Teachers, family and community in the urban elementary school: Evidence from English school log books c.1880-1918[1]

Susannah Wright*

Westminster Institute of Education, Oxford Brookes University

Introduction

The decades around the year 1900 were a time of widespread fears about children in England, as they were in many other countries. The press and literature of the period show acute and wide-ranging anxiety about the physical and moral state of the younger generation. Politicians in central and local government, churchmen, philanthropists and voluntary workers, among others, were concerned that a variety of social and cultural shifts, including industrialisation and rapid urbanisation, the associated breakdown of family and community ties, and the perceived decline in the influence of organised religion, were damaging for children.[2] Fears of this sort were focused on the urban poor. Many perceived undesirable influences from home and community.[3] With the expansion of elementary education in the late nineteenth century, contemporaries put their faith in the school as the institution that would civilise the poor urban child, and, through the child, bring order to the home.[4] Schools were called on to rescue the young from the bad influences that surrounded them, while promoting an alternative, and improving, cultural milieu.

Teachers working in elementary schools came into regular contact with the families and communities of their pupils. They did so from a position of authority, that of the expert

[1] I would like to thank colleagues, family, and referees for their invaluable comments on earlier drafts of this article.
[2] See John Davis, *Youth and the Condition of Britain* (London: Athlone Press, 1990), 42–85; Susannah Wright, '*The Struggle for Moral Education* in English Elementary Schools 1879–1918' (PhD thesis, Oxford Brookes University, 2006), 15–44.
[3] David Reeder, 'Predicaments of City Children: Late Victorian and Edwardian Perspectives on Education and Urban Society', in *Urban Education in the Nineteenth Century*, ed. David Reeder (London: Taylor & Francis, 1977), 75–94, 81–4; Gareth Stedman Jones, *Outcast London* (Oxford: Clarendon Press, 1971), 10–14.
[4] Anna Davin, *Growing up Poor. London 1870–1914* (London: River Oram Press, 1996), 133.

intervening in the homes and communities of the children they taught.[5] Annemieke Van Drenth and Francisca De Haan's concept of caring power – 'a mode of power which operates through care' – captures something of the essence of the relationship between teachers and pupils and their families. Teachers were, to use the words of Van Drenth and De Haan, '[committed] to the well-being of others'. Their commitment was exercised from a position of authority derived from their professional role and also, in many cases, their superior social standing *vis a vis* the pupils in their school. They, rather than parents or pupils, defined what 'well-being' was and how this should be achieved.[6]

This article focuses in particular on the actions and attitudes of headteachers. Drawing on an exploratory case study of 14 elementary schools in Birmingham and Leicester, it examines how headteachers in urban elementary schools in England experienced and described relations between school, home and community.[7] Case studies, William Marsden suggests, offer a valuable opportunity to relate 'detailed happenings in schools and the communities they served', and to explore the 'social relationships' of schooling, within the school and also between the school and the wider community.[8] School log books from the 14 schools, supplemented by other primary and secondary sources, are analysed for insights into how headteachers perceived, and acted towards, their pupils and pupils' families. Through this methodology this article adds a new perspective to a rich body of research into elementary schooling and informal educative programmes in urban areas.

This article seeks to address the following substantive questions: how did the headteachers writing in log books perceive the homes and communities of their pupils?; and how

[5] The requirement to act in *loco parentis* (the common law principle that teachers should have responsibility for pupils during school hours and show the same duty of care as would a parent) conferred on teachers legal and symbolic authority. John Burnett, *Destiny Obscure. Autobiographies of Childhood, Education and Family from the 1820s to the 1920s*, 2nd ed (London: Routledge, 1994), 152. This principle was first defined by a court in Britain in 1893 (Williams v Eady).
[6] Annemieke Van Drenth and Francisca de Haan, *The Rise of Caring Power* (Amsterdam: Amsterdam University Press, 1999), 11.
[7] These 14 schools were examined as part of my wider doctoral research project. Wright, *The Struggle for Moral Education*, 191–232.
[8] William E. Marsden, *Educating the Respectable. A Study of Fleet Road Board School, Hampstead, 1879–1903* (London: Woburn Press, 1991), 268. See also Harold Silver, *Education as History* (London: Routledge, 2007), 8.

did they seek to influence and intervene in the homes and communities from which their pupils were drawn? It also explores ways of reading and analysing log books, and considers their value as a historical source for answering substantive questions of this nature. A final section questions how far headteachers were able, in practical terms, to exercise caring power in order to, as they saw it, improve the lives of their pupils, and examines the implications of this historical analysis for a consideration of the work of teachers in the present day.

Improving the urban child

Concerns about children and childhood in the late Victorian and Edwardian period, particularly those focused on the urban poor, have been well documented. Researchers have examined broad cultural debates, and important issues around humanitarianism, power and control.[9] Harry Hendrick and John Springhall highlight fears about delinquency and disorder on the streets, and anxiety about the impact on the working-class population of elements of popular culture from penny dreadful magazines to music halls.[10] Geoffrey Searle shows that wider concerns in the decades around 1900 about physical and moral degeneracy, influenced by eugenicist theories of racial deterioration, the poor physical condition of young recruits during the South African War, and fears about political and economic competition from other countries, were focused on the young.[11]

Such thinking underpinned a range of educative interventions, voluntary and state led, aimed at the physical and moral uplift of the urban population. There has been valuable research on the work of voluntary organisations, state agencies, and individual activists who targeted

[9] Kevin Brehony, 'A "Socially Civilising Influence"? Play and the Urban Degenerate', *Paedagogica Historica* 39 no. 1/2 (2003), 87–106; Joyce Goodman, 'Sex and the City: Educational Initiatives for "Dangerous" and "Endangered" Girls in Late Victorian and early Edwardian Manchester', *Paedagogica Historica* 39 no. 1/2 (2003), 75–86; Gertrude Himmelfarb, *Poverty and Compassion. The Moral Imagination of the Late Victorians* (New York: Alfred A. Knopf, 1991); Van Drenth and de Haan, *The Rise of Caring Power*.

[10] Harry Hendrick, *Images of Youth. Age, Class and the Male Youth Problem, 1880–1920* (Oxford: Clarendon Press, 1990), 75–82, 119–54; John Springhall, *Youth, Popular Culture and Moral Panics* (Basingstoke: Macmillan, 1998), 11–97.

