

https://dspace.org/

The role of the history of education in teacher Education in South Africa, with particular reference to developments in Britain and the USA

Randall, Peter Ralph

2015
http://hdl.handle.net/10539/18116

Downloaded from a DSpace repository. https://dspace.org/

the 1890s was in response to the need for trained elementary school teachers. After the 1902 Education Act attention became focused on the need for teachers for the new secondary school system.

The early period: 1890 - 1914

Brian Simon periodises the study of education at unversities into four stages.(34) The first of these, from the 1890s to the outbreak of the First World War, was marked by 'an electic version of Herbartianism', the contributions of several distinguished historians of education, particularly Foster Watson (35), W H Woodward (36) and J W Adamson (37), and the coming into prominence of psychology in teacher training courses, primarily in the form of 'child study'. In this first stage, then, history and psychology emerged as the main theoretical 'disciplines' applying to education as a subject of university study. As far as the history of education as a discipline is concerned (the primary focus of interest in the present study), Joan Simon makes the point that Woodward, Watson and Adamson were all concerned to raise the standard of teacher training, particularly by encouraging the pattern of a degree course followed by a year of professional st dy, and were equally concerned with securing the status of educational studies, including the history of education, at university level.(38) Towards the end of a long life, Adamson expressed regret that histories of English education were 'of the fewest', since he believed that England, 'perhaps more than any other country, would be helped by an understanding of her educational past'.(39)

Under the direction of such men, history of education enjoyed considerable status in some of the new university departments of education. Their approach to the past, as Watson expressed it, was t' t it was 'the antecedent states of the parts which in their organised form now constitute the present'.(40) In accepting the basic soundness of this view, some later historians have used it as a springboard for attacking the tendency of some of their colleagues

'to accept an analysis of the organised form which constitutes the present, advanced by social science, and to apply it to investigating antecedent states'.(41) The relationship between past and present in studying the history of education is discussed at various points in this study.

Adamson, professor of education at the University of London, categorised historians of education as i) professional educators, mostly biographers of 'great thinkers', who saw their task as 'the edification of schoolmasters and schoolmistresses'; ii) scholars advancing 'the evolution of educational theory'; and iii) the chroniclers of 'certain, concrete institutions'.(42) This extremely apt typology was to hold true for many generations of historians of education. The discipline itself Adamson defined, in a broad sense, as 'the history of the development of the ideals, principles, and customs of social life which make the civilisation of a nation or of a continent', and, in a more restricted sense, as 'a history of schools, universities, and similar institutions'.(43) As will be demonstrated shortly, Adamson, like the early historians of education in the USA (Cubberley and Paul Munroe in particular), was to be strongly criticised by some later historians on the grounds of their missionary zeal to advance the standing of the teaching profession and their uncritical acceptance of the notion of 'progress' in the evolution of mass schooling systems, but it is clear that he and his colleagues made a major contribution, not only through their own researches and publications, but also through the development of an intellectual framework for the discipline and a deeper understanding of its function and theoretical base. In the definition given above, for example, Adamson foreshadows the early revisionists in the American history of education in the late 1950s and early 1960s.(44)

The positive assessment of authors like Adamson needs to be balanced, however, with the retrospective critique of Roy Lowe, who, in a penetrating analysis of early work in the history of education in England, concluded that Adamson, Watson and Woodward, and other

teacher trainers like R H Quick (45), S S Laurie (46) and Oscar Browning (47):

> glorified the process of teaching, over-emphasised the significance of teachers as transmitters of culture and, by concentrating upon the continuity of educational tradition, effectively established a Whig school which took more than fifty years to supplant.(48)

As will be seen in the next chapter, the complaints that the revisionists in American history of education began to direct against <u>their</u> early writers like Cubberley were cast in almost identical terms. Lowe also presents convincing arguments and evidence that many of the pioneer British historians of education failed to adhere to the 'ineluctable rules' of historical enquiry and offered accounts which were in effect 'propagandist'. Watson and A F Leach (49), for example, were anxious to restore the grammar schools to their former position of esteem and in the process were somewhat uncritical.

But, from what has been said already, it is not possible to dismiss such scholars as Adamson out of hand. Even less well-known figures during the early period identified by Simon sometimes sound surprisingly modern. Alexander Darroch, professor of education at Edinburgh, for example, advocated a general academic education for all teachers, including teachers of domestic science, upheld the right of women and working class children to equal educational opportunities, and warned against 'this pragmatic sprit' and 'the new utilitarianism' which bedevilled teacher education under the influence of the American, Dewey. In relation to the history of education, he firmly rejected the 'great man' theory then in vogue, as well as 'the vague doctrine of the genius of the age' as an explanatory tool.(50)

In a passage suggestive of the thinking of a much later historian like E H Carr with regard to the relationship between past and present, Darroch also accepted the need for constant re-interpretation of the past. He in fact offered a justification for what was to become known as revisionism:

> If the present can only be thoroughly understood in, and by means of, the light derived from the study of the past, so, in like manner, the past can only be thoroughly understood and interpreted by means of the insights which we have of the significance of the present, and hence in every age, with every advance of thought, there will arise the need for a fresh reconstruction - a fresh re-interpretation of the past.(51)

Of course, not all the new professors of education were as far-sighted as the examples given so far. The students at Leeds must have laboured under the burden of F H Matthews, author, inter alia, of A Dialogue in Moral Education, who felt that educational theory should aim at the establishment of 'certain general principles'. He saw history as a major tool in this task, particularly through study of the lives of the great educators. In language that exemplifies the lofty and moralistic tone of much contemporary writing on education, Matthews described biography as 'the very sap of history, bathing the whole plant in a flood of human interest...'.(52) His approach to course planning appears to have been extremely casual: 'Even if we take unconnected biographies from very different periods... no harm is done: the intervals are blanks which will be filled up in time'(53)

At Liverpool, too, 'students who propose(d) to enter what is called the profession of teaching', as Professor E T Campagnac chose to put it (54), were less fortunate than their contemporaries at, say, London or Edinburgh. Campagnac's view of the history of education may probably be taken as representative of the majority. It was a very narrow view, influenced no doubt by what he had been taught in his own student days. He saw the history to be taught to prospective teachers as embodying no more than 'a study of the institutions' and of those 'detailed accounts which some men have left of their performances as teachers'.(55) In chapter three of his textbook he provided a rapid chronological survey of periods of education from classical Greece to the Reformation, during which men 'have tried to discern some single ruling principle' and each of which made its contribution to the progress of mankind and of education, the common Whiggish view of that and other times.(56) In

the process Campagnac delivered himself of very many highly generalised judgments of dubious value: 'The Romans', for example, 'had a more material, and yet a more spiritual conception of their destiny than the Greeks'.(57) Chronological, evolutionary accounts of the history of education, both British and American, tend towards unhelpful broad statements of this kind, as do the writings of historico-pedagogicians in South Africa, as exemplified by J C H R Coetzee and I S J Venter, amongst others (see Chapter 5).

The underlying conception in Campagnac's work is the idea of a cosmos, a whole of ordered thought, which could be made available to prospective teachers through a combination of history, some psychology, some philosophical musings, and practical teaching hints - a kind of primitive vision, perhaps, of the 'discipline' approach that was to come in the 1960s? All this was premised on the notion of the history of education as illustrative of progress, the dominant theme of most contemporary British (and American) textbooks on the subject, and in time this was to become the particular target of the critique launched by revisionist historians of education against the 'traditional' approach to the discipline. In time there was also to be a reaction among teacher educators against courses such as those propounded by Campagnac, in effect a loose stringing together of various strands on the assumption that this would somehow make a meaningful whole. The outlines of the 'Principles of Education' which were to dominate the 'theoretical' elements of teacher training for so long are clearly visible in Campagnac's curriculum. Such 'undifferentiated mush', the phrase used by R S Peters (55), was to be rejected in the 1960s.

Campagnac's views have been discussed in some detail here since they seem particularly representive of the model that came to dominate teacher education for generations, not only in Britain, but in South Africa as well. It is surely Campagnac, rather than Adamson, who really deserves the strictures of Roy Lowe.

The Inter-War Years: the 1920s and 1930s

Brian Simon describes this period as one of stagnation in the study of education in Britain.(59) He adds the suggestive comment that the economy as a whole was largely stagnant at the same time. While this theme obviously requires cautious treatment, it is nonetheless interesting to speculate whether the educational disciplines tend to flourish in times of economic development, which are also usually marked by expansion of the education syst In this regard one might refer to the example of the 1960s in Britain when teacher education, including the study of the history of education, underwent major changes, at least partly as a result of a massive expansion of formal education. At least one writer has drawn a connection between the British economic crisis of the 1970s and early 1980s which resulted in popular demands for 'accountability' from all sectors of education, and the decline of theoretical studies in teacher education.(60) Be that as it may, the point remains that the period under review was marked by economic depression, and by stagnation in the study of education.

Joan Simon makes the point that the promising start made in the study of the history of education (by such men as Adamson, Watson and Woodward) did not oulast the twenties. Nor did specialist historians fill the breach and education in fact received little attention.(61) Brian Simon comments on the paucity of research during the inter-war years: 'untouched by significant research or revision, the earlier history of English education became bedded down into something approaching a reverent commentary on the findings of predecessors'.(62) Joan Simon refers to the dullness and inadequacy of most textbook accounts: 'they see the distant past in terms of the present'(63), and instead of considering the question of what education really meant in early English society, insist on trying to find the origins of modern schooling long before this is relevant (again, a criticism also directed against the early American historians of education). Like many other commentators, Joan Simon makes the point that to deal exclusively with schools and

other institutions of formal education is to provide a distorted account of the history of education since for centuries very few children attended school and there were much more influential forms of education.(64) The textbooks of Beatty (65) and Boyd (66), with their sweeping accounts of the evolution of formal education, may be taken as representative of the period.

