

The Schooling of English Workers' Children, 1780s-1880s: Some Themes

Bruce Fulton and Robert J. Hind

I have no quarrel with the student of history who brings to his work a touchingly childish, innocent faith in the power of our minds and our methods to order reality; but first and foremost he must respect the incomprehensible truth, reality, and uniqueness of events.... To study history one must know in advance that one is attempting something fundamentally impossible, yet necessary and highly important. To study history means submitting to chaos and nevertheless retaining faith in order and meaning. It is a very serious task ... and possibly a tragic one.

Hermann Hesse, *The Glass Bead Game*

National Contexts

Any sketch of the educational experiences of English workers' children—which in this instance excludes those who attended workhouse, factory, industrial and ragged schools and those who had no schooling—must remain partial and tentative. Well before their postmodern demise, certainties were—or should have been—elusive. Workers' views about religion, politics, familial obligations, etc., contrasted sharply. Living and working conditions in specific trades, within and between urban districts, between town and country, between rural districts close to and distant from industrial or mining expansion, between a 'close' and open parish in geographical proximity, varied greatly. Economic expansion and innovation, which differed markedly in place, chronology and intensity, continued to alter these variations. Comparisons of regional studies demonstrate the dangers of general conclusions. Young wine was also stretching the old social skin: 49 per cent of the population was under the age of twenty in 1821. The growth of population (in millions) 7.5 (1781), 15.9 (1841), 26.0 (1881), its changing location and

increasing urbanisation—about a third (1801), a half (1851) and three quarters (1901)—kept augmenting local diversities. Urbanisation obviously had many common characteristics. The ‘multiplicity of urban systems and varieties of internal urban’, which ‘safeguarded capitalism by scattering rather than exposing it as a target’, should nevertheless not be overlooked.¹

Historiographical debate about English education remains too rudimentary and about English history too vigorous and too unresolved to address adequately in a short article. There is, however, a degree of consensus about such frameworks as the nature of economic expansion—and its indebtedness to women and children, a significant component of the first industrial proletariat, as much as to male artisans and factory workers. Simplistically, statistics support perceptions of declining real wages until the 1820s, with subsequent improvement. England’s most rapid economic expansion, between the 1840s and 1870s, remained distinctly uneven. Amelioration of workers’ circumstances then stemmed primarily from greater stability of employment. Late nineteenth-century declining food prices—30 per cent less in 1887 than a decade earlier—generated further improvement. These developments occurred notwithstanding the removal of most paternalistic legislation by the early nineteenth century. This removal intensified workers’ hardships caused by trade-cycle fluctuations and, some would argue, by the later adoption of free-trade policies.²

Religious renewal was transforming English society with a dynamism almost equal to that of industrialisation and demographic growth. If middle-class charity flowed primarily from religious impulses, it was also an insurance premium for social stability that workers’ progressive alienation from institutional Christianity accompanied. Many of them never entered a place of worship by the 1850s. ‘Churches, both established and dissenting, have become either aristocratic or middle-class societies.’ Pompous officials, fashionably-dressed congregations and ministers’ partially comprehensible language made workers who attended feel uncomfortable. Too frequently they were made to feel that they were

but poor men. The pastor visits the more wealthy ... members, but he crosses not the poor man’s door. Weight and importance are attached to every suggestion of a rich member, but it is almost a piece of presumption

The Schooling of English Workers' Children

for a working man to express his opinions at a church meeting.³

Workers' belief that they had no right to belong to a congregation unless they could contribute to its incessant fund-raising solicitations 'was probably more fundamental than the "respectability" barrier' in keeping them away. Attitudes some workers expressed in *The Parson's Creed* probably lacked denominational precision.

Money. O money thy praises I sing,
Thou art my Saviour, my Lord and my King.
It is for thee that I preach, for thee that I pray,
And give praises to God three times in the day.

The menace of pauperism dogged workers throughout the transformations of lives effected by waves of industrial and demographic growth and religious renewal. Despite such substantial material benefits as a 60 per cent increase in real wages between the 1860s and late 1890s, poverty remained 'a regular feature of the life of almost all working families ... especially in old age or before young children started earning'. A mother might be indebted throughout her early married years and begin to repay her debts as soon as her children started to work. J. S. Rowntree showed (1899) that even with the most judicious expenditure every 'labourer who has as many as three children must pass through a time, probably lasting for about ten years, when he will be in a state of "primary" poverty; in other words when he and his family will be *underfed*'. 'Abhorred as it was because of the stigma that attached itself to the bereaved family, a fifth of the population could expect a pauper's burial as late as 1900.'⁵

If one became a 'burden to society', one ceased '*pro tanto*, to be a free' person and came under the jurisdiction of 'a special code of laws applicable' to one's social condition. Until 1865, laws of settlement and removal impeded the mobility of labour and made the 'parish of settlement a prison, and every other parish a hostile fortress'. The need to obtain a certificate to leave one's parish was an onerous provision, particularly when one or a few individuals owned a parish. In such cases parishioners 'may be said to be the property of the proprietor[s], and to be sold with the land. The labourer has but one chance of emancipation; to quit the country. But this chance is very small'. A measure of 1795 augmented the security of workers who had found employment where they lacked settlement rights but gave no protection from compulsory

removal if they needed poor relief. This provision constituted a 'cruel and costly instrument of tyranny and arbitrary oppression' of working people.⁶

The manner in which parishes fulfilled their poor-law obligations before 1834 was local, expedient and unpredictable, ranging from the humane to the inhumane. From the late eighteenth century the Webbs maintained that parishes acted with greater clemency. Perhaps they did. Some young orphaned children were nevertheless transported in closed waggons from London to provincial centres where they were apprenticed, sometimes for fourteen years, to harsh manufacturers. Presumably to remain independent of poor-relief, lace-making families of *fin de siècle* Nottingham, for instance, enforced and endured the 'seasoning'—their terminology albeit more customarily applied to slaves' revitalisation after transshipment—of their children. Healthy breast-fed infants were drugged

in order to prevent their cries interfering with the protracted labour by which they [parents] strive to obtain a miserable subsistence. The infants became pale, tremulous, and emaciated, the joints and head enlarge, they become listless, and death at length steps in to [great numbers of] their relief.

In this declining trade, wives' and children's labour had become indispensable. Children who survived until they were three or four began to recover once the laudanum, etc., was discontinued. They then had to work as soon as they could use the needle. 'Almost all the families employed' were 'supported, more or less, by the labour of their children.'⁷

The poor law amendment act of 1834, 'perhaps the most sustained attempt to impose an ideological dogma, in defiance of the evidence of human need, in English history' associated poor relief unequivocally with indignities and degradation in a way that had not generally been the case earlier. This brutal measure 'arguably made the deepest, most bitter, and widespread impression upon the labouring classes, rural and urban'. To avoid pauperism, workers at Bolton in the 1840s made 'all sorts of shifts and sacrifices to live above it, by pledging their furniture and even their clothing; their food is deficient, their physical strength greatly reduced, and the rate of mortality is rapidly increasing'. A suicide note affirmed: 'I can face poverty and degradation no longer,

The Schooling of English Workers' Children

and would sooner die than go to the workhouse, whatever may be the awful [eternal] consequences.' One lad, placed in a workhouse in 1842, returned to his beloved Sunday school in his workhouse clothes. The other pupils, almost as poor as he, taunted him and drove him away. He was 'tainted with a social leprosy'. Half a century later, when poor-law administration had lost some of its severity, Charles Booth noted workers' 'absolutely universal' aversion to the workhouse and their acceptance of 'almost any amount of suffering and privation' to avoid it. At least 90 per cent of unemployed people, for instance, never approached the poor-law authorities.⁸

Workers, more particularly that proportion—between a tenth and a third—who lived in poverty, imposed onerous sacrifices upon themselves and their families to avoid pauperism. Far more 'physical deprivation and suffering ... [lay] buried in silence ... clothed in the garb of respectable poverty' than street beggars or statistics suggested. Concealment of 'the unrecognised destitution that preys, like a consuming ulcer' possibly outweighed savage social indictments in official documents and helped to mislead mid-nineteenth-century writers. They generally assumed that most workers had an income sufficient to provide adequate housing and food, and to cover life's vicissitudes. In 1858 Lord Shaftesbury claimed that there was 'no good reason whatever for pauperism'. The annual report of the Charity Organisation Society (1876) depicted good wages as the norm.⁹

