

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/

This unhappy picture is the result of 'a vast educational complex' which has 'served to train producers and consumers, to manage labour supply, and, more importantly, to teach those values necessary to maintain the kind of community now in existence'.(187) The book from which these passages are extracted is a collection of documents, grouped together under a series of introductions by Karier. The intention is to provide illustrations of the kind of thinking that Karier regards as being responsible for America's ills. The evidence includes pieces by the popular columnist Walter Lippmann and others on mental testing, and writers on dysgenics and 'applied raceology'. Some of it is very damning, for example the production of clear evidence that J D Rockefeller was able to apply pressure on the University of Chicago in the appointment and 'controlling' of academic staff at the turn of the century.

It may be possible at this point to draw somewhat facile comparisons with the development of the study of educational history in South Africa. The 'old' history in South Africa also neglected the position of the subordinate groups in society, ignored the importance of educational agencies other than the school, and tended to view the evolution of formal education for whites as 'progress', sometimes with the implication that this occurred under divine guidance. Such 'new' history of education as has begun to emerge in South Africa, particularly in response to the crisis in black education which reached a peak in 1976 and has largely continued at acute crisis point since then, has concentrated on the education of black South Africans, has explored the role of informal and non-formal educational agencies (for example, night schools, the Wayfarers movement etc), shares a profound disillusionment with the results of formal education, and adopts what might loosely be termed a leftwing orientation, using as its analytical tools the political economy and the class struggle. But the influences on this 'new' history seem to come as much from the revisionists in general South African history like Shula Marks, Martin Legassick, Dan O'Meara and Harold Wolpe, and from recent radical British writers, as from the Americans whose work is being discussed here (it may be possible to

make an exception of Bowles and Gintis, but they are not historians).

The foregoing account of the radical revisionist movement in America was intended to highlight the main elements in that movement; in the process several important themes and writers have had to be neglected.(188) The point has already been made that the radical revisionists dominated the educational history scene in the 1970s as the 'moderate' or liberal revisionists had in the 1960s. And, like that group, they did not have it all their own way, frequently attracting criticism, often vitriolic criticism, from their colleagues and others. Cohen, in his 1976 review of the state of the art, compared them to the earlier social reconstructionists in that they, too, were committed to history of education as a form of social action.(189) Unlike the earlier reconstructionists, however, who generally retained faith in America and its potential, the radical revisionists were antagonistic towards American schools, American society, and the liberal tradition. As Cohen says:

> There are many reasons for revision in history. However, an a priori wish to condemn hardly seems legitimate, even if the partisan purpose is masked in the erudition of frame-of-reference theory or in the assertion that every generation must write its own history. Of course, someone must interpret our era to our contemporaries, but there is still a need for detachment, balance, judiciousness, and reasoned historical judgement. No two historians may tell the same story of the past, but there are 'standards of precision, credibility, and grace' which are constants. The new reconstructionists ask such loaded questions of the evidence that they can be pretty sure at the beginning what answer they will emerge with at the end. There is a finality and rationality about their work that terribly over-simplifies the ambiguity, the incompleteness, the complexity of historical events.(190)

The Neo-Conservatives

Cohen's eloquent critique was moderate in relation to the savageness of some of the attacks directed against the radical revisionists by

a group of vociferous conservative scholars. Bowers (191) lumped them together with what he contemptuously called the 'neo-romantics of the alternative school movement' in order to punish them for obfuscating the central issue which he saw as 'the technocratic ideology and its existential and ecological implications' and which, he feared, would destroy us while the radicals fiddled about. Bowers concentrated on the limitations of using class analysis as a conceptual model for understanding present problems, and the facile identification of 'capitalism' as the culprit. While conveniently overlooking grave problems in marxist countries:

> the tendency to magnify the problems of American society while remaining silent about the civil liberties and social and economic advantages enjoyed by so many American - including the leftist educational revisionists who mostly occupy safe academic positions - is such a pervasive characteristic of the revisionists' writing that one can only wonder if it is not an expression of ressentiment.(192)

Diane Ravitch has been one of the most consistent and vocal critics of the revisionists. In her most recent book, The Schools we Deserve, she deplores the lowering of academic standards in America and places some of the blame for the general malaise at the door of 'contemporary New Left histories of education' with their view that 'public schooling has been a capitalist tool of indoctrination... slyly (or brutally) imposed on unwilling masses by arrogant reformers'.(193) The truth about American schools, she believes, 'is too complicated to be explained by simplistic slogans'. In her view the proper task for the historian of education today is to 'set aside tendentious generalisations and to search for a sense of once-living people with once-vital aspirations, for the culture within which they lived, and for the processes by which they were educated', with less assertion and ideological posturing and more documentation and painstaking investigation.(194)

Ravitch clearly has some sharp and pertinent points to make about the revisionists. Her case is spoiled, however, by the sweeping nature of her condemnation, her often frankly polemical and repetitive style, and her fondness for glib assertions that a

moment's reflection shows to be totally unhelpful (like 'societies get the schools they deserve' - do black Americans 'deserve' their schools? Or black South Africans? Do the privileged classes in Britain 'deserve' schools like Eton and Harrow?). Inevitably, Ravitch has been called a variety of unpleasant names denoting a position on the extreme right wing of the political spectrum. Equally inevitably, she has become recognised as perhaps the most vocal - the shrillest, some would say - of the spokespersons for the 'back to basics' movement that has gained renewed impetus in response to the crisis in American education. In basic terms, her solution to the crisis lies largely in offering every child a good general academic education.

Towards Synthesis?

Moves towards a synthesis have been apparent in the 1980s. Kaestle, for example, spans new and old interpretations of the history of the antebellum common school (195), while Besag and Nelson provide an introduction to the study of education from divergent perspectives. Their central theme is the dialectic between synthesis and change and their method is to employ different social science models, including Marsusim.(196)

Button and Provenzo have also attempted to move the debate over the history of American education in the direction of a synthesis.(197) While a great deal of information compiled by the traditional historians was still useful, much of their interpretation was disputed; Bailyn had 'opened bright possibilities for educational historians', but had also led them into a ganzfeld, 'a world without cues and direction'; Cremin had established the need for educational institutions to be seen in their contemporary social context; Katz had initiated a fruitful new approach by employing constructs which stress the function of the school in the distribution of social rewards and power. But Button and Provenzo have reservations; firstly, Katz's focus is quite narrow - even if there were complete information on the distribution of rewards and power at a given time

and place, 'history should encompass a great deal more than that. There have been people and thoughts in history, as well as social forces'.(198) Secondly, by an unfortunate parallel, there is the ironical outcome referred to by Cohen: the new social history of the schools has the same air of inevitability as Cubberley's history did.

> Inevitable is the doom of our culture and society, largely brought on by our schools.... Thus, some new historians of education seem as certain of the evilness of schools as Cubberley was of their goodness. We are entitled to value judgments and, as historians, obliged to make them, but the history of our culture and our schools is far too complex for cosmic affirmation or denial.(199)

Button and Provenzo sum up the major developments in the study of educational history as follows:

> Bailyn changed the field of educational history by extending its boundaries. Katz and the revisionists changed educational history by introducing political and social philosophy into the field. Other changes, somewhat quieter, but perhaps even more important, have now begun in the methodology of educational history.(200)

In this latter regard they refer to the use of computers in historical research, empirical research in the field, content analysis, and the examination and analysis of photographic and other visual data. All of these, they believe, have the effect of encouraging history 'from the bottom up', i.e. grassroots history.

Against the theoretical and historical background sketched here, Button and Provenzo, in the body of their work, examine the relationship between education and American culture, dealing mainly with the history of the American public schools, but not ignoring less formal means of education, over four periods: colonial times; the first century of independence; the period of progressive reform; and the period from the Depression to the student uprisings of the late 1960s. In their conclusions, they return to their earlier theme:

> The past has not been simple, and much of it cannot be known to us. It would have been easier to demonstrate inevitable decline, just as fifty years ago it would have been simpler and more fashionable to recount inevitable triumph. But... a black-and-white representation would be too far from reality. Grays, tints, and colours, and light and shadow, come nearer to reality.(201)

As may be apparent from this passage, Button and Provenzo believe that part of the discipline of studying the past is literary. The present writer shares the belief that historical enquiry benefits at least as much from a literary imagination as from a scientific exactness.

Post-Revisionism

As has already been pointed out, radical revisionism was a phenomenon of the 1960s and 1970s and reflected the times when the Vietnam war and student unrest, for example, were important issues on American campuses. The debate thus addressed a particular period, and as the issues have changed so the debate about the nature and the role of the history of education has changed, in American as much as in British teacher education. Even the most radical of the revisionists found it impossible to be leftwing enough to satisfy all their students. They found the critique from the left 'devastating' and began to question where the end of the process would be: would normal standards of scholarship have to be abandoned? One response was a moderation of the fervour with which radicalism itself was pursued. The present climate on American campuses is very much more conservative than it was a decade and a half ago, and this is reflected in the position of educational history.(202)

In a sense, of course, revisionism went through a normal process of academic review, in which scholars presented their work for the reaction and criticism of their peers, particularly in the pages

of scholarly journals, as well as in seminal books and monographs. Over a period of approximately fifteen years, this important new initiative ran its course in this manner. The revisionist position, in its varied manifestations, was advanced, criticised and fought out, with major new insights being added to the discipline of educational history and former positions abandoned. As an issue in itself, revisionism now seems to have been laid to rest and the journals no longer reflect it as a major topic. Several of the most prominent figures in the debate have moved on, among them Katz, for example, who is now involved in urban studies.