[11] See Geoffrey Searle, *The Quest for National Efficiency: A Study in British Politics and Political Thought* (Oxford: Blackwell, 1971).

particular groups of children. Kevin Brehony, for example, examines play schemes for children living in slums.[12] Paula Bartley and Joyce Goodman investigate efforts to 'rescue' girls living in brothels or those deemed at risk of falling into prostitution.[13] These accounts highlight ambiguities around these activities and reformers' motivations, with activists desiring to help but also to control poor children and their families, while at the same time serving their own political or professional interests.[14]

Studies of schooling in poor areas suggest that teachers perceived social and cultural divisions between home and elementary school, and saw the school as having a civilising mission. Stephen Humphries' account, derived from oral testimonies from working-class pupils, presents the school as a site of class-cultural struggles between teachers and taught, whilst Anna Davin describes cultural gaps between teachers, pupils and their families in poor districts of London.[15] Other research, however, concerning schools located among less impoverished communities, suggests not a divide between home and school, but common aims and mutual benefits. Mary Claire Martin, in her study of children in eighteenth and nineteenth century Walthamstow and Leytonstone, argues that parents and teachers had common educational goals. William Marsden's research on Fleet Road Board School in Hampstead suggests that aspiring parents saw school as a means of social advancement for their children.[16] The civilising mission of the elementary school, it appears, was felt more keenly in some areas than others.

[12] Brehony, 'A Socially Civilising Influence'.
[13] Paula Bartley, *Prostitution: Prevention and Reform in England, 1860–1914* (London: Routledge, 2000), 73–115; Goodman, 'Sex and the City'.
[14] Brehony, 'A Socially Civilising Influence'; Goodman, 'Sex and the City'. Himmelfarb, *Poverty and Compassion,* 3–19, on the other hand, places greater emphasis on compassion as a motivation for activists.
[15] Stephen Humphries, *Hooligans or Rebels? An Oral History of Working-Class Childhood and Youth 1889–1939* (Oxford: Basil Blackwell, 1981); Davin, *Growing up Poor*, 132–53.
[16] M.C.H Martin, 'Children and Religion in Walthamstow and Leyton, 1740–1870' (PhD thesis, London, Goldsmiths College, 2000); Marsden, *Educating the Respectable*, 273.

School log books

This analysis is based on a detailed examination of the log books from a purposive sample of 14 schools (see appendix) for the period 1880 to 1918.[17] Schools were selected in order to ensure coverage of the range of provision in Birmingham and Leicester, and also on the basis of the availability of log books. The sample was constructed to allow comparisons to be made around interconnected themes highlighted in late nineteenth and early twentieth century debates about education: socio-economic status; urban expansion; and administrative and religious distinctions. It includes board and voluntary schools, schools located in central slum areas and wealthier suburbs, schools founded in the early nineteenth century and newer schools built in the 1880s and 1890s in areas of urban expansion.[18] A sample of this size is large enough to reveal similarities and differences between schools. It enables an examination of how far perceptions of a cultural void between home and school, and a civilising mission, were common to headteachers in all elementary schools, or whether – as other research suggests – such perceptions were felt most strongly by headteachers in schools in poor areas. However, it does not allow us to generalise for Birmingham and Leicester, and even less for the country as a whole. Birmingham and Leicester were selected as case study sites because they offer scope for enlightening insights. Common features include a Midlands location, rapid population and spatial expansion in the nineteenth century, the dominance of workshop-based manufacturing industry, local politics dominated by liberal elites from the mid-nineteenth century, and strong traditions of radicalism. The education authorities in Birmingham and Leicester, from the 1870s onwards, both perceived themselves as innovative and progressive, although Birmingham received more in the way of national and international attention.[19]

[17] Some schools were opened after 1880, in other cases log books were not available for the whole period.
[18] Challenges in constructing the sample included identifying and defining both a school's 'catchment area', and the socioeconomic characteristics of the community in which a school was located. Wright, *The Struggle for Moral Education*, 238–9.
[19] Wright, *The Struggle for Moral Education*, 10, 126–50. See Ian Grosvenor and Kevin Myers, 'Progressivism, Control and Correction: Local Education Authorities and Educational Policy in Twentieth-Century England',

School log books are a valuable source for examining the day-to-day life of the elementary school, and how headteachers perceived the homes and communities in which their pupils lived. Their value lies in part in their widespread availability – there are large collections of log books in many local authority archives – when other sources for examining the everyday experience of schooling in late Victorian and Edwardian times are scarce.[20] Historians of education have used written autobiographies and oral histories to reconstruct the experiences and views of pupils and teachers, and to challenge some of the stereotypes found in official records, but it is not possible to use these sources for this study.[21] Autobiographies do not exist, at least for Birmingham and Leicester for this period, in sufficient numbers to compare different types of schools, and it is no longer possible to gather oral testimonies for the period under consideration. In this context, log books offer valuable evidence about the life of the school. They are also important social documents, relating much about the life of the community in which the school is located. Nevertheless, their content is shaped and limited by the bureaucratic purposes for which they were established. They offer, primarily, headteachers' views. The perspectives of other teachers, as well as those of parents and pupils, are mostly absent, and when reported are filtered through the headteachers' words.

The requirement to keep a log book was first introduced in 1862 as part of the Revised Code, through which the education department sought to promote greater efficiency, economy and accountability in elementary schools.[22] Log books were checked by Her Majesty's Inspectors (HMIs) on their annual visit to the school and, more frequently, by officials of the local School Board (Local Education Committee after 1902) – signatures from local inspectors and HMIs in the log books examined testify to this practice. Log books were completed according to strict

Paedagogica Historica 42 no. 1/2 (2006), 225–47, 231–4 for discussion of Birmingham Education Authority's self-image of progressivism and its national and international reputation.

[20] The Access to Archives website (http://www.nationalarchives.gov.uk/a2a/) is a good starting point for locating log books.

[21] See, for example, see Peter Cunningham and Philip Gardner, *Becoming Teachers. Texts and Testimonies 1907-1950*, (London: Woburn Press, 2004) on oral history and Jacob Middleton, 'The Experience of Corporal Punishment in Schools, 1890–1940', *History of Education* 37 no.2 (2008), 253–75, 256–9 on autobiographies.