Earlier assumptions that overlooked structural factors and perceived individual worker's behaviour as the cause of social ills persisted. The propensity to discriminate between the deserving and undeserving poor therefore remained constant. Middle-class charitable endeavour, frequently uncoordinated, acquired impressive dimensions. In the 1870s it probably gave more money to alleviate the rigours of the independent poor's lives than the poor-law authorities spent on paupers. Investigations of workers' circumstances, inspections of their homes and families, primarily by legions of middle-class women and town missionaries, preceded assistance usually given to those who struggled to survive without resort to poor-relief or begging. This approach, which provided opportunities for the surveillance of all the poor and for homilies to the allegedly undeserving, exploited the indomitable independence of many poor people and utilised it to subordinate them to the rich.¹⁰

The Schooling of English Workers' Children

The functioning of social forces amidst the complex interacting realities touched upon previously limited working people's capabilities in relation to their children's schooling. Working people were legally free to determine all matters relating to it until the enforcement of compulsory instruction in inspected schools after 1880. Poverty and employers' insatiable appetite for child labour, however, qualified this freedom. If parents did not educate children at home—and seven per cent did in part of Bristol in 1851—they could choose between two sets of schools. Voluntary day schools founded by some richer people for workers' children as a charitable endeavour gradually formed one network of schools. Their limitations, however, owed much to the limited financial support they received from other prosperous people. The principal recommendation of the monitorial system, for instance, was its alleged cheapness. Only 5 per cent of income tax payers subscribed to voluntary schools in 1863. Alternatively, there were schools conducted exclusively by working people. These schools testified both to cultural autonomy and, partially, to a different type of charity. Without the school-pence paid by their peers, there were families of wives with incapacitated husbands, widows, elderly, maimed or handicapped individuals, colourful drinking companions, etc., who would otherwise often have been subjected to the poor-laws. These two totally different types of school remained clearly distinct. Sunday schools—virtually but surprisingly omitted from English literature—did not.¹¹

Sunday Schools

Some Sunday schools remained under an individual's—say an Anglican clergyman's—control. Many, perhaps originally non-denominational, eventually became linked to a specific congregation. Even in the 1780s, however, when Robert Raikes, Sarah Trimmer (with the Queen's approval) and Hannah More founded and propagated the merits of Sunday schools under middle-class jurisdiction, working people, male and female, autonomously founded and maintained Sunday schools. The latter's proliferation stemmed from the initiatives of impecunious, peripatetic preachers of 'new' dissent and individual working people. These schools, technically illegal until 1811, disconcerted the

The Schooling of English Workers' Children

established lay élite, established clergymen, 'old' dissenters, and even the government between 1799 and 1800 because they escaped their supervision. From the 1780s working people made it impracticable for richer people to control the Sunday school movement comprehensively through the power of the purse. Increasingly from 1800 workers' religious activities and willingness to act as unpaid teachers and officials greatly weakened constraints richer people would otherwise have exercised about an institution's foundation, location, size, ethos, curriculum and—while recognising that for about five decades only workers' children were in attendance—its social composition.

The propertied classes primarily sought children of the poorest of the poor for Sunday school instruction. When Town Meetings, usually summoned by magistrates, requested support, subscriptions and officials for the establishment of Sunday schools, they had them in mind. Managers then appointed paid teachers, visitors and inspectors and compiled regulations that often required parents to establish their deserving-poor status and abide by the institution's regulations. Results tallied with ascertainable objectives in qualified ways. Social problems often increased; less impecunious children tended to replace the poorest; middle-class interest and subscriptions waned; the inputs and influence of working people might increase—or schools might close. Within a decade no-one at Gloucester would aid Robert Raikes's Sunday schools; none existed there before his death in 1811; but six poor men later re-introduced them.¹² From the 1830s, the Ragged school movement indicated the failure of richer people to induce the poorest children to attend Sunday (or day) schools.

In many Sunday schools, class cooperation and local participation of a type unknown in day schools emerged. If their voluntary teachers, many of whom were working people, had received modest payment, the cost would have exceeded that of the national contribution to day schools until 1859. Expenditure, as for accommodation, printed material, etc., increasingly depended upon numerous small donations after 1800. Annual gatherings at 'owr sermons' for what were implicitly 'owr' schools facilitated this change. They became associated with processions of teachers and pupils, the latter of whom sang in a public place at Sheffield from 1813. Three years later each school there began to carry banners which became larger and more elaborate—and probably inspired later trade union practice.¹³

Regional efforts of organisations such as the Sunday School Union increased foundations and indicated the strength of and varied balances within social collaboration. At Newcastle upon Tyne heated discussions commenced in 1814. Two years later 35 schools with 600 teachers, by 1831 142 schools with 2,826 teachers, indicated this organisation's achievements in the north-east. The Sunday School Union's protagonists circularised every church and dissenting chapel. Its members met, tried to persuade and counselled congregations that would receive them. If successful, its visitors, who travelled 3,000 miles annually in pairs at their own expense, gave regular advice. Many schools, backed by the organisation's bookshop and book depository, created clothing and benefit societies to facilitate poorer children's attendance.¹⁴

Notwithstanding crude methods, appalling use of the Bible, and sometimes long hours, children inundated Sunday schools where, especially in nonconformist establishments, a 'considerable working-class takeover of control' occurred. Children attended primarily because of parental directives. Working people's initiatives and efforts helped them to transform and utilise numerous Sunday schools for their own purposes. Many became 'vehicles of a domesticated, internalised, working-class evangelicalism for teaching a mixture of religious beliefs and more practical lessons'. The schools' values of orderliness, punctuality, industry and cleanliness reinforced those which respectable workers instilled at home. Less than 4 per cent of Sunday school pupils were ever attached to a denomination and subsequent obligations remained light. For fifty years less than 1 per cent of pupils in Birmingham returned to immediate membership of church or chapel. Young adults were nevertheless known to sing hymns learnt in Sunday school while they worked in factories. Anniversary celebrations showed how thoroughly the culture of working people had incorporated many Sunday schools—the only religious institution that the majority of them patronised—and how acceptable this form, presumably because so much of it came from themselves, was.¹⁵

Sunday schools helped meet other aspects of the demand of the poor for education noted by parliamentary investigators in 1818. Until 1870 it would be difficult to determine what basic skills their children gained from day and from Sunday school. Numerous schools as at Leeds, Sheffield, Manchester, etc., taught reading and writing from their inception. By the 1830s writing came to be regarded as a wrongful

The Schooling of English Workers' Children

use of the Sabbath and its teaching contracted perceptibly. Evening instruction in writing and arithmetic, sometimes supplied by Sunday schoolteachers in pupils' homes, often increased. Some nonconformist establishments, however, did not change and numerous children, as at Bolton, switched Sunday schools *en masse* for continued tuition in writing.