One is struck by the lack of evidence of any really meaningful interaction between American and British historians of education during this period. While there was a common tendency to present the evolution of formal education in a positive and optimistic light and to adopt a circumscribed view of the past, emphasising landmark developments (the 'Acts and Facts' approach), the contributions of 'great educators', and the role of schools to the virtual exclusion of all other educational agencies, this seems to have occurred in almost total parochial isolation.(67) Hurt's criticisms of the actual teaching of the discipline seem to apply to both Britain and America: the subject was generally badly, and boringly, taught, with too much chronology and not enough relation to the rest of history, while the almost messianic vision of the unfolding of a system of compulsory education had an indoctrinatory function, in the sense of persuading the student that the status quo should be viewed rather uncritically as the culmination of evolutionary progress.(68) As will be seen in Chapter 5, substantially the same criticism could be levelled at South African teacher education institutions, both English and Afrikaans. Webster has substantially the same view: the major functionof the history of education was to familiarise intending teachers with the development of public education. This 'uninspired and unedifying' exercise concentrated on a 'seemingly endless succession' of commissions and Acts of parliament.(69)

Silver believes that in order to understand fully the periodisation offered by Simon, some attention must be given to such matters as the status of schools and of teachers, since the nature and purposes of teacher education have been determined to a great extent 'by the

status of the teacher, divisions amongst teachers, community expectacions of the teacher, the profession, the organisation...'.(70) While an exhaustive treatment of this theme would be beyond the scope of the present study and would expand it to inordinate lengths, it is clear that this is a very significant factor in considering the changing role of the history of education in teacher education. In this regard, it is of interest to note that by 1939, the end of the period being reviewed here, both the National Union of Teachers and the Joint Standing Committee of the Training College Association and Council of Principals were considering broad issues related to teacher education, and were arriving at conclusions that signified important shifts of attitude, perhaps forshadowing the changes that were to occur in the post-war years, particularly once the British economy had begun to recover and expand and the educational boom of the 1960s was under way.

The NUT established a committee to investigage the training of teachers, and its report was adopted by the NUT Executive in March 1939.(71) The committee was not suprised to find 'a certain conflict' between the claims of theory and of practice, but - perhaps surprisingly for a body of practitioners - agreed with one witness whose view was that unless students gained 'a reasonable knowledge of educational principles, and, above all, unless they form a habit of thinking critically not only about their own work but also about wider educational problems', they would remain mere journeymen perpetuating present and past habits. Pointing out that future educational administrators would come from the present generation of students ('except, of course, those divinely endowed persons who enter the profession without any training at all'), the committee - and in turn the NUT Executive - were clearly in favour of a 'theoretical' content in teacher education courses, including an examination of the relationships between education and society. The report, however, stopped short of making any specific recommendations regarding theoretical studies.(72)

The Joint Standing Committee of the Training College Association and the Council of Principals concluded that there had been a marked improvement in the quality of teaching at the training colleges as a result of the supply of trained graduate teachers emerging from the universities. The appointment of such people to the training colleges meant 'not merely a general widening of the training college outlook', but also a change in the character of the courses, with less emphasis on 'school method' and more attention to the underlying educational principles.(73) The Joint Standing Committee found that all types of training included courses in the Principles of Education, and that in all colleges and university training departments this subject was considered to be of high importance in the curriculum. Educational psychology (based on the prevailing 'child-centred' ideology and with emphasis on mental testing)(74) was always included under the 'Principles' sometimes as a separate subject, but usually it formed part of a general course. The history of education sometimes figured separately, but as a rule 'time allows only of incidental treatment'. The third component listed under the 'Principles' was methods of teaching.(75)

It is clear that by the outbreak of the Second World War, 'theoretical' studies were firmly established in British teacher education courses, under the title Principles of Education, an amalgam of lectures which constituted the core of the one-year course. Psychology and history remained the major 'theoretical' disciplines, but history had begun to lose ground, sometimes being offered merely 'as an alternative to such subjects as Music and Handwork'.(76) The inclusion of method under the Principles of Education must have resulted in an uneasy practice-theory mix. At least in the minds of the organised profession the importance of considering, during training, wider social issues in relation to educational practice was accepted. What actually went on in most lecture rooms, perhaps particularly in relation to the history of education, may well not have measured up to the views of the NUT and the JSC. There was to be, after the War, a major reaction against

both the composition of the Principles of Education and its actual teaching, with particular questions being asked about the 'relevance' and 'function' of such subjects as history of education in the teacher education curriculum.

Brian Simon concludes that the base for the serious study of education was still attenuated, and there was a failure to come to terms with and to engage in such study 'on the scale insistently required by social developments'.(77) This was the main burden of the challenge presented by Fred Clarke, director of the London University Institute of Education, in 1943.(78) Simon regards Clarke as the most important seminal thinker on education during the period.

The Immediate Post-War Period

Simon describes the world of the educational historian in the 1950s as 'small and relatively self-contained... more or less ruled by a handful of elder statesmen until a younger generation, returned from the war, became active in what were soon expanding departments in both colleges and universities'.(79) The Education Act of 1944, passed almost as an act of faith while the war was still being waged, embodied the popular desire for educational advance. It was the major instrument in the immediate post-war period of expansion in institutions, student enrolment and staff numbers. The great majority of lecturers in the university departments of education, and, of course in the training colleges, were primarily concerned with the practical business of preparing students for their classroom practice. The focus was on training in the methods of teaching their particular subjects. This left little time and energy for serious study or research in education. In Brian Simon's view this operated to restrict the vision of lecturers in education and did not allow the proper development of educational studies as a university subject. It was, he concludes, partly for these reasons that some of the new post-war universities deliberately established education departments that did not have responsibility for teacher

training.(80) Another important development was the setting up of Institutes of Education in all the main English and Welsh universities (with the exception of Oxford and Cambridge). Their main function was the in-service training of teachers, but they also brought the training colleges into a much closer relationship with the universities (after the Robbins Report, 1963, most of the universities fused their departments and institutes into Schools of Education, Leicester being the first and Cambridge being a notable exception, so that its department and institute are still separate.)(81)

A sense of the state of educational studies in the 1950s may be gained from the British Journal of Educational Studies, which commenced publication after the war under the editorship of A C F Beales, the educational historian from King's College, London. The first number surveyed three areas of educational research, history, theory, and comparative education, a rather strange amalgam which perhaps reflects a general uncertainty about the parameters of educational study, an essentially inter-disciplinary undertaking.

It would be erroneous to give the impression that no significant scholarly work was undertaken at this time. As in each of the periods being surveyed here, there were individuals who produced important and pioneering work. In the previous period, for example, E C Mack (82), an American, published his two-volume study of the British public schools, the first really serious account of the inner development of these influential institutions. In the period now under review there were, for example, important studies of denominational schools (Methodist secondary schools, by F C Pritchard, 1949, and Quakers by W A C Stewart, 1953) and W H G Armytage's study of British civic universities (1955). By and large, however, it would seem that recent research of this nature rarely found its way into teacher education curricula, which still tended to follow the old 'Acts and Facts' and 'Great Educators' approaches. Lowe concludes that some of the most widely read post-war historians of education perpetuated myths first formulated

in the early period (1890 - 1914) by writers like Leach, Adamson and Watson. He identifies, for example, Pollard (Pioneers of Popular Education, 1956) and the frequently-prescribed T L Jarman (Landmarks in the History of Education, 1951): their work helped mould 'the attitudes of student teachers and educationalists for at least two decades after the Second World War'.(83) Jarman's Landmarks cetainly ends on a strongly and uncomplicatedly positivist note: 'Life itself depends upon education, but at the same time education makes possible the good life'.

A Period of Decisive Change: the 1960s and early 1970s

The point has been made frequently that interest in the past seems to become stimulated during periods of crisis and change.(84) Certainly the critical period that South African education has been in since at least 1976 has seen significant attempts at re-interpretation of the history of this country's education.(85) The 1960s in Britain may offer a less dramatic example, but one which also supports the general contention. This was a period when formal education came to be seen as important in terms of economic development and national prosperity. Human capital theory, imported from the USA, helped to advance this perception and, as in the American case, the unexpected scientific and technological triumphs of the Russians undoubtedly acted as a further spur to educational expansion and to a critical re-examination of the successes and failures of the educational system. This was a time when the socially divisive effects of secondary streaming were being criticised and the move towards comprehensive secondary schools was being implemented. There was a general concern over the 'wastage' of human potential as a result of an inadequate education. Inevitably there were major changes in teacher education to meet the new situation. The crucial factor in this was the report of the Robbins Committee (1963) which proposed, inter alia, a plan for a vast increase in higher education over twenty years. The Robbins Report also proposed that school teaching should become a fully graduate profession and to this end recommended the introduction of

the BEd degree as a four-year course for students in training colleges or colleges of education. Educational studies would be a major component in such a course. At the same time, the old two-year certificate was abolished in favour of the three-year certificate course. Academic staff at colleges of education increased from 3 334 in 1960 to 11 937 in 1970, while the number of students rose from 33 993 to 107 386 over the same period.(86) The BEd, while taught in colleges of education, was to be awarded by the validating universities, and this brought the colleges into yet closer relationship with the universities. One outcome of this was a general rethinking of the nature of educational studies and a recognition of the need for a theoretical underpinning in graduate teacher education.

The prime mover in this re-thinking was R S Peters, who succeeded in 1962 to the chair of philosophy of education at the London Institute of Education. In his inaugural lecture Peters argued that the Principles of Education on general offer at both universities and colleges of education was so much 'undifferentiated mush'.(87) It was necessary to look at education as a process and to identify and clarify the major disciplines on which its study was based. Paul Hirst, the philosopher of education, supported the view that education was not in itself a subject but was best seen as an area of practical activity to which different disciplines contributed general principles.(88) The views of Peters and Hirst received support from educational psychologists like Stephen Wiseman and sociologists like Basil Bernstein and Jean Floud, particularly at a seminal conference in Hull in 1964. Thus the model of educational study known as the 'four disciplines' came into being. In terms of this model, students of education should be inducted into the thinking relevant to the philosophy, sociology, psychology and history of education.

