THE NEW PSYCHOLOGY AND THE CONSULTING PSYCHOLOGIST.
Royce, Josiah
Forum (1886-1930); Sep 1898; American Periodicals
pg. 80

THE NEW PSYCHOLOGY AND THE CONSULTING PSYCHOLOGIST.

THERE have been recently a number of discussions by very competent authorities concerning the present situation and prospects of the various studies and investigations that constitute what is often called the New Psychology. It is, perhaps, presumptuous for me to undertake to add to the contributions to this topic. But as a student of general philosophy, and also as one interested in certain aspects of the New Psychology itself, I have taken such interest in the recent controversies as to lead me to attempt in the present paper both a brief review of the general nature of our present problem and a practical suggestion as to a way in which the New Psychology may be aided in obtaining a more satisfactory relation to the profession of the teacher.

No one familiar with the literature of any of the recent types of psychological investigation can doubt that much, both of novelty and of value, is constantly coming to light in the course of the newer studies of the mental aspects of human nature. It is not surprising, therefore, that those who have practically to deal with the management of human nature, above all, the teaching profession, should be encouraged to cherish very high hopes as to the service which may be derived from these investigations. On the other hand, as has been lately pointed out by various authorities, a good many of these hopes concerning what psychology in the present state of its development can do to settle fundamental questions as to educational methods and ideals have been over-sanguine. The psychologist, whatever his speciality, has his own scientific tasks. The teacher, whatever his training, has his own plans, and must pursue in the end methods determined by these plans and by numerous social interests with which the study of psychology may have little or nothing to do. The teacher hopes too much, if he ventures to anticipate that the scientific study of human nature can of itself alone predetermine even the most fundamental part of what the teacher himself has to seek as an ideal, or of what he has to use as means for attaining that ideal.

Over-sanguine hopes, however, may easily lead to correspondingly bitter disappointments. This incongruity between the purposes of a sci-

Reproduced with permission of the copyright owner. Further reproduction prohibited without permission.

ence and the undertakings of an art is in other branches of human endeavor a familiar fact. The theoretical study of electricity went on for a long time before modern electrical engineering was in existence, or was even a very near and reasonable hope. Yet, in many such cases, patient waiting has been rewarded; and, just as truly, over-hasty hopefulness has been often disappointed. Anyone duly acquainted with the present undertakings of modern psychology ought to agree that these undertakings must in the end prove as important for our dealing with human nature as physical and physiological researches have proved in other modern arts. But, on the other hand, it is perfectly true that the psychologists themselves have a right to pursue these lines of research without being continually interrupted by over-hasty demands for practical results. It is equally true that no immediate and fundamental revolution in educational methods and ideals can be said to be warranted by what is at present known through the newer psychological researches. One who discusses the relation between psychology and education at the present time has no right, therefore, to attempt to settle anything as a finality; for the psychological science of to-day is simply no finality whatever. The true practical interest of such a discussion lies in attempting to consider how at the present time, and under the present temporary and rapidly changing conditions, the teacher and the psychologist can best be brought into coöperation.

I.

A closer approach to this question may first be made through an attempt at a plain statement as to the general situation in psychology at the present day. Every discussion of the New Psychology and of its place in education seems to presuppose the thesis that there *is* a New Psychology. This thesis is undoubtedly, in some sense, correct. None the less is the whole matter subject to a good deal of misunderstanding; and we may, therefore, ask at once: "In precisely what sense is there a New Psychology at all? In what sense was there an Old Psychology, which is now abandoned or superseded?" To these questions I find at present answers, current and frequently repeated, which I think to be nevertheless wrong answers. I refer particularly to two statements, both of which are not unknown in the recent literature of the subject. I shall consider these two statements in order.

The first of these statements runs: There was once something in existence and in favor which is henceforth to be known as the Old or

Reproduced with permission of the copyright owner. Further reproduction prohibited without permission.

Rational Psychology. This psychology, so the statement in question continues, was concerned with the nature, the origin, the destiny of the human soul, of the ego, of man as he is in himself. But, the same statement adds, modern thought has somehow changed all this. We now no longer study that Old or Rational Psychology. We have given up trying to find out the true nature of man or of the soul, or the true destiny and meaning of our life. We now study nerve-cells and reflexes, the knee-jerk, and the scatter-wittedness of children's minds. We take reaction times, and make tables of the statistics of fears, bad dreams, and color-hearing. And this is the New Psychology. This, in sum, is the first of the two statements to which I have just referred. I summarize this statement in a somewhat crude form; but what I mean is that the statement in question, in any form, sets forth an essentially false antithesis. As a fact, no such change in the objects and interests of human thought has taken place as this false antithesis implies.