The contribution of Sunday schools to basic literacy was nevertheless impressive for almost a century. Pressure upon some Sunday schools was so great that once children could read the Bible they had to leave immediately to make room for others. In Birmingham more than three quarters of all the teaching of reading and a smaller proportion of writing was apparently effected in Sunday schools until 1868. The teaching of basic skills by these institutions continued there after the passage of the 1870 act. Many children's day-school experience was discontinuous, irregular and remarkably brief. Their early age of entry into the rigours of employment or apprenticeship virtually guaranteed the loss, in part or entirely, of whatever skills had been attained previously. Sunday schools enabled these skills to be regained, improved and increased. Edward Baines asserted excessively that an 'average of about *eight years* of Sunday instruction for every child of the working classes' supplemented their brief day tuition.¹⁶

Between 1818 and 1851 the population increased by 54 per cent: but the attendance of children at Sunday schools quintupled and at day schools doubled. Other features of Sunday schools augmented their greater acceptability. Particularly in urban districts the choice of schools allowed parents to exercise their social or religious sensitivities and have their children taught with the similarly situated or the like-minded. Although the established church had 671,224 more day pupils than its rivals in 1855, it had 497,225 fewer Sunday school pupils. In rural districts, where social supervision was more practicable than in towns, the chapel and its Sunday school were the only means by which working people and their children could avoid some of the injunctions of squire and parson.¹⁷

For several generations no middle-class children attended Sunday schools. Thenceforth they rarely entered establishments which workers' children overwhelmingly dominated: they tended to be concentrated in the Sunday schools of prosperous congregations. Consequently, they neither distorted the Sunday school tuition of workers' children nor

alienated their parents. These consequences became discernible in the 1840s when middle-class children began to attend day schools founded for workers' children and received markedly preferential treatment. Sunday school classes of about ten pupils were a far cry from monitorial schools in which one adult could allegedly teach a thousand children. Sunday schoolteachers, moreover, were more likely to be homely and zealous, to empathise with their charges, and to use local dialects than were the staff in middle-class provided schools. Voluntary day schools frequently gave 'No admittance except to Officials, Teachers and Scholars'. They too often treated parents, whose wishes they disregarded, as pernicious influences upon their children. The Sunday School Union meanwhile emphasised the importance of enlisting parents' full sympathies. Only a proportion of schools were in connection with this organisation but its attitude towards parents appears to have been widespread in nonconformist establishments from the 1820s. Numerous Sunday school buildings were unsatisfactory but were analogous to those of day schools run by working people. They were probably warmer and less intimidatory to workers' children than purpose-built voluntary schools.¹⁸

Voluntary Day Schools

Day schools the upper and middle-classes provided for workers' children had features more intimidatory than their buildings. Their charitable basis constituted a major deterrent. Workers felt 'strong aversion', a 'universal repugnance to the humiliation of gratuitous education' because it affixed a stigma to everyone who accepted it. Workers found demeaning the obsequious deference and gratitude that pupils had to display publicly to the schools' benefactors. Perceived in the 1840s as 'savages in the midst of civilization' whose education was essential to protect persons and property, they had one offered stamped with 'the brand of pauperism'. Consequences that stemmed from schools' original orientation persisted beyond the commencement of state involvement in education (1833) and the education act of 1870. Governmental aid to schools was arguably a 'species of outdoor relief [i.e. not in the workhouse] administered by a central office'. In some districts the poor-law authorities denied parents relief if they had a child at school. In others, impecunious parents received school fees not exceeding three

pence a week per child from the poor rates in the late 1870s. Conversely, local vagaries sometimes rated poor rural people 'to give the pauper children in the workhouse an education they could not give their own'.¹⁹

Charitable schools offered a 'modicum of learning which they think fit for the children of working people, and in which parents have no voice'. Religious organisations, the Anglican National Society and the nondenominational British and Foreign School Society (BFSS) from the 1810s and other denominations later, established schools that concentrated overwhelmingly upon religious education until the 1830s. National schools had prescribed readers replete with references to God, the Commandments, the Thirty-Nine Articles and eternal life. British schools used scriptural extracts exclusively as reading material until 1839. All their teaching was 'strictly subservient to the communication of scriptural knowledge'. Both types of voluntary school admitted that they emphasised religion 'lest they [children] should know anything else'. Both inculcated obedience to constituted authorities, inured children 'to habits of order and subordination' and, allegedly, prevented idleness and intemperance, reduced crime and poor rates, and made their pupils 'faithful and honest in their service to others, and happy and contented in themselves'. Until about 1840 many schools supplied no secular instruction other than reading. They appeared to discern 'something evil in knowledge, which required to be counteracted by bad theology'. Some offered 'nothing that could be of use either in this world or the next'.²⁰

Voluntary schools initially gave free tuition. Many began to charge small weekly payments in the 1820s—to prevent some schools closing when subscriptions declined and, ostensibly, to encourage more regular attendance. Parents' fees supplied about a third in 1836, three times more than state expenditure in 1853, and more than a quarter in 1861 of voluntary schools' costs. Horace Mann and other analysts nevertheless claimed in the 1860s that 80 per cent of the population depended for its instruction upon the charity of the richer classes. Parents' payments similarly went unrecognised by committees of management upon whom they continued to have neither representation nor influence. No working person was a school trustee in 1842. Educationalists and Her Majesty's Inspectors (HMIs) did 'immense harm to the development of ... parents as promoters of education'. HMIs had to be acceptable to schools' lay and ecclesiastical patrons and to the leadership of the denominations.

They promoted substantial curricular and methodological improvements. They also reinforced existing managements' authority over parents too often burdened with increased fees as middle-class subscriptions and interest waned. Warwick's National schools' income from voluntary contributions declined from 83 per cent in 1847 to 15 per cent in 1879.²¹

The richer classes' notion that the schooling of workers' children was a charity, a privilege graduated by social position, and was best supplied by them persisted until the 1870s. If these certainties rested upon the premise that ignorance should defer to knowledge, the basic issue was different. Although children in voluntary schools received a subsidised education, most parents paid. Payers normally selected payees and expected some consideration from, and influence over, them. The richer classes, socially and progressively separated geographically from people whom they regarded as degraded by their dependence upon daily labour, refused to ascertain their educational needs, elicit their opinions, or consider their prejudices. They treated parental representations as impertinences. Parents, reduced to a 'state of pupillage', had to accept what was offered or 'keep their children at home'. From 1880 even this option was withdrawn.²²

Isolated middle-class arguments recommending parents' inclusion on schools' committees appeared from the late 1850s and even in the Newcastle Commission's report but were completely ignored. Parental cooperation, the principal cause of a school's success consequently remained largely absent. Numerous managers tried to sever natural familial bonds. Frequently, a teacher's first lesson, 'a sad necessity', warned children to beware of their parents and 'look with disgust, if not horror, at the filthiness and abominations of their own homes'. Managers also excluded 'a large mass' of children by over-strict regulations. National schools, for instance, required girls as well as boys to have short hair. The shearing of beautiful curls preceded admission—and indicated a beneficiary of semi-charitable instruction.²³

Schools' managers selected and directed teachers and stood between them and parents. National organisations with which most of their schools were eventually associated trained the fully qualified teachers, a minority. From the mid-1810s, residential training triumphed. It more thoroughly facilitated the inculcation of appropriate religious principles and the removal of presumption from trainees. Yet in Francis Place's opinion, the BFSS could have produced better educated teachers much

more cheaply by soliciting available, more advanced, non-residential applicants. Schools' managers frequently regarded teachers as missionaries. They opted for inferior ability and attainments to secure religiously oriented staff. Pupil-teachers (from 1846) had their religious and moral development guided by the trained teachers to whom they were apprenticed and, by the terms of their five-year indentures, reviewed annually by clergymen, schools' managers and inspectors. Male teachers in National schools were reputedly masters in every sense of the word. Most voluntary-school teachers apparently did not mix socially with parents.²⁴

Parents loathed the cheap and allegedly efficient monitorial system which prevailed in many voluntary schools until the 1850s and thereafter survived with considerable tenacity. Parents withdrew children because 'a parcel of boys' taught them. The average age of monitors never exceeded eleven in the 1840s. Reluctant, neither necessarily trained nor paid, they frequently left, to be replaced by others. Encouraged by parents, pupils often stayed at home or left school when monitorial duties loomed. Parents 'didn't wish theirs to teach t'others; they wanted them to learn'. Monitors reportedly hit, misrepresented other children, and promoted bribery, corruption and favouritism by soliciting presents. A 'positive hindrance' to schools' effectiveness and attendance, they also 'communicated religious truths in a manner ... calculated to make religion permanently distasteful'.²⁵