From the survey given to this point, it is clear that psychology and history had been central components of educational studies since the 1890s (even if there had been some significant changes in their

content over this period, especially in the case of psychology). But it was the relatively new disciplines of sociology and philosophy (the first named chair in the philosophy of education was established only in 1947, at the London Institute) that took the dominant role in the study of education in the 1960s. The philosophers' contribution to the clarification of concepts relevant to educational discourse and action, provided, in Brian Simon's words, 'a stimulating addition to courses of educational study'.(89) However, Simon concludes that the main impact on educational studies in the 1960s was made by sociology, whose emergence as a logitimate field of university study took place 'with astonishing rapidity'.(90) Between 1963 and 1965 the number of chairs of sociology in Britain increased from two to twenty-three: this development presaged the establishment of sociology of education as an important sub-discipline. A similar process was to occur in South African universities in the late 1970s.

The 'canonical' four disciplines rapidly became institutionalised, particularly in advanced studies (MA courses in the history, sociology, philosophy and psychology of education proliferated), but also in most BEd syllabuses. Several major series of student texts were published under the editorial aegis of scholars intentionally appointed to represent the four disciplines.(91) Educational theory flourished as it had not previously done. Part of the reason for this was presumably the great increase in the number of people involved in the study and teaching of education, many of whom were now freed from the task of supervising students' teaching practice. As Dearden says, 'in the second half of the 1960s, theory was riding high'.(92) Its popularity was reinforced by the Plowden Report on primary education (1967) which rested heavily on theoretical evidence and perspective. The political climate of the times was conducive to work aimed at eliminating social and educational disparities, starting with an understanding of the historical causes of inequality. Simon talks of the 'social democratic consensus of those years' and refers to the mass of data produced by empirical

research on the relationship between social class and educational opportunity which became an important issue at this time.(93)

It is clear that the concept of education as a field of study became much broader and deeper during the 1960s. Simon's view is that university studies in education came of age in this period with a closer relation to 'main line' studies and more penetrating and systematic research.(94) Simon's own work in the history of education marked a major shift towards a more analytical and critical approach. Significantly enough, his first major book, Studies in the History of Education, appeared in 1960, at the very start of the period of decisive change being reviewed here.(95) This study of education during the industrial revolution employed marxist analytical concepts to describe the working class struggle for education and the emergence of an organised schooling system for the different classes. In 1965, Simon's Education and the Labour Movement extended his thesis that state intervention had brought about a divided educational system which helped perpetuate class divisions, effectively leading to 'two nations' in Britain, to the early twentieth century.(96)

Several other important historical analyses were also published during the 1960s, notably Harold Silver's account of the implications of Owenism for popular schooling (97), while Kenneth Charlton raised new questions about the extent and influence of informal educational agencies in the Renaissance period.(98) A new agenda for historians of education was being established. Working class education and informal education were but two items on that agenda, which was also influenced by developments in the study of history in general, including the publication, in 1963, of E P Thompson's The Making of the English Working Class, and such trends as 'history from below', which:

> directs attention to people whose names never figured in the older history books, the people who were deprived or neglected in their own time and whose participation in government was

> minimal or non-existent, whose attitudes towards authority' could be deferential or resentful, passive or hostile. The study of 'history from below' often creates a greater sense of understanding along with a recovery of immediacy. It quickens the curiosity of the historian and leads him into examination of related patterns of work and 'leisure', participation and 'apathy'.(99)

Among the items to be firmly placed on the agenda in the 1960s was the role of elites, with Sheldon Rothblatt's The Revolution of the Dons (1968) opening up new perspectives in the study of English universities, David Newsome's Godliness and Good Learning (1961) dealing with the distortion of Christian values in the public schools, and Rupert Wilkinson's The Prefects (1964), one of the first of the wave of sociological studies, sub-titled 'British Leadership and the Public School Tradition: a comparative study in the making of rulers'.

As an explanatory tool for the issues of both class inequality and elite perpetuation, the concept of 'social control' was developed during the late 1960s and early 1970s. Richard Johnson, for example, argued in Past and Present that the growth of elementary education involved the imposition of 'social control' in which the school inspectorate played a crucial role.(100) The problems in the use of this concept ('one easily brought into play but less readily interpreted in a consistent and viable manner')(101) have made it one of limited value for historians. Joan Simon, for example, writes of sociological modes of exposition 'each essentially one-sided and tending to make points in the 'received' language rather than intent on contributing to the coming of age of 'education' '.(102) The use of 'social control' in order to explain educational change almost inevitably invites over-simplification. With regard to Johnson's use of the concept, referred to earlier, it is significant that John Hurt's meticulous study of the evolution of public schooling heaps praise on that 'much-maligned figure', the Victorian civil servant, for the establishment of a successful elementary education system before 1870. It is precisely the Victorian civil servant who would be regarded as the villain of the

piece in any account of nineteenth century English education that takes social control as its central thesis. (The point should be made that Hurt is by no means uncritical in his analysis of nineteenth century education: like Simon and others he concludes that 'we are in danger of carrying into the last quarter of the twentieth century the socially stratified educational system of the nineteenth century'.(103) Silver has also criticised the use of the concept of social control, for example by Richard Johnson (1970) as 'unenterprising analysis and 'uni-directional'.)(104)

This matter has been dealt with in some detail here as it illustrates the tension that developed as a result of attempts to 'sociologise' history of education. Joan Simon and others have been anxious to defend the historical approach as vital to educational studies, 'beset as they are by sociological, psychological, philosophical modes of exposition'.(105) The institutionalisation of the four canonical disciplines obviously created problems in defining (and defending) their respective boundaries.

Attention has been drawn merely to some of the outstanding features of the work in the history of education in Britain in the 1960s and early 1970s. An exhaustive survey of the research and the publications of the period is neither feasible nor necessary here: this can be found in such overviews as Simon (1966 and 1982), Webster (1976), W B Stephens (1981)(106), and Keith Dent (1982).(107) It may also be useful to take note of a summary-critique by Gillian Sutherland, writing in 1969, of the work in the history of education undertaken to that date.(108) She concluded that history of education seemed 'at last to be coming into its own' after being for too long an appendix either to studies of the philosophy and psychology of education (the omission of sociology is interesting, in the light of subsequent developments) or to descriptions of contemporary educational institutions. She also remarked on the fact that more and more 'mainstream' historians were entering the field. Her major criticism was that much recent work in the field was not as sophisticated as that in other areas of

piece in any account of nineteenth century English education that takes social control as its central thesis. (The point should be made that Hurt is by no means uncritical in his analysis of nineteenth century education: like Simon and others he concludes that 'we are in danger of carrying into the last quarter of the twentieth century the socially stratified educational system of the nineteenth century'.(103) Silver has also criticised the use of the concept of social control, for example by Richard Johnson (1970) as 'unenterprising analysis and 'uni-directional'.)(104)

This matter has been dealt with in some detail here as it illustrates the tension that developed as a result of attempts to 'sociologise' history of education. Joan Simon and others have been anxious to defend the historical approach as vital to educational studies, 'beset as they are by sociological, psychological, philosophical modes of exposition'.(105) The institutionalisation of the four canonical disciplines obviously created problems in defining (and defending) their respective boundaries.

Attention has been drawn merely to some of the outstanding features of the work in the history of education in Britain in the 1960s and early 1970s. An exhaustive survey of the research and the publications of the period is neither feasible nor necessary here: this can be found in such overviews as Simon (1966 and 1982), Webster (1976), W B Stephens (1981)(106), and Keith Dent (1982).(107) It may also be useful to take note of a summary-critique by Gillian Sutherland, writing in 1969, of the work in the history of education undertaken to that date.(108) She concluded that history of education seemed 'at last to be coming into its own' after being for too long an appendix either to studies of the philosophy and psychology of education (the omission of sociology is interesting, in the light of subsequent developments) or to descriptions of contemporary educational institutions. She also remarked on the fact that more and more 'mainstream' historians were entering the field. Her major criticism was that much recent work in the field was not as sophisticated as that in other areas of

social history. There were two particular problems: i) 'a kind of hindsight, a marked tendency to write and analyse in terms of ideals and absolutes, good and evil, and struggles for progress'; and, ii) 'a tendency to dignify a simple description of some aspect of an educational system with the label 'education-and-society', as if description of the one automatically invoked and even explained the other'. The first tendency could lead to a backwards projection of current battles, and in this regard Sutherland refers, inter alia, to Simon's Education and the Labour Movement. Her view was that any educational system could be examined meaningfully only within the context of its own society and that this implied as full a knowledge of that society as possible (she was later to express doubts that history of education existed as a separate discipline at all). Some writers on 'education-and-society', in her view, assumed the links to be plain, whereas 'the attempt to unravel and delineate the relationship between the two is a most difficult and delicate task'.(109) These views are now taken for granted by most British historians of education, but at the time they might have seemed quite challenging, particularly in view of the approaches that some sociologists were bringing to historical enquiry.(110)

One major lacuna in the literature of the period was the comparative neglect of pedagogy, as few writers dealt directly with what actually went on in schools, either past or present. As educational studies became more rigorous and academic, according to Brian Simon, the historic neglect of pedagogy, the theory and the practice of teaching, was accentuated.(111) 'Method' tutors concentrated narrowly and almost exclusively on the teaching of their subjects. The result was 'a certain separation between theory and practice'(112), at least in the one-year PGCE course. The 'theoreticians' teaching sociology, philosophy and history (perhaps less so in the case of psychology) generally did not see their disciplines as having direct application to the practice of teaching, although the indirect effects were frequently given as part of the justification for their inclusion in teacher education

courses. Simon believes that the relationship between theory and practice in initial training courses was never adequately resolved and that the dominance of 'theory' in the second half of the 1960s and the early 1970s led inevitably to a reaction in favour of 'practice'.(113) In 1971 Entwistle was asking such warning questions as whether educational theory was not too 'simple', or 'too utopian', and declaring that good theory can really only be derived from practice (114), a view that was to be echoed by none other than Hirst more than a decade later when disenchantment with theory had risen yet higher. This discussion will be pursued later. In the meantime it is necessary to examine the place of history of education, specifically, in teacher education at the time.(115)

The establishment of the History of Education Society in 196- was an important development. Its aims were to further the study of the history of education, to provide a forum for debate, organise meetings and conferences, and publish a bulletin and other documents. The Society's first conference dealt mainly with the role of historical study and the teaching methods to be employed (and evoked considerable criticism on this score from Gillian Sutherland, who found it 'depressing' that the Society should concentrate on the place of history of education in education courses: 'It sounds as though the Society has yet to establish for itself the independent status and nature of historical enquiry').(116) Three papers surveying the field were presented to the conference. (117) In summary, their findings were i) that the certificate courses in colleges of education usually included the period from 1760/1800 to the years after the Second World War, that the historical element suffered as a result of linking history of education to other topics like administration, philosophy or sociology, that teaching methods were largely 'traditional' (presumably a kindly term for boring and out-dated), and that some new trends like the use of source material and local resources had begun to enter the courses; ii) that in the BEd courses the history of education was commonly offered as an option in the fourth year of

study and that, under the general theme of the development of education in England and Wales, there was considerable variety of content and approach; and, iii) that the PGCE was the main university course in which the history of education was taught, usually concentrated on English educational history of the nineteenth and twentieth centures, and that historical studies of education were popular in higher degree work. The survey of the university courses concluded with the remark that there was uncertainty about the role of history of education, especially in compulsory courses. This uncertainty was to grow as the whole notion of educational theory came under scrutiny and attack.