It is true that once questions about the origin and destiny of the human ego, in other words, questions about man's place in the universe, were current and favorite questions,—current and favorite amongst believers in any form of religious faith, amongst theologians of every school, amongst philosophers of every seriously reflective and thoroughgoing group of philosophical investigators. It is also true that precisely such questions are current to-day amongst precisely the same types of persons. If you have any form of religious faith, you believe something about man's nature and destiny and place in the universe. If you study a technical theology, you are interested in the statement and defence of some such faith. If you have time to study philosophy, the principal part of your work as a student of metaphysical issues will properly be devoted to precisely these questions. These questions, then, are in no sense antiquated. They are not superseded. They are as modern, as human, as intensely fascinating, as rational as ever they were. The human mind has precisely the same right to face ultimate issues that ever it had. And, in facing these ultimate issues, if it seeks new light, it also respects, uses, and depends upon types of insight that are very ancient. No new psychology, no other form of current doctrine, has in the least changed this essential situation. So long as man is interested in his own destiny, he will either believe or philosophize about ultimate questions. And when he has time and spirit for the undertaking, he will have a right to philosophize; and neither neurology nor child-study will ever interfere with rational attempts at a philosophy of mind. If such a philosophy of mind be what is meant by the Old Psychology, I reply that such Old

Reproduced with permission of the copyright owner. Further reproduction prohibited without permission.

Psychology is precisely as new and as interesting to philosophers to-day as ever it was.

But, meanwhile, I myself should maintain that no such philosophical study of ultimate questions has any very direct bearing upon the technical problems of educational methods. Philosophy notoriously bakes no bread. It is true, therefore, that the sort of psychology of direct interest to the teacher must, in general, be Empirical Psychology. Empirical Psychology is an effort to understand, in as scientific a way as possible, the natural history, the facts, and laws of the behavior of man's mind as they exist for our daily experience. And the study of the natural history of the human mind is itself in no wise dependent upon any particular philosophical or theological theory. The philosophical study of man's nature and destiny is itself very distinct from the study of Empirical Psychology proper. But this distinction is in no wise a novel one. Nor is the recognition of this distinction in any sense peculiarly modern. Aristotle already clearly distinguished the study of the natural history of man, in his physical, in his mental, and in his social aspects, from the inquiry into metaphysical or ultimate philosophical and theological problems. Empirical Psychology, viewed as such, never has undertaken to solve ultimate philosophical issues. So far, then, there is a true antithesis between the philosophy of mind and the empirical study of the contents and behavior of man's mind. But this antithesis is simply not one between the Old and the New. It is, *mutatis mutandis*, very much the kind of distinction of office which exists between mathematics and the special physical sciences. A man who talked of mathematics in general as something to be called "old," and who opposed what he called the Old Mathematics to what he called the New Theory of Electricity, and who said that one of these pursuits was destined to supersede the other, would be as ignorant of the business of science as are those who narrowly and absurdly oppose something said to be superseded, which they call the Old or Rational Psychology (and which was and is nothing but the philosophical study of man's life), to something which they call the New Psychology, which is merely our best present effort to make out what we can about the natural history of the human mind. So much, then, for the first of our two statements of the antithesis between the old and the new in psychology.

II.

The second false statement which I wish to set aside defines the antithesis between the Old and the New as follows: Once, it says, there

Reproduced with permission of the copyright owner. Further reproduction prohibited without permission.

existed a study of human nature which was exclusively introspective. The psychologist studied merely his own individual mind. That was the psychology of the arm-chair. That was the Old Psychology. It was pursued, says this statement, until very recently; say until Fechner, or until Herbert Spencer. The New Psychology is not thus exclusively introspective. It is experimental, or social, or physiological, or comparative. It forsakes the arm-chair, and makes use of the laboratory, of the dissecting-room, and of a wide observation of many beings with minds. Now of course the Old Psychology, being, according to this view, introspective, interested merely the individual psychologist, who edified himself and not his brethren. As the teacher has not amongst his own pupils that particular Old Psychologist whose book used to be a classic, the teacher can be but little helped by that respectable person's study of his own states of mind. Therefore the teacher must be exclusively interested in the New Psychology, since that psychology is not concerned with any one man's states of mind, but with facts capable of a more universal verification.