Best's most recent work provides an excellent survey of recent developments in research into the history of American education.(203) The topics dealt with provide one with a clear indication of the agenda of the American educational historian in the 1980s and illustrate the way in which current work in the field has now moved beyond the revisionist debate. They include institutional history, biographic study, quantitative history, oral history, history of curriculum, policy study, comparative and cross-cultural study, regional study, ethnic and minority study, women's history and the history of childhood and family life. This is reminiscent of the current agenda in the UK, described in the previous chapter. One is reminded here of the 'somewhat quieter' changes in the methodology of educational history referred to by Button and Provenzo. There have also been important changes in the themes. For example, educational and social historians have begun to abandon social control in interpreting the past. As Reese says, 'By emphasising the role of individuals as active forces in shaping the past, historians continue to chip away at social control theories of American history and develop more complex interpretations'.(204)

Finally, in any survey of the recent historiography of American education, mention has to be made of Sol Cohen's monumental task in compiling the most extensive documentary collection on the subject, covering nearly five centuries in five volumes.(205)

History of Education and Teacher Education: the 1970s and 1980s

The literature on the history of American education flourished so profusely and the debate raged so vigorously from the 1960s that it has required a somewhat lengthy exposition in order to review them even briefly. Having established the background, however, it is now possible to view the position of the history of education in American teacher education during the 1970s and 1980s, the previous discussion having taken us to the 1960s and the failure of the protagonists of the various schools of thought (the supporters of the social foundations of education; the advocates of separate disciplines; the 'academicians' and the 'professionals') to reach consensus, a situation that Cohen described as the nadir of the history of education in the USA.

The work of the early revisionists like Bailyn and of the Committee on the Role of Education in American History had a great influence on educational historians involved in teacher education. Opportunities for research and study opened up and several important conferences were mounted, as already mentioned.(206) In 1968 history of education was brought into the fold of academic respectability through the establishment of Division F: History and Historiography within the American Educational Research Association.

As Cohen remarks:

> for educational historians in schools of education, the early 1960s was the beginning of a new era.... When the history of education began to attract the departmental historians, we had an opportunity to reconnect with the rigorous canons of historical scholarship. The alliance with history meant emancipation from the clutches of foundations courses. We were finally able to renounce the requirement that our work be immediately relevant and provide clear direction for dealing with current problems, dilemmas, and crises of contemporary education.(207)

Writing in the mid-1970s, Cohen was able to claim that the vision of a new history of education advanced by Bailyn, Cremin and

Wilson Smith - of a discipline based on humanistic values, broadly conceived, and with close connections with social and intellectual history - had come true, accompanied by 'an unprecedented enrichment of educational historiography' and presenting prospects for the history of education that seemed brighter than ever.(208) It will be recalled that a similar period of vigorous expansion in the history of education occurred in Britain at roughly the same time. Some of the underlying reasons appear to be comparable: it was, in both countries, a time of social tension and growing concern about the role of education in either perpetuating social inequality or eradicating it; it was also a time of relative economic prosperity and of a concomitant expansion in formal education, in both cases stimulated at least partly by unexpected Russian technological and scientific successes; it was also a time when significant developments in general history inevitably affected the history of education.

As in the case of Britain, too, the revival in the history of education in American teacher education was rather short-lived. Tension between 'professionals' and 'academicians' was not removed, even within departments and schools of education.(209) As Cohen says, the question of the educational historian's 'function' in the schools of education, 'liberal' or 'professional', seemingly settled in one decade, erupts in another.(210)

The present writer's investigations in the USA during the summer of 1985 suggest that history of education in American teacher education courses now occupies roughly the same place it does in Britain. Pre-service or initial courses have been almost entirely oriented towards teaching expertise, with 'peripheral' subjects having been squeezed out. Many education graduates complete their courses without any specific exposure to the history of American education; at best they might have undertaken an introductory course with a smattering of the old disciplines. One factor in this situation is the high cost of tuition which pushes students towards 'practical' courses rather than the 'luxury' of 'theoretical' courses. While

history of education still enjoys support - varying from university to university - at the advanced study level, even here the major emphasis is on such 'technically' oriented courses as learning disability, math education and curriculum. In some institutions general courses in 'policy studies' or 'comparative and international studies' provide an opportunity for broad issues to be examined historically.

While the general view is that the foundation disciplines are in retreat, particularly in the cases of history and philosophy, much as they are in Britain, there is a dissenting view which holds that the disciplines are in a healthy state and strongly re-emergent in American teacher education at post-graduate level.(211) This view holds that history, sociology and philosophy have simply taken the 'new' disciplines and general courses on board, which may not be very far from the view that the practitioners of the old disciplines have taken strategic refuge under other labels. A proper assessment of the present position would be possible only with the aid of a full and accurate survey of teacher education courses across the USA, which is clearly beyond the scope of the present study. The picture sketched above is therefore impressionistic and based on visits to a limited range of institutions, interviews with a small number of individuals involved in the field, and such information as is available in the most recent literature.

The mid-1980s are, in general, a critical period in American education, signified by a federal commission whose report, Nation at Risk (1983), expressed alarm at declining standards and downward trends in student achievements. Low opinions of teacher competence and of teacher education in general were reflected in a special section of the Teachers College Record of Spring 1983 (see also the discussion on this point earlier in this chapter), and in the literature more widely.(212)

While the public mood favours a demand for better trained teachers, there are inevitably conflicting views on how this might be

achieved.(213) The University of Minnesota, for example, has introduced an additional year of preparation, making five in all, for all teaching graduates. The fifth year builds on an academic discipline as well as providing intensive work in method and a spell of supervised teaching. The problem is that it is expensive for students and for society. The American Association of Colleges for Teacher Education (with 720 member institutions, including large universities and small liberal arts colleges) has so far strongly resisted the idea of a fifth year, largely for fear of declining enrolments.

One of the anxieties experienced by some teacher educators is that state involvement may have a levelling down effect as a result of relatively low state requirements becoming the norm. Some states operate a system of 'program approval' in terms of which teacher education courses are reviewed and approved every five years (cf the discussion in chapter 2 on the operation of the NCATE in Britain).

It is clear that the days of free-booting endeavours in teacher education, if ever they really existed, are over and that training institutions are faced with new demands of accountability and relevance. In this situation, the history of education, like the other components of the traditional teacher education curriculum, faces challenges to its existence. Some historians have thrown in the towel, others are seeking new ways for their discipline to survive. It is unlikely that history will again come to occupy the pre-eminent place it once did in American teacher education programmes, and it is unlikely that historians of education will again come to exercise the power and the influence once wielded by men like Cubberley and Monroe.

A Brief Case Study: the changing Teachers College curriculum

Teachers College (of Columbia University, New York City), or TC as it is commonly called, has been a pre-eminent teacher education institution, and many of the developments and many of the leading

historians of education featured in this chapter have been associated with it. It was, for example, the pioneering institution in its introduction of the Social Foundations of Education in the 1930s. For these reasons an examination of the changing TC curriculum illustrates many of the major themes of this chapter.(214)

In 1912-1913, a course in the History and Principles of Education was compulsory for all undergraduate students, together with courses in general and educational psychology, in keeping with the contemporary dominance of history and psychology as the main 'theoretical' disciplines in teacher education. 'History and Principles of Education' involved 'the study of the educational ideas and practices of historic periods during which conceptions of education based on fundamental principles have been formulated'. There was a clear intention to present the course as having practical relevance: 'The aim of the course is to present the essential features of the educational thought of the past as a basis for the more detailed historic, philosophic, and methodic study of the principles of education as formulated in the present'. History of education was well-represented in other courses on offer: the Educational Theories of Herbart and Froebel, and the Social and Philosophical Foundations of Greek and Roman Education each occupied two and a half courses, while Professor Paul Monroe gave two full courses on each of History of Education in the USA and History of Education in England.

By 1936-1937 the Foundations of Education had been introduced, with courses in the 'General Fields of Education dealing with the Nature of the Individual and Objectives of Education in Modern Society'. There had been a proliferation of optional courses; history, for example, included:

i) Historical Development and Current Problems in Education;
ii) Historical Foundations of Modern Education;
iii) Historical Development of Modern Education;

iv) History of Education in its relationship with sociological backgrounds (including the rise and evolution of nationalism, social changes following industrial revolutions and their effects on the development of universal education);
v) History of Education in its relationship with intellectual and ethical backgrounds (a general survey and interpretation of the more significant intellectual influences on modern education);
vi) History of Education in the United States before 1860;
vii) History of Education in the United States after 1860;
viii) Education of Women - including Russia, Germany and the USA;
ix) Historical Research in American Education.

Two of the main teachers of these courses were Professors Butts and Reisner.

The second and third of the courses above represented the main chronological surveys. The second covered the centuries from the classical Greeks t the European Renaissance, and specific consideration was given to Plato, Aristotle, Cicero, Abelard, Erasmus and Calvin. Atte. tion was also given to several fundamental problems 'which appear to have repeated themselves in different form and context in each critical era of human history'. These included the rise and decline of educational institutions; the educational changes demanded by a changing social order; the construction and reconstruction of the school curriculum; and the role of education as an instrument of social control. (One may be struck by the relative modernity of the content here, including the reference to social control). The third course looked at education during the previous three centuries, and considered the development of modern science and scientific education; the emergence of modern democracy and individualism; the origin and development of psychological theories; and the development of new ethical and religious requirements in education. Special attention was given to Rousseau, Pestalozzi, Herbart, Froebel, Thorndike and Dewey.

By 1951, the foundations of education were being offered in two departments, Social and Philosophical Foundations, and Psychological Foundations, and all work was on a graduate level. Courses in Historical and Comparative Foundations in the first of these

departments were presented in these terms: 'The history of education and its comparative study are used to gain fruitful insights and to suggest sound historical interpretations upon which to base present decisions in educational policy'. Five courses were on offer here:

i) Historical development of Modern Education (Cremin was the teacher), which considered the development of Western education from ancienct Greece: 'The role of education in differing societies will be discussed with constant reference to present day problems' (still the usual anxiety to justify history of education on the grounds of its relevance for contemporary problems).
ii) History of Education in American Culture (Butts), which examined the social and intellectual forces that shaped educational theory and practice from colonial to present times.
iii) Church and State in American Education (Butts).
iv) History of Education in Western Culture (Cremin): modern education in Europe and America, with special attention to liberalism, industrialism, nationalism, totalitarianism and democracy.
v) The Historical Approach to Current Issues in Education (Butts and Cremin): an 'historical treatment of some of the most important problems that face the makers of educational and public policy in America' - including the church-state controversy, the struggle for federal aid, academic freedom and professional organisation, the equalisation of educational opportunity, and the relation of social classes and social forces to educational policy.