The Society's first Bulletin carried a clear warning against complacency regarding the role of the history of education.(118) Although history of education remained a normal component in initial teacher education courses, its future position was by no means secure.(119) Summing up the then position Dent concludes that in 1967 history of education 'had a substantial base within initial teacher training, from which it would seem to have been able to resist serious threats, and from which it could develop its role in the new BEd'.(120) As he points out, by the 1980s the position had changed dramatically. The nature of that change will be explored later.

It is ironical that history of education in teacher education should have been forced on to the defensive precisely at a time when it was enjoying a period of unprecedented vigour and growth in Britain. The establishment of the Society was both a consequence and a cause of this liveliness. By the mid-1970s Webster could confidently assert that 'there is now a new vitality, spontaneity and creativity in the field'.(121) Reeder echoes this: he sees the mid-1970s as a watershed, with a sense of change, of new themes, of more ambitious methodologies, while the interest shown by economic and social historians in education stimulated a broadening of the

agenda of educational history, to include, for example childhood and popular culture, literacy and studies in social recruitment.(122) This widening of the scope was also reflected in the topics for the History of Education Society's conferences: informal education, middle class education, the education of women and girls, the relationship between history and sociology. Reeder's own work on urban history is a further example of the trend.(123) While it is not possible to survey here the whole corpus of literature produced in the decade between 1965 and 1975, attention may be drawn to work as diverse as Gosden's How they were Taught (1969), a collection of documentary materials for the study of classroom practice over time; Malcolm Seaborne's The English School (1971), which suggested by implication that school buildings themselves could be important sources of information on educational practice; the excellent illustrated students' text by John Lawson and Harold Silver, A Social History of Education in England (1973); Brian Simon's The Politics of Educational Reform 1920 - 1940 (1974), a detailed critique of the divisive effects of the policies of the Board of Education, under the influence as it were of psychometrics; and a number of local histories.(124) Finally, to round off this picture of vigorous and diverse activity, mention should be made of the appearance of two journals, the Journal of Educational Administration and History, published, since 1968, by the School of Education of the University of Leeds (which also maintains an excellent Museum of the History of Education in the Brotherton Library), and the History of Education Society's journal, History of Education, whose first issue in 1972 contained a seminal piece by the renowned 'mainline' historian Asa Briggs (125) who firmly located the study of the history of education 'as part of the wider study of the history of society, social history broadly interpreted'.(126) Briggs identified new trends in the study of history which were achieving a new balance between specialisation and generalisation and from which educational historians needed to learn. These included a more sophisticated approach to local history; comparative history; quantitative history; a more analytical political history; and 'history from below'.

By the mid-1970s the study and the teaching of the history of education had come a very long way since the early period identified by Simon. The 'traditional' approach to the subject, involving superficial chronological surveys from classical times, the lives of the 'Great Educators' and, above all, a triumphant account of the evolution of mass schooling in Britain, told by means of reference to the appropriate 'landmarks', particularly Commissions and Acts of Parliament, had been abandoned everywhere, with the possible exception of small pockets manned by lecturers unaware of the changes that had transformed their subject. Likewise the defects of 'a Whiggish approach to the past'(127), in which the older historians had sought to justify and explain the current educational system, in the process treating educational change largely in a vacuum, had also been overcome.

The Shift to Functionalism

As already mentioned, despite these advances and despite the apparently flourishing state of scholarship in the history of education, the later 1970s saw a dramatic decline in the fortunes of the discipline in teacher education programmes, consequent on a general decline in the popularity of educational theory as such. Wardle's complaint about a lack of 'any comprehensive explanatory system of theory in the history of education'(128) - a lack which he identified but did not himself seek to redress - may point to a partial explanation, although it is likely that many historians would be sceptical about and even repelled by the notion of an overarching theoretical structure of explanation. Dearden may well have captured another part of the truth when he asked whether the temporary rise of educational theory was not 'just a strange and temporary aberration for the sturdily pragmatic British?'(129) The educational writers of the 1960s had not made exaggerated claims for their disciplines in relation to the practical activity of teaching. Simon, for example, made it clear that 'no claim should be made that

the study of the history of education directly affects the practice of the teacher'.(130) But it is still possible, as Dearden says (131), that inappropriate expectations had been aroused. This may have been particularly so in view of the heightened hopes placed on education generally in the 1960s and the plans for much improved teacher education as a means of raising the level of education as a whole.

In terms of the history of education in particular, it is possible that despite the vigorous activity already referred to, the new generation of historians had not succeeded in establishing their discipline securely enough to supplant the image that it still retained in the minds of those who had been trained in an earlier period. According to Dent, part of the problem was that Her Majesty's Inspectorate and teacher educators in general had a fixed image of the 'old' history of education, not having bothered to keep up to date with developments in the field.(132) It is also possible, of course, that the historians of education were themselves equally to blame for not having undertaken adequate 'public relations' work outside their immediate circle. Certainly the debates within British history of education did not reach anything like the degree of intensity that has occurred in the USA. This may be due partly to the absence of a large, coherent and determined school of radical revisionists in Britain, in contrast to America, where the thunder of battle could not fail to be heard outside the ranks of the historians themselves.(133) Dent remarks on a dual paradox: on the one hand, that at the time of the discipline's best achievements it became eroded in teacher education, as has already been observed, and that despite the doubts cast on the discipline by HMI and others no one seemed to question the importance of history itself as a school subject.(134) There is, of course, a further irony, and that is that most reports on educational matters begin with an almost obligatory historical survey that draws heavily on the work of historians of education.

A further factor in the decline of the history of education in colleges and universities may well have been a degree of confusion about the nature and the parameters of the discipline in the aftermath of the rethinking of the 1960s. The impact of sociology, for example in relation to nineteenth century education, 'produced disappointingly few insights likely to be of long-term historical interest' and involved 'such a degree of simplification that the conclusions generated are incompatible with the historical evidence'(135) The same complaint will be heard when we examine the position in American history of education, and it may not lack relevance in terms of recent developments in the South African historiography of education.

It is also possible that the very broadening of the field of the history of education led to some confusion, perhaps particularly in the minds of those in the HMI, the Department of Education and Science and the local education authorities who were already negatively disposed towards the discipline. Webster makes the point that 'the more conscientious the attempt to appreciate the complexities of the educational process, the greater the temptation to sweep the net more widely until the history of education becomes an encyclopaedia of social and intellectual history, in which it is almost impossible to obtain any clear focus on the educational experiences of childhood and adolescence'.(136) The pendulum had swung too far: 'for the historian education as a concept formerly embraced too little; now it is rapidly coming to include too much'.(137) The question of what properly constitutes the field of the educational historian is a complex one, which became a particular issue in America, and this is discussed elsewhere in this study. Faced on the one hand with a static view of the history of education and on the other by an apparent mish-mash of themes and topics, some educational planners may well have concluded that the subject had no real place in teacher education. In this they would have been supported by the attack on educational theory as such

which was mounted from the mid-1970s. Peter Searby, the Cambridge historian of education (138), is one of several who date the 'about-face' from 1975, when Paul Hirst first 'preached relevance and utility, using the analogy of the training of a general medical practioner'.(139) Hirst later developed his 'new' views on educational theory in words almost startling in their echo of those employed by Andrew Bell more than seventeen decades earlier (and quoted at the beginning of this chapter):'In education, as in any other area of activity, we come to understand the activity, its problems and their answers from engagement in the activity itself'.(140) Of course, few would plead that teacher education should be 'unpractical', but it should also set out to do other things as well as preparing teachers for their classroom practice, in other words the liberal educational function should not be discarded in favour of sheer utility. However, it is clear that those in the DES and the lea's for example, who distrusted educational theory welcomed Hirst's views. The general feeling in such circles in the late 1970s was that teachers needed a more effective preparation for the practical activity of teaching, a conclusion doubtless strengthened by the move toward comprehension in secondary education with its consequent demands on teachers.

Hirst was not the only writer to question the value of educational theory. As Dearden says, what was new was the disenchantment with theory amongst some theorists themselves.(141) John Wilson, for example, raised doubts not only about the val of theory but whether educational theory really existed at all.(142) Hartnett and Naish, although given the space of two volumes by their publishers, in the end remained unconvinced of the relevance of educational theory, expressing 'moderate scepticism' about its place in educational practice.(143) This discussion is pursued in the first chapter of this study.