Once more I have stated somewhat crudely the view that I oppose; but what I mean is, that, in any form, this statement is hopelessly unhistorical. It gives us a false antithesis. There has never been any notable study of human nature in its empirical aspects that was satisfied to be mainly introspective. Aristotle's psychology, as it appears in his treatise on that subject, the first of all European treatises belonging to the field, is fundamentally a psycho-physical doctrine. Aristotle very carefully states the psycho-physical programme, and pursues it according to his light. He uses introspection very much as a modern experimental psychologist would do. His sources of psychological knowledge are on occasion medical. They are very frequently, in the more general sense, biological. They include an effort toward a study of comparative psychology. They make especially prominent observations upon mankind in general. In the ethical and political treatises of Aristotle, such observation was pursued far into the social realm.

Nor is the later psychology of the ancients, nor is mediæval psychology, at all exclusively introspective. To take a notable instance, the famous doctrine of the Faculties of the Mind was obviously derived from nobody's study of his own mind, but rather from the common social traditions about human nature embodied in the current psychological vocabulary. These common social traditions are the precipitate, so to speak, of generations of comments passed upon men by other men. In brief, one may simply defy students of psychology to point out where, in

Reproduced with permission of the copyright owner. Further reproduction prohibited without permission.

the whole past history of man's efforts to understand the human mind, an exclusively or even mainly introspective empirical psychology has ever existed or even been attempted. The common gossip of social intercourse, the more precise observation of the forms of social and political life, the obviously psycho-physical doctrine of the temperaments,—a doctrine absolutely inaccessible to pure introspection,—these are typical cases illustrating the methods by which the study of the natural history of mind has always been pursued. To quote one more special case, consider Locke's doctrine about the intellect. The first book of Locke's "Essay on the Human Understanding" is devoted to the famous onslaught on the doctrine of innate ideas. As Locke pursues this argument, what are his sources of psychological information? I reply, apart from their necessary crudity when criticised from our present point of view, Locke's sources have to be defined as anthropology and child-study. Locke uses, as empirical arguments, travellers' reports about savages, and anybody's observations of childhood. Is this an exclusively introspective psychology? Is this an especially antiquated method of work? To be sure, in the Scottish philosophers you very frequently find, side by side with psychology, a great many investigations which depend upon what some people call introspection, and upon what nobody should call Empirical Psychology. But this other something in the works of such thinkers is Philosophical Reflection. In such works Empirical Psychology and metaphysics are frequently very confusingly blended; but in any case Philosophical Reflection is something very different from the introspective observation of the contents of one's own mind for purposes of natural history. Introspection, in the psychological sense of that word, the relatively exclusive study of the contents of one's own mind for the sake of finding out the laws of this mind, is a process that you find deliberately pursued in a very few of the older works belonging to the literature of our subject. But these works are not text-books of psychology, or independent investigations into the science as such. They are psychological autobiographies, of greater or less value as documents. But in precisely this same sense introspection is present as a notable factor in the literature of to-day. In fact, there is much more autobiographical confession in modern literature than ever there was before. The introspection of St. Augustine has its representatives in the older literature, say, by tens. The introspection of Marie Bashkirtseff has in the newer time slain its thousands. And so much for the Old and the New as regards this aspect of introspection. But if you ask whether the truly scientific psychologist of the present time has wholly abandoned introspection, then every

Reproduced with permission of the copyright owner. Further reproduction prohibited without permission.

respectable text-book of recent psychology would show you how little this is the case. In general, modern Experimental Psychology constantly involves the scientific pursuit of introspection under artificial conditions, accompanied indeed by a wide comparison of the reports of various observers.

In brief, then, the second statement often current as to our antithesis is false. The Old Psychology was not exclusively nor even mainly introspective. It was always, according to its light, psycho-physical, social, and comparative. It studied mind and body together, and observed indirectly as many minds as could be got under some sort of scrutiny. On the other hand, the New Psychology does not neglect a proper introspection; but gives to a due comparison of introspectively obtained results an even more prominent place than the introspective ever obtained in the older psychologies.