[22] Pamela Horn, 'School Log Books', in *Short Guides to Records*, *Second Series*, ed. K. M. Thompson (London: Historical Association, 1997), 104–8, 105. Many individual voluntary schools kept log books before 1862, and the requirement to keep log books was retained into the late twentieth century.

instructions issued by the education department. The headteacher or principal teacher was to write in a 'stoutly bound' volume of 'not less than 500 pages', making an entry at least once a week, detailing 'ordinary progress', visitors, facts about the school, details of staff (including when they started or left, and any cautions or other issues with conduct), and anything else 'which … may … deserve to be recorded'. 'Reflections or opinions of a general character' were forbidden.[23] Yet within this general framework, log book entries varied greatly. They ranged from short, factual statements to lengthy, detailed narratives, close to 'reflections of a general character'. Lengthy accounts appeared sometimes to record events for posterity, sometimes to allow the teacher to let off steam, or to explain actions that might be criticised. The nature of entries in a school log book could be altered dramatically with a change of headteacher. These differences in how individual teachers interpreted their instructions mean that log books vary in the amount of information they provide for the educational historian. These variations, however, are themselves instructive as they reveal important differences between teachers and schools.

Log book entries cover a wide range of subjects including pupils' academic progress, the curriculum, pupil and teacher absence, attempts to promote pupil welfare through feeding and medical inspection, and communal school events and celebrations.[24] Analysing log books from a number of schools over 38 years gives one a feel for the rhythms and cycles of school life, and the recurring challenges that headteachers faced in running an urban elementary school. At the same time, the guidelines for their completion demanded a focus on exceptional activities outside the normal timetable. Similarly with pupils, if individuals were discussed they tended to be the exceptionally good or exceptionally difficult ones, those who won prizes or scholarships or who were punished for truancy. Such an emphasis on the exceptional was no doubt encouraged by the emphasis in the education department's guidelines on events that '[deserved] to be recorded'.

[23] Education Department, *New Code of Regulations with Appendices*, London: HMSO, 1880 (Articles 36 and 37). The guidelines in the Code changed little over the period 1880–1918.
[24] Horn, 'School Log Books', 106–8.

There is relatively little explicit commentary on the cultures of home and school; instead we find mainly brief allusions. Education department guidelines and the public nature of these documents might have discouraged headteachers from writing much about potentially sensitive issues (except when they wished to explain their actions), or from reflecting on educational or broader cultural topics. Lack of explicit discussion may also reflect shared assumptions about working class urban communities which, precisely because they were shared, were not commented on at length but hinted at in a few words. The researcher faces challenges in understanding euphemism and interpreting sparse entries. Headteachers' ideas about the cultures of home and school are revealed through their reactions to the children in their care (and their families), and through the messages about morality that they conveyed through direct teaching, and indirectly through labelling pupils, comments in passing, and their exercise of school discipline. Yet in the absence of explicit discussions there is, inevitably, a danger of interpreting teachers' words in ways they did not intend. In order to guard as far as possible against over-interpretation, it is important that the researcher is sensitive to complex motivations and attitudes on the part of the headteachers, and is aware of both their position of power and the practical challenges that they faced. The use of secondary literature, and a subtle interpretative concept like that of caring power, facilitates the careful reading of log book entries that is required.

School, family and community in log books

Trends

Two key trends emerge across the sample of log books. The first relates to the socio-economic status of the schools' 'catchment area'. The poverty or affluence of the area in which the school was located appears to have been a key defining factor in teachers' attitudes towards pupils and their families and communities. Teachers in schools in poor areas paid more attention in log books to families and communities than their counterparts in wealthier areas, and were more

likely to define and describe these families and communities as a negative influence on pupils. This may partly be accounted for by problems being watched for, and expected, in these schools: schools in poorer areas were, as they are currently, policed and observed more closely than those in more affluent districts. On the other hand, headteachers in these schools encountered severe practical challenges, and entries undoubtedly reflected the scale of the difficulties they faced. The second trend relates to change over time. Relevant log book entries are concentrated in the years before 1905: there are fewer after this date. There are a number of possible explanations for this change. Did the episodes described in these entries actually become less frequent? Or was it patterns of reporting that changed? Did the problems identified matter less as individual students' academic achievement became less vital for a school's funding, and other priorities around health and welfare emerged? Or did headteachers feel less need to record the problems of their local communities as they became accustomed to them over time? The evidence examined here provides no clear answer.

Family and community

Relevant log book entries have three main foci: family and community, pupils, and the actions of teachers. To address the first of these, headteachers were concerned about the attitudes and behaviours that pupils were exposed to in their homes and their communities. They adopted a range of strategies to deal with what they perceived to be undesirable or dangerous. Their concerns and strategies are located within a changing legal framework which regulated childhood and parental responsibilities, with intervention in pupils' and their families' lives by state and voluntary agencies increasing over the period covered in this study.[25] Headteachers, with other professionals and organisations in what Ferguson describes as the 'penal-welfare community',

[25] Harry Ferguson, *Protecting Children in Time* (Houndmillls: Palgrave Macmillan, 2004), 23–51; Harry Hendrick, *Child Welfare. Historical Dimensions, Contemporary Debates* (Bristol: Policy Press, 2003), 19–86; John Hurt, *Elementary Schooling and the Working Classes 1860–1918* (London: Routledge & Kegan Paul, 1979), 211–12; Linda Mahood, *Policing Gender, Class and Family. Britain, 1850–1940* (London: UCL Press, 1995), 48.

sought to protect pupils where risks were detected.[26] Identification of undesirable influences and consequent interventions were undoubtedly based on a genuine concern for children's well-being. At the same time, headteachers, from a position of power, passed highly moral and often sweeping judgements about family and community life.

Headteachers identified, and found ways to deal with, 'problem families'. Children in these families, it was believed, learned bad behaviour and attitudes at home and were encouraged to challenge the authority of the class teacher. For example, in 1898 the headmaster of Floodgate Street School, located in one of the poorest slum districts in Birmingham, complained about the Harvey family: 'The whole family have been a nuisance. They are encouraged at home to be lazy and impudent'.[27] Fifteen years later, the head of Cowper Street School in Birmingham suspended two girls for 'gross insubordination and impertinence to Class Teacher, as this was the result of instructions given to the children by the parents'. The girls were re-admitted two days later when the parent 'had given an undertaking to conform'.[28] The use of the word 'conform' is telling: not only pupils but parents too were required to submit to and support the authority of the school. Such entries suggest a perception of cultural gaps and power struggles between home and school similar to those which Stephen Humphries identifies in his account based on pupils' oral testimonies.[29]

'Problem families' are identified in references to truancy.[30] In these entries we can read moral judgements about what parents' obligations to their children should be (i.e. to keep their children from the dangers of the streets),[31] and also the effects of the changing legal framework governing childhood on teachers' work. The log book for Floodgate Street School contains frequent references to truancy. In April 1892 the headmaster noted that several truants were

[26] Ferguson, *Protecting Children in Time*, 42.
[27] Floodgate Street School Log Book 1891–1920, Birmingham Archives and Heritage Services (BAHS), S68/2/1, 9 September 1898. Pseudonyms have been used for all pupil names referred to in this article.
[28] Cowper Street School Log Book 1885–1924, BAHS, S215/1/1, 18 November 1913, 20 November 1913. See also 29 April 1914.
[29] Humphries, *Hooligans or Rebels*, 54–6.
[30] See also Hurt, *Elementary Schooling and the Working Classes*, 110–11 and Nicola Sheldon, 'The School Attendance Officer 1900–1939: Policeman or Welfare Worker?', *History of Education* 36 no. 6 (2007), 735–46, 737–9 for identification of 'problem families' in relation to truancy.
[31] Ferguson, *Protecting Children in Time*, 34–6.