There may also have been practical reasons for the decline of the

history of education specifically. Gosden has pointed to an inherent weakness in the place that it occupies in teacher education (144). The general acceptance of history, sociology, philosophy and psychology as separate disciplines taught by specialists in university departments of education placed 'impossible' requirements on students in initial courses: 'to study all four deeply enough to acquire more than a superficial familiarity was more than could be expected in the time available'. The usual solution was to let students choose two of the four, but this flew in the face of the argument that all four components were necessary for the study of education. As Gosden says, it then becomes difficult to argue that any one of the four is really necessary, and in this way 'one soon begins to arrive at the standpoint of the James Committee and the present position'. In this situation it was perhaps inevitable that history of education should suffer more than the others in the light of the disadvantages already mentioned (inter alia, its unpopularity in the minds of those who had been taught the 'old' history of education, particularly members of HMI; the traditional methods of teaching still adopted by many lecturers; confusions about the parameters of the discipline and its relationships with the others, and questions about history's relevance for prospective teachers). History may also have been at a particular disadvantage vis a vis the other disciplines given the relative shortness of time available for it in most teacher education courses: according to Simon, this was a very telling reason why the history of education often took the form of 'a concentrated course covering chiefly what might be called surface phenomena'.(145)

The report of the James Committee on Teacher Education (1972) both reflected and encouraged the growing rejection of educational theory. The Committee was impressed 'by the volume of comment stressing at once the importance and the inadequacy of teaching practice' and declared that 'many courses place too much emphasis on educational theory'.(146) The separation between theory and practice already referred to, and the misgivings of many educationists about what they viewed as irrelevant subject matter in

teacher education courses, had a further outcome in 1974 when the Universities Council for the Education of Teachers launched an enquiry into the PGCE course. The result was a decision that students preparing for secondary teaching should focus specifically on the skills and abilities required in the first year of classroom teaching.(147) As Simon remarks, this signified an important move away from the four basic disciplines as the main focus in initial teacher training courses.(148)

The Position in the 1980s

The position of the history of education in the professional education of teachers had been eroded to such an extent that the History of Education Society devoted its Spring 1982 Conference to the subject.(149) As had been the case in 1968 (150), papers were presented which surveyed the scene at higher degree and diploma level and in initial training courses.(151) In the process, as Roy Lowe says in his introductory editorial remarks to the collection of papers from this conference, they reveal, both overtly and by implication, 'the kinds of defence which historians of education offer for the teaching of their subject'.(152) The volume thus provides a valuable account of the state of the art at the opening of the decade of the 1980s.

What emerges from the papers is the quite startling change that had overtaken teacher education institutions since the late 1960s (when the Society had been founded). Gosden actually talks of a 'collapse of the college of education sector'.(153) When the Society was established, teacher education, as has been noted, was still expanding rapidly and the general mood in education was one of relative optimism and confidence. By the time of the 1982 Conference the mood had become 'much more narrowly defensive as institutions have been closed or merged'.(154) Gosden refers to HMI investigations of 1979 and 1980 which make it clear that history had begun to lose ground against the other three foundation disciplines (155), while, following the James Report, initial training courses

had become much more school-focused, partly because of student pressure for 'relevant' components in their courses, and partly because of the James Committee's recommendation that initial teacher education should be training in the skills needed by beginners in the classroom. In a period of contraction, with large cuts in educational expenditure and falling rolls, significant changes were inevitable in the work of teacher education institutions and, more specifically, in the position of such 'theoretical' studies as the history of education. In the universities, the number of students involved in history of education in diploma courses, taught Masters' courses and research degrees was very low.(156) At very few universities was the history of education before 1750 taught at all, with attention being concentrated on the nineteenth and early twentieth centuries; at the same time there was little attention to contemporary studies. Only five universities appeared to offer research courses in the discipline. The theses presented for research degrees concentrated on the nineteenth and early twentieth centuries and their titles and topics were, in Batho's view, extremely conservative. Batho concluded from the position in the universities that 'there is room for innovation in the teaching of the history of education at advanced levels, for expansion of its content as well as of its teaching methods, and for much greater encouragement to research by postgraduates'.(157)

It is possible to conclude, in the light of the subsequent developments which will be described later, that such calls and exhortations were too late and that the history of education had lost its opportunity to establish itself as an important and relevant aspect of teacher education. From Batho's findings it is clear that the exciting advances made in the study of the discipline from the 1960s (and described earlier in this chapter), had failed to penetrate into many courses and that the traditional, old-fashioned approach to the subject still held sway in many institutions.

If the position of the history of education in higher degrees was

uncertain by the early 1980s, in initial training it appeared little less than parlous. In 1967 the discipline still remained a normal element in initial training courses, both the PGCE and the newly-established BEd programmes.(158) By 1982, there had been something of 'a dramatic change and an increasingly defensive role for historians teaching on initial training courses'.(159) History of education was seen as an essential component in roughly only half of the PGCE courses. In courses validated by the Council of National Academic Awards (CNAA), as against university-validated courses, the position of the history of education was particularly tenuous.(160) As Dent concluded:

> any complacency about the total picture of historical study in the PGCE could only be based upon University-validated courses, and... as CNAA-validation spreads across more institutions the likelihood of sustaining any serious historical studies in the one year initial training course will diminish, even setting aside any natural tendency towards diminishing theoretical content.(161)

(The 'natural tendency' mentioned here is presumably a reference to the growing emphasis, already described, on the practical preparation of students for their first teaching posts).

The responses with regard to BEd courses, 'so confidently forecast fifteen years earlier as a sure basis for development in the History of Education'(162), suggested that the numbers of students taking history of education options in university-validated courses were an indication of lessening popularity. Of the 60 institutions that sent in responses, only 13 did not offer history of education at all and only 17 did not consider it an'essential' component. This term, however, was clearly seen as covering a great variety of possibilities, including, in the case of one institution for example, only two hours being devoted to history, despite its 'essential' nature. It also included a role for history of education within broader components of a multi-disciplinary nature, which was the position amoung the majority of CNAA-validated courses.(163)

In considering both the PGCE and the BEd, Dent repeated the kind of complaint uttered by Batho: in his view there was little evidence that study, resources, staffing and teaching strategies in the history of education had advanced as much in fifteen years as one would have wished. In particular, he referred to the limited role of fieldwork and research, and a continued reliance on the traditional teaching methods of lecture and seminar.(164)

Dent went on to offer some personal comment on the reasons for the decline in the fortunes of the history of education. In the first place, he saw this as closely connected with major changes in teacher training itself and in the nature and role of the training institutions, accompanied by severe financial cut-backs, with inevitable consequences for the expectations, the morale and the status of the profession as a whole (a point reminiscent of that made by Harold Silver and referred to earlier in this chapter). Dent's personal comment provides a most useful and perceptive analysis of the reasons for the state that history of education had reached in teacher education in the early 1980s.(165) The closures of Colleges of Education, or their amalgamation with other institutions, together with economic cuts, had gone along with a growing separation between the universities and the colleges, the validating functions of which had increasingly been taken over by the CNAA. These changes in structure and procedure had removed much of the protection afforded to the established pattern of theoretical studies by the university connection. This inevitably affected the position of the history of education, particularly in view of what seems to have been a general trend away from the discipline in both colleges and universities during the 1970s. There was also the growing popularity of thematic studies with a stress on immediate practical professional relevance for beginning teachers. Such themes - or issues - as multi-cultural education, special education, gender education and school and work were rapidly becoming part of a new orthodoxy in initial teacher education programmes. As will be described in the next chapter, much the same sort of development was occurring in the USA, and would also occur in some of the English

language universities in South Africa (see Chapters 5 and 6).

Dent also sees the CNAA validating panels as having a role in the loss of support for the history of education since they were 'not entirely sympathetic' to a discipline-centred approach in the first place.(166) Dent's own experience was that he was often the only historian on CNAA panels, waging a kind of rearguard action in defence of the discipline.(167) He quotes one respondent whose views support those expressed earlier that many educational planners and administrators were simply ignorant of the changes that had overtaken the study and the teaching of the history of education since 1960. (As has been mentioned, it is possible that these advances had insufficiently influenced much of the work actually being done in the lecture room). In the absence of university support, Dent saw little hope of alternative protection: the teaching profession seemed generally antipathetic towards theory, and saw little importance in historical studies in teacher training, and the inspectorate probably shared these views.

The dangers inherent in the new orthodoxy, with its emphasis on the professional, classroom-based aspect of teacher education and on themes and issues under the overall catch-phrase of a problem-solving approach to educational studies, were eloquently summed up by Dearden:

> the perceived needs of practitioners are likely to be of a narrow and immediate kind, which will create a climate of expectation inimical to the kinds of insight offered by the liberalising disciplines.(168)

By the mid-1980s, many historians of education in teacher education institutions in England believed that the gloomy prospect forecast by Dearden had already come about. A major factor in the new situation in teacher education was the state's increasing intervention in and control over initial training in particular. The clearest manifestation of this was to be found in the Department of Education and Science's circular 3/84 on Initial Teacher

Training.(169) This draws a clear distinction between validation of the academic merit of a course and approval of its suitability for the professional preparation of teachers. While responsibility for the first remained with the universities and the CNAA, the Secretary of State for Education and Science (and the Secretary of State for Wales where appropriate) was to have responnsibility for the second. The Secretaries would be advised by a Council for the Accreditation of Teacher Education (CATE) whose members come:

> mainly from practising school teachers, teacher trainers and elected members and officers of local education authorities, with the aim of giving the Secretaries of State the benefit of the advice of experience professionals with a broad knowledge of the best practice in teacher education.(170)

There is an obvious emphasis here on the purely practical and professional aspects of teacher education - Dearden's immediate and narrow needs, with none of the liberalising influences of a study of the disciplines.