In 1971-1972, what was now the Division of Philosophy, the Social Sciences and Education, of which Cremin had become director, offered an even wider range of courses in the history of education, the choice of topics revealing quite dramatically the changes that had been introduced to the agenda. The teachers of these courses included Butts, McClintock, Sloan and Hu (Cremin was away on leave that year, but would normally have undertaken an active teaching role). The courses on offer, under the label of history, were:

i) Education in Western History (the educational repercussions of changes in the modes of communication).
ii) Religion, Class and Politics in European Education.
iii) History of Education in the United States.
iv) Education of the West (Butts, naturally).
v) Education and the Problem of Nationalism (in the non-Western World and with emphasis on the nineteenth and twentieth centuries (Hu).

vi) Chinese Education under Communism (Hu).
vii) Religion, Culture and Education in Nineteenth Century America.
viii) Class, Culture and Education in Modern England.
ix) The History of American Social Thought (including nationalism, Social Darwinism, progressivism, collectivism, neo-romanticism, the new physics, social science and cultural pluralism).
x) History and Theory of Higher Education.
xi) Comparative History of Higher Education.
xii) Asian Education and Cultural Change (Hu).
xiii) African Education and Cultural Change (tradition and change in contemporary Africa, especially Sub-Saharan Africa).
xiv) Studies in African Education (selected problems in African education of particular relevance for students from Africa or with previous experience in Africa).

In addition to the course work, there were seminars on the history of education in the West, in America and in Asia; on Afro-American history; and on education and the modernisation process in developing nations. Several comments may be made on this quite bewildering list. As already suggested, it reflects the widening agenda of the history of education and the emphasis on change in society and education, which is part of the revisionist approach to education as process rather than institution. The widening geographical scope was clearly because there were experts available (Hu for Asia, and Sheffield for Africa) and also because TC was attracting larger numbers of students from the Third World, but it was also part of the general widening and deepening focus. Finally, the regular attention to connections between education and cultural change is a marked feature of the courses listed for 1971-1972.

By 1985-1986 Cremin ' become President of TC, but he still taught in the Division of Philosophy, the Social Sciences and Education. The history courses were now organised into three groups, Introductory, Intermediate, and Advanced.
Introductory;

i) History of Education in the United States (Cremin and Lagemann).
ii) Religion and Education in American Culture (Sloan).
iii) History of American Social Thought (similar to the

1971 course).
iv) History of Urban Education in the USA: the development of formal public education, especially in New York City (Ravitch).
v) Educational Thought in the West, from Socrates to Freud, via, inter alia,Dante, Erasmus, Luther, Locke, Rousseau, Marx, Nietzche and Weber (McClintock).
vi) Class, Culture and Education in Modern England (cf the 1971 course)
vii) History of Education in Modern Europe: the origins and development of modern universities and secondary schools and class structure in the nineteenth century; and the quest for equality in the twentieth).
viii) History of Educational thought in America.

Intermediate:

i) History and Theory of Higher Education (Sloan).
ii) Education in Western Literature (McClintock).
iii) Education and Politics in European Thought (the educational ideas of political theorists)(McClintock).
iv) Knowledge and Human Values: an historical and philosophical perspective on conceptions of knowing, modes of consciousness, and educational aims in nineteenth and twentieth century American thought) (Sloan).
v) Historical Interpretation in American Education.
vi) Historical Method.
vii) Theories of History.

Advanced:

i) Colloquium in history and education: a discussion of research and teaching topics, the presentation of dissertation proposals and drafts, and exploration of employment prospects of specialists in history and education.
ii) Seminar in the History of American Higher Education (Sloan).
iii) Seminar in the History of Western Education (McClintock).
iv) Seminar in the History of Asian Education.
v) Seminar in the History of American Education (Cremin).

Perhaps the most striking change here is the almost total concentration on Western education, particularly American education. Also worthy of note are the pruning of several themes popular in the seventies and the introduction of urban education (cf the discussion of this in chapter 2).

As a graduate school, TC admits candidates who already have a

Bachelors degree (usually from a liberal arts college) to the MA, MS, EdM, EdD and PhD degrees. The specifically teacher education programmes (programmes for the psychological and health service professions are also offered) are generally field-based, sometimes offering up to two semesters of observation, internship and student teaching. Applicants need not have included courses in education in their undergraduate programmes but are expected to be adequately prepared in their teaching fields. The actual curriculum to be followed by a student pursuing, say, the elementary or the secondary teacher's course, is very flexible and fluid and is chosen from a range of elective courses very much broader than is the case in comparable programmes in Britain or South Africa. The State of New York requires of masters' high school programmes that the student takes a major teaching subject (at least 26 undergraduate credits, which would normally be obtained during the liberal arts programme), and work in curriculum design, classroom management, adolescent development (developmental psychology), the foundations (again, the liberal arts programme may have satisfied the requirements here), and in subjects related to the major subject. Particularly in the elementary teachers programme the assumption is that the real need is to develop skill and competencies rather than undertake advanced study. Clearly, in the professional programmes the general bias is towards functionalism and many students will gain no exposure to the history of American education as such. In research degree work and post-doctoral study, however, Teachers College offers rich opportunities in the history of education.

Notes

(1) Lawrence Cremin, Foreword to Merle L Borrowman, Teacher Education in America: a documentary history, Teachers College Press, Columbia University, New York, 1965, p vii.

(2) Quoted in Borrowman, Teacher Education, p 31.

(3) Beryl Lois Schwartz, 'Analyzing Curriculum with Notions from Habermas' Theory: an analysis of an historical instructional program for training teachers', unpublished EdD thesis., Teachers College, Columbia University, New York, 1983.

(4) Newton Edwards and Herman G Richey, The School in the American Social Order, Houghton Mifflin, Boston, 1963 (first published 1947), Chapter 16, 'Changing Patterns in Teacher Education', pp 576-619, provides a useful overview of American teacher education from the normal schools of the mid-nineteenth century.

(5) Ibid, p 579.

(6) Ibid.

(7) Ibid, p 591.

(8) Cf Ibid, p 596.

(9) Borrowman, Teacher Education, p 15.

(10) Ibid, pp 1-2.

(11) See Chapter 2, n 168.

(12) Borrowman, Teacher Education, p 3.

(13) Ibid, p 25.

(14) Borrowman dealt with this theme in The Liberal and Technical in Teacher Education, Teachers College Press, New York, 1956.

(15) Sol Cohen, 'The History of the History of American Education, 1900 - 1976: the uses of the past', Harvard Educational Review, Vol 46, No 3, Aug 1976, p 305.

(16) Ibid.

(17) Edwards and Richey, The School in the American Social Order, p 598.

(18) Henry Johnson, The Other Side of Main Street, Columbia University Press, New York, 1943, p 203.

(19) Edwards and Richey, The School in the American Social Order, p 598.

(20) Ibid, p 200.

(21) US Department of Health, Education and Welfare, Educational Directory of the Office of Education 1959 - 1960, Part III, 'Higher Education', Government Printing Office, Washington DC, 1959, lists these institutiions.

(22) Edwards and Richey, The School..., p 600.

(23) Ibid, p 606.

(24) Cohen, 'The History of the History of Education...', Harvard Educational Review, p 305.

(25) J B Sears and A D Henderson, Cubberley of Stanford, Stanford University Press, Palo Alto, 1957, p 63.

(26) James Earl Russell, 'A Summary of some of the Difficulties connected with the making of a Teachers College', in Borrowman, Teacher Education, pp 208 - 217.

(27) A more recent reference would be Donna Kerr, 'Teaching Competence and Teacher Education in the United States', Teachers College Record, Vol 84, No 3, Spring 1983, p 533. Kerr writes that 'almost anyone who has been part of a university could attest both to the low regard in which schools and colleges of education are held and to the great effect this negative attitude has on teacher education'. Milton Schwebel, 'The Clash of Cultures in Academe: the University and the Education Faculty', Journal of Teacher Education, Vol 36, No 4, 1985, pp 2 - 8, attempts to explain the low status of education faculties in historical terms. He draws attention to their relative recency, and to the different functions which they perform as compared, say, to the liberal arts or the pure sciences.

(28) Russell, 'A Summary of some of the Difficulties...', in Borrowman, Teacher Education, p 208.

(29) Borrowman, Teacher Education, p 209.

(30) Kerr, 'Teaching Competence...', in Teachers College Record, p 533.

(31) Edwards and Richey, The School..., p 606ff.

(32) Cohen, 'The History of the History...', p 303

(33) I am indebted to the late Professor Maurice Boucher for pointing out that the groundwork for the founding of the AHA and for the dominance of "scientific history" had been laid in the universities by such men as C K Adams at Michigan in 1868, Herbert B Adams at Johns Hopkins in 1878, J W Burgess at Columbia and Henry Adams at Harvard. See Hale Bellot, American History and American Historians: a review of recent contributions to the Interpretation of the history of the United States, London University, Athlone Press, 1952.

(34) Harold Silver, Education as History, Methuen, London and New York, 1983, p 177.

(35) I am indebted for many of the points made in this paragraph to Professor Douglas Sloan, who permitted me to attend his seminars on the History of Higher Education in the USA at Teachers College, Columbia University, New York City, during June 1985.

(36) This concern has frequently surfaced in the educational press in the 1980s. See, for example, the Times Higher Educational Supplement of 14 June 1985, which carried at least three items on the topic. On p 6 there was a report under the heading 'Why we still need the lessons of the past' of the Historical Association's protest at the British government's treatment of the humanities and its favouring of science, engineering and technology. On p 11 a report, 'More Dollars than Scholars', described efforts by American universities to attract experts in high technology onto their faculties, often at the expense of the humanities. An editorial on p 40 dealt with the switching of resources in British and European universities into science and technology. 'The picture of a university in which less than a quarter of income goes on social science in spite of the fact that it accounts for 70 per cent of the students, is an alarming one'.