Social changes made some voluntary schools inaccessible, others less attractive to working people. By the late 1850s, British schools, in Matthew Arnold's opinion, recruited mainly from the middling classes of society. Most had also become dominated by a specific non-conformist congregation. Wesleyan Methodists were an extreme case of congregations that became prosperous and whose schools excluded workers' children by charging high fees, the highest of all in the 1870s. They nevertheless continued to receive governmental money, originally intended to assist the poor, even when they 'really did not know what to do with it'. From the 1830s, some voluntary schools began to attract middle-class children because they offered the best and cheapest available instruction. Amongst working people were those who objected to this phenomenon even when tuition remained free or fees for their children remained unchanged. In most Derbyshire schools, for instance, labourers' children did not receive the same treatment as those of

farmers or tradesmen. Many teachers devoted a 'large portion of their time' to the instruction of the latter's children—who paid more and remained longer—in grammar, arithmetic and other subjects. In one school elsewhere they sat: the others stood. Children taught gratuitously were 'only set to read during a few odd fragments of time that can be spared from teaching the rest.... It is no wonder that the poor feel the injustice of this, and withdraw their children'. Teachers' propensity to concentrate upon the most advanced, predominantly children of superior artisan and middle-class parents, to address the latter as 'master' or 'miss', and make placement in higher classes entirely dependent upon the amount of fees paid, alienated poorer parents further. Other social sensitivities were affronted. A skilled mechanic refused to send his children to a National school, the best in the vicinity, because he did not want them to mix with middle-class children.²⁶

Some parents, for whom the chapel was their life, considered it a 'far greater sin to send children to the National School than to let them remain uneducated'. Some would not 'on any account' send children to institutions that taught any religion other than their own. Others aspired to non-denominational schools. A canvas at South Shields ascertained that parents would send 900 children to a non-denominational but only 47 to a National foundation. Others were utterly indifferent to such considerations. Amongst them were those who were absolutely convinced that they could transmit their own religious beliefs to their children as effectively as their dialects.²⁷

Parents' reluctance to accept free schooling for their children remained constant until 1891 when it became a qualified right and 'not a concession to poverty'. Some parents were not prepared to receive charity and also pay school pence. Others certainly utilised free schools that failed to teach reading properly after six years' attendance because in no other school could their children 'get so well clothed gratis'. Where charitable schools competed parents were also known to withhold children in the hope that they would obtain clothing etc. from the schools' benefactors—and to change schools for additional benefits. The weight of evidence, however, supports the view that most workers abhorred 'any form of dependence'. Some exceptionally impoverished people objected to free schools 'except in extreme cases'. At Morpeth, parents accepted free schools' tuition lightly and conditionally—and lightly relinquished it. Parent attitudes were more extreme than the

claim that if 'in any degree raised above want, they would sooner forego the pecuniary advantage' than accept free schooling. Free schools within a hundred yards of people's homes failed to persuade numerous impoverished parents to send their children to them. This reluctance was perhaps even more pronounced when schools also charged fees. A vicar paid the school-pence for a penniless widow's children, but she loathed accepting it. A family that paid National school fees for two children kept the third at home rather than ask for the school-pence. A poverty-stricken Londoner with five school-age children intermittently could not pay fees for them all. He then reluctantly kept some at home rather than apply for free instruction. An extremely poor mother, with one child at school for whom she paid and four withheld, preferred to see her children 'run in the street than receive the school-pence as charity'.²⁸

Governmental policy ensured voluntary schools' 'entire dependence' upon local resources, i.e., resident parochial property-holders. Richer neighbourhoods supported most schools, the poorer the least and worst: distribution remained uneven until after 1870. Places existed for 40 per cent more children than attended in 1851 and 60 per cent more in 1870. In 1846, 142 children attended one school built for 980. The 'frequent irregularity of attendance', lack of punctuality, and the 'very early age' at which a 'fearfully large' proportion of enrolled children left school were matters of common notoriety. An estimated two million children remained unschooled in 1851.²⁹

Workers' Private Schools

Some parents only sent their children to voluntary schools when they faced exceptionally severe financial difficulties. Like so many of their social peers they clearly preferred private paying day-schools totally untainted by the charity, values and jurisdiction of other classes. Basic issues of provision, access, method, curriculum, freedom and independence were at stake. Private schools, moreover, 'are often ... but proofs of the inefficiency of public ones'. The names bestowed on these schools by middle-class commentators changed, denigrated, and misleadingly oversimplified varied, responsive educational agencies. Although best comprehended as workers' or working-class private schools, misleading middle-class terminology of the 1830s and 1840s

is also utilised here on grounds of its familiarity. Dames' and common day schools were depicted as dens of ignorance that misinstructed or failed to instruct perhaps slightly more than a third of the labouring classes' children in the 1830s and a little less in the late-1860s. These parents' preference strengthened the conviction of voluntary schools' protagonists that working people were incorrigibly benighted and totally unfitted to make valid educational choices. Historians of education, overwhelmingly whiggish in favouring the triumph of inspected voluntary and board schools, have also with rare unanimity unjustly maligned schools run by working people.³⁰

These schools had neither the inclination to keep nor the facilities to store records and left none. Evidence about a 'very small proportion' of their 'real number', usually held in the teacher's home, even if a one-room familial home, has survived. In London it was 'almost impossible to find many of them' in the 1870s. Because teachers there, like those at Bristol and Kingston upon Hull, were 'most jealous of any enquiry ... little information' could be obtained about the functioning of those located. Middle-class investigations and official documents provide most information about these schools. Childhood recollections in the comparatively few memoirs left by working people are particularly valuable. They, however, are brief, individualist, overwhelmingly male, 'respectable', and no more likely to be correct than anyone else's.³¹

Dames' schools—less commonly all-age, single-sex or co-educational—supplied the infant education of the 'mass of the people' in 1848 and took 'more than their share' of children with accessible voluntary schools. Charging up to five times as much as dames' schools, common day schools often attracted the 'choicest specimens' of workers' children. This situation persisted even in less prosperous decades. By the 1860s, notwithstanding the 'somewhat unfair competition of schools assisted by Government' private schools had 'scarcely, if at all, diminished'. Like voluntary schools, their number had probably increased. Private-school supporters included mechanics and labourers above receiving a charitable education for their children, or allowing them to mix with 'low company'. Educational officials could not understand why parents sent children to be taught, allegedly badly, 'most frequently in a poky, ill-ventilated and over-crowded room ... ill-furnished with books and apparatus, when they can at generally a less cost send them to a well-conducted school ... where

teachers and material are alike thoroughly efficient'.³²

Parents were not necessarily gulled as easily as middle-class contemporaries, with axes to grind, and historians by comparisons that misrepresented the inadequacies of numerous voluntary schools. There were districts with higher illiteracy rates amongst those who had attended day schools than amongst those who had not. It was a 'subject of wonder', the Newcastle Commissioners recorded, 'how people so destitute of education as labouring parents commonly are, can be such just judges as they also commonly are of the effective qualification of a teacher'. 'No greater mistake is made than in supposing the working classes to be indifferent to the state of the schools. They watch with a very critical eye every defect both in the management of schools and the instruction of the scholars.' In any case, the assertion of independence and exercise of traditional educational rights in traditional and completely autonomous agencies of instruction clearly outweighed other considerations. Established in pre-industrial society, this highly diversified educational network had none of the features of voluntary schools in which 'everything partook of a air'. Private schools, moreover, had 'wonderful elasticity in adapting themselves to the requirements of all times' and all familial circumstances.³³

Apart from a small minority of adolescents, private schoolteachers were adults. Fully experienced in the hardships and other aspects of working people's lives, necessity generally drove them into an occupation that, particularly for women, usually supplied only the 'bare means of subsistence'. Their financial circumstances were generally incomparably worse than those of qualified voluntary schoolteachers. An unknowable proportion of these teachers—71 per cent in Birmingham in 1838—simultaneously pursued another occupation. Variations were pronounced. Hetton Colliery, population 5,887, had a National school and fourteen others conducted by masters whose average fees were twice those of the voluntary school. Leeds had three female teachers for each male teacher and more than half of their schools were perceptibly cheaper than at Hetton. Finsbury had an 'immense preponderance' (9:1) of female teachers, incidentally of 'good moral ... decidedly religious character'. Private schoolteachers had diversified backgrounds that voluntary schoolteachers could never possess and offered parents more meaningful choices. When William Morris left Miss Noad's dame school he went to two of the other

three schools nearby. One of their schoolmasters had been a man-of-the-world and an excise officer, one a wool-stapler and soldier with service in Egypt and at Waterloo, and one was a 'nice kind old gentleman, scrupulously exact'.³⁴