The circular went on to say that HM Inspectors would visit teacher training institutions in the public sector, and, 'by invitation', university departments of education. Reports on visits to colleges are published, but those on university departments remain confidential, with publication being at the university's discretion. But since CATE has right of access to HMI reports, and since without such a report CATE may not consider accreditation of a university's initial teacher training courses, the distinction appears to be more symbolic than real. In the eyes of many university teacher educators this development marks a major step in the increasing involvement of HMI in the content and teaching of teacher training courses.(171)

'Official' thinking on the content of courses is clear from the Criteria for the Approval of Courses annexed to Circular 3/84. These criteria stress the school-based nature of much of the training, the great importance of students' school experience and practice teaching (which together should comprise at least 15 weeks in a post-graduate course or a three-year BEd, not far short of half of the total time available), insist on teacher training staff having recent, successful school teaching experience, and lay down that the educational and professional elements of initial training should provide students 'with adequate mastery of the basic professional skills, on which to build in their teaching careers'.(172) Drawing together several of the strands that had begun to emerge in initial training courses, the DES also called for courses to pay attention to such aspects of the teacher's work as a professional approach to curriculum, and pastoral and administrative duties. In the only reference to what might be considered theoretical studies, the criteria include much of the thematic and issue-centred approach that had already taken the place, in the great majority of institutions, of the formerly 'canonical' disciplines:

> Students should be made aware of the wide range of relationships - with parents and others - which teachers can expect to develop in a diverse society, and of the role of the school within a community. They should also acquire an appreciation of the way in which the education system is structured and administered. They will also need to have a basic understanding of the type of society in which their pupils are growing up, with its cultural and racial mix, and of the relationship between the adult world and what is taught in schools, in particular, ways in which pupils can be helped to acquire an understanding of the values of a free society and its economic and other foundations. Opportunities should be provided for students to reflect on and learn from their own classroom experience, and to place their role as a teacher within the broader context of educational purposes.(173)

Much of this seems admirable, although it does suggest a rather static view of education and society, with no recognition of the value of an understanding of the historical roots of the present system nor of the need for constant renewal and transformation. The other major criticism would be that the kinds of concerns expressed in the quoted passage above should surely be more central to the curriculum than their placing - as a sort of afterthought to the rest of the document - suggests.

The position in English universities in 1985, as the present writer was able to understand it during his research for this study, was that the separate disciplines had virtually disappeared as discrete components in initial teacher training courses. Of the disciplines, history generally appeared to be the most negatively affected, for reasons already outlined. Such issues as social influences in schooling, multi-cultural education, the comprehensive organisation of schools, school and work, sex, drugs, and accountability, were common staples in PGCE and BEd courses. The historian's role (where historians of education as such were still employed) was largely confined to providing an historical perspective (or 'input') in the discussion of appropriate themes. It was clear that the only place for any sustained work was in in-service courses, particularly in taught Master's courses. Many university departments still offered Masters courses specifically in the history of education (and, of course, in the other disciplines as well), but even here there were threats to the position of history. Several historians interviewed felt that in the comparatively near future there would be fewer and fewer posts specifically for historians of education as such (174), since there was no longer any room for specialists in the discipline in initial training courses and a lessening demand in in-service courses, where other subjects are often seen as more 'relevant' for teachers. These more 'relevant' courses include sociology, curriculum studies and psychology, and employing authorities often exert some influence in the choice of courses taken by serving teachers, steering them towards those they regard as of most practical benefit - school administration and school management, for

example.(175) It was clear that the number of students taking masters degrees in the history of education by dissertation was very low and unlikely to increase significantly, thus raising the possibility of problems of recruitment to the discipline in future.

If the changes in the history of education presented here represent a startling reversal of fortune compared to the early days of university involvement in teacher education, described near the beginning of this chapter, it is important to bear in mind that no aspect of the curriculum, no matter how apparently entrenched and hallowed by age, can be assumed to have permanent rights of occupancy. The disappearance of the classics from the normal school curriculum after they had dominated it for centuries is a case in point. Another example, from the field of educational studies, is the virtual eradication of comparative studies after their brief period of popularity in the 1940s and 1950s.

The response of historians of education involved in teacher education to the position outlined above differed markedly. The majority of those interviewed, including Hurt and Lowe at Birmingham, Reeder and Don Jones at Leicester, Keith Dent at Westminster College, Oxford, and Peter Searby at Cambridge, were distressed by the virtual disappearance of their discipline from initial training and its decline in advanced studies, and by the sweeping moves to instrumentality in teacher education generally, which had taken place at the expense of theoretical studies. A common view was that training was a more appropriate word than education when describing the present position in initial courses. Ironically enough, it may be possible to sum up their views in the words used by Tibble to criticise the standard form of teacher training that was in use more than a century before: 'The main defect of the pupil teacher system of training lay in the inadequacy of the academic education given to candidates for the profession'.(176)

On the other hand, several of those interviewed found little

difficulty in accepting the position of the history of education, at least with regard to initial teacher training. Harold Silver, for example, did not believe that the PGCE should contain discrete disciplines, as it was not possible to be anything but superficial in one's treatment and coverage of them in a one-year course. As far as the history of education was concerned, his view was that it had more to say to students in relation to other disciplines like sociology and economics than as a separate subject.(177) At the University of Reading School of Education, Ray Davies felt that the separate disciplines were now outdated in initial training and that history's role was to illuminate the themes being studied in relation to the current education system.(178)

In marked contrast to both these sets of views were the optimistic feelings encountered at the University of Leeds, where the history of education apparently still flourished in 1985, and even continued to feature in both the primary and secondary PGCE courses. (179) Reasons for this state of affairs - one in marked contrast to most of the other university departments visited during the research for the present study - include the existence of a strong historical tradition at Leeds, exemplified by the Museum of the History of Education, the School's Journal, previously referred to, and the presence on the staff of enthusiastic and committed historians like Gosden and Unwin. The vigorous use of fieldwork methods and other forms of direct research in the teaching of the subject would also seem to operate in its favour.

To conclude this review of the position in university departments of education, an analysis is given of the new PGCE courses introduced in the School of Education, University of Leicester, in 1986. This will provide a good example of the trends which have influenced the position of the history of education in particular, and theoretical studies in general, in teacher education in England since the 1960s. The new PGCE courses (primary and secondary) at Leicester appear to be fairly typical of those in many other university departments of

education and can thus be regarded as something of a useful case study.(180)

The Leicester PGCE was previously reformed in the 1960s, when the School of Education was founded. The basic pattern established then lasted until 1985. 'Its aim was to produce teachers with well-developed subject identities and with special interests in education, both in the basic disciplines and in professional studies'. In this PGCE the basic disciplines of philosophy, history , psychology and sociology maintained 'specialist integrity'; they were taught separately from each other and from the professional studies. 'Freedom, diversity and specialisation, therefore, characterised the PGCE of the sixties and seventies'. Critics argued, however, that too many students were unprepared for some of the new demands being faced by the teaching profession. 'Too few students, moreover, appeared to have fully understood the relevance of the educational disciplines to classrooms and schools, however well they had been taught' (which rather sounds like a polite way of saying that the courses were considered to be irrelevant to the students' needs). The content of the 'old style' PGCE history course is given below, in the programme for the autumn term of 1984.

PGCE SECTION A	HISTORY OF EDUCATION	AUTUMN TERM 1984
3rd October	The Origins of Popular Education	Dr D Reeder
10th October	Education and the early Labour Movements	Dr D Reeder
17th October	Changing concepts of childhood 1870-1941	Dr D Reeder
24th October	The Politics of Educational Change: the Education Act, 1870	Mr D K Jones
31st October	The Education of Girls	Mrs Ruth White
7th November	The Emergence of Secondary Education	Dr D Reeder

14th November	The Rise of the Comprehensive School	Mr D K Jones
21st November	'Nature versus nurture': a long running educational debate	Mr D K Jones
28th November	Education and Industry: a recurring debate	Dr D Reeder

It would certainly seem from this list of topics that many of them would be valuable in terms of helping students to understand the development of the educational system and their place in it as well as giving them an appreciation of the major educational issues of the time. It is also clear that the course was firmly grounded in the modern approach to the history of education. But, whatever its virtues, the history option was abandoned in 1985.

The new secondary PGCE course formulated for implementation in the autumn term of 1985 introduced what were called 'important commonalities' in general courses which aimed at relating theory and practice. In place of the options in the basic disciplines there was to be a unitary course with the theoretical and practical components integrated into the 'substantial commonalities'. The four compulsory general courses are:

The Comprehensive School

Teaching and Learning

Education, the Economy and Society

Special Educational Needs; Multi-Cultural Education; Education for 14 - 19; Pastoral Care

History is subsumed under Education, the Economy and Society. The aim of this general course is 'to provide a broad context for the range of activities and courses which students are experiencing'. The course is taught throughout the Spring term, half a day each week for 12 weeks being devoted to it. This is part of the attempt to meet the recommendations of the DES, particularly regarding the desirability of integrating theory and practice:

> Drawing on the perspectives and modes of analysis of historians and sociologists, with some contribution from educational philosophy at appropriate points, it will be concerned with structural changes in secondary education and with the nature of the curriculum... key themes, particularly the issue of inequality and its significance for education, are intended to introduce theoretical and historical perspectives on fundamental issues involved in considering the state provision of education....Seminars and workshops (will) show how these perspectives clarify the constraints and opportunities within the contemporary school situation which students are experiencing.(181)

The historical element is essentially confined to the first four weeks of the course. In the first two of these weeks the theme is Popular Education and the Working Class, which is an historical introduction to the relations between education and society in the development of 'mass' schooling and which will acquaint students with recent controversies over the experience of nineteenth century popular education, especially the issue of 'social control'. It is also seen as linking pressures for the extension of compulsory schooling to changes in the economy, and to new attitudes to working class children and youth.

In the third and fourth weeks, under the title of Hierarchy and Meritocracy in the Development of Secondary Education, the formative influences on the development of secondary education are dealt with, using the notions of hierarchy and meritocracy as organising principles in structural change and as background to the rise of comprehensive schooling.

The remaining eight weeks of the course on Education, the Economy

and Society deal with more sociological topics, with one session given over to 'a philosophical consideration' of inequality, followed by sessions on social inequality and equal opportunities (including 'disadvantaged pupils' and strategies of 'compensatory and positive discrimination'); gender and education (the position of women, how schools perpetuate and can challenge sexual stereotypes); education, the economy and jobs (the view of education as investment, the Great Debate of the 1970s, the present position, especially the relationship between education and employment); education, training and recurrent education (alternatives for future developments, the role of community education, the New Training Initiative); education and the crisis of the welfare state.

An interesting aspect of the assessment procedures for this secondary PGCE course is the requirement that students do a lengthy dissertation (8 000 - 12 000 words) on a topic that 'is relevant to education' and does not repeat in a substantial way work done in another section of the course, although it may develop such work further. Such an exercise could clearly give scope for students wishing to expand interests they might have developed in one of the basic disciplines, including historical studies.

