of little importance. The element of greatest importance is that all groups with programs of action which interest them desire to extend their ideas to people outside the group. The most effective control flows from social institutions. The institutional organization, because of the standardization of ideas and because of the financial power which the institutions often possess, is usually successful in imposing its standards. The purpose of this chapter will be to show how the educational

sociologists under investigation see the purpose of social control.

The information summarized in Tables XVII, XVIII, XIX, and XX reveals the opinions of the educational sociologists under consideration regarding: the meaning and forms of social control; the origins of social control; the dominant influences of social control; and the role of the school as an agency of social control.

The Meaning and Forms of Social Control

A matter of education. Finney defines social control as a term used in sociology which refers to the control of the individual by society. A beginner in the study of sociology thinks of the law, the police officers, the criminal courts, and the prisons as the means by which society controls its members. Although these are instruments of social control, they are not the only ones or even the most important ones. Finney maintains that most people never get into trouble with the law:

. . . they voluntarily behave in such a way as to avoid that disgrace. Nor is it fear of the law alone that keeps us on our good behavior. Not at all; the fact is that we feel neither impulse nor desire to behave otherwise.¹

¹Finney, Elementary Sociology, pp. 47-48.

TABLE XVII
THE MEANING AND FORMS OF SOCIAL CONTROL

Finney	Social control is a matter of education. The institutions that result from structured human activities include the prevailing effects of that education.
Payne	Living in society as a socialized human being demands some agreement to customs and rules. Most people attain patterns of conduct that agree with the social expectations in their primary groups. Individuals come to think and act according to these standards. Such habits are the basis of social control.
Peters	Strong "centripetal forces" pull individuals into solid group life. These instinctive forces are not adequate to hold all individuals in line as completely as the optimum interests of the group seem to demand. Therefore, different pressures are used to coerce the opposition into agreement with the whole.
Smith	Social control is active interrelation of personal qualities and institutional forces which stimulate and restrain human behavior. It is a complex arrangement of personal and social forces which unite to form a series of social pressures from which neither individuals nor organizations can entirely escape.
Snedden	Social control specifies collectively thousands of various procedures borrowed by social groups to induce individuals to fit well into the group. Controls vary from praises and frowns at children by elders to constitutions and laws.

TABLE XVIII
THE ORIGINS OF SOCIAL CONTROL

Finney	This author does not discuss the origins of social control.
Payne	The method of developing social control is the same as that of education. Roots deep in the psychological process. Control of all behavior is entwined within the individual's personality and experience.
Peters	Society resorts to several means of pressure in order to drive individuals into agreement with the general needs. Some pressures operate as parts of the apparatus that evolution has brought out. These forces that make a line of activity seem worthwhile are called sanctions.
Smith	In primitive society, control was practiced almost completely through direct contacts in small groups; few rules were necessary. As civilization expands, the range of human relationships, the size of social groups, and a greater variety of agencies for control evolve.
Snedden	Almost all social groups have changing memberships. Older members are best informed as to the values of group cohesion; the young tend to follow their personal preferences. Processes of social control include both the adaptation of the young to the group and the holding of all group members to their responsibilities.

TABLE XIX

THE DOMINANT INFLUENCES OF SOCIAL CONTROL

Finney	Social control is contingent upon the dominance of certain beliefs, ideals, and habits of the social mind. If social control is to be reached, those contents of the social mind must be imparted and communicated from generation to generation.
Payne	People must be orderly if they are to live together. Must act somewhat alike, conform to similar practices and ideas, if society is to prevail. In order to become a member of a group, the individual must conform to the group's specific behavior characteristics.
Peters	This author does not discuss the dominant influences of social control.
Smith	In highly cultivated modern nations people are often subjected to social pressures by various groups. Every individual and every institution places some disciplinary power over others. The controlling influences of social control cluster about the relations of the individual and the social group.
Snedden	Influences of social control are varied in kind and in methods of use. Democracy and freedom of thought are weakened where social control is for long periods, through the influence of arbitrary authority, imposed on blind obedience.

TABLE XX

THE ROLE OF THE SCHOOL AS AN AGENCY OF SOCIAL CONTROL

Finney	Education aids in control by serving as an agency by which the mores are transmitted. Beliefs and practices accepted and transmitted by society are accepted for the sake of attaining the maximum of social order with the expenditure of the minimum of work.
Payne	An often-used classroom method is the appeal to the student's need for recognition and status, a need around which motivational controls often evolve.
Peters	The teacher chooses facts, arranges subject matter, assembles his examples in such a way as to result in insights and talents that will thrust the pupil into desired types of conduct throughout the rest of his life.
Smith	Active student participation in school enterprises is highly educative. Too many teachers believe that the goal of student participation is merely to obtain better order rather than to provide citizen training. Cooperative sharing in school affairs cultivates a sense of responsibility in their management.
Snedden	This author does not discuss the role of the school as an agency of social control.

Therefore, Finney asks, "How did we get into that fortunate frame of mind or heart? Are we just naturally that way, or has something happened to us to make us want to do the very things that society wants us to do?"² This is a sociological problem that never occurs to the minds of beginners, any more than it occurs to the minds of children to inquire why bodies fall down instead of up. The answer is that desires and impulses have been shaped by the many influences that society uses for that very purpose. According to Finney, religion, the school, art, public holidays, and ceremonies all contribute to the molding of minds and wills:

Society deals out mental rations to us as it chooses . . . in order that we may believe what society wants us to believe . . . and do what society wants us to do and nothing else. . . . Society wants us to keep our nakedness covered; so it teaches us as little children that it is shameful to be nude. . . . The belief in free self-direction is in large part myth. . . . We come much² nearer being automatons than we like to suppose.

Social control is a matter of education. The institutions that result from organized human activities consist of the prevailing products of that education. "This is as important sociologically as it is difficult to present to the untutored imagination."³

¹Ibid., p. 48.

²Ibid., p. 49.

³Ibid.

The necessity of social control. "It is never given to man to do altogether as he pleases." In Payne's view, living in the group as a socialized human being requires some conformity to customs and rules:

Man's biological drives must be restricted; he must regard the property rights of others; he must observe the etiquette and manners of his group; he must assume his proper responsibility as a member of the group. He must be subject to social control.¹

Most people, Payne says, acquire patterns of conduct that conform to social expectations in their primary groups. Individuals come to think and act according to these standards. Such habits are the foundation of social control.²

Payne insists that most people are not ordinarily aware that they are acting according to social expectations. People usually judge their own conduct in terms of group expectations. On account of primary group training, people conform.³

Payne believes that the simplest form of control is to order that this shall be done, and that something else shall not be done. This device is used by parents in handling their children. The substance of much law is derived from this technique.⁴

¹E. George Payne, "Social Control and Education," Compass Needle, Vol. 4 (May-June, 1937), p. 21.

²Ibid.

³Ibid., pp. 22-23.

⁴Ibid., p. 24.

In the modern world, Payne concedes, people are less emphatic in ordering and forbidding than in earlier times. The democratic family believes that through cooperation much of the commanding can be avoided in teaching children to live according to the expectations of their parents and community. With better motivation toward learning, through cooperation between pupils and teachers, and through student government, a working relationship in the school can be achieved without much ordering and forbidding. Group living and sharing have become more effective methods of control.¹

"In the great society out beyond the primary groups," as Payne argues, "controls tend to be more formal. The institution of government is the supreme authority in modern societies. It directs much of its attention to social regulation."²

One phase of governmental control is the military. In emergencies, Payne implies, it becomes an intricate framework of regulation. In some societies it dominates civil authority.³

By Payne's analysis, religion has been a vast system of social control. Its codes, rituals, doctrines, creeds, traditions, and precepts have provided for a system of orderly

¹E. George Payne, "Educational and Social Control," The Journal of Educational Sociology, Vol. I, No. 3 (November, 1927), p. 137.

²Ibid., p. 138.

³Ibid., p. 139.

behavior for mankind. Some religions use love and duty as controls. Others may stress fear and threat of punishment.¹

Payne says that in modern society, business and industry are major influences in social control, particularly in changing habits and introducing new ways of doing things. One of the main control devices business uses to change habit is advertising. Almost without our knowing it, advertising influences our patterns of consumption and our acceptance of the latest fashions.²

Application of pressure. Peters cautions that there are strong "centripetal forces" pulling individuals into compact group life. However, these instinctive forces are not sufficient to hold all individuals in line, "under the artificial conditions of modern civilization, as completely as the optimum interests of the group seem to demand."³ Therefore, various pressures are resorted to in order to force the resistant "into harmony with the whole." Suggestion and example keep the ideals of the group before the individual and push him towards these standards. What he does that agrees with the group outlook is met with some form of approval.

¹Payne, "Social Control and Education," p. 24.

²Payne, "Education and Social Control," pp. 140-141.

³Peters, Foundations of Educational Sociology, pp. 246-247.

Peters says that what he does in opposition of the group's standards is met with disapproval and is consequently made repulsive to him for the future:

Constantly he hears appeals to the traditions of the group: "It is not our way to do as you have done"; "Nobody ever saw one of our men do so and so"; "We believe thus and so"; "From the earliest days our organization has taken a leading position in this and this." Or there is explicit discussion of the relation of questionable acts to the interest and standards of the group, with resultant solidarity of conviction regarding the matter.¹

Where all of these forces still fail to restrain the individual, such penalties are employed to put him into line as "lynchings, hazings, jail sentences or fines."² Therefore, in Peters' analysis, social control is the complicated process by which groups adjust new individuals to courses of action believed to be for the general good.³

Personal and social forces. Smith believes that social control may be characterized as the active interrelation of those personal qualities and institutional forces which stimulate and restrain human behavior. For Smith, it includes the innate predispositions:

. . . such as sympathy, fairness, resentment, dominance and submission, and self-expression and

¹Ibid., pp. 247-250.

²Ibid., p. 251.

³Ibid., p. 252.

self-restraint, which determine the reaction of the individual upon society. Likewise it embraces all the traditions, taboos, customs, laws, ethical codes, aesthetic ideals, and institutional regulations through which society reacts upon the individual to mold his character and direct his activities.¹

Therefore, it is a complex coordination of personal and social forces which combine to form a series of social pressures from which neither individuals nor organizations can completely escape.²

According to Smith, from birth to death the individual is involved in environmental restrictions:

. . . either enticed . . . or repressed . . . by the natural or human agencies about him. No sooner does the hermit or the frontiersman free himself from the constraints of a stabilized society than the barriers of nature rise up to mock his independence.³

Smith admits that the need for social control arises out of the "cross-currents" inseparable from associated life. Men have always lived in "societies, hordes, clans, tribes, races, and nations."⁴ These societies are composed of individuals and of social groups. The individuals have "egoistic appetites, impulses, instincts, and capacities" which they seek to

¹Smith, Principles of Educational Sociology, p. 294.

²Ibid., p. 295.

³Ibid., p. 298.

⁴Ibid., p. 299.

gratify. Likewise the groups have common aims and needs which they strive to fulfill. In an attempt to satisfy their wants, individuals come into conflict with other individuals and with group designs. In fulfilling their purposes, the social groups arouse the anger of other groups and individuals. Therefore, in the turmoil of individual and group desires, a constant series of interferences arise which must be adjusted. It is the task of social control to provide "checks and balances" which will so modify these interferences as to prevent "destructive collisions," and therefore enable both individuals and social groups to function effectively.¹

Varied social control. A meaningful perspective of Snedden's definition of social control is provided in School Educations:

The general term "social control" is now widely used by sociologists to designate collectively the thousands of kinds of procedures adopted by social groups (. . . or the more "group invested" members within them) to induce or coerce individual persons to "fit well" into the group and its purposes.²

In Snedden's analysis, "social controls range from praises and frowns directed at children by elders, to constitutions and laws."³ They include urgings on the one hand and world-

¹ Ibid., pp. 312-318.

² Snedden, School Educations, p. 144.

³ Ibid., p. 145.

wide propaganda on the other. Methods of social control draw upon all kinds of punishments:

. . . upon thousands of kinds of solicitations and appeals to "better" (that is, more social) nature, and upon thousands of the crystallized things of the social inheritance--great forbears, creeds, monuments, emotivating songs and poetry, the instructions possible in schools.¹

Processes of social control operate through "courts and public opinion, history and art, private blame and public praise, fear of disapproval and love of influence." Religions become powerful means of social control towards better "moralities and civisms."²

The Origins of Social Control

Deep in the psychological process. According to Payne, education from a sociological point of view and defined as the process by which behavior changes are produced may serve two general functions:

. . . changes in the behavior of the individual in his relation to the groups in which he lives and with which he comes into contact or changes in the behavior of the group itself. Obviously there are no changes in the individuals that compose the group, but the educational process may look directly toward³ the modification of the life of the whole community.

¹Ibid.

²Ibid., pp. 146-147.

³Payne, "Education and Social Control," pp. 143-144.

Payne further maintains that education may be identified with social control; the process of developing social control is the same as that of education. "Social control, however, roots deep in the psychological process."¹ It is therefore necessary to examine the psychological basis of social control. The control of all behavior is bound up in the individual and his personality and experiences. Control of behavior depends upon the special sets of habits, knowledges, and attitudes that have been developed in the individual through his process of adjustment or adaptation to the social life.²

Social control as sanctions. Peters insists that there are various means of pressure to which society resorts for the purpose of driving individuals into conformity with the general needs. Some of these pressures are entirely unplanned by society; they function merely as parts of the machinery that the forces of evolution have brought out.³ However, some of the means have been consciously planned by the leaders of society to bring men to a desired state of mind. According to Peters, these forces that make a line of activity seem worthwhile are called "sanctions":

¹Payne, Readings in Educational Sociology, Vol. I, pp. 178-179.