'sleeping out' at night. He wrote to the local police and was informed that 'the majority belonged to criminal families'.[32] In a log book entry a few months later he connected truancy and associated misdemeanours with lack of parental care: 'Brought four truants from Market Hall two have been locked up for theft – took them to [School] Board Office – Mr Weston says he has no remedy beyond summoning parents … Boys still wandering about uncared for'.[33] The truants were referred to the National Society for the Prevention of Cruelty to Children (NSPCC).[34] The headmaster of Slater Street School in Leicester similarly encountered pupils truanting and sleeping away from home during the 1880s. A series of entries relating to one pupil reveals a process of negotiation between the headmaster and the boy's parents over what should be their respective responsibilities. On 2 February 1883 the headmaster wrote as follows:

> This lad is most incorrigible. He has many times played truant and was once sent to the Work House for begging after having been from home three nights. At the request of the parents I gave the lad a severe beating administering four stripes at 10 o'clock and two at 12 o'clock.

Much the same happened on 5 May. However, on the third and fourth occasions that the parents asked for their son to be punished for truancy and sleeping out the headmaster refused: 'I consider it the parent's fault'. Though the headmaster had acceded to the parents' earlier requests to punish this boy, he also felt that they should supervise and discipline their son.[35]

Log book entries referring to cleanliness and hygiene are increasingly common after about 1900, perhaps reflecting a broader policy context of increasing professional attention to

[32] Floodgate Street School Log Book 1891–1920, 8 April 1892.
[33] Floodgate Street School Log Book 1891–1920, 14 October 1892. See also 14 May 1897.
[34] On the NSPCC see George Behlmer, *Child Abuse and Moral Reform in England, 1870–1908* (Stanford: Stanford University Press, 1982) and Ferguson, *Protecting Children in Time*, 23–51. Under the 1889 Children's Charter and the 1908 Children Act the NSPCC, in partnership with local authorities, had the power to search homes and remove children, but, as Behlmer and Ferguson show, in most cases children were not taken from their homes.
[35] Slater Street School Log Book (Boys) 1874–1893, Record Office for Leicestershire, Leicester and Rutland (RLLR), DE4467/1, 2 February 1883, 5 May 1883, 28 May 1883, 15 June 1883. See William E. Marsden, *An Anglo-Welsh Teaching Dynasty: the Adams family from the 1840s to the 1930s* (London: Woburn Press, 1997), 84–6 for a similar episode.

pupils' health and welfare in a climate of concerns about 'national efficiency'.[36] In such entries, the notion of neglect encompasses not only the lack of supervision identified in cases of truancy but also inadequate physical care. Signs of neglect include children being 'dirty', 'verminous', or 'infested with lice'. A variety of professionals, including headteachers, education committee officers, and school nurses, spoke to parents in situations where neglect was identified.[37] Severe cases were referred to the NSPCC. The head of Cowper Street School referred 'several very bad cases of absolute neglect on the part of parents' in November 1913. A log book entry for Holy Cross School, Leicester, in July 1902 records a visit by an NSPCC inspector who had been alerted to a 'case' of neglect by an outside source – the pupil was 'found to be in a very filthy state'.[38] The words 'filthy state' echoes the powerful language in other log book entries: 'his clothes were more dirty than [his] body, I could smell the lad three feet away', 'Rose Brady was in an unspeakable condition', 'the dirty condition of some of the children is really appalling'.[39] Such language suggests that headteachers were alarmed, and repelled, by what they found. Physical revulsion was combined with moral judgements about family responsibilities in headteachers' decisions to intervene in pupils' home lives, or invite other professionals or agencies to do so.[40]

There was also concern about negative influences from others in the community. For example, in 1891 the headmaster of Willow Street School wrote about 'betting men' on the street near the school:

[36] See, for example, Bernard Harris, *The Health of the Schoolchild. A History of the School Medical Service in England and Wales* (Buckingham: Open University Press, 1995).
[37] Cowper Street School Log Book 1885–1924, 16 February 1917; Elbow Lane School Special Department Log Book 1900–1924, RLLR, 19D59/VII/339, 1 February 1906, 14 September 1911; St Saviour's School Log Book 1882–1919, RLLR, 18D68/1, 16 December 1908.
[38] Cowper Street School Log Book 1885–1924, 14 November 1913, Holy Cross School Log Book 1875–1910, RLLR, DE2735/1, 17 July 1902. See also Severn Street School Log Book (Boys) 1886–1921, BAHS, S178/1/2, 21 July 1915.
[39] Ladypool CofE School Log Book 1897–1932, BAHS, S113/3/1, 18 November 1904, 17 March 1914; Elbow Lane School Special Department Log Book 1900–1924, 13 February 1911.
[40] Ferguson, *Protecting Children in Time*, 32 similarly detects a sense of revulsion in the case notes of NSPCC workers.

> Every day between 1.30 and 2 O'clock the road is blocked and I have repeatedly seen boys and girls of 13 or 14 yrs of age bringing money. There is no attempt at concealment and the effect upon the minds of the school boys must be bad.[41]

The headmaster of Slater Street School had to deal with a different problem, 'rabbit coursing' [i.e. 'dogs tearing rabbits apart'] on the Pasture – a piece of common land near the school. He cut short an outing to the Pasture because he feared that seeing the coursing would have a 'demoralising effect on the minds of the boys'. However, he was unable to stop boys watching during their lunch break.[42] Headteachers were also worried about the older boys or adults their pupils spent time with while truanting from school. 'These boys', wrote the headmaster of Willow Street School in 1888, referring to some truanting pupils, '[are] allowed to roam the streets' (note the implied criticism of lack of parental control here). '[They] form the acquaintance of vagrants of 14 or 15 years and find themselves confirmed truants and occasionally before the magistrates'.[43]

Pupils

Log book entries, particularly for schools in the poorest areas, provide evidence of ambivalent attitudes to working-class children. They were seen as fragile and requiring protection, but also as dangerous and needing correction.[44] In this vein, headteachers used their position of power to condemn and punish misdemeanours, but also worked for pupils' rescue and reform.