I have thus dealt with two false statements of the antithesis between the Old and the New psychological methods. Having set aside the false antithesis, it is easier to state in more practically valuable terms the nature of the true answer to our question, What is the New Psychology? Recent psychological study is separated by no chasm from the psychology of the past. It is a pursuit, with vastly improved instruments, and with vastly increased numbers of observers, and with greatly intensified technical training, of the old study of the natural history of mind upon methods and with ideals every one of which the past, according to its light, already in a very genuine sense anticipated. It is the fruit, therefore, of the past, just as it is a stage on the way to a higher future insight into how man's mind behaves, and into what we can best do to manage and to cultivate minds. Very imperfect is our knowledge about all these matters at present. Perfectly worthless would be our knowledge, however, if we had not the whole tradition of our older acquaintance with human nature to draw upon. And every sensible psychologist constantly uses that older tradition, constantly attempts to add to it, and is a New Psychologist merely in so far as he is at present able to use certain special instruments of research which were until recently inaccessible. In the novelty of these special instruments and their use lies what makes our psychology a new psychology.

So much for the situation of the moment. The New Psychology is no mystery, no miracle, no wonder of recent invention. The newer researches have indeed been as fascinating in their details as they have thus far been incomplete as regards their theoretical results. Our em-

Reproduced with permission of the copyright owner. Further reproduction prohibited without permission.

pirical knowledge of human nature is still in its infancy. It has always been in its infancy. And so far the Old and the New may indeed lie down together. Our knowledge of human nature is unquestionably growing; but our scientific theories as to the natural history of the human mind have not recently been in any thoroughgoing sense revolutionized. We know a great deal more than Aristotle knew about the psycho-physical problems that Aristotle already began to study; but our theoretical insight into the fundamental laws of mind is still small. Nevertheless, if one considers the worth of special researches, there is indeed a complex, and, in view of the great mass of details which the new instruments of research have recently added, a relatively new empirical psychology. The power of this psychology to give final guidance to the teacher, or to any other practical manager of the mind, is very imperfectly developed. Nevertheless, just because practical workers have constantly to do with details, rather than with theories, this vast collection of manifold details concerning the behavior of mind is full of suggestions that from time to time can prove of very considerable practical importance to the teacher.

III.

This being the general situation, our problem reduces to this: There is a great deal in the newer study of mind which can be, and which ought to be, of practical service to the teacher. But the new science is pursued for its own sake, just as the teacher's art is carried on with reference to the teacher's own interest. The problem is to bring about a wholesome coöperation between pursuits related, but just now too much kept apart. What the teacher constantly desires is to get at the New Psychology, to learn what it means and what it has found out. If the New Psychology were in some perfectly clear and glaring contrast to the Old, some striking revolution of practical methods might be expected to follow from it, and to be capable of definition. But since neither theoretical development nor novelty is as marked a feature of the New Psychology as some hopeful accounts would imply, the teacher in general no sooner approaches the new science than he is baffled by its wealth and by its puzzles; while the New Psychologist no sooner endeavors to guide the teacher than he is obliged to show, by his mysterious manner or by his wonderfully constructed sentences, that what he most desires to impart is still in the main simply unspeakable.

As a fact, I feel that at present the relation between the students of the newer psychology and the teachers of our country is not yet a very

Reproduced with permission of the copyright owner. Further reproduction prohibited without permission.

healthy relation. I myself have been for two or three years temporarily the chairman of a "Philosophical Department" in my University. As such I have had to consider the hopes and difficulties of a number of young men entering upon the profession of psychology. I have felt very much concerned about the harassing and painful situation in which some of them are at present put. I have feared sometimes lest the public misunderstandings as to what their profession may do or ought to do for teachers, might in the end result in injury to the success of these ardent investigators. I believe profoundly in the study of that psychology which, in the sense just pointed out, is indeed new, since, without breaking with the past, it is constantly renewing its youth. But one of the missions of the public, whenever it feels a strong need for a good thing, seems to be to do all sorts of deeds to hinder the fulfilment of its own ends, and to confuse those who are trying to help it. I feel, then, disposed to refer to what at the moment is too often the situation in which the young psychologist innocently and painfully finds himself.