²Ibid., p. 180.

³Peters, Foundations of Educational Sociology, p. 249.

They may depend upon pressure from the gods--religious sanctions; upon pressure of man upon man directly--civic sanctions; or upon the lure of the worth inherent in the act itself--ethical sanctions.¹

The growth of society. Smith believes that education should be expected to improve the social process of social control. Increasing social complexity inevitably leads to increasing social interferences. Competition and cooperation take on more varied forms. In primitive society, where control was exercised almost completely through direct contacts in small and simply organized groups, few regulations were necessary. As civilization widened, however, the range of human relationships, the size of social groups and a greater variety of agencies for control had to evolve.²

The process of "institutionalization," according to Smith, results in transferring much of the responsibility for the control of conduct from the individual and small groups to a general public. In a highly "institutionalized" society, therefore, individual will must be supplemented by social pressure, and self control by social control. In order to express the concept of self control when influenced by group conditions, sociologists use the term social self control, by

¹Ibid., p. 251.

²Smith, Introduction to Educational Sociology, pp. 384-386.

which they mean self control "in the presence of extraneous social stimuli."¹

Modern social control includes all the forces a society brings to bear upon individuals and groups to stimulate and restrain their thoughts and actions. Therefore, Smith says that a large share of the social heritage consists of agencies devised for such purposes:

Customs and . . . public opinion, religious creeds and . . . morals and ideals . . . dominate conduct and mold character. . . . (W)here the forces of law and order are in the ascendant, and ethical ideals permeate social relationships, vice and crime will languish. Much of the well-being of any society depends upon the maintenance . . . of all the checking and molding agencies of the public will.²

Adjustment of the young to the group. Snedden asserts that almost all of the social groups that are formed by men, women, and children have a shifting membership. The group remains, while its individual members come and go. Therefore almost every group contains some old and some young members. The old are best informed as to the values of group cohesion, while the young tend to follow their personal preferences. The processes of social control involve both the adjustment

¹Ibid., pp. 387-388.

²Ibid., p. 389.

of young or less responsible persons to the group, and the holding of all group members to their responsibilities.¹

According to Snedden, initiation as a "sensational stage" in a process of social control is everywhere in evidence:

"Naturalization" is a process of adjusting newcomers to the citizenship standards of the adopting people. . . . Primitive peoples develop complicated rituals through which youths are admitted to the company and responsibilities of warriors and workers. Apprenticeship . . . and formal acceptance . . . (are) processes by which social groups screen out undesirables, and give preliminary² shaping to those whom they will eventually receive.²

In all healthy social groups this process of recruiting is constant, and is almost always directed by the older, more experienced members of the group. When recruits are "born" into the group the process becomes one of long and difficult assimilation. Where matured persons are to be accepted or rejected, "immigration, election, intermarriage, or formal communion" can be required so that only candidates having approved qualities shall be selected. Every "exclusive group, clique, social set, club, learned society, school, state, aristocratic family, labor union, church, or secret society," has its special requirements for excluding the unwelcome.³

¹Snedden, Educational Sociology, pp. 189-190.

²Ibid., p. 190.

³Ibid., pp. 191-193.

The Dominant Influences of Social Control

From generation to generation. Finney believes that social control depends upon the prevalence of certain beliefs, ideals, and habits of the social mind. If social control is to be achieved, those contents of the social mind must be imparted and transmitted from generation to generation. The question of whether children learn them by rote or by reason is not important from the standpoint of this objective. "Our overemphasis upon individual initiative and independence is the natural concomitant of our progress cult and our misconception of democracy."¹ Neglect of and contempt for memorization methods and drill are but part of the failure to conserve. According to Finney, for progress we must have initiative and invention:

. . . at least upon the part of the capable few, and in the fields where they are expert. But for orderliness . . . we must have memorizing and drill, especially for the vast mass who . . . are hardly capable of much contributory thinking. For the sake of the objective now under consideration there may even be occasion for regimentation under duress.²

Whether the young radicals approve or enjoy the process is a matter of very minor importance. A certain amount of

¹Finney, A Sociological Philosophy of Education, p. 469.

²Ibid., p. 469.

resistance is to be expected, due to the natural conflict between "social necessities and youthful instincts." However, social control depends upon that resistance being overcome. Finney cautions, "The protest of the Zeitgeist would be far wiser if it were aimed against indiscriminating compulsion, instead of against compulsion as such."¹ The real question of democracy is who controls, and for whose benefit. To control per se, the alternative is not freedom but social chaos. Being soft and indulgent with our children is no substitute for discriminative thinking relative to the control that ought to be imposed upon them in their own interests.²

The importance of social control may be appreciated by taking stock of the "marvelous technique" the society has developed for securing the individual's conformity to the social routine. To one who has not considered the matter it is amazing how society causes the individual "to think what it prefers him to think, to want what it wants him to want, and to do what it desires him to do." The means of social control vary from the most unconscious influences of social participation to the most overt and radical compulsion.³

¹Ibid., pp. 469-470.

²Ibid., p. 470.

³Ibid.

Conformity to the group. In Payne's opinion, people must be orderly if they are to live together. They must act somewhat alike, must conform to similar practices and ideas, if society is to exist. No society "can cater to the whims of all its members."¹ The world would be a hopeless "muddle" if everyone were allowed to do exactly as he pleased and have all the freedom he wanted. Each person, in his desire for freedom, would often infringe on the rights of others and threaten the social institutions which most of us consider to be important. This would soon lead to no one's having any rights.³

According to Payne, many controls affect the health and safety of the group:

(for example,) rules on the disposal of garbage, traffic laws, registration of firearms. . . . Others, like our marriage and divorce regulations, are designed to maintain the family as a social institution and preserve our system of morality. Some other controls we wish to keep merely because they add to general convenience.³

In Payne's view, to become a member of a neighborhood group, the child must show a willingness to conform to the group's particular behavior traits. If a member shows an

¹Payne, Readings in Educational Sociology, Vol. II, p. 621.

²Ibid., pp. 622-623.

³Ibid., p. 625.

unwillingness to conform, he will probably be expelled. If each member behaved differently, there would be nothing to hold the group together. Group existence depends on members having something in common.¹

No society, Payne cautions, can tolerate individuality in excess. Yet no individual can always conform to every social regulation. Here is one source of personality conflict for everyone. Each person is willing to conform only in so far as he is provided with a reasonable degree of opportunity for development. "Robbed of this, he loses his interest in living or openly revolts against the existing order."²

One of the major problems of all societies, Payne says, is that of maintaining a balance between individual liberty and social regulation. "To stifle individualism too much is to block creativity, build frustration, and encourage needless revolt." To give too much liberty is likely to lead to too great a weakening of social control and to social disorganization. Societies tend to fluctuate between too great restraint and too great liberty at various times in history.³

Conformity, Payne concludes, is the law of social life:

¹Ibid., p. 625-626.

²Ibid., p. 627.

³Ibid., p. 630.

. . . it is the non-conformist who . . . directs the way to progress. Control . . . brings about an indifference to changes. . . . A too great satisfaction with the existing order puts humanity into a rut. Only when someone rebels and challenges the accustomed ways of living does progress come about. This is not to say that all rebellion brings progress. Progress depends largely upon whether the rebel is motivated by a concern for the general well-being.¹

The predominance of group needs. In primitive life, Smith asserts, the agencies of control were limited. The elders disciplined the young, the strong controlled the weak, and the wise ruled the simple. "Physical prowess, warlike skill, priestly craft, and bartering ingenuity reigned supreme."² With the increase of social organization and the advance of democratic ideals, however, the means of social control were multiplied and mass regulations "undermined individual domination."³ "Folkways, customs, traditions, and ethical practices" were weighted with the approval or the censure of public opinion, and religious, political, and economic rights were enforced by governments. According to Smith, in highly cultivated modern societies people are constantly subjected to the social pressures represented by:

¹Ibid., pp. 630-631.

²Smith, An Introduction to Educational Sociology, p. 371.

³Ibid., p. 372.

. . . government, law, and politics; religion, ethics, and ceremony; tradition, custom, and taboo; public feeling, public opinion, and class standards; the arts, crafts, and industry; professional, business, and labor organizations; the press, the stage, the platform; science, philanthropy, and reforms; the family, the lodge, and the social clique; amusements, fashions and ideals.¹

Every individual and every institution exerts some disciplinary power over others. Altogether they constitute such a coercive force that many scholars go to the extreme of denying the existence of free will.²

The dominant influences of social control, Smith stresses, cluster about the relations of the individual and the social group. Each tries to exploit the other, and "every society echoes with their quarrels." Social policies tend to favor either "individualism or collectivism, personal independence or institutional regularity, individual initiative or group conformity."³ It is obvious that general social welfare is promoted by organization and group efficiency. If group efficiency is to be attained and group purposes are to be achieved, some kind of social discipline must be enforced:

The individual must be held in leash and molded to type. For this purpose initiation ceremonies and sacrifices are imposed upon the neophyte, and

¹Ibid., pp. 373-374.

²Ibid., p. 374.

³Smith, Principles of Educational Sociology, p. 296.

loyalty, obedience to regulations, and service is required of active members in all groups.¹

No institution can be effective without internal solidarity, and this can be guaranteed only by enforcing reasonable conformity. Smith maintains that it is not less evident, however, that social welfare depends upon the maintenance of wide areas of individual freedom and self-expression:

Without . . . thought and action there can be little invention . . . (or) creation. Bold spirits chafe under social restrictions, and strong natures break through the "cake of custom." Many of the great achievements of history have been the result of revolts against traditions, institutional "red tape," class smugness, or civic complacency.²

Democracy and freedom of thought. The influences of social control, to Snedden, are varied in kind and in methods of use. The educator thinks first of education, the politician of government, the minister of religion, and the economist of the pursuit of wealth, "as the most potent instrument whereby men are brought into the safe bounds of collective action."³ The biologist, thankful of the very intense and effective collectivism of various animal groupings, "reads great

¹Ibid., p. 297.

²Ibid., pp. 297-298.

³Snedden, A Digest of Educational Sociology, p. 33.

importance into the instinctive forms of docility, suggestibility, and imitativeness that he finds in all human beings."¹

The sociologist, Snedden maintains, still experiences difficulty in detecting the invisible influences of social control. For many purposes of control, the conventions of society are more effective than are constitutions and laws. However, their origins are hardly distinguishable, and their methods of operation very obscure. Under some circumstances the fine arts may do more to shape right social appreciations and ideals than the more "spectacular machinery of collective worship of deities."²

Snedden contends that means effective at one stage of culture may be quite ineffective under other conditions:

Throughout the Middle Ages in Europe much use was made of conscious authoritarian controls--that is, of reliance on authority, physical or moral. . . . Such types of control seem the natural offspring of military necessity; and it can plausibly be argued that the medieval family, church, school, guild, municipality, and province followed the warrior's lead in a time when armed conflict was shared by nearly all men.³

It is generally believed, Snedden says, that both democracy and freedom of thought are impaired where social control is for considerable periods achieved "through the sway of

¹Ibid., p. 34.

²Ibid.

³Ibid., p. 35.

arbitrary authority imposed on blind obedience."¹ The modern school renounces corporal punishment. Freedom of press and speech are guaranteed by constitutions and laws. Religious reformatations move steadily toward substitution of reason for dogma. The "divine right of kings" disappears with heredity and autocratic government. Family government itself evolves along more democratic lines. "Half-concealed oligarchy in business organization is hunted out by means of scores of penalizing, even if as yet easily evaded laws."²

The Role of the School as an
Agency of Social Control

Transmission of mores. In Finney's analysis, the activity which is covered by the formally organized work of the school is designed to serve the ends of control. The work of the school should and does emphasize group activity. The school should provide persons with information and with skills that will put them at ease with persons of the opposite sex, with persons of different economic levels, and with persons of different national and racial groups. The work of the school should assist in eliminating social friction, thereby creating order. In order to do this, the school will be obliged to

¹Snedden, Educational Sociology, p. 193.

²Ibid., p. 194.

use material which deals with the problems of employment, race, religion and other crucial questions, "to the end that the viewpoint of other groups will be quite as clear as that of our own." Social control should arise from an appreciation of other groups than our own.¹

The school needs to recognize other activities in its program of control beyond the emphasis which it should place upon a comprehension of groups. According to Finney, closely associated with an emphasis on group life is the emphasis which should be placed on rationalized conduct:

A large part of the school's work ought to consist of an examination of the slogans, the shibboleth's, the appeals, the watchwords by which the masses of people are led in . . . elections, in church disputes, in pedagogical differences, as well as in many other questions of public welfare.²

Almost universally the crowd is ready to follow the "coiner of phrases," who specializes in the avoidance of issues. Education ought to train people "to inhibit their irrational impulses and utilize their capacities for reasoning."³

Finney therefore suggests that education also aids in control by serving as an agency by which the mores are transmitted. The beliefs and practices which are accepted and

¹Finney, A Sociological Philosophy of Education, pp. 490-492.

²Ibid., p. 492.