The new Primary PGCE at Leicester is 'firmly school-based' and makes considerable use of 'Partnership Schools' and 'teacher-tutors'. Theory is confined to two mornings a week for eight weeks in the Spring term and covers 'aspects of educational theory considered in relation to primary schooling'. The first part of this is based on a psychological approach to teaching and learning, and the second, Perspectives on Primary Education, 'drawing from the disciplines of philosophy, history and sociology, examines the place of the primary school in the wider context of society'. It is emphasised that any putative primary school teacher ought to have a critical awareness of the historical development of such educational ideas as progressivism or child-centred teaching. In this course, of 14 half sessions, five each are devoted to history and sociology and four to philosophical questions. The history sessions deal with the origins

of mass schooling; changing images of the child, especially in the period from 1870 to 1918; the invention of the primary school and the roots of progressivism, especially the work of Samuel Wilderspin and Froebel; twentieth century progressivism in Britain and the USA, especially the Dalton Plan and the English model of the 1960s; and the primary school in the twentieth century. The sociological sessions deal with educational inequality, ethnic minorities and schooling, and gender and the primary school. The philosophy covers developmental theories of education, children's needs and interests and the curriculum, children's creativity, and schooling and integration.

An interesting aspect of the historical section of this course is that it has what seems to be an extraordinarily extensive reading list for such a brief course.(182)

In essence it would seem that the new courses developed here are as sensitive to current concerns and as comprehensive in their attempts to equip student teachers intellectually for their careers as is possible within the constraints of a one-year course and of the requirements laid down by the Department of Education and Science. Many historians - and specialists in the other basic disciplines - may regret the relative down-grading of their subject, but this appears to have become inevitable in the light of the historical forces operating in teacher education in Britain since the mid-1970s.(183)

NOTES

(1) The details in this and the following paragraphs are taken from HC Dent, The Training of Teachers in England and Wales 1800 1975, Hodder & Stoughton, London, 1977, Chapter 1.

(2) Ibid, p 5.

(3) Ibid, p 7.

(4) HMSO, Education 1900 - 1950, the Report of the Ministry of Education, 1950, White Paper Cmd 8244, June 1951, London, p 79.

(5) Dent, The Training of Teachers..., p 15.

(6) Wesleyan Training College, Oxford (predecessor of the Westminster College, North Hinksey, Oxford), Rules, over the signature of James H Rigg DD, Principal, c 1885.

(7) HMSO (1951), Education 1900 - 1950, p 81.

(8) Ibid, p 82.

(9) Ibid, p 79.

(10) Ibid

(11) Ibid, p 80.

(12) Ibid

(13) Ibid

(14) HMSO, Regulations for the Instruction and training of Pupil Teachers and Students in Training Colleges, Cd 1666, GB Board of Education, London, 1903, p 15.

(15) Ibid, Cd 2607, 1905, p 5.

(16) Ibid, p 27, p 37.

(17) Ibid, Cd 3444, 1908, p 8.

(18) Ibid, p 36.

(19) HMSO, Regulations for the Training of Teachers in Training Colleges, Cd 2134, Prefatory Memo., 1904, p xiii.

(20) Ibid

(21) HMSO, Cmd 8244 (1951), Education 1900 - 1950, p 82.

(22) HMSO, Regulations for the Training of Teachers for Elementary Schools. Cd 6795, Board of Education, London, 1913, p 14.

(23) Joan Simon, foreword to J W Adamson, Pioneers of Education in the Seventeenth Century, Classics in Education No 45, Teachers College Press, Columbia University, New York, 1971, p xi.

(24) S J Colledge, 'The Study of History in the Teacher Training College, 1884 - 1914', History of Education Society Bulletin No 36, Autumn 1985, p 45.

(25) HMSO, Cd 6795 (1913), pp 71-72.

(26) J B Thomas, 'University College, London and the Training of Teachers', History of Education Society Bulletin No 37, Spring, 1986, p 44.

(27) HMSO, Cmd 8244 (1951), p 82.
J B Thomas, op.cit., gives average position of students on the Queens Scholarship lists as evidence of the poor quality of entrants. He also points to the wide range of subjects required by the colleges, pp 46-47.

(28) Ibid, p 83.

(29) Ibid, p 84.

(30) Ibid

(31) J B Thomas, 'The Day Training College: a Victorian innovation in Teacher Training', British Journal of Teacher Education, vol 4, No 3, 1978, p 250.
The Senate later opposed a suggestion that the university should incorporate a teacher training college on the grounds that this would bring in a number of young men of a "somewhat miscellaneous description"
(E Fiddes, Chapters in the History of Owens College and Manchester University, 1851 - 1914, Manchester U P, 1937, p 170).

(32) Brian Simon, 'The Study of Education as a University Subject in Britain', Studies in Higher Education, vol 8, No 1, 1983, p 1.

(33) Ibid

(34) Ibid, pp 3ff.

(35) For example, The English Grammar Schools to 1660 (London, 1908); and The Beginnings of the Teaching of Modern Subjects in England (London, 1909).

(36) For example, Studies in Education during the Age of the Renaissance (Cambridge U P, 1906) (republished, with a foreword by Lawrence Stone, by Teachers College Press, Columbia University, New York, 1967).

(37) For example, Pioneers of Modern Education in the Seventeenth Century (Cambridge U P, 1905) (republished, with a foreword by Joan Simon, by Teachers College Press, Columbia University, New York, 1971); and A Short History of Education (London, 1919). In 1949, in homage to Adamson, the chair of King's College was made a chair in the history of education, the only one at the time in any English university. In 1985 this chair was abolished after the retirement of Professor Kenneth Charlton.

(38) Joan Simon (1971), Foreword, p x.

(39) J W Adamson, 'A Plea for the Historical Study of English Education', in The Illiterate Anglo-Saxon and other Essays, Cambridge U P, 1946, pp 155-6.

(40) Foster Watson, 'The Study of the History of Education', Contemporary Review, vol cv, 1914, p 85.

(41) Joan Simon, 'The History of Eduction in Past and Present', Oxford Review of Education, vol 3 no 1, 1977. She goes on to attach the 'sociologism' and the 'flirtations with psychoanalysis' evinced in the writings of some modern historians of education like the American, Lawrence Stone.

(42) J W Adamson, A Guide to the History of Education, SPCK (Society for Promoting Christian Knowledge), 1920, p 3.

(43) Ibid, p 9

(44) See, for example, Oscar Handlin, Introduction to special issue on Education and American History, Harvard Educational Review, vol 31, no 2, Spring 1961, pp 121-2. Handlin's view is that a major breakthrough occurred from looking at the educational process through 'a broad range of relationships to the totality of culture', in the place of a narrow focus on educational institutions themselves. This is substantially the same view adopted by the early revisionists, Bailyn (who speaks of the 'configuration of educational processes': Education in the Forming of American Society, University of North Carolina Press, Chapel Hill, 1960, p 15) and Cremin (who likewise called

for a broad approach involving an examination of 'what agencies, formal and informal, have shaped American thought, character and sensibility': American Education: the Colonial Experience, Harper and Row, New York, 1970, p xi). Bailyn and Cremin and the other revisionists will be discussed in the next chapter.

(45) R H Quick's Essays on Educational Reformers was first published in London in 1868 in only 500 copies addressed to his fellow public (in the British sense) schoolmasters. It was re-issued in 1890 and reprinted several times to meet the demand from the new university departments of education. The Essays firmly established the biographical tradition among English historians of education, a tradition that has by no means died out in the 1980s (e.g. G H Bantock, Studies in the History of Educational Theory, 2 vols. George Allen and Unwin, London, 1980)

(46) S S Laurie was professor of History of Education at Edinburgh (one of the two first professorships in education). His Educational Opinion from the Renaissance (1903) aimed at an 'analytical exposition of the doctrines of eminent writers' in the conviction that the study of such writings 'is an important part of the general preparation of those who adopt the profession of schoolmaster' (p v). Laurie was thus an important figure in the school of the history of educational ideas.

(47) Oscar Browning's Introduction to the History of Educational Theories (1881) emphasises the 'practical use to teachers' of studying the past.

(48) Roy Lowe, 'History as Propaganda: the strange uses of the history of education', History of Education Society, Trends in the Study and Teaching of the History of Education, Occasional Publication 7, 1983, p 51.

(49) A F Leach, English Schools at the Reformation (1896); and The Schools of Medieval England (1915).

( ) Alexander Darroch, Education and the New Utilitarianism, Longmans Green, London, 1914, passim.

(51) Ibid, p 164.

(52) F H Matthews, The Principles of Intellectual Education, Cambridge University Press, 1908, p 71.

(53) Ibid, p 72

(54) E T Campagnac, Studies Introductory to a Theory of Education, Cambridge University Press, 1915, p vii.

(55) Ibid, p 14

(56) Ibid, p 63

(57) Ibid, p 54

(58) R S Peters, Education as Initiation, Evans Bros, London, 1965, p 7.

(59) Brian Simon (1983), 'The Study of Education...', p 5.

(60) Roy Lowe, 'History as Propaganda: the strange uses of the history of education', p 48. The same connection may perhaps be made with regard to the economic problems besetting South Africa in the mid-1980s.

(61) Joan Simon (1971), Foreword, p xii.

(62) Brian Simon, 'The History of Education in the 1980s', British Journal of Educational Studies, XXX, 1 February 1982, p 86.

(63) Joan Simon, The Social Origins of English Education, Routledge and Kegan Paul, London, 1970, p ix.

(64) Ibid, p x.

(65) H M Beatty, A Brief History of Education, Watts, London, 1922. Beatty (p 2) complains of the paucity of British histories of education as compared to European (especially German) and American. Like several of his contemporaries, Beatty defends the study of the history of education on the grounds that human nature is unchanging and that rudiments of all educational experiments can be traced to the past. Also, education is "largely an experimental science" and history "has its own useful part to play in enlarging our view and stabilising our judgment" (p 5). The content of his book is "traditional": a chronological survey from the Greeks to the Renaissance, and the lives of the Great Educators.