As with 'problem families', headteachers identified 'problem pupils', often in log book entries relating to truancy. In 1892 the first headmaster of Floodgate Street School described two boys who were 'locked up' for stealing as 'confirmed truants and thieves'. In 1903 his successor

[41] Willow Street School Private Log Book (Boys) 1886–1892, RLLR, 19D59/VII/440, 13 April 1891, 11 May 1891. The 'Private Log Book' appears to have been intended chiefly for communication between the headmaster and managers.
[42] Slater Street School Log Book (Boys) 1874–1893, 14 March 1890.
[43] Willow Street School Private Log Book (Boys) 1886–1892, 12 November 1888.
[44] See Pamela Horn, *The Victorian Town Child* (Thrupp: Sutton Publishing, 1997), 180.

wrote about pupils 'whom nothing but detention in a Truant school can cure'.[45] Similarly, in 1886 the headmaster of Cowper Street School referred to several truants 'of established reputation' and asked 'what good can be done with these?'[46] There were particular concerns about 'gangs' of truants.[47] Gang leaders were identified as a dangerous influence over their peers and were singled out for punishment. In 1888 the headmaster of Willow Street School wrote about 'prominent members' of a gang of truants being sent to the local industrial school, while in 1893 the headmaster of Floodgate Street School noted that the 'ringleaders' of such a gang were sent to the workhouse for a week. Both headmasters hoped that by punishing the leaders they would break up their gangs.[48]

Metaphors of disease convey the idea that truancy was bad for all pupils. The first headmaster of Floodgate Street School described 'outbreaks' or 'epidemics', often in autumn or spring.[49] His choice of words suggests that truancy was contagious, a threat to everyone in the school, and needed to be stopped before it could spread. This sort of language, arguably, reinforced the perception that truancy was dangerous, justifying actions such as severe corporal punishment and, in the worst cases, separating the truant from their family through referral to court and, potentially, the workhouse or industrial school. Yet other log book entries show belief in the possibility of reform for some pupils. In November 1886 the headmaster of Cowper Street School noted 'a great improvement … in the characters' of some of the truants he had despaired of earlier that year, and that several were attending punctually and regularly to 'make up for lost time'.[50] An entry for Floodgate Street School in 1909 shows a belief in reform, and also an individualised approach to dealing with misbehaviour. One girl had been charged at Children's

[45] Floodgate Street School Log Book 1891–1920, 16 September 1892, 23 October 1903.
[46] Cowper Street School Log Book 1885–1924, 4 February 1886, 21 May 1886.
[47] These concerns chime with contemporary fears of crowds. See for example Jones, *Outcast London*, 291–6 on concerns about overcrowding and rioting among the 'residuum'.
[48] Willow Street School Log Book 1880–1905, RLLR, 19D59/VII/437, 16 November 1888; Floodgate Street School Log Book 1891–1920, 17 November 1893. See also Slater Street School Log Book (Boys) 1874–1893, 11 November 1883.
[49] Floodgate Street School Log Book 1891–1920, 1 April 1892, 9 September 1892, 23 September 1898, 26 April 1901. Springhall and Cohen show that language of disease accompanied moral panics about youth in different historical periods (the 1860s and the 1960s respectively). Springhall, *Youth, Popular Culture and Moral Panics*, 157; Stanley Cohen, *Folk Devils and Moral Panics* (London: MacGibbon & Kee, 1972), 62–3.
[50] Cowper Street School Log Book 1885–1924, 3 November 1886.

Court for a misdemeanour not disclosed in the log book and was in danger of committal to industrial school. The headmaster sent the girl's teacher along to speak in her favour: 'The girl was of exceedingly good conduct and manners, and in my opinion & that of her teacher not a suitable case for an Industrial School'.[51]

There are also references to absence because of casual employment. The headmaster of Floodgate Street School referred to 'children … peddling Xmas novelties' and 'hawking and making Xmas goods', while the headmaster of Willow Street School in Leicester noted that 'local events such as the execution of Boxton & Race-meetings greatly affect the attendance, so many boys being occupied in selling papers and cards'.[52] The short entries in log books only note pupil absence and do not reveal whether headteachers were concerned, as were many of their contemporaries, about 'blind alley' employment and exposure to popular culture.[53]

The notion that female pupils could be led by their (older) peers into temptation or sexual misconduct, which was so prominent in broader debates of the period about young girls, appears only in the log book of Elbow Lane School Special Department, Leicester.[54] This suggests particular concerns about sexuality, lack of self-control, and impressionability among girls with special educational needs (to use modern parlance).[55] There are references to pupils being 'morally bad' that are absent in other log books, which seem to refer to sexual conduct, though the references are veiled. An entry from September 1911 described a girl who was 'found out to be immoral' and 'leading others astray'. A log book entry from 1916 reveals the headteacher's perception that 'immorality' was linked to the home environment. She had received complaints

[51] Floodgate Street School Log Book 1891–1920, 13 May 1909.
[52] Floodgate Street School Log Book 1891–1920, 18 December 1891, 20 December 1895; Willow Street School Private Log Book (Boys) 1886–1892, 10 December 1886.
[53] For detailed discussion see Hendrick, *Images of Youth*, 75–82, 119–54; Pamela Horn, *The Victorian and Edwardian Schoolchild* (Gloucester: Sutton, 1989), 126–34; Springhall, *Youth, Popular Culture and Moral Panics*, 11–97; Chris Waters, *British Socialists and the Politics of Popular Culture 1884–1914* (Manchester: Manchester University Press, 1990).
[54] Goodman, 'Sex and the City', 86; Lesley Hall, *Sex, Gender and Social Change in Britain since 1880* (London: Macmillan, 2000), 37–8.
[55] This fits within a wider discourse about disabled children (and adults) being both more at risk and more risky than the non-disabled. See Stephen Humphries and Pamela Gordon, *Out of Sight: The Experience of Disability 1900–1950* (Plymouth: Northcote House, 1992), 88; Ian Copeland, *The Making of the Backward Pupil in Education in England 1870–1914* (London: Woburn Press, 1999), 182–3.

about two of her pupils stealing money, one from a shop, the other from her grandmother. 'Both girls are morally bad in other ways', she wrote, 'environment bad in both cases – no trouble in school'.[56]

Teachers' actions: corporal punishment

Of the log book entries concerning the actions of teachers, those about corporal punishment provide the clearest evidence of headteachers' attitudes to, and interactions with, the families and communities of the pupils who attended their schools.[57] Despite criticisms from some educationalists, corporal punishment was generally, though not universally, accepted as a necessary feature of classroom management in the late nineteenth and early twentieth centuries. It was also widespread in homes. Attitudes, however, were complex before, during, and after this period.[58] As Philip Gardner has argued, teachers who considered it necessary also thought that, if carried out unfairly or with excessive brutality, it could be damaging to pupil, teacher, and school.[59] References to corporal punishment in log books reveal the difficult decisions that headteachers had to make in order to maintain discipline and order in the school as a whole whilst balancing the sometimes conflicting interests of their staff and pupils.