³Ibid., p. 493.

transmitted by society are accepted for the sake of securing the maximum of social order with the expenditure of the minimum of effort. If the mores are considered "to be a product of man's best efforts in the realm of trial and error," it may be concluded that the transmission of them is socially desirable.¹

Positive and negative controls. Social controls in school situations, in Payne's view, may be classified into two groupings:

- (1) positive controls which are designed to develop a favorable attitude or approved behavior, and (2) negative controls, such as punishment, which are designed to prevent certain forms of behavior from developing.²

The chief mechanisms of social control may be located along a continuum with rigid forms of overt control, like force, at one end, and "highly symbolic forms, like hunting, praise and flattery, or symbolic avoidance at the other."³

One method of control, that Payne says is used extensively in the classroom is the appeal to the student's desire for recognition and status. The desire for status and recognition "is one around which motivational controls often develop." Forms of motivational control have certain important common

¹Ibid., pp. 493-495.

²Payne, Readings in Educational Sociology, p. 634.

³Ibid., p. 635.

elements, namely, "support, permissiveness, and restriction of reciprocation."¹ Support is designed to give individuals a greater feeling of security in their aspirations, motivations, and efforts. According to Payne, support may be obtained from individual students, groups of students, by the teacher, and by behavior models:

. . . the understanding teacher will allow some degree of permissiveness and accept the deviancy yet he will try to evaluate it and . . . try to pull the student back from deviation to accepted behavior. The teacher must be able to deal with . . . outbursts of panic and collective behavior and, at the same time, help the student develop the support necessary for his own mental well being and status.²

Restrictions of reciprocation, Payne asserts, signifies that one member of a group may react in a hostile way to another member; yet control is often effective when the hostility is not returned. The refusal of the individual to reciprocate deviation for deviation illustrates restriction of reciprocation, which serves to deter individuals from repeated deviance.³

Other means of social control, Payne says, are classroom norms and institutional norms. These are often expressed as

¹Ibid., pp. 637-738.

²Ibid., p. 639.

³Ibid.

rules or regulations. Norms established by the school system are expected to apply to everyone in the system. School norms are often more effective if they are developed jointly by teachers, administrators, and students. Consideration should be given to the formulation of student norms by the students themselves with some participation by the parents. These attempts are made in the cooperative development of youth codes, where "reciprocal freedoms and responsibilities of parents, their children, and the school are set forth."¹

Desired pupil behavior. The American system of education of the young is a comprehensive and highly purposive system of suggestions "driving on toward the end of bending the youth's will to the interests of society."² This is not true of all elements of education. For Peters, training for various kinds of skill and for reasoning ability could be regarded as forms of suggestion:

But besides skills and reasoning abilities the educator also sets up as goals the development in the individual of certain ideals, interests, prejudices, perspectives and appreciations, and organizes his materials for the production of these effects. The creation of these is dependent upon the potency of suggestion.³

¹Payne, Principles of Educational Sociology, pp. 27-28.

²Peters, Foundations of Educational Sociology, p. 257.

³Ibid., p. 258.

Therefore, in Peters' analysis, the teacher selects facts, arranges subject matter, and collects his illustrations in such a way as to result in insights and talents that will drive the pupil into desired types of conduct throughout the rest of his life:

He is not . . . only after memorization of the content of civics, physiology, history, or literature; an important value of these studies lies for him in the suggestions for citizenship and morality that come incidentally . . . out of these pregnant materials.¹

Active student participation. According to Smith, while active entrance into any student enterprise is educative, the most significant of these activities is student participation in school government. From the elementary grades to the university the movement to grant students a share in their own control is universal. "Recent studies indicate that about one third of our high schools have a student council or other agency which shares in the control of conduct."² Even without such established machinery, wise teachers seek to understand the moving currents of student opinion and direct them into helpful cooperation. If students can be made self-governing

¹Ibid.

²Smith, Principles of Educational Sociology, p. 319.

in school the task of maintaining "a democratic governed society is immensely simplified."¹

In Smith's view, too many teachers take it for granted that the aim of student participation is merely to secure better order rather than to provide citizen training. Conscious sharing in school government arouses a sense of responsibility in the management of school affairs. Smith insists that it develops interests and abilities which correspond to those needed to make an institutional society effective:

. . . the transition from "beneficial autocracy" to democracy in school control, and the tendency to trust the pupils to assume responsibility for their own conduct, are probably doing more to provide an incidental but direct and powerful training for social control in later years than any other agency in current American civilization.²

Summary

According to Payne, people adopt patterns of conduct that conform to social expectations in their primary groups. In primitive society, control was practiced almost entirely through direct contacts in small groups. As civilization

¹Ibid., p. 320.

²Ibid., pp. 320-321.

develops, the scope of human relationships, the size of social groups, and a greater diversity of agencies for control evolve.

Payne contends that the method of developing social control is the same as that of education. Social control lies deep in the psychological process. Control of all behavior is intermingled within the individual's personality and experience.

Social control, for Finney, is contingent upon the dominance of certain beliefs, ideals, and habits of the social mind. If social control is to be reached, those contents of the social mind must be imparted and communicated from generation to generation.

Education aids in control by serving as an agency by which the mores are conveyed. For Finney, beliefs and practices accepted and transmitted by society are accepted for the sake of attaining the maximum of social order with the expenditure of the minimum of work.

In Peters' view, the teacher chooses facts, arranges subject matter, assembles his examples in such a way as to result in insights and talents that will thrust the pupil into desired types of conduct throughout the rest of his life.

The purpose of this chapter has been to present how these educational sociologists regard the purpose of social control.

Chapter VII will investigate what the main objectives of educational sociology are in a democratic community, according to these educational sociologists.

CHAPTER VII

THE MAIN OBJECTIVES OF EDUCATION IN A DEMOCRATIC COMMUNITY

The community influences the school, and the school likewise influences the community in various ways. This interaction is not a temporary phenomenon. It is an interrelation which is mutual, basic, and continuous. Changing the behavior of individuals is not enough; education must seek to modify community patterns of behavior through close and constant interaction with the total culture of the community. This chapter is devoted to the description of the main objectives of education in a democratic community, according to the educational sociologists in question.

The material contained in Tables XXI, XXII, XXIII, and XXIV summarizes the educational sociologists' ideas concerning: the meaning of democracy, democracy in the United States, democracy and education, and the democratic nature of the school community.

TABLE XXI
THE MEANING OF DEMOCRACY

Finney	Two different meanings; original meaning government by the people. Other meaning is giving to all men the opportunity to share all the good things in life, to cultivate his dormant powers and to use them for the advancement of his own benefit.
Payne	Means not only a government of the people and by the people, but a government for the people. In a government for the people there will be a continual attempt on the part of each individual to encourage to the fullest extent the success of each individual.
Peters	Political democracy admits every citizen into a share in the management of the state. Industrial democracy gives him a decision in the direction of the processes with which he works. In a true social democracy every man or woman is an individual.
Smith	The aim of civilization. It seeks to gain for each individual equal rights, privileges and opportunities to make the most of whatever nature has supplied.
Snedden	Both liberty and freedom are included in the democratic ideal. When liberty has been attained, freedom must be verified and protected. Does not insure that every individual will reach every goal he sets for himself.

TABLE XXII
DEMOCRACY IN THE UNITED STATES

Finney	Americans have done little to comprehend the meaning and significance of democracy. A "handy tool" to disguise obscure ideas about government, even though little consideration is given to its specific meaning.
Payne	Many Americans do not perceive its ideals and meaning. They believe the fundamental idea is that each person is assured the right to do as he pleases at all times, is to be freed from restrictions, and is free to follow any wish that may occur to him.
Peters	United States has always defended democracy not only in argument but also in action. Devotion has become a "primal passion" in America. Critical problem is stability.
Smith	No other subject has received so much attention from American thinkers, nor has any other movement been more dominating. Every phase of life is affected by it; every institution in America is being overhauled to meet its imperatives. The school in the United States must identify the principles of this "dynamic democratic change."
Snedden	Participation in the interaction of a democracy is the best experience for development of personality and is the best preparation for the democratic way of life. Task of the American school becomes that of guiding learners to participate in even more socially useful and individually satisfying, democratic ways of living.

TABLE XXIII

DEMOCRACY AND EDUCATION

Finney	The school should be a place where facts, ideas, and theories should be investigated and positively accepted or rejected. In a democracy, the school should be a place where problems of life are solved.
Payne	Democracy is the fundamental ideal of society and the ultimate goal toward which all school functions should be directed. Requires elimination of the social defects that scientific discovery has demonstrated as necessary and the development of open mindedness upon those questions which past experience and scientific investigation have not determined.
Peters	If democracy is to be successful, new ways must be found to prepare the members of democratic groups for effective accomplishment of the obligations they have assumed. Must come about through the slow molding of individuals by the right kind of education.
Smith	More democracy means more general education; more general education means more universal education. Real democracy cannot exist without universal education, and universal education cannot be obtained except in a democracy.
Snedden	In a modern democracy every adult is supposed to participate. To insure further advances in effective democratic political control, the mass of the population must be more efficiently educated than now.

TABLE XXIV

DEMOCRATIC NATURE OF THE SCHOOL COMMUNITY

Finney	The democratic nature of the school should be to cause education to perform its function completely. The curriculum will have to be altered even further if the objectives of the American educational system are to be fully accomplished.
Payne	School life should be modeled after the democratic ideal. Social attitudes, insights and habits and cultivated only in a social environment. The school, along with the home and other institutions, should be a "miniature society" possessing the traits of a democratic ideal.
Peters	The school community should be void of undemocratic elements. The school can supply children with a place to live which does not involve "distracting evils."
Smith	The school must meet the demands of the community. The aim of the school should be to instruct the child as definitely as possible to take up the duties of politics, business and society, and to carry them on efficiently. Since schools are locally supported, they owe their "training allegiance" to the local community.
Snedden	The school community ranks next to the home as the most important source of educative experience and development for children.

The Meaning of Democracy

Two meanings of democracy. In Finney's view, democracy has two different, though related, meanings. The original and narrower meaning is the one the Greeks gave to it: "government by the people (demos, the people, kratein, to rule)." Finney says that the newer and broader meaning is:

. . . keeping the door of opportunity open before every man--opportunity to share all the good things of life as well as in government, to develop his latent powers and to use them for the promotion of his own welfare and that of such societies as he wishes to serve.¹

A democracy, Finney says, is not primarily a kind of "machinery" of government. Political unities and various organizations often have all the "machinery" of so-called democracy and still are not democratic. A "spirit of altruism" prompts the democratic organization to try to promote the welfare of every member. Consequently, every individual attempts to promote the welfare of every other member and also the welfare of the group as a whole.²

Social and political democracy. Democracy, Payne asserts, means much more than the establishment of a representative form of government. Although a government might have legislative, executive, and judicial branches established by the

¹Finney, Causes and Cures for the Social Unrest, p. 143.

²Ibid., pp. 147-148.

people, it still may fall far short of being a democracy. It is not the "machinery" of government that constitutes democracy. It is the "inner spirit pervading the people and their duly elected officials."¹ Democracy implies a spirit of "fairness, justice, and good will." It means not only a government of the people and by the people, but a government for the people. The real spirit of democracy was expressed more clearly in the "Sermon on the Mount and in Lincoln's Gettysburg Speech"² than in any other human documents. There might be a government of the people and by the people that is primarily selfish, bureaucratic, and oligarchial. According to Payne, office holding might mean just an opportunity to promote selfish interests rather than the welfare of all the people:

But in a government for the people there will be perpetual effort on the part of each member . . . to promote the welfare of the government, and on the part of the government to promote to the fullest extent the welfare of each individual. The interests are absolutely mutual; there is an implied contract to attain these ends.³

Blueprinting. Political democracy, as Peters advocates, admits every citizen into a share in the management of the state; it grants him the protection of the state regardless

¹Payne, Principles of Educational Sociology--An Outline, pp. 64-65.

²Ibid., pp. 66-67.

³Ibid., p. 68.

of any accidents of birth or wealth.¹ Industrial democracy gives him a voice in the control of the processes with which he labors and accords to him respectful consideration for his personality.² Social democracy involves a similar treatment of the individual in all of those relations not covered by his political and vocational activities.³

Peters believes that in a true social democracy, every man or woman is a person. The principle of social democracy is specified by the Declaration of Independence in the statement that "all men are created free and equal." The United States has fallen far short of complete attainment of the implications of this principle.⁴ As part of social engineering, it is therefore essential that "Americans render explicit these implications by definitely blue-printing them, just as they have already blue-printed political and industrial democracy."⁵

The goal of civilization. Smith maintains that democracy looks forward to the protection and development of the

¹Peters, Objectives and Procedures in Civic Education, pp. 7-8.

²Ibid., p. 9.

³Peters, Foundations of Educational Sociology, pp. 89-92.

⁴Ibid., pp. 95-98.

⁵Ibid., pp. 102-103.

physical, mental, and moral welfare of all people everywhere.¹ Democracy may be called the goal of civilization.² Democratic policies, however, are more restricted. They are confined to limited groups bound together by some sort of social machinery through which policies may be carried out, such as "states, churches, or leagues." Democratic programs are not just restricted to those groups, but apply to specific aspects of life within them, such as "popular suffrage, free schools, or easy access to courts of justice." Emphasizing this point, Smith says that in each of these forms democracy implies a struggle to free people from artificial disparities:

Its essence is equality of opportunity--not equality of possessions, equal rewards for effort, or equal responsibility for service. There is . . . no equality among individuals in mental or moral ability, physical health, social influence, or cultural enjoyment. Any attempt to equate such variables would be undemocratic in that it would destroy equality of opportunity for the superior.³

What democracy seeks is to secure for each individual comparatively equal rights, privileges, and opportunities to make the most of whatever possibilities nature has provided.⁴ The

¹Smith, Principles of Educational Sociology, p. 350.