(37) W F Connell, A History of Education in the Twentieth Century World, Teachers College Press, New York, 1980.

(38) Borrowman, Teacher Education, p 31.

(39) John Dewey, 'The Modern Trend towards Vocational Education in its Effect upon the Professional and non-Professional Studies of the University', in Association of American Universities, Journal of Proceedings and Addresses, 1917, p 29.

(40) Ibid.

(41) A clear statement of this approach can be found in Donald P Cottrell (ed), Teacher Education for a Free People, American Association of Colleges for Teacher Education, Oneonta, New York, 1956.

(42) Borrowman, Teacher Education, pp 40 - 41.

(43) Ibid.

(44) Ibid.

(45) Ibid, p 52.

(46) See Chapter 2, n 128.

(47) John Dewey, 'The Relation of Theory to Practice in Education', 1904, reprinted in Borrowman, Teacher Education, p 162 - 172.

(48) Ibid, p 171.

(49) Ibid, p 169.

(50) Cohen, 'The History of the History...', p 304.

(51) For example, Gabriel Compayre's The History of Pedagogy (translated by W H Payne), D C Heath, Boston, 1886; and R H Quick's Essays on Educational Reformers (see also Chapter 2, n 45.

(52) Richard G Boone, Education in the United States, Appleton, New York, 1889, and Edwin Grant Dexter, A History of Education in the United States, Macmillan, New York, 1904.

(53) Dexter, A History of Education in the United States, p vii.

(54) Bernard Bailyn, Education in the Forming of American Society, University of North Carolina Press, Chapel Hill, 1960, p 5.

(55) Thomas Davidson, A History of Eduction, Scribners, New York, 1900.

(56) Bailyn, Education in the Forming of American Society, pp 6 - 7.

(57) Quoted in ibid, p 8.

(58) Ibid, p 8.

(59) Ellwood P Cubberley, Public Education in the United States: a study and interpretation of American educational history. An introductory textbook dealing with the larger problems of present-day education in the light of their historical development, Houghton Mifflin, Boston, New York and Chicago, 1919.

(60) Ibid, author's preface, p vii.

(61) Ibid, p viii.

(62) Ibid, p 496.

(63) Ibid, p 502.

(64) Ibid, p 504.

(65) Bailyn, Education in the Forming of American Society, 1960.

(66) Lawrence A Cremin, The Wonderful World of Ellwood Patterson Cubberley: an essay on the historiography of American education, Teachers College Press, New York, 1965.

(67) Michael B Katz, 'Education and Social Development in the Nineteenth Century: New Directions for Enquiry', in Paul Nash (ed), History and Education: the Educational Uses of the Past, Random House, New York, 1970, pp 83 - 114.

(68) Ibid, p 86.

(69) Cohen, 'The History of the History...', p 307.

(70) Ibid, p 306.

(71) Lawrence A Cremin, David A Shannon and Elizabeth Townsend, A History of Teachers College, Columbia University Press, New York, 1965, p 43.

(72) Lawrence A Cremin, American Education: the Colonial Experience, Harper and Row, New York, 1970, p ix.

(73) Bailyn, Education in the Forming of American Society, p 9.

(74) Ibid.

(75) Ibid, p 10.

(76) Paul Monroe, A Brief Course in the History of Education, Macmillan, New York, 1907. This was a condensation of his longer work, A Textbook in the History of Education, Macmillan, New York, 1905.

(77) Ibid, pp viii - ix.

(78) See chapter 2, n 62.

(79) Frank Pierrepont Graves, A Student's History of Eduction, Macmillan, New York, revised edition 1936 (originally published 1915), p 9. Graves, incidentally, adopted the common chronological approach, running through 'primitive', Jewish, classical, Christian, medieval and European history before turning to the USA in the last quarter of his book.

(80) Samuel Chester Parker, A Textbook in the History of Modern Elementary Education, Ginn, Boston, 1912.

(81) Francesco Cordasco, A Brief History of Education, Adams and Co, Totowa, NJ, 1963 (revised edition 1976).

(82) Cf Cohen, 'The History of the History...', p 307.

(83) Cubberley, Public Education, p v.

(84) Ellwood P Cubberley, Readings in Public Education in the United States, Houghton Mifflin, Boston, New York and Chicago, 1934.

(85) Ibid, p 527.

(86) Ibid, p 534.

(87) E G Malberbe, Education in South Africa, 1652 - 1922, Juta, Cape Town, 1925.

(88) William H Burnham and Henry Suzzallo, The History of Education as a Professional Subject, Columbia University Press, New York, 1908, p 53.

(89) Cohen, 'The History of the History...', p 306.

(90) Cf Ibid, p 306.

(91) For example, Edgar Knight, Education in the United States, Ginn, Boston, 1929; and Stuart Noble, History of American Education, Farrar and Rinehart, New York, 1938. Incidentally, both of these authors were former students of Monroe at Teachers College.

(92) Otis W Caldwell and Stuart A Courtis, Then and Now in Eduction, 1845 - 1923: a message of encouragement from the past to the present, World Book Co, New York, 1924. Caldwell was a professor of eduction at Teachers College and Curtis was dean of the Detroit Techers College.

(93) Ibid, preface, p vi.

(94) Ibid, p v.

(95) Ibid, p 118.

(96) Frederick Eby and Charles Flinn Arrowood, The Development of Modern Education in Theory, Organisation and Practice, Prentice Hall, New York, 1934. Eby and Arrowood were professors of education (teaching history and philosophy) at Texas University.

(97) Ibid, preface, p ix.

(98) Ibid, p x.

(99) Frederick Eby, The Development of Modern Education in Theory, Organisation and Practice, Prentice Hall, Englewood Cliffs, NJ (second edition), 1952.

(100) Ibid, preface, p vii.

(101) Frederick Eby and Charles F Arrowood, The History and Philosophy of Education Ancient and Medieval, Prentice Hall, Englewood Cliffs, NJ, 1940. (This book went through eleven impressions by 1960).

(102) Ibid, preface, p ix.

(103) Ibid, p x.

(104) Cf Cohen, 'The History of the History...', pp 308 - 310.

(105) For an exposition of the social reconstructionist position see, for example, William H Kilpatrick, Education and the Social Crisis, Liveright, New York, 1932.

(106) For example, Charles Beard, Carl Becker, James H Robinson and Frederick J Turner. See Richard Hofstadter, The Progressive Historians, Knopf, New York, 1968. Hofstadter examines the work of Beard, Turner and Vernon Parrington.

(107) The most notable of the Commission's publications in this regard were A Charter for the Social Sciences in the Schools, and its final Conclusions and Recommendations. (See Cohen, 'The History of the History...', p 310).

(108) Cf Cohen, 'The History of the History...', p 311.

(109) Ibid.

(110) See, for example, Harold Rugg, The Teacher of Teachers, Harper, New York, 1952, pp 208ff and pp 224ff. Also Cremin, Shannon and Townsend, A History of Teachers College, pp 139ff, and Borrowman, Teacher Education, pp 218 - 220.

(111) R Freeman Butts, The College Charts its Course, McGraw-Hill, New York, 1939, preface. p i.

(112) Ibid, p 246.

(113) Rugg, The Teacher of Teachers, p 237.

(114) Cohen, 'The History of the History...', p 312.

(115) Archibald W Anderson et al, The Theoretical Foundations of Education: Historical, Comparative, Philosophical and Social, Bureau of Research and Service, University of Illinois, Urbana, Ill., 1951, pp 17, 80.

(116) Cf Cohen, 'The History of the History...', pp 313 - 314.

(117) R Freeman Butts, 'Editorial Commentary', History of Education Journal No 1, 1949, pp 1 - 4.

(118) See chapter 2, n 112.

(119) Lawrence A Cremin, 'The Recent Development of the History of Education as a Field of Study in the United States', originally published in the History of Education Journal, Autumn 1955, subsequently issued as a monograph, The Role of the History of Education in the Professional Preparation of Teachers, NSCTCE, 1957.

(120) Archibald W Anderson, 'Bases of Proposals concerning the History of Education', in Cremin, The Role of the History of Education.

(121) David Tyack, Foreword to Harold Silver, Education as History, pp xii - xiii. It is an interesting question whether the lack of any radical re-interpretation of South African educational history before the 1970s may

not have had at least in part similar causes. The reactionary political climate and the existence of such laws as the Suppression of Communism Act, in which 'communism' was very widely and loosely defined, must presumably have had an inhibiting effect on historians as well as on other scholars. There were, of course, other reasons as well, which are touched on in chapters 5 and 6.

(122) Anderson, 'Bases of Proposals', in The Role of the History of Education, p 56.

(123) Ibid.

(124) Cohen, 'The History of the History...', p 321.

(125) Ibid, p 322. Isaac Kandel, of Teachers College, dealt with the report from an 'academician's' viewpoint: 'A Controversy Ended', Educational Forum No 22, 1958, pp 175 - 181.

(126) See references 43 and 44 above.

(127) Adolphe E Meyer, An Educational History of the American People, McGraw-Hill, New York, 1957, p ix.

(128) Ibid, p x.

(129) Ibid.

(130) Ibid, p xi.

(131) Wilson Smith, 'The New Historian of American Education', Harvard Educational Review, vol 31, no 2, Spring 1961, pp 136 - 143. This issue of the Harvard Review was devoted to Education and American History, indicating the renewal of interest in the history of American education as a subject for research and teaching.

(132) Ibid, p 136.

(133) Ibid, pp 141 - 142.

(134) Oscar Handlin, Introduction to Harvard Educational Review, Vol 31, No 2, 1961, p 121.

(135) Richard Storr, 'The Education of History: Some Impressions', in Harvard Educational Review, Vol 31, No 2, 1961, p 124.

(136) Handlin, Introduction, Harvard Review, p 121.

(137) Bernard Bailyn, Education in the Forming of American Society, p 5.

(138) Ibid, p 54.

(139) Ibid, p 13.

(140) Ibid, p 15.

(141) Ibid, p 21.