The psychological investigators, and especially the younger psychological investigators in our laboratories, are, for one thing, just now in the position common to men who are forced to win a hearing by somewhat magnifying their own office. If Empirical Psychology is not new, the laboratories are new; and they are unquestionably very valuable and admirable means for the advance of the science. Attention, however, has to be attracted to these laboratories. The attention and support of such practical people as the teachers are very valuable for the young psychologist. He, in his turn, is sanguine. He is devoted to his calling. He hopes that whatever interests him can be made to interest everybody; and so he is disposed, if not to make very large promises to teachers, at least to make very considerable calls upon their time and patience. In consequence, the teachers who are under his influence are frequently led to hope that whatever happens in his laboratory may in some way pretty directly contribute to the establishment of sound methods in education, to the saving of souls, or to the answering of all those countless practical questions that seem so frequently, in the average teacher's mind, to demand an immediate solution. Hence the teachers look more or less wonderingly toward the laboratory. And the man in the laboratory is more or less stimulated, and, I fear, sometimes more or less confused, by these calls from another profession. Thus stimulated and thus hopeful, he of course longs to help everybody. Distracted by the external calls for aid upon matters which perhaps do not directly concern him at all, he tends to undertake the solution, not indeed of

Reproduced with permission of the copyright owner. Further reproduction prohibited without permission.

everything, but of most of the things that the teachers desire him to solve.

Meanwhile the young psychologist feels that the teachers have countless facts which they might furnish to aid him in his researches. These facts are occurring in the school-room or elsewhere, but so far not in the laboratory. Perhaps the psychologist thinks that these facts can be got indirectly into the laboratory by means of the now well-known syllabus. The syllabus asks questions and furnishes a blank, which the teachers, according to their lights, are to fill out in such wise as to indicate the contents of the minds of their children. But the psychologist in the laboratory cannot well control the scientific use of the syllabus by persons outside of the laboratory. Lacking himself the time for an adequate personal study of children in school-rooms, the laboratory psychologist is consequently too often left dependent on the observations of unskilled persons for far too many of his data. Meanwhile the syllabus, often inexpertly used and filled out, through the busy teacher's aid, may have led to much waste of time in the school-room. It may also tend to produce in the end a feeling of disappointment in the teacher's own mind. Countless so-called facts go on record; but the results are still to wait for. The syllabus comes; but wisdom lingers. The teacher, too, lingers on the shore of psychology; and somehow or other the entire situation begins to get a painfulness of which we have recently heard many echoes.

Or, perhaps, the young psychologist does not use the syllabus. He rather plans to bring his instruments to the school-room, or, on occasion, the school-children to his laboratory. Both undertakings are frequently thoroughly justified. But, in any case, experiments pursued under such conditions are subject to a double criticism. The laboratory psychologist properly desires these experiments for theoretical purposes. The teacher desires them to be of immediate practical significance. It is true that the combination of these two interests has been in some cases notably very easy. But in other cases it may be very difficult. And the psychologist in his laboratory may find it hard to acquire sufficient experience of the school-room and its problems to adjust these conflicts when they arise. He is led to making vast promises. The teachers remain promise-crammed. So far, that is for the time being too often all. As a fact, the young psychologist ought not to be distracted by this demand for immediate practical application. On the other hand, the teachers ought not to be asked to give extra time to contribute to the advance of purely scientific interests. They need to get direct practical benefits. And yet at present these two bodies, whose interests, if related,

Reproduced with permission of the copyright owner. Further reproduction prohibited without permission.

are so diverse, ought to be made to coöperate; while the coöperation is still left to the ingenuity and social adroitness of a busy young laboratory man, who has recently obtained his Doctor's degree, who has the whole problem of his career before him, who has to teach college-classes, to interest the public in his science, to contribute papers to the psychological journals, and perhaps to keep up polemic relations with his metaphysical colleagues, at the very moment when the teachers desire him to give them infallible advice, and when he himself is longing to find out something about what goes on in the school-room, as well as in any other place where human nature displays itself.

Now I say that this situation involves altogether too great a demand upon the young psychologist. If he frequently fails wholly to satisfy the demand, if his polemical essays have a somewhat hectic tone, if his promises to the public have a somewhat crude vagueness, the fault is very frequently not his, but the result of the unfortunate situation in which his profession and the public still place him. Now if we do not better this situation, we shall all suffer. And the remedy lies not in trying to ignore the New Psychology, nor merely in telling the teachers that they have nothing to hope from its work. The remedy lies precisely where experience has so often shown that in similar cases the difficulties of too complicated a situation are to be met, namely, in a new division of labor.