²Smith, Introduction to Educational Sociology, p. 160.

³Smith, Principles of Educational Sociology, p. 351.

⁴Ibid., p. 351.

necessity of a continued struggle in order to establish and maintain democracy is therefore inherent in human nature.¹

Liberty and freedom. If socialization is to be effective, Snedden cautions, education must present democracy's aims and objectives. If the standards and values of our society are to become the significant factors in human relations, they must be internalized by young people. Devotion to the idealism inherent in the democratic way of life must be more than "lip service."² Education for democratic living, the essence of the socialization process, requires skillful and dedicated teachers. The fundamental concept of equality of opportunity is difficult to teach. The student's questions must be answered satisfactorily before the idea of democracy can be assimilated.³

Snedden says that both liberty and freedom are involved in the democratic idea. When liberty has been achieved, freedom must be established and protected. Rights and privileges are defined by custom and law; the accompanying duties and responsibilities are outlined. The obligations of democratic

¹Ibid., p. 352.

²Snedden, A Digest of Educational Sociology, p. 43.

³Ibid., pp. 44-45.

citizenship are enforced through social pressures or legal sanctions.¹

In Snedden's analysis, democracy does not guarantee that every individual will attain every goal that he sets for himself. Some individuals may be frustrated in their pursuit of happiness as they define that pursuit, since true democracy implies the denial of special privilege. The fact that democracy demands equal opportunity for everyone does not mean that everyone is equal to the demands of democracy.²

Snedden foresees that individuals will have to develop and practice self-discipline if they are to function successfully under the discipline of democracy. A democratic government is organized to provide for the best interests of society. The process of democracy is the "tool" of freedom. The objective of democracy is to provide the greatest possible benefits to the greatest number of people while respecting the rights and privileges guaranteed to all.³

Snedden argues that implicit in socialization is the obligation to teach the fundamental principles of citizenship and the responsibilities that accompany the privileges inherent

¹Ibid., p. 47.

²Snedden, Towards Better Educations, pp. 323-325.

³Ibid., pp. 327-329.

in democracy.¹ If society is to fight and solve the problem of juvenile delinquency, for example, education must concern itself with self-discipline in young people. The standards of conduct and morality peculiar to the particular culture must be taught and demonstrated. Therefore, in Snedden's program, the idea of lawless freedom must be replaced by the concept of freedom under the law:

If young people are to learn the chief lesson of democracy--namely, that members of a society are truly free only so long as they protect the rights and privileges of their fellow men--the school must provide guidance, both formal and informal, in every area of the student's educational experience.²

Democracy in the United States

Dependent on other social institutions. Americans, Finney claims, have heard and read much about democracy. At the same time, Americans have done little to understand its meaning and significance. For many Americans the word has been a "handy tool" to cover vague ideas about government, even though little or no attention is given to the exact meaning that the word might carry. Some people seem to apply the term in describing individuals who are approachable, genial

¹Ibid., pp. 331-332.

²Ibid., p. 334.

and talkative. Others seem to think of democracy as a great "leveling process" by which all people are to be reduced to certain common levels and to certain fixed activities. Americans have "toyed with the word . . . until its use makes definition necessary."¹

Finney concedes that, in a broad sense, democracy is an attribute which can and often does accompany institutions other than the state and its "attending machinery" known as government. Democracy can be conceived as existing in the social institutions, the church, industry, the family, and the school. The existence of democracy within the state is largely dependent upon its existence in some of the other institutions.²

Individual determination of the law. Payne acknowledges the fact that many Americans do not understand the meaning and ideals of democracy. They think the fundamental idea is that each individual is guaranteed the right to do as he pleases at all times, is to be freed from restriction, and is free to follow any wish that may occur to him.³

¹Finney, General Social Science, p. 78.

²Ibid.

³E. George Payne, "Significant Developments in Education," The Journal of Educational Sociology, Vol. 19 (September, 1945), pp. 59-62.

Payne concedes that Americans who have for any reason developed such a meaning of democracy decide that obedience to any law is a matter of individual determination. If a given law is not liked, they assume that they have the right to break it. However, if each one claims immunity from the binding force of law, there is anarchy.¹

To Payne, it is natural for adolescents to develop a similar idea of democracy. The young citizen should learn that a democracy is primarily a government in which all may have a part in determining the laws. This is done either by voting on them directly or by voting for representatives who enact the laws. In a democracy, majorities decide. It is then the duty of both majority and minority groups to abide by the enacted laws. Once enacted, the laws should be binding on all until they are repealed.²

Each individual, according to Payne, does have the right to challenge any law, even the United States Constitution, and to try by established means to have a law changed or abolished. The United States Constitution has had numerous amendments and doubtless will be amended many more times. However, the individual in a democracy should abide by the

¹Ibid., p. 327.

²Payne, "Education, the War and After," pp. 90-91.

regularly enacted laws, not because of his loyalty to the form of government under which he lives. Payne implies that it is a rare individual who does not at some time claim individual protection through the laws.¹

The problem of stability. A perspective of Peters' viewpoint is provided in his book Objectives and Procedures in Civic Education. He explains that in the United States there is a great deal of boasting about democracy. Americans count themselves "blest" among the nations because theirs was the first to commit itself to popular government on a large scale, and because it has been the best example of a large state with a thoroughly democratic organization. The United States has always championed democracy not only in argument but also in action, "as witness the situation out of which the Monroe Doctrine historically grew . . ." Devotion to democracy has become a "primal passion" in America.²

According to Peters, democracy, as a mode of dealing with the complex world of today, is as yet only an experiment; it is still on trial. Great civilizations in the past have been broken "by their own weight, or by reason of inability to compete with virile new forms--Crete, Mycena, Athens, Rome,

¹Ibid., p. 92.

²Peters, Objectives and Procedures in Civic Education, p. 1.

Egypt, and others." There is no certainty that the same thing may not happen in the civilization of the United States.¹

Peters insists that many valuable possibilities are involved in democracy. It is the only state of society in which every person can stand on his own two feet and direct the forces with which he works. However, there are also many threatening possibilities. "It has within itself the dormant forces which, unloosed, may rend it to pieces." According to Peters, the critical problem for democracy is stability:

Can it, from within, so stabilize itself that its citizens will always adjust their rights to their duties and will continually temper self-direction with obedience, in such a way that the potential forces of disruption will expend themselves as propulsive rather than as explosive pressures?

Peters maintains that society must rely upon education for the guidance of its dynamic individuals. "By that is not meant merely having children go to school and get their minds trained"; that might be as harmful to society as helpful. Keeping democracy intact will depend upon the ability of the United States to equip all individuals with the insights, the ideals, the information and the skills necessary for making them directors of their own destinies.³ It is primarily the

¹Ibid., pp. 1-2.

²Ibid., p. 3.

³Ibid., pp. 3-5.

teacher who will determine the answer to the question, "Shall the present world-wide experiment in democracy come to a beautiful florescence and fructification or shall it shrivel and decay as did the classic civilizations of the past?" In Peters' opinion, one of the most vital questions for every teacher to consider is, "What kind of education is needed to make democracy successful?"¹

Dynamic democratic change. Smith believes that from the first "horde-like assemblages" of human beings, social organization has increased in complexity through the continuous extension of group relationships. In the United States, these complex relationships have been fostered by the trend toward democracy. No other subject has received so much attention from American thinkers and writers, nor has any other movement been more dominating. Every phase of life is influenced by it, and every institution in the United States "is being overhauled to meet its imperatives."²

It is this growth of democracy, Smith argues, that is speeding up the rate of social change. The forward rush of economic and social democracy was so overwhelming in the middle of the eighteenth century that historians have called

¹Ibid., pp. 6-7.

²Smith, Introduction to Educational Sociology, pp. 159-160.

the era the Industrial Revolution. However, Smith asserts, progress then was slow compared with recent advances:

Economic and social change must keep pace with the automobile, the transcontinental express, the telephone, the wireless telegraph, and the aeroplane. Science, art, business organization, political programs, and social selection are all being democratized and used in constant organizations of existing society.¹

Smith suggests that the school in the United States must recognize the principles of this "dynamic democratic change." They must deal with impulsive, forward-looking youth, ever impatient with static conditions. Education must be aggressive and progressive. Teachers need a wholesome conservatism to balance the radicalism of youth. However, this necessity has led them in the past to overstress institutional reverence and to hold to traditional culture and customs. Educators in the United States are now breaking through the "shell of convention" and facing present day problems. As their mission has broadened, they have had to deal with and understand the whole public. Therefore, they have been "infected with the democratic virus of the greatest good to the greatest number."²

Promotion of democracy. In the United States, according to Snedden, democracy is a way of group life in which persons

¹Smith, Principles of Educational Sociology, pp. 361-362.

²Ibid., p. 363.

share in making decisions concerning common problems.

Democracy promises the satisfaction of human needs by being responsible to them.

In Snedden's opinion, participation in the interaction of a democracy is the best experience for the development of personality and is the best preparation for the democratic way of life. Since the school is an agency for the development of personality, it follows that the school must include meaningful democratic group experiences as a vital part of its program.¹ From a sociological standpoint, there are two corollaries to this conclusion: "group experiences must satisfy the need of the community for informed participants, and the needs of the child for security and activity." Consequently, the task of the American school becomes that of guiding learners to participate in even more socially useful and individually satisfying democratic ways of group living.²

Democracy and Education

Investigation of various ideas and theories. In order to achieve the democratic ideal, Finney contends that the school must be kept free from influences by which certain

¹ Snedden, Sociological Determinants of Objectives in Education, p. 268.

² Ibid., p. 270.

agencies hope to have their ideas accepted by children at the expense of the public. The school should be a place where facts, ideas and theories should be investigated and positively accepted or rejected. In a democracy, the school should be a place where problems of life are solved and not an institution for the advancement of the ideas of those people who succeed in getting a hearing. Organizations should be examined before they are allowed to use the school to spread their ideas at the expense of the public. "Otherwise the school should open its doors to all persons who have a cause to plead rather than merely to some."¹

The following illustration provides insight into Finney's thought:

If this high purpose of freedom to study, examine, investigate and even accept the theories and ideas of people is to be attained it will mean that the teacher must not only be free from the control of those who would insist upon the exploitation of the school but the teacher must also be a well trained person of good judgement who is able to detect the motives as well as the errors in the material which is submitted for examination.²

Commercial organizations are eager to use the school as a place in which to distribute necessary commercial items and attempt to impress children with the importance of using them.

¹Finney, American Public School, pp. 139-142.

²Ibid., p. 143.

If the school is open to one organization for this purpose it should be open to all. "Probably the wisest course of procedure will be to open it to none."¹

The development of openmindedness. For Payne, democracy is the fundamental ideal of society and the ultimate goal toward which all school functions should be directed. This task, as a matter of education, requires two definite achievements:

. . . the elimination of the social defects that scientific discovery has demonstrated as necessary; and . . . the development of open mindedness upon those questions which the experience of the past and scientific investigation have not settled.²

For example, Payne says that medical science has determined that practices with reference to nutrition are essential to bodily vigor. The task of the school with references to nutrition within fixed limits is settled by what science has to say. In the field of government, questions concerned with the selection of our political leadership are in a state of flux and ideals of "open mindedness" are essential. It is not known whether the "convention, the primary election, the referendum, the commission form of government, proportional representation" will solve any of the social evils; all of

¹Ibid.

²Payne, Principles of Educational Sociology--An Outline, p. 63.

these must be regarded as experimental. The objective of the school, in reference to these practices, is to develop "open mindedness" and understanding.¹

The right kind of education. In Peters' analysis, "the artificiality of democracy demands that it be continually bolstered by propaganda and supported by purposive training." The natural tendency is to lapse from democracy into some form of aristocracy, so that there is continual danger of "having the shell, the form, of democracy but not the substance." The rank and file of people, apparently in control, tend to become a "phantom public."²

Peters cautions that if democracy is to be brought to "florescence and fructification," new ways must be found to prepare the members of our democratic groups for the effective accomplishment of the obligations they have assumed. This end cannot be accomplished by the decree of a president, or by the legislation of particular statutes. According to Peters, it must come about through the slow molding of individuals by the right kind of education:

. . . when education is defined broadly in the sense of controlling the reactions of persons by means of training that results from the total

¹Ibid., p. 64.

²Peters, Objectives and Procedures in Civic Education, p. 15.

efforts of all social agencies concerned with fitting men better to perform their duties.¹

Cause and effect. In Smith's thought, the relation of democracy and education is direct and fundamental. Education and democracy are "bound up in an unending chain of mutual cause and effect."² Each idea demands and fosters the other. More democracy means more general education, and more general education means more universal democracy. They are both mass movements, and call for mass treatment. A real democracy, Smith says, cannot exist without universal education, and universal education cannot be obtained except in a democracy:

Democratic education must be of the people, by the people, and for the people. It cannot be given from above. Philosophers and teachers and reformers cannot impart it. They are merely leaders, not the enshrined embodiments of wisdom to be worshipped from afar.³

German education, as Smith sees it, has obtained practically universal literacy. However, it is instruction given from above for definite economic and military purposes, and fails to function in lifting the masses of the German people above those of surrounding countries. Before that superiority can be obtained, the system must be made democratic. It

¹Ibid., p. 16.

²Smith, Introduction to Educational Sociology, pp. 165-166.