(142) Ibid, p 49. (Bailyn's comments here are, of course, suggestive for any examination of the colonial period in the history of South African education).

(143) Ibid, pp 78ff.

(144) Lawrence A Cremin, American Education: the Colonial Experience, p 11.

(145) Harold Silver, 'Aspects of Neglect: the strange case of Victorian popular eduction', in Oxford Review of Education, Vol 3, No 1, 1977, p 61.

(146) Michael B Katz, 'Education and Social Development in the 19th Century: new directions for enquiry', in Paul Nash (ed), History and Education, p 87.

(147) Ibid, p 106.

(148) Cremin, American Education: the Colonial Experience, p 577. In another place Cremin calls Bailyn's thesis 'beautiful' (American Education: some notes towards a new history, Phi Delta Kappa Monograph, Bloomington, Indiana, 1972, p 3).

(149) Ibid, p 578.

(150) Ibid, pp 16 - 17.

(151) Fund for the Advancement of Education, Committee on the Role of Education in American History, Education and American History, New York, 1965. The members of the Committee included Arthur Schlesinger, Paul Buck, Merle Curti, Richard Hofstadter, Richard Storr, and, of course, Bernard Bailyn.

(152) Adolphe E Meyer, An Educational History of the Western World, McGraw-Hill, New York, 1965, p v.

(153) For example, Hermann Weimer, Concise History of Education from Solon to Pestalozzi (trans. from the

German by I Langnas), Philosophy Library Inc., New York, 1962; and Robert R Rusk, The Doctrines of the Great Educators, first published by Macmillan in 1918. At Rusk's death in 1972 (at the age of 93) the book had gone through four editions and 17 impressions; it has been reprinted several times since then. A new edition appeared in 1979, with James Scotland adding a new preface, some new material and a defence of the 'great educators' approach: Rusk and Scotland, Doctrines of the Great Educators, St Martins Press, New York, 1979. The longevity of Rusk's work is, of course, a tribute to his great erudition and scholarship.

(154) For example, S Alexander Rippa (ed), Educational Ideas in America: a documentary history, David McKay, New York, 1969. This is described by Rippa as a source book to bring educational history to life by illustrating the richness and diversity of America's heritage through the works of eductors, historians, political theorists, theologians and essayists.

(155) Francesco Cordasco, A Brief History of Education, 1963.

(156) Ibid, p xxiv.

(157) Robert Holmes Beck, A Social History of Education, Prentice-Hall, Englewood Cliffs, NJ, 1965, p 3.

(158) R Freeman Butts, The Education of the West, McGraw-Hill, New York, 1973, preface.

(159) William W Brickman, 'Revisionism and the Study of the History of Education', History of Education Quarterly, Vol iv, No 4, December 1964, pp 209 - 223.

(160) Timothy L Smith, letter, HEQ, Vol 5, No 2, June 1975, pp 78 - 79.

(161) Robert Mason, review of Cremin's The Wonderful World..., HEQ, Vol 5, No 3, Sept. 1965, pp 187ff.

(162) Cohen, 'The history of the History...', pp 301 - 302.

(163) His Transformation of the School, Knopf, New York, 1961, was generally regarded as a successful effort to reach all three audiences.

(164) 'Editorial Commentary', HEQ, Vol 1, No 1, 1961, pp 1 - 2.

(165) James B Conant, The Education of American Teachers, McGraw-Hill, New York, 1963.

(166) Cohen, 'The History of the History'..., p 324.

(167) Ibid, pp 325 - 326. For example, a 'professional' like Professor Patrick J Ryan of San José State College was warning in 1966 that the history of education was in low esteem, that irrelevant textbooks were being used (after all, 'some utilitarian expectations of the students are justified') and that the pressure to cut back on courses might result in history of education being discontinued if history continued to be taught for its own sake (letter, HEQ, Vol 6, No 3, Fall 1966, p 118). This letter inevitably drew rejoinders from more 'academically' inclined historians - see, for example, the letter from three of the faculty of the University of Western Ontario, HEQ, Vol 6, No 4, Winter 1966, pp 103 - 104.

(168) R Freeman Butts, 'Public Education and the Political Community', HEQ, Vol 14, No 2, Summer 1974, pp 165 - 184.

(169) R Freeman Butts, 'Civilization-Building and the Modernization Process: a Framework for the Reinterpretation of the History of Education', HEQ, Vol 7, No 2, Summer 1967.

(170) Ibid, p 147.

(171) I am indebted to Professor John Hardin Best for this point, made during a discussion at Penn State University, 17 July 1985.

(172) Michael B Katz, Education in American History: Readings in the Social Issues, Praeger, New York, 1973, p 348.

(173) Michael B Katz, 'Education and Social Development in the 19th Century', in Paul Nash (ed), History and Education, pp 83 - 114.

(174) See the work by Caldwell and Courtis, n 92 above.

(175) Katz, 'Education and Social Development', pp 108 - 109.

(176) Diane Ravitch, The Schools we Deserve: Reflections on the Educational Crises of our Times, Basic Books, New York, 1985, p 206.

(177) Katz, 'Education and Social Development', p 110.

(178) Ibid, pp 112 - 113.

(179) John D Pulliam, for example, published his History of Education in America, Charles E Merrill, Columbus, Ohio, a chronologically organised pot-boiler text, in 1976. The level of the book can perhaps be judged from Pulliam's own remark that it is 'about what most American universities expect graduate students in education to know about the field' (p 3). See also S Alexander Rippa, Education in a Free Society (1980), R Freeman Butts, Public Education in the United States (1978), and Harry S Good and James D Teller, A History of American Education (1973), the latter an update of Good's original book published in the 1940s.

(180) David B Tyack, 'New Perspectives in the History of American Education', in Herbert J Bass (ed), The State of American History, Quadrangle, Chicago, 1970.

(181) Paul C Violes, The Training of the Urban Working Class: a history of twentieth century American education, Rand McNally, Chicago, 1978, pp ix - xii.

(182) Ibid.

(183) Ibid, p 230.

(184) S Bowles and H Gintis, Schooling in Capitalist America, Routledge and Kegan Paul, London, 1976.

(185) Violas, The Training of the Urban Working Class, p 235.

(186) Clarence Karier, Shaping the American Educational State 1900 to the Present, The Free Press (Macmillan), New York, 1975, p xvii.

(187) Ibid, p xix.

(188) For example, James J Shields Jr and Colin Greer (eds), Foundations of Education: Dissenting Views, John Wiley and Sons, New York, 1974. To mention only one contributor to this volume, Joel H Spring (pp 36 - 44) deals with 'Anarchism and Education: the dissenting tradition'. See also John Barnard and David Burner (eds), The American Experience in Education, Franklin Watts Inc, New York, 1975, an anthology of some 'of the more recent and provocative writings on the history of eduction' which move beyond the educational experiences 'of white, middle class boys and youths... to the eduction of American Indians, blacks and women' (p xiii). Also, several important works by Katz, Tyack and others have not been mentioned, for example Katz's The Irony of Early School Reform, Harvard University Press,

Cambridge, Mass., 1969; Tyack's The One Best System: a history of American urban eduction, Harvard UP, Cambridge, Mass., 1974; and Colin Greer's The Great School Legend: a Revisionist Interpretation of American public education, Viking Press, New York, 1972.

(189) Cohen, 'The History of the History...', p 327.

(190) Ibid, p 328. In n 98, Cohen makes the point that there was already, in the mid-1970s, a large literature critical of the 'new reconstructionists', as he prefers to call them, and he lists many of the relevant titles.

(191) C A Bowers, 'Educational Critics and Technocratic Consciousness: Looking into the Future through a Rearview Mirror', Teachers College Record, Vol 80, No 2, Dec. 1978, pp 272 - 286.

(192) Ibid, p 279 (cf Hooker's 'resented past').

(193) Diane Ravitch, The Schools we Deserve, p 183. See also her The Revisionists Revised, Basic Books, New York, 1978. Ravitch of course, rapidly attracted her own personal backlash, as it were: see, for example, Walter Feinberg et al, Revisionists Respond to Ravitch, The National Academy of Education, Washington DC, 1980.

(194) Ravitch, The Schools we Deserve, p 207.

(195) Carl F Kaestle, Pillars of the Republic: Common Schools and American Society 1780 - 1860, Hill and Wang, New York, 1983.

(196) Frank P Besag and Jack L Nelson, The Foundations of Education: Stasis and Change, Random House, New York, 1984.

(197) H Warren Button and Eugene F Provenzo Jr, History of Education and Culture in America, Prentice-Hall, Englewood Cliffs, NJ, 1983.

(198) Ibid, pp 343 - 344.

(199) Ibid, p 344.

(200) Ibid, p xv.

(201) Ibid, p 341.

(202) I am indebted to John Hardin Best for many of the points made in this paragraph: personal interview, Penn State University, 17 July 1985.

(203) John Hardin Best (ed), Historical Inquiry in Education, American Educational Research Association, Washington DC, 1983. This collection looks, inter alia, at institutional history, biographic study, quantitative history, oral history, women's history, history of childhood and of family life (in short, the agenda of the 1980s).

(204) William Reese, 'Neither Victims nor Masters: Ethnic and Minority Study', in Best (ed), Historical Inquiry, p 231.

(205) Sol Cohen (ed), Education in the United States, Random House, New York, 1974, five vols.

(206) Cohen, 'The History of the History...', p 324.

(207) Ibid, pp 324 - 325.

(208) Ibid, p 325. For a comprehensive contemporary review of the field see Douglas Sloan, 'Historiography and the History of Education', in Review of Research in Education, 1, 1973, pp 239 - 248.

(209) See for example, The Graduate Study of Education: Report of the Harvard Committee, Harvard UP, Cambridge, Mass., 1966, for an account of such tensions.

(210) Cohen, 'The History of the History...', p 326.

(211) For example, Professor Charles Willie, Harvard Graduate School of Education, personal interview, Boston, 18 June 1985.