Individuals apparently often became private schoolteachers at the suggestion of 'kindly neighbours' or friends or relations who promised to send their children. In one case an informal association, not all of whose members were parents, met on Saturday evenings in a public house. After a few hours' drinking they raised a subscription and handed it to the schoolmaster who was expected to spend part of it regaling the subscribers. Fully integrated into the immediate local society, private schoolteachers responded wholeheartedly to parental wishes. One teacher briefly introduced cheap, subsidised, Religious Tract Society and Society for the Promotion of Christian Knowledge publications. Parental aversion to 'anything that might be regarded as charity' effected 'immediate withdrawal' of children. Teachers complied with parental requests that their children be untroubled with learning, not even the needlework that often commanded half of girls' time in voluntary schools. In such cases they supplied semi-parental care for children who could not be looked after at home and prevented them mixing with undesirable companions on the streets. One third of wives in a Birmingham study fulfilled home duties. The others had paid employment in forty-seven different occupations. Unless instructed otherwise, however, private schoolteachers concentrated upon the basic educational skills. Specialisation existed. Separate schools for reading and for writing coexisted in urban districts with those that offered both or the 3Rs. Flexibility prevailed about attendance and punctuality, with tuition and fees specifically suited to familial circumstances. One school's fees, for instance, were 50 per cent higher if children wrote on paper.³⁵

Private schoolteachers, like a proportion of Sunday school teachers, neither maintained the type of order nor instilled all the specific values that richer people deemed essential. In their concentration upon the 3Rs they, unlike Sunday school teachers, gave little attention to religious and moral education. Theirs were reputedly 'merely *secular schools*' in the north-east. From a different perspective, little harmonious blending of denominations occurred except in workers' private schools: voluntary schools were usually sectarian because one denomination

The Schooling of English Workers' Children

predominated in them. Diversity prevailed in these small, perhaps 20–30 pupil, schools. Children, for instance, often read, and sometimes learnt to read from, books brought from home. Teachers gave children personal assignments and supplied guidance, help and tuition when necessary. This individual method received interminable criticism on grounds of its inefficient, formless disorganisation. It could not incorporate efficient educational innovation: that is, the prescribed systematic texts, standards, class, and (subsequently castigated) monitorial or pupil-teacher systems of teaching and training. Private schools could not keep pupils in the same standard for ‘two, three, four, and in one case even six’ years—and thus destroy the confidence of slow learners. Their overcrowded pupils were compared to playful puppies. In inspected schools ‘luckless, little’ infants, ‘frequently packed away in a dark corner’, entrusted to a ‘dull monitor’ merely gained the ‘opportunity of learning how, without crying, to sit still for hours together with dangling legs and aching backs’.³⁶

If private schoolteachers applied corporal punishment it had no association with conflicts of class, religion or culture. The ‘injudicious, if not unprincipled, way in which punishments are frequently administered’ in voluntary schools had such a connexion and persisted as a principal obstacle to their improvement. Private schoolteachers did not share educational officials’ obsessive insistence upon single-sex tuition wherever practicable and the provision of separate playgrounds for boys and girls. It is highly unlikely that they would have considered inflicting eighteen lashes on the bare back of a schoolboy for speaking to a girl in the ‘airing grounds’ (which they, of course, lacked). The inadequacies of private school premises merely reflected those of working people’s housing. Relativity, however, has its place. Decades after Newcastle upon Tyne’s ‘dames’ schools were found to be ‘more clean and orderly than expected, considering the dirt and disorder that surrounded them’, its School Board sanctioned the use of toilets as premises for teaching purposes.³⁷

Observations

With sacrifices ‘grievously underestimated’, working people managed ‘somehow or other to get much more knowledge than would appear probable from the difficulties in their way’. Very ‘few of their children

were completely uninstructed' in 1851. Almost all working people appreciated the importance of education. In view of their pressing constraints of time and money, they required expeditious and effective tuition in basic educational skills. Voluntary schools 'invariably' removed parental indifference and were 'filled with pupils', even those of badly-paid farm labourers, when they supplied it. For such schools parents 'always and everywhere' paid willingly while managers often had difficulty in maintaining subscriptions. An emphasis on the 3Rs, however, fell 'manifestly' short of subscribers' insistence upon specific types of religious and moral training and socialisation. Middle-class individuals who testified to the validity of parents' judgement of voluntary schools rejoiced that they withdrew children to spare them unimaginable boredom and waste of time.³⁸

The secular component of voluntary schools' curricula tended to increase slowly from the mid-1830s; and the gradual replacement of monitors with pupil-teachers and changes in the training of teachers somewhat improved the effectiveness of tuition. Yet the Newcastle Commissioners found in 1861 that the 'great majority' of children 'do not learn, or learn imperfectly, the most necessary part of what they came to learn—reading, writing and arithmetic'. Under the prevailing patterns of attendance 60 per cent of children ought to have mastered the 3Rs but only 25 per cent did. The Revised Code of 1862 related inspected schools' grants unequivocally to effectiveness in teaching the 3Rs. Greater concentration upon teaching the basic educational skills gradually secured more parental support for the voluntary schools. For the schooling of every three children assisted by governmental grants in 1860, incidentally, four remained unaided.³⁹

Working people's allegiance to their private schools remained tenacious. It resisted varied forms of suasion to attract their children into voluntary schools. Provided that their children were 'unobjectionable', for instance, they were allegedly 'never refused admission into the paying schools merely because the parents cannot pay'. The education act of 1870 neither withdrew parental educational liberties nor abolished private schools but its consequences and subsequent indirect initiatives rendered parents' use of them impracticable. The act remedied deficiencies in voluntary school provision through elected School Boards empowered to levy rates. Surveys ascertained officially acceptable schools. Private schoolteachers

who failed to complete the required return had their schools declared unacceptable. Tuition had to be efficient, and accommodation adequate by official determination. Inspections, 1870-1871, closed thousands of schools on the latter grounds alone.⁴⁰

Private schoolteachers and parents whose children they taught thenceforth experienced warnings, threats, harassment and endless conflicts with local educational officials. Many surviving private schools withstood this, but not the next onslaught. Without a certificate of proficiency in the 3Rs or a certificate of two years' attendance awarded by a certified efficient school—a novel category—no child over the age of ten could legally enter the workforce after the passage of Lord Sandon's act of 1876. This indirect compulsion effectively made privately instructed children between the ages of ten and thirteen legally unemployable and played a decisive role in the final destruction of workers' private schools. Compulsory 'efficient' schooling between the ages of five and ten (1880) and free instruction (1891) delivered their *coup de grace*. The Education Department estimated that more than a million children were missing from inspected schools' registers in the early 1880s. E. G. A. Holmes, HMI, was certain that three quarters of them were in 'schools which are inefficient in every conceivable respect. This is no random assertion'.⁴¹

Meanwhile, the teaching of language—the 'most perfect instrument of empire' (1492)—was also being transformed. Standard language became almost completely identified with the accents of authority from the 1840s. By the time workers' private schools were destroyed it had become a class dialect, the language of the educated.

The educated classes spoke English correctly, and in their possession of this capacity they were also guardians of the language, preservers of the cultural tradition, and masters of the national history. Official schooling aimed at obliterating class and regional dialects as part of the creation of a 'standard' language that was distinctly non-standard in origin. The result often took the form of an alienating split.⁴²

Workers' private schools, which impeded this process, had never been an educational wasteland. From the 1780s, they and cognate traditions helped to make workers' contributions to the Sunday School movement substantial and effective. This involvement prevented it from becoming an exclusively middle-class agency. Workers' private school

traditions were perhaps also a seed-bed for the isolated individual enterprise of the few members of congregations that often founded Sunday schools and kept them alive. A nineteenth-century congregation tended to take little cognisance of its Sunday school (usually for *workers' children*) and treated it as a servant rather than as a child. This in turn accounts for a presumably welcome feature of Sunday schools to parents—the otherwise inexplicable lack of obligation or pressure upon children to adhere to a denomination. Sunday schools also complemented workers' private and other schools by supplying a 'large amount of elementary instruction' (1854) too commonly in premises widely criticised from the 1870s and which HMIs would have condemned.⁴³

Workers' private schools had helped working people to gain the widespread late pre-industrial literacy that made their subsequent political activity possible, to overcome, as in Lancashire, deteriorating standards of literacy caused by rapid industrialisation, and then to improve literacy generally. 'Most men struggling for a living', moreover, 'knew well enough that for them literacy bought no bread.'⁴⁴ The richer classes meanwhile established voluntary day schools sluggishly in the first third of the nineteenth century despite their protagonists' conviction that they would promote social stability. From 1792 politicisation moved down the social scale decisively. Governments faced a powerful concentration of radical political thought and activity from working people. They imposed repressive legislation to curtail workers' diverse challenges to the established order. Part of this repression attacked the 'seditious' and 'blasphemous' press that articulated and disseminated working-people's grievances and proposals. Through fiscal measures and prosecutions particularly onerous between 1819 and 1835, governments tried to price its publications beyond workers' reach and to destroy that part of the press. Parts of the repressive legislation and the intended curtailment of publications that working people wished to read *inter alia* impeded the extension of literacy amongst them.