³Ibid., p. 166.

should be the kind of education the people want and must progress toward the development of a free, self-governed, and self-directed population. To be really educated, Smith believes that the population:

. . . must have initiative, a certain amount of personal independence, and the ability to organize the social structure on such a basis that they will be able, not only to multiply achievement, but to spread its benefits throughout the body politic.¹

The German educational system developed technical and expert leadership, but it failed to develop the mass movements and cooperation necessary to the "highest accomplishment."²

The growth of the ruling class. Snedden believes that the state is the one group that has the power to control all other groups as well as individuals. For this reason, the state must be controlled more efficiently by the intellectual phases of indirect contacts. Modern states have grown exceedingly large, and international relations are apparently developing into a possible world state for the relating of all parts of the world.³

Snedden further contends that the ruling class has been always more or less educated. That condition was one of the

¹Ibid., p. 167.

²Ibid., p. 168.

³Snedden, Educational Sociology, p. 106.

reasons why it was the ruling class. As the ruling class has enlarged and as democracy has developed, the training of intelligence needs to be extended to all those included in the citizenship. In a modern democracy every adult is supposed to participate. He must decide on his political actions among various problems and issues, his relations to many of which are only indirect. To insure further advances in effective democratic political control, the mass of the population must be more efficiently educated than now, else either "autocracy of wealth, or of education, or of ignorant agitators will prevail."¹

To Snedden, education and democracy go hand in hand:

Neither is likely to advance far without the other. Democracy depends upon an intelligent and trained electorate. On the other hand, an intelligent and trained populace is not going to submit to an autocratic rule. Such a population feels fully able to govern itself through cooperative action.²

Education and democracy both will develop much in the future, though both will need to be different and far more efficient than they are at present.³

¹Ibid., pp. 108-110.

²Ibid., p. 111.

³Ibid.

The Democratic Nature of the School Community

The changing curriculum. In Elementary Sociology, Finney maintains that the democratic nature of the school should be to make education perform its functions completely instead of partially. The curriculum will have to be changed even further if the objectives of the American educational system are to be fully achieved. The health of school children must be looked after adequately instead of partially; provisions for the vocational education of all must be completed. In Finney's view, this is the greatest of all educational problems "because the equipment will be expensive, the administration will be complicated, and . . . (vocational education) will have to be taken care of in special vocational schools closely connected with the industries themselves."¹ Studies adapted to civic training, particularly "civics, economics, sociology, and history," will have to be given an adequate place in the curriculum. The problem is to get rid of the subjects that impart only a false culture, and to select the ones that have real culture in them.²

Institutions, Finney asserts, consist of prevailing ways of "thinking, feeling, and willing." Institutional changes

¹Finney, Elementary Sociology, pp. 70-75.

²Ibid., p. 77.

are therefore nothing more than changes in the prevailing states of mind. To change the prevailing beliefs about education, for example, is to change the educational institution. The institutions of the future will depend upon the beliefs, ideals, and habits now being impressed into the minds of the rising generation. If individuals become prevalently law-abiding, the democratic government will work. However, if the habit of disregarding the law becomes prevalent, government will break down. The school is a "social machine" whose very business is to put knowledge of its own selection into all young minds, and to mold habits and ideals according to its own particular purposes. Therefore, the school can make the institutions of the future into what it pleases. Since institutions consist essentially of prevailing states of mind, it follows that the school is the "steering gear of a democratic society."¹

Real life experiences. Payne insists that the educational implications of the democratically constituted society deserve attention. Essentially this means that school life must be patterned after the democratic ideal. As Dewey has well stated, we never educate directly but indirectly by means of

¹Finney, "Education and the Reconstruction," pp. 11-16.

the environment.¹ Social attitudes, insights and habits are developed only in a social environment. The child becomes democratic by living in a democratic society. It is unreasonable to expect to develop in pupils a "humanistic spirit and a free intelligence" apart from a democratic school environment. The school, along with the home and other institutions, should be a "miniature society" possessing the traits of the democratic ideal. Therefore, all that has been stressed about the meaning of a democratic society is pertinent for a complete conception of a suitable social environment for the school.²

Emphasizing this point, Payne says, "the school is under obligation to make possible the child's dealing with numerous social problems similar to those in society but in a less complicated form."³ Society is very complex and is changing rapidly. The complexity and mobility of the present time seriously interfere with the sharing of students in its many problems. To deal with the ever new and complicated conditions of today requires the ability to solve social problems in a simplified form.⁴

¹Dewey, Democracy and Education, pp. 18-20.

²Payne, Principles of Educational Sociology, pp. 74-75.

³Ibid., pp. 76-77.

⁴Ibid., pp. 77-78.

In the simplified conditions of the school, practice in both leadership and fellowship is possible to the extent that even the most hesitant and backward children may participate sufficiently for their normal development. Left to chance development in the confusion outside the school, the aggressive easily become autocratic and domineering, while the timid become submissive and unintelligent followers. Payne contends that outside the school the child must continually make choices as he faces ever new social problems:

. . . whereas in the complex situations of society mutual understanding and the spirit of good will have increased largely by chance and at great cost, the relatively simple democratic society of the school can be used . . . to promote social mindedness, gained often after much friction and unhappiness outside the school.¹

The lack of democracy. The school community, Peters stresses, should be void of undemocratic elements. The democratic ideal condemns such practices as "snobbery, gambling, fighting, drinking, stealing, and improper conduct between the sexes, which go contrary to the welfare of society as a whole."² Society, in attempting to free itself from these practices, encounters uncontrollable conditions which make success extremely difficult. The school, however, can provide

¹ Ibid., p. 78.

² Peters, Objectives and Procedures in Civic Education, pp. 281-282.

children with a place to live which does not contain the "distracting evils" common in the adult community. This makes possible positive growth in a variety of acceptable interests. This will tend to strengthen the child against antisocial conduct prevalent outside the school.¹

Peters explains that full acceptance of the criterion of democracy automatically eliminates autocratic practices in school administration. Administrators and teachers talk much about the obligation of the school to turn out democratic citizens. However, in organization and procedure the school is often predominantly autocratic. The administrator dominates the teacher, and the teacher in turn dominates the pupil. The spirit and practice of democracy is often lacking throughout the school system. Educators must see that only as children are permitted and encouraged to live as democratic citizens in the school will they learn to live in like manner in the community.

Directed toward public end. In Smith's view, the school, more than other institutions, must meet the needs of the community. It is not supported by a class of people, but by the whole people. It serves, not one interest, but all

¹Ibid., pp. 283-284.

²Ibid., pp. 288-293.

interests. Social, economic, political and religious interests are equally bound up in the educational system. What may be best for one may not necessarily be best for the others, but what serves one will necessarily react upon all. What injures one of these fundamental interests cannot benefit another. They all depend for their highest welfare upon well-developed individuals, and they are consequently interested in the efficient work of the schools. "Just as all institutions must be vitally affected by the kind of training our children get in the home . . . so must they be affected by their later . . . training in the schools."¹

For Smith, the family and the play group are, in our civilization, mainly "individualistic enterprises." "The school is communal and socialistic."² The first two groups cannot be dominated by the public and cannot be controlled by public officials for the public good. However, the school, being a community enterprise, can be directed toward public ends. It can be made to train the children of the public for political, economic, and social welfare. "Not only can it be done but largely in proportion as it is done can the school as a compulsory public institution be justified."³

¹Smith, Introduction to Educational Sociology, pp. 102-104.

²Smith, Principles of Educational Sociology, pp. 187-188.

³Ibid., p. 188.

Therefore, in Smith's analysis, the individual and social ends of education must be looked after. However, since the home looks primarily after the individual welfare of the specific child, the school must be careful not to neglect the social welfare of the individual as related to the social welfare of all. Consequently the aim of the school must be to train the child as definitely as possible to take up the duties of politics, business and society, and to carry them on efficiently. Likewise, since schools are locally supported, they owe their "training allegiance" to the local community.¹

An important source of educative experience. Snedden concedes that the school community ranks next after the home as the most important source of educative experience and development for children. Classroom and school are the source and the "clearing house" of numerous small associations, such as "gangs, cliques, clubs, and sets" through which such education proceeds.²

Snedden suggests that the membership of the school community is "extremely heterogeneous--male or female, old and young, leisurely and preoccupied . . . it embraces poor

¹Ibid., pp. 188-189.

²Snedden, Educational Sociology, pp. 88-89.

and prosperous, ignorant and learned, moral and immoral, native and alien."¹

Therefore, according to Snedden, a large variety of problems arise out of community education:

Can the school community be so educated that its composite qualities and influence shall be approved by those holding moderately high standards or social values? . . . Will it make of itself a good "school" for the educative development of the rising generation?²

Snedden maintains that on the other side are the similar problems of educational objectives in schools. The children of today will control the community of a few decades from now. "What shall be included in their social education for the purpose of preparing them to maintain higher community standards in their day?"³ Historic forms of school education have done little in the direction of "concrete appreciations, evaluations, and insights." These objectives of education are to be adequately developed only on the basis of a better democratic community than has yet evolved.⁴

¹Ibid., p. 89.

²Ibid.

³Ibid., pp. 89-92.

⁴Ibid., pp. 94-96.

Summary

According to these educational sociologists, the school exists primarily for the benefit of the community it serves. The types of pupils, their vocations and interests, their hopes and prospects regarding the future, their customs and habits, the similarities and differences of groups within any community vary from community to community. Every community has a slightly different pattern of socialization. Local requirements and needs also vary along with cultural patterns.

For these educational sociologists, the school is not only a social institution in itself but is also supplementary to other social institutions in nature and function. It has to cooperate with them all. It should therefore know the distinctive characteristics and needs of the people of its community. However, every community is inevitably interrelated with other communities and is a part of the larger community, the state and nation. The school should adapt its general philosophy and specific purposes to the needs of its own small community as well as to those of the larger community of which it is a part. In other words, the school should adapt its functions, both cultural and social, to its regional and democratic needs.

In this chapter the main objectives of education in a democratic community, according to the selected educational sociologists, were compared.

The following chapter will present the Summary, Conclusions, and Recommendations to the views compared in Chapters III, IV, V, VI, and VII.

CHAPTER VIII

SUMMARY, CONCLUSIONS, AND RECOMMENDATIONS

The origins of educational sociology can be traced back to the seventeenth century when European theorists proposed to improve society through a controlled environment and to effect social programs by means of education. Their effort awakened interest among American educators and sociologists, some of whom began to discuss these ideas in their writings and to devise courses in which prospective teachers might come to understand the close relationships between sociology and education.

Beginning in 1898 and for ten consecutive years, educators and sociologists of New York University, Clark, Stanford, Chicago, Virginia, Columbia, and the normal schools of Minnesota, Wisconsin, and North Dakota offered educational sociology courses for the first time. Other American thinkers concentrated upon the type of education which might effect social consciousness in school children; they called this kind

of training "social education."¹ Such an emphasis in the education of children gave added impetus to the introduction of educational sociology courses in teacher training programs, and efforts were made to establish a closer relationship between sociology and education.

This study examines the educational and sociological views of : Ross Lee Finney, E. George Payne, Charles Clinton Peters, Walter Robinson Smith, and David Samuel Snedden. More specific, the study compares the major areas of agreement and disagreement between these five early leaders in the field of educational sociology. Included is a descriptive and historical investigation of these educational sociologists. Particular attention is given the following questions as the questions are viewed by these five educational sociologists:

1. How do these five educational sociologists view the significance of educational sociology?
2. What is the sociological concept of education in the work of these educational sociologists?
3. According to these educational sociologists, what has been the effect of religion and the family on education?

¹Drost, David Snedden and Education for Social Efficiency, p. 83.

4. How do these educational sociologists regard the purpose of social control?
5. What are the main objectives of educational sociology in a democratic society, according to these educational sociologists?

Summary

Finney, Payne, Peters, Smith, and Snedden are distinguished educational sociologists, each of whom exemplified an expression of American educational thought in the early part of the twentieth century. These men lived in the same historical period and were affiliated with similar intellectual groups.

The evidence presented in this research has certain implications for all persons who are concerned with the American educational system.

According to Finney, education should be consistent throughout the nation. Children in more fortunate communities should not have better schools than those in less fortunate communities. In Snedden's view, education is one of the means followed by society to communicate its culture. It is the means by which a social group molds the inexperienced generation to support those responsibilities accepted by the more experienced.

For Snedden, sociology is the science that discusses the social relations of human beings. Snedden and Smith maintain that there are two views of sociology: the pure, or theoretic, and the applied, or practical. For these two men, sociology is concerned with the underlying theories of social interaction, and applied sociology is concerned with the effective applicability of these theories in the control and direction of social activities.

Payne states that educational sociology defines the institutions and social forms through which the pupil increases and classifies his knowledge. Further, these institutions and social forms are connected to the educational system in its development and changing role.

In Finney's opinion, educational sociology is concerned with investigating the structural and effective phases of the educative process. Educational sociology is the investigation of the social and cultural processes as they pertain to the educative process.

Educational sociology, by Payne's analysis, cannot limit itself exclusively to the investigation of the school as an educational institution; therefore, educational sociology appraises the educational work of the complimentary institutions in order to interpret the educational province of the school.

Finney stresses that sociological exploration into social processes contributes immensely to education. The educational sociologist furnishes the fundamental element and related view of the social order. By stressing its sociological approach to all educational problems, sociology is focusing attention on the fact that schools should be complete propagandists for democracy. Educational sociology explains the adaptation of education to the demands of society and the bearing of group phenomena upon the educational procedures by which these demands are satisfied.