IV.

One who attempts to define a relatively new practical office is subject at the present day to the easy criticism that we already have too many officials. It seems indeed unnecessary to create an office until you already have a man for the office. But, in the case of the recommendation that I now propose to make, it seems to me that we already have both the men and the practical need for the office. The situation of the students of the New Psychology is one which needs to obtain relief. The situation of the teachers who desire to get at the New Psychology is one which needs to receive assistance. From both sides comes the call for the official whose office I shall now try to define. Already, in a number of cases, young laboratory psychologists of sufficient skill and energy have actually made the task which I have in mind their principal business. Already, in the case of certain special public institutions, as in schools for defective children, an office substantially identical with the one that I propose has been recognized. What I wish to suggest is, that the recognition and definition of the proposed office should be made systematic,

Reproduced with permission of the copyright owner. Further reproduction prohibited without permission.

and that its importance as a means of bringing about a true relation between modern psychology and modern education should be recognized.

I think, then, that the time is ripe for the recognition of a new kind of intermediate scholar and official, whose business it shall be to mediate between the teaching profession and the work of the laboratory psychologist. My practical proposal is that in our large cities, and later in other places, there should appear in the office of the Superintendent of Instruction, a person whom I shall venture to call a Consulting Psychologist. He should be a well-equipped, modern, experimental psychologist, with a thorough University training, with skill as a laboratory investigator, but, after he once accepts his office, with the responsibilities and duties of a decidedly practical man. He should be well versed in what our better institutions have to offer in the way of the general study of the art of education. He should also, if possible, have had some experience as a practical teacher. But he should not, on the other hand, be a professor of pedagogy. He shall not be responsible for teaching psychology to college classes, or to anybody else, excepting so far as the spirit moves him to discuss his science with the teachers of his city. He shall indeed consult, but he shall not be regarded as anybody's final and authoritative official adviser, infallible or otherwise. If possible, he shall never be called "Professor." He shall have no authority over the organization of schools or the determination of school methods. But this shall be his office and his responsibility, namely: To find out, so far as may be, and with a minimum of interference with the ordinary work of any school, whatever it is worth while for the teacher and the trained psychologist together to know concerning the mental states and processes present in the children of the schools of his city. In other words, his official task shall be simply to investigate and report upon those facts concerning the school-children of his city which are at once of psychological character and of practical interest.

Space would of course fail me in this connection to attempt to set forth, with any sort of fulness, what classes of facts answering to this definition may be regarded as already accessible in the school-room, in case the trained psychologist is from time to time present to direct their collection. The recent literature in praise of the virtues and the hopes of the New Psychology has already had a great deal to say about these classes of facts. For instance, at the moment a great deal of discussion is going on concerning the phenomena of fatigue in the school-room, and concerning the influence of fatigue upon the intellectual work of children. The difficulty with all these later investigations of fatigue is, that

Reproduced with permission of the copyright owner. Further reproduction prohibited without permission.

they are at present in a stage which forbids the inexpert person to form any independent judgment about the worth of the methods of investigating fatigue, or about the practical results of such investigation. The whole subject is in a transition state. Yet there can be little doubt that work by experts, when practically controlled by the presence and the plans of practical teachers, would rapidly tend to reach results that would be more or less tentatively applicable to educational purposes. The development of the study of fatigue in its practical relation will never be rapid and wholesome unless theoretical students and practical workers coöperate. Nor can one hope for sufficient attention to be given to these investigations on the part of the possible medical inspectors of our schools. The phenomena in question are largely, and in some cases very subtly, psychological. A thorough investigation of them can be hoped for only from those who are primarily interested in mental life as such. One need entertain no exaggerated hopes concerning the revolutionary effect of such study, if one believes, as a matter of plain sense, that much will be gained if the psychologist and the teacher have the opportunity to consult together concerning the accessible facts, and concerning the methods of work as they from time to time develop. Yet no one but a psychologist whose life is principally devoted to consultation with teachers can have at his disposal time sufficient for such useful investigation.