A premise upon which the censorship of working people's reading rested was that they, unlike the differently educated richer classes, were '*destitute* of all means of arriving at the truth'. Although the soundness of working people's judgement about voluntary schools received some recognition, this alleged characteristic accounted—to richer people—for many parents' private-school preference. They had 'very inadequate means of judging different schools.' Even prospectively, many doubted

that they would ever be 'fit judges' of the 'proper duration' of their children's schooling. Workers gained the freedom of the press but later lost the freedom to use their private schools. From the 1780s the dice were loaded. These schools received no equitable assessment, no understanding, and no recognition of their importance to working people's lives and culture. They never received fair competition from voluntary schools' associates or fair treatment from the state. Its power, influence, and resources were used against them, often indirectly. HMIs only examined voluntary and board schools which alone received governmental grants. The state, voluntary school managers, and School Boards had interlocking financial and, as they saw it, incomparably preferable educational interests in securing the private schools' elimination.⁴⁵

HMIs, diocesan inspectors and others frequently criticised the workings of individual voluntary schools but richer people rarely questioned their widespread assumption that they should control the schooling of workers' children. Different denominations, conservatives, whigs, liberals and middle-class radicals shared this view. Classical economists otherwise often *laissez-faire* advocates—in Adam Smith's case as a prophylactic against 'the most dreadful disorders'—and utilitarians keen to promote a 'happiness' attainable only through the inculcation of their tenets also favoured directed instruction for workers' children. Controversy, compromise and the richer classes' ordering of their priorities dogged and delayed the implementation of this objective. Parliament had accepted in principle the need for national elementary education in 1807.⁴⁶

A clear distinction nevertheless existed between the state's 'enforcement of education' and its assumption of the direction of that education. If government had merely required 'for every child a good education', it could have saved 'itself the trouble of *providing* one'.⁴⁷ A certificate of proficiency in the 3Rs and enforcement of an age limit for the commencement of work would have sufficed—but not have given all workers' children a religious, moral and social training approved by richer people. Application of such a policy would also have raised attainment standards in workers' private schools.

Quite exceptionally, glimpses appear of private schools' potential. Many children who had learnt nothing from tuition in class blossomed under individual tuition. Men of 'high class' were private schoolmasters

as well as 'persons of inferior attainments'. A full-time dockyard labourer gave extremely successful preparation for competitive examinations in his evening school. The advantages of drawing children from dame and common day schools into one with a charitable basis were 'very questionable'. Dames' schools at Leeds warranted the sympathy and help of the public. A diocesan inspector praised dames' schools at Lichfield for their 'parental feeling', criticised only their lack of the 'interrogative element', and suggested that a little guidance from the clergy could remedy this defect. If it were remedied, this inspector would 'infinitely prefer' three dames' schools to one large infants' school. Working people, moreover, a third of whom at Hull belonged to benefit societies, had collaborative, self-help traditions and organisational skills. With the assistance of a building society but without governmental aid, miners at a Northumbrian colliery built a commodious school and a schoolmaster's house to overcome their children's lack of adequate instruction. Every adult miner, regardless of marital status or paternal prowess, made the same substantial contribution towards the capital expenditure and thenceforth paid three pence weekly for current expenditure.⁴⁸

The insatiable demand for child labour, curbed tardily and partially by the state from the 1830s, persisted in the bishop of Manchester's opinion of 1873 as the 'most capital fault' in all endeavours to school workers' children. The damning indictment of their exploitation in the Children's Employment Commission, 1842—instances of children starting work aged 3 or 4 years, 'not infrequently' at 5, more generally 7 and 8, and working usually twelve but up to eighteen hours a day—showed continuity as well as greater diversity of inhumanity. For the previous half century boys of poor families were being sent down pits between the ages of 6 and 8.⁴⁹

From the 1830s factory legislation was extremely limited and extended slowly—to branches of silk-manufacturing, for instance, in 1874. Its part-time educational provisions secured unenthusiastic implementation: six of two thousand mill-owners acted upon those of the 1833 measure by 1836. A factory inspector repeatedly highlighted the few good factory schools and the lamentable failures of the great majority. Because there was 'evidently no disposition, in any quarter, to have the glaring defects in the law corrected', he refused, in his final year of service, to enlarge any further upon the adverse educational

consequences of factory legislation in 1859. Legislation relating to workshops, often domestic (and which produced half of Birmingham's manufactured goods in the 1850s), was even more belated. Youngsters in such enterprises remained unprotected for many decades. Working people's powerful pressure for the regulation of child labour, shown in Samuel Kydd's *The History of the Factory Movement* (1857), had strictly circumscribed results. Proposals to extend schooling by fining anyone who employed a child under the age of 10 without a certificate of educational proficiency went unheeded until the 1870s.⁵⁰

The testimony of HMIs, diocesan inspectors, and officials of voluntary schools points unequivocally to a more widespread exploitation of child labour as its curtailment in certain mines and factories commenced. Juvenile labour was essential to employers 'in a vast number of manufactures, trades and occupations'. Demand for it, which increased yearly throughout the country, was greater in 1861 than in 1839. The labour of the child tended to '*supersede the labour of the parent*' with 'every improvement of machinery'. Parents, driven by poverty, were engulfed by fierce competition and the 'absolute necessity which has been created for the employment of children at too early an age and for too long a time'. Employers' insistence that they '*must* have the children' usually acquired 'irresistible force' when accompanied by the intimation that if parents withheld their children their own services would no longer be required. The demand for juvenile labour was known to triumph even when parents were neither indifferent about their children's schooling nor too poor to pay for it. Consequently, the age reached by children in schools and the regularity of their attendance had been 'gradually but steadily diminishing' for more than a decade of mid-century prosperity.⁵¹

Children at Sheffield had a longer, less fragmented school life when trade was neither very good nor very bad. The schooling of children with parents in regular moderately-paid employment was least affected by prosperity or reduced economic activity, and that of those receiving daily payment less than those of pieceworkers. Intermittent or unpredictably sustained high wages did not ensure the protection of children's schooling. The commonplace deduction that schooling was 'more likely ... in periods of prosperity for the family' is logical but not necessarily valid generally. Derbyshire ironstone miners' occupational practices differed greatly from those of skilled artisans in

Birmingham or Sheffield but they all curtailed their children's day schooling during periods of prosperity. A study of six agricultural and six manufacturing districts drew the same conclusion: prosperity increased demand for child labour. Children's wages—sometimes all a mother received if her husband spent his wages entirely upon himself—contributed significantly to domestic income. A third of a farm labourer's, and more of an artisan's, familial income disappeared if he sent two children, aged 9 and 11, to a paying school. In numerous workshop trades and crafts children were often employed by or apprenticed to working people, perhaps their fathers or mothers. They earned wages. They also increased male and female skilled and unskilled pieceworkers' productivity and income significantly, perhaps by relieving them of time-consuming tasks that required little skill or strength. Pieceworkers in various occupations also had a powerful incentive to increase the number of their apprentices or juvenile employees during periods of vigorous economic activity.⁵²