Snedden defines socialization as that process which transmits to the individual the basic knowledge of a society, and this basic knowledge allows him to employ his skills intelligently in various situations. Socialization is the process whereby society orients the individual toward those values and beliefs deemed ultimately important.

Socialization, Finney says, includes learning how to solve issues of all types. He contends that the gathering of problem-solving techniques is an important segment of the educational process.

Smith admits that a socially educated person must have extensive interests and associations and a sane outlook upon life. A fully socialized education would ensure that whatever personal ability and character one owned it would be

readily and intelligently used in social, civic, and cultural affairs.

Education, for Peters, goes on wherever one is having experiences that will allow him to handle better any predicament in the future. All education must be by experience. Any schooling that does not consist of giving vital experiences to the student is really not educative.

The church, according to Peters, should supplement the moral education of the school and the common religious attitudes the school can produce by appealing to sanctions not available to the church. The church should serve as the "continuation school" for adults who no longer are able to gain the assistance of any other educational agency.

Neither the church nor the school, by Smith's analysis, is giving adequate religious education. They should cooperate. Some of the spiritual aspirations and ethical idealism of the church may be introduced into the school, and the teaching efficiency of the school may be introduced into the churches.

Payne regards the family as composing the first social group in which the child increases and arranges his social experience. It is the most basic group in giving direction to personality and social adjustment. Payne further asserts that unity of family life is in member interaction. The family does not depend for existence on the harmonious

relations of its members nor does it necessarily dissolve as a result of struggles between its members. The family lives as long as interaction takes place and dies when it ceases.

Payne cautions that living in society as a socialized human being demands some adherence to customs and rules. Most people attain patterns of conduct which agree with the social expectations in their primary groups. Individuals come to think and act according to these standards, and such habits are the basis of social control. Social control has roots deep into the psychological process. Control of all behavior is entwined within the individual's personality and experience.

Finney states that social control is contingent upon the dominance of certain beliefs, ideals, and habits of the social mind. If social control is to be attained, those contents of the social mind must be imparted from generation to generation.

Finney's view is that education aids social control by serving as at least one agency which transmits mores. Beliefs and practices transmitted by society are accepted for the sake of attaining the maximum of social order with the expenditure of a minimum of work.

For Smith, democracy is the aim of civilization, and both liberty and freedom are included in the democratic ideal.

When liberty has been attained, freedom must be verified and protected.

Payne and Finney maintain that Americans have done little to comprehend the meaning and significance of democracy. Finney says democracy is a "handy tool" to disguise obscure ideas about government and that little consideration is given to the specific meaning of democracy. Finney believes that the school should be a place where facts, ideas, and theories should be investigated and positively accepted or rejected. In a democracy, the school should be a place where problems of life are solved.

Smith believes that the school must meet the demands of the community. The aim of the school should be to instruct the child to take up the duties of politics, business, and society, and to carry them on efficiently. Since schools are locally supported, they owe their "training allegiance" to the local community.

The five educational sociologists under investigation are worthy of study. Each man was clearly motivated by his interest in improving conditions of development for future generations. Each believed that education is a means for bringing about improvement. Of special interest is the fact that all were concerned with processes which give to posterity ideals which accentuated the tradition of liberty and freedom.

The work of these men initiated the systematic study of educational sociology in the United States.¹ This method of study marked the beginning of a viable methodology for the investigation of educational problems. These scholars made an effort to extricate themselves from an a priori mode of thought concerned with the problems of education. This development in methodology was basic to the rise of educational sociology and contributed to the growth of the scientific foundations of education.

The field of education has been greatly influenced by scientific procedure. This influence contributes to considerable experimentation, and important contributions have been made to various educational techniques. There is a rising undercurrent of opinion that too much emphasis is being given to the perfection of scientific techniques. Science can tell how to accomplish an end, but it cannot tell whether that end ought to be accomplished. Therefore Finney feels that a new social and educational philosophy is needed into which should be woven the accumulated results of scientific experimentation. The frame of reference in which Finney develops his educational views is that of the cultural heritage. The cultural heritage should be preserved, but Finney fails to say what

¹Brown, Educational Sociology, pp. 41-43.

cultural heritage he would preserve. He also does not specify what means he would use to accomplish this objective. To talk about functions of education in broad generalities is simple, but to define exactly what one means by a general function of education is rather difficult. It is even more difficult to indicate precisely the means to be used in accomplishing generally agreed-upon goals of education. In Causes and Cures for the Social Unrest, Finney says, "This book is addressed to persons who regard themselves as one hundred per cent American . . ."¹ This appears to be a piece of propaganda and could be viewed as an attempt to sell to the socialized middle class a sympathetic understanding of the causes of proletarian unrest.

Finney envisions himself as a crusader for the American middle class. He thinks that the school should guide social evolution and that it is the business of teachers to run not merely the school but the world. The world will never be truly civilized until teachers assume that responsibility. Finney opposes an educational philosophy that encourages the individual to rise out of his class because in a democratic society the hope of such a rise must remain a delusion for all but a few. His solution for the class difficulty would

¹Finney, Causes and Cures for the Social Unrest, p. 211.

be to enable the lower classes to escape en masse out of their cultural deprivation by the introduction of some institution comparable to the Danish folk high school.

Finney maintains that if educators in the larger sense are to influence the evolution of society then they must have a clear insight into the evolution and current functioning of ideals and institutions.

Although essentially an educational sociologist, E. George Payne did not produce a treatise on this subject. This may be due to the fact that his time had been so largely consumed in research and administrative duties and that his predominantly practical nature led him to avoid system building.

Payne reveals a definite political preconception in favor of democracy. It is evident that he has identified himself with the Jeffersonian conception of the function of education as an aid and support to democracy. His emphasis upon the social heritage as the subject matter for education and educational research appears to be too limited. More and more educators are coming to look upon educational prediction and projection as legitimate for educational research. Payne's early research deals with the inadequacy of individual psychology. He was one of the first¹ to challenge the

¹Ogburn, "Contributions to Sociological Research," p. 23.

entrenched position of a psychology that emphasizes the deterministic aspects of instincts and intelligence quotients and then seeks to classify children on the basis of batteries of aptitude and achievement tests with total disregard of causative factors outside the individual. The evolution of a science depends upon its environment. Payne gave to the forces attempting to develop educational sociology a rich experience based on his expertise in understanding the practical relations of educational institutions with other social institutions. His work is important because he saw the realness of the factors that were basic and fundamental. In current sociological research, one of the most important trends is the examination of the shifting of latent and manifest social functions in a world of social change. These shifts are from one social institution to another, that is, from family to government, from village to industry. Payne's work contributed to this trend. Schools did not exist in a vacuum and they were a part of the social fabric. In this modern world of changing institutions, the school is the recipient of forces emanating from community, industry, and family. Education was and is sociological.

Payne is one of the first among modern sociologists¹ who grasp the importance of research and an experimental basis

¹Bernard, "Contributions to Education," p. 22.

for practical, social, and educational programs. His research emphasis is upon the testing of old programs and the construction of new ones rather than upon theoretical research for the sake of research. His earlier experiences make him practical minded and his long administrative career perpetuates this outlook in sociological investigation.

Like his predecessors, Peters finds difficulty in organizing the various materials that must be dealt with in educational sociology. Educational sociology appeals to two types of thinkers: (1) the sociologist who is interested in the sociology of education and in the school as a fundamental social institution, and (2) the practical educator, who is interested in the contributions sociology can make to educational theory and the aid it can render him in the solution of his daily problems. Both phases of the subject need vital scientific treatment. Peters' approach is that of the professionally trained educator, but he has dealt quite effectively with such phases of the social process as association, socialization, social control, social progress, and democracy. His conception of educational sociology is that it should not be considered as merely sociology for teachers. It should not seek to study sociology from the standpoint of education but rather to study education in its sociological aspects. The educational sociologist should show the

adjustment of education to the needs of society and the bearing of group phenomena upon the educational procedures by which these needs must be met.¹

Peters' most significant contribution lies in the insistence upon sociological research into educational problems. In Foundations of Educational Sociology, he outlines special techniques for making specific quantitative studies for determining educational objectives as a basis for curriculum-making. It should also be noted that he scarcely mentions the sociological aspects of administration, discipline, and method, which are vital parts of a genuine educational sociology in the determination of aims and curricula.

Smith says that the schools have drawn their inspiration more from their own traditions than from their social environment. Education has been too much of an isolated institution. He further maintains that ". . . in our day social organization has become so complex and democratic that we are perforce growing more interdependent and cooperative."² According to Smith, it is therefore necessary to increase the reach and broaden the content of school work. Smith sees education as the introduction of the young into society's heritage and life;

¹Peters, Foundations of Educational Sociology, p. vi.

²Smith, An Introduction to Educational Sociology, p. vii.

he regards this as a rather novel view. In the preface of An Introduction to Educational Sociology, Smith states that he must be elementary because sociologists are untrained in educational theory, educators are untrained in sociology, and undergraduates are untrained in either field. This infers that educational sociology may be an application of sociology only in the mind of the instructor; it is an independent discipline to be developed on foundations of its own.

Educational sociology does not cover the whole of sociology, even in review. Smith defines his subject as "the application of the scientific spirit, methods, and principles of sociology to the study of education."¹ It would seem that educational sociology, in the ordinary meaning of the term, is not sociology at all, but rather a sociological study of education. Such a correlation of two different subjects would naturally presuppose some acquaintance with both. Educational sociology must take into account every phase of sociological thought, but in "an elementary treatise an application of the teachings of each division of the general field would be needlessly complex and academic."² He merely selects those principles out of the general field which seem

¹Ibid., p. 15.

²Ibid., pp. 42-43.

to be necessary to educational sociology as a system coherent within itself.

In spite of the sociological emphasis in the development of educational theory and practice, no book had appeared until Walter R. Smith wrote An Introduction to Educational Sociology in 1917. Smith organized the principles of sociology and applied them specifically to the particular problems of education, and the book has been credited as the first to be concerned specifically with educational sociology. Since 1917, numerous textbooks and revisions of earlier ones have appeared frequently.

Snedden's significance in American education may be found in his ability to delineate and articulate the ever present possibilities in curriculum making and/or education for social efficiency. Social efficiency, as Snedden defines it, is the position in education that requires the direct teaching of knowledge, attitudes, and skills, intended to shape the individual to predetermined social characteristics. Social efficiency presumes to improve society by making its members more vocationally useful and socially responsible. Those who blame the schools for not remedying the ills of society frequently look to social efficiency as the means to reform. Applied to the curriculum, social efficiency usually leads to the demand for reorganization of studies and sometimes

requires a whole new synthesis of different and more practical subjects. Snedden asked that traditional subjects be reviewed to determine their possible contribution "to the more specific and satisfactory aims of education."¹

At different times, variations of this position have appeared under other names. Social efficiency was the outstanding characteristic of the proposals for life adjustment education in the late forties and early fifties. The essentialist platform of William Bagley in 1938 emphasized the importance of the minimum essentials and of the selection and teaching of organized studies. Bagley himself used the term "social efficiency" as far back as 1905.² At an even earlier date it was implicit in Herbartian Frank McMurry's "tower of strength," explained as a little knowledge thoroughly understood which would shape the thoughts that control conduct. The Herbartian reorganization of subject matter around a single center of interest may also have proved useful in stimulating the imagination of the educator for social efficiency. Regardless of the sect, all who take this position tend to reject the notion of pursuing a study simply for the pleasure of learning.

¹David S. Snedden, "History as an Instrument in the Social Education of Children," Journal of Pedagogy, Vol. 19 (June, 1906), p. 259.

²William Bagley, The Educative Process (New York: The Macmillan Company, 1905), p. 60.

Snedden went a step further than the social efficiency tradition by proposing that a concerted effort be made to determine the probable destination of each individual in society and to prescribe a curriculum especially suited to promote his ultimate efficiency. Snedden seemed to be concerned only with maintenance of the status quo. He seemed to have had a limited view of the amount of future upward mobility possible for the individual, except within carefully prescribed bounds.

The rigid structuring of society, first by 1960, then by 1980, was not a main feature of Snedden's programs for the schools.¹

His sociological determination of objectives with little allowance for changing circumstances and the introduction of new knowledge was another matter. The importance of this contribution may be readily verified from latter-day assumptions about education for life adjustment and some current educational proposals for the inner city.

Snedden seemed to refuse to consider the opportunity for social mobility afforded by the principle of free election and wide opportunity for choice. When he was forced to react

¹David S. Snedden, American High Schools and Vocational Schools in 1960 (New York: Teacher College Press, 1931); "Rural Education in 1960--A Prophecy," Addresses and Proceedings of the National Education Association (1932).

to this possibility, he expressed doubt that students, parents, or teachers could render a wise choice. Instead, much of what he came to consider the science of education, or more precisely educational sociology, was concerned with making these kinds of decisions for groups of people.

When pressed to make a choice between social efficiency and democracy Snedden maintained that efficiency must prevail. This position was quite consistent with another of his views: that the schools, as the only institution of society in the control of the government, should be consciously used for purposes of social control and should represent the majority view in society. Snedden presented the school as an institution of the majority and felt that the school was obligated to reinforce majority views. He conceded the school might cause its graduates to become aware of problems and provide them with an attitude receptive to change, but he never explained how he intended to accomplish this with an educational program based upon maintenance of the status quo. He made it quite clear, however, that it was not the business of the school to bring about social change.