(212) The writings of Ravitch, for example, should be seen in this context of dismay and anger over apparently declining standards in American education. The conventional view of teacher education is illustrated by an almost offhand comment in a recent issue of a scholarly journal: the training of teachers, in this view, 'tends to be largely irrelevant to teaching and quickly grows obsolete' (Paul Berman, 'The Next Step the Minnesota Plan', Phi Delta Kappan, Nov. 1985, p 188).

(213) I am indebted to Professor Harold Mitzel of the College of Education, Penn State University, for several of the points in this paragraph: personal interview, Penn State, 17 July 1985.

(214) The information in this section has been drawn from course outlines etc as embodied in the following Teachers College Bulletins:

3rd Series No 17, April 20, 1912
27th Series No 4, 1936
42nd Series No 3, July 1951
Series 62, Autumn and Spring Terms 1971-2
Series 76, Autumn, Spring and Summer Terms 1985-6,

and from interviews and discussions with faculty members, in particular Professor Douglas Sloan and Dr Terence Fredericks, during June and July 1985.

CHAPTER 4

The Development of formal teacher education in South Africa

In this chapter an attempt will be made to provide a context for the subsequent discussion, in Chapters 5 and 6, of the role of the study of the history of education in the training of teachers in South Africa. For such a discussion to be meaningful it is first necessary to trace the historical development of teacher education in this country, as was done for Britain and the USA in the previous two chapters. Since this theme has been relatively under-researched in this country, some detail will have to be entered into, particularly with regard to black teacher training. Where it seems relevant and helpful, comparisons will be drawn between the three countries, and note will be taken of British and American influences on the South African situation.

Attempts to apply Bailyn's 'retrospective analysis'(1) to a study of any aspect of the history of South African education are complicated by several factors which do not always apply to Britain and the USA. The most obvious of these is the presence of two strongly contrasting traditions in education, which may broadly be labelled 'Afrikaner nationalist' and 'English liberal'. Such a sweeping categorisation, of course, tends to obscure the fact that within each of these traditions there are a number of different approaches and 'schools' and that over time important new developments have taken place in each which further reduce the usefulness of such a simple dichotomous classification. Thus in due course this study will consider such significant trends as Fundamental Pedagogics and Metagogics which have arisen within the 'Afrikaner' tradition and the current revisionist challenge to the 'English liberal' tradition.

Secondly, there is the racial and ethnic stratification that has shaped South African education historically and that is still its most characteristic feature. This has had important implications for teacher education. Until the comparatively recent past, educational studies in South Africa concentrated on the white sector and neglected the black. Now, however, partly as a result of the crisis that has engulfed black education since 1976, the education of black South Africans has become a prime focus in educational studies.(2) At the risk of over-simplification, it is probably true to say that while social stratification and class inequalities have been major preoccupations of writers on modern British education, racial and ethnic conflict and inequalities are the major preoccupations of their South African counterparts. Racial and ethnic factors do, of course, bear upon the British and American education systems, but the problem there is of a different dimension. It is the formal and legalised structuring of South African education along racial lines that distinguishes the situation here in contrast to both Britain and America. An important additional difference is the existence in South Africa since Union in 1910 of two official languages together with several indigenous African languages, and the resulting issue of the medium of instruction.

For the sake of organisational convenience, and because of the divergent educational experiences of most South Africans, this chapter will consider the position of the two major race groups separately, while bearing in mind the caution that 'the racial fragmentation of the educational system does not imply that there is no single and basic dynamic informing the whole', and that one should not isolate 'black education', for example, in a tight compartment without addressing its relationship to the entire educational edifice.(3)

The origins of formal teacher training in South Africa

The nineteenth century was the formative period for South African

education, in teacher training no less than in other sectors. It was during this period, for example, that the dualism that characterises the education of whites was established in the Transvaal, with English and Dutch generally attending separate institutions and being taught in their mother tongues. In the Cape and Natal instruction through the medium of English was the general pattern. Dutch-medium schools did exist, but were few and far between. As the state system burgeoned, it became exclusively English, especially after the University of the Cape of Good Hope came into being in 1873. The first break-through for Dutch came in 1911 with the Cape school elementary examination. It was the Transvaal pattern, however, that came to dominate the national system after Union. It was also the period when the foundations of a racially segregated system were laid, a system marked from its inception by gross inequalities in access and provision and, very often, by differentiated curricula. There were, of course, exceptions to these general patterns: a surprisingly large number of white children attended black mission schools in the Cape, for example (4), and some white parents anxious to foster bilingualism deliberately sent their children to schools of the other language group, some Afrikaners actually preferring the private schools modelled on the British public schools.(5) But for the great majority, black and white, the general patterns held good, and do so to this day. Even in the relatively few dual-medium or parallel-medium white schools, 'National and political tensions seeped into us from all directions'.(6) It is, of course, inevitable that the divisions and tensions of the wider society are reflected in its educational system.

Teacher training for whites

Only a cursory survey is given here, since Kellermann, Niven and Nel and Duminy provide exhaustive accounts of the origins and development of formal teacher training for white South Africans.(7)

In tracing the origins and development of formal teacher training

for whites in nineteenth century South Africa, one may follow Malherbe in concentrating on the Cape system, 'since that system may be looked upon as the mother system... and whatever deviations may have been made by the other provinces when they instituted their own forms of certification, they followed the old Cape system very closely'.(8)

The first move towards state involvement in formal teacher training came in 1859 when the Cape administration placed the pupil-teacher system, adopted from the British practice (see Chapter 2), on a firmer financial basis by providing grants to pupil-teachers. Candidates had to be not less than 13 years old and had to serve an apprenticeship of five years. The supervising schoolmasters had to devote at least one hour daily, 'not within the stated school hours, to the instruction of the pupil-teachers under their charge in the subjects of examination'.(9)

In 1874 the training period was reduced to three years and supervising teachers received an additional grant for every candidate who passed the final examination for the elementary teacher's diploma. The compulsory subjects for examination were English, Reading, Writing, Arithmentic and School Management, with Dutch or 'Kafir' as optional subjects. In 1878 the Cape Education Department instituted a Middle Class Certificate, obtained after two years training and regarded as equivalent to the matriculation examination.

In Natal the pupil-teacher system was officially recognised in 1874. This involved teaching under supervision in the morning and study and instruction in method in the afternoons. After four years and the successful completion of the examinations in handwriting, arithmetic, spelling, English grammar, English history, geography, domestic economy and drawing, the candidates were awarded their Third Grade Certificate. In time this could be improved through private study to a Second Class Certificate, and then to a First Class Certificate after examination in one of Greek, Latin, German,

French, mathematics as a science.(10)

It is clear that, as in the case of Britain, the curriculum offered to pupil-teachers was an extremely circumscribed one, with nothing in it that might remotely be regarded as 'theory of education', and with no attention to the history of education as such. The emphasis was on content and teaching competence in the elementary school subjects. As happened in Britain, the pupil-teacher system in the Cape grew rapidly and constituted a major source of trained teachers well into the twentieth century. The other major source was the "importation" of trained teachers from overseas, particularly Britain.

The first Normal College in the Cape was established by the Dutch Reformed Church in 1878, following the setting up of a fund for the training of teachers (through the Acta der Synodi of 1862). The church had been active since the 1850s in promoting the pupil-teacher system (cf the role of the Church of England in the early days of teacher training in England). By the end of the century, further normal colleges had been established by the Cape Department of Education in Cape Town, Wellington and Grahamstown. Another ten colleges followed in other towns by 1919. As the number of training institutions increased, the pupil-teacher system declined and eventually ceased. Whereas in 1908 there had been 1 204 pupil-teachers and 680 students in colleges, by 1922 the position was reversed, with only 34 pupil-teachers as against 1 512 student teachers in colleges. One may note here that by 1925 the Cape Department had only four training institutions for Coloured teachers, and 14 'Native' institutions, both types being mostly run under the auspices of the English churches.(11)

The initial entry requirement for the Normal Colleges was Standard Four: this was raised in 1899 to Standard Five, in 1901 to Standard Six, in 1909 to Standard Seven, and in 1920 to Standard Eight. At first the entry requirement was the same for white and black student teachers, but by the time of Union the formal equality of standards ended. One may note here that the comparable dates for African

teacher training in the Transvaal are:

1905	Standard 3
1915	Standard 4
1924	Standard 5
1928	Standard 6 (12)

Discrepancy in formal qualifications remains one of the serious problems in South African teacher training.

The pupil-teacher system also operated in the British colony of Natal, and it was only in 1908 that the first institutions for the training of white teachers, the Natal Training College, was established in the former Governor-General's residence in Pietermaritzburg. This was fully half a century after the Natal Central Board of Education had first recommended the setting up of a college, although training classes had been run in conjunction with the Model Schools in both Pietermaritzburg and Durban since 1904. As late as 1922 there were still only 104 white student teachers in the province.(13) The primary teachers' course ran over two years, and was partly professional, partly academic. The first principal, R A Gowthorpe, is described as 'a firm believer in repetition, in correctness of statement, and in attention to detail. He used to drill into his students definitions and declarations which he believed contained essential pearls of wisdom'(14)

In the South African Republic (the Transvaal) before the South African War, some training was provided at State Girls School and the State Boys School, but the output was very small.(15) Apart from practical subjects the students studied Dutch, English, French, German, arithmetic, nature study, history, geography and hygiene.(16) In 1897 the Volksraad passed a law to make provision for a teacher training institution (Kweekschool ter Opleiding van Onderwyzers) but the outbreak of war intervened.(17) By 1899 the Transvaal had produced only 39 trained teachers with Third Class Certificates, which required merely a two year training post-Standard Six.(18) It was only after the war that the newly-established Transvaal Education Department, created by the

British administration, moved to set up Normal Colleges, in terms of the Public Education Ordinance of 1903. This provided for the establishment, maintenance, inspection and control of a system of state educational institutions, including Normal Schools for the training of teachers, and laid down that teachers in state schools from 1904 had to be certificated by the Director of Education.(19) Although the Pretoria Normal College tried to insist on Standard Ten as the minimum entry qualification, in practice it had to admit students who would complete Standard Ten only during their period of training.(20)