Dostoevsky witnessed the 'triumph of Baal' when he first visited England in 1862. The 'contrast between the "colossal facade" of riches, luxury and general prosperity of the few and the abject poverty of the many and their "coolie-like" acquiescence in their fate' struck him forcefully. The schooling of working people's children was one of England's 'gigantic' social problems but many parents showed little acquiescence in their grappling with it. These problems were related to 'the increased luxury of the opulent, the widening chasm and diminished sympathy between class and class, the struggle between wealth and poverty, and the wide destitution of one portion of the poor' which had allegedly 'robbed them of all heart, and mind, and power'. The struggle also generated the 'habits of intemperance and sensuality in another portion, in imitation of the luxurious living of their social betters'. In 1857, when demand for child labour was increasing daily, Rev. W. J. Kennedy, HMI, was unusually explicit. He doubted whether England could 'undersell all other nations, and yet educate duly our youthful labourers'. He believed that 'we must make up our minds to sacrifice the one object to the other'. As he did not see any preparedness 'to part with any portion of our manufacturing and commercial greatness', the promotion and improvement of school attendance ought to continue '*within the limits compatible with our commercial pre-eminence*'.⁵³

The Schooling of English Workers' Children

Notes

- 1 Neil McKendrick, 'Home Demand and Economic Growth: A New View of the Role of Women and Children in the Industrial Revolution', in *Historical Perspectives: Studies in English Thought and Society in Honour of J. H. Plumb*, ed. Neil McKendrick, London, 1974, p.157; P. J. Waller, *Town, City and Nation: England 1850–1914*, Oxford, 1983, p.126.
- 2 John Belchem, *Industrialization and the Working Class: The English Experience, 1750–1900*, Aldershot, 1990, pp.11–13, 153, 156, 207.
- 3 G. Kitson Clark, *The Making of Victorian England*, London, 1962, p.147; Samuel Couling, *Our Labouring Classes: Their Intellectual, Moral, and Social Condition Considered*, London, 1851, pp.50–2.
- 4 Stephen Yeo, *Religion and Voluntary Organisations in Crisis*, London, 1976, p.119; L. R. Haggard, ed., *I Walked by Night: Being the Life and History of the King of the Norfolk Poachers*, London, 1974, p.113.
- 5 Belchem, *Industrialization*, p.33; Robert Roberts, *A Ragged Schooling*, London, 1984, p.23; Peter Keating, ed., *Into Unknown England 1866–1913: Selections from the Social Explorers*, London, 1976, p.191; James H. Treble, *Urban Poverty in Britain, 1830–1914*, London, 1979, p.188.
- 6 Nassau W. Senior, *Suggestions on Popular Education*, London, 1861, p.85; Michael E. Rose, *The English Poor Law 1780–1930*, Newton Abbot, 1971, p.204; Sidney Webb and Beatrice Webb, *English Poor Law History in English Local Government*, London, 1963: 7 i 327; 8 ii 1.
- 7 Geoffrey Taylor, *The Problem of Poverty 1660–1834*, London, 1969, p.85; William Dodd, *The Labouring Classes of England*, Boston, 1847, pp.69–70, 86.
- 8 E. P. Thompson, *The Making of the English Working Class*, Harmondsworth, 1977, p.295; F. M. L. Thompson, *The Rise of Respectable Society: A Social History of Victorian Britain, 1830–1900*, London, 1988, pp.343, 351–2; *Journal of the Statistical Society of London* (hereafter *JSSL*) 5 (1842): 77; Charles Shaw, *When I was a Child*, by 'An Old Potter', London, 1903, pp.135–7; Keating, ed., *Unknown England*, p.168.
- 9 John Dufton, *National Education, What It Is, and What It Should Be*, London, 1847, p.32; Dodd, *Labouring Classes*, p.28; Earl of Shaftesbury, *National Association for the Promotion of Social Science*, London: 12 Oct. 1858, p.7.
- 10 As early as 1816, the Spitalfields Association organised 8,460 visits to 3,366 families in an eleven-week period. Phillip McCann, ed., *Popular Education and Socialization in the Nineteenth Century*, London, 1977, p.26; David Roberts, 'Dealing with the Poor in Victorian England', *Rice University Studies* 67 (1981): 60.
- 11 Phil Gardner, *The Lost Elementary Schools of Victorian England*, Beckenham, 1984, p.98; Eric E. Rich, 'The Passing of the Education Act of 1870', Ph.D. diss. London University, 1932, pp.10–11.
- 12 See Robert J. Hind, 'Working People and Sunday Schools: England, 1780–1850', *Journal of Religious History* 15.2 (1988): 199–218; see also *idem*, 'Elementary Schools in Nineteenth-Century England: Their Social and Historiographical

- Contexts', *Historical Reflections/Reflexions Historiques* 11.2 (1984): 189–205.
- 13 David Wardle, *Education and Society in Nineteenth Century Nottingham*, Cambridge, 1971, p.44; Philip B. Cliff, *The Rise and Development of the Sunday School Movement in England 1780–1980*, Redhill, 1986, pp.91–92, 100; see also Thomas W. Laqueur, *Religion and Respectability: Sunday Schools and Working Class Culture, 1780–1850*, London, 1976; Malcolm Dick, 'The Myth of the Working-Class Sunday School', *History of Education* 9.1 (1980): 27–41.
 - 14 Cliff, *Sunday School Movement*, pp.88–90.
 - 15 Thompson, *Respectable Society*, p.141; Cliff, *Sunday School Movement*, p.5; David Hempton, *Methodism and Politics in British Society, 1750–1850*, London, 1984, p.89; *Minutes of the Committee of Council on Education* (hereafter MCCE), 1844, 1:151.
 - 16 Cliff, *Sunday School Movement*, pp.116, 129; Laqueur, *Religion and Respectability*, p.124; Alfred Hill, ed., *Essays upon Educational Subjects Read at the Educational Conference of June 1857*, London, 1857, p.53.
 - 17 Committee of the Sunday School Union, *The Census and Sunday Schools*, London, 1854, p.6; *JSSL* 18 (1855): 154.
 - 18 Less than a quarter of Sunday school pupils were middle-class children by the 1850s. *The Report of the Proceedings of the Sunday School Convention*, 1–5 September 1862, p.162, affirmed that children of labourers, artisans and smaller craftsmen attended but not those of clerks, large traders, professional people and persons of independent means; Marion Johnson, *Derbyshire Village Schools in the Nineteenth Century*, Newton Abbot, 1970, p.204.
 - 19 *Parliamentary Debates* (hereafter *Parl. Deb.*), 3rd ser., 20 (30 July 1833):150; *ibid.*, 91 (19 April 1847): 1008; *ibid.*, 137 (2 May 1855): 2118; *JSSL* 1 (1838): 458; *JSSL* 42 (1879): 458–9; Jelinger Symons, *School Economy*, London, 1852, p.11.
 - 20 *The Educator*, 3rd ser., 1.6 (London, 1863): 177; 1st *Annual Report of the National Society for Promoting the Education of the Poor in the Principles of the Established Church, 1812*, pp.51–2; 21st *Annual Report of the British and Foreign School Society, 1826*, p.69; *ibid.*, 40th *Report of the BFSS, 1845*, p.39; MCCE, 1847–48, 1:4; *Educational Record* 1 (1849): 27, 64; *ibid.*, 2 (1853): 184; *Parl. Deb.*, 3rd ser., 48 (20 June 1839): 595; *ibid.*, 116 (22 May 1851): 1247, 1251–2.
 - 21 Frederic Hill, *National Education*, London, 1836 1:76; *Parl. Deb.*, 3rd ser., 125 (4 April 1853): 528; *Parliamentary Papers*, XXI, part 1, 1861, *Report of the Commissioners Appointed to Inquire into the State of Popular Education in England* (hereafter *Newcastle Commission*), 1:20; *JSSL* 5 (1842): 308; *JSSL* 25 (1862): 52; Horace Mann, *National Association for the Promotion of Social Science*, 1862, p.269; *Educator*, 3rd ser., 1.6 (1863): 158; Robert James, 'The Development of Education in the Borough of Warwick during the Nineteenth Century', M.Ed. diss. Warwick University, 1971, p.163.
 - 22 MCCE, 1847–1848, 1:24; F. B. Zincke, *Why Must We Educate the Whole People?*, London, 1850, pp.39–41, 43; *Parl. Deb.*, 3rd ser., 138 (11 June 1855): 1789.