In a new field he had helped to define, Snedden became the spokesman of the most thorough-going form of social efficiency. It was a reasonable consequence of the environment

from which he rose, the intellectual content he found stimulating, and the major social reform movement where he had found a place. His proposals, put forward as "concrete" solutions likely to withstand the tests of time or as projections of what the future must hold, had the added appeal of offering surety in an area where it was not commonly found. It is possible that his own view of upward social mobility, based upon hard work and keen intellect in the best tradition of the "American dream," is more eloquent in its message than its own proposals of education for social efficiency.

The Journal of Educational Sociology. In 1927, The National Society for the Study of Educational Sociology under the direction of Finney, Payne, Peters, Smith, and Snedden began publication of The Journal of Educational Sociology.

The Journal was committed fundamentally to the scientific conception of the nature of educational sociology, but it also looked beyond research to the use of its products in the practice of educational reconstruction and to the improvement of educational philosophy.

Throughout the history of The Journal the leading authorities of the related fields have contributed to its pages. One of the most satisfying characteristics of the

journal has been that its pages have been open from the beginning to fledglings in research. In the second issue a place was made for a preliminary report of research by a graduate student, and in most other issues reports of other beginners in research have appeared. This policy has stimulated interest both in doing and in reporting research. It has encouraged graduate students at universities to think more scientifically of the problems of educational sociology and to make and report investigations. These two elements particularly characterize this journal and attract to its pages younger enthusiasts in the field. One of the results has been that names not as "well-known" have come to have more prominent places in more recent issues. The encouragement of The Journal as an outlet of early scholarly efforts has contributed in no small measure to scholarly development and success.

The Journal occupies a unique place in sociological and educational periodical literature. To a certain extent it is a liaison between sociology and education, but it also has an established place of its own as a journal dedicated to the development of scientific sociology. Early in its history it found a welcomed place among the approved national journals of the American Sociological Society and of various national

educational associations. Throughout the years, national societies have continued to give it high rank among professional periodicals because of the scientific character of its work.

The Journal continues to hold to its original purposes and point of view of educational sociology as a new scientific field developing from the application of principles and methods of sociology to the problems of education.

One of its other outstanding contributions is that it has been instrumental in making educators more conscious of education as an integral part of the social structure and organization, and it has made sociologists conscious of a new and productive field for scientific research. The recognition of the importance of sociology in education as a medium of research and reconstruction is indeed a noteworthy contribution to social progress. Sociologists and educators are brought into closer understanding of mutual interests and points of view through a growing consciousness of the interdependence of education and social well-being; cooperation is resulting from the common interests and purposes for the improvement of the individual study of society.

The major insight of Finney, Payne, Peters, Smith, and Snedden must be considered because it is the essence of their

thought. The major insight of these educational sociologists may be described as an ability for synthesizing educational issues, a way of seeing things in their whole relationships. In the sociological sense, they clearly saw the need for the education of all aspects of the human personality. In the actual process of education they systematized and synthesized the functions of education to help the pupil learn more effectively. These educational sociologists often overstate their arguments, make dogmatic statements difficult to substantiate, and misuse statistics. Nevertheless, they draw public attention to some serious weaknesses of education and have made some constructive proposals for reform.

Conclusions

The author of this dissertation concludes that education is not fixed or static. Across the span of centuries, education has changed to meet the constantly expanding needs of man. Education is currently receiving an unprecedented amount of attention and scrutiny from both academicians and laymen alike. Vast amounts of financial and manpower resources are being expended for educational research and development. Debate over educational policy rages among public officials and consumes an increasingly larger amount of space in newspapers and journals.

Within American colleges and universities, academicians from a diversity of disciplines have developed a variety of interests in the study of education. During the last two decades the study of education has emerged as a distinct field within the discipline of sociology.

Today, there is little disagreement with the fundamental assumption that education is a social phenomenon with definite social goals. Education is being integrated with sociology. Similarly, educational sociology is becoming a science which is uniting sociology and education. Through this union the knowledge of sociological method, problems, and generalizations may be adequately interpreted to every educator. Modern education cannot disregard the contributions of sociology; it must depend, in both theory and practice, on the knowledge made available by the advances of sociology.

Sociology, in its relation to education, still remains in the "twilight zone" of social science, despite the fact that it has steadily witnessed distinct progress in determining its viewpoint, scope, methodology, and worth. The field of educational sociology is often considered an "academic orphan." The editors of the Encyclopedia of the Social Sciences, completed in 1935, refused educational sociology the privilege of being a member of the social science family by the simple

process of failing to mention it as a subject or to include references to studies devoted to it. Yet, one of the main contributions of sociology has been the gradual development of educational sociology. Educational sociology, in turn, has made considerable contributions to sociology as well as to education.

Educational sociology was originally involved with issues such as the connection of education to the family, the church, race, industry, government, and the community. As a result of the direction of Finney, Payne, Peters, Smith, and Snedden, educational sociology expanded its pursuits toward more comprehensive goals. These men attempted to construct an educational and sociological science which could specifically influence the aims and methods of everyday life.

According to these five educational sociologists, educational sociology must furnish all school personnel with definite standards and attainable objectives through the investigation of specific social groups. The fundamental contribution sociology can make to education is to increase sociological insights and concepts that will allow an accounting of organizational, cultural, and interpersonal factors which influence educational decisions. We have seen through the presentations of these five educational sociologists

that they have accentuated a pluralistic approach to educational issues.

There are hazards to be avoided as well as advantages to be gained from the more personal relation between the disciplines of sociology and education. One of these hazards is the utilization of results of limited sociological research to form generalized conclusions that have no reasonable foundation. Sociologists as well as educators have failed in this respect. A second hazard is the indiscriminate acceptance of unconfirmed statements made by sociologists. Speculations need to be differentiated from confirmed statements. There are many justifiable pronouncements to be found in the textbooks of the educational sociologists under investigation that, although controversial, are founded on strict research statements.

Also hazardous is the acceptance of sociological research findings without a critical examination of assumptions and without the use of adequate research methods. The literature on the significance of social class structure in American education is permeated with these and other hazards. Every educator needs to be cognizant of these difficulties in the application of sociological investigations to educational issues.

In their investigations, and in their specific educational suggestions, these men have not in any way disputed the economic, social, or educational pattern. Although these five educational sociologists have conceded the possibility that improvements could be made to both the democratic order and the educational system, their disclosures have been only moderate in character. These educational sociologists have done little to arouse the American public out of its complacency toward the public school system. They have not forced educators to re-examine their own ideas and to make these ideas more explicit and understandable to the general public. They have failed to help turn a national spotlight on educational problems.

Recommendations

The summary and conclusions of this investigation suggest a number of recommendations which should be of interest and concern to those interested in the effectiveness of the school, the future of the family, the future of the community, and the future of the nation. The sociological view of education insists that social vision be used in order to assess the various forces that have a bearing on educational and sociological objectives. Social institutions must be preserved,

perpetuated, and revised; and they must meet the needs of an advancing civilization. According to these educational sociologists, the school must aid in perceiving the social heritage, in adding to the efficiency of social organization, and in encouraging active participation in the agencies of social control. Their bold solution to the problems of the twentieth century is basically to return to the educational methods of the nineteenth century. Such a solution is more one of timidity than of foresight.

With the universal trend toward social emphasis in the political, economic, and social life of the world, it seems safe to predict that the social emphasis in teacher education courses will not diminish. It seems safe to assume that this emphasis will grow in importance. In view of world-wide events and in view of the present transitional status of educational sociology, it would be advisable for educational sociologists to concentrate their efforts in three areas. First, some attempt should be made to foster greater cooperation among professional educators, sociologists, and social scientists interested in maintaining a social emphasis in teacher-education. It is urgent that educators, sociologists, and social scientists comprehend the similarities in their conceptions of the field; they should be willing to share and

discuss their ideas. A common effort to designate and delineate the field seems essential. Second, educators, sociologists, and social scientists should try to enlist the support of an official body of educators in order to strengthen their professional ties with the American Sociological Association, the American Educational Research Association, the National Society for the Study of Education, and the National Society of College Teachers of Education. A review of the current periodicals in education shows that these organizations have been more concerned with the sociological problems in education than others. One means of improving relations with the American Sociological Association would be for educators to show greater appreciation for the contribution sociologists have made to the field through educational sociology.¹ Third, the field of educational sociology would further progress if research throughout the years were systematically analyzed, organized, and evaluated in a manner similar to that used by the editors of the Psychological Abstracts. A review indicates that a thorough investigation of the literature in educational sociology has not been carried out in over forty years.

Any definite prediction concerning the future trends in educational sociology is extremely dangerous. A critical

¹American Sociological Association Directory of Members 1973-1974 (Washington, D.C.: American Sociological Association, 1974), pp. 422-426.

view of society indicates that educational sociology must play a more significant part in the training of future teachers in this country. Educational trends lead one to reasonably assume that the social concerns of the school must expand.¹

Consideration of the research needs in certain problem areas in educational sociology leads to the conclusion that education is a rich area for very necessary sociological inquiry. Many problems exist which can be solved only through systematic research. Exploration of these problems will undoubtedly yield a rich harvest to the storehouse of sociological knowledge and the field of education.

¹Jerome S. Bruner, On Knowing: Essays for the Left Hand (New York: Atheneum, 1965).

BIBLIOGRAPHY

Primary Sources

1. Books

- Finney, Ross L. The American Public School. New York: The Macmillan Company, 1921.
- _____. Causes and Cures for the Social Unrest. New York: The Macmillan Company, 1922.
- _____. Elementary Sociology. New York: Sanborn, 1923.
- _____. General Social Science. New York: The Macmillan Company, 1926.
- _____, and Zeleny, Leslie. An Introduction to Educational Sociology. Boston: Heath, 1934.
- _____. A Sociological Philosophy of Education. New York: The Macmillan Company, 1927.
- Payne, E. George. Principles of Educational Sociology--An Outline. New York: New York University Press, 1928.
- _____, ed. Readings in Educational Sociology. Two vols. New York: Prentice-Hall, 1933.
- Peters, Charles C. Curriculum of Democratic Education. New York: McGraw-Hill, 1942.
- _____. Foundations of Educational Sociology. New York: The Macmillan Company, 1924.
- _____. Objectives and Procedures in Civic Education. New York: Longmans, Green and Co., 1930.

Smith, Walter R. Introduction to Educational Sociology.
New York: Houghton-Mifflin, 1917.

_____. Principles of Educational Sociology. New York:
Houghton-Mifflin, 1924.

Snedden, David S. Administration and Educational Work of
American Juvenile Reform Schools. New York: Teachers
College, 1907.

_____. American High Schools and Vocational Schools in
1960. New York: Teachers College, 1931.

_____. Cultural Education for Common Sense. New York:
The Macmillan Company, 1931.

_____. A Digest of Educational Sociology. New York:
Columbia University Press, 1920.

_____. Educational Applications of Sociology. New York:
Century, 1924.

_____. Educations for Political Citizenship. New York:
Teachers College, 1934.

_____. Educational Sociology. New York: Century, 1923.

_____. Educational Sociology for Beginners. New York:
The Macmillan Company, 1928.

_____. Foundations of Curricula: Sociological Analysis.
New York: Teachers College Press, 1927.

_____. An Introductory Sociology for Teachers. New York:
Nelson, 1935.

_____. Problems of Educational Readjustment. Boston:
Houghton, 1913.

_____. Problems of Secondary Education. Boston: Houghton,
1917.

_____. The Problems of Vocational Education. Boston:
Houghton, 1910.

_____, with Warner, William E., and others. Reconstruction of Industrial Arts Courses. New York: Teachers College, 1927.

_____. School Educations: Sociological Sources of Values. New York: Columbia University Press, 1930.

_____, and Allen, William. School Reports and School Efficiency. New York: The Macmillan Company, 1908.

_____. Sociological Determinants of Objectives in Education. Philadelphia: Lippincott, 1921.

_____. Towards Better Educations: Some Critical Sociological Examinations. New York: Teachers College Press, 1931.

_____. Vocational Education. New York: The Macmillan Company, 1920.

_____. What's Wrong with American Education. Philadelphia: Lippincott, 1927.

2. Articles

Finney, Ross L. "Education as a Factor in Social Progress." Educational Research, Vol. 58, June, 1919, pp. 39-58.

_____. "Education and the Reconstruction." School and Society, Vol. 8, July 6, 1918, pp. 11-17.

_____. "The Function of Educational Sociology." School and Society, Vol. 19, May 19, 1924, pp. 110-120.

_____. "The Function of Sociology in the Training of Teachers." Educational Research, Vol. 63, February, 1922, pp. 110-120.

_____. "Prime Task of Educational Sociology." School and Society, Vol. 19, May 19, 1924, pp. 623-627.

_____. "Religion and the Reconstruction." Bible World, Vol. 52, November, 1918, pp. 227-233.

- _____. "Sociological Principles of Determining the Elementary Curriculum." School and Society, Vol. 7, March 23, 1918, pp. 338-339.
- _____. "Sociological Principles Fundamental to Pedagogical Method." Educational Review, Vol. 55, February, 1918, pp. 91-110.
- _____. "A Sociologist's View on Character Education." Religious Education, Vol. 24, March, 1930, pp. 127-131.
- _____. "Ultimate Aim of Education." Educational Review, Vol. 56, November, 1918, pp. 305-324.
- _____. "What Do We Mean By Community Civics and Problems of Democracy." School Review, Vol. 32, September, 1924, pp. 521-528.
- Payne, E. George. "Community Coordination and Education." The Compass Needle, Vol. IV, May-June, 1937, pp. 24-27.
- _____. "Determining the Results of Education." The Journal of Educational Sociology, Vol. 11, April, 1938, pp. 468-472.
- _____. "The Development of Educational Sociology in America and Its Present Status." Sociological Review, 1936.
- _____. "Editorial." The Journal of Educational Sociology, Vol. 2, February, 1929, pp. 331-333.
- _____. "Editorial." The Journal of Educational Sociology, Vol. 1, September, 1927, p. iv.
- _____. "Editorial." The Journal of Educational Sociology, Vol. 5, May, 1932, pp. 531-532.
- _____. "Editorial." The Journal of Educational Sociology, Vol. 2, September, 1938, pp. 1-2.
- _____. "Editorial Notes." The Journal of Educational Sociology, Vol. 2, January, 1929, p. 271.
- _____. "Educational Sociology in City Training Schools." School and Society, Vol. IX, February, 1919, pp. 212-216.