Prior to the South African War, the pupil-teacher system in the Orange Free State involved an apprenticeship of three years, with the state providing small grants. In 1899 a Normal College was founded in Bloemfontein, but the war put an end to this first attempt to establish a formal teacher training institution.(21)

The development of formal teacher training in South Africa, through the creation of training colleges and, as will be described below, the involvement of universities in teacher training, was much tardier than was the position in Britain and America. One obvious reason for this was the strong reliance on teachers imported from abroad, especially Britain in the case of the Cape and Natal in the nineteenth century and well into the twentieth, and in the Transvaal after the South African War. The Boer Republics had also relied greatly on teachers from Holland. The Volksraad's Law No 14 of 1896, for example, provided for the importation of additional Dutch teachers, with the expense to be borne by the state. The Superintendent of Education in the Transvaal, Dr N Mansvelt (1892-99), was himself a Hollander, but he pleaded for the training of teachers by the Transvaal:

> Ik beschouw het voor ons land van het hoogste belang dat terstond maatregelingen genomen worden om ons eigen onderwijzerspersoneel te vormen, ten einde niet langer van de onzekere en menigwerf ongewenschte hulp uit het buitenland afhankelijk te zijn.(22)

It may be noted here that in the case of African education, including teacher training, there was also until at least the Second World War a strong reliance on teachers from Britain and to a lesser extent other countries. These teachers were generally supplied by the different missionary societies. Another factor here was the importance, for both black and white education, of the Cape as a source of trained teachers. This can be illustrated by the numbers of students in training in the different provinces in 1921:

Cape	1436	
Transvaal	362	
OFS	136	
Natal	104	(23)

It was only in the 1920s that serious attempts were made to look to local sources of supply for trained teachers, and the long reliance on teachers from abroad not only had a retarding effect on teacher training but also, in the view of Brookes and Webb, fostered 'a colonial mentality'(24), with obvious implications for such matters as the content of the curriculum, in teacher training as in other branches of education. Since a great many of those involved in the training of teachers in South Africa had themselves been trained in Britain, it is only to be expected that their methods and the content of their courses followed closely on the British models described in Chapter 2. Although Britain provided the greatest degree of influence in the Cape and Natal, Dutch influences were also important in the former as well, of course, as in the northern republics. In the nineteenth century, for example, Dutch-speaking aspirant teachers in the Cape were expected to make a study of Denzel's textbook on the basic principles of education and teaching, first published in Amsterdam in 1836; the 'principles' dealt entirely with matters of school management and organisation, as well as offering uplifting remarks about the desirable characteristics of the teacher. The following is a typical example:-

> De onderwijzer moet altijd zijne kinderen met eene opgeruimde ziel, vrolijk gezigt en opgewekte gebaren voorkomen. Het gemoed der

> kleinen is voor het voorbijgaan der donkere wolken in het hoofd des onderwijzers zeer vatbaar, en hunne vrolijkheid, de eigentlijke levensbron voor het leeren, word gestoord, wanneer het gezigt des onderwijzers zware donkere trekken vertoon.(25)
>
> (The teacher must always approach his children with a cheerful spirit, happy face and lively gestures. The mood of the little ones is very susceptible to the passing of dark clouds across the teacher's forehead, and their joy, the real life source of their learning, is disturbed when the face of their teacher shows heavy, dark lines - my translation).

A detailed examination of the curriculum and the textbooks used in South African normal schools and training colleges is beyond the scope of the present enquiry: this is one of many examples of the lacunae in educational research in South Africa.

University involvement in white teacher training

The Cape colonial administration instituted the First Class Teachers Certificate from about 1892. It could be awarded to serving teachers of long experience and exceptional merit, without any specific requirements regarding training or examination.(26) The TC 1 was intended for senior secondary teachers, and by 1906 only six Cape teachers had been awarded the qualification. It was, however, to provide the basis for a postgraduate course of training introduced by the Union government in 1913. The entry requirement was a BA degree and the course itself ran for one-and-a-half years, with the certificate being awarded provisionally thereafter, pending a three year probationary period in a secondary school and the submission of a thesis 'giving proof of ability to present in an appropriate manner the result of an investigation into an eduational subject which requires the Minister's previous approval'.(27) This clearly represents a major adance in the intellectual demands placed on student teachers, and in fact was probably too stringent since by the time the qualification was abolished in 1923 only some 135 teachers in service had qualified for the TC 1. An interesting aspect of the abolition of the certificate was that this marked the

central government's withdrawal from white teacher training, this function henceforth being formally left to the provinces.

After Union in 1910 the central government assumed control of higher education, in terms of the Union of South Africa Act, delegating to the provinces responsibility for 'eduction other than higher'. This was a sop to the fears of both English- and Dutch-speaking whites concerning possible cultural domination by the other group, and the term was not clearly defined, leading to several conflicts and anomalies, one of which concerned teacher training.(28) The provinces continued to provide teacher training through normal schools and training colleges while, as indicted above, the central government for a while controlled the postgraduate TC 1. Increasingly, however, the newly established universities began to offer their own postgraduate teacher training. The first to do so was the University of Cape Town, which established a Department of Education headed by a professor in 1910, when the institution was still known as the South African College, although the Grey University College in Bloemfontein had actually established a chair of pedagogy the previous year.(29)

Under its first professor, the Englishman Fred Clarke, who was to play such an important role in the development of educational theory in Britain (30), in 1916 the new department incorporated the Cape Town Normal College, established by the Dutch Reformed Church in 1878, and in 1919, shortly after the South African College had become the University of Cape Town, the department became a full Faculty of Education. In the 1920s two degrees, the BEd and the PhD, were offered, and so were three certificates, the Secondary Teachers Certificate, the Higher Primary Teachers Certificate, and the Primary Teachers Certificate.(31)

Rhodes University, Grahamstown, founded in 1904, introduced courses in education from 1913, and in due course also established a Faculty. All South African universities were subsequently to provide both initial and in-service teacher education courses, in

some cases late and somewhat reluctantly. The University of the Witwatersrand, for example, created a Faculty of Education only in the early 1970s, as a result of the passing of the National Education Policy Act, No 39 of 1967, and the National Education Policy Amendment Act, No 73 of 1969, which laid down the requirement that all (white) secondary school teachers should be university trained (this can happen in conjunction with a college of education or a technikon).

At first the general distinction was that the provinces trained primary teachers, in training colleges, and the universities trained secondary teachers. That distinction was never, however, a hard and fast one, as has already been indicated. Some training colleges have provided courses for specialist teachers of subjects like art and physical education in the junior secondary school and some universities have run degree courses for primary teachers.

The first university education departments inevitably drew their inspiration from their counterparts in Britain, and, in the case of Afrikaans universities, from Holland and Germany. The English-medium universities were largely staffed by people trained in Britain, who brought with them the influences of that country, and their curricula were generally based on the 'mother' country's, while British textbooks provided the prescribed reading. Like their English counterparts, South African university students of education in the first two decades of the century pondered on the lives and thoughts of the Great Educators, underwent a rapid chronological survey of the periods of western education from classical Greece, and studied some child psychology. The writers who led them through the thicket of the history of education would have included R H Quick with his essays on the educational reformers, Oscar Browning, Adamson, Watson and Woodward, all familiar names from the second chapter of this work. Later would come Americans like Paul Monroe and John Dewey (see Chapter 3), and finally, for some in the later 1920s, might come the first significant South African historian of education, E G Malherbe.

Teacher training for blacks

As was the case in much of colonial Africa - and if one ignores the sporadic efforts at schooling under the Dutch East Indies Company at the Cape in the seventeenth and eighteenth centuries - the first formal schooling for blacks in South Africa was provided by Christian missionaries in the nineteenth century. The models for the education systems were taken from the countries from which the missionaries came, and are 'a clear example of the importation of non-African ideas to the continent'.(32)

Formal teacher training for Africans in South African also began with the missionaries, and it is a matter of historical interest that they were engaged in this enterprise some considerable time before the Cape colonial government provided teacher training for whites. Lovedale Seminary (named after Dr John Love, a founder of the London Missionary Society and later chairman of the Glasgow Missionary Society) was the first to provide a form of teacher training, as an outgrowth of its elementary school which began in 1824 and in line with its policy of training indigenous evangelists and teachers.(33) By 1839 the elementary school had 139 pupils and two years later the seminary was opened with an initial enrolment of eleven black and nine white male students. The whites were mainly the sons of the missionaries. The entrants had to be at least twelve years old and had to have had some elementary education, including a degree of proficiency in English. Lovedale's teacher training proper dates from 1851. In the early years the institution, which grew in time to include an industrial school and a co-eductional secondary school as well as the theological seminary and the Normal department, was regularly interrupted by the frontier wars and the output was low. The colonial authorities provided small grants-in-aid (£12 p.a.) for every African teacher trained by the missionary institutions. By 1863 Lovedale itself had trained about twenty African teachers. In 1882 the Inspector-General of Schools reported favourably on Lovedale as 'probably the greatest educational establishment in South Africa'.(34) At the same time he

commented very negatively on the great bulk of the colony's mission schools. According to Pells:

> Lovedale was now producing about 40 native teachers a year, and the other ten institutions a dozen or more between them. These teachers had passed Standard VI and had then learned a little more arithmetic, English, geography.... This gave them the Elementary Teachers Third Class Certificate. None of these teachers could teach any handwork.(35)

The records of the Cape Education Department, as analysed by Shepherd (36), reveal that between 1873 and 1876 Lovedale produced 184 passes in the ETC 3, the highest number in the colony. Among the African institutions only Healdtown (Wesleyan), which began with teacher training in 1853, was also able to produce a significant number of successful candidates. Between 1984 and 1886 Lovedale achieved 597 passes in Standards 3, 4 and 5, a higher number than was registered by any of the the other 700 schools in the Cape. Its nearest rival was the (white) Wellington Girls School with 411 passes.