(66) W Boyd, The History of Western Education, A & C Black, London, 1928. Boyd begins with the confident assertion that "the history of Western education... begins with the educational ventures of the Greek people" and carries the story up to the beginning of scientific pedagogy in the twentieth century: "It is essentially a record of evolution" (my emphasis) (from Preface to the first edition, 1921). It is instructive to consider the subsequent history of Boyd's book, as this illustrates some important developments in the study of the history of

education itself. By the seventh edition (1964) it had been revised and enlarged by Edmund J King: "after much thought and experiment, it was decided to keep the story substantially unchanged until the middle of the nineteenth century" (Introduction, p vii), while the chapter on the later 19th century was entirely rewritten and new chapters on the 20th century were added.

By the 10th edition (1972), joint authorship was attributed to Boyd and King, with a new chapter on the twentieth century. This included "a new view" of educational history: "it is only in very recent years that historians of education have really taken stock of the world significance" of such factors as modernisation and the technological revolution; "there are still a few writers who look for Marxist-style 'determinants' or liberal-style 'personal interventions'. It is sometimes difficult to persuade them to recognise how far a search for 'laws', pivotal interventions, and any other supposed cause-and-effect relationship has become outdated because of the scale, penetrating power and accelerating speed of technology (his emphasis) in politics and education" (p 484). King's conclusion is a far remove from Boyd's original statement: "Thus, in the history of education above all, the reinterpretation necessary is not one of simply clarifying the retrospective vista. The historical task is rather to discern in times past some antecedents of new, universal concerns of education and humanity. These are now expressed in terms quite different from those which seemed acceptable when the Western tradion of education was still parochial and circumscribed" (p 499).

(67) For an interesting discussion of the benefits and drawbacks of parochialism in the study of the history of education see the chapter on 'Comparative and Cross-cultural History of Education' in Harold Silver's Education as History, Methuen, London and New York, 1983, pp 281-292. Interestingly enough, for one of the rare historians to work on both sides of the Atlantic, Silver believes that parochialism may indeed have advantages, for example in that 'it makes it more difficult to lose sight of the pursuit of historical realities' (p 283). The present study is partly an attempt to move beyond the parochialism of South African history of education, hopefully without losing sight of the historical realities.

(68) John Hurt, personal interview, School of Education,

Birmingham, 9 May 1985.

(69) Charles Webster, 'Changing Perspectives in the History of Education', Oxford Review of Education, vol 2 no 3, 1976, p 201.

(70) Harold Silver, personal letter to the writer, Oxford, 30 October 1985.

(71) National Union of Teachers, The Training of Teachers, report of a Committee of Investigation appointed by the Executive of the NUT and adopted by the Executive on 3 March 1939, London, 1939.

(72) Ibid, pp 83, 84.

(73) The Training of Teachers, Memorandum drawn up by the Joint Standing Committee of the Training College Association and the Council of Principals, University of London Press, 1939, p 6.

(74) See, for example, R A (Roy) Lowe, 'Eugenicists, Doctors and the Quest for National Efficiency: an Educational Crusade 1900-1939', History of Education, vol 8, no 4, 1979, pp 293-306; and 'Eugenics and Education: a note on the origins of the intelligence testing movement in England', Educational Studies, vol 6, no 1, 1980, pp 1-8.

(75) The Training of Teachers, Joint Standing Committee (1939), pp 19-20.

(76) Ibid, p 20

(77) Brian Simon (1983), 'The Study of Education ...', p 6.

(78) Fred Clarke, The Study of Education in England, Oxford University Press, 1943.

(79) Brian Simon (1982), 'The History of Education in the 1980s', p 88.

(80) Brian Simon (1983), 'The Study of Education ...', p 2.

(81) Ibid, p 3.

(82) E C Mack, Public Schools and British Public Opinion 1780 - 1860, Methuen, London, 1938, and Public Schools and British Public Opinion since 1860, Columbia University Press, New York, 1941.

(83) Roy Lowe, 'History as Propaganda...', p 58.

(84) See, for example, Charles Webster, 'Changing Perspectives...', p 201.

(85) In particular several of the essays in Peter Kallaway (ed), Apartheid and Education, Ravan Press, Johannesburg, 1984.

(86) Brian Simon (1983) 'The Study of Education...', p 12, n 14.

(87) R S Peters, 'Education as Initiation', in Peter Gordon (ed), The Study of Education, vol 1, Woburn Press, London, 1963. Subsequently republished as Education as Initiation, Evans Bros, London, 1965.

(88) PH Hirst, 'Educational Theory', in J W Tibble (ed), The Study of Education, Routledge and Kegan Paul, London, 1966, pp 29-58.

(89) Brian Simon (1983), 'The Study of Education...', p 9.

(90) Ibid

(91) The most notable of these was Routledge and Kegan Paul's Students' Library of Education, whose editorial board consisted of a philosopher (R S Peters), a sociologist (William Taylor), a psychologist (Ben Morris), and an historian (Brian Simon), under the chairmanship of J W Tibble. The major work in this series was J W Tibble (ed) (1966), op cit, which was followed in 1971 by An Introduction to the Study of Education (in which, interestingly enough, Malcolm Seaborne replaced Brian Simon as the historian).

(92) R F Dearden, Theory and Practice in Education, R K P, London, 1984, p 3.

(93) Brian Simon (1983) 'The Study of Education...', p 10.

(94) Ibid.

(95) Brian Simon, Studies in the History of Education 1780 - 1870 (first published 1960). Retitled The Two Nations and the Educational Structure 1780 - 1870, Lawrence and Wishart, London, 1974.

(96) Brian Simon, Education and the Labour Movement 1870 - 1920, Lawrence and Wishart, London, 1965 (republished 1975).

(97) Harold Silver, The Concept of Popular Education, MacGibbon and Kee, London, 1965.

(98) Kenneth Charlton, Education in Renaissance England, London, 1965.

(99) Asa Briggs, 'The Study of the History of Education', History of Education, vol 1, no 1, January 1972, p 7. The relevance of the concept of history from below in the South African context is obvious.

(100) Richard Johnson, 'Educational Policy and Social Control in early Victorian England', Past and Present, 49, 1970, pp 96-110.

(101) Brian Simon (1982), 'The History of Education in the 1980s...', p 91.

(102) Joan Simon, 'The History of Education in Past and Present' (1977), op cit, p 83.

(103) J S Hurt, Education in Evolution: Church, State, Society and Popular Education 1800 - 1870, Hart Davis, London, 1971, p 9.

(104) Harold Silver, 'Aspects of Neglect: the strange case of Victorian Popular Education', Oxford Review of Education, vol 3, no 1, 1977, p 62.

(105) Joan Simon (1977), 'The History of Education...', p 83.

(106) W B Stephens, 'Recent Trends in the History of Education in England to 1900', Education Research and Perspectives, vol 8, no 1, June 1981, p 3-15.

(107) Keith Dent, 'History of Education', in Cohen (ed), Educational Research and Development in Britain 1970 - 1980, NFER/Nelson, London, 1982, pp 19-30.

(108) Gillian Sutherland, 'The Study of the History of Education', Education, vol LIV, no 180, February 1969, pp 19-59.

(109) Ibid, p 53. She may well have had in mind P W Musgrave's Society and Education in England since 1800 (1968).

(110) In this connection see, for example, Philip McCann (ed), Popular Education and Socialisation in the Nineteenth Century (1977).

(111) Brian Simon (1983), op cit, p 10. And see his 'Why no Pedagogy in England?' in B Simon and W Taylor (eds), Issues in the Eighties (1981), pp 124-145. One valuable addition, however, was Peter Gosden's How they were Taught (1969).

(112) Brian Simon (1983), 'The Study of Education...', p 10.

(113) Brian Simon, personal inteview, Leicester, 17 May 1985.

(114) Harold Entwistle, 'The Relationship between Theory and Practice', in J W Tibble (ed) (1971), An Introduction to the Study of Education, pp 96-97.

(115) Malcolm Seaborne, 'The History of Education', in J W Tibble (ed) (1971), pp 65-79, is a useful broad survey of this topic. See also Keith Dent (1982)'History of Education', pp 19-21.

(116) Sutherland (1969), 'The Study of the History of Education', p 52.

(117) i) D Bradshaw, 'The History of Education: its place in courses for the BEd degree', History of Education Society, Bulletin 1, Spring 1968, pp 13-18.
ii) M Seaborne, ' History of Education: current syllabuses at Universities', in Ibid, pp 18-27.
iii) N Whitbread, 'History of Education in the three-year Certificate course', in Ibid, pp 4-13.

(118) History of Education Society, Bulletin 1, Spring 1968, p 3.

(119) Ibid, pp 4-5.

(120) Keith Dent, 'The Relevance of the Rear-View Mirror in Initial Training', History of Education Society, Trends in the Study and Teaching of the History of Education, Occasional Publication No 7, 1983, p 30.

(121) Webster, 'Changing Perspectives...', p 202.

(122) David Reeder, 'History, Education and the City: a review of trends in Britain', typescript, Leicester, 25 April 1985, p 8 (to be published in W E Marsden and R Goodenow, Urban Educational History in Four Nations, forthcoming).

(123) See, for example, D A Reeder (ed), Urban Education in the Nineteenth Century, History of Education Society, London, 1977.

Author Randall P R
Name of thesis The role of the History of Edcuation in Teacher Education in South Africa, with particular reference to developments in Britain and the USA 1988

PUBLISHER:
University of the Witwatersrand, Johannesburg
©2013

LEGAL NOTICES:

Copyright Notice: All materials on the University of the Witwatersrand, Johannesburg Library website are protected by South African copyright law and may not be distributed, transmitted, displayed, or otherwise published in any format, without the prior written permission of the copyright owner.

Disclaimer and Terms of Use: Provided that you maintain all copyright and other notices contained therein, you may download material (one machine readable copy and one print copy per page) for your personal and/or educational non-commercial use only.

The University of the Witwatersrand, Johannesburg, is not responsible for any errors or omissions and excludes any and all liability for any errors in or omissions from the information on the Library website.