- _____. "Education, the War and After." The Journal of Educational Sociology, September, 1941, Vol. 15, No. 1, pp. 83-92.
- _____. "A New Educational Function." School and Society, Vol. 20, August, 1924, pp. 216-218.
- _____. "A Program of Educational Sociology." The Journal of Educational Sociology, Vol. II, April, 1929, pp. 457-463.
- _____. "The Progress of Educational Sociology." Proceedings of the American Sociological Society, 1927, pp. 260-266.
- _____. "The Relation of Educational Sociology to Educational Psychology." School and Society, Vol. XIX, June, 1924, pp. 653-657.
- _____. "Research Problems and Trends in Educational Sociology." Journal of Educational Research, Vol. XXV, April-May, 1932, pp. 239-252.
- _____. "Significant Developments in Education." The Journal of Educational Sociology, Vol. 19, September, 1945, pp. 59-62.
- _____. "Social Control of Education." The Compass Needle, Vol. IV, May-June, 1937, pp. 21-24.
- _____. "The Social Meaning of Education." The Compass Needle, Vol. III, February-April, 1937, pp. 10-11, 50-51.
- _____. "A Socio-Scientific Approach to Education." The Compass Needle, Vol. III, December, 1936, pp. 4-6, 45.
- _____. "The Sociological Basis of the Normal School Curriculum." The Journal of Educational Sociology, Vol. I, September, 1927, p. 1.
- _____. "Sociology and Education." The Journal of Educational Sociology, Vol. 12, February, 1929, pp. 321-327.
- _____. "Sociology in Teacher Education Programs." The Journal of Educational Sociology, Vol. 12, May, 1939, pp. 513-520.

- Peters, Charles C. "Healthy Disagreements to Educational Sociology." School and Society, Vol. 20, July 12, 1924, pp. 53-54.
- _____. "How to Translate a List of Detailed Objectives into a Practical Program of Civic Education." The Journal of Educational Sociology, Vol. 1, September, 1927, pp. 49-51.
- Smith, Walter R. "Foundations of Educational Sociology." American Journal of Sociology, Vol. 22, May, 1917, pp. 761-778.
- _____. "Fundamentals of a Socialized Educational Program." School and Society, Vol. 8, July 13, 1918, pp. 35-41.
- _____. "Present Status and Immediate Future of Educational Sociology." School and Society, Vol. 17, April 21, 1923, pp. 421-426.
- _____. "Program for Socializing Education." Educational Research, Vol. 56, October, 1918, pp. 199-214.
- _____. "Reflections of an Educational Sociologist." School and Society, Vol. 15, May 20, 1922, pp. 541-546.
- _____. "Sociological Aspects of Our Educational Aims." American Journal of Sociology, Vol. 24, July, 1918, pp. 81-95.
- _____. "Value and Scope of Educational Sociology." School and Society, Vol. 6, July 14, 1917, pp. 41-47.
- Snedden, David S. "Educational Sociology Again." School and Society, Vol. 12, July 31, 1920, pp. 93-94.
- _____. "Educational Sociology: Its Province and Possibilities." American Journal of Sociology, Vol. 25, September, 1919, pp. 129-149.
- _____. "History as an Instrument in the Social Education of Children." Journal of Pedagogy, Vol. 19, June, 1906.
- _____. "New Aims of Education." Teachers College Record, Vol. 29, February, 1928, pp. 397-403.

- _____. "Rural Education in 1960--A Prophecy." Addresses and Proceedings of the National Education Association, 1932, p. 425.
- _____. "Sociological Analyses as a Basis to Educational Sociology." The Journal of Educational Sociology, Vol. I, January, 1928, pp. 262-265.
- _____. "Sociology, A Basic Science to Education." Teachers College Record, Vol. 24, March, 1923, pp. 420-423.
- _____. "What Is Educational Sociology?" The Journal of Educational Sociology, Vol. I, October, 1927, pp. 77-78.
- _____. "What Is a School of Education?" Teachers College Record, Vol. 30, April, 1929, pp. 656-660.

Secondary Sources

1. Books

- Bagley, William. The Educative Process. New York: The Macmillan Company, 1905.
- Baldwin, James Mark. Social and Ethical Interpretations in Mental Development. New York: The Macmillan Company, 1897.
- Bell, Robert R. and Stub, Holger R. The Sociology of Education: A Sourcebook. Homewood, Illinois: Dorsey, 1962.
- Bolton, Frederick and Corbally, John E. Educational Sociology. New York: American, 1941.
- Brameld, Theodore. Philosophies of Education in Cultural Perspective. New York: Holt, Rinehart and Winston, 1955.
- Brim, Orville. Sociology in the Field of Education. New York: Russell Sage, 1958.
- Brookover, Wilbur R. and Gottlieb, David. A Sociology of Education. New York: American, 1955.

- Brown, Francis J. Educational Sociology. New York: Prentice Hall, 1950.
- Bruner, Jerome S. On Knowing: Essays for the Left Hand. New York: Atheneum, 1965.
- Case, Clarence Marsh. Outlines of Introductory Sociology. New York: Harcourt Brace and Co., 1924.
- Chancellor, William E. Educational Sociology. New York: Century, 1919.
- Clow, Frederick R. Sociology with Educational Implications. New York: The Macmillan Company, 1920.
- Cook, Lloyd and Cook, Elaine F. A Sociological Approach to Education. New York: McGraw Hill, 1960.
- Corwin, Ronald. A Sociology of Education. New York: Appleton-Century, 1965.
- Curti, Merle. The Social Ideas of American Educators. New York: Charles Scribners and Sons, 1935.
- Dewey, John. Democracy and Education. New York: The Macmillan Company, 1916.
- _____. School and Society. Chicago: University of Chicago Press, 1899.
- Drost, Walter H. David S. Snedden and Education for Social Efficiency. Madison, Wisconsin: University of Wisconsin Press, 1967.
- Durkheim, Emile. Education and Sociology. Glencoe, Illinois: The Free Press, 1956.
- Giddings, Franklin H. Principles of Sociology. New York: The Macmillan Company, 1896.
- Good, Alvin. Sociology and Education: Sociology From the Viewpoint of Education. New York: Harper, 1926.
- Havighurst, Robert J. and Neugarten, Bernice L. Society and Education. Boston: Allyn and Bacon, 1960.

- Jensen, Gale. Educational Sociology. New York: Center for Applied Research, 1965.
- Kallenbach, W. Warren and Hodges, Harold M. Education and Society. Columbus, Ohio: Charles E. Merrill, Inc., 1963.
- Keller, Albert Galloway. Societal Education. New York: The Macmillan Company, 1915.
- Kinneman, John. Society and Education. New York: The Macmillan Company, 1932.
- Kulp, Daniel. Educational Sociology. New York: Longmans, Green, and Co., 1932.
- Lee, Harvey. The Status of Educational Sociology in Normal Schools, Teachers Colleges, Colleges, and Universities. New York: New York University Press, 1932.
- Mannheim, Karl and Stewart, W. A. C. An Introduction to the Sociology of Education. New York: Humanities Press, 1962.
- Meltzer, Bernard and others. Education in Society: Readings. New York: Thomas Y. Crowell, 1958.
- Mursell, James L. Principles of Education. New York: Norton and Co., 1934.
- Page, Charles H. Sociology and Contemporary Education. New York: Random House, 1964.
- Pounds, Ralph L. and Bhyner, Jane R. The School in American Society. New York: The Macmillan Company, 1967.
- Pavalko, Ronald M., ed. Sociology of Education: A Book of Readings. Itasca, Illinois: Peacock, 1968.
- Raywid, Mary Anne. The Ax-Grinders. New York: The Macmillan Company, 1962.
- Robbins, Florence G. Educational Sociology. New York: Henry Holt and Co., 1953.
- Rodehaver, Myles W. and others. The Sociology of the School. New York: Thomas Y. Crowell Co., 1957.

- Roucek, Joseph S. and Associates. Sociological Foundations of Education. New York: Thomas Y. Crowell, 1942.
- Saucier, W. A. Introduction to the Modern Views of Education. New York: Ginn and Co., 1937.
- Small, Albion W. and Vincent, George E. An Introduction to the Study of Society. New York: American Book Co., 1894.
- Sumner, William Graham. Folkways. Boston: Ginn and Co., 1906.
- Stalcup, Robert J. Sociology and Education. Columbus, Ohio: Charles E. Merrill Pub. Co., 1968.
- Tuttle, Harold S. A Social Basis of Education. New York: Thomas Y. Crowell, 1934.
- Vincent, George E. The Social Mind and Education. New York: American Book Co., 1897.
- Waller, Willard. The Sociology of Teaching. New York: John Wiley, Inc., 1932.
- Ward, Lester Frank. Applied Sociology. Boston: Ginn, 1906.
- _____. Dynamic Sociology. New York: Appleton-Century, Vol. II, 1883.

2. Articles

- Barnes, Harry Elmer. "Sociological Contributions to Political Thought." Contemporary Social Theory. Edited by Harry Elmer Barnes and others. New York: Appleton-Century Co., 1940, pp. 647-668.
- Bernard, L. L. "Contributions to Education." The Journal of Educational Sociology, Vol. 13, September, 1939, pp. 11-21.
- Bode, H. Boyd. "Editorial." The Journal of Educational Sociology, Vol. I, February, 1928, pp. 305-307.
- Bressler, Marvin. "Sociology and Collegiate General Education." The Uses of Sociology, edited by Paul Lazarsfeld and others. New York: Basic, 1960, pp. 45-62.

- Dewey, John. "My Pedagogic Creed." Journal of the National Education Association, Vol. 24, No. 1, January, 1935, pp. 13-16.
- Ellwood, Charles A. "The Sociological Bases of the Science of Education." Education, Vol. 32, November, 1911.
- _____. "What is Educational Sociology?" The Journal of Educational Sociology, Vol. I, September, 1927, pp. 25-30.
- Ernst, Herman A. "Dean E. George Payne--Student, Teacher, Scholar." The Journal of Educational Sociology, Vol. 13, September, 1939, pp. 1-4.
- Harris, William T. "Froeb1 Education by Self Activity." Educational Review, Vol. VI, 1893, pp. 84-85.
- _____. "Introduction." Addresses and Proceedings of the National Education Association, 1896, pp. 124-126.
- Keith, John A. S. "The Place and Scope of Sociology in Normal Schools." National Education Association: Addresses and Proceedings, Vol. 53, 1915, pp. 764-766.
- Moore, Clyde B. "Aims and Contents of a Course in Educational Sociology." Education, November, 1924, pp. 158-170.
- Ogburn, William F. "Contributions to Sociological Research." The Journal of Educational Sociology, Vol. 13, September, 1939, pp. 23-35.
- Roucek, Joseph S. "Some Contributions of Sociology to Education." Contemporary Social Theory, edited by Harry Elmer Barnes, Howard Becker, and Francis Bennett Becker. New York: Appleton Century Co., 1940, pp. 793-833.
- Small, Albion W. "The Demands of Sociology Upon Pedagogy." National Education Association: Addresses and Proceedings, Vol. 35, 1896, pp. 174-184.
- Suzzalo, Henry. "Education as a Social Study." School Review, Vol. 16, May, 1908, pp. 330-340.
- Withers, John W. "Contribution to Education." The Journal of Educational Sociology, Vol. 13, September, 1939, pp. 5-10.

Zeleny, Leslie. "Content of the Course in Educational Sociology." Sociological and Social Research, November, 1934, pp. 150-160.

_____. "New Directions in Educational Sociology." American Sociological Review, Vol. 13, June, 1948, pp. 336-341.

_____. "The Sociological Curriculum." The Journal of Educational Sociology, Vol. 13, April, 1940, pp. 453-461.

Zorbaugh, Harvey W. "Research in Educational Sociology." The Journal of Educational Sociology, Vol. 1, September, 1927, pp. 18-24.

_____. "Significant Books of 1929." The Journal of Educational Sociology, Vol. 3, April, 1930, pp. 509-514.

_____. "Topical Summaries of Current Literature: Educational Sociology." American Journal of Sociology, Vol. 33, November, 1927, pp. 444-454.

3. Publications of the Government, Learned Societies, and Other Organizations

American Sociological Association Directory of Members 1973--1974. Washington, D.C.: American Sociological Association, 1974, pp. 422-426.

4. Dissertations

Lawrence, Irene J. "A History of Educational Sociology in the United States." Unpublished Ph.D. dissertation, Stanford University, 1951.

Schaper, Florence W. "The Rise and Development of Educational Sociology in the United States." Unpublished Ph.D. dissertation, New York University, 1932.