It is important to note that, despite such impressive figures - which suggest that in the second half of the nineteenth century African education could compete successfully with white - there was very little opportunity for Africans to undertake post-elementary education. This position lasted well into the twentieth century. Apart from Lovedale's 'higher department', the only secondary courses available to Africans as late as the first decade of this century were provided by the teacher training courses at the various missionary institutions. In 1906 almost two-thirds of the Cape's African schoolchildren did not complete Standard One and only 2,5% were in or above Standard Five.(37) Many of these latter were, of course, undertaking the teacher training course, the entrance qualification for which had been gradually raised, to Standard Five in 1899 and to Standard Six in 1901 (compare the figures given earlier in this chapter for the Transvaal, where Standard Six was laid down as the entry requirement for African student teachers only in 1928). Many of those taking the ETC 3 followed it not so much because they wished to become teachers as because it offered their

only entry route into other white collar occupations, for example as clerks or interpreters.(38) On the other hand, the intention of the missionary institutions themselves was to train sufficient numbers of teachers to staff their rural mission schools, which were predominantly small lower primary establishments with only one or two teachers.

Lovedale was certainly not typical of the missionary institutions. In 1892 only 31% of African candidates entered from eleven centres for the ETC 3 managed to pass.(39) One of the problems was the curriculum: many people questioned the wisdom of including elements of a classical British public school course, particularly Greek and Latin (the rather wistful remark by Pells about the lack of handwork has already been noted, and a later section of this chapter will consider the question of a differentiated syllabus). James Stewart, principal of Lovedale from 1870 to 1905, was one of the critics. He scorned the strange combination of 'Greek and grout of Portland cement, Horace and the hodman's load of mortar'.(40) He emphasised moral education, practical training and the need for hard work:

> Nothing will lift you to any equality with other nations except that which the majority of the race do not like, and that is hard work, persevering effort, continuous exertion, whether of mind or body.(41)

The issue of the content of African education, whether in school or in teacher education, and the question whether or the extent to which it should be adapted and differentiated from that offered to the dominant group, is an important and complex one and will be discussed below, as will the question of a segregated education in which, it will by now have become obvious, the missionaries played a significant role through the very fact of the establishment of separate institutions for blacks (the presence of some white pupils at Lovedale and certain other leading missionary institutions does not alter the general pattern and in any case the practice had ceased by the end of the century, largely as a result of pressure from the colonial government). Before considering such issues, which are fundamental to the present study, it is first necessary to complete this brief historical sketch of the origins and development

of teacher training for Africans in South Africa.

In Natal, the first examinations for African teachers' certificates were held in 1887.(42) Candidates were drawn from teacher training colleges run in co[illegible]tion with mission schools. Adams College, near Amanzimtoti, was the first to offer some form of teacher training, in 1853, thus not long after the pioneering moves in the Cape, and once again well before the Natal colonial authorities provided formal teacher training for whites. It was, however, only in 1911 that proper teacher training courses were established at Adams, followed by St Chad's, Mariannhill and others. Prior to that, the 'course' was merely an adaptation of the ordinary elementary curriculum, with an examination paper on teaching methods for those who wished to become teachers. After 1911 the course also involved teaching practice in a day school attached to the college, with some attention being paid to the 'principles' of education, method, and such matters as school organisation, marking and departmental returns. As in the British training colleges, the Methods Master played an important role: he arranged demonstration classes and listened to his students presenting model lessons. The emphasis throughout was on the practical skills required in the classroom, and there was little or no attention to 'theory of education' as such.

Myeza gives an exhaustive account of the development of African teacher training in Natal, highlighting the differences between the Protestant and Catholic institutions. This is not relevant to the present study, but one may note in passing that the influences that shaped African teacher training in South Africa came not only from Britain but also from the USA, through the American Board of Commissioners for Foreign Mission (commonly abbreviated to the 'American Board', and later known as the United Church Board of World Ministeries) which supplied Adams College with teaching staff for many years as well as establishing other schools, several with teacher training departments, in many parts of Zululand. The work of the American Board was influenced by the self-help philosophy of

Booker T Washington and the Tuskegee Institute, with important implications for the curriculum. Other influences came from Europe via the Catholics, including the Trappists who founded Mariannhill near Durban, which provided the base for the establishment of St Francis College in 1915. St Francis was one of the foremost African teacher training colleges in the country until the closure of the training department in 1973. Other leading Catholic institutions included St Joseph's, founded by the Benedictines near Vryheid in 1923, and St Bruno's, founded by the Dominican Sisters near Newcastle in 1923: both these colleges had only a short history in the field of teacher training as they were forced to close in 1956 as a direct consequence of the Bantu Education Act, which aimed at bringing control over African education under the state. Denominational influences in African teacher education and indeed in African education as a whole represents another of the many lacunae in the history of South African education, and could offer an interesting field for research.

It was not only the Catholic Church that introduced diverse European influences. The Norwegian Missionary Society, for example, started a Bible School at Umpumulo in 1893 which gradually developed into an important teacher training institution. The first African teacher training college in the Transvaal was begun by the Lutherans (the Berlin Missionary Society) at Botshabelo in 1926, and in the Orange Free State by the Anglicans at Modderpoort in 1928: previously Africans from these provinces, and from other parts of southern Africa, attended colleges in the Cape and Natal.

The significance of the various missionary societies in the provision of formal education, including teacher training and higher education, for Africans in South Africa over a period of about a century and a half cannot really be over-emphasised. By the mid-1940s, for example, Adams had a post-matriculation course which was transferred by the Natal Education Department to St Francis College, Mariannhill, in 1949, since the latter offered a Teachers' Third Class Senior Certificate course. This included four BA

courses of the University of South Africa. By 1957, the college had trained approximately 4 000 men and women teachers and its staff had published textbooks on school organisation and teaching methods, on agriculture, home economics, physiology and hygiene. These books were recognised by the Natal Education Department and were also used in teacher training courses in the other three provinces and in the British High Commission Territories of Basutoland (now Lesotho), Bechuanaland (now Botswana) and Swaziland.(43)

This picture represents a considerable advance on the position at the time of the report of the Phelps-Stokes Commission of 1921-22, which summarised its impression of the teacher training course at the best of the institutions, Lovedale, in these words:

> The teacher training course covers three years, requiring completion of the sixth standard for entrance. The first year is largely a repetition of the academic work of Standard 4, the second year repeats the work of Standard 5, and the third year that of Standard 6. The course fails to provide a sufficient amount of practice teaching, and the constant repetition of lower standard subjects not only excludes the possibility of advanced study, but also develops an indifference on the part of the student that is very noticeable. In this respect the attitude of the training college pupils was in striking contrast with the more active and alert attitude of the high school pupils.(44)

The contribution of the missionaries to African education must be seen in the context of the relative neglect of the field by colonial administrations, and, in the case of South Africa, of the central government in the first few dacades of Union. At the same time it is important to recognise that when full state control came in this country through the implementation of the Bantu Education Act, this did not altogether represent a complete break with the past, but that there were clear continuities with the education provided by the missionaries. These included segregation in education, and an adapted curriculum. These issues arise in the history of education throughout Africa, wherever Christian missionaries initiated formal, western education.(45) They form the subject of the next section of this chapter.

'The Head of the Native' : adaptation and segregation

Many white colonists in the nineteenth century and well into the twentieth century were opposed to the very idea of providing any formal education for Africans, particularly of an academic nature. It would 'spoil' them, render them unfit for their 'proper' occupations of manual or domestic labour, give them ideas above their station, make them dissatisfied, reduce the amount of money available for the education of whites, estrange them from their own communities, cause them to become mere imitators ('apeing the white man') or, more seriously, provide them in time with the means to compete on equal terms with their masters and rulers.(46)

This 'debate' need not detain us here. What is more important and relevant for the purposes of the present study is the issue of the proper content of 'native education', including teacher training. In essence this involves the question whether such education should simply follow European models as transplanted into colonies, or whether it should be adapted to local needs and circumstances, and, if so, to what extent.(47)

Underlying such questions are a number of problems of interpretation, including an interpretation of the role of the missionaries in providing education. Were they noble altruists and selfless servants of the Gospel, or were they, wittingly or unwittingly, the agents of colonial and capitalist exploitation? The question is probably unanswerable, since evidence can be produced to build a case for either answer. It is obvious that moral judgments are involved, and that one needs to take as objective a view as possible. The role of the missionaries will be considered in some detail here, because an understanding of their role is fundamental to an understanding of the subsequent development of the South African education system, as has already been hinted above.

At one extreme there is the eulogistic view represented by Horrell:

> It was the missionaries who first brought formal education to the Africans in South Africa. Their original purpose was to provide elementary education as an ancilliary to evangelisation, but in so doing they began the process of sharing with Africans not only their knowledge of the true God but also the treasures of more highly developed civilisations. The dedicated work of the early missionaries, serving in remote rural areas, began to equip African tribesmen to play a worthy part, side by side with members of other races, in the development of the country they shared...(48)

Cross has made the point that theological arguments alone are not adequate to understand the complexity of the missionary enterprise.(49) At the other extreme from Horrell's uncritical view is the almost total condemnation expressed by Majeke (50) and, more recently, Molteno.(51) A more balanced conclusion is provided by writers like Etherington (52) and Cock. In the latter's view:

> Missionary education was an important agency for social control, socialising blacks into a respect for the coloniser's culture. But it would be a gross oversimplification to present this as the whole picture. Majeke argues that the missionaries played a crucial role in securing white dominance, and certainly they did help 'to build up a whole system of new ideas, new needs, and desires, new allegiances, new authorities and a new morality, all leading to an acceptance of the new civilisation by the Africans'. But they also generated pressures which would in time challenge white dominance. Thus missionary education operated in a complex and contradictory way, tying women to subordinate roles but at the same time liberating them from the particular subordination of tribal society by introducing them to new occupational roles - which implied a revolutionary new level of independence and earning capacity. Domestic service, as well as teaching and nursing, offered something of an escape from rural poverty and the constraints of traditional society. And for a minority, missionary education involved an exposure to ideas which questioned the fundamentals of both tribal and colonial inequality.(53)

It is the 'complex and contradictory' nature of missionary education that needs to engage our attention here: its effects were both negative and positive, both repressive and liberating.

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.