If the phenomena of fatigue thus form one of the general fields of possible investigation, there are other fields that even more obviously and directly both interest the teacher and puzzle the psychologist. Good and bad spelling; the countless sorts of good and bad memory; the mental effects of physical exercise; the psychological relation of manual training to other parts of the school-work; the increase of skill with the use of this or of that method of training in arithmetic or in some other branch of school-work; the phenomena of school excitements, rumors, occasional mutinies, and the like; the psychological relations of various methods of school discipline; the presence and the variety of the psychologically interesting temperamental differences among the school-children,—all these are instances of classes of facts already accessible to expert psychological observation. None of these classes of phenomena is exclusively related to the study of exceptional or morbid children. The matters thus far on our list may be studied more or less statistically and in relation to large numbers of children at once. The interest of all these classes of phenomena, both for the psychologist and the teacher, is easily recognized. Yet there is nobody at present whose

Reproduced with permission of the copyright owner. Further reproduction prohibited without permission.

official business it is to study them at once with professional expertness and with a strongly practical interest. Neither by the use of the syllabus, nor through occasional invasions of the school-room by the overworked college teacher of psychology, nor by the equally sporadic visits of medical inspectors, will such facts come to get the sort of examination they need. To interest teachers in such classes of facts, by lecturing about them, is indeed useful in its own place and time. But the teachers are not sufficiently expert in psychology to make successful study of these facts for themselves. In consequence, we are left at present to crude observation or to loose generalization by the practical teachers, on the one hand, and to laboratory investigations or to statistical collections of far too theoretical an interest, on the other. The Consulting Psychologist, working from time to time in the school-room, and engaged along with the teacher in investigating such facts, is the person needed at present to bridge over the gulf which separates the two professions, whose coöperation is now so desirable, but often apparently so hopeless, an ideal.

The term "Consulting Psychologist" at once suggests, however, to many minds the thought of a person specially interested in the more pathological problems of the school-room. And of course I should be disposed to expect that our Consulting Psychologist would indeed be much interested in precisely these problems also. I should merely be unwilling to confine his work, or the prospects of his success, to the field of the study of exceptional phenomena. The psychology of the healthy is in itself more practically important than the psychology of the morbid; and I do not wish my Consulting Psychologist to be conceived merely as a student of the defective and disordered school-children. Nevertheless, it is true that the study of defect and disorder of any grade could be carried on in a useful way by our Consulting Psychologist in connection with the rest of his task. And here he could coöperate with and supplement the work of the medical inspector. Defects of sense-organs might easily attract his attention, when they had escaped the attention of others. Extraordinary forms of naughtiness or of stupidity might yield their secret to him, when the medical man had not had enough time or interest to advise the teacher concerning the nature of the defect. The various sorts of liars who appear at different ages in many schools would frequently be proper persons for the study of the Consulting Psychologist. Obstinacy, eccentricity, or precocity, where they occur, would interest him, and would be a topic for useful consultation between him and the teacher. As our theoretical knowledge of the meaning of such phenomena increases, the Consulting Psychologist would

Reproduced with permission of the copyright owner. Further reproduction prohibited without permission.

be responsible for knowing the progress of his science, and for applying it to the schools with which he had to do.

But most important it is, for my present purpose, to insist upon the fact that, at all events in the present state of the science, my Consulting Psychologist, as I conceive him, would be a searcher for facts much more than a director of other people's methods. He would not be an authoritative adviser in any such sense as that in which the medical inspector may be an adviser. The decision as to what has to be done in a given case involves as much the practical experience of the teacher as the scientific wisdom of the psychologist.

The investigations conducted by the Consulting Psychologist would always be subject to the direct criticism of his superintendent, of his School Board, and of the teachers whom he both serves and, within the range of his own skill, enlightens. The false impression now existing, that, if psychology means anything, the psychologist can infallibly direct the teacher, would tend to pass away at the very moment when an intimate relation between the two made each serviceable to the other. My Consulting Psychologist will not say: "Great is Science; and we the prophets of science are verifying this or that theory, and you, the teachers, must wait until we have some day shown you the value of it all." The Consulting Psychologist will cultivate modesty along with his efficiency, and will avoid mystery the more he becomes useful. His daily speech will be plain; and in his "Pedagogical Seminaries," if ever they come to exist, the sentences used will be as straightforward as those now customary among practical workers. He will be directly responsible for pointing out to the practical people with whom he is associated verifiable facts present in their school-rooms, and facts capable of being advantageously used by them and in their art. Such a Consulting Psychologist, relieved from the heavy duty of expounding his science as college teacher, of contributing to its theoretical advances, of converting the public, and of dealing with the theologians all at once—relieved, I say, of these heavy burdens, will be able, by reason of the very limitations of his task, to contribute in the end to what may often prove to be the most general as well as the most practical interests of both teachers and psychologists.