Log book entries tend to refer to problematic cases of punishment where education department or school board regulations were broken, or which led to conflict between teacher and pupil or parent. Log books, examined by inspectors and local education authorities, were used by headteachers to explain and justify their actions before their paymasters. I found entries relating to corporal punishment of this nature for all but one of the 14 schools in my sample, but

[56] Elbow Lane School Special Department Log Book 1900–1924, 21 September 1911, 24 February 1916.
[57] For discussion of entries concerning corporal punishment in the log books of other schools see Marsden, *Teaching Dynasty*, 134–40; Pamela Silver and Harold Silver, *The Education of the Poor: the History of a National School, 1824–1974* (London: Routledge & Kegan Paul, 1974), 143–5.
[58] Burnett, *Destiny Obscure*, 149–51, 236–7; Philip Gardner, 'The Giant at the Front: Young Teachers and Corporal Punishment in Inter-War Elementary Schools', *History of Education* 25 no. 2 (1996), 141–63, 146, 153–7; Hurt, *Elementary Schooling and the Working Classes*, 162–4; Jacob Middleton, 'Thomas Hopley and Mid-Victorian Attitudes to Corporal Punishment', *History of Education* 34 no. 6 (2005), 599–615; Middleton, 'Experience of Corporal Punishment'; Jonathan Rose, 'Willingly to School: The Working-Class Response to Elementary Education in Britain, 1875–1918', *Journal of British Studies* 32 no. 2 (1993), 114–38, 129–31.
[59] Gardner, 'Giant at the Front', 150, 157.

references were more common for schools in poorer areas. There are some references, with limited comment, to teachers breaking corporal punishment regulations.[60] In other entries, its excessive use was presented as an indication that teachers were struggling to control the pupils in their classrooms. For example, the headmaster of Slater Street School noted in 1887 that a teacher who had administered corporal punishment when he was not permitted to do so 'had great obstacles to overcome' in class.[61] Whether these obstacles were the teacher's lack of competence, pupils with severe academic deficiencies, pupils from 'problem' homes, or some other problem, is unclear.

A number of entries concerning corporal punishment in the log book for St Mark's School in Leicester in the years around 1900 reveal tense and violent encounters between teachers, pupils and parents in a school in an increasingly impoverished city centre location. A small, underqualified, and largely female staff clearly struggled to supervise the older boys in the school's mixed classes.[62] There are detailed descriptions of problematic cases of corporal punishment over the course of a few months in 1899. One episode in particular highlights the extreme situations, with danger of physical harm to both teachers and pupils, that could arise when teachers struggled to maintain control.[63] It also highlights the potential for differences of opinion amongst authorities, in this case the managers and the magistrates, over whether teachers' actions were justified.[64] In the log book entry for 4 May 1899, less than two weeks into her job, the new headmistress wrote at length about the circumstances that led to her being summoned by the magistrates for 'unlawfully beating' one of the boys two days earlier. She caned Arthur Twist on several occasions during one day, initially for being disobedient and untruthful in class, and later in response to his violent behaviour – kicking out at the headmistress, seizing

[60] Floodgate Street School Log Book 1891–1920, 14 March 1892; Willow Street School Log Book 1905–1928, RLLR, 19D59/VII/438, 24 April 1907; Slater Street School Log Book (Boys) 1874–1893, 19 April 1889. Education Department regulations allowed only the headteacher (and in some schools also an assistant teacher) to inflict corporal punishment.
[61] Slater Street School Log Book (Boys) 1874–1893, 14 January 1887.
[62] St Mark's School Log Book 1874–1901, RLLR, DE3893/23, Inspection Report 27 October 1899.
[63] See also Horn, *The Victorian and Edwardian Schoolchild*, 31–2 and Humphries, *Hooligans or Rebels?*, 34, 130 for examples of pupils being violent towards their teachers.
[64] Hurt, *Elementary Schooling and the Working Classes*, 162–4 notes varied outcomes in court cases of teachers charged with assaulting pupils.

her cane and holding it 'threateningly', and wielding an open clasp knife. The boy's mother came into school using 'abusive and threatening language', exposed her son's injuries, and demanded an investigation. The school managers found that the boy had a history of violent behaviour in class, decided he had 'brought all punishments on himself', and expelled him. The magistrates, however, disagreed, and decided against the headmistress.[65] The school managers had acted to protect the headmistress rather than the pupil, a decision which, the log book entry suggests, was motivated by judgements about the pupil based on his past behaviour. They may also, arguably, have been acting to protect other pupils: seeking through Arthur's expulsion to maintain order and discipline in the school as the whole, and to prevent a similar incident occurring in the future.

Judgements about punishment could be tempered when 'problem pupils' or 'problem families' were involved. This is evident in the incident at St Mark's School described above, and also in the one reference to corporal punishment in the log book for Edgbaston School, located at the edge of an exclusive suburb in Birmingham. In April 1884 the monitor struck a pupil in the playground. The monitor was reprimanded for breaking regulations and 'taking the law into his own hands', but the headmaster noted that he 'received much provocation' from the pupil in question, 'a most officious and troublesome boy'.[66] The headmaster of Willow Street School wrote as follows in 1883, excusing the use of corporal punishment and questioning the legitimacy of parental complaints: '…if a stripe with the cane is given complaints are made that children are abused and knocked about. I generally find the same parents frequently keep their children away from school on the most trivial and frivolous excuses'.[67] Whilst headteachers could take action against members of the teaching staff breaking corporal punishment regulations, on some occasions it appears that prior judgements about problem pupils and problem families, or sympathy for their staff working under difficult conditions, might have compromised the way that these regulations were enforced.

[65] St Mark's School Log Book 1874–1901, 4 May 1899, 8 May 1899.
[66] Edgbaston CofE School Log Book (Boys) 1906–1931, BAHS, S62/1/2, Inspection Report 1912, Inspection Report 1916; Edgbaston CofE School Log Book (Boys) 1881–1906, BAHS, S62/1/1, week ending 4 April 1884.
[67] Willow Street School Log Book 1880–1905, 15 June 1883.