The Schooling of English Workers' Children

- 23 *Newcastle Commission* 1:320; *MCCE*, 1845, 1:256 ; *ibid.*, 1846, 1:260, 443; *The Educator*, 3rd ser., 1.6 (1863): 148.
- 24 British Library, Francis Place Papers, Add. MS. 27823, fos. 43–5, 49–50; *JSSL* 1 (1838): 456; *MCCE*, 1839–40, pp.111–12; *ibid.*, 1842–43, p.33; *ibid.*, 1845, p.245; *Newcastle Commission* 5:163.
- 25 John Armitstead, *On the Means Possessed by the Church for the Education of the People*, London, 1847, p.21; *MCCE*, 1842–43, p.437; *ibid.*, 1844, 2:138, 510, 523; *ibid.*, 1845, 2:114, 180; *ibid.*, 1853–54, pp.673–7; *Central Society of Education, Second Publication*, London, 1838, pp.363–4.
- 26 *Central Society of Education, First Publication*, London, 1837, pp.59–60; *JSSL* 15 (1852): 116; *MCCE*, 1842–43, p.52; *ibid.*, 1858–59, p.344; Matthew Arnold, *Reports on Elementary Schools, 1852–1882*, ed. Sir F. R. J. Sandford, London, 1889, pp.8–9, 79; *Educator*, 2nd ser., 26 (1860): 27, 40; *ibid.*, 3rd ser., 1 (1862): 50; *Leeds Mercury*, 13 April 1869; Public Record Office (hereafter PRO), Ed 24/13A/3, W. E. Forster (copy), 3 April 1878.
- 27 John Burdett, ed., *Destiny Obscure. Autobiographies of Childhood, Education and Family 1820s to 1920s*, London, 1982, p.38; George C. T. Bartley, *The Educational Conditions and Requirements of One Square Mile of the East-End of London*, London, 1870, pp.23, 48, 53; *Educational Record* 8 (1867): 94; *Educator*, 3rd ser., 1.6 (1863): 159.
- 28 William W. Mackenzie, *A Treatise on the Elementary Education Acts, 1870–1891*, London, 1892, pp.130–42; *Central Society, Second Publication*, pp.340–1; *16th National Society Report*, 1827, pp.12–13; *JSSL* 1 (1838): 455; *ibid.*, 25 (1862): 61; Bartley, *One Square Mile*, pp.43, 45–8, 51–2; *MCCE*, 1844, 2:444.
- 29 *Parl. Deb.*, 3rd ser., 111 (5 June 1850): 785; Rich, 'Education Act, 1870', pp.220–1; *MCCE*, 1844, 2:12, 141; *ibid.*, 1845, 1:154–5, 2:175; *ibid.*, 1847–48, 1:xcv.
- 30 Phil Gardner, *The Lost Elementary Schools of Victorian England*, pp.1–80; *Central Society of Education, First Publication*, London, 1837, p.59.
- 31 Bartley, *One Square Mile*, p.15; *JSSL* 4 (1841): 156, 250.
- 32 *MCCE*, 1845, 2:114; *ibid.*, 1846, 2:11; *JSSL* 1 (1838): 455; *ibid.*, 25 (1862): 60; *Report of the CCE (England and Wales), 1882–1883*, p.110; *Educator*, 3rd ser., 1.6 (1863): 199.
- 33 *Newcastle Commission*, 1:175–6; *JSSL* 1 (1838): 73; *Educator*, n.s., 16 (1858): 86; Richard W. Hiley, *Sundry Attacks on Private Schools and Strictures Thereon*, London, 1884, p.33; Edmund H. L. Willes, *Elementary Education in Leicestershire*, Leicester, 1869, p.12.
- 34 *JSSL* 2 (1839): 348, 416; *ibid.* 3 (1840): 29–31; *ibid.* 4 (1841): 160; *ibid.* 6 (1843): 31; William Morris, *Swindon Fifty Years Ago*, Swindon, 1885), pp.285, 290–2.
- 35 Gardner, *Lost Schools*, p.95; *JSSL* 1 (1838): 457–8; A. Hill, ed., *Essays upon Educational Subjects*, p.69. The growth of female employment shown by the census of 1851 was one of its most significant features.
- 36 Gardner, *Lost Schools*, p.165; PRO, Ed 21/12634/14320, Wesley Road Junior Mixed School, Middlesex, Report by H. H. Piggott, HMI, 22 June 1914; Symons,

- School Economy*, p.6; *Report of CCE (England and Wales), 1882–1883*, p.88.
- 37 *MCCE*, 1845, 2:234–5; *Report of CCE (England and Wales), 1882–1883*, p.91; *Northern Liberator*, 1 November 1839; *JSSL* 1 (1838): 358, N. E. Dennis, 'The Provision of Schools in Newcastle upon Tyne during the School Board Period, 1870–1903', M.Ed. diss., Newcastle upon Tyne University, 1969, p.58.
- 38 Nassau Senior, *Popular Education*, p.3; *Educator*, 3rd ser., 1.6 (1863): 198; *JSSL* 25 (1862): 50; *MCCE*, 1842–43, p.472; *ibid.*, 1844, 2:88, 187; *ibid.*, 1845, 1:257.
- 39 *Newcastle Commission* 1:168, 295; *Educator*, 3rd ser., 1.1 (1862): 8.
- 40 *Newcastle Commission* 1:394; Gardner, *Lost Schools*, pp.188–210.
- 41 *Report of CCE (England and Wales), 1882–1883*, pp.114, 124.
- 42 Rod Mengham, *The Descent of Language: Writing in Praise of Babel*, London, 1993, pp.102, 128, 130.
- 43 Anon., *Sunday School Reform*, London, 1871, pp.3–4; Committee of Sunday School Union, *The Census and Sunday Schools*, p.2; Cliff, *Sunday School Movement*, pp.178–9.
- 44 For an introductory bibliography on literacy see Phil Gardner, *Lost Schools*, pp.186–7, n.148; Robert Roberts, *The Classic Slum*, Harmondsworth, 1980, p.167.
- 45 Stanley Harrison, *Poor Men's Guardians: A Survey of the Struggles for a Democratic Newspaper Press, 1763–1973*, London, 1974, p.73; *Parl. Deb.*, 3rd ser., 76 (19 July 1844): 1079; *ibid.* 141 (11 April 1856): 930.
- 46 Adam Smith, *The Wealth of Nations*, London, 1950, 2:272.
- 47 John Stuart Mill, *On Liberty*, London, 1963, pp.129–30.
- 48 *Report of an Educational Conference of Parochial Clergy and Schoolmasters*, Oxford, 1856, pp.35–6; *JSSL* 2 (1839): 416; *ibid.* 6 (1843): 31; E. G. West, *Education and the State*, London, 1965, p.167; *Report of CCE (England and Wales), 1863–1864*, p.93; *Educator*, 3rd ser., 1.6 (1863): 198.
- 49 Bishop of Manchester, *A Great Demonstration in Favour of Religious Education*, Manchester, 1873, p.13. This commission of 1842 showed that children under the age of five were employed primarily by working people, often their parents.
- 50 Hill, *National Education*, 1:129; Nassau Senior, *Popular Education*, p.185; *Essays*, 1857, pp.69, 76. See also P. W. J. Bartrip, 'State Intervention in Mid-Nineteenth Century Britain: Fact or Fiction?', *Journal of British Studies* 23 (1983): 63–83.
- 51 *Parl. Deb.*, 3rd ser., 148 (11 February 1858): 1229; *MCCE*, 1844, 2:283; *ibid.*, 1846, 1:256; *Newcastle Commission* 1:39; *Essays*, 1857, pp.14, 20, 128, 170, 277.
- 52 *Essays*, 1857, pp.72–3; John Rule, *The Labouring Classes in Early Industrial England, 1750–1850*, London, 1986, p.230; Sunday School Union, *Census and Sunday Schools*, p.12; Nassau Senior, *Popular Education*, p.4.
- 53 *The Best Short Stories of Dostoevsky*, trans. David Magarshack, New York, 1992, p.xviii; *Essays*, 1857, pp.236, 264.