In fine, my Consulting Psychologist will occupy a place that will grow progressively more important, when once progressive young men are given a start in the calling. Collector and reporter of facts about the minds of school-children, he will tend to be a discreet and cautious investigator, because he will work constantly under fire. Expert in his work, and limited as to the field of its application, he will be able to pre-

Reproduced with permission of the copyright owner. Further reproduction prohibited without permission.

vent the waste of time now frequently involved in the pursuit of child-study by psychologically inexpert teachers. He will be near enough to control the sort of child-study that it is worth while to pursue in the schools. He can be constantly consulted as to how to make this or that child-study investigation exact. He will venture upon distributing no syllabus, unless he can pretty clearly show to his own superintendent and teachers why their practical needs are furthered by just such an inquiry. On the other hand, he can distinctly represent to the teacher the interests and the dignity of the truly scientific study of psychology.

As to his practical influence, such a student, if he were once appointed, would obtain that in proportion to his strength. But he would lack that infallibility which sometimes seems to hedge the college professor, yes, to hedge him in, until somebody detects that it is only a false infallibility, and until people then, with false reaction, forsake altogether the studies that have disappointed them. As for the actual daily usefulness of the Consulting Psychologist as a person present in the Superintendent's Office, I have been told by a prominent city superintendent of this country, that in his own office a great part of the actual work is, as he expressed it, psychological, since so many of the problems that come to his office are psychological. Once get such a good Consulting Psychologist into the schools of the city, and the superintendent would prize him, the school-children would love his visits, and the teachers, I may say, would constantly, even eagerly, surround him.

Meanwhile he would be in no sense priest or prophet. He would be investigator—investigator of what was practically worth knowing about the minds of children in that city. In his turn, he would constantly be able to pass over contributions to the professional college psychologist in the laboratory. The latter, for his part, would be relieved of the arduous duty of constantly providing milk for all the psychological babes of his community, whatever their calling; while from the work of the Consulting Psychologist the theoretical psychologist would in the end derive numerous and fruitful scientific contributions. The new calling would thus contribute both to the organization of psychological research and to the practical application of such research to the work of the teacher.

While no immediate revolution of methods would follow from the services of the new official, the daily value of properly adapting psychological research to practical needs would be shown to teachers through the person and work of the Consulting Psychologist. And then we should no longer hear this unhappy question concerning the Old or Rational and

Reproduced with permission of the copyright owner. Further reproduction prohibited without permission.

the New Psychology, since all, from the least unto the greatest in the teaching profession, would know that the only psychology worthy of the distinctive name of Empirical Psychology is neither old nor new exclusively, and is always both old and new, and is best called Sensible Psychology. It is destined to be as useful to the teacher as his practical skill and tact can make its results.

If one asks whether good young consulting psychologists could even now be obtained, I answer unhesitatingly, Yes. There are, in this country, more than half a dozen universities already well equipped to train such men. If one asks whether the useful Consulting Psychologist would be a very expensive luxury, I answer that he could be obtained easily, according to his age and experience, at from $1,500 a year upward. If one asks whether such a man would have to be a great genius in order to be serviceable, I answer at once, No.

In the present condition of psychology, any really well-trained young man of sense, a graduate of a first-class university-course in his subject, when once at work in the city schools, could show the teachers in six months more about the practical relations of Empirical Psychology and teaching than these teachers will get out of years of those dreary general courses of public lectures on Pedagogical Psychology which they nowadays so pathetically crowd, and so self-sacrificingly support. I speak advisedly, and as a lecturer, when I say this. Many shall run to and fro, and knowledge shall be increased, and of making many lectures there will doubtless be no end. But in this field, as in any other, it is, after all, as everybody knows, work that counts, and not talk. And the work that teachers want done by psychology for them is practical work, from time to time in the school-room, by a trained psychologist, who knows what is doing in his science, and who wants to help the teachers see in their school-room facts worth seeing.

And that is what, as a poor metaphysician, whose practical wits are of course dull, I may venture at the moment to say about a way to bring our rich and progressive educational life into a closer and truer relation to what in a proper sense is to be called the New Study of Psychology.

JOSIAH ROYCE.

Reproduced with permission of the copyright owner. Further reproduction prohibited without permission.