Discussion: caring power and its limits

Headteachers might have been motivated by genuine sympathy for pupils. But the log books, particularly those of schools located in areas of poverty, reveal highly moral judgements about, and a desire to change, the conduct and moral standards of pupils, families, and indeed whole communities. Headteachers could react with distaste or disgust to lives very different from their own. Some pupils were deemed more in need of improvement than others, as is evident from the concentration of entries pointing to cultural gaps between school and home in the log books of schools located in the poorer areas of Leicester and Birmingham.

Particular domestic situations and neighbourhoods were labelled problematic through a 'restricted vocabulary of descriptors'.[68] Such identification is apparent not only in headteachers' log book entries but also in the inspection reports that were copied into log books.[69] HMIs were required, when deciding on the level of grant to award the school, to take account of the school's social environment, making allowance for 'special circumstances' such as a 'shiftless, scattered, very poor or ignorant population'.[70] Thus phrases like 'poor home circumstances', 'poor home surroundings', 'bad environment', 'wastrel classes' recur in reports on schools in poor areas.[71] Through these descriptors, groups of pupils were singled out as dangerous, but also in need of rescue from their homes and communities. Conversely, Edgbaston School was attended by a 'superior class of boys' from 'good homes'.[72] The implication was that pupils from poor homes required surveillance, and needed protection, or discipline, or both, while pupils from good

[68] Grosvenor and Myers, 'Progressivism, Control and Correction', 242.
[69] The requirement to copy inspection reports into log books was stipulated in the elementary school code.
[70] Committee of Council on Education, Instructions issued to Her Majesty's Inspectors under the Code of 1882. In: *Report of the Committee of Council on Education (England and Wales) with Appendix 1882-83* [CC-3706-1].
[71] For example, Floodgate Street School Log Book 1891–1920, Report for year ended 30 June 1896, Report for 1916; HMI Reports on Schools 1901–02, RLLR, 19D59/VI/101, Inspection Report for Elbow Lane School, 11 February 1902; HMI Reports on Schools 1903–04, RLLR, 19D59/VII/140, Inspection Report for Willow Street School, 17 February 1904; Cowper Street School Log Book 1885–1924, Inspection Report 1888; Slater Street School Log Book (Girls) 1899–1924, RLLR, DE4467/5, Inspection Report 1912. This use of language suggests multiple negative connotations attached to slums in the late nineteenth century as identified by Brehony, 'A Socially Civilising Influence', 89–91 and Judith Walkowitz, *City of Dreadful Delight* (London: Virago Press, 1992), 15–39.
[72] Edgbaston CofE School Log Book (Boys) 1906–1931, Inspection Report 1912, Inspection Report 1916.

homes could be left alone.[73] The use of such descriptors may have been motivated by a genuine concern to make allowances for circumstances outside the school. However, labels of this sort might have influenced important decisions affecting pupils' education, and could, potentially, have been ascribed by pupils themselves.[74]

Such labels gave headteachers' judgements particular weight, underpinned as they were by their professional and legal power, and (for schools in poor areas) superior social status *vis a vis* pupils and their parents, as well as the pronouncements of inspectors.[75] They helped legitimise invasive actions, sometimes over-riding parental authority or pupils' freedom. Yet, despite evidence of blanket judgements, headteachers also responded differently to individual cases of pupil misdemeanours, and altered their assessments of pupils over time. Headteachers working in elementary schools in districts of urban poverty may have perceived cultural gaps between school and home, but within this general framework they could differentiate between the particular situations and people they encountered.

In practice headteachers were limited in their ability to intervene in the lives of pupils. They sought to alter and control the behaviour of unruly, often poor working-class, children and their families, giving some credence to theories of elementary schooling as part of a project of socialisation and social control.[76] However, even if control was intended, log books indicate many *ad hoc* interventions rather than a coherent, planned strategy of socialisation, and also that interventions were not always effective, as is evident, for example, from headteachers' continuing battles with truancy. Indeed, the overall conditions and contexts in which headteachers worked restricted how far they were able to exercise their 'caring power' and 'improve' their pupils and pupils' families. Those in schools in poor areas could work in overcrowded, ill-ventilated, poorly

[73] See Ian Grosvenor, '"All the names": LEAs and the Making of Pupil and Community Identities', *Oxford Review of Education* 28 no. 2/3 (2002), 299–310 for a discussion of surveillance through the maintenance of local authority records.
[74] See Grosvenor and Myers, 'Progressivism, Control and Correction', 245–6 for a similar argument regarding Birmingham Education Authority's Education Census and After-Care record cards.
[75] Anna Davin notes that teachers in 'slum schools' in London rarely lived in the poor quality housing around the school, and frequently commuted some distance from their upper working-class or lower-middle class homes. Davin, *Growing up Poor*, 134.
[76] See, for example, Davin, *Growing up Poor*, 134; Humphries, *Hooligans or Rebels?*; Phillip McCann, ed. *Popular Education and Socialization in the Nineteenth Century* (London: Methuen & Co. Ltd, 1977).

heated buildings, often facing staff shortages and illness among teachers and pupils.[77] Confronted with so many problems, how far were they able to supervise the pupils in their care? In these conditions they might, arguably, have been engaged in something like crowd control.[78] Moreover, it is possible that, in practice, staff time and attention were directed towards what was inspected and funded (attendance, punctuality, and good performance in examinations): the amount of space and attention devoted to these issues in log books must, to some extent, have reflected everyday priorities. And regular attendance and academic performance were generally, according to the log books examined, harder to achieve in schools in poor areas. In 1895, the headmaster of Ladypool Road School wrote the following poignant entry in the school log book, about five months before he resigned:

> The strain upon myself owing to these continual [staff] absences has been most severe … Having no teachers on supply who could fill up the vacant places, the school as a whole must necessarily suffer … I feel within myself that I shall not always be equal to the demands which have of late been made upon my strength, and this, coupled with my anxiety for the children's future prospects has compelled me, though reluctantly, to make this statement.[79]

This headmaster felt that staff shortages placed severe constraints on his ability to run the school. He was anxious about the long-term effects of these shortages, fearing that pupils' 'future prospects' could be jeopardised if the efficiency and stability of the school as a whole were not maintained. It appears that the pupils subject to 'pernicious influences'[80] from their family or community were in schools where teachers were most likely to struggle to maintain efficient and safe conditions in the school as a whole. A clear pattern seems to emerge for this sample of schools. The schools in which headteachers had, in their view, the most to do to 'civilise' their

[77] Pupil-teacher ratios in elementary schools were, generally, improving by the turn of the twentieth century. However, even into the twentieth century, log books for some of the schools examined describe staff shortage, illness, or rapid staff turnover resulting in large classes, or the teaching of two classes together.
[78] Gardner, 'Giant at the Front', 145–6; Rose, 'Willingly to School', 115–16. However, Hurt, *Elementary Schooling and the Working Classes*, 168–9 and Rose, 'Willingly to School', 127–8 argue that despite these conditions some schools offered poor children more light, cleanliness and warmth than they received at home.
[79] Ladypool CofE School Log Book 1862–1897, BAHS, S113/1/1, 8 November 1895. Levels of staffing were a recurring source of disagreement between the headteachers (sometimes supported by Local Education Authority officials) and the school's managers over the next ten years.
[80] Floodgate Street School Log Book 1891–1920, Inspection Report for year ended 30 June 1899.

pupils, and to secure their well-being, were those where they met with the greatest obstacles in their day-to-day work to intervening effectively in pupils' lives.

Log books show that teachers working in schools in the poorest areas a century ago had to deal with numerous child protection issues. Yet these same teachers faced great challenges – staff shortages, illness, poor buildings to name a few – which might have compromised their ability to protect pupils in their care. In the immediate contexts in which educators work, tensions of this nature are still very evident today. Arguably, those who have the most to do in protecting children, and thereby engaging in the lives of their families and communities, are those who face significant obstacles in their day-to-day working environment that might, potentially, make this sort of engagement difficult. This historical analysis raises a fundamental question: are we, as we did a century ago, asking teachers and other professionals working with children in certain schools to manage the impossible?

Conclusion

This analysis of log books from 14 schools in the decades around the turn of the last century has discussed headteachers' perceptions of children, and the role of the school and the teacher in relation to pupils' lives inside and outside school. This is one perspective on elementary schools and their local communities but an important one. Common themes and patterns emerge. Log books also reveal varying circumstances in schools and the different approaches of individual headteachers both to log book writing and to the business of running an elementary school. Overall, this study suggests the need to guard against over-simplistic, generic models of the elementary school's 'civilising mission' as a framework for understanding the social relationships between teacher, family and community in the late nineteenth and early twentieth centuries. The notion of caring power allows for the nuanced analysis that is required.

This study shows that, despite methodological challenges, log books can offer valuable insights into relations between school and home and community from the point of view of headteachers. Further insights could, potentially, be generated by analysing log books alongside other primary sources. A range of sources could, potentially, provide valuable information on the national administrative context, policy-makers' intentions, and other schools. These include the Education Department's annual Code of Regulations for elementary schools, instructions for inspectors, district inspectors' reports, the *Suggestions for the Consideration of Teachers*,[81] occasional circulars, and also major reports which draw on evidence from educational experts, administrators and teachers who worked in and with a wide range of schools across the country.[82] At the local level, school board and educational records can be examined alongside other sources relevant to the locality. William Marsden offers a useful model. He draws on the records of the London School Board to locate Fleet Road School, Hampstead, in the context of local educational policy and administration, and uses other sources, including Charles Booth's survey *Life and Labour of the People in London*, to discuss the socio-economic and cultural milieu of the school's locality.[83] Good, though incomplete, School Board and Education Committee records survive for both Birmingham and Leicester. Whilst there is no equivalent to Charles Booth's survey, other records such as population census returns, the records of professional agencies and voluntary agencies outside the school, including those of the police and medical officers of health and local philanthropic bodies, are likely to provide valuable evidence about families and communities. An exploratory study of the area around Floodgate Street school reveals, by combining the evidence in the school log book with pamphlets, newspaper articles and the records of Middlemore Emigration Homes, that teachers and other professional and voluntary

[81] Board of Education, *Suggestions for the Consideration of Teachers and Others Concerned in the Work of Public Elementary Schools* (London: HMSO, 1905). Reprints with minor revisions, and additional instalments, were issued in the years up to 1918. This document was substantially revised and renamed *Handbook of Suggestions for Teachers* in 1927. Peter Gordon, 'The Handbook of Suggestions for Teachers: its origins and evolution', *Journal of Educational Administration and History* 17 no.1 (1983), 41–8.
[82] *Final Report of the Royal Commission Appointed to Inquire into the Working of the Elementary Education Acts* (London: HMSO, 1888). The earlier volumes of evidence are also useful.
[83] Marsden, *Educating the Respectable*, 1–27, 85–94.

workers used a common language to talk about the Floodgate Street area and its inhabitants, and worked together to provide material assistance to the children living in the area, to protect them from harm, and to punish misdemeanours.[84] Further local case studies could explore the potential for combining primary sources in this way.

I return to my starting point concerning anxieties about the condition of the younger generation. The analysis presented here seems pertinent as present day educators grapple, as did their counterparts a hundred years ago, with fears about children. Themes and attitudes in log books have obvious currency. By revealing that current concerns, serious as they may be, are not entirely new but have historical antecedents, this analysis helps us see these concerns in a different way. As John Tosh puts it, 'to know that the past can illuminate the contours of the present is to be better equipped to make intelligent decisions about difficult public issues'.[85] The evidence examined suggests that present panics about childhood relate to adults' fears about the moral state of the younger generation, particularly of children subject to urban deprivation. Behind these fears is an ideal of behaviour and attitudes which educators aim to achieve, even if the language is now of emotion and citizenship rather than the moral instruction or moral training of the late nineteenth and early twentieth centuries.[86] There are also potential parallels between the sweeping assessments that educators made about the bad influences on children coming from particular homes and neighbourhoods, and judgments within the current policy context of postcode and household income influencing decisions over funding and resources. Perennial problems take on new forms. Corporal punishment is rarely used now, but the questions it raises about discipline, classroom management, and teachers' attitudes to pupils speak directly to current concerns. We cannot learn or apply direct 'lessons' from this small-scale analysis, but such an analysis can reveal our current situation in a new light and help us understand it better.

[84] Susannah Wright, 'The Work of Teachers and Others in and around a Birmingham Slum School 1891–1920', *History of Education* 38 no.6 (2009), 729–46.
[85] John Tosh, *Why History Matters* (Houndmills, Basingstoke: Palgrave Macmillan, 2008), viii.
[86] See Kathryn Ecclestone and Dennis Hayes, *The Dangerous Rise of Therapeutic Education* (London: Routledge, 2009).

Appendix

TABLE 1 TO GO HERE